

CITIZEN SERVICE CENTERS

Pathways Toward Improved Public Service Delivery

Human Rights-Based Assessment Tool for Citizen Service Centers

Moving Toward a Rights-Based Approach in Design, Strategy, and Implementation

Abstract

This note provides practical advice on how to adopt a human rights-based assessment for the design, strategy, and implementation of service delivery by citizen service centers. Designed for World Bank teams conducting preliminary assessments, the tool presented here can also be useful to clients such as citizen service center managers to deepen their understanding of the value of a human rights-based assessment and to improve the quality, accessibility, and effectiveness of service delivery. The tool consists of an introduction to the human rights-based approach (HRBA), its relevance to citizen service centers, rationales for adopting the approach, and a 20-question survey instrument.

I. Citizen Service Centers and the Human Rights-Based Approach

1. Citizen Service Centers and Human Rights: Mutually Reinforcing Dynamics

A citizen service center (CSC) is a central location where citizens can access a variety of public services. Modeled after one-stop shops, which were introduced to facilitate interactions between the private and public sector, CSCs facilitate interactions between citizens and the state. At a service center, citizens can access a broad range of

information and services—such as obtaining an identification card and paying bills—at a single location rather than having to visit multiple offices. CSCs can operate at various levels of government, from municipal to national, and the depth of service delivery can range from information provision to conducting transactions.¹

Citizen service centers are inherently linked to the enjoyment of human rights. They uphold and advance human rights when they improve a state's capacity to fulfill its fundamental responsibilities toward its citizens and promote their rights. They may also reinforce human rights by offering services such as access to health and education, water, and social security, among others. The more effective a CSC is at delivering services and ensuring they are accessible to citizens, the more a whole array of human rights can be realized.

CSCs serve as a strategic node between the central public administration and citizens—the rights holders. They can support the fulfillment of specific human rights by improving public service delivery for citizens. As an arm of the government, a CSC is obligated to provide services in a way that upholds the rights of the requestor, such as serving all in a nondiscriminatory manner, including the disadvantaged or vulnerable. This includes “those individuals or groups

¹ For more information on citizen service centers, see World Bank (2017).

who, by virtue of, for example, their age, gender, ethnicity, religion, physical, mental or other disability, social, civic or health status, sexual orientation, gender identity, economic disadvantages or indigenous status” (World Bank 2016, 1) are typically excluded from enjoying the same access to services and to the broader benefits of development as other parts of the population. CSCs are bringing the state closer to the people and are looking at service delivery from the perspective of the citizen rather than the state and making adjustments accordingly. Considering service delivery from the perspective of the citizen improves accessibility and inclusion. CSCs can also make a contribution to the good governance agenda by promoting transparency, accountability, and inclusiveness. It is therefore important to recognize that the relationship between CSCs and human rights is not a one-way street. While CSCs can facilitate the state fulfilling its obligations regarding specific human rights, a human rights-based approach can guide CSCs in operating and informing the design and implementation in ways that help states promote and fulfill human rights more broadly and that serve citizens better.

2. The Human Rights-Based Approach

Basic human rights were first laid out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and then codified into international law through nine core instruments.² Human rights principles that are directly relevant to CSCs are universality, indivisibility, dignity, and nondiscrimination—the recognition that all people have the same human rights, that these rights are interdependent, and that all should be able to enjoy them without discrimination.³ CSCs can promote the human rights principles of participation and accountability by offering, for example, opportunities for citizen feedback and grievance redress and strengthening transparency and accountability in service delivery. Specific human rights that can be served through CSCs or can inform their operations include the right of equal access to public service; the right to social security,

to work, to education, and to own property; and the elimination of discrimination on the basis of race, gender, disability, or age.⁴ According to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, “a human rights-based approach is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights” (OHCHR 2006).

There is no single recipe but, according to the 2003 United Nations (UN) Statement of Common Understanding, (United Nations Development Group 2003) the essential elements of a human rights-based approach include:

- Human rights fulfillment as the main objective of development policies and programs;
- The identification of rights holders and their entitlements and the corresponding duty bearers and their obligations, as well as working toward strengthening their respective capacities to make claims or meet their obligations.
- The use of principles and standards derived from international human rights treaties to guide all programming across sectors and phases, including equality, nondiscrimination, participation, inclusion, accountability, and the rule of law. A “human rights-based approach to programming is an approach that gives equal attention to what should be done and to how it should be done. A HRBA (...) puts equal attention on the process chosen to achieve (...) goals, as on the achievement of the goals themselves” (UNDP 2009).

3. Objective of the Assessment Tool

The great potential citizen service centers have in terms of reinforcing human rights, both outcomes and management processes, is clear. Much less clear is how a CSC might adopt and implement a proactive human rights strategy that actually achieves change. This note provides practical advice on

2. For a full list, see: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CoreInstruments.aspx>.

3. For an explanation of human rights principles, see <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Pages/WhatAreHumanRights.aspx>.

4. These are codified in the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC).

Table 1. Elements of Programming under a Human Rights-based Approach

Necessary and Unique Elements of an HRBA	Good Programming Practices Under an HRBA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment and analysis in order to identify the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate, underlying, and structural causes where human rights are not fulfilled. ▪ Programs assess the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights, and of duty-bearers to fulfill their obligations. They then develop strategies to build these capacities. ▪ Both processes and outcomes of programs are implemented, monitored, evaluated, and guided by human rights standards and principles. ▪ Programming is informed by the recommendations of international human rights bodies and mechanisms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People are recognized as key actors in their own development, and not as passive recipients of commodities and services. ▪ Participation is both a means and a goal. ▪ Strategies are empowering, not disempowering. ▪ Analysis includes all stakeholders. ▪ Programs focus on marginalized, disadvantaged, and excluded groups. ▪ The development process is locally owned. ▪ Programs support accountability to all stakeholders. ▪ Programs aim to reduce disparity. ▪ Top-down and bottom-up approaches are used in synergy. ▪ Situation analysis is used to identify immediate, underlying, and basic causes of development problems. ▪ Measurable goals and targets are used for programming. ▪ Strategic partnerships are developed and sustained.

Source: UNPF 2014: 297.

how CSCs can adopt a human rights-based approach in their design, strategy, and implementation of service delivery. The guidance is aimed at World Bank teams conducting this preliminary assessment, but the tools can be used more broadly as well, for example by CSC managers seeking to increase their understanding of the impact of a human rights-based approach and move from theoretical considerations (a rights-informed approach) to practically implementing the approach across operations. This assessment tool provides a diagnostic and human rights-related recommendations for CSC action plans. In this sense, it can serve to spur on discussions, which can lead to the consideration of incremental changes, rather than a final verdict or evaluation. It should be considered a “living” document, which will be updated and revised based on the collection of actual experiences.

II. Why A Human Rights-Based Approach?

Before introducing the assessment tool, it is useful to remember what the added value of a human rights-based approach could be for citizen service centers. Why should a CSC adopt a human rights-based approach? This question can be answered in three ways.

1. Legal Obligations

A CSC could be legally bound to respect human rights. The vast majority of countries are party to the core international human rights treaties; and human rights have become customary international norms.⁵ Therefore, a simple reason for a center to adopt a human rights-based approach is to be

5. For a breakdown by treaty and country, see: <http://indicators.ohchr.org>.

in compliance with the law. For instance, the Australian law, the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006, which came into full effect in January 2008, was designed to protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens; and it assigns responsibilities to various arms of government. The law has greatly influenced the way in which many community organizations operate, including compelling them to consider human rights in their daily practices. Many public authorities have begun to include human rights arguments in their interactions with various public institutions. For example, community law centers have begun to give greater weight to human rights arguments when seeking better and fairer outcomes for their clients with other public entities, such as eviction issues with the housing office (Federation of Community Legal Centers 2015).

2. Ethical Considerations

There are also ethical and moral reasons for citizen service centers to foster human rights. Adopting a human rights-based approach leads to public servants having a greater respect for the inherent dignity of individuals regarding the public service delivery process. A CSC taking such an approach is also a way to communicate universal values rather than special privileges; it is a way of viewing people as whole human beings rather than merely service users.

3. Practical Considerations

There are practical benefits to a CSC adopting a human rights approach to service delivery. Some of these positive impacts are articulated below.

- **Increased consistency, efficiency, and effectiveness.** Using a human rights compatibility lens can lead to increasing attention being paid to monitoring and the development of more thorough reporting mechanisms regarding funding and service agreements, for example, as well as open and transparent service standards and accreditation processes. By providing a common language to measure the policy and practice of the CSC against

universal benchmarks, the human rights-based approach can lead to the realization of new opportunities and to the streamlining and simplification of organizational processes, thereby reducing costs and increasing the reach to the most marginalized segments of the population.

- **Positive financial impact due to improved risk management.** By improving transparency, accountability, and relations with stakeholders, a human rights-based approach has the potential to reduce the risk of service-user complaints, resource diversion, litigation, and reputational damage. The human rights-based approach can thus be viewed as a tool to better manage social risk and enhance organizational reputation.
- **Increased worker productivity, retention, and motivation.** Adopting a human rights-based approach makes the service center attractive as an employer:

“human rights strategies consistently can: reduce stress, sickness and absenteeism, prevent accidents and reduce insurance costs. Employees and volunteers who feel valued and well-treated are more likely to work harder, develop their career potential, and maximize their contribution to the organization’s knowledge and skill base” (Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission 2008, 9).

A human rights-based approach can improve the working environment of employees by mainstreaming fairness, dignity, and respect in working relationships, providing staff support, building staff skills, “eliminating discrimination, preventing harassment, promoting and valuing diversity, guaranteeing a decent wage, improving workplace health and safety, and providing a mechanism for airing grievances”, which increases productivity and loyalty among staff and decreases turnover (Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission 2008, 9).

- **Better dialogue with and participation by end users, which leads to enhanced quality of service delivery.**

Adopting a human rights-based approach can help improve users' experience of service delivery, for example, through the adoption of user-centered design techniques that focus on understanding the needs and expectations of all citizens. A human rights-based approach can foster mindsets focused on the provision of meaningful opportunities for participation, giving citizens and other stakeholders an opportunity to voice their priorities and build valuable partnerships. These human rights-inspired practices are useful trust-building exercises that can help a center earn the respect of the local community, service users, and funders, among others. They will also enhance long-term operational sustainability through increased legitimacy and are likely to lead to higher public service delivery standards, improved outcomes, and heightened user satisfaction.

- **More informed and better decision-making for service delivery.** Using a human rights-based approach can help justify CSC decisions to internal and external audiences. It provides a holistic and objective framework that facilitates decision making and ensures compliance with human rights principles. This impartial and rigorous approach could help deal with sensitive issues as well as increase citizens' confidence in the state by strengthening the legitimacy of the CSC and thus one of their closest points of contact with the state.

These arguments illustrate how a human rights-based approach could be a growth opportunity for citizen service centers, with the potential of bringing about key benefits to the organization, its users, and wider stakeholders. The next section presents a practical way to evaluate the extent to which a CSC has already successfully adopted a human rights-based approach, both in terms of *what* it does, and *how* it does it. It also provides guidance regarding potential avenues for strengthening the protection and promotion of human rights through a CSC.

III. Human Rights Assessment Tool

The human rights assessment tool for citizen service centers consists of a 20-question checklist. While not exhaustive, it provides an overview of key issues that help determine the degree to which a CSC complies with and promotes human rights. The tool can serve as a roadmap for entities that are designing or implementing a service center. Each question allows for a "yes" or "no" answer, but to introduce more granularity, answers can be declined along a continuum of four possible scenarios, according to the broad categories below:⁶

0	1	2	3
Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
Significant attention must be paid to this dimension.	This dimension requires vigilance. Elements for effective performance are in place, but gaps and constraints persist.	Satisfactory performance with most elements demonstrating effective and efficient parameters.	Highly satisfactory practice with broad-based success in the examined elements.

Each question can receive a score from 0 to 3, culminating in a final score of 0 (lowest) to 60 (highest). To facilitate subsequent actions, a "comments" category accompanies every question, where an assessor can elaborate on the justifications of the score given and provide additional information on the current state of affairs and other circumstantial challenges faced by the specific center. Recognizing the limited length of the survey and options for answers, the entity implementing the survey is encouraged to use discretion and explain the rating in the comments section if, for example, the assessment does not fully match the descriptions of the categories.

6. These categories—latent, emerging, moderate, and advanced—are inspired by the interagency social protection assessment, a set of practical tools that help assess a country's social protection system. See <http://ispatools.org/>.

The 20 questions are structured along two parts. Part 1 looks at human rights programming, i.e., the extent to which human rights are being mainstreamed into CSC management and strategic planning. This is important because it helps ensure that human rights shape operational development from the very start rather than being an afterthought or an ex post compliance exercise that places an additional burden on staff. The eight questions listed in part 1 enable the assessor to evaluate whether human rights are part of the systematic framework guiding the CSC's activities. Conclusions and recommendations drawn from Part 1 questions are likely to lead the CSC to rethink or reprioritize its activities to ensure

that human rights inform and become an integral part of the CSC's strategic priorities.

Part 2 examines whether or not CSC operations conform to human rights principles and standards. Twelve questions examine how well the CSC's service delivery conforms to human rights principles such as equality, nondiscrimination, attention paid to vulnerable groups, participation, inclusion, accountability, and the rule of law; as well as human rights standards such as availability, accessibility, and quality.⁷

7. This distinction is suggested in UNDP (2012: 6).

CHECKLIST: Key Questions

Part 1: Human Rights Programming within the CSC

1. Does the authority in charge of the CSC demonstrate a strong commitment and willingness to champion human rights?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
Higher leadership levels (for example at the participating line ministries) are not aware of or do not show any commitment toward human rights.	High-level leaders are aware that the CSC has a human rights responsibility and are interested in implementing a human rights strategy but do not feel they have or cannot allocate the necessary time, human, and financial resources to do so.	High-level leaders are aware that the CSC has a human rights responsibility and have signaled their readiness to invest limited time, money, and resources into the implementation of a human rights-based approach.	High-level leaders are strongly supportive of human rights and have already invested significant time, money, and resources to implement a human rights-based approach in the CSC. A dedicated strategic-level team is prepared to move the idea forward.	Comments:
2. Has the CSC scanned its operating environment to identify exactly which human rights it is going to serve and who the relevant rights holders and duty bearers are?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
CSC management and staff do not consider the center's services to be related to or serving rights holders but rather as «just business.»	CSC management and staff know that the center's services have human rights implications, but they are not clearly delineated or defined.	CSC management and staff know that the center's services have human rights implications and serve specific rights (e.g., the right to social security and the right to education). They perceive themselves as duty bearers and service users as rights holders, but there is little clarity regarding how human rights could influence internal processes.	CSC management and staff are very clear regarding the human rights that the CSC contributes to fulfilling. They have identified rights holders and duty bearers within the CSC's sphere of influence (e.g., volunteers, service users, contractors, partners, suppliers, nongovernmental organizations, local community, and ministries); and they have mapped out their respective roles, expectations, rights, and duties.	Comments:

(continued)

3. Has the CSC developed a strategic vision and an action or implementation plan relating to human rights?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
<p>The CSC does not have a strategic vision related to human rights nor does it have an action or implementation plan. Senior level staff, such as the board, managers, and supervisors, and more broadly, human resources, service delivery, reception, and external contractors, are unaware of how human rights relate to the CSC as a whole or to their specific roles.</p>	<p>Human rights are part of the CSC’s strategic vision, but this has not translated into concrete operations. Some CSC staff are aware of their responsibilities to human rights but do not know how to carry them out on a daily basis or feel that the boundaries of this responsibility are unclear or blurred.</p>	<p>Human rights are an essential part of the CSC’s strategic vision, and this translates—at least in part—into operations, for example, through an action or implementation plan. CSC management has examined—or plans to examine—how human rights can drive performance improvement in service delivery and help address potential operational, legal, political, economic, and reputation risks. Most of the CSC staff is clear about their operational human rights responsibilities due in part to their having been being outlined in policies and procedures. The CSC has reviewed existing policies, practices, and procedures to ensure compatibility with human rights.</p>	<p>Human rights are integral to the CSC’s strategic vision, and this has systematically translated into the CSC’s operations with the help of an action/implementation plan, as an example. Human rights considerations are routinely integrated into the CSC’s management systems, including leadership, human resources, role and resource allocation, planning, strategic direction, and goal setting; in addition to processes such as user-centered service delivery, policy and program development, evaluation, reporting, and results monitoring. Various decision-making levels have received a clear human rights remit. Perhaps a human rights policy and strategy leader or a dedicated human rights post have been filled.</p>	<p>Comments:</p>

(continued)

Human Rights-Based Assessment Tool for Citizen Service Centers:
Moving Toward a Rights-Based Approach to Design, Strategy, and Implementation

4. Does the CSC focus on strengthening the capacity of duty bearers to fulfill their human rights obligations?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
No specific initiative is underway for building the capacity of duty bearers to meet their obligations.	Limited initiatives exist to build the capacity of duty bearers. For example, staff has access to information and trainings, but content is not necessarily well developed or in-depth. The quality and frequency of trainings provided could be increased. Additional human, technical, or financial resources are needed to enable duty bearers to meet their obligations.	Staff has access to job-specific trainings, guidance, and information or materials (e.g., face-to-face trainings, web resources, and information packages). The quality and frequency of provided trainings appears to be satisfactory.	Training has been mainstreamed across the organization (e.g., general human rights awareness-building as part of staff induction, in-depth staff training on human rights impact assessment, and inclusion of human rights into performance management and professional development processes). A significant portion of the CSC budget is allocated to staff development for human rights implementation; and staff is very satisfied with the quality and frequency of the trainings that are provided.	Comments:
5. Does the CSC focus on strengthening the capacity of right-holders to claim their human rights?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
No specific initiative is underway to build the capacity of rights holders to claim their rights.	Limited initiatives exist to build the capacity of rights holders.	Several initiatives exist to build the capacity of rights holders, but they could be further expanded. For example, the CSC actively informs users of their rights and provides them with support to engage in and contribute to CSC operations. Advocates for the human rights of particular groups or individuals are empowered.	The capacity of rights holders to claim their rights is effectively maximized. Service users receive comprehensive information about human rights and the process of claiming them. Participation of relevant stakeholders is a policy and strategic priority. The CSC actively engages with the community with a particular focus on targeting the most vulnerable.	Comments:

(continued)

6. Do specific performance indicators measure the human rights impact of CSC operations?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
No performance indicator measures the human rights impact of CSC operations.	Human rights considerations are taken into account when discussing the CSC's performance.	Contribution to human rights is part of the performance evaluation of the CSC. Key performance indicators track progress on human rights issues and goals. The CSC has carried out at least one human rights-based audit or at least some audit strategies, policies, budgets, and programs examine the center's impact on human rights.	Human rights have become part of the overall quality standard with impact assessments on them being regularly conducted. Human rights are among the priorities about which the CSC reports, and results are communicated to employees and other interested parties. Measures are taken to address any shortcomings.	Comments:
7. Are human rights reflected in the CSC's internal communications?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
CSC practices and objectives are not framed in human rights language, and there does not seem to be any plan to work toward this goal.	The CSC is considering ways to incorporate a human rights-based approach into the internal communications of the organization, but few concrete steps have yet been taken.	The CSC has reviewed existing policies and practices to clearly articulate their link with human rights. Staff is sensitized to the issue; incentives reward staff for incorporating human rights considerations into their work and encourage them to raise concerns.	The vision, values, goals, and objectives of the CSC are defined in human rights terms. Human rights language is used in the CSC's mission statement, internal policy documents, guidelines, codes of conduct, job descriptions, posters, and notice boards, as examples.	Comments:
8. Are human rights reflected in the CSC's external communications?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC's external communications do not make references to human rights, and there does not seem to be any plan to work toward this goal.	The CSC is considering ways to incorporate human rights into the organization's external communications, but few concrete steps have yet been taken.	The CSC has reviewed existing communications and has started to include explicit reference to human rights for external audiences on its website, publications, annual reports, brochures, and newsletters, as examples.	The CSC uses clear, accessible, and consistent human rights messaging across various media to sensitize stakeholders and contribute to the promotion of a human rights-based approach.	Comments:

(continued)

Part 2: Conformity of CSC Operations with Human Rights Principles and Standards**Equality, Nondiscrimination, and Attention to Vulnerable Groups****9. Does the CSC collect and analyze highly disaggregated statistical data about its service users?**

0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC does not collect or analyze statistical data about its service users.	The CSC collects basic data about its users but does not have the capacity to thoroughly analyze it.	The CSC collects relevant data about its users, disaggregated by sex, disability, population quintiles, as well as urban/rural location, as examples. Capacity exists or is being developed to include data analysis as part of regular reporting and decision making.	The CSC collects relevant data, which is disaggregated beyond typical categories such as race, color, ethnicity, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, disability, and national or social origin to identify possible impacts on human rights. The data is being analyzed and shapes decisions regarding service delivery.	Comments:

10. Has the CSC identified vulnerable and disadvantaged groups among its stakeholders, and has it taken appropriate steps to ensure that their specific needs are being considered?

0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC does not have any particular policy in place to address the needs of vulnerable, disadvantaged, and hard-to-reach service users, e.g., populations that are discriminated against or who live in remote areas, persons with disabilities, and groups with limited economic, social, and political resources.	The CSC is aware of marginalized groups and has made some arrangements to address their needs.	The CSC explicitly and specifically targets vulnerable, disadvantaged, and hard-to-reach groups, and has measures in place to improve their access to CSC-provided services.	The CSC's policies, programs, and budget allocations intentionally address causes for disparity in service delivery by, for example, prioritizing marginalized groups and removing barriers.	Comments:

(continued)

11. Is diversity and nondiscrimination promoted across the CSC?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
There is no attention paid to diversity and nondiscrimination.	The CSC has basic safeguards in place to avoid discrimination.	The CSC has codes of conduct that ensure equal opportunity and respect for diversity and inclusion among staff and service users.	The CSC has clear goals for tackling discrimination and promoting diversity and inclusion in all policy and planning, and these are directly linked to human rights principles. Clear guidance is provided to staff.	Comments:
Participation and inclusion				
12. Does the CSC involve its users in service design to ensure citizen-centered service delivery?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC does not include any of its users in service design.	The CSC informs and consults users regarding service design, but does not sustainably engage or partner with them.	The CSC ensures that a representative number of people, including those usually not heard, are actively and meaningfully involved in service delivery design, which assumes that CSC staff is aware of possible barriers to participation for some and seeks to address them (e.g., attitudes or social, cultural, physical barriers and sensitivities).	The CSC informs and consults users and collaborates with stakeholders through long-term dialogue that enables common strategy development and service design. Participatory mechanisms are effectively used.	Comments:
13. Does the CSC involve users in service evaluation/monitoring through dedicated feedback mechanisms?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
CSC users have no established mechanism to voice concerns or give feedback about the quality of services received.	CSC users can provide feedback about services received, but the ease of use, visibility, and accessibility is limited—e.g., the CSC provides only one suggestion box for written feedback and the awareness level among users is low regarding its existence.	CSC users can provide feedback about services received through several channels, but the feedback loop is not necessarily closed. Additional efforts could be made to raise user awareness of the various feedback opportunities.	Several feedback channels are available for CSC users, and the feedback loop is closed through systematized follow ups. The CSC is proactive in seeking out users' opinions. There is a high level of awareness among users of these mechanisms.	Comments:
<i>(continued)</i>				

Accountability and rule of law				
14. Is the CSC transparent and open in terms of information and data?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC publishes scant official information. Most information is only available upon request, if at all.	The CSC publishes a fair amount of information.	The CSC transparently shares information about its activities, statistics, and results, and makes sure there are no barriers to accessing this information, including using minority languages and a variety of communication channels, and ensuring that alternative formats are available when requested.	Information about the CSC's services and activities is clear, timely, and easy to access for all segments of the population. The CSC is committed to an open data policy.	Comments:
15. Is an efficient, fair, and accessible complaint/redress mechanisms in place?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC does not have any complaint/redress mechanism in place.	The CSC has a complaint/redress mechanism in place but it is not clear whether the CSC users are aware of it, have easy access to it, or have the capacity to use it.	The CSC has a well-established complaints/redress mechanism in place. User complaints are recorded, responded to in a timely manner, and effectively resolved. If the CSC does not have a whistle-blowing protection mechanism in place, it is seeking advice on how one could be developed.	The CSC has a well-established complaints/redress mechanism in place as well as a whistle-blowing policy that enables staff to confidentially report abuses. Complaints are monitored and used to improve the quality of services. Both staff and users can make disclosures of improper conduct or noncompliance with human rights without fear of retaliation.	Comments:

(continued)

16. Does the CSC hold itself and contractors accountable for human rights?				
0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC does not have any human rights-related clauses regarding partnerships or contracts with third parties.	The CSC has an ad hoc process of selecting third parties to uphold human rights, but this is not always confirmed in practice nor is it part of the official guidelines.	Key contracts and procurement policy include special clauses pertaining to human rights, but they could be expanded, for example, by checking the human rights credentials of suppliers and contractors, monitoring their compliance with human rights, developing an action plan in the event of noncompliance by a third party (e.g., sanctions or disbarment).	When negotiating contracts and partnerships, the CSC systematically and explicitly requires third parties to protect, respect, and promote the human rights of service users. These clauses outline high standards regarding human rights, and there is consistent follow up.	Comments:

Availability**17. Is the CSC equipped with what it needs to function and provide services in sufficient quantity and a timely manner?**

0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
Users frequently leave the CSC without having their request answered for lack of equipment or insufficient staff, or they have to dedicate considerable amounts of time to reach an outcome after submitting requests. Timeframes to access specific services are unclear.	Due to technological problems or material limitations, there can be some disruptions in the services provided by the CSC. Users generally have access to requested services, but waiting times and lines are often long; and they often have to go to the center more than once even though the citizen provided the necessary papers and the transaction could have been processed in one visit. Timeframes are set for some service delivery but not in a systematic way.	The CSC is well equipped in terms of technology, staff, and overall infrastructure; and users can usually get their request answered in one visit. Clear timeframes are set for service delivery across the board, but the CSC could benefit from additional improvements, such as ticketing machines, digitized processes, and shorter service-delivery timeframes.	Management processes and budget allocations guarantee fast and reliable service delivery for users. Opportunities to improve service delivery are actively sought and implemented.	Comments:

(continued)

Accessibility (Physical, Communicational, and Economic)

18. Is the CSC within safe reach for all sections of the population, especially vulnerable and marginalized groups, and is the CSC accessible to persons with disabilities?

0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
No special arrangements are in place to cater to the needs of vulnerable or marginalized populations, such as persons with disabilities.	Some basic arrangements are in place in terms of transportation, access, and appropriate seating, but barriers remain that prevent some segments of the population from accessing the center's services, such as limited operating hours.	Attention is paid to the accessibility of the CSC regarding opening times and translation of documents into local and minority languages or alternative formats suitable to the needs of disparate users.	The CSC is adapting its structures to ensure maximum accessibility through, for example, mobile units. Rather than waiting for citizens to come to the CSC, the CSC proactively brings services closer to the citizens and ensures that information is available in accessible formats.	Comments:

19. Are the services provided by the CSC affordable for all?

0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The cost of attaining basic CSC services threatens the satisfaction of other basic needs; CSC services place a disproportionate burden on the budget of poorer households. Bribes often increase the cost of access to CSC services.	While most service fees are affordable, for some, the fees are a major expense to the household. Incidences of corruption skew the cost of accessing services.	Service fees do not represent a barrier to access for any segment of the population. There are no instances of corruption reported.	Service fees are accessible for all, including poor households. There are no instances of corruption. The CSC researches and implements solutions to further reduce the costs of service delivery to users, such as through digitalization.	Comments:

Quality

20. Are quality and culturally appropriate facilities, goods, and services available?

0—Latent	1—Emerging	2—Moderate	3—Advanced	Score:
The CSC does not really take into account disparate cultural values, user patterns, or needs. Quality of delivered services is poor.	Services are mostly offered in culturally acceptable forms. Quality of delivered services is average.	The CSC demonstrates sensitivity to culture, gender, disability, and lifecycle requirements. Quality of delivered services is good.	The CSC demonstrates sensitivity to culture, gender, disability, and lifecycle requirements, as well as to individual physical, psychological, spiritual, and social needs and preferences. Quality of delivered services is outstanding and fostered by quality standards, adequate capacity development (skilled personnel), competitive salaries, and quality monitoring (special controls).	Comments:

References and Resources

- Abrahams, Désirée and Yann Wyss. 2010. *Guide to Human Rights Impact Assessment and Management*. International Finance Corporation, International Business Leaders Forum, in association with the UN Global Compact.
- Federation of Community Legal Centers. 2015. *2015 Review of the Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*. www.fclc.org.au/public_resource_details.php?resource_id=2405.
- OHCHR (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights). 2006. *Frequently Asked Questions on a Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Cooperation*. United Nations. <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FAQen.pdf>.
- . 2012. *Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation*. United Nations.
- United Nations Development Group. 2003. *The Human Rights Based Approach to Development Cooperation: Towards a Common Understanding Among UN Agencies*.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2009. *A Human Rights-Based Approach Toolkit*. UNDP, Vietnam.
- . 2012. *Mainstreaming Human Rights in Development Policies and Programming: UNDP Experiences*. UNDP.
- UNPF (United Nations Population Fund). 2014. *A Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming*. http://hrbportal.org/wp-content/files/UNFPA_HRBAto-Programming_2014.pdf.
- UNPF (United Nations Population Fund) and WHO (World Health Organization). 2015. *Ensuring Human Rights within Contraceptive Service Delivery: Implementation Guide*. UNPF and WHO.
- United Nations Practitioners' Portal on Human Rights Based Approaches to Programming. <http://hrbportal.org>
- Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission. 2008. *From Principle to Practice: Implementing the Human Rights Based Approach in Community Organisations*. State of Victoria.
- World Bank. 2013. *Human Rights Impact Assessments: A Review of the Literature, Differences with other forms of Assessments and Relevance for Development*. Commissioned by the Nordic Trust Fund.
- World Bank. 2016. *Bank Directive: Addressing Risks and Impacts on Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2017. "Recent Developments in the Design and Implementation of One-Stop Shops for Citizens: A Design Guide for Citizen Service Centers." World Bank, Washington, DC.

Acknowledgements

This tool is part of an effort to deepen the understanding of the relationship between citizen service centers and human rights, by a team led by Sanjay Agarwal and comprising Hélène Pfeil, Berenike Schott, Kimberly Johns, and Saki Kumagai at the World Bank. The document's principle author is Hélène Pfeil, with valuable contributions by Berenike Schott and Sanjay Agarwal. The core team benefited from valuable input, comments, and guidance from Anna Autio, Nina Bhatt, Rob Boone, and Charlotte McClain-Nhlapo. The authors would also like to thank Laura Johnson for her excellent editorial support.

Finally, the authors are grateful to the Nordic Trust Fund (NTF) for supporting the activities under this initiative. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this report are entirely those of the authors and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, to its affiliated organizations, or to members of its Board of Executive Directors or the countries they represent.