

# Research on the Construction of Public Management Standardization Capacity for Service-Oriented Government

---

Dawei Jiang<sup>1</sup>

1.Institute of Applied Sciences Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia, 11000

Author's email: Dawei Jiang,wibbus@163.com

\*Corresponding to: Dawei Jiang, Institute of Applied Sciences Belgrade, Serbia, 11000 , wibbus@163.com

## Abstract

With the rapid development of social economy and the increasing diversification and personalization of people's needs, building a service-oriented government has become a key strategic direction for China to deepen administrative system reform and promote the modernization of the national governance system and governance capacity. The core of a service-oriented government is to be guided by public needs, strengthen public service functions, and improve the transparency, fairness and efficiency of government services. As an important cornerstone for promoting the construction of a service-oriented government, the construction of public management standardization capabilities is not only related to the standardization of government service processes, the optimization of resource allocation, and the improvement of service quality, but also an important way to enhance the public's satisfaction, trust and participation in government services. This article deeply analyzes the connotation, current situation, problems and improvement strategies of public management standardization capabilities under the framework of a service-oriented government, aiming to provide theoretical support and practical guidance for the construction of a service-oriented government.

**Keywords:** Service-Oriented Government, Public Management, Standardization, Capacity Building, Governance Modernization

---

## Competing Interests:

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## **1.Introduction**

In recent years, my country has been undergoing a critical period of profound transformation in government functions. Emphasizing a "people-centered" development philosophy, China is committed to building a more open, transparent, and efficient service-oriented government. The development of a service-oriented government is not only a comprehensive overhaul of the traditional government management model, but also a key initiative to respond to public needs, improve government effectiveness, and enhance government credibility. Against this backdrop, standardization of public management has become a crucial tool for achieving modern government governance. By establishing a unified, scientific, and operational standards system, the government can more effectively standardize service processes, optimize resource allocation, and improve service quality, thereby better meeting the diverse and personalized needs of the public and enhancing public satisfaction with and trust in government services. Therefore, strengthening public management standardization capacity is not only an inherent requirement for improving government governance effectiveness but also a key path to further developing the service-oriented government.

## **2.Theoretical Relationship between Service-Oriented Government and Public Administration Standardization**

The essence of a service-oriented government is to prioritize citizen needs and provide efficient, convenient, and fair public services through institutional innovation and process optimization. Its core characteristics include service orientation, legal regulation, transparency, timely response, and performance orientation. Standardization, as a systematic management tool, emphasizes the development and implementation of unified standards to achieve controllable processes, measurable results, and assessable quality. The two concepts align closely with each other in terms of both philosophy and objectives. First, standardization helps standardize service processes. By establishing lists of service items, service process standards, and service timelines, it reduces human intervention and discretion, ensuring fair and consistent service delivery. Second, standardization promotes information sharing and cross-departmental collaboration. In the context of "Internet + Government Services," unified data, interface, and platform standards are the technical foundation for achieving "one-stop

service" and "cross-provincial service." Third, standardization provides a quantitative basis for performance evaluation, facilitates the establishment of a scientific government service evaluation system, and promotes continuous service improvement. Therefore, public management standardization is not only a technical tool but also a concrete manifestation of the governance philosophy of a service-oriented government.

### **3. The Importance of Public Management Standardization Capacity Building to a Service-Oriented Government**

#### **3.1 Improving the quality of public services**

The construction of public management standardization capacity builds a solid "baseline" for the quality of public services and eliminates the arbitrariness of service provision by refining standards. In the field of education, standardization can cover core links such as "curriculum setting, teaching time, and teacher allocation". For example, the compulsory education standardization rules formulated by a certain province require rural schools and urban schools to use the same textbook version and offer the same number of art courses per week, which reduces the gap in urban and rural educational resources by 15%. In medical services, standardization not only standardizes the diagnostic process (such as patients with chronic diseases need to be reviewed every 3 months), but also clarifies the use of drugs (such as antibiotic prescriptions need to be marked with allergy history verification results). A county-level hospital has reduced the misdiagnosis rate by 20% by implementing standardized diagnosis and treatment <sup>[1]</sup>. Standardization in the field of social security further highlights the value of equalization. For example, the standard for inter-regional transfer of pension insurance is clearly stated as "completed within 45 working days", which avoids people from traveling back and forth; the low-income security recognition reduces subjective judgment through the "family income accounting standard", so that people in remote areas can also enjoy policy benefits fairly, and truly realize "standards in front of, service homogeneity".

#### **3.2 Enhance government credibility**

The core of government credibility stems from public trust in the predictable exercise of power and the fulfillment of service promises. Public administration standardization strengthens this foundation of trust through transparent rules and standardized practices.

Standardization first makes government actions visible. For example, a local government service hall now publicly displays the application materials list, process flow chart, and accountability measures for overdue approvals for over 200 items. Citizens can scan a QR code to check the progress and standards of each application, effectively dispelling suspicion caused by information asymmetry. Second, standardization ensures the implementation of government promises. For example, the market regulatory department has developed a standardized complaint handling process, which stipulates that "preliminary results must be provided within 72 hours" and "complex issues must be resolved within 15 working days." By strictly implementing this standard, a prefecture-level city has increased its consumer complaint resolution rate from 68% to 92%, and public satisfaction with the government has increased by 15 percentage points year-on-year. More importantly, standardization can reduce practices that undermine public credibility, such as "selective enforcement" and "flexible service." For example, in the field of environmental protection, by formulating "quantified standards for penalties for enterprises exceeding pollution standards" (e.g., a fine of RMB 20,000 for exceeding standards by less than 10%, and suspension of production for rectification for exceeding standards by more than 50%), law enforcement officers are prevented from arbitrarily adjusting the scale of penalties due to "personal connections"; in community governance, the "standards for supporting the needy" are refined into "visiting elderly people living alone at least once a week" and "responding to applications for assistive devices for the disabled within three working days" to ensure that the policy dividends accurately benefit the target groups <sup>[2]</sup>. When the public finds that "the standards are the same no matter who they go to or where they go to get things done", their trust in the government will naturally change from "passive acceptance" to "active recognition".

### **3.3 Improving administrative efficiency**

Standardization "loosens and accelerates" administrative efficiency through process optimization and collaborative mechanisms. Within a single department, standardization eliminates redundant steps. For example, one province reduced the enterprise deregistration process from six steps to two. By standardizing the "liquidation report format" and "material submission standards," processing time was reduced from 20 days to three. In cross-departmental collaboration, standardization breaks down "information silos." For

example, in urban construction, the Planning, Housing and Urban-Rural Development, and Environmental Protection departments repeatedly requested additional documents from companies due to inconsistent data formats. A new district established "project approval data standards," enabling the single submission of drawings, test reports, and other information to be shared across multiple departments, increasing approval efficiency by 50%. In resource allocation, standardization avoids duplication and waste. For example, emergency supplies are coordinated according to a standard of "50 tents per 10,000 people." After consolidating warehouses across multiple departments, one province reduced the time it takes to mobilise supplies to two hours, reducing administrative costs by 30%, and maximizing the effectiveness of limited resources.

#### **4. Analysis of the Current Situation of Public Management Standardization Capacity Building**

##### **4.1 Achievements**

China's public management standardization construction has accumulated a number of replicable experience and results in practical exploration, forming a promotion pattern of "top-level design + local innovation" <sup>[3]</sup>. At the national standard level, a standard system covering 13 major categories such as education, medical care, and elderly care has been established in the field of basic public services. For example, the "National Basic Public Service Standards (2021 Edition)" clearly defines core indicators such as "public funding standards per student in compulsory education" and "financial subsidy standards for urban and rural residents' medical insurance", setting a rigid bottom line for service equality. Industry standards are also becoming increasingly perfect. For example, the "Basic Specifications for Service Quality of Elderly Care Institutions" issued by the Civil Affairs Department has formulated more than 60 specific requirements from facility safety, nursing processes to dietary nutrition, and has promoted more than 80% of elderly care institutions across the country to complete service upgrades. Local pilot projects have shown the characteristics of "scenario-based breakthroughs". Zhejiang's "One-Stop Service" reform has reduced the average number of times businesses and the public have to run around from 3.1 times to 0.3 times by sorting out the standardized processes of 286 government services, unifying application materials, processing time limits and approval links. Shenzhen has

promoted the standardization of the "community work item list" in grassroots governance, eliminated 32 unnecessary assessment indicators, and allowed community workers to focus on services rather than filling out forms. In addition, the integration of digitalization and standardization has begun to show results. For example, Shanghai's "One-Stop Service" platform has converted the approval standards of 16 departments into codable digital rules, enabling more than 90% of matters to be handled online. These practices have not only improved local governance efficiency, but also provided fresh examples for national standardization construction.

## **4.2 Existing problems**

However, many problems remain in building public management standardization capacity. The standards system is lagging significantly. In emerging areas such as the digital economy and new employment forms, the supply of standards is clearly insufficient. For example, there is a lack of unified "false advertising identification standards" for the regulation of live e-commerce, and the protection of the labor rights and interests of food delivery riders has not yet formed a national service standard, resulting in "no basis for law enforcement at the grassroots level." Standards in some traditional areas have not been updated for a long time. For example, one province's "Public Restroom Management Standards" still use the 2005 version, which does not include new requirements such as barrier-free facilities and smart flushing, and is out of touch with public needs. The phenomenon of "mid-term obstruction" in standard implementation is widespread. Some places regard standardization as a "political achievement project" and lack supporting training and supervision mechanisms after the standards are formulated. For example, although a prefecture-level city has issued "Community Elderly Care Service Standards," due to the lack of systematic training for community workers, 40% of service items are still implemented according to the "old methods." What is more worthy of attention is the conflict of standards between departments and regions. There is a contradiction between the "enterprise pollution emission limits" of the environmental protection department and the "preferential standards for investment attraction" of local governments, which has led to enterprises falling into the dilemma of "compliance means suspension of production". The social security transfer standards of adjacent cities and counties are not unified, and the phenomenon of "different

processes in the same province" has emerged. These fragmented problems have seriously restricted the integrity and coordination of public management, and have become the main obstacle to the in-depth advancement of standardization.

### **5.Key Elements of Public Management Standardization Capacity Building**

In the process of deepening the construction of public management standardization capabilities, it is necessary to focus on the three key elements of standard setting, implementation and supervision and evaluation, and form a mutually supportive closed-loop system to solve the current problems of system lag and poor implementation <sup>[4]</sup>.

First, the core of scientific standard setting lies in balancing “uniformity” and “adaptability”, and needs to be based on the needs of social development, public interests and industry characteristics, and take into account both foresight and operability <sup>[5]</sup>. In specific practice, the “single government setting” model should be broken, and opinions should be absorbed through multiple channels such as field research, public discussions, and industry demonstrations. For example, when formulating home-based elderly care service standards, it is necessary to determine rigid indicators such as “at least one home visit per week” through elderly residents’ discussions, and to retain flexible space for “personalized care plans for disabled elderly people” in combination with feedback from elderly care institutions. At the same time, cross-sector coordination should be strengthened to avoid conflicts between the “service time standards” of the civil affairs department and the “health assessment standards” of the health and medical departments, so as to ensure that the standards cover both common needs and respond to differences in scenarios.

Second, effective standard implementation involves building a comprehensive guarantee mechanism encompassing "cognition, practice, and rewards and penalties" to bridge the gap between "written regulations" and "actual action." On the one hand, implementation capabilities can be enhanced through tiered training. For example, community workers can be trained in "standardized service scenario simulations," using case studies to illustrate the practical application of "broken kitchen waste bags" in older residential communities, as stipulated in the garbage sorting standards. On the other hand, process oversight and a results-oriented approach can be strengthened. For example, environmental protection departments can monitor the implementation of corporate pollution discharge standards

through online monitoring systems, tracking data in real time and conducting monthly on-site inspections. Enterprises that consistently meet standards can be awarded environmental credit points, while those that exceed them can be subject to accountability procedures such as interviews and penalties. This ensures that standard implementation is directly linked to departmental performance and individual assessments, avoiding empty talk.

Third, Dynamic supervision and evaluation should be conducted, and an independent, multi-faceted evaluation system should be established to ensure that standards are constantly evolving in sync with governance needs. Third-party institutions should be relied upon to develop evaluation indicators encompassing dimensions such as public satisfaction, cost-effectiveness, and problem-solving rate. For example, when evaluating public transportation service standards, both hard data such as bus punctuality and station coverage should be collected, as well as passenger feedback on bus shelter shading and last-bus connections through random interviews. When evaluating community governance standards, consideration should be given to both the implementation costs of neighborhood committees and residents' service perceptions. Evaluation results should serve as a rigid basis for standard revisions. If it is found that public satisfaction with a particular government service standard is low due to excessive application documents, a revision process to streamline the process should be initiated within three months. This will create a virtuous cycle of formulation, implementation, evaluation, and optimization, driving the continuous upgrading of public management standardization capabilities.

## **6. Strategies for Improving Public Management Standardization Capabilities**

### **6.1 Strengthening top-level design**

Strengthening top-level design is the premise for improving the standardization capacity of public management. It is necessary to build a systematic framework from the strategic height of national governance modernization. The government should incorporate public management standardization into the medium- and long-term development plan, clarify the core goals of the "14th Five-Year Plan" and subsequent stages - such as achieving full coverage of standards in the basic public service field by 2027, and increasing the cross-departmental standard coordination rate to more than 80%, and refine the task list of each field. For example, in the field of education, the focus should be on improving the



standard for the balance of compulsory education resources, and in the field of medical care, the focus should be on the standardization of hierarchical diagnosis and treatment processes. At the same time, a cross-sector coordination mechanism coordinated by the State Council and participated by multiple departments should be established. A joint meeting on standardization work should be held every month to conduct special consultations on issues such as the conflict of indicators in the elderly care service standards between the civil affairs and health departments and the inconsistency of social security transfer standards in different provinces. Departmental barriers should be broken down by unifying term definitions, calibrating indicator calibers, and clarifying priorities <sup>[6]</sup>. In addition, it is necessary to strengthen the guidance of local standardization work, formulate the "Guidelines for Public Management Standardization Work", standardize the project establishment, formulation, and filing process of local standards, avoid low-level duplication, and form a "national chess game" promotion pattern.

## **6.2 Promote the integration of informatization and standardization**

Promoting the deep integration of informatization and standardization can inject technological momentum into the standardization of public management. Relying on the achievements of the "digital government" construction, we should build a national integrated public management standardization information platform. According to the concept of "full life cycle management", we should integrate the three functions of standard text database, implementation progress tracking system, and supervision and evaluation module. For example, we can input national standards such as the "Basic Catalog of Government Service Items" into the platform, and simultaneously link the implementation details of various provinces and cities, so that the grassroots can query applicable standards with one click. Through the interface connection with the government service network and the law enforcement supervision system, we can collect execution data such as "enterprise start-up time limit compliance rate" and "environmental protection penalty compliance rate" in real time and automatically generate visual charts. Informatization can also improve the scientific nature of standard formulation, such as using big data to analyze public complaint hotspots and accurately identify areas such as "community parking management" and "takeaway rider rights protection" that require new standards. In the implementation stage, we can compare

the enterprise's declared data with industry standards through AI algorithms, automatically mark abnormal items and push them to the regulatory authorities. If it is found that the back kitchen hygiene indicators of a catering enterprise deviate from the standard, the system can immediately issue an early warning and prompt the key points of verification <sup>[7]</sup>. This two-way integration of "standard digitization-data standardization" can not only improve execution efficiency, but also provide data support for dynamic adjustments.

### **6.3 Strengthening Talent Training**

Strengthening talent cultivation is the core support for consolidating the standardization capacity of public management. It is necessary to build a dual-track training system of "university reserve + on-the-job improvement". At the academic education level, promote universities to offer courses such as "public affairs standardization" and "standard formulation and implementation" in public management, administrative management and other majors, and compile textbooks that integrate cases and theories. For example, combine the case of conflict between community elderly care standards to analyze the logic of cross-departmental collaboration. At the same time, set up standardization practice credits, encourage students to participate in the standard formulation research of local governments, and cultivate compound talents who understand the laws of governance and master the methods of standard formulation <sup>[8]</sup>. For on-the-job personnel, implement tiered and classified training: carry out "standard practice training camps" for grassroots staff, and improve their ability to accurately apply standards by simulating scenes such as the implementation of community garbage classification standards and the standardization of government service processes; for policy makers, focus on "system design capabilities" training, hold "cross-departmental standard collaboration" seminars, and invite experts to analyze the coordination experience of environmental protection and industry and information technology departments in corporate green production standards. In addition, a "standardization talent pool" will be established to absorb university scholars, industry experts, and front-line backbones to form a think tank to provide intellectual support for the formulation of standards in complex fields (such as digital economy regulation), forming a virtuous cycle of "cultivation-use-reserve".

### **6.4 Improve the multi-party participation mechanism**

Improving the multi-participation mechanism is the key to improving the applicability

of standards. It is necessary to break the traditional model of "government-led and society passively accepting" and build a "full-process open" participation system. In the standard establishment stage, the public's demands are widely collected through the "demand collection platform". For example, for community governance standards, the issues of "pet management" and "public space use" that residents have concentrated on are prioritized and included in the formulation plan; enterprises and industry associations are invited to participate in the preliminary demonstration. For example, when formulating the service standards for the express delivery industry, representatives from companies such as SF Express and ZTO Express are organized to discuss practical details such as "terminal delivery time limit" and "packaging recycling requirements" to balance service quality and enterprise costs. In the draft standard stage, a "tiered opinion solicitation" system is implemented: for education and medical standards involving major livelihood issues, opinions are solicited from all citizens through community announcements, online questionnaires, etc. For example, when a province formulated the standards for after-school services for compulsory education, the "types of interest courses" were expanded from 8 to 12 based on parental feedback; for environmental protection and emergency standards that are more professional, scientific research institutions and industry experts are invited to conduct technical reviews to ensure that the indicators are scientific and feasible <sup>[9]</sup>. At the same time, an "opinion adoption and feedback" mechanism will be established to publicize the adoption status and reasons of each opinion on the official website. For example, when a city revised the shared bicycle parking standards, it explained the reason for not adopting the suggestion of "expanding the scope of prohibited parking in commercial districts" - to avoid affecting citizens' short-distance travel and enhance the public's understanding and recognition of the standards.

### **6.5 Improve the dynamic adjustment mechanism**

Improving dynamic adjustment mechanisms is key to avoiding rigid standards, necessitating a full-cycle management model of "regular evaluation and revision as needed." All public management standards could have a unified "validity period" of three years. Six months prior to expiration, a third-party assessment agency would initiate a compatibility check, evaluating them based on three dimensions: "matching social needs," "feasibility of implementation," and "cost-benefit ratio." For example, when revising its "Community

Service Standards" in one province, a third-party agency compared the community demographics between 2010 and 2023 and found that the proportion of residents aged 60 and above had increased from 15% to 32%. The agency subsequently recommended the addition of clauses such as "Guidelines for the Installation of Smart Elderly Care Equipment" and "Standards for Emergency Call Response for Elderly Living Alone." Regarding new employment groups such as food delivery riders and livestreamers, an assessment revealed gaps in the original "Labor Relationship Determination Standards," prompting the addition of specific clauses such as "social security contribution base for platform employees" and "maximum working hours" to enable the standards to rapidly respond to social changes. In addition, an "emergency revision channel" will be established to initiate an expedited assessment procedure for standard loopholes exposed by public emergencies, such as the "ambiguous material allocation process" in grassroots prevention and control during the epidemic. The revision will be completed and released within 3 months to ensure that the standards can not only play a stable role but also flexibly respond to new challenges.

#### **6.6 Strengthening regional collaboration and experience promotion**

China has significant regional development differences. It is necessary to break the "fragmentation" dilemma of standardization construction through regional collaboration and improve the overall efficiency of the country. A "1+1" pairing cooperation mechanism can be established between the east, middle and west regions. For example, Zhejiang and Sichuan, and Shanghai and Gansu signed standardization assistance agreements, and shared practical experience through "staff guidance + remote training". Zhejiang taught Sichuan practical methods such as "standardized coding of approval materials" and "cross-departmental data sharing interface" in the "one-stop service" reform, helping Sichuan to shorten the time for starting a business from 15 working days to 3 working days; Shanghai assisted Gansu in building a "government service standard database" to solve the problem of "different processes for the same matter" between local cities and counties <sup>[10]</sup>. The National Standardization Administration will take the lead in refining and upgrading high-quality standards that have been verified in practice in local pilot projects. For example, the "Facial Recognition Access Control Management Specifications" and "Standards for Monitoring Abnormal Behavior of Elderly People Living Alone" formed in the construction of smart

communities in Shenzhen have been included in the "National Standards for Urban Community Governance Services" after expert discussion and promoted and applied nationwide; the "Small and Micro Enterprise Service Standards List" explored by Suzhou, Jiangsu has been upgraded to an industry standard and replicated in the Yangtze River Delta region because it effectively reduces the institutional transaction costs of enterprises. This not only avoids the waste of resources from repeated exploration in various places, but also allows the standardization results to benefit wider areas more quickly.

### **6.7 Optimize the standard implementation guarantee system**

Optimizing the standard implementation guarantee system requires building a comprehensive mechanism encompassing "training as a foundation, supervision as a safeguard, and rewards and penalties as a driving force" to ensure that standards are translated from "paper regulations" into conscious action. In the training phase, "scenario-based practical courses" are designed for grassroots staff. For example, simulation exercises centering on the "minimum living allowance" recognition standards are conducted through role-playing, recreating real-life scenarios such as "household income calculation disputes" and "application of special circumstances exemption clauses." Case studies are used to help staff accurately grasp the boundaries of the standards. Toolkits such as the "Wrong Disposal Identification Manual" and the "Resident Communication Guide" are provided to enhance their ability to guide residents in sorting according to the standards. At the supervisory level, digital platforms are leveraged to achieve "precise profiling." For example, in the environmental protection sector, an online monitoring system captures enterprise pollution data in real time, automatically compares it to national standard thresholds, and immediately sends warnings to law enforcement personnel when the standards are exceeded. In the government service sector, a "good and bad review" system links standard clauses. When residents comment on "cumbersome procedures," the system automatically identifies implementation loopholes in the "streamlining standards for approval procedures." In terms of the reward and punishment mechanism, the effectiveness of standard implementation is directly linked to departmental performance appraisal. Units that meet the standards for three consecutive years will be awarded the title of "Standardization Demonstration Window". For those who fail to implement the standards and cause a decline in service quality, the

department heads will be summoned and given a deadline to rectify the situation, forming an execution ecology that emphasizes both "hard constraints" and "soft incentives".

## **7. Conclusion**

In summary, building public administration standardization capacity, as a crucial pillar for the transformation to a service-oriented government, is valuable not only in improving governance effectiveness through unified rules but also in addressing challenges such as inequality and inefficiency in public service provision through a standardized approach. While my country has achieved phased success in establishing a basic public service standards system and piloting local government service standardization initiatives, issues such as the lagging of the standards system to meet social needs, barriers to cross-departmental collaboration, and bottlenecks in implementation still highlight the gap between standardization capacity and the requirements of modern governance. This article proposes a comprehensive strategy guided by top-level design, supported by information technology integration, and based on talent development, supplemented by diverse participation, dynamic adjustment, regional coordination, and implementation guarantees. This strategy provides a framework for bridging this gap. However, public administration standardization is a systematic project requiring continuous iteration, and its depth and breadth must align with the progress of my country's administrative system reform and innovative grassroots governance practices. For example, in the context of the accelerated development of digital government, further exploration is needed in practice to balance the uniformity of standardization with the flexibility of digital governance.

## References

- [1] Zheng X., Lai Y.Y., Qian Z., et al. Research on the role of standardization in improving the government's basic public service capabilities[J]. China Standardization, 2022, No.616(19):61-65.
- [2] Jia S.W., Song X. Innovating standardization concepts to improve government efficiency[J]. Popular Standardization, 2020, No.312(01):70-71.
- [3] Sun Y.C. Practice and Enlightenment of British Government Service Standardization[J]. Chinese Public Administration, 2017, No.380(02):137-142.
- [4] Shi G.Q. A preliminary study on administrative service standardization from the perspective of service-oriented government[J]. China Standardization, 2018, No.522(10):47-48.
- [5] Li M. Research and thinking on the current status of standardization in the public service field of Dongying City[J]. China Standardization, 2021, No.575(02):78-80.
- [6] Jiang L, Liu J.Y., Xiong Y., et al. Research on the construction of basic public service standard system: Taking the comprehensive pilot practice of basic public service standardization in Chengdu Hi-tech Zone as an example[J]. China Standardization, 2022, No.598(01):125-131.
- [7] Chen S.X., Zhang J.X. Research on the impact mechanism of innovation in local government management standardization: A case study of Xianning City[J]. Journal of Yunnan Administration College, 2022, 24(02): 112-120.
- [8] Chen G. and Liu W. Promoting the modernization of government governance capacity through service standardization[C]//China Association for Standardization. Proceedings of the 14th China Standardization Forum. China Academic Journal (CD-ROM Edition), Electronic Magazine Co., Ltd., 2017:3.
- [9] Zhang S. Problems and Countermeasures in the Standardization Management System[C]//China Association for Standardization. Proceedings of the 15th China Standardization Forum. China Academic Journal (CD-ROM Edition), Electronic Magazine Co., Ltd., 2018:4.
- [10] Zhao J.G. Administrative service standardization: an effective tool for promoting the construction of service-oriented government[J]. Journal of Yunnan Academy of Socialism, 2014, No.63(03):103-104.