



European eGovernment Awards 2007 – Challenges and Barriers for eParticipation

Christine Leitner

**Head of Center for European Public Administration (CEPA)
Danube University Krems (AT)**

CEPA 2007



CEPA

- Public sector modernisation and cross border cooperation: international good practice
- European eGovernment Awards
- Master of Public Administration



BACKGROUND

- European eGovernment Awards 2007
 - Good practice initiative to support i2010 (GP label, eEurope Awards)
 - 4th Ministerial eGovernment Conference in Lisbon (PT), 19-21 September
- Closely linked to the Good Practice Exchange Initiative www.epractice.eu/awards

CATEGORIES

1. Better public services for growth and jobs
2. Participation and transparency (12 finalists)
3. Social impact and cohesion
4. Effective and efficient administration
5. The most inspiring good practice (*public prize*)

WINNERS

1. HoReCa1 - Hotel, rest., café licences (NL)
2. Mypage – self-service citizen portal (NO)
3. Bensancon.clic (FR)
4. German Administration Services Directory (DE)
5. On-line Police Station (IT)

CRITERIA

1. Evidence of impact
2. Evidence of/potential for sharing good practice
3. Understanding of multi-channel aspects
4. Innovation and management efficiency
5. Overall impression/communication capacity

i2010 OBJECTIVE

By 2010 member states are invited to demonstrate tools for effective public debate and participation in democratic decision-making

COM (2206) 173 final, 25.04.2006, p.11

THEME FOCUS

Participation and Transparency -

Interactive initiatives that empower citizens and business to influence open government, policy-making and the way public administrations operate and deliver services.

CASES – Focus and objectives

- Enhancing transparency (DOPS, PortalU, MEP AeApps, Gencat 2.0, MyPage)
- Supporting political activity and improving consultation in decision-making and service delivery (iVote, ePetition, e@SY, Madrid-p, Vicky,)
- Enhancing deliberative spaces and facilitating community development (VirtuoCity)
- Other aspects (e.g. monitoring tools; eCC)

PROGRESS (2005 – 2007) - 1

Number of countries with
eParticipation policies:

- 2005: 13/30
- 2007: 20/30

Number of cases

- 2005: 15% (part
of 'state & society'
category)
- 2007: 16%

- Focus on dialogue, active participation and building trust
- Little evidence of impact available
- Most actions at the local level
- Rather experimental nature
- Bottom up or top down

PROGRESS (2005 – 2007) - 2

Organisational aspects

Governance and institutional aspects

Technology aspects

Policy aspects

CASES – Legal issues

- PortalU (DE)
- iVote (EE)
- eCC (NL)
- Mypage (NO)

CASES –Barriers

Barriers	Indications	Case
Leadership failures	xxx	iVote, Mypage, eCC
Financial inhibitors	x	PortalU
Digital divides and choices	xx	eCC
Poor co-ordination	xxx	PortalU, Mypage, eCC
Workplace and organisational inflexibility	x	
Lack of trust	xx	iVote, Madrid-p,e@sy
Poor technical design	xx	Mypage, PortalU

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS

Institutional and political challenges

Benefits and risk assessment of citizens' involvement

Process design and discourse rules

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS - 1

Institutional and political challenges

- Clarity
- Roles of institutions/actors
- Decision shaping and control of decision process
- Link to good governance in projects
- Impact of ICT on formation of broader policy networks

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS - 2

Benefits and risk assessment of citizens' involvement

- Does ICT really encourage and facilitate engagement?
- Does it encourage populist participation rather than mature engagement and well informed debate?
- Relation to offline developments to decide on effective strategies
- Skills to exploit new tools (technical, social, political), attention to the socially excluded

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS - 3

Process design and discourse rules

- Design of processes that take into account user needs and democratic objectives
- Use and relevance of different devices (e.g. elections, referendums, etc.) in different contexts
- Un-intentional consequences for democracy due to the implementation of particular devices
- How is deliberation moderated? Is there space for dissent? How is it managed?

CONCLUSIONS

Option 1

Focus on common priority policy areas

Option 2

Online/offline developments

Option 3

European charter stipulating basic principles

CONTACT

<http://www.donau-uni.ac.at>

christine.leitner@donau-uni.ac.at

European eGvoernment Awards

www.epractice.eu/awards