**NOTES**

attention but are not the best when it comes to providing solutions, especially as they pertain to citizens’

qualitative research methods and direct user feedback

usually provide more actionable insights, quantitative data are needed to understand the extent to which

the data coming from non-representative samples can be generalised to the whole population

Transforming data into insight requires using service performance data from various sources (e.g.

satisfaction surveys, user research, citizens’ and users’ feedback, objective performance indicators, etc.)

to model the experience of a user with a service.

Surveys by individual service providers can be useful to describe the profile of users (e.g. socio-economic

background) and their recent experience with the service. Typically, these surveys ask citizens and users

about the accessibility (e.g. affordability, availability of channels, access to information and clarity of

procedures), responsiveness (e.g. courtesy of staff and timeliness) and quality (e.g. quality of

infrastructure, competence of staff and outcome) of services that they have used. These surveys target

service users: thus, only individuals who have successfully accessed (and likely, used) the service are

included

### **3. Netherlands:** Gemeentelijke Burgerpeiling **(Municipal Citizen Survey)**

* **Description**: Standardized national survey framework used by municipalities to collect feedback on service quality.
* **Focus**: Benchmarks citizen satisfaction across regions (e.g., safety, public transport).
* **Example**: Rotterdam uses results to prioritize infrastructure investments.
* **Source**: [Dutch Association of Municipalities (VNG)](https://vng.nl).

### **4. Germany:** Bürgerzufriedenheitsstudien **(Citizen Satisfaction Studies)**

* **Description**: Conducted at federal and state levels to evaluate services like healthcare, unemployment support, and digital administration.
* **Focus**: Includes metrics like waiting times and transparency.
* **Example**: Berlin’s Zufriedenheit mit Verwaltungsleistungen (Satisfaction with Administrative Services) survey.
* **Source**: [German Federal Statistical Office (Destatis)](https://www.destatis.de).

### **5. South Korea:** Minwon24 **(Civil Petitions System)**

* **Description**: A digital platform for citizens to submit complaints, suggestions, or feedback on public services (e.g., tax, licensing).
* **Focus**: Real-time tracking of service resolution rates and user satisfaction.
* **Example**: Over 1.2 million petitions processed annually, with 90% resolution rate.
* **Source**: [Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS)](https://www.mois.go.kr).

### **6. Singapore:** REACH **(Government Feedback Unit)**

* **Description**: A national platform for citizens to share opinions on policies and services via surveys, forums, and social media.
* **Focus**: Used to shape policies like healthcare subsidies and public housing.
* **Example**: Our Singapore Conversation initiative gathered 47,000 citizen inputs in 2013.
* **Source**: [REACH Singapore](https://www.reach.gov.sg).

### **7. United States:** American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) for Government

* **Description**: Measures citizen satisfaction with federal agencies (e.g., IRS, Social Security Administration).
* **Focus**: Combines survey data with performance metrics (e.g., processing times, accuracy).
* **Example**: The VA improved healthcare access after scoring low on ACSI in 2018.
* **Source**: [ACSI Federal Government Report](https://www.theacsi.org).

### **8. Estonia:** e-Governance Feedback System

* **Description**: Integrated into the country’s digital services (e.g., e-tax, e-health) to collect user experience ratings.
* **Focus**: Drives iterative improvements to digital platforms.
* **Example**: Feedback led to simplified e-residency application processes.
* **Source**: [Estonia e-Government Academy](https://ega.ee).

### **9. Japan:** Government Satisfaction Survey **(行政サービス満足度調査)**

* **Description**: Annual survey by the Ministry of Internal Affairs on satisfaction with services like disaster response and pensions.
* **Focus**: Identifies regional disparities in service quality.
* **Example**: Post-2011 tsunami surveys improved disaster preparedness systems.
* **Source**: [Japanese Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIC)](https://www.soumu.go.jp).

### **10. France:** Baromètre de la Qualité des Services Publics

* **Description**: National barometer tracking satisfaction with public services (e.g., hospitals, transport, courts).
* **Focus**: Highlights areas needing investment (e.g., rural healthcare access).
* **Source**: [Interministerial Directorate for Public Transformation (DITP)](https://www.modernisation.gouv.fr).

Even where

These measures can be collected at the point of service or…

User-reported outcomes

A key \*\*\*

e.g. in OECD report

international measures of perceptions

“Patient-Reported Experience Measures (PREMs)”

**Canada’s “Citizen First” Surveys:**

**New Zealand’s “KiwiCount” Surveys:**

User Feedback: Citizen satisfaction surveys, complaint resolution rates, or net promoter scores (NPS).

Even where these surveys are not used to … they are still useful

***Table 3.*** *Citizen Feedback Systems*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | System | Description | Description |
| **Sweden** | Medborgarpanelen  (Citizen Panel) | *A representative panel of citizens regularly provides feedback on public services (e.g., healthcare, education, transport).* | *Measures satisfaction, trust, and perceived quality of services.* |
| **Denmark** | Den Nationale Borgerundersøgelse (National Citizen Survey) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Australia has the Report on Government Services.

Public services as opportunities for public participation: Governments are seeing public

services as an opportunity to engage citizens in exercising their rights, building trust, and holding

governments accountable for upholding democratic values such as openness and inclusion.

France is improving public services by collaborating with citizens to identify avenues to improve

and engage civil society organisations in the development of better services.

An international comparative Survey on the Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions was conducted by the OECD in 2021 and 2023, part of the Organisation’s Reinforcing Democracy Initiative. It questioned responsdnet on attitudes toward national, regional and local govenrent, law and orer instituoisn, and satisfaction with healthcare and education systems, adminsitratinve services, and trust in the use of personal data by public agencies. While finding wide variation between countries and demographics, the Survey results indicated that a key driver of trust is the perceived responsiveness of public institutions to evidence in decision making, and to to public feedback. reliability, fairness and openness

**Digitally Indexing Trust in Government Services**

In many countries, digital government units have taken on central roles in the co-ordination of service-improvement strategies across various government departments, guided by a *user experience* approach to design and delivery (Baredes, 2022).

**Digital Life Events Service**

First, the public sector provides a wide range of services. As a result, it is challenging to ensure

performance is consistent among all services provided, especially given the fact that many services are

provided at the local level and are beyond the control of the central/federal government. For this reason, some policies make an explicit choice to focus on a subset of them, in order to monitor their performance

on a regular basis and ensure that they provide a seamless and integrated experience to citizens and

users.

making services comparable in order to benchmark their performance and to identify good

practices that can be reapplied (with the objective of providing a seamless experience to citizens and

users) is one of the main challenges for practitioners2

The comparability of services could be enhanced

by classifying them by the type of need they address and/or how users come into contact with the service

In many countries, digital transformation strategies have been oriented around a user experience approach to service-improvement, with digital government units

central agencies are required to provide advice and support to the agencies

that deliver public services at the central/federal level on how to gather feedback from users and how to

improve their services following citizens’ and users’ feedback. They must also provide tools that can be

reapplied by several services (this can be anything from modules to gather feedback that can be reused

in agencies’ websites to templates to assess the agencies’ capacity to deliver services). The key idea is to

support agencies in embedding citizens’ and users’ feedback in their decision-making processes to ensure

that they deliver on the aspects that matter the most to citizens and users

However, there are issues in using an overall satisfaction indicator to compare the performance of services

at the central/federal level. First, a single overall satisfaction judgement does not indicate what standards

an individual is using to assess their experience or whether they are comparable across services. For

example, to assess their satisfaction with health care, a person may focus on how clean the health care

facilities were, while for education the same individual may emphasise their child’s grades when evaluating

their satisfaction with education. Second, a persons’ reported satisfaction may be more revealing of the

subjectivity of the person who emits the opinion (e.g. their expectations or their prejudices, which relate to

the person’s socioeconomic background and experiences) than of the performance of the service itself.

Similarly, overall satisfaction indicators do not provide granular or actionable insights that can drive

improvements in service delivery

These transformations included the introduction of citizen-surveys. As services liberalised in the 1980s

and 1990s, complaint mechanisms were often set up. In addition citizens and customers charters were

implemented to set standards that public organisations had to reach and maintain (Van de Walle, 2018[11]).

More recently, satisfaction with public services has become a key indicator of the quality of governance in

the international agenda. System responsiveness… As a result of these efforts to deliver for citizens, many mechanisms for collecting feedback and satisfaction

data from users have become omnipresent. Most countries now have a complex system of surveys to

gather data on satisfaction, as is the case in Norway In Norway, multiple surveys on satisfaction with services exist. Since 2010, the Norwegian Agency for

Public and Financial Management (DFØ) has conducted the Citizen Survey, which aims to collect data

on citizens’ experience and satisfaction with services. Respondents that had used a particular service

(e.g. hospitals), were prompted to answer a specific “User Survey” that enquired about their experience

with the service. This included aspects such as quality, accessibility, benefits, information and

communication, consumer orientation, competence, trust, and overall satisfaction

Australia’s Citizen Experience Survey

Switzerland’s National eGovernment Study that supports the monitoring of the eGovernment Strategy of

Switzerland8. It seeks to monitor the penetration of digital government in society and businesses, and

assess users’ level of trust and satisfaction with online services.

Expectations are highly subjective and may vary

between individuals, even when they receive a similar service. For example, respondents who interact

more frequently with the government (and who possibly have higher awareness of their own rights and of

their government’s obligations) have higher expectations of what constitutes good quality compared to the

rest of the population

Table 1. Countries’ surveys on satisfaction with services

81% of the change in satisfaction across countries and years can be

associated with a change in the objective performance of services as measured by the 22 indicators

from Government at a Glance.

**Designing a monitoring system including satisfaction indicators alongside other more objective**

**measures of the performance of services,**

A performance monitoring system should have a distinct user focus, which entails being clear about what

characteristics users (of the service and of performance information) value and the standards they expect

(Pidd, 2012[39]). ‘Value’ involves what matters to individuals as well as the wider society or institution. Most

public agencies at the central/federal level have a dual monitoring system. One system is specific to them,

to track the achievement of their own key objectives for which they have expert knowledge (e.g. increasing

tax compliance and enhancing tax collection for the tax authorities). The other is related to the experience

they deliver to citizens and users, for which they need to cooperate with other agencies (e.g. the tax

administration’s would need to cooperate with the motor-vehicle registration in the journey of selling a used

car to ensure that citizens and companies do not need to provide the same information several times).

These two monitoring systems are not mutually exclusive, as long as their contribution to the work of each

agency responsible for delivering services is clear.

Satisfaction is one of the most common indicators of service performance because it reflects citizens’ and

users’ experience with services, and it is faster (and cheaper) to collect and disseminate than objective

measures of performance. For this reason, satisfaction surveys have proliferated in the public

administration. Most countries now have two types of surveys. One type is conducted by individual service roviders (e.g. the health insurance administration) and can focus on each individual service they provide.

The second type is conducted by the central government (as shown in the example of Norway

Surveys by individual service providers can be useful to describe the profile of users (e.g. socio-economic

background) and their recent experience with the service. Typically, these surveys ask citizens and users

about the accessibility (e.g. affordability, availability of channels, access to information and clarity of

procedures), responsiveness (e.g. courtesy of staff and timeliness) and quality (e.g. quality of

infrastructure, competence of staff and outcome) of services that they have used. These surveys target

service users: thus, only individuals who have successfully accessed (and likely, used) the service are

included

Central surveys can address the population in general and explore the barriers of access to services,

identifying groups that struggle to have their needs met by the public administration. Central surveys can

focus on user journeys or life events (e.g. losing the ability to work, getting married), asking citizens and

users how they solved their needs (e.g. how many agencies they interacted with, what for, etc.)

Yet, while these surveys can provide an accurate account of the trends in the performance of public

services, overall satisfaction ratings summarise a wide range of aspects of service performance (e.g.

accessibility, responsiveness and service quality) that need to be unpacked to inform decision-making.

Satisfaction data can contribute to stimulating discussions about service performance trends and alert

decision-makers to take action.

However, without other indicators or sources of data, such data may not

provide insight into what specific aspects are underperforming or what improvements are needed (e.g. if

certain groups of the population are not able to access a service because it is not affordable for them,

should they receive a subsidy? should fees be reduced? are there any other reasons why the service is

so costly?).

A complete performance measurement system for public services should include process (e.g. waiting

times in hospitals), output (e.g. survival rates), service quality (e.g. satisfaction with the service), and

outcome (e.g. are people better off as a result of the service?) measures to give a balanced view of the

performance of the institution, reflecting the most important aspects of the mission of an organisation (Pidd,

2012[39]). However, different sources of data (and indicators) can provide diverging pictures of the actual

performance of the agency. Therefore, more time is needed to analyse and reconcile these sources of

information and to draw insights that can help in improving services.

Usually, quantitative data allow governments to identify the areas where there is a problem that needs

attention but are not the best when it comes to providing solutions, especially as they pertain to citizens’

and users’ experience with a service. Indeed, qualitative research provides a better understanding of the

feelings, motivations and experiences of users, which can more easily provide insights into user pain

points. It is important to bear in mind that while qualitative research methods and direct user feedback

usually provide more actionable insights, quantitative data are needed to understand the extent to which

the data coming from non-representative samples can be generalised to the whole population

Transforming data into insight requires using service performance data from various sources (e.g.

satisfaction surveys, user research, citizens’ and users’ feedback, objective performance indicators, etc.)

to model the experience of a user with a service.

The Serving Citizens Framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Access | Responsiveness | Quality |
| Affordability | Courtesy and treatment | Effective delivery or services & outcomes |
| Geographic proximity | Match of services to special needs | Consistency in service delivery & outcomes |
| Accessibility of information | Timeliness | Security (safety) |

PC

A complete performance measurement system for public services should include process (e.g. waiting

times in hospitals), output (e.g. survival rates), service quality (e.g. satisfaction with the service), and

outcome (e.g. are people better off as a result of the service?) measures to give a balanced view of the

performance of the institution, reflecting the most important aspects of the mission of an organisation (Pidd,

2012[39]).

1. Set frameworks to measure user experience and service performance, by:

a) undertaking regular, robust surveys of users and the public to understand needs,

expectations, experiences and satisfaction with services, and to examine the aspects of user

experience which influence satisfaction;

b) regularly gathering other sources of user feedback, such as complaints and user interviews,

to further identify issues affecting satisfaction with services;

c) setting service delivery standards, with inputs from stakeholders, and regularly tracking

performance against those standards, using defined and transparent methodologies;

d) regularly assessing administrative burden and complexity of services, improvements

achieved, and needs for further simplification and transformation;

e) adopting common survey measurement tools and methodologies across service providers to

ensure consistent and comparable findings, and support cross-agency co-ordination in

delivering improvements.

2. Collect and analyse data which provide a holistic and inclusive view of service design and

delivery from the perspective of users and the public, recognising the diversity of expectations and

experiences of different people, by:

a) collecting and analysing data on user experience and service performance for all services for

which it is practical, particularly services linked to life events which require accessing services

from multiple service providers;

b) systematically reviewing the experiences and identifying the needs and expectations of

groups in vulnerable and disadvantaged conditions, by disaggregating analysis by

demographic and other relevant characteristics of users, and looking for issues caused by

intersecting characteristics;

c) systematically collecting, and analysing data on the user experience with, and service

performance of, different delivery channels, including digital, physical and telephone;

d) analysing the needs, expectations and barriers affecting persons who cannot or do not access

the services which are available to them.

3. Engage with stakeholders to improve service performance, by:

a) publishing complete and transparent information on service performance, including where

possible both intended and unintended policy impacts, at regular and pre-defined intervals,

covering all performance targets, which is open by default to all stakeholders;

b) communicating clearly on how public sector entities will use data on user experience and

service performance to improve future performance;

c) implementing mechanisms to allow the public to be involved in service design and

improvement, including by making performance data re-usable by the public;

d) providing effective feedback channels from users to the public administrations, in order to

better understand and target service delivery problems.

4. Use experience and service performance data as a core input and guide on how to improve

services, building an effective feedback loop to improve service design and delivery by:

a) instituting management practices to help ensure user experience and service performance

data is used to identify potential improvements in service delivery; ) incorporating user experience and service performance data into service design and review

processes, identifying observed or potential performance issues and examining options to

resolve or mitigate them;

c) ensuring that data collection is cost-effective, sustainable, and automated where possible to

limit reporting burden and increase frequency.

GOVERNMENT AT A GLANCE

Estonia set concrete numeric targets for trust in the national and local government and the Riigikogu (Parliament), currently derived from Eurobarometer, as monitoring indicators in their “Estonia 2035” long-term development strategy.

**UN EGDI report:**

t is recommended that Governments clearly define their national KPIs and introduce regular internal and external auditing, monitoring, and evaluation processes, as well as other observational and assessment tools such as user surveys, mystery shoppers and sentiment analysis using social media and big data. This process involves systematically collecting and analysing data to assess how well digital government initiatives are meeting their objectives and serving constituents.

Praia handbook:

Non-discrimination and equality: distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference or other differential treatment

Participation: ways in which individuals take part in the conduct of political and public affairs

Openness: extent to which public institutions provide access to information and are transparent in their decision- and policy-making processes

Access to and quality of justice: ability of people to defend and enforce their rights and obtain just resolution of justiciable problems

Responsiveness: This chapter focuses on whether people have a say in what government

does and whether they are satisfied with the government’s performance.

Absence of corruption:

Trust:

Safety and security

Digital Tools: Countries like South Korea and Estonia integrate feedback directly into e-government platforms.

Challenges: Response bias (e.g., overrepresentation of vocal minorities) remains a critique.

Several existing examples illustrate how feedback metrics can effectively measure service quality. The OECD's "Government at a Glance" report highlights countries employing citizen satisfaction surveys and feedback loops as standard practice. For instance, South Korea’s Government 3.0 initiative leverages digital platforms to gather real-time feedback on public services, while Canada’s Treasury Board Secretariat uses regular public opinion research to assess service performance across departments.

-A trust index for government services formalises the methodology for aggregating various sources of data …

-individual v collective services

Further consideration should be made of which services are considered as preventative services. An imputed valuation for the preventative service A should then be used where this is the product of the probability in reduction in use of service B and the actual discounted cost of service B.

**Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands are promoting “Improving civic participation through emerging technologies”, a project funded by the European Commission under the Technical Support Instrument (23PT04). Since 2023, the OECD Observatory of Public Sector Innovation, together with the OECD Open Government Unit, have been working on the project as implementation partners. This project aims to support Portugal, the Netherlands, and Spain in enhancing civic participation using emerging technologies with the objective of:**

**Exploring the potential benefits and challenges of these technologies for innovative civic participation**

**Adopting civic participation methods to design, monitor, and assess innovative solutions to priority policy challenges identified during the project.**

**Trust in public administration in Finland**

**On assignment of the Government and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and**

**Development (OECD) and the Finnish Government, Statistics Finland conducts an inquiry measuring citizens' trust in Finland's public administration, as well as satisfaction with the quality of public services.**

**The inquiry is carried out appended to the Consumer Confidence Survey in October 2023. The inquiry is part of the OECD's international assessment comparing trust in public administration in different European countries.**

[**https://www.apsc.gov.au/aps-data-digital-and-cyber-workforce-plan-2025-30-has-been-released**](https://www.apsc.gov.au/aps-data-digital-and-cyber-workforce-plan-2025-30-has-been-released)

**From G3 to G4**

Digital and innovative foundations for efficient public services: Governments are investing in

scalable digital infrastructure, experimenting with emergent technologies (such as automation, AI

and modular code), and expanding innovative and digital skills to make public services more

efficient. Italy’s national social security institute is using AI to sort and classify messages, improving

response times and empowering public servants to focus and prioritise urgent citizen needs.

Personalised and proactive public services for accessibility and inclusion: Governments are

making public services more personalised and proactive to better meet people's needs and

expectations, reduce psychological costs and administrative frictions, ensuring they are more

accessible, inclusive and empowering, especially for persons and groups in vulnerable and

disadvantaged circumstances. The United States made assistance for disaster survivors more

accessible, reducing the administrative burdens and cutting assistance registration times by over

15%.

Data-powered public services for better decision-making: Governments are drawing on

traditional and non-traditional data sources to guide public service design and execution. They are

increasingly using experimentation to navigate highly complex and unpredictable environments.

In Korea, sensory data in urban spaces are being used to improve the quality, safety and

attractiveness of public transportation.

Governments are moving beyond the use of traditional data sources, such as internal records, official

statistics and surveys, which have certain drawbacks, such as infrequent updates, narrow scopes, self-

reporting bias or inconsistent coverage

Non-traditional and unstructured data sources, such as sensor, satellite imagery and big textual data,

enable governments to obtain richer, real-time insights that complement existing monitoring mechanisms

and reduce time lags associated with conventional feedback loops. Among the relevant innovations in this

area are the United Kingdom’s InnOvaTe Programme (see Box 5.2), which uses some 3,000 sensors and

a centralised data hub to monitor different public spaces and services; Korea’s approach to IoT (see Case

Study 4), focusing on mobility and pedestrians’ safety; and, Sierra Leone’s Integrated Geographical

System Portal (IGIS) cross-sectoral spatial data infrastructure, which helps the government implement

policies and interventions towards the Sustainable Development Goals. In Singapore, whole-of-

government platforms for the analysis of unstructured textual data, which use natural language processing

tools, speech-to-text transcription and video analytics, make it possible for every public servant to analyse

and make sense of non-traditional data.

Personalised and proactive

public services for accessibility and

inclusion

Use of artificial intelligence in government A.3.2 National AI strategies (UN EGDI)

n Italy, more than 22 million people receive their pensions and more than 25 million workers are insured

through the National Institute of Social Security (INPS). One of the country’s largest public service

organisations, INPS had more than 20,000 employees and 448 territorial offices across the country as of

2022. It is one of the main points of contact between citizens and Italy’s public administration, and one of

the main channels that citizens use to communicate with INPS is certified emails.

When the COVID-19 pandemic drastically limited in-person visits, INPS employees saw a surge in digital

communication via certified emails. Previously, employees handled these requests manually, sorting the

emails by subject and forwarding them to the appropriate departments, a time-consuming process. With

more than 500 services to manage, the sheer volume of requests left employees overwhelmed and citizens

without timely answers.

To manage this surge in certified emails, the INPS has implemented a cutting-edge robotic automation

tool. Using AI and an innovative machine learning model, the tool is able to sort and classify web requests,

enabling a much faster response time, and allowing public servants to better manage and prioritise urgent

requests. With a focus on precision, more than two-thirds of emails are now automatically dispatched, with

80% accuracy.

Developed internally and following strict rules, the tool was developed to respect data sensitivity and to

complement the work of employees. Its implementation has been gradual, with employees at the centre;

there has been a robust and comprehensive onboarding process. The tool has successfully been

implemented in 10 major cities and in medium-sized cities. Italy aims to deploy it across the whole country

by the end of the year.

To further enhance the use of technology, INPS is experimenting with large language models (LLMs) to

craft pre-written emails, accelerating and streamlining the communication process. This solution is

paradigmatic of how AI technologies, such as robotic processing tools, are empowering governments to

build stronger foundations and provide citizens with more efficient public services.

The tool has already treated more than 1 million requests, streamlining their processing, alleviating the

workload of first-level operators and ensuring a more immediate resolution of citizen requests. At the same

time, the tool is making it possible for employees to focus on emails that the technology struggles to label

or handles incorrectly. As such, this innovation has not only facilitated the processing of emails, but it has

also allowed the INPS to better allocate its human resources and to respond to citizen’s requests in a

timely manner, demonstrating how innovations can provide better value for money.

Virtual Singapore is a 3D digital

model of Singapore that uses real-time and topographical data. It is a digital twin of the city-state and the

first digital twin of a country. This tool also facilitates collaboration among government agencies, utility

companies and other stakeholders, enabling informed decision-making and resource allocation.

Additionally, real-time data integration enhances emergency services’ response planning and improves

transportation efficiency. This innovation offers immense value in enhancing urban planning, infrastructure

management and disaster preparedness. It allows decision-makers to optimise land use, assess flood risk

and manage underground utilities more effectively, harnessing the power of granular evidence to support

better public services

Another potential human-centric approach involves incorporating a human element in the automation process. Although AI tools are powerful, they are not accountable for the results they provide, so human supervision is needed to close gaps in the chain of responsibility for AI processes and outcomes. countries should implement a humans-in-the-loop or humans-on-the-loop approach to oversee the use and application of AI and ensure accountability. Where possible, countries should explore ways to integrate explainable AI (XAI) in digital administration and oversight to enhance transparency and allow for a thorough review of AI algorithms by human coordinators.

A pivotal starting point in promoting AI capacity-building in developing countries is the establishment of robust data governance and digital governance structures. AI technologies fundamentally rely on data for their implementation, irrespective of the specific methodology employed (whether it be supervised, unsupervised, or reinforcement learning). AI is a product of machine learning algorithms that use historical data divided into three sets: training, validation and testing.

Developing AI technologies without a robust data foundation is impractical and could result in investments becoming non-performing assets, risking the sustainability of AI technologies. Even the latest generative models (including transformer-based models) require the input of accurate data to return accurate results. In other words, if the accumulated data are inconsistent or have wrong instances, they will lead to the creation of underperforming algorithms or algorithms that provide wrong results. The importance of a solid data infrastructure cannot be overstated.

Improving AI capacity is an urgent priority for developing countries but is actually recommended for developed countries as well since AI literacy is required at all levels. To address this need, the AI4GOV programme – developed by Italy and Spain25 and co-financed by the connecting Europe Facility of the European Union – is administering a master’s programme in artificial intelligence for public services. This ten-month graduate programme is designed to prepare future leaders in digital transformation, equipping them with the knowledge and skills they need to manage the development of AI and its adoption in the public sector.

**Portugal**, **Spain** and the **Netherlands** are promoting “Improving civic participation through emerging technologies”, a project funded by the **European Commission** under the Technical Support Instrument (23PT04). Since 2023, the OECD Observatory of Public Sector Innovation, together with the OECD Open Government Unit, have been working on the project as implementation partners. This project aims to support Portugal, the Netherlands, and Spain in **enhancing civic participation using emerging technologies** with the objective of:

**https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/use-of-artificial-intelligence-in-government-summary.pdf**

*While the potential benefits of AI technologies are substantial, so are the potential risks. The ethical, security and social implications of AI must be carefully addressed. One ethical concern is data bias. AI algorithms are intrinsically data-based, meaning they rely heavily on accumulated data to produce results. consequently, any bias in these data can lead to the misrepresentation or underrepresentation*

*of certain groups. This bias is especially problematic when Governments employ AI in the development of public policies intended to serve the entire population, including marginalized groups.*

Participation professionals often face a trade-off between obtaining in-depth qualitative insights from small groups or quantitative information from large ones. This means a gap may arise for generating meaningful qualitative insights in large scale initiatives. In such cases, policymakers face high costs and significant time demands, often over one month, to analyse data for which they sometimes rely on external consultants. This situation risks disincentivising the organisation of ambitious participation initiatives. Furthermore, it may result in slowed feedback loops between the government and the public, which may undermine trust and inclusivity in participation processes. This challenge affects policymakers, participants, and taxpayers alike, as valuable citizen input is lost or underutilised.

We wish to explore ways to create scalable, flexible AI tools to streamline the analysis of unstructured text capturing the nuances of the public’s opinion, enhance transparency, and strengthen democratic engagement. Therefore, we look for designing and developing contributions for a tool that can analyse large amounts of qualitative data and transform it into coherent summaries that contain arguments and emotions/tone underneath the arguments.

…

The Government of the Netherlands’ coalition agreement emphasises the importance of engaging citizens in lawmaking and public debate, especially on complex societal issues like countering disinformation. The Ministry of Interior and the Province of South Holland have been working on the open-source platform Polis to foster inclusive, democratic participation. While Polis offers a valuable mechanism for dialogue, there is a need to modernise the platform to better support diverse and constructive public debate. Current challenges include improving user-centric interfaces for accessibility and inclusivity, as well as expanding AI-driven analysis capabilities, and implementing ethical moderation tools. The goal is to enhance Polis in order to bridge communication gaps between citizens and policymakers, and foster meaningful dialogue that reduces affective polarisation and promotes a resilient democracy.

**https://oecd-opsi.org/blog/call-for-co-creation-bootcamp/**

Administrative: Requesting or renewing items that do not require an extensive eligibility

determination or multi-stage review processes such as getting a license, passport, or social

security card.

 Benefits: Applying for or progressing through more complex government processes to

determine eligibility and degree of benefit such as immigration, Medicare, Veterans’ Health

services, or a small business loan.

 Compliance: Completing required actions such as filing taxes, submitting information for or

engaging with an auditor, environmental reporting, or completing a survey mandated by law.

 Recreation: Utilising public spaces such as national parks and historical sites, or visiting

museums.

 Informational: Providing authoritative knowledge-based resources to the public such as

designing labels, releasing warnings, requiring disclosures, or providing health

recommendations.

 Data and Research: Conducting or funding research, maintaining and preserving artifacts,

collecting, analysing, reporting, and sharing data.

 Regulatory: Providing clear guidance to support commerce, transportation, employment rules,

workplace safety, and public safety (e.g. ensuring clean water, safe medicines), which facilitates

the reporting of grievances (e.g. consumer protection)