

ICA COUNTRY REPORTS HIGHLIGHTS: Day3

LARRY CAFFREY

Before I start the final session on the Country Reports I would like to advise you of a future conference involving many government representatives. I have left the details of this conference on the table at the back of the hall. It allows for contributions from all interested parties. Europe's ministers and officials will meet for the third EU government summit in Manchester in November. Have a look at the information provided. It's for information only. If you feel you have something to contribute, and want to, you may do so.

The second handout is the ICA booklets: we call them Information Kits. Everything you really wanted to know about ICA but were frightened to ask! They also are on the table at the back. These are mainly intended for people who are here at conference for the first time. It will give you some background, some information, etc. National representatives and those of you who have been before should already have one of these. Now in the middle, or just inside the front page there are a number of loose leaves. These are the items that change from day to day or year to year in ICA. So there is a completely up-to-date list of National Representatives, who the deputy national representatives are, all the other officers of ICA, and those summary reports of the study groups that have been published during the year. This loose-leaf information is replenished every year. For those of you who already have the booklets, there is an up-to-date copy of the variable information at the back of the hall. So please take one on the way out.

Here in ICA, we are particularly keen and anxious to get you to fill in your evaluation forms. These are the different coloured forms that are actually in your folders. Please make sure before the end of the day you complete them and hand them to Choy Peng, Nachman or myself. If you can't find any of us, leave them in the secretariat office. But whatever you do, please fill them in and please leave them. The reason we are so keen on getting back the results is that it helps us to plan the next conference. It also helps us because you tell us your views of how this conference has gone, what changes we might make, any improvements we might make, what we might do away with (like the Round Table or whatever). They are very carefully studied and a report on your evaluation forms is given to the board on the programme committee at the January meeting. We then move forward for planning the next conference taking all your items into account.

Now, Welcome to the third and final session of the Round Table. First of all, in case I forget later, can I thank you all for your contributions. You've done most of the work. We are slightly different today. As I think we proved during the last 3 days we are in a world of accelerating change. Technology continues to defy Moore's law, we've got e-Gov, we've got m-Gov, we've got u-Gov, we've got i-Gov, we've got goodness what else! With strategy phases 1, with strategy phases 2 and some of us are even looking at strategies 3. And over the last few conferences we have usually had a futurist who is going to warn us around the corner. I think last year he was even showing us that we would be flying, levitation, in a few years time! But today, I am going to take a slightly reflective view. We are now going to look specifically at your

Country Reports, and this is your chance for you to raise items in your own report that you feel are particularly valuable for your fellow delegates but which I, or anyone else, has not yet covered. The second opportunity is for you to raise any question you may feel in somebody else's report that you've read and would like to follow up. Don't worry if you can't think of anything at the time, I will give you time to think, and in any case I've got enough items from your reports to keep us here till this time tomorrow. But we will finish in one hour's time. So does anyone, at this moment, have a burning desire to give us a view on their own report, or ask anyone else a question? The only thing I would say is that as usual, feel free to pass but in this case if you are asked the question, would you do us the courtesy of when you get home, replying to the question to the person who made it, by email or whatever.

Right, does anyone wish to start the ball rolling? Michael, in your report from Taiwan you identify that you are doing a very wide government reform, and this is likely to bring much stronger controls to the Executive Yuan. Could you just give us a few words about that? You said, I believe, that the government reforms are leading you to bring down the number of ministries quite significantly, and also a lot of executive power will move within your own ministries' sphere, within your area.

Michael Yuchuan Lin, Taiwan

Okay. Government reform currently is very important inside our government. We are going to reduce the number of ministry level agencies from currently 37 to 22. So such kind of change of organisation needs some legal work, so currently there appears to be a standard to view of our congress and since this is the time for government restructuring so we put a lot of effort in the consideration that we think about to take this opportunity to also do some information system re-engineering. It could be a great opportunity and chance to make a significant change for our information architecture for the e-government development. So, currently accompanying such kind of government restructuring we set up a taskforce to manage the passport information organisation, and also for information system change in the future. For each new future ministry we formed a steering group for dealing with the information system change and also dealing with the re-organisation of ICT units. So accompanying with this 2 different workforces hopefully we will make a big change for our future e-government and, of course, this could be a great opportunity but we must deal with carefully and we are prepared to also cause big trouble for our information systems.

So that is why I was quite concerned, and raise a question to Denmark's presentation, because it seems that in Denmark, currently, they are still undergoing such kind of preparation work, and as I also understand in the past, Japan also had a very big change for their government organisations. So I am wondering if we can learn more experiences and listen in ICA about such kind of information system, re-engineering a company with government restructuring. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey

Thank you. If anyone has any questions they want to raise to follow up on any of the speakers please just raise your hands and I will give you the opportunity. I must admit that I am full of admiration for the way in which you've all managed to produce such fulsome reports in what must be a very difficult language for you all. They make

fascinating reading. I can only say thank you very much, I would hate it to have to try to do this job if they were all in your language.

Choy Peng. I would like to ask you perhaps, in looking at your Country Report: one of the people issues that seems to be coming through very strong is what you are doing for e-citizens and e-TownMayor's. Perhaps give us a few words on that?

Choy Peng Wu, Singapore

In terms of citizens, I think we have got quite a good uptake but we have an explicit strategy of not having multi-channels and it is a very explicit strategy that we will as much as possible close down counters as we move all the services online. So in parallel we will have to address the accessibility issues. So what they have done have basically put in a lot of self-service terminals in all government agencies, and you can go to any government agency to access so this is another government agency. We are also moving to what we call facilitate it helps so you can go to your community centre and if you are not able to use the online service there is actually somebody there who will help you go through your online service and actually teach you how to do it.

So it is slightly different from a lot of larger countries – we are city state, highly literate, so there is quite an explicit strategy that we must have return on investment for our e-government initiatives and we feel that so long as you have parallel channels you are not likely to reap the full benefits of going online. So because of that, so we have to do quite a fair bit in terms of accessibility and facilitate that helps.

In driving e-citizen, I think in some countries you are quite clustered, in our country it is just quite e-town. What we have done is we have basically made the Permanent Secretary, or in some countries I think you call it the Deputy Minister, is in charge of his e-town which will involve a few ministries and a few agencies, and the e-TownMayor, they are supposed to set the work plan and they will then be given a budget to make sure that whatever services and integrated services that will come up in the e-town are funded, but the Permanent Secretary, or e-town, is actually accountable for the delivery of all the targets or the key performance indicators that we have set for every town. So that is full ownership at the most senior civil service level: to drive the development for each town.

Larry Caffrey

But they actually get the budget and cash in hand to fulfil those?

Choy Peng Wu

Yes. They have to do their own work plan and come to the Ministry of Finance or in our office to say what they will deliver for their e-town in that year, and their money is given to them and devolved to that particular Ministry to drive it. Because there are many cross agency services we think that you do need a very senior Civil Servant to resolve all the other organisational politics and issues so that is why we thought of putting that job on the Permanent Secretary.

Larry Caffrey

Right. Thank you very much. Anyone anything to offer or to add or to question?
Arvo. I must admit I have always admired the way in which your country's gone from literally a zero population as far as IT information goes to a complete e-gov within less than 10 years. But your report's now highlighting that you are now moving into the education area where you're teaching, with a number of partners, 19 or 20 different countries and helping them develop their e-gov strategies. Can you give us some words on that please?

Arvo Ott, Estonia

Thank you. Yes in Estonia we have had many related topics to manage and in this process I think that we have been more successful in some periods and less successful in some, but 10 years of development has trained us in this way, that Estonia is a small country with a lot of questions while only a few persons have discovered the wider perspective. So we have this simple examples about organisational issues, about legal issues, about IT architectures, now it is in several countries especially in the Soviet Union and also the Balkan States and in Africa where they are looking for experience about e-governments, how to build IT governments in their countries which have started a similar process. So it is, of course, a really interesting topic for us. Going back to the development in Estonia we are just now deeply working on fixing some IT architecture questions and basic things in legislation. And it has been very difficult process in the last 2 years. I would say the difficulties we discussed have been between lawyers and IT architects. So if you would like to listen more about this experience I can explain later on.

Larry Caffrey

Right. But you also actually work with partners in industry to produce, is it packages or is it in only education, or do you actually teach people the skills as well?

Arvo Ott, Estonia

I think that in this e-gov architecture feel that having also partners from private businesses in Estonia but is mainly support of discussing different projects in more deeper technical level. Talking about public partnership, I think that in Estonia we have the situation where banks and telecoms are trying to offer basic training and government and public sector are supporting it, and it is this some simple similar models of how to work in small countries where we can also explain to many others in the framework of e-government academia.

Larry Caffrey

Right, thanks Arvo. Nachman, Choy Peng – it is worth looking at that because where Arvo is teaching some 19 or 20 countries there is a possible source of recruitment in the not too distant future, so we might keep an eye on that one.

The next item might be slightly different because you may not be able to give me the answer, Denmark. I notice that you're very strong on performance measurement: you have always been the leader in XML, I think. Certainly well known for the work you've done on XML. But your Country Report talks about developing a

methodology for benchmarking with lines to a common accounting framework. Do you happen to know anything about it?

Bjarne Heltved, Denmark

Accounting framework? This is what we have been talking about – the legislation that every private company if they want to deal with the public sector they have to make an electronic invoice, and it is specified in legislation in the XML format, I think it is the first time I have seen people discussing now in the public service around Denmark. Discussing what is XML and what is this about? It is really like taking the legislation to force technology into the private sector. Here the public sector has gone ahead of the private sector: they are screaming, they are making noise on the interest organisations say, but they don't get any money. And it is building contractors, everybody, they have to do it. It is quite fun to see but that's happened. I don't know so much about the measuring of the benchmarks, what they are trying to develop there but I am pretty sure we now have a lot of measurements of the effect of doing IT projects: you saw my example, is also the methodology to make business cases for every project we make: either in economic or quality aspects that has to come out of it. I hope that satisfies.

Larry Caffrey

Thank you. Similarly in that vein though, staying really in the area of performance measurements, Robin: you are developing a demand and assessment methodology? I don't think you got a chance to mention that this morning but could you give us a few words on that?

Robyn Fleming, Australia

Thanks, Larry. The demand and value methodologies of business case that we developed for putting our government services online, we are now in the process of developing a second version of that report which will form part of our investment framework and will be a standardised business case for not only new services but extending existing services. It looks at the finance around investments as well as the social benefits.

Larry Caffrey

Right, thank you. I hate to catch you as you come in because I have just been speaking to you Denmark, but I was going to follow up that question because in your Country Report you were talking about a brand new policy for critical infrastructure and the risks in protection. I found that particularly interesting, I wonder if you can add a little to it?

Bjarne Heltved, Denmark

The critical infrastructure? I am afraid I can't tell you much about it. It is not my business area.

Larry Caffrey

OK, Thank You. I am now going to have a couple of words on central funding. I think Choy Peng made the point there that to make the policies at times, or the initiatives work, you need cash, you need cash in hand really. I know I alluded to it yesterday but, Taiwan: Michael again, you said in your report you actually have a \$100 m available to you to develop this policy. Before you say anything, the other report that caught my eye was that the USA have all the plans and the money and the facilities but they can only get about \$3 m out of their central funding. Now, have you any advice for them?

Michael Yuchuan Lin, Taiwan

Yes, actually when I made my presentation yesterday I talked about 2 different interim e-government programmes. The first one was a 3 year programme and the second one was a 4 year programme. During the second one, in the first two years we were very poor body in budgeting which has lacked money to do a lot of projects in e-government so we just have a good programme but without enough budgeting support. We just cry out in every occasion to say that we need more money. Eventually we got a very good support from the executive including our Prime Minister so we got a big breakthrough - that was brought the whole under items that was originally only for physical construction such as building, highway, building a bridge, that kind of budget. We dig a hole from that part. Since then we went into a paradise for our e-government project. That was the main reason we got so much budget support. We are really happy about that because when we got the budgeting support, now we can start our idea about the innovative services development. Since that kind of idea was not based on a single government authority, that was about service's need to integrate deeper into government agencies, working together. So with this kind of new budgeting support then we can start it. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey

Now, Dollene I will go to you in the USA this time because perhaps you can mention the difficulty being promised the money and actually collecting it, and the frustration you must feel at times.

Darlene Meskell, USA

Frustration is not the word for it. In fact we actually asked for over \$300m some years ago and we are getting smatterings of the few million here and a few million there, and this year Congress appropriated \$3m for all of e-gov programmes. However, if I might say, we are going into cost savings mode now and I would like to, if I may, turn the podium over to Marty Wagner to talk about the lines of business programmes that we have in place to consolidate our back office functions, and to save the government more money than they would allocate to e-gov.

Marty Wagner, USA

Thank you. Let me try to do a brief summary. There is a paper that John Sindolaw wrote that you have, I just was looking over on the ICA website, I will actually try to give you a quick precise on what is going here. First on the issue of the budget: the problem we have is that whereas the executive branch at the top levels understand the value proposition, Congress does not. So we need to move in a more direct, more

traditional mode. If I were to characterise the problem the economies of scale of solutions today are greater than that of departments today. And the reason we think that is when we look at companies they tend to be consolidating too. This is actually not an unusual business case to make to the Congress, it just has not been done well in the past. The process now is very much driven by the budget where, for example, we have gone through the budget, or RMB has gone through the budget, there is \$11 - \$12 billion in the budget of fiscal year 04 and 05 for what is called development and DM (I always forget what DM) but basically new money to develop enhancements to applications. One billing of that is dedicated to financial systems in human resources systems. The idea is we need to look at that money and not make the same investment in multiple agencies but make it in very few. The methodology to do that is pull together what is called a line of business initiative which we do in my agency. We pull together as a community, usually information technology and subject matter professionals. Talk to them about the value of wearing a big hat that means the government as a whole, not the little hat your agency, and come up with options towards fewer, better, more standard solutions then run that through the budget process, sell it to the hill on the basis of increasing effectiveness and saving money which is why when we talk about our investments we may have this 3 million dollar problem but it is really how to manage a billion dollars better and we are taking a different approach. I am guardedly optimistic but I have been in government before so it usually takes a little longer than I hope. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey -thanks Marty.

I guess recent events mean that you will either get nothing or in fact there will be a really big move towards more money for the people. I hope so anyway for you.

Can I just ask the UK – the way you are centrally funded as far as e-gov goes is really, if I am right, backed by promises from the Prime Minister is it not?

Ewen McKinnon, UK

The Prime Minister certainly owns the agenda and is very much attached to the agenda but the central funding is really to cover operational activities from the e-gov unit and managing the e-gov programme and also to cover some central infrastructure but the basic principal is that we centrally fund on a similar basis to Canada – we provide catalytic funding to develop central infrastructure and then we look to trying to recoup those costs over time by charging department and agencies that use them. The rest of the funding for government services, putting government services on line are really bid for by departments themselves so most of the funding is actually distributed in the UK. It all helps to have obviously, the Prime Minister behind the agenda but ultimately we look at funding just catalytic funding centrally and operational costs to manage the central programme.

Larry Caffrey – right thank you.

Strangely enough that makes me feel more confident. Living in the UK at times I feel that the money that is always on offer seems to be the same money being offered to everybody. I am a bit more confident that you can actually get your hands on it when you can show that you need it.

Israel is always interesting – of course they have come up with a solution. What they are doing is that if they can't get any central funding they take 10% off everybody else and form a pot, which seems a wonderful idea to me. A few words (name)

Shimon Broner, Israel

Thank you Larry. I just tell you the numbers - because Israel doesn't have a central ministry of IT and communication the budget divided into all ministries, computer centre. Each ministry has its own computer centre and in order to achieve a government wide project what happens is that // budget every year. The Minister of Finance just - you plan your budget for the next year and on the 1st January 10% out of it goes for the general projects for all ministries. Talking about budgets in Israel, we listen to the number of the countries here have so we are very small. You are supposed to know about 45% of Israel budget goes on defence, another 35-40% goes on welfare and all the rest is budget for all governmental activities so the IT budget is very small. We are talking about total of 195 million, 401 US\$ per year divided it into 14 or 16 ministries you find out that the budget is not much and it is a little bit heavy to finish at that stage of e-gov with such a budget so that is why the system was like you say before – in order to ensure governmental wide budget for IT like e-government, they took 10% from the budget each year and that is where we find ourselves each year with less and less money for this.

Larry Caffrey – seems a good idea to me. Perhaps somebody else might like to try that one.

Taking another subject, we've not asked Netherlands to comment in this session yet. You have come up with an interesting UME -- Universal Messaging Machine – I wonder if you can perhaps tell us a few words on that, it seems to be of interest to a number of people.

Jan Timmermans, The Netherlands

I don't know if I am the right person to tell you something about that Universal Messaging Machine would be something like getting electronic forms ready but what we are doing now with some priority is in our country are getting telephone number which perhaps is the Universal Messaging Machine which is based on the idea of the 311 number in New York in which you can call one number and you get all your questions answered and you can also make complaints and arrange things. That is one of things that we are going to look into now and we go on to try also integrate municipalities in those numbers and furthermore we are looking at getting the building stones ready to get electronic government on the move.

We have had a new minister this year and he had the good sense when he was meeting parliament for the first time to tell them “look I will be here for two years and then my tour will be over – please tell me what should be my priorities” and luckily they told him that electronic government would be one of those priorities so he has a strong political backing now even from opposition to do something about it. So it means that we will have to get the building stones ready in a short period and in the meantime we will have to work on intermediate solutions like electronic authentication, like getting a common service number for all citizens and for all companies. Like getting key registers ready and key registers, well you could call them if you compare them with this morning, you could call them the route registers

of government in which all the data is initially registered so that other registrations can use those registrations that is necessary to have the policy implemented of just putting information somewhere only once so that the citizen doesn't have to give that every time.

Well and if we are ready with building all those building stones then we can get an e-government which also is transparent for the citizen in which we can have a personal internet page and which the citizen can see what information is registered of him by the government from all registrations and the citizens will also have a kind of role to decide which information will be passed on to other registrations and even in the future perhaps we can have a system in which the citizen can also decide to give information to the private sector on his terms and on his conditions. So that is where we stand now and that is what we do.

Larry Caffrey – thank you Jan.

I also noticed that in this particular area Hungary – you are developing a u-gov or at least a government customers control centre which really is a multi-channel delivery service. Now multi-channel deliveries have turned up in a lot of reports but you specifically referred to that item and I wonder if you could give us a little description on it please.

Gábor Bódi, Hungary

Yes, so first, let me introduce myself, I am from the Hungarian Prime Minister's office and as far as I know this is the day to day when we try to start the working of this client information centre, we could say like that. This is basically a call centre which is responsible for and to give any kind of information to citizens no matter which field they try to contact the government, well actually not simply the government but the whole civil service so we mean not only governmental institutions to connect in the whole system but we try to have all the utility providers of Hungary and we try to make a really common approach and really concentrated system to our citizens and businesses so the core of the whole thing is that we, I think the biggest problem for citizens is to get information about the processes so they cannot start how to approach government or how to find the case which they have to handle and with this centre we would like to give a good answer for that. The basic assumption of this system is that more than 90% of the calls should have to be answered by this centre and only 8 or 10% of the calls have to be sent towards the really relevant institutions so we would like to handle the whole system together and we would like to make a concentrated database about this information. For that we have a central system which is based on the election government backbone, our portal, there is a client gateway and this client information centre will be, I should say, on the top if we would like to see it from the client side and we really hope that this will lead us for a successful client centric government. That's all thank you.

Larry Caffrey – Thank you.

Costas, welcome to the Round Table. Last year we had some very interesting talks from your people on new tax systems and Theseas and we have got one or two updates, they come neatly in your country report. I wonder if you could perhaps give us a comment on those and also the very much wider developments you have in mind.

Costas Agrotis, Cyprus

Okay. First of all I would like to thank you Larry for giving me the opportunity to say something following last year's conference.

Before tackling the taxation and customs issue I would like to refer to the restructuring exercise we had. If you remember we were trying to introduce a degree of decentralisation, we had already submitted to the council of ministers a proposal which is a little bit based on the loosely covered environment rather than the tightly covered as we are now. We are waiting for their decision.

Now moving to the taxation, yes the filing of tax returns for income tax, VAT or for fiscal and legal persons already in place. Last year we had a sufficient response from the public. We are waiting for a bigger response this year. This year the customs management system is a success, we have already finished with the development and the implementation of all phases and we have no problem for take-up. Actually, I can tell you that the majority of businesses they even use a system during the night because they have a lot of work to do.

Following these two taxation systems we have started moving to the web other systems we had. We have successfully moved to the web our social security system and we have moved to the web our candidate placement system, which is system for enrolling the job seekers and finding jobs for them. We have already moved to the web our road transport system and the identification and registration of shipping cattle involves those things and we are studying now the similar administration and companies registration in order to complete our database.

In addition to that we have now issued a tender for preliminary study for the set-up of a gateway which will carry out authentication into a connection through workflow and security so every citizen will log in through the gateway, get authenticated and then driven through the workflow to appropriate systems. This is coupled with a new portal, which we have already finished and is going to be published in fifteen days time. Actually we were planning to publish the new portal early September but we had to pass a decision through the council of ministers in order for the other ministers and departments to vet the content of the portal which relates to their own functions.

And in parallel we are working in order to set up and go live the first kiosk by the end of the month. Actually our President wants to make a campaign about the kiosks in spite of the fact that he selected the wrong area for the kiosk I think that it will be a success.

We are working also on two big systems, one is a human resource management with horizontal system which will cover all the government and the health information system which we believe we will award the contract in fifteen days time. It's a 12 million contract and you know it is a bit difficult to decide with which company to sign and the plan is that by the end of the year we will issue a government wide health tender as well. So we have a lot of work to do with too little number of employees. That's all.

Larry Caffrey – thank you very much, thank you. Does anyone else have anything they would like to raise there is still a couple of minutes left. Yes, Choy Peng.

Choy Peng Wu, Singapore

Not entirely e-government, I am just curious about ten to fifteen years ago IT was a very popular topic and the faculty, the computer science school was able to attract primarily top students but we notice in Singapore today IT is no longer sexy and we do not attract the best students any more for IT and I am wondering whether this is just a Singapore phenomenon and whether this also happens in the other countries in Europe, in the Americas.

Larry Caffrey – very interesting, Now to Des Vincent.

Des Vincent, UK

Yes, I can reinforce that Choy Peng. We have closed one of the classes in the Faculty of Informatics – we are not attracting as many students as possible.

Larry Caffrey – very interesting. When I first started, you had to pass an exam to be allowed to even train in IT. .

Philip O'Reilly, Ireland

In Ireland it is the same and it is actually slighter broader than that. It actually spreads into all of the engineering disciplines so there is a fall-off in engineering as a whole so it probably has hit IT maybe more obviously because there are quite a number of courses and some have been amalgamated but it goes right across mechanical engineering and though some of the engineering disciplines have held up well like civil engineering and stuff like that but mechanical engineering, electronics engineering all of those have found a fall-off with fewer students, people going into business, medicine, architecture points for those who have stayed up for engineering. I think it is perceived by students that for third level the courses on average are more difficult, they are more difficult than other courses maybe business courses and the rewards at the end aren't commensurate with the effort they have to put in to get there.

Larry Caffrey – thank you, an interesting topic

Costas Agrotis, Cyprus

Larry, I agree with Choy Peng, I am interviewing a lot of people for the last three years for our recruiting department and yes I agree that the quality of candidates coming to seek for employment even if they have one or two university degrees in science is not the same as it was five years or eight, ten years ago and I believe that and this is a personal observation young people nowadays they consider that if they are computer freaks they can go and study computer science. I believe that these things are two different things they are not the same. They might be advanced users but not necessarily becoming good computer scientists. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey – thank that's an interesting topic. Thank you for raising it Choy Peng.. Anybody else got a final comment they would like to make?

Darlene Meskell, USA

Yes, it is the same story in the United States. The young people are not, a number of recent surveys are showing that young people are not going into science, engineering including computer sciences and our large corporations want very much to hire more of people in that category from China, India and other countries more than our immigration procedures and laws will support at this time. So it is a big problem.

Larry Caffrey – last comment, Marty.

Marty Wagner, USA

Just an observation, in the US government we are doing less and less IT internally and more and more under contract so we actually have less of a need in terms of number of IT professionals but we need higher level IT professionals for those jobs that remain in government.

Larry Caffrey – yes, I think, governments from what Choy Peng and the others were saying that you are no longer to get the cream of the flock necessarily.

I think it is quite clear from what we have heard at conference and from your reports that we are moving to a time of true citizen engagement. The citizens in the future are more likely to want to dictate their on-line requirements to government. They are likely to comment on the policies and change on-line and they will expect change on-line. They will be moving in new ways and they will have new preferences in the way in which they utilise these services. I think there are very clear indications that the PC will no longer be the main item of communication. We are moving through the phone, not necessarily the mobile phone. I think it was made quite clear that the static phone is still an important feature and of course TV.

So I think our challenge for the future is for government to become and then manage effectively a total delivery of services, that includes goods and by that I mean benefits as well as collections and all the services that the customer requires and by the customer I do mean the citizen and you need to deliver those services by whatever means the citizen requires.

Well while you are ready to read the challenge I think from reading your reports there is a real growing awareness and acceptance of that task. I wish you well and I hope to see you all next year when we can start discussing the whole thing all over again. Thank you for your reports and your contributions over the last three days.

Goodbye.