

The 2023

State of UserCentriCities

How Cities and Regions are Delivering Effective Services
by Putting Citizens' Needs at the Centre



By Chrysoula Mitta, David Osimo, Anna Pizzamiglio and the UserCentriCities Community



About the UserCentriCities Consortium

UserCentriCities is a 30-partner consortium co-financed by the European Union. The consortium brings together the Lisbon Council, Eurocities, VTT Technical Research Centre (Finland) and the Centre for C-Centricity at IE University (Spain) with 26 leading cities and regions: Arezzo, Barcelona, Catalonia Region, Brussels Capital Region, Emilia Romagna Region, Espoo, Ghent, Glasgow, Gothenburg, Helsinki, Kronoberg Region, Kyiv, Lisbon, Ljubljana, Madrid, Mataró, Milan, Murcia, Olesa de Montserrat, Paris, Porto, Riga, Rotterdam, Tallinn, Terrassa and Utrecht. For more information, visit <https://www.usercentricities.eu/>.

The 2023 State of UserCentriCities

How Cities and Regions are Delivering Effective Services
by Putting Citizens' Needs at the Centre

By Chrysoula Mitta, David Osimo, Anna Pizzamiglio and the UserCentriCities Community



Chrysoula Mitta



David Osimo



Anna Pizzamiglio

About the Principal Authors

Chrysoula Mitta is director at the Lisbon Council. **David Osimo** is director of research at the Lisbon Council. **Anna Pizzamiglio** is research associate and project manager at the Lisbon Council.

The views expressed in this report are those of the principal authors alone and do not necessarily represent the view of the members of the UserCentriCities consortium, the participating cities and regions, the European Commission or any of their associates.

Putting Citizens at the Centre: Introduction and Key Findings

User-centricity, or building public services around the needs of citizens, is not a controversial goal.¹ You won't find any expert or policy paper arguing for building services around the needs of public administrations.

Yet the objective remains surprisingly elusive to deliver, as shown not only by the everyday experience of any citizen but also by the historically slow adoption metrics for digital government services. The majority of European adults shop online since 2016, use online banking since 2018, but as of 2022 do not yet use digital government services.²

'The UserCentriCities Dashboard allows cities and regions to track progress and to learn from each other.'

One of the reasons for this paradox is that being user-centric is such a vague concept that any public administration can claim to be “user-centric” based on their own metrics and reading. This is particularly true for local governments, which do not have clear benchmarking tools available compared to the national level.³

This is why six European leading local administrations came together in 2020 with three research and advocacy organisations to create UserCentriCities, a collaborative learning and benchmarking platform.⁴ The project has grown to 30 partners. One of its core achievements is the [UserCentriCities Dashboard](https://www.usercentricities.eu/ucdashboard) – a unique platform for collecting and visualising local data in the digital government field – accessible online at <https://www.usercentricities.eu/ucdashboard>. This unique tool allows cities and regions to objectively track their progress in delivering cutting-edge city services, to compare outcomes and to learn from each other. In 2023, 21 cities and regions contributed data to the dashboard, up from 13 in 2022, with more in the pipeline.⁵

1 This report builds on research co-created for the UserCentriCities project, a 30-partner consortium co-financed by the European Union. The consortium is led by the Lisbon Council and includes the Centre for C-Centricity at IE University (Spain), Eurocities, VTT Technical Research Centre (Finland) and 26 leading cities and regions (founding partners: Espoo, Milan, Murcia, Rotterdam, Tallinn and Emilia Romagna Region. And participating cities and regions: Arezzo, Barcelona, Catalonia Region, Brussels Capital Region, Ghent, Glasgow, Gothenburg, Helsinki, Kronoberg Region, Kyiv, Lisbon, Ljubljana, Madrid, Mataró, Olesa de Montserrat, Paris, Porto, Riga, Terrassa and Utrecht). Since its launch in 2020, the project has developed metrics, provided a support toolkit and driven policy debates intended to deepen digital government at the local level. The principal authors of this report – Chrysoula Mitta, David Osimo and Anna Pizzamiglio – would like to thank Roberta Cocco, Giorgio Constantino, Mayra García-Blásquez Lahud, Paul Hofheinz, Alice Iordache, Tim Lyon, Evgenia Malikova, Stella Meyer, Christina Moise, David Muñoz and Marcello Verona. Any errors of fact or judgement are the principal authors' sole responsibility. For more information, visit <https://www.usercentricities.eu/>.

2 The data from Eurostat digital economy and society indicators was accessed in March 2023. For more, visit <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/digital-economy-and-society/overview>.

3 The European Commission, for one, has been benchmarking “user-centricity” since 2002 in European Union member states. However the data – based on an old methodology – ignores the complex problem of user satisfaction and simply tabulates website features, resulting in a 2022 average adoption rate of 88% that seems genuinely at odds with the experience of most users. See European Commission, *eGovernment Benchmark 2022* (Brussels: European Commission, 2022).

4 The founding cities and regions are Espoo, Milan, Murcia, Rotterdam, Tallinn and Emilia Romagna Region. For more, visit <https://www.usercentricities.eu>.

5 Under the existing methodology, participating city administrations upload answers to each of 41 binary sub-indicators and provide evidence to back up the statement. Once validated by the UserCentriCities team, the results are immediately published and visible to all. The data in this report presents data compiled for the UserCentriCities Dashboard as of 31 March 2023. Any changes to the dashboard after that date are not reflected in this report. For more, visit the section on Methodology on page 24.

Such a dashboard is not just important because it fills the data gap for the local level. It has three additional strategic benefits:

- 1) By defining user-centricity alongside 12 indicators and 41 sub-indicators, it makes results more concrete and tangible and provides a shared vision of what needs to be done.
- 2) By tracking and comparing progress, it makes governments accountable and incentivises genuine progress through virtuous competition.
- 3) By gathering qualitative evidence from each city or region, it offers a learning opportunity for how to get there.

Behind the indicators lies a common vision of what it means to be user-centric. A user-centric government is one that has strong in-house expertise in service design and user experience and constantly works to improve the digital competences of civil servants and

‘By tracking and comparing progress, the dashboard makes governments accountable and incentivises virtuous competition.’

citizens. It enshrines the importance of users in official documents and binding guidelines. It collaborates actively with an ecosystem of private and public players to deliver services by making available application programming interfaces (APIs), using interoperable solutions provided by other administrations and involving innovative startups. It co-creates services with users, in constant iteration, before and after the design of a service, including disadvantaged groups. It embraces “digital by default” and delivers usable and secure services through multiple channels and in a proactive manner, ensuring that citizens don’t have to provide documents when the information is already held by public administrations (the so-called “once-only” principle). Finally, it regularly monitors and accounts for the impact in terms of data on adoption of services, the reduction of burden and the satisfaction of citizens. A box on page eight summarises these findings.

The UserCentriCities Framework

User-Centricity		
Enablers	Performance	Impact
I.1. Skills	II.1. Co-creation	III.1. Adoption
	II.2. Supply of online services	
I.2. Strategies	II.3. Useability	III.2. Reduction of burden
	II.4. Security and privacy	
I.3. Ecosystem	II.5. Citizen redress and feedback mechanisms	III.3. Satisfaction
	II.6 Interoperability	

Source: UserCentriCities Dashboard

The results are encouraging, and even more importantly, useful. The average score of 58% shows that local administrations – at least those taking part in the data collection – have genuinely prioritised putting users at the centre. Particularly striking is the fact that the majority of cities (15 of 21) mention user experience in their strategy, have defined city-wide design guidelines (13) and actually employ service designers (11), in some advanced cases devoting entire organisational units to user experience or service design. Most cities also use data analytics to analyse users’ behaviour, have data showing that the majority of transactions are now carried out online and actually publish such adoption data.

‘The average score of 58% shows that many local administrations have genuinely prioritised putting users at the centre.’

Astonishingly, all 21 cities enable users to authenticate via secure digital ID, mostly using common service modules developed at national or regional level.

Other aspects are in need of further work. While 13 cities have design guidelines, a minority of cities (nine) have adopted formal

service standards, and only eight actually enforce the compliance with the guidelines. While most cities use co-creation methods habitually, few keep co-creating even after the service is launched, or specifically do it only with disadvantaged communities, or plan for regular release after the service is launched. On service provision, very few cities have widely used city apps, or provide proactive services, or deliver on pledges contained in the European Commission’s Single Digital Gateway Regulation, a flagship programme designed to establish a unique multi-lingual portal for improving local and intra-European access to important citizen services such as registering cars or claiming a pension.⁶

Overall, the city of **Milan** and the **Catalonia Region** stand out with an average compliance of 87% across all topics. However, the goal is not to identify winners and losers. In fact, simply taking part in the UserCentriCities Dashboard is itself a sign of a genuine strong commitment to user-centricity. In this sense, all participating cities and regions are winners. And each one, from the top-rated **Milan** to **Nuovo Circondario Imolese**, a union of municipalities in the Bologna municipal district, can also use the dashboard to identify areas for improvement and change.

How to achieve such improvement? Well, this falls beyond the scope of this dashboard or even a larger project such as UserCentriCities. But besides metrics, the UserCentriCities Dashboard contains a trove of qualitative insights that can genuinely help each participating administration. In this case, the angel is in the details. Did you know that Rotterdam employs 25 service designers and a user-interface lab? That the property tax payment in Bratislava is reviewed and improved every year? That Ghent automatically registers families in need for social benefits, using data held by different levels of administration? That Madrid processed 70% of registrations in digital form in 2022, up from 23% in 2019? That Kyiv, despite the challenges of war, has continuously updated its city app adding new services daily for citizens in need, such as a map of bomb shelters and heating points?

⁶ The Single Digital Gateway Regulation spells out legal obligations for local authorities to provide services to citizens from other European Union countries. By December 2022, local authorities should have a dedicated section on their website informing citizens from other EU countries how they can access their services locally. By 2023, all services should be accessible in or out of the home country using a national ID to access the system. The regulation was approved in 2018. For more, visit https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/single-market/single-digital-gateway_en.

Table 1. Ranking

Ranking	Local authority	Overall score
1	Catalonia Region	87%
	Milan	87%
3	Rotterdam	86%
4	Bratislava	79%
5	Tallinn	75%
	Ghent	75%
7	Madrid	74%
8	Utrecht	71%
9	Kyiv	65%
10	Gothenburg	63%
11	Porto	62%
12	Espoo	58%
13	Murcia	52%
14	Emilia Romagna Region	48%
15	Olesa de Montserrat	45%
	Sant Boi de Llobregat	45%
17	Unione delle Terre d'Argine	44%
18	Ferrara	33%
19	Riga	32%
20	Arezzo	29%
	Nuovo Circondario Imolese	29%

Source: UserCentriCities Dashboard

The online dashboard is full of such surprises and hidden gems, which couldn't all be fitted in this report. Among the key findings:

1 Leading the dashboard ranking, with a tie for the best performer, are **Catalonia Region** (No. 1) and **Milan** (No. 1), closely followed by **Rotterdam** (No. 3). All three score exceptionally well across all indicators. Rotterdam performs particularly well on Enablers with an impressive score of 100%, as well as on User-Centricity Performance, with a score of 88%. What makes Milan and the Catalonia Region the two leading local authorities of the dashboard, however, is their excellent performance on Outcomes, where both score a staggering 100%. This demonstrates that both authorities show great interest in monitoring the impact of their digital services and reporting impressive adoption and satisfaction rates.

'A user-centric government has strong in-house expertise in service design and user experience.'

2 Bratislava (No. 4), a new entry on the UserCentriCities Dashboard with an overall score of 79%, performs quite well across all pillars. But despite an impressive overall performance, Bratislava scores below average in supply of online services, indicating that more improvement is needed in offering more services fully online.

‘The city of Milan and the Catalonia Region lead the rankings with an average compliance of 87% across all topics.’

3 Sharing the No. 5 spot, **Tallinn** and **Ghent** also perform very well, but their relatively low scores on the

Outcomes, respectively 67% and 50%, bring the overall performance down. Despite having user-centricity as a key part of their digital strategies, more work is needed to measure and monitor the concrete outcomes for citizens especially with regards to the reduction of burden.

4 Madrid (No. 7) is a strong performer with an 83% score in Outcomes. But while the city’s 2023 digital strategy, Madrid Digital Capital, names user-centricity as its flagship goal, more progress is needed in the User-Centricity Performance pillar, where it scores a 68%, and in particular in areas such as interoperability and co-creation.

5 Utrecht (No. 8) performs well with an overall score of 71%. The city scores an impressive 100% in Enablers but more progress is needed in User-Centricity Performance, where it scores below average in supply of online services and useability.

What is a user-centric government?

Answering that question is beyond the scope of this project. And yet, a careful study of the results produced in this report does yield some interesting patterns and themes. Governments that score well on the UserCentriCities Dashboard have many traits in common, including the following:

A user-centric government:

- has strong in-house expertise in service design and user experience and constantly works to improve the digital competences of civil servants and citizens
- enshrines the importance of users in official documents and binding guidelines
- collaborates actively with an ecosystem of private and public players to deliver services by making available application programming interfaces (APIs), using interoperable solutions provided by other administrations and involving innovative startups
- co-creates services with users, in constant iteration, before and after the design of a service, including disadvantaged groups
- embraces “digital by default” and delivers usable and secure services through multiple channels and in a proactive manner, ensuring that citizens don’t have to provide documents when the information is already held by public administrations (the so-called “once-only” principle)
- regularly monitors and accounts for the impact in terms of data on adoption of services, the reduction of burden and the satisfaction of citizens

6 At No. 9, **Kyiv** is a positive surprise. The city’s efforts to keep digital services running even in times of war are paying off. Kyiv scores 63% in User-Centricity Performance, where more progress is needed in interoperability and in supply of online services. Kyiv Digital, the city’s mobile application, has reached high satisfaction and adoption rates, as it provides life-saving bomb alerts and information about shelters and heating points.

7 **Gothenburg** and **Porto** (Nos. 10 and 11, respectively) perform well across Enablers and User-Centricity Performance, but show less interest in measuring the Outcomes of their digital services, driving their overall score down.

8 **Supply of online services** is an area where local authorities lag behind with an average score of 36%. Only the **Catalonia Region** and **Ghent** score above 80% thanks mostly to their unique efforts to provide proactive services to their citizens. Clearly, local authorities need to put more effort into unlocking the power of proactive service delivery, in offering more services online and meeting the targets of the Single Digital Gateway Regulation.⁷

9 Another area where more ground needs to be covered is **interoperability**. With an average score of 45%, local authorities need to do more to apply the once-only principle to their services and to encourage the use of standards in information and communication technology (ICT) development and procurement and the use of open-source solutions. Only **Milan** and **Bratislava** score 100% in this area.

10 **Espoo** and **Murcia** (Nos. 13 and 14, respectively) both do reasonably well in Enablers but lag behind in User-Centricity Performance, where they score 61% and 56% respectively. Both cities need to concentrate their efforts in co-creation, supply of online services and interoperability. Their performance in Outcomes is below the average. Despite its low scores in Outcomes, Espoo publishes data on usage of online services and measures satisfaction but fails to report any data on measuring the reduction of burden.

11 **Emilia Romagna Region** (No. 15) performs reasonably well, despite the fact that the regional authority does not offer services directly to citizens, a competence reserved for municipalities in Italy.

12 **Olesa de Montserrat** and **Sant Boi de Llobregat** share rank No. 17 followed by **Unione delle Terre d'Argine** (No. 18). Contrary to most local authorities ranked on the UserCentriCities Dashboard, all three perform the worst in the Enablers pillar, scoring 25%, 47% and 47% respectively – an indication that smaller municipalities may not have the means to employ specialised workforce in user experience and service design.

‘The majority of cities have city-wide design guidelines and actually employ service designers.’

⁷ For more, see Footnote 6 on page six and visit https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/single-market/single-digital-gateway_en.

13 At the bottom of the ranking we find **Ferrara** (No. 21), **Riga** and **Arezzo** (sharing No. 22) and **Nuovo Circondario Imolese** (No. 23), which suffer from poor performance across all three pillars. Ferrara, Nuovo Circondario Imolese and Riga do not use co-creation practices in service design whereas Arezzo scores a lukewarm 20% in that indicator. Surprisingly, Nuovo Circondario Imolese performs particularly well in the sub-pillar on useability, where they score higher than average. They also do very well when it comes to adoption of digital services, with a score of 100%, meaning that when a service is available digitally, the majority of transactions are carried out online. Riga and Arezzo, on the other hand, have a higher than average score on privacy and security, where both authorities score a 100%.

14 Overall, with an average score of 69% in Enablers, the ranking shows that most local authorities have put in place the right skills, strategies and ecosystem that enable user-centricity. However, in the area of User-Centricity Performance, with an average score of 55%, there is still room for improvement. Most notably, more progress is needed in applying co-creation to service design, in interoperability and in supply of online services. Local authorities show little interest in measuring the outcome of their digital services, scoring an

‘Even a small municipality such as Sant Boi de Llobregat employs two service designers.’

average 42% in the Outcomes pillar. While measuring adoption of the services as well as citizen satisfaction is gaining ground, local authorities tend to overlook the effects of digital services on the administrative burden and the financial gains from user-centric digitalisation.

1. Enablers of User-Centricity

With an overall score of 69%, the Enablers pillar is by far the pillar on which cities and regions perform best, meaning cities are on the right path to set up the framework and components to drive digitalisation and to implement user-centricity in public-service delivery.

Enablers measure the skills that cities employ in particular related to service design, their strategies and their interaction with the ecosystem, such as startups and other administrations.

1.1 Skills

Skills is an indicator in which regions and cities perform particularly well, with an average score of 70%. One year into this project, the interest among cities and regions to establish internal service design teams and provide ICT training to citizens and employees remains high, but more progress is needed in service design training.

Of the 21 local authorities on the UserCentriCities Dashboard, 11 reported having dedicated internal positions for user experience, such as service designers, user experience designers, and researchers. **Milan** has established an internal specialised division on “citizens experience” with a total of 58 employees out of which 13 positions can be strictly identified

as user research, user experience experts or service designers. **Catalonia Region** has established dedicated user-experience (UX) teams and **Rotterdam's** UX Lab employs 25 experts. In **Bratislava**, the department of innovation in digital services employs seven full-time service designers. **Porto** has established Porto Digital, a non-profit association to promote the digitalisation of the city and its metropolitan area. Porto Digital employs two user-experience designers and two design thinking experts. And even smaller municipalities such as **Sant Boi de Llobregat** employ two service designers in charge of the city's digital transformation projects. **Unione delle Terre d'Argine**, the union of the municipalities of Campogalliano, Carpi, Novi di Modena, Soliera in the **Emilia Romagna Region**, employs one user experience designer.

'Utrecht has trained around 60 employees on user experience.'

The majority of cities and regions recognise the importance of digital skills and have implemented training programmes to upskill their employees in ICT. Out of the 21 cities and regions surveyed, 18 provide ICT training to their staff. While progress in ICT training is significant, training in service design is not as widespread. Out of the 21 local authorities, only 12 have provided training on service design or user research to their employees. **Ghent** has developed several courses on service design and launched the "Everyone Digital" project to ensure that all 2,000 employees without their own work computer are digitally equipped. Similarly, **Utrecht** has trained around 60 employees on journey mapping, interviews, and customer feedback tooling.

The efforts to improve digital skills are not limited to civil servants alone. Many cities are also offering training in digital technologies to their citizens. Out of the 21 cities and regions surveyed, 17 reported actively providing digital training to their communities. In the past three years, **Emilia Romagna Region** has delivered courses to 16,845 citizens. Through the "Pane and Internet" project, funded by the Emilia-Romagna Region as part of the Regional Digital Agenda, **Unione delle Terre d'Argine** has helped 411 citizens to develop digital skills and ensure access to the information society.

While **Tallinn** does not offer on-site training, it provides a considerable amount of instructions on how to use digital services that are continually being created and updated. The city reports that this is mainly due to the fact that Estonia has a high level of ICT skills, as the country has taken a proactive approach to address this challenge on a national level.

1.2 Strategies

On the strategies sub-pillar, local authorities score on average 65%. Eighteen cities and regions out of the 21 participating have digital strategies in place that are less than three years old, accounting for an overall average score of 64%. Moreover, 19 of the cities and regions report having a chief digital transformation officer (CDTO) in their teams.

Even smaller municipalities, such as **Arezzo**, **Nuovo Circondario Imolese**, **Olesa de Montserrat**, **Sant Boi de Llobregat** and **Unione delle Terre d'Argine**, report that they have in place a digital agenda and a chief digital officer.

Of the 21 local authorities with a digital strategy in place that is less than three years old, 15 explicitly mention user-centricity in their strategies. In 2022, **Madrid** published Madrid Digital Capital, the city's digital transformation roadmap, outlining its strategic objectives towards becoming a world-leading city in digitalisation and innovation. In this strategy, user-centricity takes a leading role, underpinning the city's plans to offer "digital services for people." Madrid is going to spend over €398 million in order to digitalise the municipal public services with the goal of undertaking a transformation that will provide services that are focused on the citizen – proactive, agile and simple. The city's digital office has been a partner in UserCentriCities since 2021 and has taken an active role and inspiration from the network that fed into this strategic digital vision with the citizens at the centre. In the "three-year digital innovation plan," **Ferrara** explicitly includes better user experience and accessibility as one of the main goals of their digital strategy. The importance of having

'Emilia Romagna Region has delivered Internet Technology courses to 16,845 citizens in the last three years.'

user-friendly applications and digital services is also explicitly recognised by **Ghent** in their digital strategy. Human-centricity is a fundamental principle in the digital strategy of **Porto**. For instance, the Porto Innovation Hub, which is the

municipal platform designed to foster open innovation and co-creation, adopts a "human-centred approach and utilises service-design methodologies." Additionally, an innovation guide was developed based on the same principles.

On the downside, only nine of the 21 local authorities report that they have formal service standards in place. For instance, **Espoo** has enterprise architecture principles that give guidelines to digital service design and are in line with national legislation considering digital service delivery. **Rotterdam** interestingly reports a change in the way they approach service standards. They have changed from "service standards" to "citizen satisfaction." The reason for this change in approach lies in the fact that there is only limited correlation between service standards and citizen satisfaction, which is in the end their main goal.

Furthermore, 14 of the 21 cities and regions have service design guidelines in place valid across departments. **Espoo** has both technical level guidelines and operational level standards for service delivery, such as guidelines for "tone of voice" in customer service and accessible language.

While there is progress in defining strategies, service standards and guidelines, many local authorities fail to put in place formal methods to monitor and enforce such tools. Only eight of the 21 local authorities report having in place formal methods to monitor and enforce such service standards and design guidelines, revealing a gap in implementation that needs to be addressed if local authorities want to truly become user-centric.

1.3 Ecosystem

The ecosystem indicator covers the activities devoted to collaboration with the various actors that play a role in delivering services to citizens. This is an area where cities and regions perform really well, with an outstanding 76% score across all indicators.

Sixteen of 21 cities and regions surveyed provide APIs to other administrations as well as private companies. Most regions and cities report a high number of monthly requests, with **Milan** processing an average of 3,000 requests per month. **Emilia Romagna Region** displays touristic information using APIs and **Espoo** offers more than 20 open APIs, for example to geographic and map data. **Ghent** unlocks its APIs via the city's API gateway and has identified six customers including the citizen lab, the border services, police, the fire brigade and more.

Local administrations have made impressive progress in adopting and implementing national key digital services such as electronic identification or invoicing,

using standardised service modules provided at the national or European level. Twenty of the 21 participating local authorities report providing such services to their citizens. **Milan** and **Arezzo** also offer the Italian national mobile application, AppIO, for citizens to interact with different local or national public administrations and access all their services, communications, payments and documents in one place.

‘The 21 participating cities all enable users to authenticate via secure digital ID, mostly using standardised service modules provided at the national level.’

When it comes to innovative procurement methods, 13 local authorities report that they have introduced pre-commercial procurement, hackathons or other forms of collaboration with SMEs and startups. The Open Challenges platform in **Catalonia Region** connects administrations and innovative companies. The region has also introduced a special mailbox for innovative proposals where companies can share the most innovative solutions to noted problems with the administration. Five of the surveyed regions and cities report having actively taken part in and/or organised hackathons. For instance, **Kyiv** held a hackathon to expand the functionalities of the Kyiv Smart City App. Similarly, **Ghent** regularly organises “Apps for Ghent,” a hackathon where participants use their programming talents to tackle today's challenges. During Apps for Ghent, various teams get creative with the datasets made available by the city via its data portal. Another interesting example is the “Hackacity” project in **Porto**. Hackacity is a hackathon that aims to discover the potential of open city data to create solutions that will have a significant impact on the community. Since 2016, Porto has organised five Hackacity editions. **Bratislava** organises a yearly Climathon, as the city is trying to improve the efficient functioning of the city's infrastructure and create services that support the city's climate resilience. Innovative solutions are based on live city data and valuable data from partners, which can only be accessed during the Climathon event.

2. Performance in User-Centricity

Local authorities on the dashboard score an overall 55% in Performance in User-Centricity due to low scores in co-creation, supply of online services and interoperability against high scores in useability, security and privacy and citizen redress.

2.1 Co-creation

The co-creation sub-pillar covers the engagement of citizens in the design and delivery of digital services. Despite its vital role in user-centric service design, few local authorities adopt co-creation in service design as a standard practice. Overall, the average score in this area is 43%.

Twelve out of the 21 local authorities involved report using service co-design before the launch of a digital service. **Rotterdam** engaged 10,000 citizens who tested the beta version of the city's new website in 2022. Similarly, **Catalonia Region** actively involves both users and civil servants in co-design and validation sessions. For the creation of the region's web platform for children, teenagers and young adults, the design process included two context analysis sessions, four co-creation sessions with the team and interviews with the target groups. User-journey experiences were also conducted to ensure a user-friendly platform. **Ghent** foresees co-creation in all of its digital public service development and it is one of the requirements for acquiring funding for digitisation projects internally.

Co-creation is particularly important in designing services that are accessible to disadvantaged communities. But only seven out of the participating local authorities report regular use of co-design/user research sessions with disadvantaged communities. In the municipality of **Porto**, community consultation is a standard procedure, including for disadvantaged communities. An example of this is the CommuniCity project, which is funded by the European Union and targets the hard-to-reach community of *Campanhã*, an area known for economic and social issues. The project uses technology to promote social and digital inclusion, improving the quality of life of these individuals.

‘Only a minority of cities have adopted formal service standards and enforce their compliance.’

Effective service delivery requires engaging users not only in the design phase but also after the service is delivered. Yet **Bratislava, Milan, Porto** and **Rotterdam** are the only cities that report engaging in co-creation or user research sessions after the launch of a service. **Porto** conducts feedback sessions for services with higher impact once a year after the launch of the service. **Rotterdam's** UX Lab is in charge of making iterations and changes to existing services based on users' feedback. **Milan** has developed a customer relationship management (CRM) service that monitors the impact on citizens and users' satisfaction through surveys, social media analysis and tickets opened by contact points.

Bratislava habitually carries out at least five different feedback sessions in different settings after the launch of a digital service.⁸

Even if they do not foresee co-creation for all service innovation projects, local authorities do utilise web analytics to track and enhance digital services. Fifteen of the 21 cities and regions report that they collect information to enhance digital services by using analytic websites, surveys or dashboards. A few of them use Google Analytics, while others acquire data from custom-made dashboards either created in-house or by outsourcing.

It appears that local authorities do not habitually plan to release regular new features for existing digital services, in line with an agile approach to software development. Of the 21 cities and regions surveyed, only nine reported releasing new updates at least once a year. In **Milan**, new releases are issued on most digital services even more often than once a year. For instance, with reference to the app “Fascicolo del Cittadino/Citizens Folder,” new releases are regularly issued, especially for adding new features.

In 2022, the app saw four releases, showcasing the city’s commitment to keeping its digital services up-to-date and user-friendly. **Rotterdam** has implemented multiple feedback loops, such as a customer signal framework and UX testing, that help them identify

areas for improvement and prioritise citizens’ needs. While they prefer to work agile and develop, which means they do what’s needed when needed, their commitment to continuous improvement shows that habitually planning regular updates is part of their approach to digital service delivery. **Bratislava** reviews and improves its property tax payment service every year based on user feedback.

‘Overall, more progress is needed in applying co-creation to service design, interoperability and advanced supply of online services.’

The results show that local authorities still have room for improvement in terms of implementing co-creation and user-centricity principles in their digital public services at scale. While a few cities and regions have demonstrated good practices in co-creation and engagement with citizens, the majority have yet to make this a standard practice. Local authorities score an overall 40% in this indicator. This often overlooked practice is important as it allows for the development of digital services that better meet the needs and expectations of citizens, particularly those in disadvantaged communities. It is essential that local authorities recognise the value of co-creation and continue to prioritise this approach in the design and delivery of their digital public services.

2.2 Supply of online services

To be sure, the delivery of basic services online is almost a standard practice by now. Among the 21 local authorities on the dashboard, 16 provide most of their services digitally. Notably,

⁸ Co-creation is executed through a wide range of well-defined methods, including both the active involvement of citizens and the passive analysis of users’ behaviour. The key concepts are summarised in Francesco Mureddu and David Osimo, “Co-Creation of Public Services: Why and How,” *Lisbon Council Policy Brief*, 2019.

the progress is equal in larger cities, as well as in smaller municipalities. **Milan** offers 70% of its services digitally, while in **Ferrara** the percentage reaches 71%.

But the supply of online services indicator shows the amount of services cities and regions provide digitally to their citizens, including advanced services such as the development of consumer-centric apps for easy access or the delivery of proactive services, remains an area where local authorities have lots of room for progress. The average score in this area is 36%. Of the 21 participating cities and regions, only six have a dedicated app that is downloaded by more than 20% of their population. Examples include **Catalonia Region's** “*La meva salut*” (My Health) app, which has been downloaded by nearly 60% of the population, and **Rotterdam's** various dedicated apps such as Rotterdampas, Digitale Balie and MeldR.

Proactive service delivery – the automatic delivery of services that citizens are entitled to, without the need for any request from citizens – is frequently mentioned as the next step of digital government. However, of the 21 participating regions and cities, only five offer at least one proactive service to which users are automatically signed up based on government-held data. For instance, in **Gothenburg** children who are about to start their first school year are automatically signed up for a school. **Espoo** also offers a proactive service to its residents aged 68 and up through the “+68 sports wristband.” Every year citizens who turn 68 receive a letter informing them that they are entitled to this service, which doesn't require any registration or application. **Ghent** has rolled out a proactive service delivery programme that so far is delivering three services proactively. It provides low-income citizens with free garbage bags for their waste disposal; it provides automatic reductions and discounts to

parents with low income for daycare and school expenses; and through the *Uitpass*, a pass where citizens collect cultural points, the city offers automatic reductions to citizens with low income.

‘Few local authorities adopt co-creation in service design as a standard practice.’

Although the majority of cities and regions offer their services digitally, only eight out of 21

routinely afford citizens the opportunity to monitor the status of their service requests online. **Madrid** offers the possibility for citizens to check every progress of the requested service online. In **Olesa de Montserrat**, citizens can consult the progress status of the services they requested or all individual files regarding them.

On the fulfilment of the Single Digital Gateway Regulation requirements, only six out of the 21 local authorities have answered positively. The low compliance rate with the Single Digital Gateway Regulation requirements is problematic as it creates discrepancies in digital public services offered to citizens across different regions and cities within Europe. This can result in uneven access to important services such as business registration, social security and healthcare for citizens. It also hinders Europe’s efforts to create a truly integrated digital single market and reinforces existing disparities between member states. Furthermore, this non-compliance poses challenges for cross-border services, which are supposed to be made easier and more accessible through the Single Digital Gateway Regulation. Smaller municipalities might face additional challenges in meeting these requirements due to limited resources and capacity, highlighting the need for support and guidance from higher levels of government.

2.3 Useability

The useability indicator assesses how easy user interfaces are to use. It also refers to methods employed to improve ease-of-use during the design process. It is an area local authorities perform particularly well in, with most cities and regions scoring a 3/5 in the indicators. Top performers are the cities of **Rotterdam**, **Gothenburg** and **Emilia Romagna Region**. The average score in this sub-pillar is 70%.

Five of the 21 cities and regions carry out regular useability assessments of their online services using standard tools. In **Emilia Romagna Region**, all online services carry out accessibility and useability assessments. They do so by using new specific useability tests with eGLU methodology, a tool designed for those who work in managing institutional and thematic websites of all public administrations, which can also be usefully adopted by those who create online services, websites and software within public administrations.

‘Only seven cities report regular use of co-creation with disadvantaged communities.’

Having a consistent design and look and feel across websites or website sections is important for several reasons. First, it helps to establish brand identity and recognition. When users visit a website, they should be able to easily identify that it belongs to a particular city or region. Having a consistent design and look helps achieve this. Second, it improves user experience by making it easier for users to navigate between different sections of the website, as they should already be familiar with the layout and design. Finally, a consistent design and look can also help to establish trust with users, as it suggests that the city or region is organised and professional in its approach to digital communication. This is an area where local authorities perform particularly well, with 18 of the 21 participating cities and regions reporting that all their websites have a coherent look and feel. All pages have the same structure, header, footer and menu. Colour palette, font and text sizes are coherent in all the websites.

Most local authorities (18 of the 21) report that they provide the possibility to citizens to have live audio or video interaction and 17 say that their web services are in line with accessibility guidelines (WCAG). **Gothenburg** and **Milan**, for instance, have implemented a “read speaker” for better accessibility.

With an overall score of 71%, the results on the “useability” indicator shows a promising level of the actions undertaken by cities and regions for useability and accessibility.

2.4 Security and privacy

With an overall score of 83%, local authorities appear to take security and privacy issues seriously and fulfil most requirements on this indicator.

All of the cities and regions on the dashboard offer electronic identification (eID) as a method for verifying the identity of users in digital services. National eID solutions play a crucial role in supplying local authorities with secure, interoperable and trustworthy digital identification

solutions. Italy's SPID is implemented across larger municipalities such as **Milan** and smaller ones such as **Arezzo**, **Ferrara**, **Unione delle Terre d'Argine** and **Nuovo Circondario Imolese** as well as the **Emilia Romagna Region**. **Catalonia Region** fully incorporates Spain's national eDNI and Cl@ve and in addition, the region also offers idCAT, a regional solution used by Catalonian municipalities such as **Sant Boi de Llobregat** and **Olesa de Montserrat**. **Rotterdam** and **Utrecht** both use the national DigiD electronic identification. **Espoo** uses the Finnish national Suomi.fi e-identification solution. **Ghent** is using the Belgian national eID as well as *ItsMe*, a mobile application that allows Belgian citizens to securely log into government services and to verify identity for an array of official services. Citizens in **Gothenburg** can use Digg.se, the national Swedish eID solution, as well as digital messaging and mailboxes. In **Kyiv**, citizens can verify their electronic ID through the *Dii* mobile application, the country's flagship public services platform. **Tallinn** allows citizens to identify, sign and pay electronically via the pioneering e-ID with a state-issued identity or ID-card, using Mobile-ID on their smartphones or the application Smart-ID. Tallinn uses X-Road, Estonia's secure data exchange layer for sending and receiving data between both private and public sector organisations. **Porto** offers the national electronic identification solution, *Autenticação*. **Riga** applies the Latvian eID scheme and **Bratislava** uses the Slovakian national eID *klient* solution.

When it comes to ICT security, the progress is equally strong. The vast majority of local authorities have in place documents on measures, practices or procedures on ICT security, including cybersecurity. The Cybersecurity Agency of Catalonia in **Catalonia Region** sets high standards in ICT security and is in charge of implementing the public cybersecurity policy and developing the Government of Catalonia's cybersecurity strategy. **Tallinn** is following measures and practices set on a national level such as Estonia's three-level IT Baseline Security System ISKE. The **Riga** centre for data protection and ICT security has developed 15 internal documents on measures, practices, or procedures on ICT security.

While local authorities show particularly positive results in the use of eID and in ICT security, providing citizens with control over their data still remains a challenge. Most local authorities have well outlined privacy policies; 15 out of the 21 have in place measures to ensure citizens' control over the data held about them such as seeing who has access to the data

'Some local authorities show limited interest in measuring the outcome of their digital services.'

and for what reason, correcting the data or deleting it. In most cases, local authorities provide citizens with the right to request information about their data via email or an online form. Exceptions are **Rotterdam** and **Utrecht**, which offer citizens information about their data via their processing register where the city records the

procedures in which personal data are processed. The registries describe the goal for which personal data is collected and processed, the type of personal data used, the recipients of that data, the retention period and the security of the data.

2.5 Citizen redress and feedback mechanisms

With an average 75% score, providing citizens with redress and feedback mechanisms in digital services is an area where local authorities do very well.

Sixteen of the 21 local authorities provide online mechanisms for both citizens and businesses to complain and seek changes to a decision. **Rotterdam** uses text mining to scan all qualitative feedback provided by citizens on the complaint channels. The complaints are followed up on by a central complaints-coordinator, and can be referred to the responsible department. **Tallinn** uses “service cards” to forward each complaint to the right person in charge within the municipality.

‘Most cities, both large and small, provide the majority of their services digitally.’

Cities and regions also show a great interest in collecting feedback from citizens. Eighteen of the 21 cities and regions have in place standardised and user-friendly ways for citizens to provide their suggestions, comments and complaints or even praise for a service. Most commonly, local authorities offer citizens the possibility to give feedback online through a form on their web portals. **Rotterdam, Tallinn** and **Ghent** have standardised feedback buttons on their portal’s home page. In **Catalonia Region**, citizens evaluate the useability, accessibility and simplification level of digital services in the region’s Citizen Experience Spaces. In these spaces, citizens verify that the language used is understandable; the steps to be followed are understood and do not lead to errors in interpretation; access to the service is adequate in the service channel (face-to-face, telephone or digital); the user has a good experience; expectations are met, or the service is considered useful. In the citizen portal of **Porto**, an integrated multichannel service (online, phone and face-to-face) is dedicated to answer to the needs and expectations of the citizens.

2.6 Interoperability

This indicator was introduced to the UserCentriCities Dashboard in the 2023 version. It assesses whether and how local authorities apply the once-only principle to their digital services as well as their use of standards in procurement and open-source solutions. Interoperability has become a flagship goal in the European Commission’s digital decade strategy. The proposed **Interoperable Europe Act** aims at accelerating the digital transformation of Europe's public sector and help deliver better public services to citizens and businesses.⁹

The 2023 UserCentriCities Dashboard assesses interoperability based on three sub-indicators. First and foremost, it asks whether local authorities apply the once-only principle. Only eight of the 21 local authorities apply the once-only principle to their services, a concept enshrined in *The 2017 Tallinn Declaration*, under which citizens are not required

⁹ European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Measures for a High Level of Public-Sector Interoperability across the Union (Interoperable Europe Act)*, 18 November 2022.

to submit documents or information already held by the administration. In **Catalonia Region**, three platforms (Platform for Integration and Administrative Collaboration (PICA), the Inter-administrative Coordination Platform (PCI) of the AOC Consortium and the Data Intermediation Platform (PID)) are also interconnected to guarantee the exchange of data and documents between Catalan administrations and the General State Administration. In **Ghent**, several of the city's online forms are connected with federal data services where city administrators can derive available information without asking the citizen to provide them multiple times. Interoperability between national, regional and local registers is the backbone of Ghent's proactive service delivery. **Bratislava** has launched Bratislava ID, a single platform where all digital services that the city offers are accessed. When citizens apply for services through the platform, the city uses its own datasets and national registries to enforce the once-only principle.

Thirteen of the 21 cities and regions encourage the use of standards in the development and (to a lesser extent) procurement of internet-technology solutions. **Rotterdam** and **Utrecht** both follow the nation-wide "common ground strategy," an initiative by the Dutch government to reach a common architecture to make sharing, integration and connectability easier. Based on this programme, Dutch municipalities team up to develop common services that can be replicated and used by 17 million citizens around the country. For instance, municipalities work together to develop the dialogues and the content for a virtual assistant called Gem and further manage its development. Gem is now applied across more than 13 municipalities. **Milan's** enterprise architecture unit has drawn the standards for ICT procurement. The city uses forms and flow charts that settle standards that are compulsory also for external providers.

'Only five cities offer proactive services where users are automatically signed up based on government-held data.'

The image is similar when it comes to the use of open-source ICT solutions. Twelve of the 21 cities and regions encourage the use of open-source ICT solutions. In **Ghent**, the city strives to be a municipality that

is more than a smart city, pushing well beyond with the human-centric use of data, innovation and digitalisation. The city's strategy calls for a digital infrastructure that puts compatibility, open standards, open services and data at the centre of policy. Using open source and open data is an important principle in **Gothenburg**. For instance, the city has built the Enkelt app with open-source code. The app helps citizens report improperly constructed curbs and other obstacles they encounter in their everyday lives. And when **Emilia Romagna Region** publishes calls for tender, open-source technologies and platforms are the preferred choice. **Riga**, since the creation of its Digital Agency in 2022, puts increased emphasis on the use of already existing open-source solutions.

3. Outcomes in User-Centricity

3.1 Adoption

Low adoption rates have always been a challenge for digital government but clear progress is visible, as the digital channel is starting to become standard for accessing government services, not just commercial ones. Overall, local authorities on the dashboard score an encouraging 60% in adoption of digital services.

Fifteen of the 21 local authorities report that the majority of service transactions are carried out online – considering only the services that can be digitised. **Tallinn** reports that 90% of the overall transactions are carried out online. **Emilia Romagna Region** and **Catalonia Region** go one step further to measure the adoption rates in the region as a whole as well as its municipalities. In **Olesa de Montserrat**, the percentage of digital transactions in 2022 was 67%. The city of **Arezzo**, where adoption reaches 70%, reports that when a new service is digitised it results in a significant decrease of the turnout at the physical desk and often employees are diverted to service management with visible time savings and speeding up the completion of the services.

‘Ghent automatically registers families in need for social benefits, using data held by different levels of administration.’

Publishing adoption data has become a sign of genuine user-centricity in itself. It creates a positive incentive system towards putting users at the centre,

and it is one of the first measures that legendary digital teams such as the United Kingdom Government Digital Service introduce when established. This is becoming widely recognised, as the majority of local authorities (13 of the 21) publish data on a regular basis about the usage of their services.

3.2 Reduction of burden

It remains very challenging for local authorities to measure the financial savings for the administration and the time saved for citizens from digitising services. Only four of the 21 local authorities measure the average time saved by citizens when using an online service compared to the offline one. When it comes to measuring the financial savings for the administration, only **Bratislava**, **Madrid**, **Milan** and **Catalonia Region** provide a convincing “yes.”

In 2022, **Catalonia Region** estimated that each citizen saved up to four hours per year by using the online services offered instead of the offline. And thanks to the enforcement of once-only measures, each Catalan citizen provides on average 11 documents fewer per year. For its online property tax payment service, **Bratislava** calculates that the cost of a simpler way to send a bill in response to COVID-19 was €144,394 and the cost of finding a better way to send a bill through authorised mail was €494,810.

3.3 Satisfaction

Eleven of the 21 local authorities measure citizen satisfaction with regard to service provision, showing encouraging progress but at the same time a need to cover more ground. **Bratislava, Catalonia Region, Espoo** and **Rotterdam** use Net Promoter Score, a widely used and standardised measurement of customer satisfaction, while Milan uses the customer satisfaction score method (CSAT) indicators. **Ghent** subcontracted a local service-design consultancy to measure citizen satisfaction with the city's first-line services for 2022. Based

‘Madrid processed 70% of registrations in digital form in 2022, up from 23% in 2019.’

on their findings the city can make adjustments and improvements and follow up on how their services are improved. In “**Utrecht** in numbers,” the city's online database, the city publishes data annually on satisfaction based on 23 indicators.

While the majority of local authorities show interest in measuring citizen satisfaction, only eight – **Bratislava, Catalonia Region, Ghent, Madrid, Milan, Kyiv, Rotterdam** and **Tallinn** – report that the level of citizen satisfaction is above 80%.

UserCentriCities in a Changing World

The UserCentriCities project is transforming. From 2020 to 2023, it was led by the Lisbon Council, a Brussels-based think tank, which built the network, supervised data analysis and worked to deliver the “policy impact” sought on projects of this type. In coming years, the project will be led by **Living-in.EU**, a network of large and small cities and communities, co-founded and supported by the European Union, and an array of leading European city associations and initiatives taking part in that initiative.¹⁰ From the end of 2023, the Living-in.EU portal – accessible at <https://living-in.eu/> – will host the UserCentriCities Dashboard and its future iterations.

In that context, we do have two points of advice to share with the friends and partners who will take this project forward: 1) reach out to even more partners, bringing them, their cities and their local concerns into the undertaking. And 2) strive at all times to make and keep the focus on a “citizen-centric approach” and the end user experience.

If a project like this is to maintain its place and impact, it needs to be continuously transformed. New indicators and topics will emerge. Cities and citizens will raise new demands and needs. But throughout this change – which is good and necessary – a users-first approach to evaluating public-service delivery must be kept in the forefront and maintained. In other words, only by obsessive focussing on the user experience can a dashboard like this fulfil its historic mission and offer the concrete feedback that policymakers want and need.

‘Kyiv has rapidly and continuously added new services to its city app to help citizens during the war, such as a map of bomb shelters.’

The effort to date has been substantial, but the benefits have been orders of magnitude bigger as the many participating cities and regions have made clear. UserCentriCities showed that benchmarking and knowledge sharing, when done right, can deliver important lessons and enormous value. And there are network economies to be had along the way. Every additional partner makes the results more robust and adds depth and meaning to the service. In that context, there are 88,413 local and regional authorities in Europe. Each has a role to play. They are all welcome to join.

But most crucially, it is important to bear in mind that the ultimate beneficiaries of this effort are not the local administrations but the 447,7 million citizens of the European Union. Reliable measurement and diagnostics are essential tools to make sure governments effectively serve them all.

¹⁰ The key partners in the Living-in.EU project are Eurocities, the Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR), the European Regions Research and Innovation Network (ERRIN), Open and Agile Smart Cities (OASC), the European Network of Living Labs (ENOLL), the European Commission and the European Committee of the Regions. For more, visit <https://living-in.eu/>.

Methodology

The UserCentriCities Dashboard is made up of three main pillars, each with a variable number of sub-indicators (i.e. questions). The first pillar totals 13 sub-indicators divided into three indicators. The second pillar contains 22 sub-indicators spread across six indicators. Lastly, the third pillar has six sub-indicators distributed among three indicators.

The data are provided directly by local administrations. If a positive answer is marked, respondents have to provide supporting evidence. These answers then undergo a systematic review process by the Lisbon Council, to validate the results or ask for additional information.

Table 2. Dashboard Indicators

Pillar	Indicator	Sub-Indicator
I. Enablers	I.1. Skills	I.1.1. Does the local authority have internally any position such as service designers OR user researchers OR user experience experts?
		I.1.2. Has the local authority provided training on service design or user research to its employees in the last three years?
		I.1.3. Has the local authority provided training on information and communication technology (ICT) to its employees in the last three years?
		I.1.4. Has the local authority provided training on ICT to citizens in the last three years?
	I.2. Strategies	I.2.1. Does the local authority have a digital strategy less than three years old?
		I.2.2. Does the local authority have a position of chief digital officer or equivalent?
		I.2.3. Does the local authority have a formal service standard (e.g. the United Kingdom Government Digital Service Standards)?
		I.2.4. Does the local authority have design guidelines valid across departments, including for instance standards or protocols for simple language?
		I.2.5. Does the local authority have in place formal methods to monitor and enforce such service standards and design guidelines?
		I.2.6. Are service design or user experience mentioned in a digital strategy or some other strategy level document?
	I.3. Ecosystem	I.3.1. Does the local authority provide APIs to other administrations and to private companies?
		I.3.2. Does the local authority use standardised services modules, provided at national or European level (e.g. CEF building blocks, national payment service or eID)?
		I.3.3. Has the local authority carried out within the last two years innovative forms of procurement, such as pre-commercial procurement, hackathons, other forms of collaboration with SMEs and startups?

Pillar	Indicator	Sub-Indicator
II. User-Centricity Performance	II.1. Co-creation	II.1.1. Does the local authority habitually (as standard practice on every new digital service) use service co-design / user research sessions in developing its services before their launch?
		II.1.2. Does the local authority habitually carry out regular user research sessions (at least once a year) after the launch of a service?
		II.1.3. Does the local authority habitually use specific service co-design / user research sessions with disadvantaged communities (e.g. minorities, elderly people, people with disabilities, etc.)?
		II.1.4. Does the local authority habitually use web analytics and other service data to improve digital services (e.g. completion rates and most frequent errors)?
		II.1.5. Does the local authority habitually plan for releasing regular (at least once a year) new releases for existing digital services (not including technical updates automatically provided by software provider)?
	II.2. Supply of online services	II.2.1. Does the local authority provide the majority of services fully online (out of total services provided that could potentially be digitalised)?
		II.2.2. Does the local authority have a dedicated app that is downloaded by more than 20% of the population?
		II.2.3. Does the local authority offer at least one proactive service, where users are automatically signed up for a service based on government-held data?
		II.2.4. Has the local authority already fulfilled the requirements of the Single Digital Gateway Regulation (deadline end of 2022)?
		II.2.5. Does the local authority provide habitually to citizens the possibility to check online the progress status of the services they request?
	II.3. Useability	II.3.1. Does the local authority habitually carry out useability assessment of its online services, using standard tools such as System Useability Scale (SUS)?
		II.3.2. Do all the websites or website sections of the local authority have consistent design and look and feel?
		II.3.3. Does the local authority provide the possibility to citizens to have live audio/video interaction (such as videoconference or single telephone number)?
		II.3.4. Are the local authority web services in line with accessibility guidelines (WCAG)?
	II.4. Security and privacy	II.4.1. Are the users able to use national eID as a means of authentication for online services requiring authentication?
		II.4.2. Has the local authority put in place measures to ensure citizens' control over the data held about them (such as seeing who has access to the data and for what reason, correcting data, etc.)?
		II.4.3. Has the local authority in place documents on measures, practices or procedures on ICT security?
	II.5. Citizen redress and feedback mechanisms	II.5.1. Does the local authority provide online mechanisms for both citizens and businesses to complain and seek change to a decision?
		II.5.2. Has the local authority put in place structured means for users to provide feedback?
	II.6 Inter-operability	II.6.1. Does the local authority apply the once-only principle in its services, so that citizens are not required to submit documents already held by the administration?
II.6.2. Does the local authority encourage the use of standards in ICT development and procurement?		
II.6.3. Has the local authority policies in place to encourage the use of open-source solutions?		

Pillar	Indicator	Sub-Indicator
III. Outcome	III.1. Adoption	III.1.1. Considering only services that are available online, are the majority of transactions carried out online?
		III.1.2. Does the local authority publish data on usage of online services (such as a dashboard with metrics on transactions) on a regular basis?
	III.2. Reduction of burden	III.2.1. Does the authority measure the average time saved by citizens when using an online service compared to the offline one?
		III.2.2. Does the authority measure the amount of annual financial savings for the public administration?
	III.3. Satisfaction	III.3.1. Does the local authority measure the citizens' level of satisfaction with regards to the services' provision?
		III.3.2. Is the share of satisfied users above 80%?

Source: UserCentriCities Dashboard

Bibliography and Further Reading

Bas, S.F. Oude Luttighuis, Nitesh N. Bharosa, Flori F. Spoelstra, Haiko H.G. van der Voort and Marijn M.F.W.H.A. Janssen. *Inclusion Through Proactive Public Services: Findings from the Netherlands: Classifying and Designing Proactivity Through Understanding Service Eligibility and Delivery Processes*. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research: Digital Innovations for Public Values: Inclusive Collaboration and Community, Association for Computing Machinery 2021

European Commission. *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Measures for a High Level of Public-Sector Interoperability across the Union (Interoperable Europe Act)*, 18 November 2022

Greenway, Andrew, Ben Terrett, Mike Bracken and Tom Loosemore. *Digital Transformation at Scale: Why the Strategy is Delivery* (London: London Publishing Partnership, 2018)

Mitta, Chrysoula, Charlotte van Ooijen and David Osimo. *User-Centricity: What It Means, How It Works, Why It's Needed: How Relentless Focus on End-Users Raises Adoption and Delivers Better Services to Citizens* (Brussels: The Lisbon Council, 2021)

OECD. *Good Practice Principles for Public Service Design and Delivery in the Digital Age* (Paris: OECD, 2022)

Stickdorn, Marc, and Jakob Schneider. *This is Service Design Thinking: Basics, Tools, Cases* (Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2012)

Published in Belgium by the Lisbon Council
Responsible Editor: Paul Hofheinz

Copyright © The Lisbon Council 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to the municipal authorities and UserCentriCities community members who contributed so much interesting non-personal data and on-the-ground experience to make the **UserCentriCities Dashboard** a success.

AREZZO ITALY

ALMA SERICA
European Union, Policies and Projects Officer

BRATISLAVA SLOVAKIA

PETRA DZUROVČINOVA
Chief Innovation Officer

CATALONIA REGION SPAIN

NÚRIA ESPUNY I SALVADÓ
Director-General, Digital Public Services

JOSEP MARIA FLORES JUANPERE
Head of Digital Services Improvement Area

CARME RODRÍGUEZ PÀMIAS
Senior Technician, Digital Public Services

GENÍS VIVES CANTERO
Senior Technician, Digital Services Improvement Area

EMILIA ROMAGNA REGION ITALY

STEFANO GATTI
Senior Advisor, UserCentriCities Project

GIOVANNI GRAZIA
Project Manager, Integration of Digital Services

BARBARA SANTI
Project Manager, UserCentriCities Project

DIMITRI TARTARI
Co-Ordinator, Digital Agenda, Cabinet of the President

ESPOO FINLAND

KATARIINA ESKOLA
Senior Planning Officer

VALIA WISTUBA
Senior Consultant, Human Capital Team

FERRARA ITALY

MASSIMO POLETTI
Director of ICT, Digitisation, Digital Agenda, Smart City; Director of Digital Transition

GHENT BELGIUM

SARAH SPIESSENS
Project Leader, Administrative Simplification

GOTHENBURG SWEDEN

ANDERS JOHANSSON
Senior Digital Strategist

NIINA JURVELIN
Planning Manager, Digital Services

KIM LANTTO
Development Leader, Digital Services

KYIV UKRAINE

EKATERINA MOGILNYTSKA
Project Officer

OLEG POLOVYNKO
Chief Information Officer

MADRID SPAIN

ANTONIO JOSÉ GARCÍA DE LA PAZ
Secretariat-General, Data Strategy Department

FÉLIX ALBERTO MARTÍN GORDO
Deputy Director-General, Directorate-General of Economics

FERNANDO DE PABLO MARTÍN
General Director, Digital Office

JAVIER LUCAS RODRIGUEZ
Head, Department of Co-Ordination and Monitoring of Data

MILAN ITALY

DANTE CHIARINELLI
Executive Clerk for Information Services, Digital Innovation Office

PAOLO CRUGNOLA
Project Manager, UserCentriCities Project

FABIO FAMOSO
Head, Digital Marketing and Customer Experience, Municipal Services

FRANCESCA TAVERNA
European Affairs Officer, International Relations

MURCIA SPAIN

KASPER VAN HOUT
European Programmes and Projects Expert

NUOVO CIRCONDARIO IMOLESE ITALY

LUCA FUSARO
ICT Officer

OLESA DE MONTSERRAT SPAIN

MERCÈ ROQUER COMPTE
Manager

PORTO PORTUGAL

PAULO CALÇADA
CEO and Board Member, Porto Digital

ANA CARNEIRO
Head of Project Management, Porto Digital

JOANA MOREIRA
Head of Innovation Management and Experimentation, Porto Digital

RIGA LATVIA

INGA BARISA
Adviser, European Union Digital Innovations

EDGARS INDRIKSONS
Head of Data, Riga Digital Agency

ROTTERDAM THE NETHERLANDS

JOCHEM COOIMAN
Innovation Officer, Digital Office Europe

BJORN DIRKSE
Project Manager, Department of Public Services

MAUREEN WIJSMAN-DE HOND
Senior Adviser, Department of Public Services

SANT BOI DE LLOBREGAT SPAIN

CARMEN LAVADO SÁNCHEZ
Head, Technology and Information Systems Service

TALLINN ESTONIA

AADO ALTMETS
Head, Smart City Projects Centre, Strategic Management Office

MAARJA KÕUE
Geographic Information Systems Specialist, Geoinformation Systems Department

UNIONE DELLE TERRE D'ARGINE ITALY

DANIELE CRISTOFORETTI
General Manager and Director of Digital Transition

DANIELE DE SIMONE
ICT Officer

UTRECHT THE NETHERLANDS

ASTRID BRANTJES
Project Leader, Digital Services



This project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement 101004603.

The Lisbon Council asbl

IPC-Residence Palace
155 rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
T +32 2 647 9575
www.lisboncouncil.net
info@lisboncouncil.net

