

e-Government Capacity Check Criteria



NOTE: Please refer to the Lessons Learned Document for detailed information on the process to conduct the e-government capacity check and on the summary reports.



e-Government Capacity Check[©]

A diagnostic tool to help organizations assess
their e-government capabilities

e-Government

CAPACITY CHECK[©]

evaluating organizational capability to go on-line

The challenge of meeting strategic goals with available resources has never been greater. KPMG is developing a suite of *Capacity Check* diagnostic tools to help senior management assess the capacity of their organizations to meet their targeted goals. A successful move to Government On-Line requires the efficient and effective transformation of business processes, technology and people skills. KPMG's *e-Government Capacity Check* is intended to help organizations assess their capability to use electronic service delivery to reach Canadians. The six key elements of the e-government capacity check are:

1. e-Strategy
2. Architecture
3. Risk and Program Management
4. Organizational Capabilities
5. Value Chain Integration
6. Performance Management

e-Government [©] CAPACITY CHECK

Element Descriptions

1. **e-Strategy** (where we're going). The e-strategy element defines criteria to assess an organization's capacity to articulate a comprehensive vision for e-government.
2. **Architecture** (what we're developing). The architecture element defines criteria to assess an organization's capacity to develop e-government architectures required for the design of e-government solutions.
3. **Risk and Program Management** (how we manage). The risk and program management element defines criteria to assess an organization's capacity to manage e-government initiatives.
4. **Organizational Capabilities** (what competencies we need). The organizational capabilities element defines criteria to assess an organization's capacity to develop the human and technical skills and resources required for e-government.
5. **Value Chain Integration** (how we work with partners and clients). The value chain integration element defines criteria to assess an organization's capacity to integrate partners and clients within e-government solutions.
6. **Performance Management** (how we're doing). The performance management element defines criteria to assess an organization's capacity to measure the success of e-government.

1. e-Strategy

■ *e-Vision*

Extent to which clients and stakeholders have collaborated to develop the e-vision statement, the degree of alignment with organizational business strategies and Treasury Board direction and the success of e-vision communication within the organization.

■ *Governance*

Effectiveness of the leadership and organizational accountabilities for the e-government program to support the transformation of government service delivery.

■ *Strategies, Plans and Policies*

Extent to which existing business strategies (IM/IT, HR, Finance and Assets), plans and policies (e.g. privacy) are aligned with the Government On-Line program.

■ *Resource Commitment*

The level of funding and degree to which financial and human resources are committed and aligned with the e-government strategy.

4. Organizational Capabilities

■ *e-Government Competencies*

Mechanisms used to ensure that staff competencies in support of e-government initiatives are defined, acquired, developed and sustained for e-government design, delivery and ongoing operations.

■ *e-Government Tools & Techniques*

Tools and techniques to support the organization in the design, delivery and ongoing operations of e-government.

■ *Organizational Learning*

The ability to capitalize on e-government knowledge through the access, sharing, and management of information within a learning organization.

2. Architecture

■ *Business Model*

Definition of the business processes essential for e-government.

■ *Security*

Definition of security technologies and standards to ensure that e-government transactions are secure and government is seen as a trusted information broker.

■ *Data*

Definition of data objects to support integration of e-government applications.

■ *Application*

Definition of how e-government applications are designed, how they integrate with existing internal and external systems, and where they reside.

■ *Technology*

Definition of the technologies and standards for the technical components to host e-government initiatives.

■ *Network*

Definition of the communication infrastructure for the transmission of e-government information.

5. Value Chain Management

■ *Partner Relationships*

Mechanisms and support for the formation of partnerships between organizations, with other levels of government and with the private sector to support convergence to seamless government.

■ *Value Chain Integration*

Mechanisms and procedures exist to facilitate client, supplier and inter-organizational channels and service delivery processes.

■ *Public Readiness Assessment*

Mechanisms to assess public awareness and readiness to participate in e-government initiatives.

3. Risk and Program Management

■ *Risk Management*

Mechanisms in place to identify, assess, mitigate, and monitor all risks, including government-wide, organization-wide and project-specific risks associated with e-government.

■ *Portfolio Management*

Mechanisms to plan, track, and evaluate the overall e-government portfolio.

■ *Project Management*

Mechanisms to manage projects in the e-government program to ensure the optimal deployment of initiatives.

■ *Business Transformation*

Mechanisms to transform the organization's service delivery processes to an e-government business model.

6. Performance Management

■ *Client Satisfaction*

Mechanisms to measure, evaluate, and learn from client feedback on the effectiveness of e-government service delivery.

■ *Privacy Compliance*

Mechanisms to ensure that confidentiality and anonymity are maintained in the course of conducting e-government transactions.

■ *Benefits Monitoring*

Mechanisms to measure and assess the degree to which the expected benefits of the e-government program are being realized.

■ *Predictability*

Mechanisms to monitor and measure the reliability and availability of web servers, databases and e-government application systems and to compare them with pre-determined service standards.

■ *e-Government Maturity Reporting*

Mechanisms to measure and report on the organization's progress towards implementing e-government.

**e-Government--
Capacity Check Criteria Rating
Descriptions**



Capacity Check

e-Strategy

TOPIC

1

2

3

4

5

<p><i>e-Vision</i></p>	<p>There is no clearly defined vision for the adoption of e-government in the organization.</p>	<p>Senior management is aware of the need for the organization to adopt the e-government paradigm. Steps are being taken to develop and communicate the e-vision.</p>	<p>The e-vision is clearly articulated, well understood by staff and integrated with the organizational vision and business model. While senior management has led the development of the e-vision, there has been a conscious effort to obtain staff buy in.</p>	<p>Staff input is considered critical in refining the organization's e-vision. The e-vision is consistent with the Treasury Board direction and clients, suppliers and business partners have been consulted. Business lines have a clear vision that is consistent with the departmental one.</p>	<p>Staff, clients, suppliers and business partners are all actively involved in shaping the organization's e-vision. The e-vision is continually refined to address clients needs and technology evolution.</p>
<p><i>Governance</i></p>	<p>There is no formally designated champion and organization to lead the e-government program.</p>	<p>A primary e-government champion has been identified and management of the e-government initiative is among his/her responsibilities. The champion is supported by a cross-functional team whose accountabilities involve both management and technology.</p>	<p>Regional e-government champions have been identified and meet informally and irregularly with senior management to provide updates on progress. Accountabilities for implementing e-government are well defined and understood.</p>	<p>There is an e-government management structure which includes appropriate management and staff representation. E-government is being implemented in a coordinated and integrated manner across the organization.</p>	<p>The e-government structure is effective in overseeing the transformation of government and has a demonstrated capability in decision-making, relationship building and stake-holder communications.</p>
<p><i>Strategies, Plans, and Policies</i></p>	<p>There is no alignment between existing business strategies, plans and key policies (such as privacy and security) and the e-government program.</p>	<p>Business strategies, plans and policies are aligned with the e-government program plans for some organizational units. Managers provided input into the development of these plans. Limited effort is made to align and consolidate these strategies, plans and policies.</p>	<p>E-government plans are fully integrated and aligned with business strategies, plans and policies. Desired results, priorities and resources are clearly stated and aligned with the e-government plans. Managers fully participated in the development of these e-government plans.</p>	<p>Management and staff have a high level of awareness of the linkages between business strategies, plans and policies and e-government. Mechanisms exist to measure the achievement of e-government targets in the plans. Managers are highly committed and feel accountable for their success.</p>	<p>The business strategies, plans and policies are continuously updated based on feedback from performance reviews, clients, suppliers and business partners and these updates are fully synchronized with the e-government program.</p>

Capacity Check

e-Strategy (cont'd)

TOPIC	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Resource Commitment</i>	Senior management is aware of the need for funding and limited funding exists to support the e-government Program. Resource requirements have not been identified.	Senior management has made the initial funding and resource commitments, but they are inadequate to achieve the objectives stated in the e-vision. Short-term resource requirements have been identified.	Senior management has made adequate funding and resource commitments for the initial investment in e-government. Funding re-allocations have been made to support transition to e-government.	Future year resource requirements are being identified and addressed in light of new e-opportunities and organizational capabilities. Models are in place to assess resource requirements.	Resource commitments for the e-government program are dynamically adjusted based on benefits realization and client satisfaction.

Capacity Check

Architecture

TOPIC	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Business Model</i>	An overall business process architecture in support of e-government does not exist for the organization. There is no consistent definition of the business processes in use within the organization.	An overall business process architecture for e-government is being developed within the organization, but is not yet complete and up to date. Methods for describing business processes vary between organizational units.	Organization-wide business process models for e-government have been defined and all new capabilities are developed using these methods.	Consistent methods for creating business process descriptions are in place across the organization. There are widely available automated tools which support these methods. There is wide-spread expertise in the use of these tools.	Business process methods are in place to facilitate process transformation. These methods are rapidly adaptive and allow for process integration across organizational boundaries.
<i>Security</i>	The organization does not have a security architecture to support e-government initiatives.	An e-government security architecture is being developed that gives guidance on new technologies, standards and policies. Security has not been consistently implemented across the organization.	A security architecture for e-government exists and is being applied consistently throughout the organization for all new initiatives.	Trends in technology are being monitored to determine areas for improvement in the security architecture. A process is in place to identify and correct security weaknesses in the architecture.	Security weaknesses are identified and corrected using automated capabilities, such as self-healing networks.
<i>Data</i>	An overall data architecture in support of e-government does not exist for the organization. There is no consistent definition of the data objects in use within the organization.	An overall data architecture is being developed for e-government, but is not yet complete and up to date. Data management standards such as the definition of data objects varies between organizational units and data transfer across organizational boundaries is costly and difficult.	Organization-wide data management standards have been defined and new applications adhere to this standard. Older applications need to be converted to conform to the standard.	Consistent standards for data formats and data transfer, and data object definitions are in place across the organization. There are widely available tools which support access to data objects across multiple platforms. There is wide-spread expertise in the use of these tools.	Consistent data management standards are in place across the organization and are compatible with those used externally, and thereby facilitate communication with clients, suppliers and business partners. Standards are rapidly adaptive and adhered to across organizational boundaries, and provide a solid foundation for knowledge management/ information sharing.

Capacity Check

Architecture (cont'd)

TOPIC	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Application</i>	There is no application architecture to support e-government initiatives within the organization. Business functions are achieved via a diverse and non-standardized set of applications.	An overall application architecture is being adapted for e-government , but it is not yet completed. Minimal standardization exists for some application areas.	Organization-wide application standards have been defined and new applications adhere to this standard. Older applications still do not adhere to the application architecture.	An overall application architecture exists to support e-government initiatives and all existing applications conform to the applications standards. There is wide-spread expertise in application functionality.	Application architecture standards are in place to facilitate inter-operability with clients, suppliers and business partners.
<i>Technology</i>	There is no technology architecture that describes the technical components that provide the foundation for e-government initiatives.	Work has been initiated on a technology architecture for e-government. Some e-government technology architecture decisions have been made independently at the organizational unit level.	There is a technology architecture which describes the standards for technical components to be used in e-government initiatives. Some legacy technology may still exist within the organization.	The organization's infrastructure has been upgraded to conform with the technology architecture and to support increased demand for e-government services.	The technology architecture is rapidly adaptive and is being regularly reviewed and revised in light of new opportunities.
<i>Network</i>	There is no network architecture that describes e-government communications between organizational systems, clients and partners.	An overall network architecture to support e-government has been initiated. Non-standard communication pathways exist within the organization.	There is a network architecture which describes the communication infrastructure which will be used for the transmission of data, voice and video, but not all of these capabilities have been implemented.	The network architecture is rapidly adaptive and is being regularly reviewed and revised in light of new opportunities and resources available.	The organization's network has been upgraded to conform with the network architecture and to support increased demand for e-government services.

Capacity Check

Risk and Program Management

TOPIC

1

2

3

4

5

Risk Management

No risk management measures are in place. Concept of risk management is not well understood in the context of e-government.

Risk management policies and guidelines are in place for major electronic service delivery projects. No policy or guidelines exist at the organization-wide level for on-line services. Organization-wide issues are dealt with on a "one-off" basis as they arise.

Organization-wide risk management framework and policy are in place for e-government. Major risks are identified and plans developed to mitigate risks. Managers are familiar with risk management concepts and techniques in the context of e-government. Risk assessment is done extensively at the project level.

Major risks are highlighted in strategic, business, and project plans. Systems and processes are in place to monitor risks and to determine acceptable risk levels. E-government risk management is fully integrated with the organization-wide risk management program. Managers are trained in risk assessment techniques and tools.

Organization-wide risks are monitored on an on-going basis, and action plans are in place to avoid or mitigate risks. Risk management is highly integrated into program/ project management processes. Significant risks and their implications are communicated to clients and stakeholders on an ongoing basis. Effectiveness of controls is continuously evaluated.

Capacity Check

Risk and Program Management (cont'd)

TOPIC

1

2

3

4

5

<p><i>Portfolio Management</i></p>	<p>No portfolio management processes exist to plan, control, monitor, and evaluate the progress of e-government investments.</p>	<p>Portfolio management is fragmented within the organization. Limited tools and techniques exist to support planning, tracking, and oversight.</p>	<p>E-government investments are being managed at the organization level using a standard portfolio management process. Standard tools and techniques exist to support planning, tracking, and oversight.</p>	<p>Interim results are monitored and used to decide whether to cancel, modify, continue, or accelerate the project. Post implementation reviews are consistently conducted and lessons learned are fed back into the planning, tracking, and oversight phases.</p>	<p>Measurements of actual versus projected performance are rigorously collected, evaluated, and communicated to stakeholders. Project mix in the e-government investment portfolio evolves with the e-vision and represents the best match with the organization's mission and strategic goals.</p>
<p><i>Project Management</i></p>	<p>Little or no project management processes, standards, and tools exist in the organization. Minimal capability to lead or manage e-government initiatives exists in-house.</p>	<p>Project management processes, standards, and tools exist within the organization but are not consistently applied. Less than rigorous scope, cost, schedule, quality, and issue management leads to project performance shortfalls.</p>	<p>Organization-wide project management processes, standards, and tools exist to support e-government initiatives. The majority of projects fall within acceptable performance limits and are controlled by a project management office.</p>	<p>E-government project teams are highly productive and deliver the optimal balance between cost, schedule, and quality. Stakeholder expectations are well managed.</p>	<p>E-government projects demonstrate a balance between technical, business and social issues. The project team environment is low stress with low staff turnover. There is open communication and trust among team members. Stakeholder expectations are consistently met or exceeded.</p>
<p><i>Business Transformation</i></p>	<p>There has been little or no consideration given to the cultural and business process changes required for success in the proposed e-government environment.</p>	<p>Management is aware of service delivery opportunities. A change management process exists within the organization. Key change management implications have been identified around e-government initiatives.</p>	<p>Teams have been established to initiate process re-design. Social and technical designs have been developed for key service programs and initial business cases and transition plans have been approved. Change agents have been identified and are committed to changing the organizational culture.</p>	<p>Detailed design and implementation plans for priority services have been approved and pilot projects initiated. Detailed business cases have been updated and resources have been allocated to the implementation of key on-line services.</p>	<p>The organization is ready to support and sustain operations in an environment which delivers services through both traditional channels as well as electronic service delivery. The organization has established methods for continuous improvement of re-designed on-line services.</p>

Capacity Check

Organizational Capabilities

TOPIC	1	2	3	4	5
<i>e-Government Competencies</i>	E-government competencies (knowledge, abilities, skills and behaviors) are not clearly defined or commonly understood. E-government competency building programs are not available.	Required e-government competencies have been identified, however, the current organizational competencies have not been assessed. Limited competency building programs to support e-government, such as training, self-learning, staffing, sourcing, etc. are underway.	Organizational competencies have been assessed at the position level and e-government competency gaps have been determined. Competency building programs to address these gaps are in place. Sufficient resources with the required skills are in place to support delivery of major online services.	Most key competency gaps have been addressed. The workforce demonstrates the requisite knowledge, abilities, skills and behaviors to successfully transform key programs and services for electronic service delivery. Staffing and training in e-government competencies are high priorities, and are part of ongoing training and retention programs.	E-government competencies are an integral part of the organization's goal setting process. There are no significant competency gaps within the organization and any forecast gaps are proactively addressed.
<i>e-Government Tools & Techniques</i>	Limited tools and techniques are available to assist employees in the planning, delivery and evaluation of e-government programs. Limited awareness of tool availability.	Basic tools are in place to support e-government programs. However, staff do not have the skills or knowledge to use the tools effectively. New tools required for e-government have been identified, and are being developed or acquired.	Staff have access to various analytical models, tools, and techniques to support process/ data mapping, web authoring, testing, network monitoring, client usage, multimedia, etc. Staff have been provided training on the use of these tools and are actively using them.	Expertise on the application of key e-government tools and techniques is widespread in the organization. Access to and knowledge on the use of e-Government tools has been centralized in an organization-wide repository (e.g. intranet site).	New tools and techniques and updates to existing tools and techniques are being regularly assessed and acquired in light of evolving e-government program requirements. Mechanisms exist to integrate world-wide best practices in the application of e-government tools and techniques.

Capacity Check

Organizational Capabilities (cont'd)

TOPIC

1

2

3

4

5

Organizational Learning

The organizational culture is not conducive to a knowledge sharing environment and limited information management processes are in place. Mechanisms or structures to encourage organizational learning or the acquisition and dissemination of e-government related knowledge are not evident.

Deployment of the organizational learning concept has been initiated and processes exist to support information acquisition and storage. Access to intellectual capital and knowledge sharing across organizational boundaries is limited.

Organizational learning initiatives are widespread at the organizational unit level. Senior management recognizes the importance of knowledge sharing within various parts of the e-government program and is supportive of collaborative mechanisms and structures to encourage knowledge transfer and lessons learned.

Organization-wide knowledge sharing technologies (e.g. groupware) have been implemented to capture, create and disseminate knowledge and best practices. The sharing of knowledge and best practices to support the e-government program is encouraged and rewarded.

The concept of organizational learning is incorporated into the values of the organization and is consistently applied to improve all e-government work processes. Organizational learning processes within the organization are continuously assessed and revised in light of world class practices.

Capacity Check

Value Chain Integration

TOPIC	1	2	3	4	5
Partner Relationships	The organization currently participates in a limited number of e-government partnerships.	Relationships with e-government partners are being developed on a one time basis. Service contracts are used to formulate and control relationships with partners when undertaking e-government projects. Integration is limited (e.g. simple hyper-links).	Mechanisms are in place to work with partners to develop a shared agenda and to define the contributions of each partner as well as the benefits. There is sharing of the facilities and infrastructure used to support e-government initiatives. Co-management arrangements are in place.	E-government partnering mechanisms are in place to set performance goals, measure performance targets, identify gaps, ensure that partners continue to work effectively together, and to validate the partnership relationship to ensure its continued relevance. Revenues and costs are shared.	There is a well-defined framework for developing future partnerships and/or alliances with other organizations. There is cooperation in the development of e-government plans, service delivery, technology development, and the sharing of resources, knowledge and risks.
Value Chain Integration	There is limited or no integration with clients, suppliers, other government organizations and business partners.	Collaboration with clients suppliers and business partners is currently underway. Integration with partners is limited to transfer of bulk information on a dedicated line (e.g. EDI, EFT). There is limited use of Internet capabilities for static information display to clients.	There is on-line integration with clients, suppliers and business partners of most key business functions. Integration with clients, suppliers and business partners has been extended to legacy systems within the organization.	There is full on-line integration of all key business processes and systems across organizational boundaries. Clients perceive that their online expectations are being met on an integrated basis. There is a continuous flow of information across the logistics chain. Partners have increasing flexibility and autonomy in accessing the organization's services.	A large percentage of the organization's business is conducted on the web and there is full integration with clients, suppliers and business partners. Internet services are fully supported by distribution channels. The organization provides consistent high quality internet-based services.
Public Readiness Assessment	There is no program to assess the level of public readiness for e-government initiatives.	Some assessment of public readiness has been undertaken for some, but not all, priority service programs. Clients have been consulted in priority service programs. Client access points are in place, but client knowledge and awareness is limited.	Public readiness for e-government service delivery is assessed across multiple channels, for all priority service programs. The organization understands the level of client knowledge and competence required for using e-government services. Clients are aware of the technology, and have begun to use on-line services.	Public consultations enhance client readiness. Clients are knowledgeable and willing to embrace e-government solutions as a channel for acquiring the organization's services. Clients consider e-government technology to be user friendly, and are increasingly using e-services.	Client community is proactive in requesting on-line services. Clients are influencing organizational directions with respect to innovative electronic service delivery.

Capacity Check

Performance Management

TOPIC

1

2

3

4

5

Client Satisfaction

Client needs and expectations are unknown, and there are no mechanisms to assess perceived on-line service quality. **Client feedback is obtained in an informal manner.**

Client feedback is encouraged but it is not handled in a timely or effective manner. Basic mechanisms (e.g. e-mail) exist to assess client expectations and the quality of on-line service. **Limited mechanisms exist to incorporate client feedback into the service delivery process, and to consolidate the feedback on an organization-wide basis.**

Multiple channels are used to obtain information on client needs and the actual and perceived quality of on-line services. **Results are tracked over time, and considered in planning/upgrading e-government services at the business line level. Clients are able to provide input into program design.**

Client satisfaction is measured at regular intervals **on a widespread basis**. Results are consolidated on a department-wide basis, and overall trends are analyzed and reported in a timely manner. Client satisfaction influences ongoing business planning and **drives program design** and service delivery decisions.

There is transparent, constructive, and ongoing consultation with clients on an organization-wide basis. Information on client satisfaction is shared across the organization and is published externally. The organization has demonstrated increasing client satisfaction results. **Clients are given the opportunity to participate in program and service delivery design.**

Privacy Compliance

Mechanisms are not in place to ensure that e-government initiatives are in compliance with the Privacy Act.

The organization has initiated a program of privacy compliance for e-government initiatives. Privacy impact assessments are conducted on an ad hoc basis at the project level.

The organization can demonstrate compliance with all aspects of the privacy act for e-government initiatives. This addresses issues such as the definition of private information and the sharing of data with other organizations. Training programs are provided for conducting privacy impact assessments.

All privacy requirements are communicated throughout the organization and are consistently applied to e-government initiatives. Privacy impact assessments are performed throughout the life cycle of all e-government initiatives.

Mechanisms are in place to audit adherence to the privacy policy on a regular basis and to take any required corrective actions. Clients and partners have full confidence that privacy compliance has been integrated into the development of all e-government initiatives.

Benefits Monitoring

There are little or no mechanisms in place to measure and assess the degree to which the expected benefits of the e-government program **and projects** are being realized.

Benefits monitoring is encouraged and basic mechanisms exist to support the measurement of actual versus projected benefits.

There are tools and techniques available to support benefit tracking at the project level. Benefits monitoring results are used on a limited basis to influence project decision making.

Expected benefits are rigorously tracked over time at the project level. Key project decisions are made based on benefit tracking. Benefits of electronic service delivery are consolidated at the portfolio or organization-wide level.

Benefits for all e-government initiatives are tracked and used by senior management to influence investment decisions and to enhance screening and selection decision criteria. The realization of projected benefits are shared across projects.

Capacity Check

Performance Management (cont'd)

TOPIC

1

2

3

4

5

<p><i>Predictability</i></p>	<p>There are no mechanisms or program service standards in place to measure the reliability and availability of the applications and infrastructure used to support e-government.</p>	<p>Some program service standards have been published, and new mechanisms are being developed to monitor turnaround times and service delivery predictability (e.g. reliability, availability) for e-government.</p>	<p>Electronic service delivery performance is regularly monitored and tracked against published program service standards. E-government applications are tuned and re-engineered in light of performance shortfalls.</p>	<p>Electronic service delivery performance is measured at regular intervals. Results are consolidated on an organization-wide basis, and overall trends are analyzed and reported in a timely manner. Electronic service delivery performance influences ongoing business planning decisions.</p>	<p>On-line service levels compare favorably with government-wide service standard principles for the electronic channel. The organization has demonstrated increasing levels of reliability and availability.</p>
<p><i>e-Government Maturity Reporting</i></p>	<p>A baseline set of key programs and services destined for electronic service delivery has not been identified and there is no reporting of the level of maturity achieved.</p>	<p>An organizational framework for maturity reporting exists. Organizational areas have begun to identify a baseline set of key programs and services for electronic service delivery. They have some capability to report on the status of their e-government initiatives.</p>	<p>All key programs and services destined for electronic service delivery have been identified. All organizational areas are routinely reporting progress towards the e-vision and maturity status to senior management and central agencies.</p>	<p>Ongoing measurement of on-line maturity allows the organization to adjust its e-government program to ensure success. Trend analysis demonstrates an increasing capability to deliver e-government services.</p>	<p>An efficient and timely system is in place for measuring progress against on-line targets. E-government maturity compares favorably to external benchmarks. A significant proportion of services is provided on-line with a high level of integration with other jurisdictions.</p>