A cross-border region where rivers connect, not divide

Hungary-Croatia
Cross-border Co-operation Programme

"GREEN PAPER: DEVELOPMENT OF ONE-STOP OVERNMENT SERVICES"

7 July 2018

Interreg V-A Hungary-Croatia Co-operation Programme 2014-2020

Co-operation between Public Administration in Cross-Border Regions of Croatia and Hungary for Serving Citizens Better

CATCH

Content

1. Definition of OSS

One-stop-shop (OSS) or one-stop has been a public service delivery model for a while now, implemented in several forms across different countries, administrative levels and policy areas, but its main goal has always been to make public services "available under a single roof". OSS rarely means – a notable exception being Hungary – channelling virtually all public services or at least state administrative services in one institutional and physical framework, rather, it is manifest in various service channels, institutional and financial models, and provide different baskets of services in different policy fields and administrative levels.

There are various terms associated with the concept of OSS, however, most of these implement a specific model of OSS or a specific physical or channel solution related to OSS, such as one-door services or citizen services centres. Importantly, there are two main types of services that OSS provide: information provision and service provision.

2. The purpose of OSS

There are multiple purposes OSS serve in the about 70 countries where it is implemented, however all of these can be classified is two main categories or drivers:

- better fulfilling customer (or citizen) satisfaction and needs and
- achieving efficiency gains, thus reducing public spending

While we will discuss these two key objectives, it is also important to consider wat are the citizens' and policy drivers of visiting and establishing a OSS.

Kuluoglu (2010) suggests that the majority of citizens who visit an e-government facility has four main objectives: learn about something (information services), apply for something (downloadable forms), pay for something (e-transactions) or complain about something. The first objective is the information function of OSS, while the other three are the transaction functions. Typically, an OSS comprises both functions.

As for the policy objectives, the "state" or policy makers will endeavour to establish an OSS in general to support the previously mentioned citizens' objectives, but more specifically to provide services at a wider scope for the general public in single contact points (either physical or virtual), to provide services in remote or border areas, including mobile points, or to provide services in a specific policy or administrative area, such as tax services.

Customer satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is a broad term that indeed encompasses different citizen needs and – importantly - expectations towards government services, that when met, citizens will have a positive experience and attitude. Citizens will have priorities according to age, profession, domicile, family status etc., however, their final experience and satisfaction with the experience they have will rely on several, indivisible factors.

Time and effort

We can safely say that citizens want to spend as little time and effort with administrative procedures as possible, thus the reduction of the speed of service, the time spent with administration are chief

objectives of OSS. This involves easy-to-understand rules, forms, journeys in fact such rules will be the basis of reducing lead times and time spent with administration. Time as such is broken down in several elements: the length of waiting lines, the lead time of resolving a case and the time spent in an office building without effectively dealing with the case itself (such as moving between departments). OSS is supposed to reduce the administration time specifically by reducing the need of citizens, information and documents moving between departments and by eliminating duplicated process elements.

Predictability

Predictability is also an important aspect here, as over a certain point, it matters more if citizens know predictably how much time they have to spend with a procedure than the actual absolute value of the time spent. Thus, standardisation and reliability are important aspects of OSS.

Accessibility and equality

Services should be easily accessible from two perspectives:

- Convenient access in terms of physical access and opening hours, with regard to the frequented places of work and life. This may well mean that current administrative offices will have to be relocated as city landscapes have changed over the time. Convenient places may be transport hubs, such as train or bus stations, urban transport junctions or shopping malls, which have replaced the traditional areas of shopping. While this may sound simple, such a move will generate a significant up-front investment. Another aspect is that moving back offices with front offices is obviously an even larger and complex endeavour, thus it requires a careful investigation which cases and functions might be moved to such centres without jeopardising front office – back office hand-offs. Simple cases which can be handled on-the-sport, such as issuance of a new personal document and reception and forwarding of more complex cases can be classified in this category. Physical accessibility for physically disabled persons will also have to be observed in the design of the location itself. Opening hours is another crucial aspect, as the traditional opening hours of civil service – from 8.00 to 16.30 or 7.30 to 15.30 – obviously doesn't match the reality of the working hours of citizens, who are forced to take a day off or do extra hours to compensate time spent with administration during the day. Loner opening hours at least on two working days is thus a good practice, meaning closing time at 20.00 or even 21.00 (with regard to the fact that many offices end working hours at 17.30).
- Accessibility in terms of providing better services in remote areas, which is in many cases the key objective of OSS. While previous, scattered public administration functions might have been unavailable in remote areas and making them available would have been financially unviable, establishing a single or mobile access point can be feasible.

Efficiency

While we discussed the purposes of OSS in relation to citizens as individuals, there is also a perspective from the point of view of the community. The community or the state typically intends to introduce OSS with the expectation to make public services more efficient and by that they usually mean using less financial resources to achieve the same or better service level. Financial gains are supposed to emerge from the shared use of staff, buildings or assets, streamlined or standardised processes, economies of scale over time.

However, the introduction of OSS obviously entails a significant up-front cost, as well as potentially higher unit costs of operation that are mitigated by the educed volume of resources. Gains will manifest

typically in the lifecycle of the OSS, just as it is important to account for operational costs over the lifespan of OSS that are necessary for maintaining the desired level of service and prevent service level set-backs.

It is not obvious and supported by evidence that OSS projects generally achieve the goal of cost reduction or efficiency, one reason for that being wishful thinking and the use of too vague, generous presumptions about potential gains instead of careful cost-benefit analysis and scenario planning.

3. Principles of OSS

In order to create a sustainable and excellent service experience at OSS, it is important to pin down certain underlying principles that will guide the design of the service in order to attain a seamless integration of services.

- *Lead time*: the duration of service delivery should be – the time taken to deliver a service should be less than before the introduction of OSS, both on the side of citizens and internally, on the side of administrators. This requires a survey and planning of client traffic at the current units, including peak times and typical duration of personal interactions. Handling of a case at traditional settings have the advantage that the site of the personal interaction is usually just at the office of the responsible unit, where colleagues and documents are available for consultation. As an example, the use of such consultations should be clearly mapped beforehand, otherwise separation of front office in the OSS and the back office will cause problems. It has to be clear, how often and in what cases front office personnel ask for the help of the back office and how it is done currently and plan service channels accordingly. One possible solution to this could be the rotation of staff between back office and front office as in several cases the reason why front office turns to the back office is that back office colleagues have more experience and/or qualifications. It is also possible that there is a typical group of cases where back office is needed and these cases then can be deliberately channelled separately from the bulk of the cases in the given area.
- *Citizen-centric approach*: it is a good practice that OSS services are organised around life-events and not along administrative processes, thus co-ordinating back office processes to serve a single need. Life-event approach requires that the different back office processes are integrated in a core processes (instead of obliging the citizen to submit various claims related to a life event) and are triggered by the launch of this core process at the OSS. Another aspect of citizen-centric approach is that the design of OSS – both that of the physical place and of the virtual platforms – should reflect a customer-oriented ambiance, reducing the hierarchical distance between officials and citizens and in general representing an inclusive, friendly outlook.
- *Management of change and continuous improvement*: responsiveness to change is considered from an operational and a design level. Operationally speaking, service levels should be monitored on a weekly basis and management will have to be able to react to deteriorating levels, as well as aim at continuously improving the service. Monitoring is based on a workflow or service desk solution, which enables both site managers (managers of individual OSS centres) and higher management see the identical data in a dashboard system, quickly identifying alterations over the time, according to types of case, type of client, procedure, site and administrator. Another aspect of change is however the inherent change of demand towards services, both in terms of the type of cases and in terms of the service channels and their design. Typically, there is a smaller change in every 2-3 years and a more significant change in every 8-10 years, that would affect the design of the channels as well. This has to be planned

as a periodical review and budgeted as a cost, otherwise the brand new OSS centres and virtual channels will start to look outdated after a couple of years.

- *Integration:* Integration of public services is a key aspect of customer orientation, as integration organises the administration of a case around life situations and not organisational silos. Integration may take different forms. Service provision is most likely to be seamless if back office units are integrated as well, but it is also possible that there is a front office organisation serving different back office organisations. It is not infrequent that the OSS is literally a common roof without integrating even the front office relays. It is also important that there should be adequate provisions obliging state bodies to ensure integrated case management. In some countries it might be settled through inter-organisational agreements, however in continental law it is usually required that there are legislative provisions, e.g. in Hungary it is stipulated in law that public bodies will have to request from and provide for any information regarding the given case through the principal body where the case was submitted.

- *Choice and differentiation:* Choice refers to the ability of citizens to choose between the different forms of service channels at their liberty even in one procedure and independent of time and place, and depending on their specific needs and at specific times. This means that a case can be started personally, followed upon via Internet through a mobile platform and a call centre should also be able to receive and serve requests. Also, citizens should be able to initiate a case at multiple places in the country and 24/7. This presupposes an integrated organisation of OSS covering all channels. Attention should be paid to offer citizens service in their natural channels, with regard to the diversity of the client base of public services, as opposed to many for-profit services. While citizens will use different channels, it might be advisable to identify the group of cases that attract a larger number of citizens in person, and where a physical separation of the places of care might lead to a better experience. As an example, certain social services will see citizens queueing in specific times of the months in large number and it might result in a negative experience if these citizens are handled and have to wait in the same physical place where for instance personal documents are issued. Similarly, certain – especially social care - services may require a larger degree of intimacy then others, thus even in an OSS larger distances, better separated service desks or separate rooms might be necessary.

- *Burden, easiness and outcome*
  - o Reduction of administrative burden is the major objective of administrative reform and an expectation of citizens. Administrative burden includes transportation (travel) time and time spent with administration, that we covered previously, but also simpler forms, documentation and processes. This also entails a degree of standardisation, as different types of forms across policy areas and territorial units will cause additional burden for citizens even if they can handle these cases in a OSS. Thus revision of processes and forms before the introduction of OSS and standardisation of these is recommended.
  - o Citizens highly appreciate if processes, forms and information in the OSS are easy-to-understand and handle versus a bureaucratic, legal approach that prevail in many cases. Easiness is an aspect that has to be created through the involvement of citizens (e.g. focus groups) and then validated by professionals as civil servants will tend to think in the same silos and stick to the wording they are used to.

- *Experience:* Experience is the cornerstone of service design – experience encompass in a unique feeling the feelings, impressions, thoughts of citizens as they experience a service. Experience is not confined to a procedure or process nor to an element of the service, rather, it is an evolving journey that crosses organisational and process boundaries. An experience starts with the first step when we start to search for information about a given service and ends with the

outcome of the service, including the use of the outcome, for instance, the actual use and usability of a tax certification at a bank process. In the journey as we obtain the outcome, in this example the certification, we cross different organisational borders, core and support processes. For a seamless experience, we will have our data readily filled in the given form, which is the result of interoperability provisions and processes. The quality of the desk where we talk with the officer is the result of the facility management processes. in case the creation of OSS focuses on just some processes and organisations, then the experience will be broken at some point, if not for bad service, then for the disunity of the experience. Creating typical user journey is thus a key element in creating compiling user experience and user satisfaction at the end. Experience is a holistic view of the service environment, an integrating factor of both organisational and process aspects and the different disciplines necessary to develop excellent service.

These principles are the starting point of the design of an OSS project that have to be reflected in each planning stage by transforming these principles in exact technical requirements that can be controlled throughout the process. However, beyond that or preceding that, there are also policy or organisational level conditions that are the backbone of a successful OSS project. Policy level commitment is essential, chiefly, because an OSS project is a significant transformation of the existing routines and web of local interests. Such conditions are:

- Strategic leadership: it is essential to have a clear government commitment, a clear responsibility in the government for the project and not only a general commitment but also a clarity of goals at this level. OSS is also the face of the government (of how the government works), and its commitment to take the project till the implementation is essential to avoid getting stuck. Commitment is credible, if the timeframe for the first visible steps, for the first irreversible changes are not set in a too distant future and if it is backed by operational (executive) pieces of legislation, setting responsibilities, going beyond declaration of principles. As an example, the Hungarian government initiated the public administration reform process in 2010 and the first OSS centres were implemented already in 2011. The process of expanding the OSS in the whole country took more years but the initial visible commitment made the step credible.
- Shared standards: the OSS will host different government services "under one roof", but this doesn't only mean a physical spot, but also common service standards as to how citizens are served. This covers the customer journey, the staff attitude and behaviour, the forms and virtual surfaces applied, the feedback mechanisms (e.g. sms feedback) etc. Typically, standards will stem from the principles, and will first be set in a service blueprint or master plan, then transformed into specific plans of interior design, IT system plan etc.
- Front end delivery: the establishment of OSS concerns both back-office and front office service. OSS will manifest its advantages, gains when both back office and front office services are optimised and when these are fully integrated, however, in order to kick off the change process and deliver results for citizens, it is important to focus on the front office first, even with a limited capability, as shown in the example of the Hungarian OSS before. It is also a possible solution that there is a limited integration at first, and different OSS are created according to larger policy areas, such as a general OSS, a tax administration OSS and a social affairs OSS.
- Setting the legislative framework: the regulation of OSS at the level of law, providing for the modification of all related laws (such as administrative procedures, status of public servants, duties and tasks of public organisations etc.), the provisions for operational implementation at the lower level of legislation (decree) and by-laws is essential for the public administration to

be able to act towards the objectives of OSS. This requires a separate legislative preparatory group in order to map current obligations, possible obstacles and pitfalls, and create a map of regulatory provisions to be approved.

1.Quality front offices are the major drivers of change and customer experience

4. Models of OSS

Models according to the degree of integration

OSS types can be classified into different models, which is especially useful when designing the concept of OSS and the phases of implementation, that may go through different models over the time. Kubicek and Hagen (2000, cited in Askim et al 2011) define three categories of OSS: first stop shops, convenience stores and true OSS:

- First-Stop: This type is an information function, which provides citizens with information on the services based on her/his needs. The first-stop can be both physical and virtual and can take the form of information kiosks as well. The first stop is usually integrated in the further, more integrated models. Tis model is also called a 'Reception', effectively being a signposting role only.
- Convenience Store: in this case several different transactional services are offered in one physical and/or virtual location, serving many different types of clients and cases. The convenience store integrates different, but independent public services in one place, which might be integrated at a local level as a customer service, but are effectively relays of different, non-integrated government bodies. When government services are simply placed in one physical location but are not integrated, it is called a one-door service, instead of a one-window, which presupposes actual integration at least at the level of front end service. This model is also called Surgery', where the OSS acts like a general practitioner, providing

diagnosis, feedback and to deal with common conditions, but referring to specialists when more complex cases are revealed.

- **True one-stop:** a true one-stop is when services are integrated according to typical life situations and/or customer segments and are handled by a dedicated officer and the services are integrated in organisational terms as well.

OSS are frequently not implemented as a true OSS across the whole country instantly, but the full implementation may take at least 8-10 years, during which the service goes through the above mentioned models, the different groups of services being in different stages of the models.

Delivery models

Another classification of models (Bent, Kernaghan et al. 1999, 4f.) distinguishes OSS models according to the structure of service delivery, such as:

- **Owner-delivered,** which is an OSS of a government agency in its own premises. We note that for instance in Hungary effectively all services have been integrated in the county government offices, thus
- **Owner-delivered in a co-located environment,** when e.g. several government services are moved into the building of a state administration office
- **Shared delivery through integration,** when delivery of different policy areas is done by a governmental shared and integrated organisation
- **Delegated delivery through a corporate service utility,** when all or part of the services (e.g. only service in remote areas) are delegated to a corporate or public service, either only in terms of the physical space or in terms of the service itself, e.g. delegating services to the Post Office.
- **Delegated delivery through an Inter-governmental service utility,** which is identical to the previous model save the provider is a governmental service provider
- **Delegated delivery through another service provider ("Multiplexing"),** when service delivery at local level is delegated to another provider with adequate local capabilities.

just as the models according to the degree of integration, these delivery models can be mixed ones as well, when one model is applied in larger urban centres and other models in remote areas according to the availability of providers in those areas.

In terms of physical architecture, various models exist, but the most common design in a single building with a range of service providers. Buildings may be owned by the community, local government or a public agency, or they may be leased (Bryden et al. 2007).

No-stop and non-stop shop

It is also useful to mention the concepts of no-stop and non-stop shop.

Non-stop-shop simply refers to the capability of on-line services to provide self-service 24/7, possibly backed-up by a limited customer service.

The no-stop refers to a proactive service delivery, meaning that the government delivers a service to a citizen when a life event occurs without the citizen having to request the service. This means that the citizens doesn't have to submit a claim to a public body, but the claim is effectively compiled based on available data. An example is wen the tax office automatically prepares the annual tax declaration of persons, which is now the most common practice in Hungary. A subtype of it is predictive service delivery, in which the government predicts a life event and delivers a service even before a life event

occurs. An example of it is when the government service sends an alert on a forthcoming event (e.g. expiration of driving licence) and this triggers the launch of the service.

A further distinction between OSS types is their coverage of different policy areas. When an OSS covers only one policy area, such as tax or social services, it is more likely to offer a full-scale model, a true OSS. When several areas are offered in one place, it is inevitable that at least for a period certain services have an informational role only, while others can be handled instantly on spot.

Mobile OSS

As a key objective of OSS is to provide services in remote areas, a major difficulty is to provide these services in an efficient and sustainable manner. The solution for this is the mobile OSS, which is a small truck equipped with all the equipment needed for the on-the-spot handling of the most frequent cases, as well having a reception and delivery function of claims and ready documents respectively. Such trucks have broadband Internet connection and thus can access to the government network and database services needed for the provision of services. Mobile OSS trucks are operational in Hungary

2: Mobile OSS in Hungary

OSS on cross-border areas

Inspiring example: Public Services Relay Ardennais (France)
The French State introduced the 'Public Services Relay' label in 2006 because the prefecture and public services based in the Ardennes wanted to reinforce the presence of public services in rural zones, particularly in the cross-border area. The plan was to facilitate the access to public services, introducing an officer to guide the users in their administrative procedures. Thus, it is now possible to see one person in one place, when gathering information and carrying out administrative procedures coming under several public organisations. One big change is the collaboration of people from different services who, in a 'win-win' partnership, are now able to work more efficiently together, thereby giving the users of public services a higher quality service, particularly in the cross-border context. The establishment of this partnership was possible due to an improved organisation between the back office (partners of public services), the front office (local authorities) and the

middle office in charge of the coordination (prefecture). Each authority still retains its areas of competence when it comes to managing and treating cases with Public Services Ardennes. This sort of partnership can easily be applied to other situations and can be transposed in other European cross-border areas. Today, this public service label works in French territory, but tomorrow it could easily become a European cross-border label and ultimately it could work throughout Europe.

5. Case study – Hungary

Reorganization of the territorial state administration after 2010

The strategic background, the goals and the implementation of the territorial reorganization

The new Government established in 2010 was the first one since the socialist transition, which had the power to implement a comprehensive reform of the public administration and within it that of the territorial state administration. The reason for that was the 2/3 majority in the Parliament. The communicated objective of the reform was the elimination of the problems of the former system as presented above.

The basic strategic concept of the comprehensive public administration reorganisation was laid down in the Magyary Zoltán Public Administration Development Programme. The main goal of the Programme was the establishment of the so called "Good State". It articulated a professional concept in four fields, which are the following: (1) organizational development; (2) administrative tasks; (3) administrative procedures and (4) human resource. Beyond the organizational restructuring of the public administration system, it set as objectives the overall reduction of administrative burdens, the establishment of the carrier path model for public servants, and in the framework of the renewal of the public administration training and education system the establishment of the National University of Public Service. All these measures served as the guarantee for the increased effectiveness and enhanced sustainability of the planned restructuring.

The objectives of the reform were on the on hand the restructuring of the central public administration, on the other hand the comprehensive restructuring of the territorial public administration system. The two basic pillars of the latter one were the establishment of the one-stop shop system and the unification of the fragmented territorial public administration system.

The financial development funds needed for the reorganization were provided mainly by the State Reform and Electronic Public Administration Operative Programme within the New Széchenyi Plan, financed from the European Union's structural funds.

The Government reelected in 2014 continued the development processes started in the former political cycle. The goals of the Strategy for the Development of the Public Administration and Public Services between 2014 and 2020 are to ensure, that until 2020 the Hungarian public administration will operate:

- in a modern institutional framework;
- in a transparent institutional structure;
- with the application of a consumer-friendly procedure model;
- as a system, which is accessible for everyone;
- with a professionally prepared, motivated human resource that act ethically;
- cost-effectively;

- and by shifting smallest possible administrative burden on citizens.

According to the Strategy's concept, the public administration must contribute to the improvement of economic competitiveness, the reduction of socio-economic differences between the countryside and the capital city and must offer such services, which are reasonable if we take into account their costs borne by citizens.

The development of the public administration and the territorial public administration has been implemented between 2014 and 2020 in the framework of a specialized operative programme called Development of the Public Administration and the Public Services Operative Programme. Approximately HUF 300 billion are envisaged for the above mentioned purposes.

The process of the restructuring of the territorial state administration

The initial steps of restructuring

As the result of the first step in the reorganization of territorial state administration on the 1st of September 2010, twenty county public administration offices were established in the capital and at county-level. Thereby the regional-level bodies were eliminated. The Government' intention was that the new county offices provided for the unified and harmonized operation of the territorial state administration. In order to ensure the legal basis, the coordinative and controlling authority of public administration offices in the capital and on the county-level (and later of their successor, the government offices) were continuously expanded.

The next substantial step was the establishment of the Government Offices at capital and county level from the 1st January 2011. The Government Offices in the capital city and in the counties became the territorial state administration organs of the Government with general authorization and competence, which was laid down by the Constitution of Hungary and by the law regulating the Government Offices. Their authority and their inner institutional setup is determined by government regulation. The definition of the territorial state administration body with general authority – which definition is attributed to the Government Offices – includes the performance of state administration tasks, the governing and controlling roles and the participation in the governing tasks of the Government.

Their establishment meant also the institutional integration of the territorial state administration, as 18 sectoral deconcentrated bodies operating in the past independently (for example social and guardianship office; land office; sectoral administrative body for health insurance) were integrated into the metropolitan and county Government Offices as sectoral administrative bodies.

The Government Office of Budapest and the county-level Government Offices are under a strong central control, as they were placed directly under the former Ministry for Public Administration and Justice, moreover, the heads of the offices became the Government Commissioners, who are political appointees. The organizational settlement of the Government Offices has two basic pillars. One of them is the General Office. This organizational unit is led directly by the Government Commissioner, and mostly performs tasks related to coordination, functional support services, control and surveillance, IT and training. The other pillar (institutional unit) includes the 18 sectoral organs, which used to operate separately as deconcentrated organs of the regional-level offices.

The next step of the territorial reform was the set-up of the system of District Offices (also in the capital city) from 1st January 2013, which meant the creation of the state administration level between the county and settlement level, represented by the District Offices. 175 District and 23 metropolitan District Offices were established, which operate as the sub-office of the capital and county Government

Offices. Substantial part of state administration tasks, which were provided for earlier by the notary, the mayor or by the office administration of the local government, were shifted from 2013 to the competence of the (metropolitan) District Offices. According to the provisions, within the organization of the District Office the following organs/offices started to operate at district-level: the office for guardianship-related cases; the office for construction and heritage protection; the sectoral administrative organ of the District Office with special competence regarding veterinary and food control; land office; the branch office of the public employment service; the public health institution and the offices specialized for issuing official documents.

The territorial sectoral administrative organs, which operated before the reforms separately and under the direction of the respective national sectoral authority (such as consumer protection, public employment service etc.), were placed under double management. The general office of the Government Office practiced certain management competencies mainly in connection with the operative functioning of the organs, while the head of the sectoral national central authority or agency practiced the management power related to the professional activities of the organs.

The administrative control of the Central Government increased over the territorial state administration. One instrument for this was the establishment of the Office for Public Administration and Justice (national mid-level managing governmental organ), which practiced control over several fields (for example initiated the proposals for the budgetary appropriations and staff number of government offices and exercised control over the execution of the budgetary plan). The county-level Government Offices had a periodical reporting obligation towards the Government.

By the establishment of the county-level Government Offices the functional fields were unified and centralized (this latter one was ensured through the creation of the General Offices within Government Offices). The General Office of the county-level Government Office is responsible for the provision of shared IT services, for the organization of the continuous training of civil servants, furthermore, for the accomplishment of the management and operational tasks.

The establishment of the Government Windows

An important milestone of the comprehensive reform of the territorial state administration was the Government Window ("one-stop-shop") reform, which meant the establishment of the one-stop-shop customer service. Government Windows operate as the integrated customer service offices of the county-level and capital Government Offices, with the purpose of providing unified customer service standards across the country.

The Government Windows as the integrated customer service offices of the Government Offices started to operate on 3rd of January 2011 in 29 places in the country. Today, there are Government Windows in 270 places and approximately 1600 cases can be processed in them – due to the continuous increase in the number of Government Windows and in the type of procedures to be handled by them. It is notable, that while some types of cases can be processed entirely in the Government Windows, other cases can only be initiated in them and these are then taken over by the respective sectoral organization.

The broadening and deepening of the integration and the settlement of the current system

From 1st of April 2015 mining authorities and inspectorates for environment and nature protection were integrated into the Government Offices. Certain tasks of central offices not involved in the

integration were also delegated to the metropolitan and county Government Offices (for example family allowance and home allowance related cases of the Hungarian State Treasury). Furthermore, the sectoral administrative organs were terminated and instead of them a two-tier department structure were introduced within the Government Offices at county level and one-tier department structure within the District Offices.

The decision made in 2016 provided for that state administration tasks must be performed in the Ministries, in the Government Offices and in the District Offices. As a consequence, the institutional structure comprising central sectoral administrative offices and budgetary organs was reorganized, moreover, the Government ordered the decrease of staff number employed by budgetary organs at country-level. As a result, the formerly independent central offices (for example the Office of the Chief Medical Officer and the Consumer Protection Authority) and supporting agencies of Ministries were abolished (out of 90 organs 43 with legal successor and 43 without one ceased their operation) and integrated into Ministries, Government Offices as well as in the few remaining central offices and enterprises. Due to the measures, overall staff number was reduced by approximately 10% and a big proportion of the managerial positions were abolished. Central offices were allowed to continue their operation only in case of special tasks (for example the Hungarian State Treasury functions as general payment agency for citizens; law enforcement bodies; national security organs; organs responsible for the maintenance of institutions).

After the restructuring, the responsibility of the Ministries became the legislation, the strategy creation, the policy-level management (the professional tasks of the Government Offices are led directly by Ministries through the State Secretaries). The metropolitan and county Government Offices act at first instance in county-level administrative cases and in case of special authorization in country-wide procedures as well as at second instance in cases, which are forwarded to them by District Offices and notaries. The District Offices act at first instance authorities in cases at district-level (also if it affects more districts) or county level and have special authorization in certain country-level cases (like pension administration).

6. Challenges in the implementation of OSS

OSS projects face a number of challenges which will have to be taken into account at the design stage and in relation to which we will propose brief recommendations. The implementation of OSS will have to count with a number of typical risks that therefore can be planned in advance. Such typical risks are:

- Large capital investment is needed: a full-scale OSS requires long-term capital investment in durable facilities. This may seem to be wasteful in the case of remote or sparsely populated locations and may endanger the project if it is not properly phased, since it might happen that after the first investment the state is not able/willing to finance the forthcoming parts.
- Low levels of service performance, coupled with a lack of actual power front office officials, limiting the scope of instant services provided and thus effectively necessitating at least a further step in handling the case
- Resistance within departments to change and move processes into a front office/self service environment and time and effort wasted to resolving resistance.
- The line departments cannot identify with the cause of the OSS and interpret it as a downgrading in the professional level of the policy area, as well as they do not understand why the changes are being made, how they will be made and what consequences these will have for them and the citizens.

- The organisational design and HR processes are not linked and support the new working model of the OSS, leading to demotivation and leaving the required organisational design not delivered
- The solution is organisationally driven, failing to deliver the right solution for citizens.
- Under-skilled staff or low utilisation of skills at the front office or at the call/service centres. This phenomenon emerges when front office is staffed with new personnel, focusing on service skills but less on administrative experience. Public service OSS requires multiple experience in public administration procedures, cases, otherwise citizens will face inexperienced staff which will be unable to effectively handle its case. This can also happen if an administrator is required to handle too many types of cases in which she/he cannot be proficient in a reasonable time. Remedies for this problem are the training of staff in different cases before placing them in the office, developing an easy-to-use knowledge base for front end staff and segmenting officials according to larger and synergic case groups, so that they can bot use their knowledge in a synergic way but also remain in a zone where they are professionally competent and comfortable.
- Inadequate front and back office integration: while the very purpose of OSS is the reduction of lead time and customer contact points, an inadequately designed hand-off process and definition of tasks between front and back office will lead to a higher number of contacts, requests for completion of information and frequent exception handling. The danger is if procedures are designed at the level of by-laws but are not properly simulated in practice and the actual implementation will depend on the local circumstances in an effort to interpret by-laws.
- Partial integration between on-line and physical (personal) channels and a lack of capability in the on-line channels to effectively substitute personal contacts. The efficiency of OSS is greatly improved if a larger number of cases are self-service, on-line contacts, reducing the number of citizens attending physical sites. It is also a risk that websites and personal services are not fully aligned in terms of information on processes and in terms of the actual steps, process to follow, which might be the case for instance if a centralised call-centre or service centre and the localised branches are not integrated or OSS and the back office organisations maintain parallel services.
- Deficiencies of the physical infrastructure, both as regards front offices and placement of back offices. This might manifest itself in bad design, the lack of space, the bad design of specific needs (e.g. more intimate places for certain services) etc. It may also happen that OSS, especially first OSS centres are based on existing offices that are not frequented in large number of citizens or are visited by a specific group of clients (e.g. a social service bureau familiar mainly to social service clients is transformed to an OSS centre) and thus the service cannot get popular enough to gain credibility. It is especially important at the beginning of the project, when probably OSS and other customer service places will run parallel.
- Lack of a credible roadmap: if the implementation of OSS doesn't proceed according to clear, ambitious but achievable steps, then implementation will be partial and the project will probably end up unfinished and finally deleted.
- Becoming a technology/CRM led project: the IT function fails to translate future state process designs into enabling technology solutions. As a consequence technical solutions evolve in a different direction to the service design specifications and stakeholder
- Investment is made in the development of access channels but there is not sufficient time, resource and expertise allocated to incentivising and communicating with citizens to drive the necessary change in channel usage

7. Proposals

In order to tackle the challenges and risks enlisted and deliver an OSS corresponding to the purposes and principles introduced we recommend 10 steps to be observed:

1. **Government commitment and clear responsibilities and goals**: OSS vision adopted at government level, appointed clear special commissioner (might be identical with the line minister) with special co-ordinating powers over concerned bodies
2. **User journey and experience mapping**: user expectations, current user journeys must be the starting point of the design of the new OSS translated in technical requirements
3. **Feasibility study and Master Plan**: a clear plan, assessment of different scenarios, risk analysis, cost benefit analysis of operational options and a Master Plan setting the organisational and governance structure of OSS, the integration of processes, tasks, responsibilities of personnel
4. **Facility Management Plan and Design concept**: a plan setting all requirements of the physical sites and services, cost planning of implementation (investment) and operation, planning of maintenance, interior design plan
5. **Integration Planning**: Back office-front office, Physical and virtual platform integration planning
6. **Ambitious, achievable and phased roadmap**: a roadmap that sets a sufficient but tight planning period of 6 month, a preparation phase of maximum 6 month, a quick win implementation phase of 1 year and a phased implementation of the full scale model in further 2/3-year periods
7. **Communication and visibility plan**: internal and external communication plan in harmony with the roadmap, visibility arrangements to ensure presence in line with the design concept
8. **Training of civil servants and knowledge management solution:** selection, offline and online training of civil servants, continuous update and availability of training material, provision of an easily accessible knowledge management tool
9. **Visible and credible results at the front-end in 1 year**: implementation of a limited scope of services in a limited number of central places in pilot projects
10. **Controlling, change management and continuous improvement**: setting a clear reporting structure with a management information system fed by the OSS workflow / service desk applications, regular performance reporting and assessment, monthly assessment of potential corrective actions, regular feedback mechanisms from customers and staff, collection of improvement ideas

8. Hungarian and Croatian summary

Magyar nyelvű összefoglaló

A felvázolt kihívások és kockázatok kezelése és a célok biztosítása érdekében 10 lépést javasolunk:

1. Kormányzati elkötelezettség, egyértelmű felelősségek és célok: az OSS víziója kormányzati szinten elfogadott, egyértelműen kijelölt legyen, legyen külön biztos (esetleg azonos a miniszterelnökkel) kijelölve különleges koordinációs hatáskörökkel az érintett szervek felett

2. A felhasználói út és a tapasztalatok feltérképezése: a felhasználói elvárásokból, a jelenlegi felhasználói utakból kell kiindulniuk a technikai követelményeknek

3. Megvalósíthatósági tanulmány és „master plan": világos terv, különböző forgatókönyvek, kockázatelemzés, működtetési változatok költség-haszon elemzése, valamint az egyablakos ügyintézés szervezeti és irányítási struktúráját meghatározó terv, a folyamatok, feladatok, felelősségi körök integrálása

4. A létesítménygazdálkodási terv és tervezési koncepció: a terv a fizikai helyszínek és szolgáltatások összes követelményét meghatározza, akárcsak a megvalósítás (beruházás) és üzemeltetés költségeit, a karbantartás tervezését, a belsőépítészeti tervet

5. Integrációs tervezés: Back office-front office, Fizikai és virtuális platform-integrációs tervezés

6. Ambiciózus, megvalósítható és szakaszos ütemterv: olyan ütemterv, amely egy 6 hónapos, de szoros tervezési időszakot, legfeljebb 6 hónapos előkészítési fázist, 1 éves quick win megvalósítási fázist és a teljes léptékű modell fokozatos végrehajtását irányozza elő további 2/3 éves időszakokban

7. Kommunikációs terv: az ütemtervvel összhangban lévő belső és külső kommunikációs terv, a nyilvánosság biztosítása érdekében a tervezési koncepcióval összhangban

8. A köztisztviselők képzése és a tudásmenedzsment megoldása: a köztisztviselők kiválasztása, offline és online képzése, folyamatos fejlesztés, továbbképzés és a képzési anyagok rendelkezésre állása, könnyen hozzáférhető tudáskezelő eszköz biztosítása

9. Látható és hiteles eredmények egy év alatt: korlátozott számú központi helyen végzett kísérleti projektek korlátozott körű végrehajtása

10. Ellenőrzés, változásmenedzsment és folyamatos fejlesztés: világos jelentéstételi struktúra létrehozása, rendszeres teljesítménybeszámoló és értékelés, az esetleges korrekciós intézkedések havonta történő értékelése, rendszeres visszajelzési mechanizmusok az ügyfelektől

Hrvatski sažetak

Kako bi se riješili izazovi i rizici uvršteni i dali OSS koji odgovara svrsi i načelima, preporučujemo da se poštuju 10 koraka:

1. Vladina obveza i jasne odgovornosti i ciljevi: Vizija OSS-a usvojena na razini vlade, imenovana jasna posebna povjerenica (mogla bi biti identična ministru reda) s posebnim koordinacijskim ovlastima nad zainteresiranim tijelima

2. Mapiranje korisnika i mapiranje iskustva: očekivanja korisnika, trenutna korisnička putovanja moraju biti početna točka dizajna novog OSS prevedenog u tehničkim zahtjevima

3. Studija izvodljivosti i Glavni plan: jasan plan, procjena različitih scenarija, analiza rizika, analiza troškova korištenja operativnih opcija i Master Plan kojim se određuje organizacijska i upravljačka struktura OSS-a, integracija procesa, zadataka, odgovornosti osoblja

4. Plana upravljanja objektima i koncepta dizajna: plan koji određuje sve zahtjeve fizičkih stranica i usluga, planiranje troškova implementacije (investicija) i rad, planiranje održavanja, planiranje interijera

5. Planiranje integracije: Ured za predstojeće urede, Planiranje integracije fizičke i virtualne platforme

6. Ambiciozni, ostvarivi i fazni plan puta: smjernica koja postavlja dovoljno ali neprekidno razdoblje planiranja od 6 mjeseci, fazu pripreme od najviše 6 mjeseci, fazi implementacije brzog dobitka od 1 godine i faznu implementaciju modela potpune veličine u daljnjem 2/3-godišnja razdoblja

7. Plan komunikacije i vidljivosti: unutarnji i vanjski komunikacijski plan u skladu s planom puta, način vidljivosti kako bi se osigurala prisutnost u skladu s konceptom dizajna

8. Osposobljavanje državnih službenika i rješenje za upravljanje znanjem: izbor, izvanmrežni i online obučavanje državnih službenika, kontinuirano ažuriranje i dostupnost materijala za obuku, osiguranje lako dostupnog alata za upravljanje znanjem

9. Vidljivi i vjerodostojni rezultati na front-end u 1 godini: implementacija ograničenog opsega usluga na ograničenom broju središnjih mjesta u pilot projektima

10. Kontroliranje, upravljanje promjenama i kontinuirano poboljšanje: postavljanje jasne strukture izvješćivanja s informacijskim sustavom upravljanja koji se unose u aplikacije OSS radnog tijeka / servisnih radnih mjesta, redovito izvješćivanje i procjena izvedbe, mjesečna procjena potencijalnih korektivnih akcija, redovni mehanizmi povratnih informacija od kupaca i osoblja , prikupljanje ideja za poboljšanje

9. References

The Quality of Public Administration. A Toolbox for Practitioners. European Commission, 2017.

Kubicek, Herbert – Hagen, Martin: One-stop Government in Europe – An Ovreview. University of Bremen, 2000.

Transfroming the Citizen Experience. One Stop Shop for Public Services. PWC Global, February 2012.

One stop Shops as a Model of Public Service Delivery. Local Governance Initiative and Network (LOGIN), 2015.