

E-Governance Assessment Frameworks (EAF Version 2.0)

Prepared By

Prof. T. P. Rama Rao,
Prof. V. Venkata Rao,
Prof. S. C. Bhatnagar,
Center for Electronic Governance, IIM, Ahmedabad

And

Shri. J. Satyanarayana, CEO,
National Institute for Smart Government (NISG), Hyderabad

For

E-Governance (Assessment & Replication) Division,
E-Governance and E-Rural Group,

Department of Information Technology,
Government of India

May, 2004

INDEX

	Page Nos.
1. Need for an Assessment Framework	1
2. Objectives of an Assessment Framework	1
3. Categories of Projects to be Assessed	2
4. Categories of Frameworks	2
4.1 Summary Assessment	2
4.2 Detailed Assessment	3
5. Attributes to be assessed	3
5.1 Service Orientation	4 - 5
5.2 Technology	6 - 8
5.3 Sustainability	9 - 10
5.4 Cost Effectiveness	11
5.5 Replicability	11 - 12
6. Weightages to be Assigned to the Attributes	13
7. Instruments for Assessments	13 - 15
8. Assessment Methodology	16
8.1 Summary Assessment	16
8.2 Detailed Assessment	16
8.3 Computing the Assessment Scores	16
8.4 Interpreting Assessment Scores	17
9. Criteria for selection of agencies for conducting the assessment	18
10. Summary and Conclusion	19
Annexure - 1: Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C - R	20 - 22
Annexure - 2: Detailed Assessment of G2C - U	23 - 25
Annexure - 3: Detailed Assessment of G2B	26 - 28
Annexure - 4: Detailed Assessment of G2G	29 - 31
Annexure - 5: Template for Summary Assessment of G2C - R	32 - 33
Annexure - 6: Template for Summary Assessment of G2C - U	34 - 35
Annexure - 7: Template for Summary Assessment of G2B	36 - 37
Annexure - 8: Template for Summary Assessment of G2G	38 - 39
Exhibit - 1: Detailed Assessment of G2C - R A Sample	40 - 42
Exhibit - 2: Detailed Assessment of G2B A Sample	43 - 45
Exhibit - 3: Summary Assessment of G2C - R A Sample	46 - 47
Exhibit - 4: Summary Assessment of G2B A Sample	48 - 49

Acknowledgements

The E-Governance Division of the Ministry of Information Technology, has entrusted the study of developing frameworks for the assessment of E-Governance projects, to the Center for Electronic Governance, IIMA (CEG-IIMA) and the National Institute for Smart Governance, Hyderabad (NISG). The CEG-IIMA and NISG study team would like to thank Mr. R. Chandrashekhar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, Government of India, for sharing his views and providing valuable guidance to the study team.

Dr. V.K. Dharmadhikari, of E-Governance Division, Department of Information Technology and his team members have provided feedback from time to time on the study reports. The study team would like to thank them for their valuable contributions.

The initial ideas on this study were presented in the Workshop on “ICT for Poverty Alleviation in India: Financing Models and Scaling up Opportunities” during 26-27 February, 2004 jointly conducted by World Bank, NASSCOM, Ministry of Information Technology, and CEG-IIMA during February, 2004 at IIM, Ahmedabad. The study team would like to thank all those participants who provided valuable inputs through discussions during the workshop.

Finally, the study team would like to thank Dr. Dharmadhikari, for effective coordination of this study from the e-Governance Division of the Department of Information Technology, Government of India.

Framework for Assessment of e-Governance Projects

1. Need for an assessment framework

The Department of Information Technology, Government of India, has felt it necessary to create a rational framework for assessing e-Governance projects on various dimensions. The justification for creation and use of such a framework is given below:

- 1.1. Significant investment of resources into e-Governance projects:** Significant national resources to the tune of about Rs.2,500 crores are going annually into implementation of e-Governance projects. Most of these projects are propelled by localized perceptions of the need to exploit ICT for better service, better efficiency and transparency. However, there is no evidence of any appraisal being done before the sanction / grounding of a project or during the period of its execution, as to whether the project is proceeding on the right lines to achieve its original objectives.
- 1.2. Subjective assessments & value judgment:** The rating of some of the e-Governance projects implemented in the country is currently based on subjective assessment and value judgment of a few individuals and authorizations. There is no authentic mechanism, much less an institutional mechanism, for ensuring a rational and objective assessment of the projects. Such a situation is detrimental to a healthy development and growth of the e-governance sector.
- 1.3. Large National Action Plan ahead:** The National Action Plan on e-governance has an ambitious outlay of over Rs.12,000 crores involving public and private investments over the next four years. A significant portion of the National Action Plan involves replication of successful projects across different geographical areas of the country. However, the absence of a framework for knowing what a successful project is can severely handicap such replication efforts and also may result in misdirection of the scarce resources.
- 1.4. Canalizing ongoing efforts in the right direction:** As mentioned in 1.1 above, a lot of projects are already in different stages of implementation. It is desirable that a set of instruments is available to the administrators of those projects to appreciate the various attributes of a good e-governance project, apply midcourse corrections, where needed, and steer these projects in the right direction.
- 1.5. Facilitate funding agencies to take a rational view:** The National Action Plan involves significant private investments flowing into the e-governance sector. These funding agencies which could be banks, financial institutions or multilateral funding agencies would like to be assured that the resources would go into projects that have already been rated high as per a rational framework or can be appraised in terms of a widely accepted framework.

2. Objectives of an Assessment Framework

In the context of the need for an e-Governance Assessment Framework as described in section 1 above, the following specific objectives are formulated for the proposed Framework:

- 2.1. To assess whether and to what extent a given e-Governance project has the characteristics of a good e-governance project delivering "Value" to stakeholders.
- 2.2. To guide in funding of e-governance projects at various stages of their life-cycle (newly starting, roll-out, scaling up, replication)
- 2.3. To provide guidelines for mid-term assessment of ongoing initiatives, so that mid-course corrections, if any, can be applied

- 2.4. To provide guidelines for shaping future e-governance projects
- 2.5. To provide material for e-governance training programs
- 2.6. To enhance the trust and confidence of stakeholders by enabling creation of a knowledgebase of all e-Governance projects rated as per a trusted framework.

3. Categories of Projects

The variety, scope and size of e-Governance projects are very large. It is not possible to attempt to create a framework that is applicable to all possible projects. It is therefore proposed to confine the current exercise to the projects falling in the following four categories:

- 3.1. Government to Citizen in Urban Environment (G2C- U)
- 3.2. Government to Citizen in Rural Environment (G2C- R)
- 3.3. Government to Business (G2B)
- 3.4. Government to Government (G2G)

The projects can further be categorized on the basis of the investments made. The following table brings out the limits for categorization in respect of Pilot Projects and Rolled-out Projects separately.

The investments could be by the public or private sectors. In terms of priorities, it is desirable to focus the initial efforts on the large projects.

Category of Project	Pilot Project	Rolled - out Project
Small	< Rs 3 Cr	< Rs 10 cr
Medium	Rs 3 to 10 cr	Rs 10 to 50 cr
Large	> Rs 10 cr	> Rs 50 cr

4. Categories of frameworks

A very large number of parameters and attributes will have to be considered and assessed in order to decide the overall rating of an e-Governance project as detailed in Section 5. This would involve considerable resources to be invested. However, there are several occasions where it is not possible to invest such time and resource in administering the elaborate instruments. Keeping this in view, it is proposed to develop two tiers of instruments, the first tier for a summary assessment (SA) of the project and the second tier for a detailed assessment (DA). This requirement, together with the four-category classification of e-Governance Projects mentioned in Section 3 would lead to the need for developing eight instruments as mentioned below:

4.1. Frameworks for Summary Assessment (SA)

- 4.1.1. SA-G2C-U Instrument for Summary Assessment framework for Government to Citizen, Urban Projects
- 4.1.2. SA-G2C-R Instrument for Summary Assessment framework for Government to Citizen, Rural Projects
- 4.1.3. SA-G2B Instrument for Summary Assessment framework for Government to Business Projects
- 4.1.4. SA-G2G Instrument for Summary Assessment framework for Government to Government Projects

4.2. Frameworks for Detailed Assessment

- 4.2.1. DA-G2C-U Instrument for Detailed Assessment framework for Government to Citizen, Urban Projects
- 4.2.2. DA-G2C-R Instrument for Detailed Assessment framework for Government to Citizen, Rural Projects
- 4.2.3. DA-G2B Instrument for Detailed Assessment framework for Government to Business Projects
- 4.2.4. DA-G2G Instrument for Detailed Assessment framework for Government to Government Projects

The administration of the summary assessment instruments may be completed typically in 2 to 3 working days for single location projects, and 3 to 5 working days for multi-location projects, depending on the size of the project. The administration of the detailed instrument could take from 4 to 6 weeks depending on the size and complexity of the project.

5. Attributes to be Assessed

It is desirable that the frameworks developed are comprehensive, holistic and above all meet the objectives for which they have been designed. Essentially, the EAF should provide authentic and unambiguous answers to questions like the following:

- a) How far has the Project succeeded in achieving its purpose and objectives?
- b) Has the Project been designed and developed with all the technological features that are elegant and conform to widely accepted architectures and standards?
- c) Is the Project sustainable over long periods of time, with or without the motive force that initiated the Project?
- d) Is the Project cost-effective in terms of return on investment or in terms of cost per transaction?
- e) Is the Project replicable in other geographies?

The various attributes required to be evaluated / rated in order to find reliable answers to the above 5 questions are given below. In all the tables, the columns 'Applicable to Tier' specify the applicability of the attribute to the tier of assessment (Summary Assessment: SA, Detailed Assessment: DA), and the columns 'Applicable to Category' specify the category of project (G2C-R, G2C-U, G2G, G-B, or All).

5.1. Service-Orientation

The attributes of the project, to be measured to assess the service orientation are grouped under three broad sub-groups namely: Efficiency, User-convenience, and Citizen-centricity. These are presented in the following tables.

5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Speed of delivery of service	Measure this in days/hours/minutes and give a score between 0-5 based on the difference in speed before and after the project	SA, DA	All
2.	Compliance to committed service time frame	Measure the % of compliance and score: 1 for 1-20%, 2 for 21-40%, 3 for 41-60%, 4 for 61-80%, and 5 for 81-100%	SA, DA	All
3.	Quality of Service	User perception of Service Quality based on Location ambience, Staff courtesy, Display of information etc. (Score 0 for poor and 5 for excellent)	DA	All
4.	Simplicity of user actions required for obtaining the service	Give a score between 0-5 based on the differences in ease between the before and after improvements - forms, attachments, number of visits	DA	All
5.	% users benefited through e-Service compared to conventional channels	Give scores as 1 for 1-20%, 2 for 21-40%, 3 for 41-60%, 4 for 61-80%, and 5 for 81-100%	SA, DA	All
6.	(% Socially and economically backward) users benefited through e-Service	Give scores as 1 for 1-20%, 2 for 21-40%, 3 for 41-60%, 4 for 61-80%, and 5 for 81-100%	SA, DA	G2C-R

5.1.2 User-convenience Attributes

	Attribute	Description	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Ease of access to the service	How convenient is the location of the nearest service delivery point (0-5 scale)	SA, DA	All
2.	User independence of time : (24 x 7 availability)	How convenient is the time of service delivery operations (0-5 scale)	DA	All
3.	Single window access to several services	Extent to which the project offers all related services-end to end (0-5 scale)	DA	All
4.	Integrated services enabling access to several agencies through one request	Extent to which government services processing by several] requiring departments are offered in an integrated manner through the delivery stations (0-5 scale)	DA	All
5.	Mechanisms for problem resolution and exception handling	Observe how smoothly exceptions are handled and whether alternative processes exist in case of serious problems (0-5)	DA	All
6.	Suitability of service locations to socially and economically backward users	Observe the degree of suitability of the location to the socially and economically backward groups. Give a score of 5 if no inhibitions at all in using.(0-5)	DA, SA	G2C-R

5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Degree of alignment of service design to citizen's requirement	Extent of user requirements covered in the service design (0-5)	SA, DA	All
2.	Grouping of services around user's requirements and behavior patterns	Observe the grouping of services the extent to which they are in line with user's behavior pattern (0-5)	DA	All
3.	user interfaces in local language(s)	Extent of use of local language in user interfaces (0-5)	SA, DA	All
4.	New Services and their relevance to citizens	Extent of citizen-centric new services offered - other than the conventional services offered earlier (0-5)	DA	All
5.	Reduction of visits to high level government offices	Percentage reduction in user visits to high level offices (district / taluka) to complete the transaction	SA,DA	G2C-R
6.	Knowledge of Service provider on the services offered	Extent to which the staff of service provider at service delivery station is familiar with the services packaged for different user groups	DA	G2C-R

5.2. Technology

The technology and its robustness are important for a project's performance. The attributes measuring technological base are its architecture, compliance to standards, inter-operability, security, scalability, and reliability.

5.2.1 Architecture Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Comprehensiveness of the architecture to meet the needs of the project	Is the configuration adequate to handle all the services? Score low if it is under-designed or over-designed (0-5)	SA, DA	All
2.	Conformance of the architecture to National / International architectures	Extent to which the architecture is in line with the national and International architectures (0-5)	DA	All
3.	Mechanism in place for enforcing the compliance to architecture	Is there a system in place for conducting third party audit of the systems to elicit conformance / continued conformance to the architecture originally designed ?	DA	All
4.	Provisions for Inter-operability	Does the system inter-operate with the systems of any other department? If not, does the design support such inter-operability ? 0-5	DA	All
5.	Extent of the use of Open Source Software Systems	Based on the use of OSS: for OS, DBMS, Web-server etc (0-5)	DA	All

5.2.2 Attributes on Standards

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Extent of compliance of the project to open standards	Based on use of open standards like TCP/IP, HTTP, CORBA, DCOM, ODBC (0-5)	DA	All
2.	Mechanism in place for enforcing the compliance to standards	Is there a system in place for conducting third party audit of the systems to elicit conformance / continued conformance to he standards ?	DA	All
3.	Extent of design and adoption of metadata standards	Is the system based on the use of metadata standards like XML etc ? (0-5)	DA	All

5.2.3 Security Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Design of security architecture and policy	Does the system security design conform to BS 7799? (Score -5) Or is there a security policy in place? (4 to 0)	DA	All
2.	Extent of compliance to security architecture	Degree of compliance to security architecture/ policy as assessed by a third party (0-5)	DA	All
3.	Mechanism in place for enforcing the compliance to security policy	Is there a system in place for conducting third party audit of the systems to elicit conformance / continued conformance to the standards ? (Yes -5, No- 0)	DA	All
4.	Mechanism in place for the users to make secure electronic	Yes 5; No -0	SA, DA	All

5.2.4 Scalability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Extent to which the design permits scalability	Based on the APIs available and their documentation (0-5)	DA	All
2.	Degree of scalability of project to cover target users completely	Based on provisions to handle large number of users and transactions without sacrificing response (0-5)	SA, DA	All
3.	Extent of scope for incorporating enhanced hardware interfaces	Based on the extent to which both hardware and software designs permit integration of new devices (0-5)	DA	All
4.	Extent of scope to work with alternate power and connectivity solutions	Based on the design of system which permits use of alternate energy and communication systems (0-5)	DA	All

5.2.5 Reliability related Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Degree of Availability	High degree of availability: 99.99% through disaster recovery systems and alternative channels, gets a score of 5 (0-5 scale)	SA, DA	All
2.	Degree of Accuracy	System that produces highly accurate results gets a score of 5. (Assessment to be based on third party audits and error logs of the system.)	DA	All
3.	Consistency of Response times	The consistency with which system offers reasonable response times response to be assessed from the system logs.	DA	All
4.	Availability of SLA (Service Level Agreement)	Are the operational contracts based on a system of SLAs? Yes -5; No-0.	SA, DA	All
5.	Availability of alternative service delivery channels in case of system breakdowns	Extent to which the users can depend on the system's response in case of breakdowns (power, connectivity, hardware, software).	SA, DA	G2C-R

5.3. Sustainability

The sustainability of a project depends on the organizational sustainability, commercial sustainability, and legal sustainability. The attributes measuring these are given in the following tables :

5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Existence and functioning of an organizational structure for managing the project	Whether created by reforming the conventional structure and is functioning effectively (0-5)	SA, DA	All
2.	Extent and adequacy of training imparted to employees of the organization	Based on the comfort levels of employees in offering service through new system (0-5)	DA	All
3.	Role clarity and degree of employee-buy-in (Change management)	If no ambiguity exists on the roles to be played by employees in the changed environment, 5 (0-5)	SA, DA	All
4.	Degree of involvement of employees in project design, development & implementation	Based on the degree of sense of ownership of the project by the government employees (0-5)	DA	All
5.	Continuity of top champions of the project for 3-5 years	Score 1 for each year of continuity; Less than one year 0; (0-5)	SA, DA	All
6.	Existence and effectiveness of User Groups and Service Reviews	Based on the existence and effectiveness of a system of reviewing the system operations periodically, incorporating user feedback (0-5)	SA, DA	All

5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Amenability of Service Delivery through PPP mode	Based on the degree to which the service is amenable for private participation (0-5)	SA, DA	All
2.	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	Based on effectiveness with which the private partner is executing the project (0-5)	SA, DA	All
3.	Stability, Expertise, and commitment of Service Delivery agents (if PPP?)	Based on the industry standing of the private agency and the types of projects handled by them (0-5)	DA	All
4.	Collection of user charges	Score 5, if the charges provide good stream of revenue adequate to ensure financial sustainability (0-5)	SA, DA	All
5.	Arrangements to ensure availability of service during user convenient time slots	Score 5 if power supply, and connectivity are available during the prime time slots (0-5)	SA, DA	All
6.	Period of continuous functioning of the project after launch without showing symptoms of decline through reduced number of transactions	Score 5 if the project functions for 3 years or more after launch without decline and with growth. Score MINUS 10 if the project has stopped functioning within 3 years of launch and MINUS 5 if the numbers show a decline.	SA, DA	All
7.	Economic benefit to the users in the rural areas	Extent to which the services provide economic benefit to the citizens in rural areas	SA, DA	G2C-R

5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Extent of Business Process Re-engineering undertaken	Extent to which the processes are simplified taking advantages of ICT (0-5)	SA, DA	All
2.	Amendments carried out to Act (s) and Rules relating to provision of the e-services	Extent to which age-old rules are modified to facilitate improved service delivery covering all services envisaged under the project (0-5)	DA	All

5.4 Cost-effectiveness

The cost-effectiveness will have to be assessed from the view point of users (citizens, enterprises), service providers and the government.

5.4 Cost Effectiveness Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Extent of reduction of direct cost to user compared to earlier system	Estimate the percentage reduction in direct cost like travel cost and give a score between 0-5	SA, DA	All
2.	Extent of reduction of indirect cost involved in repeated visits	Estimate the % reduction in indirect cost like cost of repeated visits and give a score (0-5)	DA	All
3.	Extent of cost reduction to government	Based on reduction communication costs, staff costs etc. (0-5)	DA	All
4.	Enhanced revenue/benefit to the government	Based on the increase in revenues and benefits to government (0-5)	SA, DA	All
5.	Degree of reduction in corruption	Based on citizens perception on corruption with new system: 0-5 (5 if high reduction)	SA, DA	All
6.	Recovery of Capital cost	If provision is made for complete recovery score as 5 (0-5)	DA	All
7.	If PPP, Commercial viability for Private Partner	If high commercial viability for Private partner 5 (0-5)	DA	All

5.5 Replicability

The factors contributing to replicability of e-Governance project are: functional replicability, technological replicability, and commercial replicability. The attributes measuring each of these factors are given in the tables below:

5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Degree of generic processes introduced compared to processes which are specific to the project geography	Extent to which the project addresses issues not specific to geography (state / district etc.); can be implemented anywhere in the country (0-5)	DA	All
2.	Degree of resemblance/ alignment of the application software to 'Product' than to a 'bespoke software'	Extent to which a product has been and/or can be developed out of the project (0-5)	DA	All

5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Multiple Platform Feasibility	Extent of feasibility of deployment Application software on multiple platforms (0-5)	DA	All
2.	Ease of installation of the systems in new locations	Extent of ease of installation - score 5 if application is browser based (0-5)	DA	All
3.	Extent of parameterization for customization	Extent to which it is customizable through parameters only (not through additional programming) (0-5)	DA	All
4.	Feasibility of replication only few modules of the system	Extent to which system permits use of few sub-systems independently (like online application) 0-5	DA	All
5.	Quality of project documentation	Based on availability of system documentation in standard format (0-5)	SA, DA	All
6.	Quality of user manuals	0-5 Based on how well the user instructions are presented	SA, DA	All

5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes

	Attribute	Description and Measurement	Applicability	
			Assessment Tier	Project Category
1.	Replication arrangement with Application developer	Whether the commercial arrangement with the developer / PPP partner permits replication - Yes / No (5 or 0)	SA, DA	All
2.	Commercial viability	Whether the transaction costs and other commercial terms are attractive enough to induce replication : Yes / No (5 or 0)	DA	All
3.	Marketing strength for replication	Is there a mechanism in place for marketing' the project and implementing it in other geographies on commercial basis Yes / No (5 or 0)	DA	All

6. Weightages to be assigned to different Attributes

All the attributes mentioned in Section 5 are not relevant to each e-Governance Project to be assessed. Even if relevant, their weightages could be different in the context of different projects. For example, while service orientation carries a heavy weightage in citizen centric projects, technology and replicability carry a higher weightage in G2G Projects aimed at enhancing internal efficiency and effectiveness of Government Organizations. The following matrix gives the set of weightages to the different parameters in each project category:

Attribute Class	Project Category			
	G2C-R	G2C-U	G2B	G2G
Service Orientation	40	40	30	20
Technology	20	20	20	20
Sustainability	20	20	20	20
Cost-effectiveness	10	10	20	20
Replicability	10	10	10	20

7. Instruments for Assessments

As presented in section 4, each type of assessment requires a different instrument for collection of data and its analysis. These instruments can be developed using the attribute tables presented above, as follows:

- a. Select the attributes applicable to the type of assessment, using the columns 'Applicability', from the tables in section 5. For example, instruments for simple assessment of a G2C Rural project will have only those attributes which are marked 'SA' in the 'Applicability : Assessment' column; and those which have "All" as well as G2C-R in the 'Applicability : Project" column.
- b. Develop questions to collect the data for the selected attributes. Each attribute is required to be scored on a scale of 0-5.
- c. In addition, each instrument should have questions to collect data on the background of projects and respondents as given in the sections below. Such background data is required to perform assessments based on the various project and respondent attributes.

7.1 Project Background

The primary set of data required to evaluate all types of projects is the project background data, which may be categorized as:

Project Context, Project Objectives, and Project Services

Detailed elements of these three categories of data sets are given in tables below. Sources of such data are mainly the project documents.

7.1.1 Project Context

The project context helps us to categorize the project and analyze its data from the various aspects. The table below gives the details of data elements that capture the project context.

Item	Remark
State	
Sector	Health, Education, Industry, Transport, ...
Target population	
Demographic profile	Composition of the population
Project Domain	G-CU, G-CR, G-B, G-G
Target group / Expected beneficiaries	All citizens, women, children, tribal, NGO, ..
Stakeholders of the project	Government Departments, Citizens, Enterprises
Stage of the project	Pilot, Phase-I, Roll out, Enhancement, etc.
Scale of the project	Small Pilot, Medium Pilot, Large Pilot, Small Regular, Medium Regular, Large Regular
Implementation mechanism	In-house, Private, Govt. Agency, PPP
Type of access to Services	Portal, Kiosk, Delivery station, Office Desk
Type of Service Delivery Contract	BOO, BOOT, Govt. own- private-run, etc.
Backgrounds & Tenures of Project managers	Project Managers at different phases
Sources of Funds and Amounts	One-time, recurring (Loans, Grants)
Sharing of Expenses	Between Govt., and Service Provider
Sharing of Revenues	Between Govt., and Service Provider
Ownership of hardware & system software	Government, Service Provider
Ownership of application software	Who owns the IP? (Govt, Service developer)

7.1.2 Project Objectives

Mostly, e-Governance projects are designed with some of the following objectives:

1. Minimizing distance to access
2. Extending access to un-served groups
3. Introducing transparency
4. Simplifying transaction procedures
5. Minimizing cost to citizens
6. Minimizing cost to government (internal efficiency)
7. Increasing the government revenue
8. Improving the time to transact (citizen, government)
9. Offering new services
10. Modernization / adoption of Best Practices

Information on the project objectives may be collected in the following table:

Objective	Importance (Rank)	Remarks

Objectives and their rank order are useful in performing a detailed analysis.

7.1.3 Project Services

Each project offers several services to achieve the stipulated objectives. To evaluate the benefits perceived by stakeholders, it is necessary to collect all the categories of services and the specific services in each category. Subsequently, detailed feedback may be obtained on each of the services. Data may be collected in the following format:

Service Category	Remarks
On-line transaction processing (all stages, some stages)	Bill Payments, Reservations, Applications (Licenses, Ration Cards, Pensions), Status report on applications, Returns filing, Results, Counseling
Information dissemination	Forms, Rules, News, Market prices, Tenders, etc.

7.2 Respondent Background

The following data on the profile of respondents (all stakeholders) may be collected for each respondent to perform detailed segment wise analysis of different target groups:

Item	Remarks
Stakeholder role	Citizen, Service Provider, Government Employee
Gender	
Caste	Only if needed
Religion	Only if needed
Age group	
Income Group	
Education	
Occupation	

7.3 Model Templates for Assessment

A set of model templates for the assessments, in the spreadsheet format, is appended to this report (Annexures 1 to 8). The attributes appropriate to each category are incorporated in each spreadsheet and the weightages are also built into the spreadsheet as formulae. This enables generation of the composite score automatic as soon as the responses to all the questions are made on a scale of 0-5. This ensures ease of administration of the instruments besides uniformity in measurement of different projects. Exhibits 1 to 4 provide sample assessments made using the templates.

8. Assessment Methodology

The evaluations are to be conducted completely under free atmosphere. This process should not be handed over to the project management staff or the service providers. There must be total autonomy to sample design, selection of respondents and locations. Similarly, there must be total freedom to administer the questionnaires. Each project to be assessed must give consent and fully cooperate in conducting the study as per the above terms.

Standard sampling techniques shall be adopted in arriving at the size of the sample, the locations and respondents.

As discussed in section 4 the assessment should be conducted in two steps: The Summary Assessment and the Detailed Assessment.

8.1 Summary Assessment

It is suggested that summary assessment be conducted on a small sample. It should start with collection of data on the project (and similar projects) from secondary sources to facilitate development of a broad framework for evaluation. The study should include interviews and administration of questionnaires on a small sample of respondents (of a representative sample of stakeholders). Summary Assessment should offer broad insights into the ground realities of the project and provide inputs to sharpen the understanding of the project objectives, identification of stakeholders, control groups, affected groups, etc., and help us refine the data collection instruments. Authorizations for conducting the interviews and collection of data should be obtained during this stage from the concerned authorities. To a large extent, the data collection should be done in a natural environment, preferably without giving prior notice to the concerned parties so that it is not biased.

8.2 Detailed Assessment

The detailed study should be based on a scientific sampling plan, which is refined by the exploratory study. The sampling plan should detail out the location wise and the type wise number of stakeholders to be surveyed.

The sampling plan must include all stake holders and representative geographic locations. It should include a reasonable sample size (about 20%) of those who are not users of the e-governance project, i.e., control groups, and those who are affected by the new system. Separate instruments may be developed for each group. The instruments for control group will have only those attributes which are in the service orientation class.

8.3 Computing the Assessment Scores

A typical instrument for assessment would have a large number of attributes grouped under the classes namely, Service orientation, Technology, Sustainability, Cost-effectiveness, and Replicability. As presented in section 5, each attribute in the instrument has to be given a score between zero and five. At present we recommend equal weight to each attribute in a class. Therefore depending on the number of attributes in the class, the total possible score for that class would vary. For example, if the service orientation class has 14 attributes, it would give a maximum possible score of $14 * 5 = 70$.

The score obtained for each attribute class should be given a specified weightage as per the scheme presented in the section 6 (for a G2C project, the weightage given to service orientation class is 40).

If the total score obtained for the 14 attributes of service-orientation class, for example is 35 (against a total of 70), to compute the assessment score for this segment, we divide the score obtained by 70 and multiply it by 40. The assessment score for 'service orientation' would therefore be $(35 / 70) * 40 = 20$.

Perform the similar computations for all other classes, using the weightages given in section 6.

8.4 Interpreting Assessment Scores

The total score obtained by a project clearly gives an overall assessment of the project. However it is important to assess a project based on the scores obtained in the individual segments. For example, a project may get an overall high assessment score, but it may be weak in sustainability segment (like sample G2B project: 12.86 out of 20). It is important to identify the attributes on which the project has scored poorly (or highly) to draw lessons for the future projects. For example, this project is weak in 'continuity of top champions', 'existence of user groups', and strength of PPP arrangement.

The following general guidelines are provided for interpreting the assessment scores of individual projects

A prima facie assessment of the strength of a project for a further investment decision, for expansion or for replication can be based on the yardstick given in the table below:

No.	Score Range	Category	Remarks
1.	70 and above	Extremely Good	Qualifies for further investment of resources / replication
2.	50 to 69	Good	Scope for marginal improvements
3.	40 to 49	Satisfactory	Amenable to improvements through course correction and gap filling
4.	Below 40	Poor	Not worthy of pursuing further

9. Criteria for selection of agencies for conducting the assessment

Agencies performing Assessments must satisfy the following criteria:

1. Have experience in conducting Market Research
2. Have familiarity with e-Governance projects
3. Should be disinterested and neutral. Example: Academic Institutions, research establishments, and consulting organizations
4. Should be able to employ investigators who understand the regional issues and local language
5. Should be able to employ investigators who should be able to broadly understand information technology and e-governance issues

Examples of such organizations are:

1. Research centers of Indian Institutes of Management
2. Management schools / departments of Indian Institutes of Technology
3. Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs)
4. IRMA, MICA, Management Institutes which have e-Governance focus
5. Departments of Universities with Management / E-Governance curriculum
6. ORG-MARG, Mudra
7. Public Affairs Council (Bangalore)
8. Institutes engaged in applied research in Economic and Social development

The selected agencies should be invited for a one-day workshop by DIT, through which they are briefed on the e-Governance projects and the assessment objectives. The first half of the workshop may cover some successful and not so successful projects from each category (G2CR, G2CU, G2B and G2G), so that the agency representatives strengthen their understanding of e-Governance projects. The second part of the workshop should cover the assessment methodology, clarifying all the attributes and their scoring.

“The assessment agents should agree to:

1. Develop questionnaires based on assessment templates
2. Employ and train investigators
3. Conduct field surveys
4. Summarize and draw conclusions
5. Present conclusions including sharing of source data”

10. Summary and Conclusion

The above methodology has been designed to serve many objectives spelt out in the first Section. Two levels of assessments (a quick assessment and an in depth assessment) are outlined to serve the important purpose of identifying those e-Governance projects which should be replicated in other States and locations.

Two important attributes of a project would determine whether it should be selected for replication:

- ◆ Value that the project delivers to its primary clients and also to the many other stakeholders that are involved in delivering the government service.
- ◆ “Adaptability of the Technology architecture to different contexts”

Value needs to be measured in concrete terms as has been proposed in this methodology. However, given the variety of contexts in which e-Governance applications are built, it is impossible to monetize the value. Whereas cost reduction, an increase in revenue are monetizable; reduction in corruption, increase in transparency or even improvements in service levels are not easily monetizable.

Judgment is likely to play a significant role in trading off specific benefits delivered across different dimensions to arrive at an overall value for purposes of comparison across projects. Through such comparison it would be possible to select those projects which seem to deliver the maximum value. A Committee of experts can be used to exercise this judgment. The methodology presented here makes it easier to exercise the judgment by presenting an unbiased measurement of benefits on dimensions that are perceived to be important for a specific application.

Annexure - 1 (G2C-R) (Detailed Assessment)

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	Quality of Service	5			
4	Simplicity of user actions required to get the service	5			
5	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
6	% disadvantaged users benefited	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
2	Availability of the service ONLINE	5			
3	Comprehensiveness of service in a single session	5			
4	Integrated Services	5			
5	Problem Resolution Mechanism	5			
6	Acceptability of service locations to disadvantaged	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Grouping of Services	5			
3	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
4	New services	5			
5	Reduction of visits to high level govt. offices	5			
6	Knowledge of Service provider's staff	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 40 for G2C-R)	90			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
2	Conformance to National architecture	5			
3	Architecture Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
4	Provision for inter-operability	5			
5	Extent of use of Open Source Systems	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
1	Open Standards compliance	5			
2	Open standards Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
3	Design and adoption of meta data standards	5			

Annexure - 1 (G2C-R) (D.A.) Contd..

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Dsign and adoption of security architecture	5			
2	Extent of Compliance to Security Architecture	5			
3	Security Standards Compliance Mechanism	5			
4	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Extent to which design permits scalability	5			
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
3	Scope for enhancements of HW interfaces	5			
4	Scope to work with alternate power and connectivity	5			
5	Alternatives in case of system breakdowns	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Degree of Accuracy	5			
3	Consistency of Response Times	5			
4	Alternative Service Delivery in case of system breakdowns	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	105	20		
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Extent and adequacy of employee training	5			
3	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
4	Employee involvement in design and implementation	5			
5	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
6	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5			
3	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5			
4	Collection of User Charges	5			
5	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
6	Period of continuous functioning	5			
7	Contribution to economic benefit of users	5			

Annexure - 1 (G2C-R) (D.A.) Contd..

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
2	Amendments for provision of e-services	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	75			
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5			
2	Reduction of Indirect Cost for getting the service	5			
3	Reduction of cost to government	5			
4	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
5	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
6	Mechanism to recover capital cost?	5			
7	If PPP, extent of commercial viability to Pvt partner	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	35			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
1	Degree of generic nature of the project geography	5			
2	Extent to which the project results in a product	5			
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Multiple platform deployment feasibility	5			
2	Ease of installation	5			
3	Extent of parameterization for customization	5			
4	Extent of feasibility to implement selected modules	5			
5	Quality of project documentation	5			
6	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
2	Attractiveness of transaction costs to induce replication	5			
3	Mechanism for marketing the project	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	55			
	Total Score of the Project		100		

Annexure - 2 (G2C-U) (Detailed Assessment)

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-U Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	Quality of Service	5			
4	Simplicity of user actions required to get the service	5			
5	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
2	Availability of the service ONLINE	5			
3	Comprehensiveness of service in a single session	5			
4	Integrated Services	5			
5	Problem Resolution Mechanism	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Grouping of Services	5			
3	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
4	New services	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 40 for G2C-U)	70			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
2	Conformance to National architecture	5			
3	Architecture Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
4	Provision for inter-operability	5			
5	Extent of use of Open Source Systems	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
1	Open Standards compliance	5			
2	Open standards Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
3	Design and adoption of meta data standards	5			

Annexure - 2 (G2C-U) (D. A.) Contd..

S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Design and adoption of security architecture	5			
2	Extent of Compliance to Security Architecture	5			
3	Security Standards Compliance Mechanism	5			
4	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Extent to which design permits scalability	5			
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
3	Scope for enhancements of HW interfaces	5			
4	Scope to work with alternate power and connectivity	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Degree of Accuracy	5			
3	Consistency of Response Times	5			
4	Availability of SLA	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-U)	100			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Extent and adequacy of employee training	5			
3	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
4	Employee involvement in design and implementation	5			
5	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5			
3	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5			
4	Collection of User Charges	5			
5	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
6	Period of continuous functioning	5			

Annexure - 2 (G2C-U) (D. A.) Contd..

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
2	Amendments for provision of e-services	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-U)	70			
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5			
2	Reduction of Indirect Cost for getting the service	5			
3	Reduction of cost to government	5			
4	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
5	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
6	Mechanism to recover capital cost?	5			
7	If PPP, extent of commercial viability to Pvt partner	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-U)	35			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
1	Degree of generic nature of the project geography	5			
2	Extent to which the project results in a product	5			
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Multiple platform deployment feasibility	5			
2	Ease of installation	5			
3	Extent of parameterization for customization	5			
4	Extent of feasibility to implement selected modules	5			
5	Quality of project documentation	5			
6	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
2	Attractiveness of transaction costs to induce replication	5			
3	Mechanism for marketing the project	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-U)	55			
	TOTAL SCORE				

Annexure - 3 (G2B) (Detailed Assessment)

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2B Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	Quality of Service	5			
4	Simplicity of user actions required to get the service	5			
5	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
2	Availability of the service ONLINE	5			
3	Comprehensiveness of service in a single session	5			
4	Integrated Services	5			
5	Problem Resolution Mechanism	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Grouping of Services	5			
3	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
4	New services	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 30 for G2B)	70			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
2	Conformance to National architecture	5			
3	Architecture Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
4	Provision for inter-operability	5			
5	Extent of use of Open Source Systems	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
1	Open Standards compliance	5			
2	Open standards Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
3	Design and adoption of meta data standards	5			
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Dsign and adoption of security architecture	5			
2	Extent of Compliance to Security Architecture	5			

Annexure - 3 (G2B) (D. A.) Contd..

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2B Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
3	Security Standards Compliance Mechanism	5			
4	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Extent to which design permits scalability	5			
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
3	Scope for enhancements of HW interfaces	5			
4	Scope to work with alternate power and connectivity	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Degree of Accuracy	5			
3	Consistency of Response Times	5			
4	Availability of SLA	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	100			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Extent and adequacy of employee training	5			
3	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
4	Employee involvement in design and implementation	5			
5	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
6	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5			
3	Stability and xpertise of Service delivery agents	5			
4	Collection of User Charges	5			
5	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
6	Period of continuous functioning	5			
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
2	Amendments for provision of e-services	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	70			

Annexure - 3 (G2B) (D. A.) Contd..

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2B Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5			
2	Reduction of Indirect Cost for getting the service	5			
3	Reduction of cost to government	5			
4	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
5	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
6	Mechanism to recover capital cost				
7	If PPP, extent of commercial viability to Pvt partner	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	35			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
1	Degree of generic nature of the project geography	5			
2	Extent to which the project results in a product	5			
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Multiple platform deployment feasibility	5			
2	Ease of installation	5			
3	Extent of parameterization for customization	5			
4	Extent of feasibility to implement selected modules	5			
5	Quality of project documentation	5			
6	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
2	Attractiveness of transaction costs to induce replication	5			
3	Mechanism for marketing the project	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2B)	55			
	TOTAL SCORE				

Annexure - 4 (G2G) (Detailed Assessment)

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2G Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	Quality of Service	5			
4	Simplicity of user actions required to get the service	5			
5	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
2	Availability of the service ONLINE	5			
3	Comprehensiveness of service in a single session	5			
4	Integrated Services	5			
5	Problem Resolution Mechanism	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Grouping of Services	5			
3	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
4	New services	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	70			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
2	Conformance to National architecture	5			
3	Architecture Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
4	Provision for inter-operability	5			
5	Extent of use of Open Source Systems	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
1	Open Standards compliance	5			
2	Open standards Compliance enforcement mechanism	5			
3	Design and adoption of meta data standards	5			
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Dsign and adoption of security architecture	5			
2	Extent of Compliance to Security Architecture	5			

Annexure - 4 (G2G) (D. A.) Contd...

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2G Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
3	Security Standards Compliance Mechanism	5			
4	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Extent to which design permits scalability	5			
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
3	Scope for enhancements of HW interfaces	5			
4	Scope to work with alternate power and connectivity	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Degree of Accuracy	5			
3	Consistency of Response Times	5			
4	Availability of SLA	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	100			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Extent and adequacy of employee training	5			
3	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
4	Employee involvement in design and implementation	5			
5	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
6	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5			
3	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5			
4	Collection of User Charges	5			
5	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
6	Period of continuous functioning	5			
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
2	Amendments for provision of e-services	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	70			

Annexure - 4 (G2G) (D. A.) Contd...

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2G Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5			
2	Reduction of Indirect Cost for getting the service	5			
3	Reduction of cost to government	5			
4	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
5	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
6	Mechanism to recover capital cost?	5			
7	If PPP, extent of commercial viability to Pvt partner	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	35			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
1	Degree of generic nature of the project geography	5			
2	Extent to which the project results in a product	5			
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Multiple platform deployment feasibility	5			
2	Ease of installation	5			
3	Extent of parameterization for customization	5			
4	Extent of feasibility to implement selected modules	5			
5	Quality of project documentation	5			
6	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
2	Attractiveness of transaction costs to induce replication	5			
3	Mechanism for marketing the project	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	55			
	TOTAL SCORE				

Annexure - 5 (G2C) (Summary Assessment)

Template for Summary Assessment of G2C-R Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
4	% disadvantaged users benefited	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
2	Acceptability of service locations to disadvantaged	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
3	Reduction of visits to high level govt. offices	5			
4	Knowledge of Service provider's staff	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 40 for G2C-R)	50			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Availability of SLA	5			
3	Alternative Service delivery in case of breakdowns	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	30			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			

Annexure - 5 (G2C) (S. A.) Contd...

Template for Summary Assessment of G2C-R Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
3	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
4	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5			
3	Collection of User Charges	5			
4	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
5	Period of continuous functioning	5			
6	Contribution to livelihood of users	5			
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	55			
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5			
2	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
3	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	15			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Quality of project documentation	5			
2	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	15			
	Total Score of the Project				

Annexure - 6 (G2C-U) (Summary Assessment)

Template for Summary Assessment of G2C-U Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 40 for G2C-U)	30			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Availability of SLA	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-U)	25			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
3	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
4	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5			
3	Collection of User Charges	5			

Annexure - 6 (G2C-U) (S. A.) Contd...

Template for Summary Assessment of G2C-U Projects					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
4	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
5	Period of continuous functioning	5			
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-U)	50			
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of cost to government	5			
2	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
3	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-U)	15			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Quality of project documentation	5			
2	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-U)	15			
	Total Score of the Project				

Annexure - 7 (G2B) (Summary Assessment)

Template for Summary Assessment of G2B Projects					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 30 for G2B)	30			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Availability of SLA	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	25			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
3	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
4	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5			
3	Collection of User Charges	5			

Annexure - 7 (G2B) (Summary Assessment)

Template for Summary Assessment of G2B Projects					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
4	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
5	Period of continuous functioning	5			
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	50			
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of cost to government	5			
2	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
3	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 20 for G2B) 1	5			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Quality of project documentation	5			
2	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2B)	15			
	Total Score of the Project				

Annexure - 8 (G2G) (Summary Assessment)

Template for Summary Assessment of G2G Projects					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5			
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5			
3	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5			
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5			
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5			
2	Use of Local Language Interface	5			
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	30			
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5			
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Electronic Payment mechanism	5			
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5			
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5			
2	Availability of SLA	5			
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	25			
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5			
2	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5			
3	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5			
4	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5			
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5			
2	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5			
3	Collection of User Charges	5			

Annexure - 8 (G2G) (S. A.) Contd..

Template for Summary Assessment of G2G Projects					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
4	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5			
5	Period of continuous functioning	5			
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5			
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	50			
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of cost to government	5			
2	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5			
3	Degree of reduction in corruption	5			
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	15			
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Quality of project documentation	5			
2	Quality of user manuals	5			
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5			
	Replicability Score (Weight: 20 for G2G)	15			
	TOTAL SCORE				

Exhibit - 1 (G2C-R) (D. A.), Sample

Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects A Sampl					
S. No	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5	1		
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5	1		
3	Quality of Service	5	1		
4	Simplicity of user actions required to get the service	5	3		
5	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5	3		
6	% disadvantaged users benefited	5	2		
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5	1		
2	Availability of the service ONLINE	5	1		
3	Comprehensiveness of service in a single session	5	2		
4	Integrated Services	5	2		
5	Problem Resolution Mechanism	5	2		
6	Acceptability of service locations to disadvantaged	5	2		
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5	3		
2	Grouping of Services	5	3		
3	Use of Local Language Interface	5	4		
4	New services	5	3		
5	Reduction of visits to high level govt. offices	5	2		
6	Knowledge of Service provider's staff	5	3		
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 40 for G2C-R)	90		39	17.33
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5	3		
2	Conformance to National architecture	5	5		
3	Architecture Compliance enforcement mechanism	5	3		
4	Provision for inter-operability	5	2		
5	Extent of use of Open Source Systems	5	3		
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
1	Open Standards compliance	5	5		
2	Open standards Compliance enforcement mechanism	5	2		

Exhibit - 1 (G2C-R) (D. A.) Contd...

Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects A Sampl					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
3	Design and adoption of meta data standards	5	2		
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Dsign and adoption of security architecture	5	4		
2	Extent of Compliance to Security Architecture	5	4		
3	Security Standards Compliance Mechanism	5	2		
4	Electronic Payment mechanism	5	0		
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Extent to which design permits scalability	5	5		
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5	1		
3	Scope for enhancements of HW interfaces		3		
4	Scope to work with alternate power and connectivity	5	3		
5	Alternatives in case of system breakdowns	5	1		
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5	2		
2	Degree of Accuracy	5	4		
3	Consistency of Response Times	5	1		
4	Alternative Service Delivery in case of system breakdowns	5	1		
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	105		56	10.67
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5	3		
2	Extent and adequacy of employee training	5	2		
3	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5	2		
4	Employee involvement in design and implementation	5	2		
5	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5	1		
6	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5	1		
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5	4		
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5	0		
3	Stability and expertize of Service delivery agents	5	2		
4	Collection of User Charges	5	1		
5	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5	1		
6	Period of continuous functioning	5	2		

Exhibit - 1 (G2C-R) (D. A.) Contd...

Detailed Assessment of G2C-R Projects A Sampl					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
7	Contribution to livelihood of users	5	1		
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5	2		
2	Amendments for provision of e-services	5	0		
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	75		24	6.40
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5	2		
2	Reduction of Indirect Cost for getting the service	5	3		
3	Reduction of cost to government	5	0		
4	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5	0		
5	Degree of reduction in corruption	5	5		
6	Mechanism to recover capital cost?	5	0		
7	If PPP, extent of commercial viability to Pvt parner	5	0		
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	35	10	10	2.86
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
1	Degree of generic nature of the project -geography	5	2		
2	Extent to which the project results in a product	5	3		
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Multiple platform deployment feasibility	5	1		
2	Ease of installation	5	5		
3	Extent of parameterization for customization	5	2		
4	Extent of feasibility to implement selected modules	5	2		
5	Quality of project documentation	5	2		
6	Quality of user manuals	5	3		
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5	2		
2	Attractiveness of transaction costs to induce replication	5	1		
3	Mechanism for marketing the project	5	0		
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	55		23	4.18
	Total Score of the Project		100		41.44

Exhibit - 2 (G2B) (D. A.), Sample

Detailed Assessment of G2B: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5	3		
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5	4		
3	Quality of Service	5	2		
4	Simplicity of user actions required to get the service	5	3		
5	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5	5		
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5	3		
2	Availability of the service ONLINE	5	4		
3	Comprehensiveness of service in a single session	5	3		
4	Integrated Services	5	3		
5	Problem Resolution Mechanism	5	3		
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5	4		
2	Grouping of Services	5	3		
3	Use of Local Language Interface	5	3		
4	New services	5	2		
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 30 for G2B)	70		45	19.29
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5	3		
2	Conformance to National architecture	5	4		
3	Architecture Compliance enforcement mechanism	5	3		
4	Provision for inter-operability	5	3		
5	Extent of use of Open Source Systems	5	2		
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
1	Open Standards compliance	5	4		
2	Open standards Compliance enforcement mechanism	5	3		
3	Design and adoption of meta data standards	5	3		
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Dsign and adoption of security architecture	5	4		
2	Extent of Compliance to Security Architecture	5	4		

Exhibit - 2 (G2B) (D. A.) Contd...

Detailed Assessment of G2B: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
3	Security Standards Compliance Mechanism	5	3		
4	Electronic Payment mechanism	5	2		
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Extent to which design permits scalability	5	3		
2	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5	4		
3	Scope for enhancements of HW interfaces	5	3		
4	Scope to work with alternate power and connectivity	5	4		
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5	3		
2	Degree of Accuracy	5	5		
3	Consistency of Response Times	5	4		
4	Availability of SLA	5	5		
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	100		69	13.80
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5	3		
2	Extent and adequacy of employee training	5	3		
3	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5	3		
4	Employee involvement in design and implementation	5	3		
5	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5	3		
6	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5	1		
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5	4		
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5	2		
3	Stability and expertize of Service delivery agents	5	4		
4	Collection of User Charges	5	5		
5	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5	5		
6	Period of continuous functioning	5	2		
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5	4		
2	Amendments for provision of e-services	5	3		
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	70		45	12.86

Exhibit - 2 (G2B) (D. A.) Contd...

Detailed Assessment of G2B: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5	4		
2	Reduction of Indirect Cost for getting the service	5	5		
3	Reduction of cost to government	5	1		
4	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5	5		
5	Degree of reduction in corruption	5	2		
6	Mechanism to recover capital cost?	5	5		
7	If PPP, extent of commercial viability to Pvt partner	5	5		
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	35		27	15.43
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
1	Degree of generic nature of the project -geography	5	5		
2	Extent to which the project results in a product	5	3		
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Multiple platform deployment feasibility	5	2		
2	Ease of installation	5	5		
3	Extent of parameterization for customization	5	3		
4	Extent of feasibility to implement selected modules	5	4		
5	Quality of project documentation	5	2		
6	Quality of user manuals	5	4		
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5	4		
2	Attractiveness of transaction costs to induce replication	5	4		
3	Mechanism for marketing the project	5	3		
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2B)	55		39	7.09
	TOTAL SCORE				68.46

Exhibit - 3 (G2C-R) (D. A.), Sample

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-R: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5	1		
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5	1		
3	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5	3		
4	% disadvantaged users benefited	5	2		
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5	1		
2	Acceptability of service locations to disadvantaged	5	2		
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5	3		
2	Use of Local Language Interface	5	4		
3	Reduction of visits to high level govt. offices	5	2		
4	Knowledge of Service provider's staff	5	3		
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 40 for G2C-R)	50		22	17.60
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5	3		
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Electronic Payment mechanism	5	0		
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5	1		
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5	2		
2	Availability of SLA	5	4		
3	Alternative Service delivery in case of breakdowns	5	1		
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	30		11	7.33
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5	3		
2	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5	2		
3	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5	1		

Exhibit - 3 (G2C-R) (D. A.) Contd...

Template for Detailed Assessment of G2C-R: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
4	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5	1		
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5	4		
2	Strength of PPP arrangement (if PPP)	5	0		
3	Collection of User Charges	5	1		
4	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5	1		
5	Period of continuous functioning	5	1		
6	Contribution to livelihood of users	5	1		
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5	2		
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2C-R)	55		17	6.18
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of Direct Cost for getting the service	5	2		
2	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5	0		
3	Degree of reduction in corruption	5	5		
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	15		7	4.67
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Quality of project documentation	5	2		
2	Quality of user manuals	5	3		
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5	2		
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2C-R)	15		7	4.67
	Total Score of the Project		100		40.45

Exhibit - 4 (G2B) (S. A.), Sample

Summary Assessment of G2B: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
I	5.1 Service-Orientation				
	5.1.1 Efficiency Attributes				
1	Speed of delivery of Service	5	3		
2	Compliance to committed service time frame	5	4		
3	% of target users benefited by the e-Service	5	5		
	5.1.2 User Convenience Attributes				
1	Ease of Access to service	5	3		
	5.1.3 Citizen-centricity Attributes				
1	Degree of alignment to user needs	5	4		
2	Use of Local Language Interface	5	3		
	Service-Orientation Score (Weight: 30 for G2B)	30		22	22.00
II	5.2 Technology				
	5.2.1 Architecture Attributes				
1	Suitability of Architecture	5	3		
	5.2.2 Standards Attributes				
	5.2.3 Security Attributes				
1	Electronic Payment mechanism	5	2		
	5.2.4 Scalability Attributes				
1	Degree of Scalability of the Project	5	4		
	5.2.5 Reliability Attributes				
1	Degree of Availability	5	3		
2	Availability of SLA	5	5		
	Technology Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	25		17	13.60
III	5.3 Sustainability				
	5.3.1 Organizational Sustainability Attributes				
1	Organizational structure to support the project	5	3		
2	Role clarity and employee buy-in	5	3		
3	Continuity of top champions of the projects	5	3		
4	Existence of User groups and Service Reviews	5	1		
	5.3.2 Commercial Sustainability Attributes				
1	Amenability of Service delivery through PPP mode	5	4		
2	Stability and expertise of Service delivery agents	5	4		
3	Collection of User Charges	5	5		

Exhibit - 4 (G2B) (S. A.) Contd...

Summary Assessment of G2B: A Sample					
SNo	Attributes	Max Score	Score as per assessment (0-5)	Score of attribute class	Weighted Score
4	Availability of service during user convenient hours	5	5		
5	Period of continuous functioning	5	2		
	5.3.3 Legal Sustainability Attributes				
1	Extent of BPR	5	4		
	Sustainability Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	50		34	13.60
IV	5.4 Cost-effectiveness				
1	Reduction of cost to government	5	1		
2	Enhanced revenue/benefit to government	5	5		
3	Degree of reduction in corruption	5	2		
	Cost-effectiveness Score (Weight: 20 for G2B)	15		8	10.67
V	5.5 Replicability				
	5.5.1 Functional Replicability Attributes				
	5.5.2 Technological Replicability Attributes				
1	Quality of project documentation	5	2		
2	Quality of user manuals	5	4		
	5.5.3 Commercial Replicability Attributes				
1	Availability of Commercial arrangement for replication	5	4		
	Replicability Score (Weight: 10 for G2B)	15		10	6.67
	TOTAL SCORE		100		66.53