



ukgovcamp

Session: 4

Room: Committee Room 2

Session title :

Session leader :

Volunteer to continue conversation after :

Notes taken by : Asil Sidahmed

Notes

How do you know if the people who need your service are using it?

You can't tell if the people aren't using it properly.

In the case of Student loans - reaching a wide range of people.

Do you know? And how do you find out which people aren't reaching your service?

What if people don't know what it is to look for?

West midlands - we keep developing digital services yet region with least internet access.

We know the problem - the solution is known though.

GOVUK has strayed. It was supposed to be a one stop shop.

Bereavement services are a one stop shop example. But how would I know that?
A lot of consolidation happened in the first five years.

One of the government's aims is to join up more and share more data.
Gov and local authorities are independent of each other so it takes massive political will to do that.

Gov services - everything must work for everybody. However how do we define "everybody"?

Any thoughts on who you are not reaching and how you would reach them?

The way we might recruit people for research is inherently digital.

We needed to get hold of people that couldn't get access to services. We went to local drop ins and local charities. This was a difficult set of interviews - but it was ground work and there were extremes.

Let's hope people come back to us.

When working in silos - you need cross communication across - cross cutting communities.

Knowing when we are all planning to ask the same question to the same communities.

It would be useful if there were a central research library.

However, user researchers would argue that is outside of context. Therefore would recommend to have a repo that helps you have the knowledge, context and information.

DEFRA librarian, just in pharma has been very hard. So across govt would be hard.

Challenges: Stall of data, when research happened. Putting them in a place and where it happened. Digital library clarification (not a physical library on Marsham street).

Important to retain working together aspect of working with communities.

Digital services could be catalogued too as there are a number of overlaps in local gov and national.

Everybody wants to see each other's information and don't want to share theirs.

Your response to that quite rightly is, No. However it could be interesting to solve this: can you show us the similarities between users. Go away and do your own user research.

How do you know who is not trying to access your service? That they need a service and how do they get to their benefits.

Phone calls - people struggling often call.

Child care entitlements HMRC call centre. Data agreements means we can't see their data.

Inclusion team?

Customer inclusion, accessibility group triangulation. Able to triangulate evidence.

Find a customer inclusion team - they have a lot of impact and gravitas.

There are four categories of calls on helplines.

People who are not phoning call centres.

Service providers are frustrated because when you get the service right you realise there are people that you are not reaching.

SWIFT system in the west midlands - is hugely expensive. For people that only use cash. Cash collecting systems are expensive - but they use it on that small group.

What is a need and what is reasonable for what a private sector org to do? There are limits and budgets come into it.

Insights from places like a car park in Glasgow - may allow us to find true needs.

Inheritance tax - complex service you need to be able to pull every type of string. They had regular meetings with charities who struggle with tax. Groups like that can be useful. If a person struggles with tax might struggle with other areas.

We are putting a lot on professionals to know how to use those services. We often assume a person next to someone will help them use a digital service.

The service going to the people rather than the people going to the service.
At ASDA a service came to the car park to do cancer screening.

The thing that strikes me is that there is a governmental organisation and culture.
Digital services do save money but that's not enough.
The implicit vision we pitch to solve - we need to include the end good. Not just mitigation of the end bad.

When we measure services, the end good how do we measure that?

Psychological safety - people are afraid of being criticised so don't want their services assessed.

It is hard to know the difference if you don't know the before.

GDS used to blog a lot more about the things that it did. Things that didn't work. Now the culture has changed.

HAs that happened outside of GDS - eg in local government.

Is this in danger of becoming permanent? When was it the last time we said - lets make sure we do this properly in GDS? GDS feels stuck in the time that it originated.

Some decision makers don't want certain groups to be included. Eg: sometimes gov happy that some people aren't collecting benefits they're entitled to.

Service standards need to be in the organisation everywhere - we get missions where we aren't even doing alphas.

IT developers talk about accessibility and that can put them in trouble with decision makers. The culture has gone backwards.

A team needs to be a bit malleable with senior people open to those thoughts.

Is culture part of the problem and why we're dealing with these issues?

GDS used to be an enabler for great work. Became a victim of its success - "Just do the framework" attitude rather than have good ideas.

GOVUK resolved in - there is a further phase of maturity to do next which is to be a small a agile. With roles clarified. But space for innovation.

Sustainability service standard being introduced.

Many of gov UK standards focus on what you can put on it. Because people learned via geo cities - in an html format. We are not trying to deal with the same problem - now it is about large information shaping actions and patterns of behaviour. Different from a footer on a website. Context is so different.

The most vulnerable