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Abstract. Beijing municipal government performance entrusts the third party survey organizations to survey the municipal authorities in three aspects—duty performance, administrative service and performance improvement. This report adopts the relevant survey data, and analyzes the public service of municipal authorities. This report addresses the subjects from evaluation of the overall situation, structure characteristics, and historical comparison. According to statistical results, this report summarizes the main problems of public service of Beijing municipal authorities, and finds possible reasons. Finally this report puts forward suggestions.

1. Introduction
Public service refers to the administrative guidance completed by the government and its staff in accordance with national policies, laws and regulations, while providing services (facilities, spirit, attitude) to the public throughout the process.

Public service is based on service-oriented government. From the point of the view of service-oriented government, public service is a kind of government service performance, which is experienced by the public personally and can be perceived practically. It is also a performance of government, which is produced in the process of face-to-face with the public or through electronic channels.

2. Basic Situation of Public Satisfaction on Public Service of Beijing Municipal Organs
The public evaluation work evaluates the performance of the main duties, administrative services and performance improvement of 58 municipal administrative organs in Beijing in 2015. There are two-level and three-level indicators in three aspects. Administrative services include seven items: service attitude, business ability, honesty and self-discipline, administration by law, work process, online government affairs and information disclosure. The main body of evaluation includes the service objects with direct business contacts with municipal departments, as well as the randomly selected public. Data were collected by telephone survey, interception survey, online survey, mysterious customers, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, micro-gathering bars and small reports, and a total of 26990 survey samples were completed.
2.1. Summary of survey data
As shown in Figure 1, in 2015, the satisfaction of public service of 58 municipal government departments in Beijing was 93.22 points. Among them, the evaluation of service object is 92.68, and that of urban and rural residents is 92.41. The evaluation of service object is slightly higher than that of urban and rural residents, but there is no significant difference.

This evaluation mainly includes three parts: performance, service level and rectification. In terms of performance, important people's livelihood facts and key annual work were selected. The service level includes such indicators as administration by law, work efficiency, business level and service attitude, and rectification was chosen from correction plans.

2.2. Structural Characteristic Analysis

2.2.1. Comparison between Five categories of departments
The average score of municipal public service evaluation is 93.22 in 2015. According to the classification of performance management departments of municipal administrative organs, five categories of departments scored from high to low respectively are: Judicial system (93.71 points), law enforcement (92.69 points), social public service (92.54 points), internal evaluation (92.52 points), examination and approval (92.37 points).

2.2.2. Satisfaction of Public Service of Four Regional Governments
Enterprises and urban and rural residents' satisfaction with public service is shown in Figure 2. From the perspective of urban and rural residents, the highest score in the four regions is the new urban development zone, with a score of 77.85, and the lowest score is the capital functional core zone, with a score of 76.5. The difference between the two regions is 1.35. According to the ranking of scores from high to low, the new urban development zone, eco-conservation development zone, urban functional development zone and capital functional core zone were ranked as 77.85 points, 77.73 points, 76.63 points and 76.5 points, respectively. From the point of view of score distribution, urban and rural residents' evaluation of government public service, the four types of regional scores are more uniform and the gap is relatively small.

Compared with urban and rural residents, enterprises in the four regions scored higher on the satisfaction of government service. For enterprises, the highest score is ecological conservation development zone, with a score of 85.5, and the lowest score is urban functional development zone, with a score of 80.91, with a difference of 4.59 between the two zones. According to the ranking from
high to low, the scores were ecological conservation development area, capital functional core area, new urban development area and urban functional development area, with 85.5, 84.35, 84.18 and 80.91 points respectively.

At the same time, from the point of view of the distribution of scores, enterprises’ evaluation of government public service is not uniform in the four regions, the gap between the top three is small, and the difference between the highest score and the lowest score is large. There was a difference of 4.59 points between the eco-conservation development zone with the highest score and the urban functional development zone with the lowest score on the satisfaction degree of government service.

![Figure 2. Comparison of Satisfaction Degree of Public Service between Four Regional Enterprises and Urban and Rural Residents in 2015](image)

2.2.3. Service Level: The evaluation results of sub-indicators are generally good, with different performances.

Service level indicators are common indicators, and the scores of secondary indicators of each department are shown in figure 3. Service attitude, business ability, integrity and self-discipline, and administration by law scored relatively high, indicating that in recent years, the quality of government service personnel has gradually improved, and has been generally recognized by the service object. Meanwhile, the scores and satisfaction rates of online government affairs, business processes, information disclosure indicators are relatively low, which shows that there is still much room for improvement in the promotion of government informatization and the optimization of business processes.
2.3. A Historical Comparison of Satisfaction Degree of Public Service of Beijing Municipal Organs

Compared with 2014, municipal authorities have greatly improved their service attitude and business ability in 2015. At the same time, there has been a decline in integrity, self-discipline and business processes. In addition, the survey of service level adds three new indicators in 2015: administration according to law, online government affairs and information disclosure, which reflects the government's innovation in e-government and interaction with the public. The overall average level of public service in all departments has improved, which shows that the measures taken by the government to improve the level of public service have achieved certain results, the gap between departments has narrowed, and the overall trend is average.

Generally speaking, the construction of service-oriented government has been deepened, the reform of administrative examination and approval system and process has been continued, the supervision in the event and after the event has been strengthened, and the standardization and centralization of examination and approval have been gradually realized. The implementation of these policies and measures also makes the public put forward higher requirements for the convenience and efficiency of public service.

3. Deep Analysis of the Satisfaction Survey of Public Service of Municipal Organs

According to the survey data, compared with the other five departments, the service level score of the approval department is the lowest, and the business process score of the approval department is also lower than the average score of each department. Among them, the most unsatisfactory aspects of the public are mainly concentrated in online government affairs and business processes. It is more common to have unclear and inefficient processes in business processes. In view of these problems, the main reasons are found as follows:

| Existing problems | Government’s officials | Organizational and Institutional Systems | Co-ordinated system |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------|

Table 1. Cause of Main Problems in Public Service of Municipal Organs.
Business processes are cumbersome and inefficient

| Lack of E-government System Construction | Business processes are cumbersome and inefficient | Inaction, difficult to do, buck-passing. | Insufficient advocacy | Government functions are vague, and there is no clear Department responsibilities. | One-stop government construction is inadequate, including software system and hardware technology. |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Some civil servants are not good at using information technology. | 1. Inaction, difficult to do, buck-passing. | 1. Inaction, difficult to do, buck-passing. | Insufficient advocacy | Government functions are vague, and there is no clear Department responsibilities. | One-stop government construction is inadequate, including software system and hardware technology. |
| 2. Public demand for E-government has increased. | 2. Insufficient advocacy | 2. Insufficient advocacy | Government functions are vague, and there is no clear Department responsibilities. | One-stop government construction is inadequate, including software system and hardware technology. |
| It took nearly a few years for information disclosure and online government to enter the performance appraisal. | 2. The bureaucratic system leads to accountability only to the leaders and not to the public. | 2. The bureaucratic system leads to accountability only to the leaders and not to the public. | Insufficient coordination among departments. | Insufficient coordination among departments. |
| 1. The construction of application system is insufficient. | 2. Integration of information resources needs to be strengthened. | 2. Integration of information resources needs to be strengthened. | Insufficient coordination among departments. | Insufficient coordination among departments. |
| 3. Information islands exist between departments | 3. Information islands exist between departments |

3.1. *Inaction or Difficulty in action of Public Officials*

In the current department responsibility design, there are still some phenomena, such as overlapping responsibilities, absence of responsibilities, conflict of responsibilities, unreasonable design of responsibilities, which lead to the relevant departments do not know how to act. At the same time, in the existing hierarchical organization system, public officials are more responsible for the superior than for the public. At present, more and more problems tend to be systematized, not only can one department solve them, but also need the cooperation of many departments. However, the coordination mechanism between departments under the current system is not perfect, so it is often difficult to act when facing complex problems.

3.2. *Insufficient Construction of One-stop Government*

At present, each department still does its own thing, and there is still a lack of coordination system and overall planning mechanism in the administrative reform. For the administrative service centers that have been built formally, the system and information construction are still insufficient. Many administrative service centers exist only as one-stop government in the physical sense. They can only provide "one-room" service in form, that is to say, they can simply gather the working windows of multiple functional departments in a hall, but the business processes among functional departments have not been reconstructed and integrated.

In addition, most of the current administrative service centers are approval service centers, whose service functions are relatively single. Most of them undertake administrative approval functions, whose service objects are enterprises, but they can not meet the diversified personalized service needs of the general public.

3.3. *E-government construction cannot meet the needs of the public.*

In the transitional period from Web.2.0 era to Web 3.0 era, information technology is absolutely necessary to the public whether in daily social life or trading with various enterprises, which will inevitably lead to a sharp increase in public demand for e-government as well. Plus insufficient integration of application system construction and information resources, as a result, there is a certain degree of contradiction between the government's e-government resources supply with public demand. Although the government has been striving to improve the level of information disclosure and online government, e-government construction is still insufficient in the face of the rapid growth of public demand.
4. Suggestions for Municipal Organs to Improve Satisfaction of Public Service

4.1. Promoting One-stop Government Construction and Innovating Public Service Mechanism

Formally building a government service center cannot fully realize one-stop government. We need to continue to promote technological innovation and institutional innovation.

Institutional innovation needs to further promote the original administrative management reform. At the same time, in the process of construction and development, the government service center also needs to innovate its operation mechanism. In addition, we can draw lessons from the working process of some embassies in China, which implement the mechanism of whole process handled by intermediaries. Thereby form an innovative mechanisms, in which one-stop service hall responsible for coordination, intermediary responsible for handling, and functional departments guiding the handling.

4.2. Promote the informationization of public service.

The construction of information-based public service requires efforts from three aspects: infrastructure construction, application system construction and information resources integration.

Infrastructure construction is the basic premise of information-based public service, the basic platform of application system with security, reliability and efficiency, and the service channel to ensure information transmission.

First of all, from the perspective of the system, the key is to establish and improve the supporting legal system. Laws enables the information sharing system to be established and perfected, thus enabling government departments to have legal basis for information sharing and providing guidance for it. While the functions and powers of each functional department, such as information collection, information processing, information dissemination and information storage, are clearly defined. Secondly, from the perspective of technology, information resource sharing needs the help of information technology. At present, information technology and Internet technology are developing vigorously. The government should make full use of these technologies to achieve the integration of existing government information resources.

In addition, government agencies should also interact with the public in the new media. The government should actively use new media, such as official micro-blog, Weixin public platform, to publish information in a timely, comprehensive and proactive manner. Using new media correctly also can optimize the process of administration and avoid wasteful duplication of effort. In this way, the general improvement of service efficiency and the improvement of service quality can be achieved, and finally the public satisfaction can be improved.
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