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Foreword

It is easy to form an impression from media and management journals that governments around the world over have suddenly realized that:

- They can’t get service delivery right.
- Citizens matter, and government services must be redesigned around citizen need.
- Outcomes are different than outputs.

However, I observed that, during the global financial crisis of 2008, social program management systems provided stability. In the 20th century, social policy played a role in the development of the western world. And now, in the 21st century, emerging countries, such as China and Brazil, are placing great importance on the development of their social systems. These revelations demonstrate that government does get service delivery and social policy right and has been getting it right for a long time.

A paradox of ideas seems to be emerging of service delivery models and social policy to achieve sustainable social outcomes. But, in contrast, the same social program management systems remain an enduring pillar of civil society, serving many countries well.

This report examines this paradox and explains how governments can achieve improvements through an evolution of the current business model for social program management to RightServicing. The evolution to RightServicing has the potential to deliver social and economic benefits across society. These benefits come from targeting the complex needs of people who are underserviced in the current business models and people who are low risk and overserviced by today’s service delivery systems.

RightServicing has emerged to rationalize how social program management systems are continually modifying and improving, from policy and service delivery perspectives, to meet the needs and wants of individuals and communities, while maintaining societal-level outcomes and fiscal realities. RightServicing identifies the key characteristics that an organization should invest in to strike this balance.

The findings in this report are based on our experience in the social program management industry and our observations of the organizations that participated in our research. This report provides practical guidance to help organizations become a RightServicing organization. I encourage people who work in social policy and service delivery organizations to read this report to help you think about social program management in a new way.

John Hearne, General Manager IBM Smarter Care & Social Programs
RightServicing: A new business approach for enabling a differential response in social program management

**Figure 1:** RightServicing: A new business approach for enabling a differential response in social program management
Researching RightServicing
This report presents findings and analysis from research that was conducted during 2011 and early 2012 with a cross-section of officials from social program management organizations and multilateral agencies in the sector. Organizations from Europe, North America, Asia and Oceania, in addition to multilateral agencies with a global remit, were consulted during this project.

The research was conducted by using an issue-based consulting approach. We introduced the concept of RightServicing and defined it within the context of nine organizational characteristics (the hypothesis). The characteristics were examined through a series of interviews, workshops and presentations, with the aim of confirming their relevance by using supporting proof points from real-life examples.

After we confirmed the characteristics as relevant, the next step was to analyze and understand the inter-relationship of the characteristics, which led to the development of the RightServicing business model. The characteristics became the attributes of organizational capability that are required for a RightServicing approach.

This report provides social program management organizations with guidance, supported by world-wide examples, on transitioning from the one-size-fits-all (standardized) approach to a differential response approach to service delivery. At the core of the RightServicing model is the assumption that, for most situations, the current one-size-fits-all approach remains fundamentally sound, but with room for improvement.

Although the issues in this report are applicable across the broad range of social programs, the terminology and definitions vary from country to country among the actors in the social system. For this report, the concept of social program management is used to collectively describe social security, social services, human services, social welfare and workers compensation or labor accident programs. The people who benefit from these programs or who are serviced by social program management organizations are collectively referred to as customers or people. Customers and people in this context represent individuals and their families, citizens and noncitizens, members, clients and the public at large. The actors who provide services to customers on behalf of social program management organizations are referred to as service providers.

This report includes examples from the following organizations about good practices that are consistent with the principles of RightServicing:

• Organizations that participated in the research for this paper
• Client organizations of IBM Cúram Software
• World-leading social program management organizations that were identified through research
• Organizations outside the social program management sector that demonstrate the principles of RightServicing from a different perspective and are included for comparative purposes
Preface

Do the right thing. It will gratify some people and astonish the rest.

- Mark Twain, American author

To “do the right thing” in delivering social programs is the product of many factors such as the level of economic and social development within a country, cultural norms and the political environment. The needs and wants of a diverse population are many. But, the ability of society to shoulder the moral and fiscal responsibilities of a social program management system is subject to a complex set of competing priorities.

Given the many factors that are involved in delivering social programs, is it possible to know what the “right thing” is? Is it the precise administration of laws and policies? Is it whatever it takes to ensure that every individual has the opportunity to lead a full and satisfying life? And, what obligations do individuals have to society in return for enjoying the benefits of society’s commitment to a social program management system?

Can the multiple needs and wants of individuals be balanced against a society’s economic and social policy objectives? The level of investment required to enable individuals to contribute to society at their potential, while maintaining an equitable, rational and sustainable approach to resource distribution across a large population, appears intractable; it is a wicked problem. Solving this problem would be gratifying to people and would leave the rest of the population astonished at such success.

Social program management is traditionally developed by using a one-size-fits-all approach to address need across large populations. Whether it is a social policy that defines social programs or administrative functions that define service delivery, the underlying design philosophy is weighted in favor of satisfying the needs of a majority. Social programs are for the overall good of society, where individuals are protected by collectively sharing risk through contributory insurance or the tax base. Through the principle of solidarity, societies come together to address social risks, with everyone sharing the collective risk.

Although the one-size-fits-all approach is easier to design and administer and easy to defend under the banner of fairness and equity, it needs updating because it is likely to dissatisfy an individual’s needs. However, this approach has been successful in providing stable and harmonious societies, leaving much in the current approach to be preserved. In this rapidly changing era of globalization, an economic and social challenge is the imperative to ensure that all individuals have the opportunity to fulfill their potential.
Social programs that are designed from the perspective of Otto von Bismarck, William Beveridge or both aim to address each of the social risks that people can experience. The success of these social programs in achieving their objectives is a direct function of how they are delivered. Good policy is undermined by poor service delivery, and excellent service delivery can never compensate for poor policy.

The principle of subsidiarity is the driving force for effective and efficient service delivery. Subsidiarity is where programs should be delivered at the lowest level possible. If assistance is needed from higher levels of government or another organization, the higher levels should assist the lower levels rather than replace them. For social program management, lower levels of government and the not-for-profit and for-profit service sectors play an important role in addressing complex social problems. They are important in areas of disadvantage, where a reliance on standard social programs that were designed according to Bismarck and Beveridge fails to resolve complex problems.

A one-size-fits-all approach is a rational model for addressing the delicate balance of meeting the needs of individuals and society. This approach offers the fallback of fairness and equity for when failures or adverse consequences occur. Inserting individual needs and individual risk into the equation poses a challenge to organizations that adhere to the solidarity principle (from either the Bismarck or Beveridge perspective). Yet, a lack of the resources or inability to address issues and problems falls outside of social norms. The subsidiarity principle offers multiple paths to engage with other organizations and other levels of government to determine the root cause of people’s social problems.

A RightServicing approach is needed so that the enduring and administrative efficiency of the one-size-fits-all approach is maintained and provisions are made for a variable or differential approach in policy and service delivery where appropriate. This approach respects and locks in the traditions and strengths of the government-to-citizen relationship that has worked well for many years. Also, it is overlaid with the flexibility and agility to address the most pressing social problems of our times.
Figure 2 highlights the government-to-citizen relationship in a democratic setting. Governments, as the representative of society, have a social contract with the citizens to provide the essentials of social and economic development. In turn, citizens have obligations, such as paying taxes and complying with laws, to government.
Within this relationship is the important provision of a social safety net that is designed to respond to the needs and wants of the people. Governments have administrative arrangements through policy ministries and service delivery agencies to provide services and to respond to needs and wants. This approach has underpinned the social and economic progress of most countries, but is it enough? Does this approach reach the needs of every citizen? Why is there social exclusion? Why is there social disadvantage? Is it affordable?

RightServicing alone is not a panacea for deep societal social problems. It helps governments to more effectively and efficiently focus their social programs and finite resources and to deliver them at the right time, in the right place and with the right amount of effort.

**RightServicing defined**

RightServicing, a concept created by the authors of this paper, is a set of organizational attributes that are combined to provide flexibility and agility for a differential service response. RightServicing offers value and benefits for society, governments and social program management organizations through social, program outlay and productivity dividends.

RightServicing represents a set of organizational attributes, each of which is a capability that is needed to deliver an optimal level of assistance for people to achieve an appropriate and sustainable social outcome.

A RightServicing business model enables a differential service response. This response is calibrated to match the level of need, from both a social outcome and service delivery perspective, and stands in contrast to the one-size-fits-all approach. The RightServicing business model for differential response brings about:

- A reduction of overservicing the majority, through the automation of low-risk, straightforward and simple interactions
- An increase in deep and personalized support to address disadvantage
- People who suffer disadvantage are often underserviced by the social program management system.
- A largely self-managed servicing approach to individuals who have been affected by a social risk and who are able to and prefer to manage their own affairs

RightServicing is a significant update to the traditional one-size-fits-all process model. Not all citizens need the same level of support to achieve a desired social outcome, and the amount of service provided should vary according to the social context of individuals and their families. RightServicing aims to address the balance of demand within the social program management system (which is difficult to manage and suppress) with supply to service and deliver (which is limited by fiscal constraints).
As an example, many unemployment benefit or insurance programs treat people who become unemployed the same way from the start, irrespective of their likelihood and readiness for reentering the labor market. The level of assistance provided to them in the first weeks (even up to 12–6 weeks) of unemployment is kept to a minimum. The reason is that many people who lose a job and seek benefit or insurance payments tend to find a new job within a relatively short time.

Even depressed labor markets always have a significant level of churn, meaning that people might lose a job but quickly find a new job. However, within this churn are people whose chances of reentering the labor market are impacted by a range of factors such as their age, skills, education or location.

A RightServicing approach aims to identify the people who have an above average risk of not finding a new job within a reasonable period (such as 12–16 weeks). This approach also aims to begin interventions to address the barriers to reentering the labor market. For those people who have good prospects of reentering the labor market, the one-size-fits-all approach is appropriate. They only need some income support while looking for a new job and do not need the effort and resources that people with fewer job prospects need. One organization that stands out as an example of implementing this approach is the Ministry of Social Development in New Zealand, as revealed during one of our workshops.

The risk of long-term unemployment (that is, greater than 12 months) increases significantly when a person is out of the labor market longer than three months. People who experience a series of barriers to re-employment can be subjected to underservicing (that is not receiving the services they need), which perversely increases the likelihood of becoming unemployed for the long term. By the time significant interventions are made to address the barriers to re-employment, people might already be disillusioned and disengaging from the labor market, which is especially relevant for countries with high levels of youth unemployment.

A significant proportion of the people who make up the churn is subjected to overservicing (that is receiving more services than they need) because of requirements to complete forms, to provide information and to be present at offices. On many occasions, these people provide information that the government already knows (possibly held by another government agency) or can access through other means.
Benefits of RightServicing

For governments, achieve societal outcomes:
• Provide sustainable social programs while supporting economic growth.
• Build confidence in a social system that fits the needs of the 21st century.
• Focus resources on people with the most need to get better outcomes for the common good.
• Deploy targeted programs to address the hardest societal problems.
• Cost avoidance from consequences of long-term social problems.
• Turn tax consumers to tax payers.

For individuals and families, achieve employment goals and meet immediate needs:
• Give people the greatest opportunity to maximize participation in the workforce and society.
• Tailor integrated services to their needs.
• Empower people to manage their needs without government intervention.
• Provide access to the full range of programs and services when needed, but withdraw them before creating long-term dependency.
• Break the cycle of intergenerational welfare dependency.

For social organizations, improve individual and societal outcomes:
• Deliver services to most people at a lower cost for an efficiency dividend.
• Implement a service delivery model that is beyond citizen-centric as it continually transforms with the evolving needs of society and its citizens.
• Bring together the collaborative potential of government at all levels to deliver a more sustainable impact on individual and societal outcomes.

Socioeconomic imperative for RightServicing

RightServicing has emerged in response to the social policy trend of the latter half of the 20th century to blend the traditional social security models that are represented by Bismarck and Beveridge. These models, although historically relevant, are becoming less influential. Countries that use the Bismark model complement their social systems with universal or means-tested benefits. Countries that use the Beveridge model introduce mandatory contributory schemes that are linked to employment. Most countries’ social insurance systems now present features of both views.

Protection against social risks is both a right and the right thing to do. The concept of RightServicing aims to ensure, from both a policy and service delivery perspective, that balance is maintained between securing individual rights and achieving good outcomes for the benefit of society.

- Danny Pieters, Secretary General, European Institute of Social Security
The blending of models is a pragmatic response to changing demographic conditions (such as aging and labor patterns (such as a life-long job that is replaced by job changes and periods of work displacement). Several issues, such as structural unemployment, raising rates of chronic disability and occupational disease, and aging populations, have exacerbated other social problems. The problems include housing stress, substance abuse, juvenile crime, crimes of violence, and abuse against women, children, the elderly and the disabled. Combined, all of these issues contribute to a widening inequality gap of rich and poor.

Globalization of trade has pulled millions of people in developing countries out of poverty. Globalization of financial markets is a major factor behind the financial and economic shocks in the developed world. These rapid social and economic changes threaten the viability and sustainability of traditional social security business models, and they need to change. This need for change is challenging the principle of solidarity, a bulwark against the forces of change that press hard against the modern welfare state.

Change is happening in the following areas among others:

- The decrease in acquired rights that are earned through contribution to social insurance schemes through replacement or complementary social policy initiatives that feature conditionality and mutual obligations, for example: mandatory return-to-work efforts to qualify for unemployment insurance
- The transfer of risk from the state to the individual through initiatives such as replacing defined benefit pension schemes with defined contribution schemes

The need to have the organizational capabilities to respond to these rapidly changing structural conditions, while coming off a base of social program management that is designed for a different era, is a powerful driving force behind RightServicing. Although the core fundamentals of social program management are enduring, the ability to respond to the social and economic challenges of our time demands a more pragmatic and flexible approach.

To add to the mix, emerging or developing economies that are led by the Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC) countries (and can include Indonesia, South Korea and South Africa) are rapidly challenging the global economic balance of power. Mature economies with aging populations and financial uncertainty surrounding their social program management systems are feeling the pressure to remain competitive in the global marketplace. However, governments are expected to maintain the integrity of their social program management systems despite the peak of well-documented financing problems within the Eurozone debt crisis. An example of the severe social impact from the debt crisis is the situation in Greece that was caused, in part, by the country’s lack of international competitiveness.
RightServicing, as a principle, is compatible with the statutory rights people have to social security. We are now seeing increased levels of coordination across programs and of cooperation between agencies in the social security system, with the aim of delivering better outcomes for people, respecting people’s rights to privacy and adhering to social codes.

- Markus Sailer, Senior Economist, German Pension Insurance-Federal Institute (DRV)

Emerging economies seek to underpin their economic success by establishing an effective social safety net. Although social systems within emerging economies remain relatively immature compared to traditional western models, these systems contribute to their comparative (some say unfair) advantage in global trade. Rising living standards in these countries from paid employment increases the pressure on their governments to fund complementary social programs such as health insurance, employment insurance, labor accident insurance and retirement pensions.

In-line with the significant changes brought on by globalization, the International Labor Organization (ILO) has developed the social protection floor initiative, which is a two-dimensional strategy for the extension of social security. It consists of a basic set of social guarantees for all (horizontal dimension) and the gradual implementation of higher standards (vertical dimension), in-line with the ILO’s Social Security Minimum Standards Convention, 1952 (No. 102), and others.5

Social stability is an essential precondition for economic vibrancy and success. It follows that social program management goes along with economic growth and development. Governments must support market growth and success and ensure against market failure through the social program management system. Social program management and economic development can be regarded as similar (two sides of the same coin).6

Developed and emerging economies are now heading toward the same point, albeit from different directions. They both need to manage the ongoing viability and sustainability of their social program management systems by:

- Expanding coverage (in emerging countries)
- Constraining expenditure on mature programs (in developed countries)

Both developed and emerging economies are focused on gaining a competitive advantage by containing production costs for goods and services and by improving product quality. The burden of covering social risks for workers is regarded as a cost of production or an investment in human capital. A RightServicing approach offers a pathway for maximizing value and making social expenditure an investment rather than a cost burden.
The path to RightServicing: From citizen-centered delivery through outcome management

RightServicing at face value is a straightforward concept. Who would argue with providing policy and services in a way that delivered the right outcomes? The question for social program management organizations that are looking to balance efficiency and effectiveness when serving large populations is: How? These organizations need to know the characteristics and capabilities that are required to become a RightServicing organization.

The research was conducted by using the issue-based consulting approach, which is a widely used method in the professional services industry. We introduced the concept of RightServicing and defined it within the context of nine organizational characteristics or attributes (the hypothesis). The characteristics were examined through a series of interviews, workshops and presentations with the aim of confirming their relevance and identifying proof points and real-life organizational examples.

The path to RightServicing began over the past 15 years in the social program management industry with the development of two significant business model trends: citizen-centered service delivery and outcome management. By observing these business model trends, we identified a gap in the conceptual thinking that led to the development of RightServicing.

Citizen-centered service delivery

The traditional approach to service delivery for social programs is a form of vertical alignment from legislation or policy to program design. In this approach, a single organization is responsible for developing legislation or a policy that is related to a social program, such as disability or employment. Then, the same organization provides the service delivery channels, such as a local office network and call centers. Such an organization might cover more than one program area.

This approach has many variations such as service delivery devolution to lower levels of government, including state, province, county, city, municipal and local. A physical separation might exist between the legislation or policy organization and the service delivery agency. However, the business relationship is often one-to-one, meaning that the service delivery agency is exclusive to a legislation or policy organization.

This traditional (and bureaucratic) public administration approach has been challenged over the past 15 years, first, in Australia with the establishment of Centrelink and again, in 2005, through the formal establishment of Service Canada. In both cases, these federal-level organizations were largely responsible for nationwide income support programs. These organizations were established to usher in a new approach for the service delivery of social programs based around individual citizens’ needs, rather than simply administering the rules and policies of social programs.
These organizations had a desire to unite the many social programs that were administered by one or more policy-based or legislative-based organizations into a set of service offerings that individuals could simultaneously access from one place. This concept, which is referred to as joined-up services, eventually led to the development of citizen-centric service delivery models. People could go to a single government shop front, call center or website to access various social programs and other relevant programs.

This one-stop-shop approach to service delivery, also known as no wrong door, delivered efficiencies for individuals and organizations. Ease of access by eliminating or reducing the overlap of various service delivery networks (more than one social program delivered through the same service delivery network) led to a reduction in costs of administration. Although improvements in social outcomes were achieved, the citizen-centric service delivery approach was dominated by the efficiency agenda.

**Outcome management**

The objective of social policy for individuals is to achieve a good social outcome that is also beneficial to society. For example, for an employment program, a desirable outcome is to match an individual’s skills to get sustainable employment that provides a stepping stone for a long-term career in the labor market. For society, the result is in a healthy labor market because a vibrant labor market is an indicator of good economic conditions.

Too often, the measure of success for an employment program is merely placing a person in a job and reducing (perhaps temporarily) the unemployment line. But, was it the right job? Will the person still be employed in 3, 6 or 12 months? Does the person have the skills to do the job competently? Is the person motivated to make the job a success?

For policy makers, the challenge is to define high goals that are also realistic and achievable outcomes. In social program management, outcomes are the high-order objectives to address a disadvantage. A focus on outcomes leads to reduced costs for society over the longer term because people who experience social disadvantage become active participants in society, rather than long-term consumers of high-cost social programs. Consider the following examples:

- Maximum participation by people who contribute to national economic output, which is achieved by reducing long-term unemployment, by ensuring that people of all ages have the skills for the economic conditions of today and the future
- Secure futures for young people, which are achieved by providing supportive home and community environments and by ensuring that young people finish school with the skills and opportunity to enter into higher education, move into work immediately, or both
- The sustained long-term health of all citizens, which is achieved by improving the health of people through diet, exercise and preventive health screening

These examples share the common characteristics of addressing complex and embedded issues, having a long-term impact and being difficult to deal with by using traditional programs. They require an approach that integrates policy and program delivery thinking. To arrive at a meaningful outcome that sets high goals that are realistic to achieve, policy makers must work outside the normal confines of a single organizational boundary. The output from many social program management organizations and others might need to be coordinated to achieve a single meaningful outcome.
The characteristics of RightServicing

As a business model, RightServicing is defined in the context of nine characteristics that were validated through research. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics. The subsections that follow examine each characteristic in detail. To understand how the characteristics combine to derive value and benefits for individuals, society and organizations, see “The RightServicing Organization” section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segmenting</td>
<td>Grouping people together with similar needs and wants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-tracking</td>
<td>Getting through the system with a minimum of fuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Complexity</td>
<td>The need to recognize the complexity of people’s circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Dynamic and focus on better service and compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing</td>
<td>The way that people access and use the social system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automating</td>
<td>Technology to eliminate manual processing and to reduce process cycle times and cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting</td>
<td>Early intervention to stop social disadvantage; prevention is better than finding a cure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Programs</td>
<td>New and innovative social program solutions to achieve desired outcomes and to address complex problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging the Ecosystem</td>
<td>Collaboration and sharing with other agencies and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: RightServicing characteristics*

Segmenting

*Grouping people together with similar needs and wants*

Policy makers and service delivery organizations have traditionally viewed people according to the social programs that they administer. Such groups of people can include aged pensioners, unemployed people, people with disabilities, people with young children and people who have had an accident at work. From the standpoint of a social program, the collective needs and wants across these broad categories of people are well understood.

We have piloted a new profiling model for working age customers. By asking a few more questions, we are able to target our response and services to better meet their needs based on their readiness for returning to the workforce.

- Niamh O’Donoghue, Secretary General, Department of Social Protection, Ireland

But, what about the unique needs and wants of people who live in rural and remote areas versus people who live in big cities? What about people with access to high-speed Internet connections versus people who have access to only a landline phone or who live in a village without access to any form of communication technology? What about differences in gender, age, culture, language and ethnicity? And, what about people who have a high income level versus a low income level or who attain a college education versus drop out of high school before graduation. The list goes on. What emerges is a complex matrix of categories with people fitting into multiple places.
Segmenting is the process of identifying subgroups of people with similar needs and wants. These groups form a critical mass for which the development of unique products and services is warranted from both social justice and fiscal perspectives. Segmenting in social program management is no different from the marketing function in the commercial world. Companies identify groups of people with similar needs and wants and then, design products to meet those needs. They develop specific marketing messages to that group of people. Have you ever seen an advertisement in electronic print media and thought, “I don’t get it. What are they trying to sell? I would never buy that product.” The odds are that the product and the advertisements are not intended for you. You were not part of the target market segment, but someone else was.

Unlike a commercial operation, social program management organizations cannot decide to exclude a segment because it is unattractive from a potential profit or market-share perspective. Social program management organizations can use segmentation to understand the collective unique needs and wants of every segment. Segmentation can be used to identify customer populations that are poorly serviced by traditional social programs or that have unique needs to be addressed.

Segmenting is the highest order RightServicing characteristic because it defines high priority areas that require attention. It is a mechanism for identifying which groups of people are underserviced and which groups are overserviced. By using Segmenting, policy makers and service delivery administrators can see the people they serve in terms of their collective needs and wants rather than as beneficiaries of a particular social program.

Segmenting is not a definitive way of categorizing people and should not be used for this purpose. People are most likely to fit into multiple segments. Segmenting provides guidance on the products and services that are required to service a client population. Actual delivery of these products and services is governed by other RightServicing characteristics.

The following examples are of segmentation:

- Program: Unemployed, retired and families
- Service mode: Third party, agent, staff assisted and self
- Societal group: Working age, baby boomers, Generation X and Generation Y
- Geographic: Metropolitan, rural and remote
- Ethnicity: Indigenous and migrants
- Life event: Birth, marriage, separation, employment and death
- Location specific: Local community, housing estate and apartment block
- Disability: Physical, intellectual, birth defect and accident
- Gender: Male, female and transgender
- Sexual orientation: Heterosexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian and transsexual
- ICT adoption: Early adopters, followers and no access
- Income: High, medium, low and income support only
Figure 3 shows an example of a Segmenting model in two dimensions: income and societal group. Based on this Segmenting model, products and services can be designed, and existing products can be tailored to the needs of the various groups that are identified in each segment. The size of each segment and the number of people in each one influence the amount of effort and investment into specialized products.
A profiling model pilot by the Irish Department of Social Protection

During our workshop with the Irish Department of Social Protection (DSP), we discussed a profiling model that was being tested by the department. The purpose of the model, which was confined to the working age population at the time, is to capture information about which age groups to base predictions on.

The scheme requires asking only 16 extra questions at the screening level. Calculations are made on the probability of customers exiting Ireland’s Live Register (unemployment benefits or assistance) in under a year, where the variables determine the responses. The information that is gathered is given to policy makers to assist them in making more informed decisions. The DSP uses this segmentation scheme to help determine who and how best to deal with the customer, which will lead to a more efficient and effective service.

Segmentation in the commercial world

Segmentation is a common market strategy tool that commercial companies use to define their market, by dividing it into customer groups that share similar characteristics.

This information is then applied to provide a better service to extract maximum value from the customers. The process entails tailoring products and services, such as shaping product offerings, pricing and marketing campaigns around a segment, to meet the specific needs of customer groups.

Segmentation allows companies to understand their customers’ needs, it identifies service gaps, and it helps them to identify market trends for specific segments. This tool can also be used in the provision of social protection services to provide a better service and to minimize service gaps and overlap.
As an example, Tesco, a retailer in the UK, Europe and Asia, used a commercial customer segmentation model to segment its customers. This segmentation was based on data analysis from its 10 million Tesco Clubcard holders. Tesco then launched brands that target the segments that it identified (Table 2).14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer segments</th>
<th>Targeted brands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finer foods</td>
<td>Tesco Finest, Tesco Fair Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>Tesco Organic, Tesco Healthy Living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Tesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>Tesco Kids, Tesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price sensitive</td>
<td>Tesco Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Tesco’s segmentation of Clubcard holders

The principle of Fast-tracking is based on the assumption that people’s access to social programs should be as simple as possible until contradictory evidence demands a different approach.

A simple way to describe Fast-tracking is to think about what happens every day at a nation’s borders. Most countries have two high-order national outcomes that they want to achieve:

- Free movement of people, goods and services across the border to facilitate trade, commerce and tourism
- Protection of citizens and state assets from terroristic or criminal activity, illegal immigration and contraband

The second outcome would be easier to achieve by applying a draconian and resource-intensive approach to border control with all people and goods thoroughly screened, searched and validated before crossing the border. However, this approach would come at the expense of achieving the first outcome. Exporters/importers and tourists would simply take their business to another country. Border management authorities in most countries have adopted a fast-track mindset so that mainly people, goods and services move quickly across borders with a minimum of fuss. National economic priorities and protecting the population are finely balanced by facilitating border movements for the majority and by identifying where and when to intervene with more intensive checking and monitoring.
Fast-tracking as a RightServicing characteristic is key to addressing overservicing. For people who are known to do the right thing, why then do we ask them to provide information that another part of government might already have or that can be sourced from other institutions? For unemployed people, why do we make them come into an office twice weekly to tell us they are looking for a job when we know that is what they are doing? These people are in the overserviced category. Conversely, a person who is known for having a poor track record in looking for work, or who is at high risk of not declaring casual employment income, might need to visit an office every day because they are in the underserviced category.

The Segmenting and Risk Management characteristics should be used to identify people, where the Fast-tracking characteristic is appropriate with the Automating characteristic to enable eligibility and entitlement information to be accessed and validated at a source. Fast-tracking requires a consent model when it involves sharing and accessing information to provide a streamlined, low-touch service experience. Consent models can either be opt-in or opt-out and depend on prevailing laws and privacy guidelines.

The US Social Security Administration fast-tracks disability processes, providing 100,000 disabled applicants with quick decisions

In recent years, the US Social Security Agency (SSA) made several improvements to its computer modeling system to increase the number of claimants who receive expedited approvals for disability benefits. Its two-track system — the Quick Disability Determination (QDD) process and Compassionate Allowances — now fast-track around 4 percent of all disability cases. This result is an increase from the 2.7 percent of cases that fast-tracked the year before the reforms began.

“In practical terms, this means that this year 100,000 – 125,000 disabled Americans (people with the most severe disabilities) will be approved for benefits in about 10 days … [not] waiting the three to four months that it typically takes for an initial decision,” said Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of Social Security. “These initiatives are truly a lifeline for those who need it most.”

QDD uses a predictive computer model that analyzes specific data within the electronic file to find cases with a high potential that the claimant is disabled so that the SSA can quickly get evidence of the claimant’s allegations. By using Compassionate Allowances, the SSA can expedite the processing of disability claims for people with severe medical conditions that, by definition, meet the SSA’s standards. These fast-track systems increase the efficiency of disability processing. They help to free up resources so that the agency can cope better with the increase of 250,000 cases that have resulted from the current economic downturn.

“During these tough economic times, getting Social Security and Supplemental Security Income disability benefits quickly to Americans who are unable to work helps them and strengthens our economy. For SSI recipients, expedited approvals also ensure that they immediately get the vital medical coverage they need,” Commissioner Astrue said. “It is critical that we continue to embrace innovative technologies to improve the services we provide to the public.”

---
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The fast-track method is a key tool for insurance companies
Insurance companies have started to invest heavily in establishing fast-track units to separate out low-risk claims and handle them by using streamlined processing. If a claim becomes too complex for the fast-track method, it is then transferred to more specialized handling.16

Addressing Complexity
The need to recognize that some people have complex circumstances
Some people and families face multiple, long-term or both types of social risk factors that lead to significant social disadvantage and barriers to work. For these people, there are no quick fixes or simple solutions. The root cause of their social disadvantage might lie deep within their family history and background. People in these situations represent a unique segment in their own right and require special attention.17

These people represent a large part of the underserviced.18 Their complex needs and the root cause of their social disadvantage often go unnoticed or are someone else’s problem within the social program management system. Yet, left unaddressed, this disadvantage spreads among other family members and becomes intergenerational.19

Although each case needs to be addressed on its merits, the first step is acknowledging that complexity exists and will always be resource-intensive on the path to achieving a satisfactory social outcome. In most cases, the solution is not found within the confines of a single agency of the social program management system. Many actors across many parts of government and civil society need to be engaged.

People in this situation create challenges for the social program management system. Their number as a percentage of the population is dwarfed by most people whose needs are much easier to satisfy. For this group, welfare dependency has already taken hold or is well on the way, unless these paths are intercepted and diverted. For example, in New Zealand, the government has started to examine such complex cases as teenage pregnancies and youth unemployment. It reports the potential liability to the state as a way to provide incentive to invest more resources up front to address the root cause of the issues.20

People with complex issues pose a challenge to the traditional approaches and support mechanisms. To address their problems, agencies require more time and effort, which can come from diverting resources from people who are overserviced.
Our member organizations often deal with people [who are] suffering significant social barriers and disadvantage. The problems are complex and difficult to solve. Social policy and service delivery solutions must be targeted at the root causes of social exclusion. It should both respond to citizens’ individual needs and enable service planners and providers to deliver effective personal care and support.

- John Halloran, CEO of European Social Network

RightServicing workshops

“Is equality that everyone gets to the same place or is it that [everyone] gets the same thing? … If it’s that they get to the same place, some people need more help.”

– Ministry of Social Development, New Zealand

This quotation sums up the feedback in our RightServicing workshops, where social program management organizations made clear that they are acutely aware of the importance of Addressing Complexity. Participants agreed that more intensive support is needed for clients with complex needs. They also mentioned that the system needs increased flexibility to cater to more challenging cases.

Decentralization was suggested as a more effective means to focus on specific issues because the community knows what the needs are. In addition to taking this approach of circumventing the normal structure of government, the advantages of collaboration were brought into the discussion. Taking a more integrated approach to Addressing Complexity allows everyone involved to reap the benefits of consolidated and focused resources in achieving a specified outcome in a community.
Addressing the problems of 120,000 families in England that fall into the ‘complex needs’ category

Around 120,000 families in England fall into the ‘complex needs’ category. They suffer from multiple disadvantages, experience regular crises and are a huge drain on the state. In the UK, a new initiative was started to address this issue, focusing on providing assistance for complex families. Interventions were set up to work with some of the most troubled families to tackle antisocial behavior, youth crime, intergenerational disadvantage and worklessness.

A persistent multi-agency approach, coordinated by a single dedicated key worker, was taken to support families to overcome their problems.

The National Centre for Social Research produced a report about the results of monitoring families who worked with family intervention between February 2007 and 31 March 2011. This report shows that intensive intervention to support troubled families is effective in turning around their lives as demonstrated by the following examples:

- The percent of families who engaged in antisocial behavior at the start of the intervention fell from 81 percent to 34 percent after the intervention.
- The percent of families who were involved in crime fell from 35 percent to 20 percent after the intervention.
- The percent of families who had truant, excluded or badly behaved children at school fell from 58 percent to 28 percent after the intervention.

A family who receives intensive support is twice as likely to stop antisocial behavior versus a family who is not receiving the intervention.

Risk Management

Better service and compliance

In the field of social program management, Risk Management has two dimensions:

- **Social risk.** One or more factors that individuals might experience that affect their capacity to earn an income or participate in society. Such factors include losing a job, becoming disabled, getting older, having children, becoming ill, suffering abuse from an adult or caregiver, and separation or death of a partner. The fundamentals of the social system are to mitigate the impact of these risks on individuals, some of whom need more assistance than others. We cannot keep from aging, but we can prevent workplace injuries or the abuse of children.

- **Funding risk.** Exposure to a program funding source as a result of a behavior, which might be deliberate or through error or omission, but that can be mitigated. Leaking funds to people who deliberately defraud the system or who fail to comply with rules and regulations can significantly affect accounts that are funded on a national or social level.

Often Risk Management focus is concentrated on funding risk. Risk mitigation strategies based on the principles of prevention, detection and deterrence are evident in most social organizations. Governments commonly promote the success of such risk-based strategies. Highlighting the number of people caught cheating the system is an effective deterrent to others. Risk Management in this context is often used to justify excessive process steps, validation and checking, which can then be applied to all (at the expense of Fast-tracking and Automation).
Addressing social risk is often left to chance, and the social program management system plays a passive role in resolving the problem after the event rather than focusing on prevention and mitigation. The statutory work accident insurance system in Germany is an example where prevention has become a powerful component for managing this social risk.

Even in the case of aging, which is something that people cannot avoid, the social system helps people to prepare for the end of their working lives by providing compulsory savings plans and voluntary pension schemes.

The social accident insurance system is built upon a principle that prevention is better than a cure; so we help employers identify where their risks are and provide advice to prevent accidents from occurring. Our organizational structure guarantees that the stakeholders’ perspective is considered in our preventive strategies. This [approach] ensures that these strategies are both efficient and effective.

-Rita Marie Höf fer, Head of International Social Law/European Law Division German Social Accident Insurance (DGUV)

Risk Management in social program management needs to focus on both social risk and funding risk in parallel. The aim is to achieve a balanced approach to the application of business processes that mitigate social risk and funding risk. This balance is characterized by the organizational response, which is demonstrated through the business processes that it applies to an individual. This organizational response can vary, based on what is required for risk mitigation, rather than a one-size-fits-all response that is based on the policy and procedural guidelines. Another way to describe this characteristic is a differential service response. Risk Management is a key capability that is required to enable Fast-tracking and Addressing Complexity with the business processes applied and adjusted according to the risk profile.

Assessing risk is continuous, variable and situational. Risk from both a social and funding perspective is a function of several factors, all of which can change at any time. The assessment of risk must be dynamic and in real time to take into account these factors.

For example, someone might experience multiple areas of disadvantage and be assessed as a complex case that requires a significant investment in time and resources. This person might be at high risk of noncompliance in terms of efforts to find work and, therefore, might be required to visit a service center regularly and to substantiate all changes of circumstances.
These factors alone, however, should not exclude a person from Fast-tracking on some aspects of social program management. For example, a person should be able to claim a health insurance rebate, where details and proof of the service provided can be confirmed without involving the person. However, if a compliance breach is detected, the person can lose rights to the Fast-tracking service or have those rights suspended.

One size does not fit all: US airport security checks give favorable treatment to low-risk travelers

The US government plans to give favorable treatment to low-risk airline passengers by providing a shortcut for them through security checks. Passengers who agree to supply personal data to US officials receive a less stringent examination at airport departure lounges.

The “checkpoint of the future” funnels passengers into three security lanes:

- Enhanced Security
- Normal Security
- Known Traveler

Passengers are allocated into the appropriate lane by using an iris-recognition system that is linked to a government database.

John Pistole, head of the US Transportation Security Administration (TSA), said it was inefficient to treat every passenger with the same level of scrutiny. “We recognize that one size does not fit all.”

This example shows the benefits that can come from using a variable approach to Risk Management. By managing risk, Fast-tracking is enabled, which in turn leads to increased efficiency and improved service. A similar approach to Risk Management can be taken in the area of social program management, where a differential response can be used to manage social and funding risk.

Experiences with Risk Management in Pôle emploi

Pôle emploi, an agency of the French government, carries out a typical range of functions for a Public Employment Service from supporting job seeking and placement to payment of benefits. Pôle emploi has a unique, integrated Risk Management department (in social security), similar to a financial services institution. The Risk Management department includes six functional areas of risk to be managed:

- Service quality
- Quality management
- Sustainable development
- Customer satisfaction
- Fraud management
- Internal audit

Despite the diversity of these risk areas, a key feature of the department is an integrated system for Risk Management with a harmonized set of processes, activities and management, blending audit and risk management disciplines.

The Authentification des Données project was a key recent fraud management project that identifies cases of fraud by recognizing suspicious links between employers and employees.
Accessing
How people access and use the social system

Since the first social program management schemes were introduced in Germany in the late 19th century through most of the 20th century, people accessed the social program management system face-to-face through a physical office of a social program organization. In the 21st century, the physical office location is complemented and, in some situations, replaced by the Internet and telephony-based channels. A significant feature of these new channels is the capability for people to self-manage and use services anywhere, anytime.

An ongoing commitment to service quality by social security organizations is essential in the delivery of dynamic social security.

- Hans-Horst Konkolewsky, Secretary General, International Social Security Association (ISSA)

Social program management organizations have discovered that significant productivity improvements can be made by enabling people to self-manage their affairs. At the same time, people have realized the benefits of being able to access services when and where it is convenient for them, without the inconvenience or dependence on other people.

Although the social system is often thought of in terms of people who face a social disadvantage and barriers, for many people, it is a right or entitlement to address social risks that they experience. In many countries, the taxation and welfare systems, which are used interchangeably by governments to execute social transfers and wealth redistribution, have a close relationship with each other. People who need these services do not consider themselves as facing a significant disadvantage, but feel that they can manage their affairs by themselves.

For example, a young professional loses his job as a result of a failed business. He has a temporary need for unemployment assistance or insurance while he finds another job, which often happens sooner than expected, even in depressed labor markets. A working age family with young children might use child allowances, health insurance rebates and child care assistance that are available through the social program management system. For many people, accessing their statutory entitlements should be hassle free and does not require the personalized attention of a social program management organization or employer.

At the other end of the spectrum are people who face social disadvantage and barriers and who need assistance that ranges from intensive to a light-touch or a facilitative approach. How a person accesses the social program management system changes, depending on their circumstances. In some cases, people might be able to self-manage (for example, claim a health insurance rebate), but in other cases, people might need intensive case management (for example, return to work).

People can move between three distinct Access models—self-managed, facilitated and managed—or use them for different situations.
Self-managed
Self-managed people are in control of their own circumstances. They can access and use programs and services in their own time and with their own means. The desired social outcome is implicit within the service that is consumed. For example, a child care rebate program has a desired outcome of a flexible labor market with more women remaining in the workforce. If a person accesses the rebate, the program can imply that the outcome is achieved.

People mainly self-manage by using the Internet, telephone-based technologies, or third parties, such as financial institutions and service providers.

Facilitated
Facilitated people want to or can self-manage. They require some or minimal assistance to guide, coach or direct them through the social program system with the aim of eventually becoming self-managed.

Assistance might occur by using a face-to-face channel, call center, third-party agent or Internet-based environment.

Customer service is all about meeting customers’ needs, to the point and cost effectively. At ATP, our channel strategy defines our customer services. We are constantly trying to move traffic toward the cheapest and most effective channels, depending on the nature of the inquiry. We aim to use the right channel at the right time.

More than 90 percent of all approaches are about relatively simple questions and have equally simple answers. Such needs are best served through an efficient and easy-to-understand, web-based FAQ service that is available [24 hours a day, every day of the week]. When it comes to the remaining inquiries, the cheapest and most effective channel is typically the phone. Our call center setup is designed to ensure immediate clarification and to avoid emails. Emails, of course, are important when it comes to complex questions, but they are expensive, and channel strategy is not always about moving all customer services online. It depends on the nature of the inquiry.

- Anders Schmidt Hansen, Deputy Director, ATP, Denmark
**Managed**
Managed people require assistance, often intensive, to achieve the desired outcomes that need to be explicitly set and managed. For example, the desired outcome might be to establish a safe environment for neglected children. To achieve this outcome, several milestones, such as appropriate foster care arrangements, must be met along the way. Several suboutcomes along the way can collectively contribute to the attainment of the desired outcome. The need for a case-managed approach can be episodic (such as a life event) or over an extended period.

The face-to-face channel is used mainly for case management, either directly or through third parties and agents, and is supplemented with other electronic-based channels.

**Relationship of the three approaches**
Figure 4 demonstrates the relationship between the three approaches: self-managed, facilitated and managed. It illustrates that, for many program areas, the desirable state is for most people to self-manage, with a smaller group facilitated and an even smaller group managed. The proportions in each category vary from program to program. Organizations need to develop individual strategies and provide guidance on deciding the relevant Access model, given the social context of the person.

![Access models](image-url)
In New York City, an estimated 19.1 percent of residents lives below the poverty line. Another 19 percent of the population has earnings in the range of 100–199 percent of the poverty line.

Many of those residents are eligible for a range of city, state and federal human services programs, but are not enrolled for the following reasons:

• They do not know about the programs.
• They do not understand the application process.
• They are reluctant to visit program offices.

An estimated only 72 percent of people who are eligible for food stamps, 89 percent of people who are eligible for public health insurance, and 80 percent of people who are eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) are enrolled in benefits programs.

New York City wanted to offer an online resource for those residents. The city wanted a single point of entry that would provide access to information about human services programs and a convenient process for assessing eligibility and applying. As a result, the public-facing online screening tool, ACCESS NYC, was created. It is available in seven different languages, including Arabic, Chinese, English, Haitian-Creole, Korean, Russian and Spanish. By using this tool, now New York City residents can quickly and easily determine their potential eligibility for 35 city, state and federal benefit programs across 15 different agencies.

The single point of entry was designed to allow residents to conveniently prescreen for programs anywhere, anytime. The user interface of the ACCESS NYC tool meets the accessibility standards set by section 508 of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

The new tool, which is also available after hours on the web, streamlines the application process, eliminating the need for residents to take time off from work or to arrange for child care to apply in person. It allows residents to save time, by preventing them from answering the same questions on multiple application forms or applying for benefits that they are likely not eligible to receive.

Between September 2006 and November 2007, ACCESS NYC reported the following metrics:

• 144,326 visits to ACCESS NYC’s home page
• 7,112 prepopulated applications created
• 19,141 blank applications downloaded
• 2,238 accounts created

Former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg said, “ACCESS NYC has a very easy-to-use interface, even for those with only the most basic computer knowledge. In a simple three-step process, a life can be made a little more manageable.”
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Automation and self-service reduce wait times when disaster strikes: Louisiana Department of Social Services

In September 2008, Hurricane Gustav tore through Louisiana, wreaking havoc. The storm forced the state’s Department of Social Services (DSS) to take a hard look at the way it distributed benefits through its federally funded Disaster Food Stamps program. This program provides money for groceries to eligible households that have lost income or suffered damage in a disaster.

After Gustav, more than 2 million people applied for Disaster Food Stamps, converging at the 60 locations that the state set up to take their applications. Customers had to line up and wait for hours to make claims. Then, they had to wait 3–4 days for their claim to be processed. DSS wrestled with technology challenges because of the large number of applications that it needed to process. The computer system crashed several times, further slowing the benefits process. The overwhelming volume also caused the system to commit occasional errors, such as issuing too much money to some electronic benefit transfer (EBT) cards or issuing duplicate benefits to about 22,000 people.

With a strong desire to better serve the citizens of Louisiana, the DSS set about finding a solution. Kristy Nichols, Secretary of DSS, said, “We wanted a clean, automated system that was user-friendly and that people could easily manage.”

The DSS decided to develop an automated, customer-centric Disaster Food Stamps system that included a preregistration process. Even before a hurricane or other disaster affects Louisiana, residents can go online or use a call center to submit information that the state needs to process their applications.

The new system resulted in reduced long lines and wait times, improved data accuracy and the implementation of new safeguards against fraud.25

Automating
Technology to eliminate manual processing, reduce process cycle times and reduce costs

Social program management organizations have been at the forefront of automation since the early days of the computing industry. The need to process large amounts of information and distribute pensions and benefits across large and growing populations drove early automation initiatives. The investment in information technology (IT) is driven by the desire to expand the coverage of more social risks and to achieve better social outcomes through more targeted social policy. It is also driven by the need to lift productivity across the expanding workforce that is needed to manage this broadening scope and added complexity. However, what stands out in contrast is that, despite the massive investment in automation by many organizations, they remain bound by paper and process. What has gone wrong?

The flip side to the increased capability for automation is that outdated or ineffective business processes are not necessarily eliminated or reformed. Automation is sometimes used to make the same (bad) process faster. A principle of automation should be to add value to a process, not to automate just because you can. For example, automation has enabled organizations to dispatch computer-generated letters to all their customers for every reason imaginable such as a change in circumstance, a statutory rate change and announcements of new policy and procedures. Each new letter generates more work as customers contact the agency to inquire about the content or purpose of the letter. These inquiries can stimulate another update, generating another letter, and then, the cycle starts again.
Automation should be focused on eliminating manual processes and transforming business processes in a way that adds value for the customer, the agency or preferably both. Agency staff time is better directed at those customer segments that are underserved such as segments with complex needs.

Adding value can come often by reducing the cycle time for a business process to complete. For example, consider a claim for a benefit or service that can be settled within one day, rather than in one week or one month. As a result of fewer inquiries to the agency about the status of the claim, the cost is taken out of the system. Reducing the cycle time from a week or month to a day is usually a function of a business transformation exercise and automation.

We have met our eligibility automation targets for both healthcare-only and time-loss claims, as well as processing over 80 percent of our healthcare invoices through payment without intervention. Through learning [gained] from better data and analysis, we plan to continuously improve our service and timeliness of payments to our stakeholders.

- Steve Barnett, Worksafe BC, Canada

Automation does not remove the human interactive element in the delivery of social program management. It ensures that the human element is inserted where and when it will deliver the most effective value and is not wasted on mundane, unnecessary and low-value tasks.

Most organizations have a significant scope to lift the rate of automation to address areas such as the following examples:

- Decision making for low-risk claims for benefits and services
- Elimination of paper-based forms
- Data access and validation at the source, such as banks; registrars of births, death and marriages; immigration records and employee records
- Risk assessments, such as social and funding, dynamic and real time, to help drive workflows across access channels

All RightServicing characteristics rely on an effective level of Automation within the system.

Insurance industry: Straight through processing

Straight through processing (STP) is a means where the end-to-end processing of financial transactions is fully automated and integrated, with no manual intervention across diverse applications, diverse systems or diverse organizations that participate in a trade.26

Automated segmentation and filtering are used to perform an initial analysis on each claim. This way, the more simple or basic claims can be fast-tracked for fully automated processing, where more complex claims are filtered off for manual assessment and review.

Because most claims can follow the basic, automated process, these systems can greatly reduce the manual work that is involved in assessing claims and save substantial sums of money.
Automation speeds up service delivery at WorksafeBC

WorkSafeBC, the independent workers’ compensation board in British Columbia, Canada, was created to promote workplace health and safety for British Columbia’s workers and 190,000 employers. This agency is also the sole provider of workers’ healthcare benefits, return-to-work rehabilitation programs and compensation to injured workers for the province. It handles approximately 170,000 claims filed per year by workers.

Caseworkers were bogged down because the agency was responding to a growing number of appeals and dealing with too many reversals of claim decisions. To address this issue, a new comprehensive workers’ compensation solution was developed. This solution provides a core set of extendible claims lifecycle management capabilities to manage claimants from injury to outcome.

The solution automates information that was historically stored in policy books and uses that information to drive the rules. The solution also generates expected transactions, so that, when WorkSafeBC receives bills, it can pay them faster because it can determine immediately whether costs are approved. The new system resulted in a major productivity boost, where services are now provided more efficiently and effectively.

Belgium’s Crossroads Bank uses automation to become more efficient and effective

In the 1980s, the Belgian social security administration created Crossroads Bank for Social Security — an internationally renowned best practice — to address many problems. Creation of the bank involved redesigning the administrative processes of 2,000 social program organizations. A new law introduced Crossroads Bank, giving it a budget and the legal authority to develop an information network, to redesign the information usage of all organizations concerned, to reduce administrative burden and to enhance privacy and ICT security.

All 2,000 organizations were not allowed to build their own information networks. Instead, every connection to any other organization had to go through Crossroads Bank. Crossroads Bank did not store the information in its own databases, but only connected the receiver of the requested information to the original owner of the information. This practice enhanced the efficiency and effectiveness of the system. It also enhanced the quality of service delivery, the level of enforcement and the legitimacy of the social security system.

Introduction of the Crossroads Bank for Social Security had the following results:

• For employers, 42 services were automated, eliminating 50 social security declaration forms. As a result, 23 million declarations were made electronically in 2008, which was a major productivity benefit for Belgian businesses, saving them an estimated EUR1.7 billion per year.27
• About 185 paper certificates that clients or employers needed from one social security institution, only to be given to another social security institution, were eliminated and replaced by direct electronic data exchanges between the social security institutions. In 2005, 500 million concrete electronic data exchanges took place with a response time of lower than 4 seconds in 98.5 percent of the cases for the online messages.
• Clients and their employers now have to provide information only once. The information can be used for all social program management that is provided by various organizations.
• The number of contacts between employees or employers and agencies has been drastically reduced.

Many subsidiary rights are automatically granted.
Predicting

Early intervention to stop social disadvantage; prevention is better than finding a cure

Administration of social program management is often conducted in a passive manner. When individuals are confronted with a social risk, they approach a social program management agency and seek assistance. However, many risks are predictable based on past experiences and observable patterns of behavior. The old adage of “prevention is better than a cure” rings true in social program management, with the costs to society by allowing social disadvantage to become entrenched.

Consider a family with young children, where the parents have a history of substance abuse. As a result, the children have an increased risk of experiencing some form of abuse. Parental substance abuse is reported to be a contributing factor for between one-third and two-thirds of maltreated children in the child welfare system in the United States.

Research supports the association between substance abuse and child maltreatment as in the following examples:

- A retrospective study of maltreatment experience in Chicago looked at children whose parents abused alcohol and other drugs. These children were almost three times more likely to be abused and more than four times more likely to be neglected than children of parents who were not substance abusers.
- A Department of Health and Human Services study found all types of maltreatment, and particularly neglect, to be more likely in alcohol-abusing families than in nonalcoholic-abusing families.28

If these factors are known or available through data analysis and, therefore, the likelihood of child abuse can be predicted, can something be done about it? Or, does the social program management system wait until reports of abuse are received? And, by then, what long-term damage has occurred to the children and the family as a whole? In this case, taking preventive action is better for all concerned than the cure.

Social security organizations are realizing that monitoring and evaluation of their systems are most valuable when they are citizen-centered. The ability to predict benefits that are paid by a national pension system and the way its tiers combine are key to gain the confidence of citizens and policy makers and to provide national systems with valuable evolutionary capabilities.

- Gabriel Martinez, Secretary General, Inter-American Conference on Social Security

A major issue for organizations that administer age pension programs is helping people to appreciate that contributing and making provisions for their retirement income is important from the beginning of their working lives. By using data analysis and predicative modeling techniques, it is possible to forecast a likely retirement outcome for workers from any stage of their working lives, based on their current life circumstances. This forecast, which is regularly updated as circumstances change, can become an incentive to encourage people to save and make contributions to social funds. When faced with the reality of a predicted adverse retirement outcome, people might change their saving behavior, especially as they enter into the later years of their working lives.
Predicting is a RightServicing characteristic that is based around the social context of individuals, families and communities. By predicting the likelihood of an event or path that leads to an adverse outcome, interventions can be initiated to prevent this expected outcome. Predicting in the RightServicing context is a more personalized extension to the general principle of prevention behind industry-based programs to mitigate social risks such as labor accidents.

For example, families with young children and who have a history of substance abuse require immediate intervention because it is predictable that a child abuse situation will develop (usually neglect). It is predictable for mature-aged factory workers to develop mental health problems if they are not offered immediate retraining assistance. It is also predictable that a community will slowly die if a major employer leaves town and no incentives exist to bring in new industries. A passive social program management system treats the child abuse victim, passes the mature worker onto the disability program, and deals with the multiple issues that arise from the social breakdown, as community social capital slowly ebbs away.

By predicting the likelihood of adverse outcomes for individuals, families and communities, appropriate interventions can be initiated to address social barriers before they lead to other forms of social disadvantage. To be proactive is to be predictive. This approach requires the ability to analyze and process information and data about people and communities. It then entails comparing them with known populations to detect patterns of behavior that indicate paths to adverse outcomes.

Predictive modeling has been used by insurance carriers on the underwriting side for years to determine whom to insure and at what rate. It has allowed carriers to segregate customers very precisely into risk groups and accurately apply a rate [that is] appropriate to the risk.\(^{29}\)

- Ernest Feiher, Vice President and General Manager for LexisNexis Claims Solutions

An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure: The high cost of neglecting Predicting

New figures show that troubled families cost the tax payer an estimated GBP9 billion per year. This money is spent on protecting the children in these families and on responding to the crime and antisocial behavior that they perpetrate. The costs are exemplified by the fact that children who live in troubled families are 36 times more likely to be excluded from school and six times more likely to be in the care of or contact with the police.

The GBP9 billion estimate comes from government figures and is the cost to both central and local government of the most troubled 120,000 families. GBP8 billion of the GBP9 billion is spent on reacting to the trouble that is caused and experienced by these families. Currently, only GBP1 billion of the GBP9 billion is spent on targeted interventions that could be taken to help turn around the lives of the troubled families.\(^{30}\)

By applying Predicting, early intervention and assistance can be provided to prevent the problems of needy families from spiraling and causing greater cost to society.
Alameda County Social Services Agency uses business intelligence to improve service delivery

The Alameda County Social Services Agency implemented a new solution called Social Services Integrated Reporting System (SSIRS). It extracts client information from a series of department-specific systems, enabling agency staff and management to view case performance from the global agency level to the worker level and all levels in between. Business intelligence and automated alerts empower caseworkers to proactively manage their client base and enable the agency as a whole to coordinate the delivery of social services.

Don Edwards, assistant director of administration and information services, Alameda County, explains the benefits: “It gives our caseworkers the tools they need to actually bring their expertise to bear in a timely manner, rather than having to rely on outdated information that no longer reflects the real situation. They know the assistance programs, and they know their clients. Now, they can see how everything fits together and understand all the relationships clearly. For the first time, they can run ‘what-if’ scenarios on the spot and see if there’s a better way to handle that case.”

Micro Programs
Designing social solutions to achieve desired outcomes and to address complex problems

The Micro Programs characteristic is based on the economic concepts of macroeconomics and microeconomics. Microeconomics is the study of individuals and business decisions, where macroeconomics looks at higher order national and government decisions. Traditional social programs, such as retirement pensions, health insurance, disability and long-term care, can be considered macro programs because they are managed and funded at the higher-order level of national or provincial level governments. A micro program is a social program that is focused at individuals, communities or both, with complex social problems such as a region of higher than average long-term unemployment or higher than average juvenile recidivism.

The challenge for social policy makers is developing solutions to address the needs and wants of an entire target population that is made up of people from all walks of life. The origins of social programs are based around people in the workforce and programs that were developed to mitigate the social risks of not being able to work such as labor accident, aging and disability. Traditional social programs were designed and developed on a macro scale and implemented on a large or national scale.

Over time social programs expanded to cover a broader range of social risks and conditions. Each new program can still be classified as a macro program because it focused on the needs of broad population segments.
Despite the myriad of macro programs, for some people and communities, the number of programs is not enough. In some cases, it might be a function of service delivery or a lack of awareness of what programs are available. However, in many cases, standard macro programs cannot reach down far enough to address the needs of people who are facing multiple disadvantages and barriers.

Is it reasonable to expect policy makers who work at the national, state or provincial level to develop macro programs that reach every pocket of disadvantage in the community? What is reasonable is when pockets of disadvantage are detected and macro programs alone are not enough. Then, other competent actors in the social program management community, such as different levels of government or other agencies, service providers or community organizations, are empowered to develop micro programs. These targeted programs might be place (community)-based or involve individualized budgeting and care planning.

Micro Programs are not a collective term for an integrated approach to delivering a range of macro programs to address the needs of an individual or community. The concept of Micro Programs is the development of a specific outcome-based plan for an individual or community, with specific interventions and obligations that are mutually agreed between the responsible agency and the individual or community. This plan can include elements of macro programs but might include variations to eligibility and entitlement rules to suit the local or personal situation.

Higher-order agencies might set the parameters within which a micro program can be developed, or they might develop the criteria for a micro program. Either way, the micro program designer must be directly engaged with the individual or community it serves.

The following three approaches are emerging that classify as examples of Micro Programs:

• **Personalized budgets** (PBs) are emerging in the area of disability services and long-term care. People with a disability or who need long-term care are allocated a budget by a funding agency from which they can choose the services that they want to consume from providers. The Productivity Commission of Australia recently made recommendations to the government in support of personalized budgets for people with disabilities or who need long-term care.

• **Conditional cash transfer** (CCT) programs aim to reduce poverty by making welfare programs conditional upon the receivers’ actions. The government transfers money only to persons who meet certain criteria. The criteria might include enrolling children into public schools, vaccinating children or participating in a nutrition program.

The CCT concept has spread to more than 20 countries. Although CCT began in the developing world to address poverty, it is now being adopted in the developed world, in such places as New York City and the Northern Territory in Australia, to address communities that experience severe disadvantage. One of the highest profile CCT successes is the Bolsa Familia program in Brazil.
• **Social Impact Bonds** (SIBs) are a form of outcomes-based contract. With SIBs, public sector agencies commit to paying for significant improvement in social outcomes, such as a reduction in offending rates or the number of people being admitted to hospital, for a defined population. Through a SIB, private investment is used to pay for interventions and is delivered by service providers that have a proven track record. The service provider is given much control over the design of the program. Financial returns to investors are made by the government based on improved social outcomes. If outcomes do not improve, investors do not recover their investment.36

The Centre for Social Impact at the University of New South Wales in Australia conducted a pilot and evaluation of SIBs from 2010–2011 for the state of New South Wales. The findings showed that, although the state offers considerable potential for tackling deep rooted social disadvantage SIBs, it is not a panacea. Their use should complement existing modes that are used to fund community benefit goals.37

**Social Impact Bonds offer a new and innovative way to fund targeted programs that are delivered by experts in the not-for-profit sector who understand the root causes of complex social problems.**

- Les Hems, Director of Research, Centre for Social Impact, University of New South Wales

The Micro Program trends have an element of significant scale. But, the principles of Micro Programs can be brought down further to an individual or small community level. In doing so, objectives must be set, a plan must be made for delivery, and an evaluation method must be agreed upon. Frontline workers in social program management should be encouraged to be innovative and to design Micro Programs that are highly targeted to the needs of an individual or small community. Micro Programs have the potential to significantly impact the lives of some of the most disadvantaged in society and to make significant savings in program spending in the longer term through improved outcomes.

**Reaching outcomes by using conditional cash transfers**

CCTs have been used to facilitate much of the outcome-focused work that has been undertaken in the developing world. They are believed to spread into the developed world over the next decade. This growth allows income-related programming to target long-term health, education and inequality issues.

CCTs have the following reach:

- 11 million households in Brazil
- 5 million households in Mexico
- 20 percent of households in Colombia
- 12 percent of the population in Jamaica38

Where CCTs have been used, the results are often startling:

- When CCTs were introduced, per capita consumption increased by 30 percent in Honduras and 7 – 10 percent in Colombia, Mexico and Brazil.
- In Nicaragua, Red de Protección Social (RPS) reduced poverty by 5 – 7 percent.39
- In Chile, Solidario caused a 35 percent drop in extreme poverty.

These incentives are used in more than just the developing world. New York City has been conducting trials with similar programs, and the early results look favorable.40
**Focusing on the most needy: UK initiative to tackle troubled families**

In 2011, Prime Minister David Cameron and Communities Secretary Eric Pickles announced plans to radically transform the lives of the country’s most troubled families. Almost GBP450 million was made available in a new, determined, cross-government drive to turn around the lives of 120,000 of some of the country’s most troubled families.

A new Troubled Families program, which was based in the Department for Communities and Local Government, was established to join efforts across Whitehall (center of the UK government). The program helped to provide expert help to local areas and to drive the strategy forward.

The GBP450 million allows the government to offer up to 40 percent of the cost of dealing with these families to local authorities. However, payment is on a by-results basis when the families achieve success.

The government outlined the goals and how success will be measured with the following criteria:

- Return children to school.
- Reduce the parent’s criminal and antisocial behavior.
- Put parents on the road to going back to work.
- Reduce the costs to the taxpayer and local authorities.

This program also funds a national network of Troubled Family “troubleshooters” who are appointed by local councils. The troubleshooters oversee the program of action in their area. Their responsibilities include making sure that the right families are getting the right type of help, that sanctions are in place when needed, and that positive results are being achieved with the troubled families in their area.41

---

**Leveraging the Ecosystem**

*Collaboration and sharing with other organizations and stakeholders*

Aristotle’s phrase “the whole is greater than the sum of its parts” succinctly describes the Leveraging-the-Ecosystem characteristic of RightServicing. The term leverage represents the value that is derived from a whole solution that targets a problem rather than a collection of component pieces that address parts of the problem.

The people and organizations that make up the social system can be considered an ecosystem. An ecosystem can be defined as a community of living and nonliving things that work together.42 If you consider the various needs and wants of people, no single agency or arm of government can address them all. Leaving people to fend for themselves, to work their way around the social ecosystem, and to find services that are appropriate to their needs is inefficient and leads to suboptimal social outcomes. This expectation is especially difficult for people who are in vulnerable situations.

The traditional social program management organization is often thought of as being at the center (or apex) of the system for the social risk concerned, with people drawn (or forced) to the center (or apex) when they need assistance. With the focus in recent years on citizen-centric program design and service delivery, this model is gradually changing. In the new model, the individual or a community (a segment) is at the center, and the various social program management organizations, service providers and other relevant actors are as satellites that revolve around the center. The satellites collaborate to develop solutions to meet the needs at the center. The needs at the center provide the binding, gravitational pull on the satellite organizations, forcing them to put aside organizational demarcations and instead focus on what they can contribute to address the needs.
The social program management ecosystem covers various stakeholders:

- People with needs and wants
- Government organizations, particularly those organizations that deal with social policy, service delivery and funding from across all levels of national, state and local government
- For-profit and not-for-profit service providers
- Community-based organizations
- Employers
- Social partners, such as trade unions, industry associations and professional bodies

The actors within the system bring a range of skills, knowledge and capability that are ready to address the needs and wants of the people at the center of the system. When these skills, knowledge and capability are brought together through a collaborative effort to develop a whole solution, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

If outcomes are defined and shared across the actors, and services are delivered in an integrated manner by a single lead organization or a coalition of collaborating actors, people experience a more powerful and meaningful response to their needs. People are enabled to provide information once and then have it shared among other actors in the system, eliminating the need for them to tell their story, over and over.

To make Leveraging the Ecosystem an effective characteristic, organizations must address the issues of privacy and sharing information. Too often privacy issues are put forward as a primary reason why organizations in the social ecosystem cannot share information about the people they serve. However, this matter needs to be closely examined within each jurisdiction because the intent of any privacy legislation is not to prevent addressing social issues and finding solutions to complex social problems. The principle of informed consent is an approach that some agencies are adopting as a way to enable the ecosystem to share information, while respecting privacy concerns.

Effective collaboration also requires organizations to consider governance arrangements to manage issues such as accountability, responsibility, funding and data ownership. A recent examination of the Integrated Service Response Model in New Zealand identified the need for flexibility in terms of organizational collaboration to achieve effective outcomes. It was suggested that public service governance arrangements needed to cater for a range of options between the following extremes:

- Loose collaboration
- Mandated sectoral grouping
- Joint venture
- Semistructural integration
- Full structural integration

One of the most high profile and successful examples of Leveraging the Ecosystem is in the Crossroads Bank for Social Security in Belgium that was referenced earlier.

*By aligning and integrating the human services system, we can reduce duplication and focus on shared outcomes for our clients.*

- Gill Callister, Secretary of Human Services, Victoria, Australia
This bank securely manages the exchange of over 650,000,000 electronic messages between over 3,000 actors in the social program management system. This example demonstrates a loose collaboration model, where the actors in the system retain their full autonomy. They are provided by the Crossroads Bank with a business and IT infrastructure that is governed by a legislative framework, enabling data and information to be exchanged for delivering efficient and effective social outcomes.

**Harlem Children’s Zone: A safety net woven so tightly that children cannot slip through**

The Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) is a nonprofit organization for poverty-stricken children and families who live in Harlem in New York City. It provides free support for children and families, with the aim of breaking the cycle of generational poverty by wrapping children in a pipeline of health, social, and educational support from birth through to college, a “cradle-to-career” approach.

The HCZ project is a unique, holistic approach to rebuilding a community so that its children can stay on track through college and go on to the job market. It has been called “one of the most ambitious social-service experiments of our time,” by The New York Times.

The HCZ project has two fundamental principles:

- Help children in a sustained way, starting as early in their lives as possible.
- Create a critical mass of adults around them who understand what it takes to help children succeed.

The organization recognizes that the issues are interconnected and that, therefore, interconnected solutions are needed. These solutions include a series of intense programs that follow children from birth through high school and beyond. They coordinate federal initiatives across multiple agencies to work jointly in communities of need, building a network of in-school, after-school, social-service, health and community-building programs.

In 2009, the HCZ project served 21,279 individuals (10,462 youth and 10,817 adults). The initiative has had a huge impact on the community to date.45

---

**Interconnected solutions provided by the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative**

“If poverty is a disease that infects an entire community in the form of unemployment and violence, failing schools and broken homes, then we can’t just treat those symptoms in isolation. We have to heal that entire community. And, we have to focus on what actually works.”

- Barack Obama, President of the United States, 18 July 2007

The Obama Administration recognizes that the interconnected challenges in high-poverty neighborhoods require interconnected solutions. Struggling schools, little access to capital, high unemployment, poor housing, persistent crime and other challenges feed into and perpetuate each other to call for an integrated approach so that residents can reach their full potential.

The Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (NRI) is an interagency collaborative that supports the Obama Administration’s new approach to federal engagement in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty. By aligning federal resources that are focused on distressed communities, the NRI can more effectively support local community, government, business, and institutional leaders in creating successful neighborhoods of opportunity.

The public rollout of the NRI took place on 21 September 2010, with the Department of Education’s announcement of the 2010 Promise Neighborhoods planning grant awards.47
Community Link from the Ministry of Social Development in New Zealand

“Social services in New Zealand are moving toward a new way of working with [the community] and in the community that takes a wider view of people and families in need. Community Link is part of this new approach and is a model for the future.”

- New Zealand Ministry of Social Development

Community Link applies a new approach to service delivery. The model aims to achieve sustainable outcomes for people through collaborating with the community to provide a more holistic and people-centered service.

Collaboration is achieved through co-locating a broad range of social services so that people can get help for a range of needs from many agencies. These services can range from simple financial assistance to advocacy, support, education and counseling services. Community Link brings the one-stop-shop approach to the next level by applying shared case management to fully integrate services.

“Community Link is a place where you should only tell your story once because services will work together, and with you, to help you reach your goals.”

- New Zealand Ministry of Social Development

The Community Link model is based on the belief that joining services to provide assistance based on a person’s whole-of-life needs is more efficient and effective for all people who are involved. It can also lead to longer lasting solutions for the client. This approach allows partnering agencies to work together to address agreed goals with clients within a cooperative relationship.

The flexible model design allows Community Link to support varying levels of need. All clients are catered to, from straightforward cases to more complex ones. The Ministry understands that complex cases require more comprehensive solutions: “Many people we serve have a wider range of needs than just the support they get from work and income.”

To cater to these cases, case workers are given more time to work on complex cases. Also, an interagency facilitator is put in place to enable the development of a collaborative shared-case-management approach to service delivery.

Client entry, assessment and case management processes have been revised over time to be more responsive and simpler for clients and workers. They include a single reception area, open-ended appointment times, adoption of a simple whole-of-life screening tool and rapid referral to partnering providers for specific needs through an online appointment calendar.

Ministry of Social Development: “He aha te mea nui o te ao? He tangata! He tangata! He tangata! What is the most important thing in this world? It is people, it is people, it is people.”

- Steve Maharey, New Zealand Minister of Social Services and Employment
The RightServicing organization
Social program management organizations come in many shapes and sizes. Some are policy only agencies, others do service delivery only, and some are a combination of both. Some are budget funded, others are statutory agencies, and others are private, semiprivate, cooperative or incorporated bodies. Yet, they share common attributes and aspirations in terms of their commitment to achieving sustainable and effective social outcomes and to achieving a citizen-centric approach to addressing need and delivering solutions.

An organization committed to RightServicing principles is likely to require change as it seeks to keep abreast of the rapid social and economic changes in society.

This simple model, shown in Figure 5, reflects four organizational types that represent the path from citizen-centric and outcome-focused to a RightServicing organization. They include traditionalists, producers, progressives and transformers.

*Figure 5: Path from a citizen-centric and outcome-focused organization to a RightServicing organization*
Traditionalists
Traditional social program management organizations are charged with developing and delivering a single or limited set of social programs. The desired outcomes are related directly to the social programs under administration.

Traditionalists dominate organizational quality by maintaining the traditional social model.

Producers
Organizations in the Producers quadrant are focused on lifting productivity and efficiency through automation, streamlining business processes and collaborating with other social organizations to provide integrated services across multiple social programs. Organizations in this quadrant have become focused on citizen centricity through service delivery reforms.

Producers dominate organizational quality by delivering efficiency and productivity.

Progressives
Organizations in the Progressives quadrant take a broader view of outcomes and are focused on being accountable for delivering societal benefits that more than likely extend beyond their own organizational responsibilities. Organizations in this quadrant have become focused on citizen centricity through social policy reforms.

Progressives dominate organizational quality through policy renewal.

Transformers
Organizations in the Transformers quadrant are advancing in parallel in terms of outcomes and efficiency. They advance into this quadrant through a set of initiatives that are aimed at reforming social policy settings and service delivery. In this quadrant, organizations are transforming themselves into a RightServicing organization.

Transformers dominate organizational quality by moving toward a new social model.

A trend toward transformation
The model shown in Figure 6 was presented to a workshop at the European Social Network's Annual European Social Services Conference held in Warsaw, Poland, in 2011. Attendees were asked to plot where they thought their organization currently stood and where they aspired to be in three years. A clear trend was to take their organizations toward the Transformers quadrant, although the extent of desired transformation had considerable variation in the three-year period.
Figure 6 plots the responses from participants at the conference and shows where their organization stood at the time and where they were aiming to be in three years. The workshop validated the research hypothesis that RightServicing is a potential dominant business model to guide the next wave of social program transformation.
For organizations, the path to RightServicing is a balanced program of initiatives based around the RightServicing characteristics as shown in Figure 7. From an individual perspective, each characteristic has a different influence on the degree of outcome-management focus and citizen-centric focus:

- **Becoming a progressive organization** has the following requirements:
  - A focus on addressing complexity within families and communities (Manage Complexity)
  - The flexibility to develop new types of social programs (Micro Programs)
  - The ability to predict and respond to people who are most likely to be impacted by progressive social programming (Prediction)

- **Becoming a producer organization** has the following requirements:
  - A commitment to risk-based analysis (Risk Management)
  - Investment in IT to eliminate and streamline business processes (Automation) for the following reasons:
    - Focus resources on where they will have the most effective impact
    - Avoid wasting resources on people that prefer to self-manage or need little interaction with the social program management organization (Fast-tracking)

- **Becoming a transformer organization** requires:
  - Tailoring the progressive and producer characteristics, plus the multichannel strategies (Accessing) to customer segments (Segmentation)
  - Having a collaborative-oriented partnering model with stakeholders (Leveraging the Ecosystem)

Transformer organizations are best positioned to differentiate their response to the social context of people and their families.
Each social program management organization has its own change drivers and socioeconomic environmental factors that dictate or influence the pace and direction of change. The following sections provide guidance for policy makers and service delivery administrators in deciding the nature of the change program that they can embark on and the RightServicing characteristics that they should invest in to support the chosen path.
The RightServicing Zone: Rebalancing overservicing and underservicing

The core of the RightServicing concept is to rebalance the effort that was expended on overservicing to focus more on underserviced areas. This principle applies across the broad spectrum of social risk, from working age and labor accident to retirement, from disability to long-term care and from family benefits to child protection. Achieving this rebalance requires a systemic and rigorous approach to automation to make it simple for the large numbers of people who have an entitlement to social benefits, but whose circumstances are low risk to the integrity of the system. This approach frees up resources that are needed to address underservicing.

At the other end of the scale are the people who need more assistance. Some people and communities need significant levels of help. This group is often underserviced by current business models. For this group, significant individual gains can be made through better outcomes that lead to overall social and economic gains for society.

Many people receive the right levels of assistance. Years of successful social program delivery around the world are evidence of this assistance. The optimal level of service that delivers good social outcomes is RightServicing. If someone expresses underservicing and overservicing as two ends of a service to an outcome experiences continuum, the people in the middle are in the RightServicing Zone, meaning that they are experiencing RightServicing.

The RightServicing Zone is shown conceptually in Figure 8. For a customer segment, such as people with children and low incomes, some people experience overservicing, underservicing and RightServicing (all expressed as a percentage of the total on a simple bar graph). The shaded area in Figure 8 is the RightServicing Zone for two scenarios: a typical scenario (left side) and a desired scenario (right side).
Figure 8: The RightServicing Zone
The scenario shown on the left side of Figure 8 is typical of many large income support programs such as a family benefit with a high percentage of people who are overserviced through heavy administrative burdens. In this scenario, the objective of administrators is through a RightServicing approach:

- Decrease the percentage of overserviced people, by a significant amount, through a range of business transformation initiatives. Set a goal of eliminating unnecessary processes, such as lodging paper-based claims and accompanying evidence, especially when this information is already on file in a government agency.
- Push the percentage of underserviced people to more targeted assistance for families who have greater needs.
- For most people, manage the program with a light-touch approach. For example, if the program is means tested, access wage and salary information directly from employers.

Making these changes shifts more people into the RightServicing Zone as illustrated on the right side of Figure 8.

RightServicing is not a measure or indicator of the actual level of service that is provided to each person in the RightServicing Zone. The level of service is differential. It ranges from very high to very low and is not one-size-fits-all. In general, you can safely assume that most overservicing happens to people who have low needs and low risk and that most underservicing happens to people who have high needs and high risk.

However, this assumption is not always true. A high-needs needs person can be overserviced, for example, by having to prove circumstances and to provide evidence for administrative reasons. A low-needs person can be underserviced. These people can be at risk of not receiving the full entitlements under the law or be at risk of making compliance errors.

Overservicing is a determinant for welfare dependency. Underservicing can result in not addressing issues, only for them to become bigger problems that cost more to resolve later.

RightServicing is striking a balance of need to the service response and having the flexibility and agility to adjust it over time in response to changes in circumstances and life events. As needs and wants increase or decrease or life events change a person's situation suddenly, the service response must keep abreast and keep the person in the RightServicing Zone.

**Getting to the RightServicing Zone**

Having described the RightServicing organization, the next question is: How do you get there? RightServicing characteristics have dependencies, interrelationships and overlapping features, and therefore, should not be viewed in isolation from each other. For example, Fast-tracking is enabled by Risk Management and Automation, but Micro Programs is an amalgam of several characteristics such as Segmenting, Predicting and Addressing Complexity.
When looked at in isolation, as found in this study, many organizations can rightfully say they have proven capability in several of the characteristics. What we did not find was an organization that uses the nine characteristics in a systemic way to deliver what is defined as the differential response at the heart of RightServicing.

*Doing the right thing is more important than doing the thing right.*

- Peter Drucker, management consultant, educator and author

Organizations that want to become a RightServicing organization will ask: Where do I start? Is there a pattern or model that we can follow to leverage the interrelationships of the characteristics?

With each new policy and service delivery initiative, apply a RightServicing test for each customer segment (with Segmenting as the highest order characteristic). For each segment, ask the following three questions:

- What percentage of people is likely to be overserviced?
- What percentage of people is likely to be underserviced?
- What percentage of people is in the RightServicing Zone?

A bar chart (similar to the example in Figure 9) shows the relative percentage of people who are likely to be under, over and in the RightServicing Zone for each segment. By creating this type of chart, an organization can start to see the scale of effort that is required to increase the percentage in the RightServicing Zone.
Within the targeted segment, the goal is to increase the proportion of people who are serviced within the right level of service to reflect the target profile as shown in Figure 10.

RightServicing is not a measure or indicator of the actual level of service that is provided for each person in the RightServicing Zone. The level of service is differential, ranging from very high (intensive and personalized) to very low (light touch to no touch). Service levels vary over time for each individual and are in-line with the individual’s changing circumstances and life events. People can receive an intensive personalized level of service for one social program and receive a low touch for another. People must be in the RightServicing Zone and experience the level of service that is appropriate to their needs.

Figure 11 demonstrates the changing service profile from the one-size-fits-all service approach to people who are serviced in the RightServicing Zone. The variation in the service profile for a customer segment (described in the Accessing characteristic of RightServicing) is represented by the RightServicing Curve. The RightServicing Curve can vary by customer segment. As initiatives to adopt or improve the RightServicing characteristics within organizations take effect, the RightServicing Curve trends downward, with a reduction in service for people who are currently overserviced. The curve trends upward as people who are currently underserviced receive more attention.
Figure 11: The path to RightServicing
The RightServicing Curve will, in general, reflect a proportion of people who receive a similar service level, which appears as a flat line in the RightServicing Curve. For some customer segments, this flat lining of the RightServicing Curve can be similar to the current level of service that is delivered through the traditional one-size-fits-all line approach. It is a reminder that government is getting it right some of the time through standardization of the service model.

The area on the graph represents the delta between the one-size-fits-all line. The RightServicing Curve represents the quantum of dividends that are accruing in terms of social benefits, reductions in program outlays and productivity dividends. These benefits of RightServicing are addressed further in the next section.

**Continuous improvement cycle of RightServicing**
Becoming a RightServicing organization requires a continuous improvement approach. In this approach, the business processes of social program management, from policy setting to program delivery, are continually reviewed with a view to transform or eliminate suboptimal processes and to create processes. Among the most widely used tools for continuous improvement is a four-step quality model, the plan-do-check-act (PDCA) cycle, which is also known as the Deming Cycle:

- **Plan.** Identify an opportunity and plan for change.
- **Do.** Implement the change on a small scale.
- **Check.** Use data to analyze the results of the change and determine whether it made a difference.
- **Act.** If the change was successful, implement it on a wider scale and continuously assess your results. If the change did not work, begin the cycle again.

A RightServicing organization requires a similar continuous improvement cycle:

- **Plan (Segmenting, Managing Complexity)**
  Identify customer segments and develop service offerings to meet the needs and wants of each segment. In a social protection context, a service offering should encompass:
  - Legislative mandate and the supporting policy
  - Target social outcome or the outcome the offering will contribute to
  - Service experience
  - Channels through which the offering will be delivered
  - Business processes
  - Key performance indicators to enable evaluation

  Acknowledge that complexity exists and that some solutions take significant time and resources to develop.

- **Enable (Automate, Micro Programs)**
  Automate business processes wherever possible to deliver the productivity benefits from within the macro programs that, in turn, will make available the resources that are required to develop and deliver Micro Programs.

- **Avoid (Risk Management, Prediction, Fast-tracking)**
  Use the interdependencies of Risk Management as it guides the Fast-tracking process and to deliver effective outcomes while delivering the efficiency dividend. This step ensures that unnecessary costs are avoided because of overservicing, a reactive rather than active service response, and prevention and detection of compliance and fraud issues.

- **Deliver (Leverage the Ecosystem, Accessing)**
  Consumption of services is facilitated by the actors in the system who collaborate to ensure the right service, right time, right place and most importantly, the right outcome.
As with the Deming Cycle, the RightServicing cycle is continuous, and each phase of the cycle leads into the next phase as represented in Figure 12. The lessons learned in the delivery phase are essential input to the planning phase as segmentation models are reviewed.
Achieving 100 percent of customers for a segment in the RightServicing Zone is an aspirational target. Fiscal realities are likely to create some underservicing, certainly from the perspective of individuals who might feel that they are not treated fairly as their social situation fails to improve to the expected norm. At the other end of the scale, some overservicing is inevitable because risk management processes that are focused on system integrity can give good cause for interventions to people who regard the intervention as nonvalue adding.

By using the model approach of continuous improvement, organizations can construct a program of initiatives with the goal of shrinking the relative percentage of overserved people and underserved people and placing them into the RightServicing Zone. The program should be a mix of big-step projects and small-step improvements. Big-step projects are the major business transformation initiatives such as shifting a segment to predominantly self-managed and online servicing from a traditional approach of paper-based forms and in-office contact. An example of a small-step improvement is refining the segmentation model as a result of data analysis.

Organizations that invest in initiatives in the Deliver phase of the RightServicing model are likely to achieve suboptimal results if they fail to complete the Plan phase by adopting a Segmenting model and recognizing how to address complexity. Conversely, organizations that adopt the Segmenting approach and understanding how to address complexity are in a much better position to optimize their return on investment in the Enable phase with automation of the right business processes.

Too many organizations rush into the Deliver phase and open up online channels (Accessing) and establish cooperative arrangements with other agencies and stakeholders (Leveraging the Ecosystem). They end up without having in place the appropriate Risk Management and Fast-tracking regimes or worse without having a proper Segmenting strategy. As a result, multiple nonvalue client contacts can be generated, adding cost to the system instead of reducing it.

This study found a lack of a structured or coordinated approaches for initiatives that were consistent with the principles of the RightServicing characteristics. This study also found evidence of initiatives that were focused on one or more characteristics of RightServicing, but that occurred mainly in isolation from other initiatives. Many of the initiatives ranged from highly successful, or at least moderately successful, to some falling well short of the stated objectives.

In our view, a structured approach of program management based on the RightServicing Model will deliver the leverage effect of RightServicing. The leverage effect of a program of initiatives that address the nine characteristics will position organizations that are on the path to delivering better social outcomes with cost savings. These savings can be reinvested or returned to the budget (or other funding body) as a financial dividend.
In establishing a program of initiatives for RightServicing, the standard principles of program and project management apply. The overall goals and objectives for RightServicing need to be established. Examples include the value to be achieved from the program across the dimensions of social, program outlay and productivity (see “The value of RightServicing” section). Establishing value targets requires performance and quality benchmarks to be set at the beginning of the program for the following reasons:

- Provide a basis for business-case development and return-on-investment decisions.
- Measure progress on individual initiatives.
- Evaluate program performance (the leverage effect) as a basis for ongoing investment in RightServicing.

**Value of RightServicing**

RightServicing by definition implies derived value in terms of social and economic benefits for people, government and society. Is it possible to measure the benefits of RightServicing? Where can an organization expect to see improvements in key performance indicators if it follows a RightServicing approach? This section seeks to address these important questions.

RightServicing offers potential value in three dimensions:

- **Social Dividend (SD).** The benefit to society is more prosperity and better well-being.
  - Increased economic output that results from better outcomes for people and communities. It is achieved through more effective social program management, for example, turning tax consumers, such as the unemployed, into tax payers.
  - Indirect through cost avoidance of not funding more programs and social costs for the social problems and issues mitigated through RightServicing. For example, the costs avoided from early reconnection to the labor market for an unemployed person can potentially head off an adverse path to mental health problems, housing insecurity or family breakup.
  - Improvements in well-being for people in society through better social outcomes. The effects influence a range of social and economic indices, including well-being, satisfaction levels, government performance and consumer sentiment.

- **Program Outlay Dividend (POD).** The benefit to government is a reduction in social expenditure costs.
  - Net program cost savings on social program expenditure as welfare dependency cycles are broken and more people participate to their potential in society. The savings are offset by the increased social program expenditure that is targeted at people and communities where underserving is identified.
  - Reduction of incorrect decision making and compliance failures through better use of information, in particular from accessing information at the source rather than relying on people to provide it manually.

- **Productivity Dividend (PD).** The benefit to the social program management organization is efficiency, leading to leaner administration costs.
  - Lower administration costs through automation, effective use of data and information, the elimination or transformation of nonvalue-adding business processes, and elimination or reduction of rework from error and mishandling of information within organizations.
A RightServicing organization expects to see improvements in key performance indicators across the three value dimensions: SD, POD and PD. All social program management organizations aim to achieve value and benefits in these areas. The question is: Can RightServicing achieve more value above “business as usual activity”? The concept of RightServicing is based on the usage and multiplier effect that comes from addressing the nine characteristics of RightServicing in a program-based manner. A RightServicing program should achieve extra value over a business-as-usual approach, where investments are made in some characteristic of RightServicing without a systemic commitment to RightServicing outcomes.

RightServicing, in the same way as any business transformation program, needs to be measured in terms of cost and benefits to ensure that the value for money is achieved from the investment.

Each organization has its own way of doing this measurement. For example, IBM has developed an approach that can be used to develop a quantitative business case for transforming service delivery.55

The following guidance is for illustrative purposes and is provided to emphasize the importance of adopting a benefits realization approach.

The RightServicing value (RV) in absolute terms over a specified period can be expressed as shown in the following equation:

\[ RV = (SD + POD + PD) - B \]

where B is the sum value of benefits that might be achieved from business-as-usual activity across the three dimensions.

The value of each dimension, especially in terms of a standard unit, such as money saved or money not spent, is difficult to quantify.56 Changes in POD and PD are more readily observable and measurable in a relatively short timeframe. Changes to SD are more difficult to measure. Many of the SD benefits are not evident until many months or years have passed. SD benefits are both qualitative (for example, well-being) and quantitative (for example, economic output). Longitudinal studies are required to measure the true impacts and, therefore, the value to society.57

**Summary of benefits**
The RightServicing value proposition depends on a program of activity that is spread across the nine RightServicing characteristics, delivering value in all dimensions of social, program outlays and productivity. Table 3 provides guidance to where benefits and value are most likely to occur from investing in capability for each of the RightServicing characteristics. Each characteristic affects the three dimensions. This table highlights the relativity in each dimension by using a single check mark (✓) to indicate the lowest impact, double check marks (✓✓) to indicate a medium impact and triple check marks (✓✓✓) to indicate the highest impact.
Table 2: RightServicing benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Program outlays</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segmenting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-tracking</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Complexity</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Risk</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automating</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Programs</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging the Ecosystem</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program managers can use this table to guide them in developing a balanced investment portfolio of projects to achieve RightServicing value.

**Next steps to RightServicing**

How will an organization know it is operating with the majority of the customers it services in the RightServicing Zone? Will it be when people who need assistance are gratified and the public at large is astonished at the progress that the social program management system has made in enabling economic and social growth and stability? Although there is no straightforward answer, a RightServicing organization will know it is making a difference when national and local social and economic indicators trend in the expected directions. A RightServicing organization needs to measure and count its successes as the transformation journey progresses.

RightServicing is a far reaching concept that might look familiar in some aspects. Such aspects as managing risk, automating processes and addressing complexity have been a key part of social programs for many years. But, overall, RightServicing represents a comprehensive set of capabilities that are required to deal with the social and economic challenges of our time, namely the rising cost of financing social programs. At times, it might fail to deliver good outcomes and to solve the most complex social problems that people experience. Although some characteristics are familiar, such characteristics as Segmenting, Micro Programs and Leveraging the Ecosystem are new or emerging capabilities with the potential to make a significant impact.

When researching this project, organizations that were contacted indicated that they are investing in capabilities across several RightServicing characteristics with some excellent results as highlighted in the case studies in this report. The full benefits of RightServicing will accrue after all nine characteristics are addressed in a systemic manner over the long term. The interplay between the characteristics and the leverage effect that is created by it leads to a transformed organization and social program management system.
RightServicing represents a significant change in the way social program management organizations approach the many challenges that they face daily. RightServicing organizations strive to achieve the following objectives:

- Develop a proactive and preventive culture to address social problems before they become pervasive and costly. The often passive and reactive social policy and service delivery culture, which is the staple of traditional social insurance models (contributory and taxpayer funder schemes), needs to be updated to meet the rapidly changing needs of modern society.
- Address the often difficult conundrum of maintaining acquired rights, while doing what is right for society, by creating new paths to address complexity and to provide more support to people who have complex problems. This objective requires thinking outside the traditional organizational accountabilities and responsibilities and collaborating with other actors in the social ecosystem.
- Be relentless in their pursuit of eliminating processes that do not add value. They automate where possible to allow people who have simple and straightforward circumstances to easily move through the system with minimal attention.
- Through collaboration, reposition their organization away from the center of the policy environment or delivery system. They move their organization to a collective network of organizations in a social ecosystem that is focused on dealing with the complex social issues that face families and communities.
- Adopt a risk-based approach to their business. They balance the risk of actively managing ongoing social problems and facilitating people's access to the social system against the risk of exposure to fraud, abuse and compliance issues. A RightServicing organization embeds a risk discipline across the whole organization and uses it to reward those individuals who want to do the right thing.
- Do not use disadvantage or social exclusion as the basis for a lowest common denominator approach to service. RightServicing organizations embrace new channels to encourage lower-cost delivery and higher performance to those people who choose to embrace this model. An objective of a RightServicing organization is to give people the means and the capability to access new channels, lowering the cost of delivery and adding value.
- Reinvest efficiency dividends and program cost savings to address underservicing and to improve social outcomes.
- Raise public awareness of initiatives based on RightServicing to counter any perception of unfairness that emerges as more public resources are directed at people and places that are experiencing underservicing. Although the phrase “the end justifies the means” has some validity in achieving better social outcomes for people, the means must be transparent. It must follow due process and have clear lines of accountability to decision makers for the expenditure of public and social fund monies.
• Challenge the legal construct of social programs and privacy provisions to ensure that they remain aligned with the contemporary needs of society. Social program and privacy legislation must be used to raise the probability of achieving better social outcomes rather than stand in the way as immovable barriers or obstacles to doing the right thing. This action should not be interpreted as advocating some form of laissez-faire approach to the law, privacy principles and acquired rights. Rather, lawmakers must enable a differential approach to policy and service delivery to address the complex social problems of today, without burdening people who can access social programs in a self-managed manner with undue process.

• Have an optimistic outlook for the future of social program management, as 19th and 20th century policy and service delivery traditions and methods are transformed to meet the needs of the 21st century.

RightServicing is not an off-the-shelf approach or solution, nor is there a standard recipe for getting to a desired end state. It represents a way of thinking for organizations within the sector to continually challenge themselves to become more proactive, more focused on core social problems, more collaborative and more outcome-oriented. For each new initiative, organizations should ask themselves the question: Is this initiative taking us toward maintaining or away from the RightServicing Zone for each segment of people we serve?

Getting to the RightServicing Zone must offer value in terms of social, program outlay and productivity dividends. Otherwise, an organization might as well stay with the one-size-fits-all approach. The need to achieve such dividends, however, is increasing. The global financial crisis has demonstrated the challenge for governments to stimulate economic growth while maintaining the social system. In many countries, the social system provided the stability mechanism that was so desperately needed during the financial meltdown, and for the future, it needs to go further.

In recent years, we have witnessed a range of responses to the many challenges that are facing social program management. RightServicing offers a systemic approach for organizations that want to develop and manage a program of activity to collectively position them to deal with these challenges.

Based on the evidence presented at the IBM International Social Sector Forum in Paris, France, in June 2011, a conclusion was that addressing the many challenges that face social program management organizations today requires a mix of evolutionary and revolutionary initiatives. RightServicing encapsulates this spirit of a mixed program of evolutionary and revolutionary change that addresses both policy and service delivery. However, the question remains: Where am I going and how do I get there?
This report opened with a quotation from the famous 19th century American author Mark Twain: “Do the right thing. It will gratify some people and astonish the rest.” The essence of RightServicing is to continually aim for a balance of (shown in Figure 13):

- Efficiency (service delivery and productivity)
- Effectiveness (social policy and outcomes)
- Fairness and equity (society and the individual)
By managing the levers of change as represented through the RightServicing characteristics, social program management organizations have the potential to improve performance and achieve dividends for society, individuals, governments and their own organization. Focusing on doing the right thing over doing things right is the agility and flexibility that are needed to consign the social program management paradigm of the past century to history.

Notwithstanding the urgent need for change, becoming a RightServicing organization is evolutionary rather than revolutionary, in-line with the continuous improvement approach that is outlined in this report. A mix of small-step and big-step change initiatives is required to collectively develop the organizational and ecosystem-wide capabilities for RightServicing.

As people notice improved social outcomes and more efficient service delivery systems, they can develop a new respect for the social program management system. They can come to regard it as an equal player with economic development (two sides of the same coin).

**For more information**
IBM Cúram Solutions offer full lifecycle support for managing health and social programs from needs to outcomes. Solutions range from social assistance and family services to employment, disability management and pensions to care management and healthcare reform. To learn more about IBM Cúram Solutions and products, see [ibm.com/software/products/en/social-programs](http://ibm.com/software/products/en/social-programs)

For more information about IBM Curam Software for social program management organizations, see: [ibm.com/software/info/curam](http://ibm.com/software/info/curam)

---

**The IBM Cúram Research Institute:**
Bridging the gap between policy and service delivery

The IBM Cúram Research Institute is IBM’s social policy research arm. Its mission is to foster the development of best practice service delivery models that improve the ability of social program management organizations to increase the social and economic potential for citizens and families.

The Institute is committed to undertaking and commissioning research with social enterprises, not-for-profits, universities and other social program management organizations. Output from the IBM Cúram Research Institute consists of industry point of views, position papers, industry consultations and input to the IBM Cúram product family.

The area of research is in the cross-over from policy to service delivery. Although there is extensive policy research undertaken and numerous reviews of service delivery success and failure, there is a gap in the intersection of these two worlds. The IBM Cúram Research Institute’s primary focus is to develop new social business models and the best practices that they encompass for this area. For more information, see: [ibm.com/software/city-operations/curam-research-institute](http://ibm.com/software/city-operations/curam-research-institute)
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2. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Pew Research Center: “People out of work fewer than five weeks are more than three times as likely to find a job in the coming month as people who have been out of work for over a year, with a re-employment rate of 30.7 percent versus 8.7 percent, respectively.”


4. There is a wide consensus that both types of social insurance do not occur in their pure form anywhere. There is also consensus on the view that all national social security systems can be interpreted as being the successors of Bismark's or Beveridge's conceptions of social security. To illustrate the latter point, you might think of the former socialist conceptions relative to social security, for example, or of the Scandinavian approach to social security.


6. The phrase, “two sides of the same coin” when referring to economic and social protection development was referred to by IBM in the report from the International Social Sector Forum (ISSF) 10 in Berlin, Germany, in June 2009. The report is called Social Security and Social Services 2020: Managing through turbulence, delivering for the Future, published in New York in August 2009. The phrase was referred to again in the ISSF reports from ISSF 12 Vienna in 2010 and ISSF 14 Paris in 2011.


9. Schoukens, P. and Pieters, D. Social Security Quo Vadis? Leuven: European Institute of Social Security, 2007. In their interviews with CEOs of social protection organizations across 15 Western European countries, they found that organizations are rarely ready to undergo substantial changes because of historical reasons and power struggles between various social and political forces.


12. Based on a model from ABJ Consulting Pty Ltd.


17. State of the Nation Report: Poverty, Worklessness & Welfare Dependency in the UK, 2010: “Multiple disadvantage is a significant problem in the UK. Over the past decade, there has been no demonstrable progress in reducing the numbers of people who suffer multiple disadvantage. Over 60 percent of the indicators in one of the main annual surveys show either no progress or a trend in the wrong direction.”


19. State of the Nation Report: Poverty, Worklessness & Welfare Dependency in the UK, 2010: “There is strong evidence that multiple disadvantage is intergenerational: 27 percent of children from families experiencing six or more parent-related disadvantages also have three or more disadvantages, compared with only 4 percent of those with no parent-related disadvantages.”


39. Ibid.


49. Ibid.


55. In IBM Center for Applied Insights report, The Value of Smarter Social Services: Making a quantitative business case for transforming service delivery in challenging times: Research was conducted among government and social services leaders with recent direct experience of social services transformation to estimate potential economic returns. The team supplemented this primary research with data from academic resources, industry publications and direct engagement with top researchers.

56. A more sophisticated approach is a ratio-based method to create an index of value (similar to a stock market index) enabling progress to be tracked over time. Creating an appropriate index is not covered in this report.

