Chapter VIII

Revamping of Delivery System

Revamping of Delivery System

Recommendations for Revamping of Delivery System dovetailed with Effective Monitoring & Evaluation System

The recommendations are for system level, applicable in principle to many sectors, some applicable even to the entire public delivery system. The concerned departments/organizations may develop the necessary details at their level.

A successful Delivery System must adhere to the following objectives :

- **it must promote transparency**

- **it must ensure people's, particularly users' participation**

- **it must provide for social auditing**

1. Rationalize the structure and functioning of the departments in the field level as well, on the lines recommended earlier for the Secretariat level, since the same rationale (overlapping of functions, etc.) generally applies down the line in the departmental delivery system in the field. Delivery System in the field should be integrated one, for example, allied activities of the agriculture, fishery, veterinary, etc. departments could be taken up in a coordinated manner.

2. Decentralize governance to the Divisional level and then to District level for more effective co-ordination of the field-level delivery system of various departments, better monitoring of the quality of delivery system and more timely feedback for improvement.

3. Redesign the *Raijor Podulit Raijor Sarkar* (RPRS) programme for improving the delivery system. For this purpose, the programme will have to be oriented more towards service delivery, since the current impression is that the programme overemphasizes public grievance petition collection. RPRS should also provide for spot redressal of public grievances with arrangement for periodic redressal of grievances needing back office references, by senior officers at least at the Block headquarters level.

4. Cover urban areas under RPRS with as much emphasis as in rural areas, albeit with a different approach. Government of India have prescribed some methodology under the various Central schemes, which could be dovetailed with RPRS.

5. Pay adequate attention to urban service delivery system and urban poverty alleviation programmes, as Central assistance is available for this purpose.

6. Arrange training for the elected representatives of the Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) as well, on the lines of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), for capacity building and proper orientation towards making ULBs vibrant institutions of urban development and effective service delivery.

7. Consider devolution of enough responsibilities and resources to the ULBs as well, as per the provisions of the 74th amendment to the Constitution.

8. Expedite devolution of functions, functionaries and funds to the PRIs for the identified subjects so that rural delivery system could function as per the people's preferences.

9. Give all welfare programmes aiming at alleviation of rural poverty to the PRIs for execution.

10. Accelerate and sustain the pace of capacity building of PRIs by way of imparting training for both elected representatives and staff, deciding on the adequate staffing pattern, etc., so that PRIs have absorption capacity to take up the responsibilities of the subjects to be devolved to them.

11. Avoid thrusting schemes of one department upon another department for implementation, since the other department may not be very enthusiastic about taking the additional responsibility and in the process service delivery may be affected.

12. Keep schemes of a similar nature in one department, the one most suitable for them, for the sake of better co-ordination of delivery system and efficient utilization of resources.

13. Develop and implement tailor-made training modules for all employees involved in the delivery system for equipping them with the necessary values, mindset and skills for effective service delivery to the user public. Enforce sets of "Dos and Don'ts" for public employees at various levels, emphasizing the basic aspects of performance and behaviour expected of all persons involved in the delivery system.

14. Build objective, achievable and practical performance indicators into the employee performance appraisal system for the key players in the delivery system.

15. Delivery System should be public demand-driven and proactive instead of governmental resource supply-driven, particularly in sectors where the role of the delivery system is to disseminate knowledge, technology, etc. while the primary activities remain in the private domain, for example, extension-based service delivery in sectors like agriculture, fishery, veterinary, etc. Here, the Extension Officers – the key players in the delivery system – would do better by working like private sector consultants to the beneficiaries, reaching out to the beneficiaries, generating demands for their services and then fulfilling those demands. Such services could be redesigned and the structure of incentives should be changed to align employee motivation and delivery system goals.

16. Reorganize service delivery organizations when the basis of their territorial jurisdictions changes for some reason, for example, the **Gaon Panchayat Samabai Samitis (GPSSs),** which are key players for PDS in rural areas, are still based on GPs of the olden times, thereby creating difficulties in effective control over PDS by today's GPs.

17. Select sites for locating important facilities in the delivery system, such as the **Primary Health Centres (PHCs),** schools, marketing centers for **Self-Help Groups (SHGs)**, etc., based on practical criteria of public demand, convenience, accessibility, etc., from the point of view of the actual users. The delivery system may be improved by relocating these organizations from sites that have not found favour with the user public or where there is practically no demand for service.

18. Encourage and support the emergence of private sector and NGOs as providers of needed services, based on people's preferences and efficiency criteria, for example, in healthcare, education, **IT-enabled services (ITES),** tourism, cultural affairs, sports, hospitality industry, etc., where private players are gaining popularity. In such sectors, public delivery system may play a complementary role as well as the role of the safety net provider.

19. Protect public interest and consumers' rights in service delivery through private sector and NGOs, for which suitable regulatory mechanisms must be developed and enforced in a fair, objective and transparent manner. The need is particularly imminent in healthcare and education.

20. Consider granting functional autonomy coupled with professional management to public sector organizations with significant role in the delivery system and having potential for becoming well-managed organizations. Examples could include the medical colleges, major hospitals, some educational institutions, and even some carefully selected **public sector undertakings (PSUs).**

21. Explore the scope of public-private partnerships in the delivery system. These could be of help in areas where the primary responsibility should remain with the government but the goods and services can be more efficiently produced and delivered by private sector or NGOs, particularly areas where innovative and novel approaches are needed or the government has to emerge as agents of social change, for example, total literacy campaign, health education, HIV/AIDS awareness programmes, anti-drug abuse interventions, development of women and children, empowerment of the weaker sections, etc.

22. Make the delivery system at all levels responsive to emerging citizen demands. Choose the correct organizational form to fit the type and purpose of service provided, and improve the capacity of Government Agency to deliver citizen-centered services. New structures should be complemented by citizen-centered management system and corporate culture to ensure that service improvement occurs. Service standards must reflect aspects of service that are important to citizens and must relate to citizens' expectations.

23. Categorically stipulate the roles and responsibilities of the service providers with inbuilt mechanisms for reducing cost and eliminating overlap and duplication. Public services should be business-like, generating revenue where possible, and keeping account to find out result vs. cost where services are rendered *gratis*.

24. Allocate adequate resources to meet service priorities, and strengthen the strategy formation and periodic planning process to meet the changing needs and demands of the delivery system.

Monitoring & Evaluation System

25. Put in place an effective monitoring and evaluation system dovetailed with the delivery system at all levels. This monitoring and evaluation system shall have to cover the key persons involved in the delivery system at each level, for whom a periodic, participatory **performance**

evaluation system shall have to be evolved, based on objective and achievable criteria, so that accountability could be ensured, and proper feedback and appreciation/ corrective action could follow.

26. Follow a **gap analysis** approach in the monitoring and evaluation system at the programme or scheme level so as to close any service gap between citizen's expectations and service delivery. For this, there should be provision for feedback to frontline staff managers and political leaders about programme efficiency and effectiveness.

27. **Periodically evaluate** each governmental agency (at least once every year; if possible, once every quarter) to see how effectively that agency is meeting its mandate. Such evaluation could be done internally or externally (through some independent organization) or both, and the report could form a part of the annual report of the government agency.

28. Use **benchmarking** tools for measuring performance and identifying areas of success or deficiency in service delivery. These tools should be used in a fair and objective manner so as to encourage desirable practices and to facilitate change in a supportive manner.

29. Involve the **stakeholders** of the projects in planning the monitoring and evaluation process and reviewing the monitoring data, so as to allay their apprehensions about the monitoring process and the impact of its outcomes on their interests and to secure their active participation in the process.

30. Take help of IT (**Information Technology**) tools, including computerized databases and electronic communication systems, to collect, collate and analyse the monitoring and evaluation data in a timely and transparent manner. These will also facilitate real time data capture operations necessary for the concurrent evaluation of certain programmes and schemes.

31. Activate the **Monitoring Cell** in the CM's Secretariat (or under the Planning & Development Dept.) to monitor the important programmes and schemes of the various departments. This Cell should be headed by a fairly senior officer, and should be adequately supported with computers and staff. All concerned departments/ Government agencies should provide timely and authentic data and information to this Cell, and the top decision-makers in the government should regularly review its reports for the sake of taking further necessary action. If it functions properly, this Monitoring Cell could become an effective internal watchdog for the government.

32. Create a well-networked, IT-based **Executive Information System (EIS)** as a decision support system for the top decision makers in the government, with updated and comprehensive data backup covering all the important sectors, so as to facilitate real time supervision of the delivery system at the higher levels of governance. Similar **Management Information System (MIS)** tools could also be developed at various levels down the line at the head of the department, division, district, sub-division, development block, etc.

33. Consider setting up an independent, external watchdog body on the lines of the **Centre for Good Governance** of the Andhra Pradesh Government, with eminent persons in the field of public administration, finance, economics, corporate governance, etc., as members, and with a mandate to keep an eye on the structure, process and outcomes of governance under the State Government. Such a body could take up the task of monitoring and evaluation of important state government programmes as well as monitoring the progress of reform efforts, and could offer its considered views and recommendations to the State Government on a regular and ongoing basis.