Heaven for grumblers or the road to better public services? A study of critical reports from a Swiss citizen co-production system

Dr. Matthias Stürmer[1]* (matthias.stuermer@iwi.unibe.ch)

Dr. Oliver Neumann[1] (oliver.neumann@iwi.unibe.ch)

Tim Loosli[1] (tim.loosli@iwi.unibe.ch)

[1]University of Bern, Institute of Information Systems

Research Center for Digital Sustainability

*corresponding author

Paper for presentation at the XXI. International Research Society for Public Management (IRSPM) Annual Conference in Budapest (Hungary), Corvinus University, April 19-21, 2017

Session D3-03

Co-production in the design and delivery of public services: The role of internal and external conditions

Work in progress.

Please do not cite without the authors' permission.

INTRODUCTION

In 2013 the city of Zürich introduced the FixMyStreet-based system called "Züri wie neu". Almost 10'000 reports on infrastructure problems have been filed by citizens since then. Recently, however, newspapers have criticized the platform claiming citizens use it manly to point out irrelevant issues (Ritter, 2016; SDA, 2016; Theile, 2016). The journalists mentioned grumbling people using their smartphones to report about trivial things such as trash at a remote sideroad or some small graffiti.

On the other hand academics have elaborated for many years about emerging, powerful citizen co-production systems and citizensourcing applications such as FixMyStreet (King and Brown, 2007; Chun et al., 2010; Johnston and Hansen, 2011; Schmidthuber and Hilgers, 2017). The use of new technologies is enabling inhabitants to participate in governmental actions and contribute their know-how and experience to improve society.

We therefore ask: How can the value of reports by a citizensourcing system such as FixMyStreet being measured and if so, what is the role of an information system regarding the value of such reports?

The article presents a short literature review of citizen co-production, citizensourcing, and open government literature, elaborates on the problem of quality in crowdsourcing initiatives, and presents a conceptual approach on how to measure the value of reports within an infrastructure issue reporting system. By applying this approach by manual coding to a sample of 990 reports from the "Züri wie neu" platform and using concepts of the information systems (IS) success model in a survey to the platform users we conduct a regression analysis determining the relationship between IS success factors and the value of such reports. Finally, we discuss the preliminary findings of our ongoing research work.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In their article on design lessons of smart governance infrastructures Johnston and Hansen (2011) identify technological revolution as the enabler for the re-emergence of citizen co-production in public services. They explain how the interaction of technology and society can leverage participation-based governance systems by involving citizens while increasing accountability and efficiency of governments. Based on positive crowdsourcing outcomes from the open source movement (Raymond, 2001) Johnston and Hansen argue initiatives like FixMyStreet.com apply similar techniques by gathering citizen-identified problems through an issue tracking system.

Similarly Linders (2012) introduced the notion "from e-government to we-government" where citizens take on the role of a partner to the government instead of just being their customers. In his conceptual article Linders classifies FixMyStreet as a citizen-reporting application, a subset of citizensourcing initiatives. In this typology, citizensourcing applications gather contributions from citizens to create value for society. Other notions such as the open government movement (McDermott, 2010; Janssen et al., 2012) and government 2.0 literature (Chun et al., 2010; Nam, 2012) argue such co-production can further help to improve quality and effectiveness of public services, increase transparency and accountability of governmental actions, as well as enhance engagement with citizens, leading to more involved citizenry and thus a stronger citizen-to-government relationship.

However, the quality of citizen contributions in co-production processes is a challenge. Projects like Wikipedia struggle with quality discrepancies in user created content (Kittur and Kraut, 2008). Assessing the precision and completeness of OpenStreetMap, a crowd-sourced mapping platform, Haklay (2010) concluded the crowd-sourced information is fairly accurate. In citizen co-production systems we consider report quality as one indicator of the value of such a platform.

In order to measure in addition the relevance of a report we applied conceptual thoughts from two different disciplines: from war medicine and from the software development industry. In military settings triage is the common practice since the Napoleon war in order to save as many soldiers as possible without overloading the limited medical facilities (Blagg, 2004). Therefore combat casualties are assessed regarding the severity of their injuries with the goal of saving as many lives as possible (Falzone et al., 2017). In the case of infrastructure reports the severity of a possible injury is assessed in order to determine the urgency of fixing the issues. Therefore we assume the higher the severity of a possible injury the more urgent the problem resolution should start thus the value of a report increases.

Similarly to the triage in the military context also software engineering practices has developed approaches to assess severity of programming errors. Peng and Wallace have developed a guideline back in 1993 on how to prioritize resolution of software errors (Peng and Wallace, 1993). They discuss the varying consequences an error may cause, from critical system failures causing loss of life (Level 6) to less serious malfunctions of the program (Level 3) up no problem at all (Level 0). Again, the more severe the possible damage of infrastructure damage is, the more urgent the problem should be fixed thus the value of a report increases.

Now what would influence the citizens to issue high-value reports? We assume system quality, the quality of the information in it, the service by the city administrators as well as the overall user satisfaction exert a positive effect on the value of issued reports. These are independent variables from the Delone and McLean IS success model (DeLone and McLean, 1992, 2003). “System quality” is defined as a the ease of use of a program, its fault resistance, and its performance. “Information quality” captures the correctness and precision of the data within the system. “Service quality” concerns the support delivered by the provider. And “user satisfaction” measures the expectations and the possibly renewed use of the platform (see also appendix 2: Survey items of the IS success model). We therefore state the following hypothesis:

H1: Severity of reports is positively associated with a) system quality, b) information quality, c) service quality and d) user satisfaction.

H2: Range of reports is positively associated with a) system quality, b) information quality, c) service quality and d) user satisfaction.

H3: Quality of reports is positively associated with a) system quality, b) information quality, c) service quality and d) user satisfaction.

METHOD

FixMyStreet.com was introduced by the not-for-profit social enterprise mySociety in 2007 in UK enabling citizens to report and discuss infrastructure problems like potholes, graffiti, or broken traffic lights (King and Brown, 2007). Since 10 years over a million reports have been issued on this online platform. As mySociety continuously develops the software publicly on GitHub and releases it below an open source license the platform has been adopted by various administrations all over the world (see http://fixmystreet.org/sites/). In Brussels for example FixMyStreet is in use since 2013 (Pak et al., 2017). Other municipalities use own platforms. For example in Linz, Austria the "SchauaufLinz" site was developed independently, but implementing functionality similar to FixMyStreet (Schmidthuber and Hilgers, 2017).

Based on the above discussed literature and on semi-structured expert interviews with public administrators from the city of Zürich, St. Gallen and Bern we defined the value of each report is determined by the three dimensions severity, range, and quality. "Severity" indicates how strong the infrastructure damage threatens the everyday life of citizens. "Range" provides an indication on how many people are affected by this threat. And "quality" rates the clarity, precision, and objectivity of the report independent from its content.

In order to assess severity, range and quality of the reports two student assistants conducted a manual coding of 990 reports submitted between July 2015 and July 2016. We used a scale from 1 to 5 for the rating of the three dimensions.

Table 1: Rating description of severity, range, and quality

Rating	***Severity***	***Range***	***Quality***
1	**No threat,** e.g. a small graffiti on a public building or some trash at a sidewalk	**Very few people affected,** e.g. some issue on a remote field path	**Insufficient quality,** e.g. report cannot be interpreted or contains dismissive language
2	**Little threat,** e.g. low risk of a minor injury by some trash at the side of a road	**Few people affected,** e.g. a small park or side road	**Low quality,** e.g. report has very little information about the issue and does not contain an image
3	**Intermediary threat,** e.g. danger of injury because of damaged pavement	**Intermediary number of people affected,** e.g. a regular suburban road	**Satisfactory quality,** e.g. report is described sufficiently clear with or without an image
4	**Substantial threat,** e.g. possible accident because of a pothole on a bikeway	**Many people affected,** e.g. a main street in a suburban	**High quality,** e.g. report is described with clear words and does contain an image
5	**Serious threat,** e.g. danger to life because of missing sewer cover on a street	**Very large number of people affected,** e.g. a frequented main street in the city centre	**Maximum quality,** e.g. report contains detailed and relevant information about the issue including an image

For example, the following reports have been published on "Züri wie neu" by citizens and were rated by the student assistants:

Table 2: Sample reports from "Züri wie neu"

Date and link	Text (translated in English)	Photograph	Our rating
6 July 2015 https://www.zueriwieneu.ch/report/6611	Electric cabinet open next to a bicycle rack		Severity: 4 Range: 3.5 Quality: 4
12 June 2016 https://www.zueriwieneu.ch/report/8549	A shopping trolley is within the Limmat about 1m away from the street (under water) at the height of 104 Limmatquai		Severity: 1 Range: 1 Quality: 5
12 June 2016 https://www.zueriwieneu.ch/report/8545	Light signal for pedestrians not visible from the Hönggerstrasse. Please readjust the signal.		Severity: 4 Range: 5 Quality: 4

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

The coding of the reports resulted in average ratings of severity, range, and quality of the reports presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of the data set

Description	Value
Interval of reports	From 31 May 2013 until 13 June 2016
Total number of reports	7501 reports
Distinct citizens creating reports	2658 persons
Sample of reports for manual coding	990 reports
Distinct citizens of the sample reports	400 persons
Average severity	3.09 out of 5
Average range	2.91 out of 5
Average quality	2.68 out of 5

We then conducted linear regressions for the three dependent variables severity, range, and quality assessing independent variables from the IS success model (Table 4). Our unit of analysis were the average ratings of all coded reports per person. We took this decision because the survey data naturally is also on a person-level.

Table 4: Linear OLS Regression Models of severity, range, and quality as dependent variables

	Linear OLS Regression Models		
	Model 1: Severity (H1)	**Model 2: Range (H2)**	**Model 3: Quality (H3)**
	Coefficient	Coefficient	Coefficient
Main variables			
a) System quality	0.088401	-0.054025	0.167109 **
b) Information quality	-0.273306 *	-0.194604	-0.145850
c) Service quality	0.073678	-0.309793 **	-0.052500
d) User satisfaction	0.115979	0.440310 ***	0.073312
Control variables			
Sex (female)	0.092765	-0.062642	-0.110503
Age (in years)	-0.003669	-0.003053	-0.006557 *
Living in the city of Zürich	-0.057820	-0.080970	-0.075354
Education level	-0.043854	-0.026397	0.006815
Native language French	0.316817	0.423940	0.065557
Native language Italian	0.006564	-0.157725	-0.390486
Native language Rhaeto-Romanic	0.096782	0.059876	-0.146569
Native language English	-0.457836	0.214716	0.395551
Other native language	-0.451306	-0.070600	0.067855
Currently not employed	-0.010545	-0.277074	-0.407320 *
Employment level (in %)	0.013113	-0.007524	-0.011031
Employed in public sector	-0.189193	-0.057644	0.059523
Employed in NPO sector	-0.041190	-0.502277 *	0.271671
Self-employed	-0.088603	0.039143	0.195369
Other employment	0.147470	0.356772	0.155673
Intercept	3.033780 ***	3.400571 ***	3.635434 ***
Model fit indices			
Multiple R-squared	0.07198	0.09276	0.07034
Adjusted R-squared	0.01934	0.04131	0.01761

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 b) is rejected: Severity of reports is negatively influenced by information quality.

The results indicate there is a negative effect on the severity of the reports in regard of the perceived information quality. Thus the better citizens understand the information and trust the quality of "Züri wie neu", the less severe are the reports they submit. It possibly means the better the city administration prepares the information quality of the portal, the less likely people report issues with high severity on it. On the other hand people who value information quality of the platform might be

more aware that it is not designed to report urgent security issues over the web but call the police or any other emergency organisation.

Hypothesis 2 c) is rejected: Range of reports is negatively influenced by service quality.

We found another negative effect regarding the range of a report. Citizens who are happy with the service provided by the city of Zürich, are more likely to report issues that concern only a few people. This means for the city staff responding quickly and taking all reports seriously in fact lowers the range of people affected by such reports thus lowering the value of such a citizensourcing platform. It possibly indicates for the city administration that making all people happy with immediate and empathic responses potentially encourages citizens to report even more remote issues relevant to only a few people.

Hypothesis 2 d) is confirmed: Range of reports is positively influenced by user satisfaction.

There is a very significant positive effect on the range of the reports if an application user is satisfied with the platform in general. Thus people who are convinced that the city administration efficiently processes the reports and acts according to the reported issues, these citizens are more likely to report problems relevant to many others. At first sight this contradicts the previous finding regarding the negative effect of service quality on report range. As explained above high service quality by the city administrators may motivate citizens to increase reports with little range. However, if someone is satisfied with the "Züri wie neu" application he or she is aware how important their reports are to the city and thus uses it increasingly for issues relevant for many people.

Hypothesis 3 a) is confirmed: Quality of reports is positively influenced by system quality.

We found another positive effect regarding the quality of the reports. If someone is content with the tool, he or she is more likely to create a high quality report. Thus increasing the system quality by improving the user experience and reducing the barriers to report an issue will possibly lead to better, more precise reports.

By controlling for the age and the employment of the citizens we found negative effects on range and quality of the reports. People working in the non-profit sector reported issues with less range. And citizens without employment work as well as older people submitted reports with a lower quality rating. We also controlled for other independent variables such as number of reports by a citizen or the time being active on the platform. None of them were associated with significant effects or improved the models.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We deeply thank Tobias Bärtschi, Ursula Jakob and Dominik von Fischer for their coding contributions and Jan Dietrich for his programming work for the data analysis.

REFERENCES

Blagg, C.R., 2004. Triage: Napoleon to the present day. J. Nephrol. 17, 629–632.

Chun, S.A., Shulman, S., Sandoval, R., Hovy, E., 2010. Government 2.0: Making connections between citizens, data and government. Information Polity 15, 1.

DeLone, W.H., McLean, E.R., 2003. The DeLone and McLean Model of Information Systems Success: A Ten-Year Update. J. of Management Information Systems 19, 9–30.

DeLone, W.H., McLean, E.R., 1992. Information Systems Success: The Quest for the Dependent Variable. Information Systems Research 3, 60–95.

Falzone, E., Pasquier, P., Hoffmann, C., Barbier, O., Boutonnet, M., Salvadori, A., Jarrassier, A., Renner, J., Malgras, B., Mérat, S., 2017. Triage in military settings. Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain Medicine 36, 43–51. doi:10.1016/j.accpm.2016.05.004

Haklay, M., 2010. How Good is Volunteered Geographical Information? A Comparative Study of OpenStreetMap and Ordnance Survey Datasets. Environ Plann B Plann Des 37, 682–703. doi:10.1068/b35097

Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., Zuiderwijk, A., 2012. Benefits, Adoption Barriers and Myths of Open Data and Open Government. Information Systems Management 29, 258–268. doi:10.1080/10580530.2012.716740

Johnston, E.W., Hansen, D.L., 2011. Design lessons for smart governance infrastructures. Transforming American governance: Rebooting the public square 197–212.

King, S.F., Brown, P., 2007. Fix My Street or else: Using the Internet to Voice Local Public Service Concerns, in: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance, ICEGOV '07. ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp. 72–80. doi:10.1145/1328057.1328076

Kittur, A., Kraut, R.E., 2008. Harnessing the Wisdom of Crowds in Wikipedia: Quality Through Coordination, in: Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, CSCW '08. ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp. 37–46. doi:10.1145/1460563.1460572

Linders, D., 2012. From e-government to we-government: Defining a typology for citizen coproduction in the age of social media. Government Information Quarterly, Social Media in Government - Selections from the 12th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research (dg.o2011) 29, 446–454. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2012.06.003

McDermott, P., 2010. Building open government. Government Information Quarterly 27, 401–413. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2010.07.002

Nam, T., 2012. Suggesting frameworks of citizen-sourcing via Government 2.0. Government Information Quarterly 29, 12–20. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2011.07.005

Pak, B., Chua, A., Moere, A.V., 2017. FixMyStreet Brussels: Socio-Demographic Inequality in Crowdsourced Civic Participation. Journal of Urban Technology 0, 1–23. doi:10.1080/10630732.2016.1270047

Peng, W.W., Wallace, D.R., 1993. Software error analysis. NIST Special Publication 500, 209.

Raymond, E.S., 2001. The Cathedral & the Bazaar: Musings on linux and open source by an accidental revolutionary. O'Reilly Media, Inc.

Ritter, P., 2016. Wer in Zürich am meisten motzt. Schweiz am Wochenende.

Schmidthuber, L., Hilgers, D., 2017. Unleashing Innovation beyond Organizational Boundaries: Exploring Citizensourcing Projects. International Journal of Public Administration 1–16. doi:10.1080/01900692.2016.1263656

SDA, 2016. Vor allem Beamte nutzen die Zürcher Nörgler-App. 20 Minuten.

Theile, C., 2016. "Züri wie neu" - Zürich hat seine eigene "Nörgler-App." Süddeutsche Zeitung.

APPENDIX 1: Factor analysis

```
lavaan (0.5-23.1097) converged normally after 102 iterations

                                                  Used       Total
  Number of observations                           351         400

  Number of missing patterns                        14

  Estimator                                         ML
  Minimum Function Test Statistic              239.916
  Degrees of freedom                                91
  P-value (Chi-square)                           0.000

Model test baseline model:

  Minimum Function Test Statistic             4801.992
  Degrees of freedom                               120
  P-value                                        0.000

User model versus baseline model:

  Comparative Fit Index (CFI)                    0.968
  Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)                       0.958

Loglikelihood and Information Criteria:

  Loglikelihood user model (H0)              -6377.586
  Loglikelihood unrestricted model (H1)      -6257.628

  Number of free parameters                         61
  Akaike (AIC)                               12877.172
  Bayesian (BIC)                             13112.680
  Sample-size adjusted Bayesian (BIC)        12919.165

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation:

  RMSEA                                          0.068
  90 Percent Confidence Interval          0.058  0.079
  P-value RMSEA <= 0.05                          0.002

Standardized Root Mean Square Residual:

  SRMR                                           0.043

Parameter Estimates:

  Information                                 Observed
  Standard Errors                             Standard

Latent Variables:
                   Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)   Std.lv  Std.all
  SQ =~
    SQ3               1.000                               0.989    0.892
    SQ5               0.932    0.054   17.328    0.000    0.922    0.881
    SQ2               0.880    0.061   14.433    0.000    0.870    0.771
    SQ1               0.862    0.059   14.513    0.000    0.853    0.787
    SQ4               0.760    0.055   13.780    0.000    0.751    0.720
  IQ =~
    IQ5               1.000                               0.875    0.872
    IQ4               0.998    0.055   18.113    0.000    0.873    0.803
    IQ1               0.913    0.062   14.746    0.000    0.799    0.718
    IQ3               0.880    0.054   16.338    0.000    0.769    0.746
    IQ2               0.764    0.052   14.655    0.000    0.668    0.703
  SvQ =~
    SvQ1              1.000                               1.327    0.939
    SvQ5              0.952    0.029   33.305    0.000    1.263    0.932
    SvQ3              0.855    0.030   28.284    0.000    1.134    0.895
  US =~
    US4               1.000                               1.277    0.928
    US2               0.889    0.035   25.369    0.000    1.135    0.875
    US1               0.856    0.038   22.254    0.000    1.092    0.834

Covariances:
                   Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)   Std.lv  Std.all
 .SQ2 ~~
```

```
   .SQ1               0.281    0.045    6.176    0.000    0.281    0.585
 .SQ5 ~~
   .SQ1              -0.039    0.026   -1.487    0.137   -0.039   -0.117
 .SQ3 ~~
   .SQ2              -0.019    0.028   -0.655    0.513   -0.019   -0.051
   .SQ5              -0.131    0.042   -3.128    0.002   -0.131   -0.525
 .IQ4 ~~
   .IQ1              -0.117    0.034   -3.428    0.001   -0.117   -0.233
 .SQ2 ~~
   .SQ4               0.215    0.042    5.110    0.000    0.215    0.413
 .SQ1 ~~
   .SQ4               0.180    0.040    4.557    0.000    0.180    0.373
  SQ ~~
    IQ                0.635    0.065    9.714    0.000    0.734    0.734
    SvQ               0.576    0.084    6.882    0.000    0.439    0.439
    US                0.595    0.083    7.168    0.000    0.471    0.471
  IQ ~~
    SvQ               0.579    0.077    7.505    0.000    0.498    0.498
    US                0.600    0.076    7.913    0.000    0.537    0.537
  SvQ ~~
    US                1.521    0.132   11.565    0.000    0.898    0.898

Intercepts:
                   Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)   Std.lv  Std.all
   .SQ3               5.891    0.059   99.341    0.000    5.891    5.312
   .SQ5               5.885    0.056  105.070    0.000    5.885    5.619
   .SQ2               5.883    0.060   97.508    0.000    5.883    5.211
   .SQ1               5.937    0.058  102.537    0.000    5.937    5.482
   .SQ4               6.152    0.056  110.339    0.000    6.152    5.897
   .IQ5               5.790    0.054  107.589    0.000    5.790    5.775
   .IQ4               5.728    0.058   98.153    0.000    5.728    5.269
   .IQ1               5.451    0.060   91.178    0.000    5.451    4.897
   .IQ3               5.836    0.055  105.336    0.000    5.836    5.656
   .IQ2               5.957    0.051  116.611    0.000    5.957    6.268
   .SvQ1              5.599    0.076   73.796    0.000    5.599    3.964
   .SvQ5              5.669    0.073   77.840    0.000    5.669    4.182
   .SvQ3              5.933    0.068   87.165    0.000    5.933    4.683
   .US4               5.768    0.074   78.093    0.000    5.768    4.193
   .US2               5.827    0.070   83.616    0.000    5.827    4.495
   .US1               5.825    0.070   82.807    0.000    5.825    4.449
    SQ                0.000                               0.000    0.000
    IQ                0.000                               0.000    0.000
    SvQ               0.000                               0.000    0.000
    US                0.000                               0.000    0.000

Variances:
                   Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)   Std.lv  Std.all
   .SQ3               0.251    0.054    4.682    0.000    0.251    0.204
   .SQ5               0.246    0.049    5.041    0.000    0.246    0.225
   .SQ2               0.517    0.057    9.118    0.000    0.517    0.406
   .SQ1               0.446    0.051    8.801    0.000    0.446    0.380
   .SQ4               0.524    0.047   11.243    0.000    0.524    0.481
   .IQ5               0.240    0.028    8.624    0.000    0.240    0.239
   .IQ4               0.420    0.041   10.180    0.000    0.420    0.355
   .IQ1               0.601    0.054   11.060    0.000    0.601    0.485
   .IQ3               0.473    0.041   11.471    0.000    0.473    0.444
   .IQ2               0.457    0.039   11.827    0.000    0.457    0.506
   .SvQ1              0.234    0.029    8.063    0.000    0.234    0.117
   .SvQ5              0.242    0.028    8.680    0.000    0.242    0.132
   .SvQ3              0.318    0.032    9.990    0.000    0.318    0.198
   .US4               0.262    0.036    7.369    0.000    0.262    0.139
   .US2               0.393    0.039   10.112    0.000    0.393    0.234
   .US1               0.521    0.048   10.859    0.000    0.521    0.304
    SQ                0.978    0.104    9.413    0.000    1.000    1.000
    IQ                0.765    0.077    9.960    0.000    1.000    1.000
    SvQ               1.761    0.152   11.575    0.000    1.000    1.000
    US                1.630    0.145   11.223    0.000    1.000    1.000
```

APPENDIX 2: Survey items of the IS success model

Nr.	Measures / Items
	System Quality
SQ1	"Züri wie neu" ist leicht zu bedienen
SQ2	ist benutzerfreundlich
SQ3	funktioniert so, wie ich es erwarte
SQ4	erlaubt es mir, einfach eine Meldung abzugeben
SQ5	verfügt über die notwendigen Funktionen
	Information Quality
IQ1	Die Kategorien bei "Züri wie neu" sind zutreffend
IQ2	Das Kartenmaterial von "Züri wie neu" ist aktuell
IQ3	Züri wie neu stellt mir alle notwendigen Informationen für eine Meldung zur Verfügung
IQ4	Die Informationen zur Anwendung von "Züri wie neu" sind fehlerfrei
IQ5	Die bereitgestellten Informationen auf "Züri wie neu" sind zuverlässig
	Service Quality
SvQ1	Die Antworten, die ich von "Züri wie neu" erhalte, gehen auf meine Bedürfnisse ein
SvQ2	Die Antworten auf "Züri wie neu" erfolgen rasch
SvQ3	Die Stadt Zürich nimmt meine Meldungen auf "Züri wie neu" ernst
SvQ4	"Züri wie neu" ist im Sinne der Bürgerinnen und Bürger entwickelt worden
SvQ5	Meine Meldungen auf "Züri wie neu" werden passend beantwortet
	User Satisfaction
US1	"Züri wie neu" erfüllt meine Erwartungen
US2	Dank "Züri wie neu" wird mein Anliegen effizient bearbeitet
US3	Dank "Züri wie neu" kann ich einfach den zuständigen Behörden eine Meldung abgeben
US4	Meine Meldungen auf "Züri wie neu" wurden zu meiner Zufriedenheit behandelt
US5	Ich würde "Züri wie neu" wiederverwenden