

# Good Governance, Citizen Charters, The Right to Information, And Public Service Delivery in India in The Global Perspective

Dr. T. Anuradha

*Associate Professor in Commerce*

*St. Ann's College for Women (Autonomous) Mehdiapatnam Hyderabad Telangana*

**Abstract**—The relationship between the citizen and the administrative state has undergone a significant conceptual shift over the last three decades. Where citizens were once treated primarily as subjects of administrative action, contemporary governance theory positions them as rights-holders to whom the administration owes enforceable duties of transparency, responsiveness, and timely service. This shift is “good governance”: a framework built on accountability, transparency, participation, rule of law, and responsiveness, which has moved from being an aspirational ideal in development discourse to a set of concrete administrative instruments in many jurisdictions. Good governance rests on a reciprocal relationship between the rights citizens hold against the state and the responsibilities the administrative machinery owes in return. This paper examines whether the Citizen's Charters and the Right to Information (RTI) Act, 2005 in India has improved public service delivery. The paper draws on a structured literature review of Indian administrative reform documents, state-level Right to Service legislation, and comparative experience from across the world. The paper develops and examines two hypotheses: First, that citizen charters and RTI mechanisms are positively associated with improvements in the service delivery outcomes in India; and second, that this association depends on enforceability, grievance redressal capacity, and citizen awareness rather than on the mere existence of a charter. The analysis synthesises secondary data, including national awareness surveys, grievance-redressal statistics, and state Right to Service Act outcomes. Findings suggest that citizen charters in India have functioned merely as declaratory statements of intent than as enforceable guarantees, with gaps in awareness, weak grievance mechanisms, and limited legal backing,

diluting their impact. Comparatively jurisdictions that combined charters with statutory service guarantees, time-bound delivery and independent working recorded better outcomes. The paper concludes with suggestions for converging India's citizen charter framework with its Right to Service Acts and RTI architecture while integrating it with e-governance platforms. This would deliver stronger grievance redressal design, as seen in the international experience.

**Index Terms**—good governance, citizen rights, administrative accountability, Citizen's Charter, Right to Information, public service delivery, India

## I. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between the citizen and the administrative state has undergone a significant conceptual shift over the past three decades. Where citizens were once treated primarily as subjects of administrative action, while contemporary governance theory positions them as rights-holders to whom the administration owes enforceable duties of transparency, responsiveness, and timely service. This shift is of “good governance”, a framework built on accountability, transparency, participation, rule of law, and responsiveness, which moved from an aspirational ideal in the discourse of development to a set of concrete administrative instruments in many jurisdictions across the globe. In India, this shift has been primarily been pursued through two instruments: the Citizen's Charter, first adopted nationally in 1997 following the Conference of Chief Ministers' Action Plan for Effective and Responsive Government<sup>1</sup>, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG), Citizen's Charters in India:

Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation, Government of India.

the Right to Information Act, 2005, which converted access to government-held information into a justiciable right<sup>2</sup>. A third aspect is the state-level Right to Service or Service Guarantee Acts, beginning with Madhya Pradesh in 2010 and subsequently adopted by Bihar, Karnataka (through the Sakala scheme), Rajasthan, Punjab, and several other states, which has “attempted to convert the voluntary commitments of citizen charters into legally enforceable, time-bound obligations”<sup>3</sup>.

Despite three decades of implementation, assessments of the Citizen's Charter framework in India have been persistently critical in lack of accountability and transparency. Government led commissioned reviews, including reports prepared for the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG), have repeatedly found little evidence that charters translated the spirit of its existence into measurably improved, accountable, and responsive administration on the ground<sup>4</sup>.

This gap between administrative intent and citizen experience forms the central problem that this paper addresses. Under what conditions do rights-based governance instruments actually improve service delivery? and what can India learn from comparable experiments abroad?

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

India's citizen-facing governance reforms have proliferated in form to be recognised as charters, helplines, portals, grievance cells, service guarantee Acts, however without a settled understanding of which design features actually improve delivery. Charters exist only as documents posted on office notice boards or websites, without enforceability, citizen awareness, or grievance redressal capacity, risk becoming merely a symbolic compliance rather than a deliverable reform.

This paper investigates the conditions under which, charters and information rights genuinely improve delivery, rather than treating them merely as a case for good governance.

### 1.2 Objectives of the Study

- To review the evolution of Citizen's Charters and Right to Information frameworks in India and abroad.
- To examine the theoretical linkage and outcomes between the citizen rights, administrative accountability, and service delivery.
- To test the association between charter and the RTI mechanisms and service delivery improvement using available secondary data evidence.
- To identify design features for enforceability, awareness, grievance redressal that moderate this association.
- To draw comparative lessons from global experience and propose suggestions for strengthening India's framework to deliver good governance

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Conceptual Foundations: Good Governance and the Rights–Responsibility Framework

The good governance paradigm, as popularised by multilateral institutions from the early 1990s, identifies accountability, transparency, rule of law, participation, and responsiveness as its central pillars. Public administration scholarship situates citizen charters and information rights within the broader New Public Management (NPM) movement, which sought to recast citizens as “customers” of public services entitled to defined standards, redress, and choice. Comparative research on service charter initiatives in the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia three core members of the NPM policy community, alongside Canada and New Zealand shows that while all three adopted charter-style instruments in the early-to-mid 1990s, their design diverged sharply: the UK's Citizen's Charter combined published standards with compensation and complaints mechanisms, the US approach emphasised customer service plans within agencies, and Australia's Government Service Charters were embedded in broader public sector reform<sup>5</sup>. This

<sup>2</sup>The Right to Information Act, 2005 (Act No. 22 of 2005), Government of India.

<sup>3</sup>Government of Madhya Pradesh, The Madhya Pradesh Lok Sewaon Ke Pradan Ki Guarantee Adhiniyam (Right to Service Act), 2010; Government

of Karnataka, The Karnataka Guarantee of Services to Citizens Act (Sakala), 2011.

<sup>4</sup>Supra note 1.

<sup>5</sup>R. Common, “The New Public Management and Policy Transfer: The Role of International

divergence in design, rather than the label “charter” itself, is identified in the literature as the key determinant of effectiveness.

## 2.2 The Citizen's Charter: Origins and Global Diffusion

The Citizen's Charter concept originated in the United Kingdom in 1991 as part of the Major government's administrative reform programme, built around six founding principles: setting standards of service, ensuring information and openness, offering consultation and choice, guaranteeing courtesy and helpfulness, providing mechanisms to rectify mistakes, and delivering value for money<sup>6</sup>. Following the UK's initiative, charter-based reforms diffused to a wide range of jurisdictions, including France, South Africa, and numerous Commonwealth and developing countries, each adapting the model to local administrative culture. Comparative reviews of this global diffusion note recurring successes greater procedural clarity and publicised standards alongside recurring shortcomings, particularly weak enforcement and limited citizen awareness, across very different administrative systems<sup>7</sup>.

## 2.3 The Indian Experience with Citizen's Charters

India formally adopted the Citizen's Charter model in 1997, with Department of Administration Reforms and Public Grievance DARPG as the nodal coordinating agency<sup>8</sup>. Over the subsequent decades, several hundred charters were formulated across central ministries, state departments, and public sector undertakings. However, independent and government-commissioned assessments converge on a critical finding: charter adoption did not translate into the delivery of more effective, accountable, or responsive administration. A review prepared for DARPG documented that several ministries continued to operate outdated charters that neither reflected current departmental structure nor communicated genuine

service commitments, undermining the credibility of the instrument<sup>9</sup>. Scholarly literature identifies recurring structural weaknesses in India's charter framework: inadequate infrastructure and technological capacity to support committed service standards; poor inter-departmental coordination; low public awareness of charter provisions; a communication gap between service providers and citizens; and a top-down drafting process conducted with minimal citizen consultation, contrary to the participatory principle the charter model is meant to embody.

Empirical awareness data reinforces these structural critiques. A 2018 study by the National Council of Applied Economic Research found that only 38 per cent of Indian citizens were aware that Citizen's Charters existed, let alone of their specific service-standard content<sup>10</sup> a finding that, on its own, substantially explains why a document-based instrument would fail to alter citizen expectations or administrative behaviour at scale. At the same time, grievance redressal infrastructure has expanded considerably: 2022 data from the Public Grievance Redressal Analysis portal recorded over sixty lakh public grievances received and redressed nationally<sup>11</sup>, indicating that the demand-side appetite for a functioning complaints mechanism is substantial even where charter awareness is low.

## 2.4 From Voluntary Charters to Statutory Right to Service Acts

Recognising the non-justiciable, voluntary character of Citizen's Charters as a central weakness, several Indian states enacted Right to Service or Public Service Guarantee legislation beginning with Madhya Pradesh in 2010, followed by Bihar, Karnataka, Rajasthan, Delhi, Punjab, and others<sup>12</sup>. Unlike a charter, which is a unilateral statement of administrative intent, a Right to Service Act creates a legally enforceable obligation to deliver specified

---

Organisations,” in *Beyond the New Public Management* (Minogue, Polidano & Hulme eds., 1998); “Service Charters: Global Convergence or National Divergence? A Comparison of Initiatives in Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States,” *Public Management Review*, 3(4) (2001).

<sup>6</sup>M. Paliwal, *Citizens' Charter and Public Services: Global Overview and Analysis*.

<sup>7</sup>Supra note 6.

<sup>8</sup>Supra note 1.

<sup>9</sup>Supra note 1.

<sup>10</sup>National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER), *Citizen Awareness Study on Citizen's Charters* (2018).

<sup>11</sup>Public Grievance Redressal Analysis (PGRA) Portal, *Annual Grievance Statistics*, Government of India (2022).

<sup>12</sup>Supra note 3.

services within defined timelines, backed by penalties for designated officers on default and a statutory appellate mechanism for citizens. Karnataka's Sakala scheme is frequently cited in the literature as a comparatively successful example of this model, combining time-bound guarantees with an accessible online tracking and escalation system<sup>13</sup>. Comparative research distinguishes sharply between the charter and the statutory guarantee: the former is described as a statement of commitment, the latter as a legal mandate a distinction the literature treats as decisive for explaining variation in outcomes across Indian states<sup>14</sup>.

## 2.5 The Right to Information Act, 2005, as a Complementary Accountability Mechanism

The RTI Act, 2005, is widely treated in the literature as India's most significant rights-based governance reform, converting access to government-held information from an administrative courtesy into a justiciable right enforceable through a statutory appellate and penalty structure<sup>15</sup>. Because charter commitments are frequently narrower than the full range of information an administration holds, civil society bodies such as the National Campaign for People's Right to Information have recommended that provisions safeguarding proactive disclosure under Section 4 of the RTI Act be more tightly integrated with citizen charter obligations, so that any failure of proactive disclosure is itself treated as an actionable grievance rather than a separate, weaker compliance requirement<sup>16</sup>. This literature frames RTI not as a substitute for citizen charters but as the transparency backbone that gives charter commitments their evidentiary teeth: information rights allow citizens to verify whether service standards were actually met.

## 2.6 Comparative International Experience

Beyond the UK's founding model, comparative public administration research offers several instructive contrasts relevant to India's reform trajectory. South

Korea's civil service reforms are repeatedly cited in comparative governance literature as an example of how systematic performance evaluation rather than the mere publication of standards drives measurable improvement in service delivery, because evaluation creates a continuous feedback loop between citizen experience and administrative performance. Singapore's experience is associated in this literature with sustained investment in administrative capability as a precondition for service commitments to be credible, while Canada's civil service reforms are linked to mechanisms of behavioural accountability embedded within agency culture rather than imposed solely through external audit<sup>17</sup>. Brazil and South Africa, both cited in global reviews of charter diffusion, illustrate the risks of adopting charter language without matching investment in grievance infrastructure, producing outcomes similar to India's own experience of declaratory commitments with limited enforcement capacity<sup>18</sup>. Taken together, this comparative literature suggests that the single most consistent predictor of a charter-type instrument's success is not its textual ambition but the strength of the accountability infrastructure evaluation, enforcement, and grievance redressal built around it.

## 2.7 Research Gap

While there is extensive descriptive literature available on Citizen's Charters in India and the considerable comparative work on charter diffusion internationally, however, relatively few studies directly test the association between the presence of enforceable, well-publicised service commitments and measurable delivery outcomes within a unified rights-and-responsibilities framework that incorporates RTI as an accountability and delivery mechanism. This paper addresses that gap by examining the available secondary evidence against two explicit hypotheses, rather than treating charter adoption as self-evidently improvement governance transparency and accountability.

<sup>13</sup>Observer Research Foundation, India's Shifting Governance Structure: From Charter of Promises to Service Guarantee (2024).

<sup>14</sup>Supra note 13.

<sup>15</sup>Supra note 2.

<sup>16</sup>National Campaign for People's Right to Information (NCPRI), Recommendations on Codification of Section 4, RTI Act.

<sup>17</sup>Global Government Forum, International Approaches to Civil Service Performance: Lessons from Australia, Canada, Singapore, South Korea, and the OECD (2026).

<sup>18</sup>Supra note 6.

### III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This paper adopts a rights-responsibility reciprocal framework, in which citizen rights for information, service standards and grievance redress that match against corresponding administrative responsibilities of disclosure, timely delivery, accountability for default.

The framework draws on three theoretical aspects

1. New Public Management theory, which explains the shift toward treating citizens as rights-bearing service recipients;
2. principal-agent theory, which frames citizens as principals who require monitoring and enforcement mechanisms to discipline administrative agents.
3. Procedural justice theory, which suggests that citizen satisfaction with governance depends not only on outcomes but on the fairness, transparency, and predictability of the process through which services are delivered.

Within this framework, a Citizen's Charter or RTI provision is not, by itself, a guarantee of improved delivery; it is merely an input whose effect is conditioned by three moderating variables identified

enforceability, citizen awareness, and grievance redressal capacity.

### IV. HYPOTHESES

Based on the literature review and theoretical framework, the following hypotheses are formulated for examination:

H1: (Direct Association) Citizen Charters and RTI mechanisms are positively associated with improvements in public service delivery outcomes in India.

H2: (Moderate Association) The strength of this association is moderated by enforceability, grievance redressal capacity, and citizen awareness such that statutory Right to Service Acts, which embed all three, produce significantly better delivery outcomes than voluntary, non-justiciable Citizen's Charters alone.

H0 (No Association: corresponding to H1): There is no significant association between the presence of a Citizen's Charter or RTI mechanism and improvements in service delivery outcomes.

| Hypothesis | Independent Variables              | Moderating Variables                                  | Dependent Variable               | Expected Outcome                                                             |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H1         | Citizen's Charters, RTI Mechanisms | None specified                                        | Public service delivery outcomes | Positive improvement in delivery outcomes.                                   |
| H2         | Citizen's Charters, RTI Mechanisms | Enforceability, Grievance capacity, Citizen awareness | Public service delivery outcomes | Significantly stronger improvements when transitioned to statutory RTS Acts. |
| H0         | Citizen's Charters, RTI Mechanisms | N/A                                                   | Public service delivery outcomes |                                                                              |

### V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 5.1 Research Design

This study adopts a doctrinal-cum-analytical research design based on secondary sources. Given the objective of drawing lessons across a wide range of jurisdictions and evaluating outcomes over a multi-decade reform period, a secondary-data literature synthesis is methodologically more appropriate than a single-site primary survey, which would not capture the cross-jurisdictional variation central to the research questions. The paper undertakes a structured, qualitative-comparative form of hypothesis

examination: it identifies jurisdictions and Indian states where the moderating variables (enforceability, awareness, grievance redressal) are present or absent to varying degrees, and evaluates whether documented delivery outcomes vary in the direction predicted by H1 and H2.

#### 5.2 Sources of Data

- Government and quasi-government reports: DARPG-commissioned reviews of Citizen's Charter implementation; Public Grievance Redressal Analysis portal data.

- Statutory texts: the Right to Information Act, 2005; state Right to Service/Public Service Guarantee Acts (Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Rajasthan, and others).
- National survey data: the National Council of Applied Economic Research's citizen awareness study.
- Peer-reviewed and working-paper literature on charter implementation in India and comparator jurisdictions, including comparative NPM studies of the UK, US, and Australia.
- Institutional and policy-research publications, including think-tank analyses of India's governance-reform trajectory.

### 5.3 Method of Analysis

The analysis proceeds by constructing a comparative matrix of cases along the three moderating variables identified in the theoretical framework, and by cross-referencing documented delivery outcomes grievance redressal volumes and resolution, awareness levels, and independent assessments of service timeliness against the presence or absence of enforceability.

This qualitative-comparative approach is appropriate to the nature of the available evidence, which is largely descriptive and survey-based rather than amenable to a single quantitative regression across comparable units; it nonetheless allows the hypotheses to be examined systematically rather than impressionistically.

### 5.4 Limitations

As a secondary-source, comparative-qualitative study, this paper does not generate new primary survey or field data, and its conclusions are accordingly bounded by the scope, currency, and comparability of the secondary evidence reviewed.

Cross-country comparisons are also complicated by differences in administrative federalism, fiscal capacity, and civil service structure, which the paper treats as contextual qualifications rather than as fully controlled variables.

<sup>19</sup>Supra note 11.

<sup>20</sup>Supra note 1.

<sup>21</sup>Supra note 10.

## VI. HYPOTHESIS TESTING AND ANALYSIS

### 6.1 Testing H1: Association Between Rights Instruments and Delivery Outcomes

The evidence reviewed offers mixed but instructive support for H1. On one hand, the sheer scale of engagement with grievance redressal infrastructure over sixty lakh grievances received and redressed nationally in a single reported year<sup>19</sup> indicates that where a channel for enforcing rights exists, citizens use it at significant scale, consistent with the reciprocity framework's prediction that rights instruments generate accountability pressure. On the other hand, DARPG's own commissioned review found little evidence that charter adoption, by itself, produced more effective, accountable, or responsive administration<sup>20</sup>, and independent awareness data showing only 38 per cent public awareness of charters<sup>21</sup> suggests that a substantial share of the citizen population cannot exercise the rights charters purport to grant, because they do not know the rights exist. This pattern is consistent with a qualified, rather than unconditional, acceptance of H1: rights instruments are associated with improved delivery only where the accompanying institutional and informational conditions allow citizens to actually invoke them precisely the moderation predicted by H2.

### 6.2 Testing H2: The Moderating Role of Enforceability, Awareness, and Grievance Redressal

The comparative evidence lends stronger and more consistent support to H2. Within India, the shift from voluntary Citizen's Charters to statutory Right to Service Acts represents a natural, real-world variation in enforceability: charters carry no legal sanction for non-delivery, while Right to Service Acts, beginning with Madhya Pradesh in 2010, impose penalties on defaulting officers and provide statutory appeal<sup>22</sup>. Karnataka's Sakala scheme, which combines a legal service guarantee with an accessible digital tracking and escalation mechanism, is consistently cited in the literature as outperforming charter-only jurisdictions on citizen-reported timeliness<sup>23</sup> directly illustrating the enforceability-and-grievance-redressal pathway

<sup>22</sup>Supra note 3.

<sup>23</sup>Supra note 13.

predicted by the theoretical framework. Internationally, South Korea's evaluation-driven civil service model, in which continuous performance assessment feeds back into administrative practice, is associated with stronger delivery outcomes than charter regimes that publish standards without a comparable evaluation or enforcement loop<sup>24</sup>, again consistent with H2. Conversely, jurisdictions that adopted charter language without matching investment in grievance infrastructure a pattern noted in comparative reviews of charter diffusion to contexts such as Brazil and South Africa, mirroring DARPG's own findings for India<sup>25</sup> did not show the delivery

improvements that charter adoption alone might have predicted. A related municipal-level case study from Nepal similarly found that while procedural transparency and timely delivery improved after charter implementation, the grievance-handling system remained weak, again underscoring grievance redressal capacity as the binding constraint<sup>26</sup>. The overall pattern across these cases supports H2: the presence of a rights instrument matters less than whether it is legally enforceable, well known to citizens, and backed by a functioning complaint-and-redress mechanism.

### 6.3 Summary of Hypothesis Testing

| Moderating condition                                 | Illustrative case                                  | Reported delivery outcome                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Voluntary charter, low enforceability, low awareness | Central and state Citizen's Charters pre-2010      | Limited evidence of improved delivery; DARPG review critical |
| Statutory guarantee, digital tracking                | Karnataka Sakala scheme                            | Cited as comparatively strong on timeliness                  |
| Continuous evaluation and feedback                   | South Korea civil service reform                   | Associated with improved delivery in comparative literature  |
| Charter adopted, weak grievance infrastructure       | Brazil, South Africa (comparative charter reviews) | Outcomes similar to India's own charter shortfalls           |

## VII. DISCUSSION

The pattern emerging from this analysis reframes the policy question. The relevant debate is not whether India should have citizen charters or RTI-style transparency instruments the reciprocity framework and the comparative evidence both support their continuation but whether India's specific design choices supply the three conditions the evidence identifies as decisive: legal enforceability, citizen awareness, and functioning grievance redress. On enforceability, India's own internal variation between voluntary charters and statutory Right to Service Acts offers a natural experiment whose results favour statutory design, echoing the UK's original charter model, which paired standards with a compensation and complaints structure rather than standards alone.

On awareness, the 38 per cent awareness finding is arguably the single most consequential data point reviewed in this paper<sup>27</sup>: no accountability instrument, however well designed on paper, can discipline administrative behaviour if the citizens it is meant to empower do not know it exists. This suggests that India's e-governance investments Digital India, unified grievance portals, and state-level service-tracking applications such as Sakala are not merely delivery-channel upgrades but potentially the most direct lever available for closing the awareness gap, provided they are actively publicised rather than passively hosted.

On grievance redressal, the scale of engagement with the Public Grievance Redressal Analysis portal indicates latent citizen demand for accountability mechanisms that substantially exceeds current charter awareness levels<sup>28</sup>, suggesting that citizens are more

<sup>24</sup>Supra note 17.

<sup>25</sup>Supra note 6.

<sup>26</sup>S. Kaphle, "Citizen Charter as a Governance Reform Initiative for Quality Services," *Productive Discourse*, 2(1), 13–24 (2024).

<sup>27</sup>Supra note 10.

<sup>28</sup>Supra note 11.

responsive to a visible complaints channel than to a charter document itself. This points toward integrating charter commitments directly into grievance-portal architecture so that a missed service-delivery timeline automatically generates a trackable grievance rather than treating the charter and the grievance system as parallel, loosely connected instruments, which is broadly how they have evolved to date.

Comparative experience reinforces this reading. South Korea's evaluation-centred model suggests that institutionalising continuous feedback from citizens to administrators, rather than a one-time publication of standards, is what converts a charter from a static document into a live accountability mechanism<sup>29</sup>. Conversely, the charter-diffusion literature's account of Brazil and South Africa cautions against treating the adoption of charter language as self-executing reform: without matching investment in enforcement and redress capacity, a charter risks becoming, as India's own DARPG review found, a document that neither reflects current administrative structure nor communicates a credible commitment<sup>30</sup>.

### VIII. FINDINGS

- Citizen Charters in India have functioned predominantly as declaratory statements of administrative intent rather than as enforceable guarantees, limiting their independent effect on service delivery a finding that qualifies rather than rejects H1.
- Low public awareness of charter provisions (found to be around 38 per cent nationally) is a first-order constraint on charter effectiveness, independent of the quality of the charter's content.
- Statutory Right to Service Acts, which add enforceability and penalties for default to the charter model, are associated with comparatively stronger citizen-reported delivery outcomes than voluntary charters, supporting H2.
- Digital tracking and escalation infrastructure, as seen in Karnataka's Sakala scheme, appears to strengthen both awareness and grievance redressal simultaneously, functioning as a force-multiplier for statutory guarantees.

<sup>29</sup>Supra note 17.

- The RTI Act, 2005, functions as a complementary accountability backbone that allows citizens to verify service performance, but its integration with charter and Right to Service obligations remains incomplete in current design.
- International experience confirms that the design of accountability infrastructure around a charter evaluation system, enforcement, redress channels is a more consistent predictor of success than the mere adoption of a charter, across very different administrative and political systems.
- India's high volume of grievance-portal engagement indicates strong latent citizen demand for accountability mechanisms, suggesting that the constraint on effective governance lies more in institutional design than in citizen apathy.

### IX. CONCLUSION

This paper set out to examine whether India's principal rights-based governance instruments the Citizen's Charter and the Right to Information Act have improved public service delivery, and under what conditions. The evidence reviewed supports a qualified rather than unconditional affirmation of this proposition: rights instruments matter, but their effect on delivery is substantially mediated by enforceability, citizen awareness, and the strength of grievance redressal infrastructure. Where India has moved from voluntary charters toward statutory Right to Service guarantees backed by digital tracking, as in Karnataka, outcomes have been comparatively stronger; where charters remain unenforceable, outdated, and poorly publicised, as DARPG's own review documented, they have not delivered the accountable and responsive administration they were designed to produce. Comparative international experience, from the UK's original compensation-backed charter to South Korea's evaluation-driven civil service, reinforces the same conclusion: good governance is produced not by the existence of rights-based instruments in the abstract, but by the institutional architecture built to make those rights actionable. Duty to deliver, in other words, must be legally and administratively engineered it does not follow automatically from the publication of a right.

<sup>30</sup>Supra note 1.

## X. SUGGESTIONS

### 10.1 Convert Citizen's Charters into Statutory Commitments

Central ministries and remaining states should be encouraged to codify their Citizen's Charters within Right to Service Act-type legislation, following the Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka precedents, so that service standards carry legal consequences for non-delivery rather than remaining voluntary commitments.

### 10.2 Integrate Charters with RTI Section 4 Proactive Disclosure

As recommended by civil society advocacy on RTI reform, charter commitments should be treated as a subset of an authority's Section 4 proactive-disclosure obligations under the RTI Act, so that a documented failure to meet a published service standard is automatically actionable as an information-rights grievance, not merely a customer-service complaint.

### 10.3 Close the Awareness Gap Through Active, Not Passive, Publicity

Given that awareness, not charter content, is the binding constraint identified in national survey data, charter and Right to Service provisions should be actively pushed to citizens at the point of service delivery via SMS, app notifications, and physical signage at service counters rather than relying on passive publication on departmental websites and notice boards.

### 10.4 Build Evaluation Loops on the South Korean Model

India's administrative reform agencies should institutionalise periodic, independent performance evaluation of service delivery against charter and Right to Service standards, feeding results back into departmental performance appraisal, rather than treating charter publication as a one-time compliance exercise.

### 10.5 Unify Grievance Redressal Architecture

The scale of engagement with the Public Grievance Redressal Analysis portal suggests it should become the single, unified front-end through which charter timelines, Right to Service guarantees, and RTI applications are all tracked, replacing today's

fragmented landscape of parallel departmental portals and reducing the administrative and cognitive burden on citizens seeking redress.

### 10.6 Institutionalise Citizen Consultation in Charter Drafting

Consistent with both the original UK model's consultation principle and the participatory pillar of good governance, charter revision cycles should include structured citizen and civil-society consultation rather than the largely top-down drafting process identified in the literature as a persistent weakness of India's charter framework.

### 10.7 Learn Selectively from Comparative Experience

Rather than importing any single foreign model wholesale, India's reform agencies should draw selectively on complementary international strengths: the UK's compensation-linked complaint mechanism, South Korea's evaluation-driven feedback loop, and Singapore's sustained investment in administrative capability, while avoiding the declaratory-charter-without-infrastructure pattern documented in Brazil and South Africa.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG), *Citizen's Charters in India: Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation*. Government of India.
- [2] Government of Madhya Pradesh, *The Madhya Pradesh Lok Sewaon Ke Pradan Ki Guarantee Adhiniyam (Right to Service Act)*, 2010.
- [3] Government of Karnataka, *The Karnataka Guarantee of Services to Citizens Act (Sakala)*, 2011.
- [4] National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER), *Citizen Awareness Study on Citizen's Charters*. New Delhi, India: NCAER, 2018.
- [5] Observer Research Foundation, *India's Shifting Governance Structure: From Charter of Promises to Service Guarantee*, 2024.
- [6] Public Grievance Redressal Analysis (PGRA) Portal, *Annual Grievance Statistics*. Government of India, 2022.
- [7] *Right to Information Act, 2005*, Act No. 22 of 2005, Government of India.

- [8] National Campaign for People's Right to Information (NCPRI), *Recommendations on Codification of Section 4, RTI Act*.
- [9] R. Common, "The new public management and policy transfer: The role of international organisations," in *Beyond the New Public Management*, R. Minogue, C. Polidano, and D. Hulme, Eds., 1998.
- [10] "Comparative study of service charter initiatives in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States," *Public Management Review*, vol. 3, no. 4.
- [11] S. Kaphle, "Citizen charter as a governance reform initiative for quality services," *Productive Discourse*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 13–24, 2024.
- [12] Global Government Forum, *International Approaches to Civil Service Performance: Lessons from Australia, Canada, Singapore, South Korea, and the OECD*, 2026.
- [13] M. Paliwal, *Citizens' Charter and Public Services: Global Overview and Analysis*.
- [14] "Citizen's charter awareness and service delivery: A study of the District Administrative Office, Morang," *Journal of Knowledge and Innovation*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 50–57, 2024.