



# How Are the “E-municipality and Resident Register Card” Understood by the People?

Report of the questionnaire survey

March 17, 2003

The Japan Research Institute, Limited  
Center for the Strategy of Emergence

<Enquiries regarding this report should be address to the following>

The Japan Research Institute, Limited, Center for the Strategy of Emergence

Shigeru Takamura      Tel: (03) 3288-4187 E-mail: takamura@ird.jri.co.jp

Takehito Kuwabara      Tel: (03) 3288-4679 E-mail: kuwabara@ird.jri.co.jp

## **Purpose**

### **1. Purpose of the survey**

The Japan Research Institute, Limited (16 Ichibancho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo: President: Shunichi Okuyama) has conducted a questionnaire survey as a part of the activities of the “e-municipality forum” that is being hosted by the Japan Research Institute, Limited. The purposes of the survey are to verify the degree of recognition and expectation by a cross section of the people towards the “e- municipality” that is being promoted by each municipality and to understand the requirements from the people regarding the “resident register card” that is scheduled to be issued this summer as a part of the activities of the e-municipality.

The full-scale implementation of the service of the e-municipality that is being developed in conjunction with e-Japan of the Government will commence in 2003. Based on the previous activities of the e-municipality, the activities are summarized into two main categories.

One category involves promotion of improvement of the information foundation such as installation of networks in regions and the provision of personal computers to individual residents through the regional Intranet operation. The other category involves introduction of online processing for the existing public service procedures including the resident register card and the security certificate by using the Internet.

We feel that these activities are disposed towards procedural matters. We believe it is necessary to verify whether people’s requirements are reflected in the promotion of the e-municipality and also to verify gain the purpose of the introduction of the e-municipality before the commencement of the full-scale implementation.

Distribution of the “resident register card” is scheduled for this August, which allows slightly less than six months to the commencement date. However, the outline has not yet been understood thoroughly at this point. Therefore, the understanding of the perception of the people regarding the resident register card may assist in the examination of the future services provided that are to be provided using the resident register cards.

To obtain the necessary information, we conducted a questionnaire survey through the Internet. The following sections provide the report of the results, and our examination and suggestions.

### **2. Contents of the survey**

- (1) Degree of recognition of the e-municipality progress status
- (2) People’s requirements associated with the e-municipality
- (3) Combined functions suitable for the resident register card, and so on

### **3. Outline of the survey**

- (1) Implementation period: February 18, 2003 to February 28, 2003
- (2) Implementation method: WEB entry method using the Internet
- (3) Target: People generally

- (4) Number of valid answers: 216
- (5) Gender ratio: Male 60%, Female 40%
- (6) Ratio by age group: 10's: 5%, 20's: 31%, 30's: 31%,  
40's: 20%, 50's: 11%, 60's: 2%

#### **4. Outline of the result of the survey**

**(1) 70% of the people do not thoroughly understand the present situation of the e-municipality.**

The degrees of recognition of the respondents regarding the e-municipal activities in their municipalities are: “hardly aware”: 37% and “do not know very much”: 31%.

**(2) Most of the people who do not know the e-municipality very much “do not know where the information is kept”**

Answers of those who “do not know very much the implementation of the e-municipality” in the previous question are: “do not know from where the information can be obtained”: 55% and “not interested”: 21%.

**(3) The e-municipality is considered to be effective for “e-application, e-notice, and e-declaration” and “e-voting”.**

The e-municipality is considered to be effective for “e-application, e-notice, and e-declaration”: 67%, “e-voting”: 47%, and information public release by “portal site”: 41%.

**(4) The e-municipality is considered to be ineffective for “e-bidding”, “e-procurement”, and “local IC card”**

The e-municipality is considered to be ineffective for “e-bidding”: 49%, “e-procurement”: 37%, and “local IC card”: 34%.

**(5) The people are apprehensive about “management of personal information” and “network security”.**

“Management of personal information”: 52%, “Network security”: 33%, and “No special concern”: 6%

**(6) The resident register card is considered to be effective by combining with “Medical Card” and “Library Card”.**

The resident card is considered to be effective if it is combined with “Medical information function”: 42% and “Library card function”: 31%.

**(7) The resident register card should not be combined with the “Credit card” function and the “e-money” function.**

The resident register card should not be combined with the “Credit card function”: 61% and “e-money function”: 36%.

**(8) The people wish to “have the initiative” for selecting the functions that can be added to the resident register card.**

The beneficiary of the resident register card should be able to decide the method of adding new functions regardless of whether the service is provided from a public sector or a private sector”: 50%.

**(9) About a half of the respondents are prepared to bear a proportion of the cost of issuing the resident register card.**

A proportion of the cost of issuing the resident register card can be borne by the beneficiary: “Must be free”: 34% and “Cannot decide until the details of the service are clarified”: 18%

## **5. Suggestions regarding promotion of the e-municipality/resident register card**

- (1) Since the people do not thoroughly understand the details and the progress status of the e-municipality, it is useful to create opportunities to familiarize themselves with the system of the e-municipality and the priorities. In this case, various media should be used for distribution of information such as public relations paper and homepages.
- (2) Since the people tend to feel the e-municipality policies useful if they are familiar with the policies and can understand them easily. Therefore, the more active promotion is necessary to appeal the effectiveness of e-bidding and e-procurement that are currently being promoted by many municipalities.
- (3) Since privacy protection and security are indicated as the major concern regarding the e-municipality, it is desirable to take the necessary measures for preventing human errors independent of the system in each municipality such as training, and establishment of security policies.
- (4) Medical and library functions were suggested as the functions that can be added to the resident register card. Since there are hardly any problems involved in the addition of such functions, it is useful to develop the service that meets the requirements of the people by starting the addition of these functions.
- (5) It is necessary to present the services that are available in order to request the beneficiary to bear a part of the cost for issuing the resident register card. For multifunctionality, flexible concepts can be incorporated such as using IC chip or printing a bar code on the card.