

Wrap-up

Bill Dorotinsky

Summary Day 1

- ISPMS has deepened our knowledge and understanding of issues, but we've gone as far as we can with existing indicators
- If unit of analysis is central government, then surveys would be way to move forward
- If unit of analysis is different, then could look at different data sources (e.g. twitter)
- Use/purpose of indicators matters: separate the apples from the oranges
- Difficult because underlying processes are hard to observe
- Appropriately designed citizen-centered indicators could meet ISPMS criteria
- Citizens' voices can be used to triangulate and confirm the salience of indicators from other sources

Day 2: Lessons from iChallenge

- Challenges of applying criteria
- Challenges of cross-country comparability
- Feasibility of collection/implementation

Day 2: Data Use

- Dashboard is a good start at triangulation, possibility for several enhancements
- Market the dataset to particular audiences
- Trade-off between cross-country comparability and diagnostic/PDIA

What have we achieved?

- An excellent understanding of the criteria of their value and limitations
- A combination of cross-government “tin-openers” and “dials”
- A sustainable and comprehensive data set of cross-country data on various aspects public management systems
- An understanding of the limits of this effort

Where could we go from here?

- Disseminate and promote the use of the database
- Promote iChallenge finalists
- New ideas emerged from the meeting
 - Learn about the strength and quality of public management systems from public servants
 - Including measures of “engagement”
 - Learn from citizens about their perceptions of public management systems
 - Trust in government and using big data
- But these approaches will cost \$\$\$\$\$