Think Paper 9: Aarhus Seminar Discussion Paper: Towards a Handbook for citizen-centricity

Neil McDonald, Michael Blakemore and Johnny Kelleher

Version No. 1.0

http://www.ccegov.eu/

i2010
Information Space
Innovation & Investment in R&D
Inclusion

ECOTEC
RESEARCH & CONSULTING

Think Paper 9: Aarhus Seminar Discussion Paper: Towards a Handbook for citizen-centricity

Neil McDonald, Michael Blakemore and Johnny Kelleher, June 2007

Version 1.0.

Prepared for the eGovernment unit, DG Information Society and Media, European Commission
http://europa.eu.int/egovernment_research

"Think Papers" aim to present strategic issues that will be explored with stakeholders and researchers. They are intended to be high-level summaries both of the issues and challenges, and of the ongoing work undertaken by the project team. They will be updated on the project web site http://www.ccegov.eu/ where registered participants can contribute to interactive explorations of definitions and issues.

This paper acts as a background briefing paper to the discussions that will take place at the Aarhus Workshop, 21-22 June 2007.

Think paper series editors: Trond-Arne Undheim and Michael Blakemore

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A: INTRODUCTION

This Think Paper is a first draft summary attempting to bring together some of the diverse content generated by the study to date. As such it represents a useful aide memoir for the third cc:eGov event, to be held in Aarhus, Denmark on 21 and 22 June, 2007. The underlying materials referenced can all be found on the study website at www.ccegov.eu.

The cc:eGov project was asked to look at the relationship between organisational change and the delivery of citizen-centric eGovernment services. What was a seemingly simple proposition has led us to examine the nature of organisational change, the meaning of citizen-centricity, and the complex policy and organisational scenarios that come under the broad heading of 'transformational government'.

At the outset we needed to test the proposition, and explore whether there could there be a generic model emerging whereby citizen-centricity could be delivered via a particular genre of organisational change. We started by looking at the broad range of material available on eGovernment projects, and by developing the series of 'Think Papers'[1] where we review key research and policy issues. This activity fed into the first two interactive workshops in Warsaw and Athens. We also initiated a series of in-depth interviews[2] with projects and people around Europe, and the intention here was to go deeper into the procedures, policies, cultures, and relationships between service providers and citizens. It was in these interviews that it became very clear that there was not a generic relationship emerging between organisational change and citizen-centricity.

Countries like Norway and Finland demonstrated that radical organisational change was not needed to deliver services that citizens both needed and used. Interviews in the UK have showed us that radical organisational change is taking place, but the levels of service uptake are relatively low, and there is a differential pattern evident in national and local scales. In Belgium, we found an emotionally-laden service, social security support, which was underpinned by a new organisation, but where the organisation was not structured along radical 'business' lines, and demonstrated many of the features of non-profit cooperative organisation. In the Netherlands we found growing levels of service use underpinned by a process that championed the citizen not just as a consumer of services, but as a partner in services, noting in particular that the rights to consume services are directly related to obligations of citizenship.

In these, and other interviews, we saw a deeper process becoming evident, notably that while organisations need to change, the impact of the change is strongly mediated through the trust relationship between citizens and government. Culture therefore matters, because the extent of trust varies across European countries. Another component of the process is transparency, most evident in Estonia where the comprehensively integrated information that underpins the ID card, and enables joined-up services, is linked to full transparency. Citizens in Estonia can

---

[1] http://www.ccegov.eu/?Page=ThinkPapers
[2] http://www.ccegov.eu/?Page=Case+Studies

log onto a secure Web site and see which civil servants have accessed their data, and for what purposes. This nicely inverts the rights and obligations argument, implying that if government has rights to use citizen data, it has associated obligations to inform the citizen when data have been used. In addition, this process also involves citizens in the process of data maintenance and quality, since they will be able to request corrections for data errors.

One year into this project we are distilling and summarising the material. Clearly, we need to do more than produce a final report that says 'we are all different' in Europe. To argue that there is unequivocal heterogeneity will be just as naïve as saying that there is a single organisational model that will deliver citizen-centric services. More likely is that there are a series of 'genres' within which organisational models, citizenry and trust, culture and political system, and information policy and transparency all interact. This Aarhus Workshop is therefore a critical opportunity for us to review the interviews and research, and set them in the wider context of available statistical classifications of eGovernment production and consumption, trust and transparency. This will guide us towards the final outputs of the study including a Handbook, designed to help citizens and organisations address citizen-centric readiness.

Part B draws on the wealth of material contained in the series of eight Think Papers produced by the cc:eGov Study, to provide a structured summary of key messages, in particular linking together the various issues considered in a way that allows us to explore possibilities for change, philosophies and technologies.

Part C draws on the results of the first two international cc:eGov workshops, held in Warsaw in November 2006 and Athens in February 2007[3].

Part D develops a preliminary set of working hypotheses for each of four strands: trust, transparency and open-ness; engagement; flexibility and agility; and effectiveness. The work of the third cc:eGov event, to be held in Aarhus on 21 and 22 June, will be to develop these four strands further to produce a series of principles; methods and approaches; and hints and tips for practitioners.

The results of the case study interviews are used throughout to illustrate and highlight successful approaches and examples of innovation.

---

[3] See http://www.ccegov.eu/?Page=Workshops for full reports of the results of these events

PART B: ISSUES

As background to the Aarhus discussions we provide the key outcomes from the current series of Think Papers produced by the Project.

1. The pan-EU and Policy Conditions for Change

Private sector techniques for organisational change have relevance in the public sector. However, leaders in the public sector must translate these techniques to suit the specific requirements of public organisations rather than simply transfer them if they are to achieve the objectives of their change process.

Public sector organisations differ from those of the private sector in terms of **culture, orientation and tasks**. Change agents, both internal and external, must therefore understand and work with the grain of the culture of public sector organisations. Understanding this culture, and how it differs from that of businesses and between public sector organisations is key for successful organisational change

Organisational change strategies can have **different underlying paradigms**: rational, normative and coercive. When developing organisational change strategies, leaders in the public sector must balance these three paradigms so that their chosen approach reflects both the internal and external context within which an organisation sits.

EU Heterogeneity: The uneven ICT landscape across the EU, and within individual states, requires a policy environment for eGovernment service delivery that is attuned to, and continually monitors, the different needs - and the emerging changes in those needs. **Technological innovation speed** is faster than policy development cycles. It is difficult for governments to engage and promote particular devices or technologies.

Good eGovernment will enable organisational transformation and citizen centric agendas by:

- Championing 'diversity' in an enlarging EU, while **synthesising major learning lessons** for all levels of government

- **Confronting 'failure'** in the same context that business does – a learning experience, not a disaster to be hidden at all costs

- Analysing the complex landscapes of governance throughout the EU, identifying trends, and setting citizen and business **relevant development agendas**

- Identifying important processes of the **consumption of governance**, not its technological production; focusing on citizenship, dignity, inclusion, rights and responsibilities

- Supporting the development of **citizen-relevant measure of eGovernment**, at spatial levels that go beyond administrative space, to functional space

2. The Organisational Conditions for Change

Maintain attention to **back-office and process reform**, along with IT efficiency gains through interoperability, to help deliver cost efficiencies while the longer-term, more contentious issues of organisational and labour reform are explored.

Use comparative research of reform in the public and private sectors, through the unpacking of the metaphors that they provide, to understand better the **values** that both sectors can provide to each other.

Continue debating about the civil service that we want, versus the civil service we have, so that we build a service portfolio that provides both operational **flexibility and public value**.

Develop a deeper focus on public value, to move attention away from the politicisation of cost savings and performance targets, towards independently **validated outcomes for service delivery**.

3. The Citizenship Conditions for Change

Citizenship is a constantly changing and contested notion within which three core aspects can be identified: rights, duties and participation:

- The citizen with rights is the citizen as service user accessing public services either offline or online through electronic service delivery.
- The citizen with duties is the citizen paying taxes or voting in elections, who may be using electronic tools to do so, for example online voting or online tax returns.
- The participative citizen is one who actively engages in political life through a variety of mechanisms including public discussion and debate.

Being a 'customer' is a sub-set of being a 'citizen'. Citizen carries a much wider set of components, not least an interest in fairness and a role in representative democracy. Citizen as customer applies to improvements in "transactional capacity'.

Approaching citizens as customers **does not necessarily imply commercialisation** of the relationship between citizen and government.

Citizens can still be customers if they have no choice and their transactions with government are not regulated by binding contractual arrangements.

There may be a **'levelling–up' of citizen expectations** as a result of experiences in the realm of private/commercial digital transactions. Such improvements focus on efficiency and flexibility of delivery and on Customer Relationship Management (CRM).

If, as some evidence suggests, **people want choice between services rather than just choice between channels**, then this has significant implications for current eGovernment approaches (i.e. those focusing on customer service only).

'**Obligations**' of being a customer are not easily linked to the complexities of the obligations of being a citizen. However, Public Value may involve similar bi-lateral obligations such as those emerging in business.

The identification of citizen and customer needs is an **iterative process** (an 'emergent' strategy) involving; dialogues; informal knowledge gained by employees in their dealings with customers; and formal knowledge, for example through customer surveys. The **cross-matching of citizen data**, with commercial data, can generate new insights into service demands and delivery.

4. Technologies for Change

Technology involves tools for that are used to build services and relationships in societal governance. The organisational adoption of technologies is subject to uncertainty, the complexities of defining cost-benefit models, especially the measurement of 'public value' and return on investment.

ICTs are more than cost-savers – they are important tools in delivering **better services** to a **more complex and demanding citizenry**. The use of ICTs in eGovernment should learn from both the positive and negative experiences of eCommerce in building multiple channel services. CRM (Customer Relationship Management) can provide centralised information, while still allowing **local autonomies** that respond directly to customer/citizen needs.

The **ownership of the ICT strategy** in an organisation is sometimes not well linked to the responsibilities for its operational delivery. Experience from the business sector shows that IT strategy often is separate from organisational strategy, and that IT strategy does not directly lead to organisational change – indeed organisational strategy often directs technical strategy.

Interoperability and interchange are optimised when existing 'communities of practice' collectively agree metadata schemes for semantics, and for content encoding to suit user-community needs. European level 'communities of practice' need to be identified and supported to ensure European level interoperability and interchange.

Citizen-relevant channels: There should be a clearer focus on technologies that use citizen-relevant channels to deliver citizen/public value, rather than just to deliver efficiency gains and cost savings. The technology component of e-Governance services should aim to use

'everyday' and commonplace technologies to maximise inclusion and utility, and to avoid unnecessary demands (skills, device purchase etc.) on citizens. Governments must monitor and understand citizen technology competencies so as to prepare for continuous technology exploitation as the ICT landscape changes. A 'vision' of emerging technologies needs to be rapidly and effectively tested in a citizen context. Focus on **everyday technologies** that are being (or are becoming) used routinely by citizens, where citizen engagement with government can be maximised.

Focus on mechanisms and policies to maximise service accessibility and citizen engagement, through maximum communication channels. While there is a valid role for the EU to stimulate and provide leadership in technological innovation, there are risks involved in trying to embed future devices into policies related to service delivery for citizens.

PART C: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

5. Problems and challenges – The Warsaw Workshop

The main objective was to shape a common agenda of organisational changes for eGovernment. It was designed to mark the start of a journey to a deeper understanding of organisational culture and citizen-centricity in the EU, establishing common ground in terms of language, scope and needs. As might be expected, the initial phase of a study of this type will include a strong element setting out many more problems and challenges than solutions.

Public sector reforms and types of organisational change

Barriers to citizen-centric government are intrinsically linked to public sector reforms and organisational change. The results of the workshop discussions articulated the following as the most important barriers, which in many cases are accompanied by suggested principles or approaches for overcoming them:

Lack of vision
- There is often a lack of clarity between complex and long-term policy objectives as opposed to strategy, which should describe the way to fulfil a vision.
- The vision at leadership level is seldom linked with effective implementation within the bureaucracy.
- There is too much focus on ubiquitous service delivery – it is important to define what is really to be delivered to all customers and in what way, and offer premium services at additional cost.
- There is a need for metrics that measure more than inputs and performance, but rather tell us more about outputs and impacts.

Organisational culture and poor understanding of processes of organisational change, or change management methods
- Acknowledge the legally rooted cultures of a civil service, building on civil service strengths as well as overcoming organisational shortcomings.
- Understand the prerequisites for cooperation across organisational silos: strong political commitment at a high level; identifying projects that are really needed for citizen service delivery; use training and workshops across public agencies, for example using simulations to overcome silo cognitive maps.
- Cross-silo projects need effective cross-silo budget lines. Ensure that the main sources of funding will be the main organisational beneficiaries of a project.

- Recruitment and succession planning tend not to be specifically undertaken for a project – instead the existing staff structure is used. This is different to business, where the team with the required skill-set is linked to a project.
- Size matters – commercial organisations with large staff numbers over a distributed territory can be just as bureaucratic and cumbersome as government departments.
- Be clear about delivering rewards for 'good' players; financial, honorary rewards, or to be values in information about appraisal and promotion procedures.
- Be clear about what is meant by 'good practice' and 'best practice'.

Separation of political and managerial leadership
- Require political representation on ICT projects to be competent in ICT use in society, and ensure that the projects have clear governance structures.
- Define managers' roles and leadership, with clear roles and responsibilities.
- Develop common simple messages about a project, and used shared technical languages between project participants.
- Understand the different roles of politicians and managers

Poor understanding of user demand
- It is important that user voice is heard at the policy formulation stage. Make sure that non-users also are consulted.
- Use CRM tools to develop and maintain intelligence about user needs, and to understand better how users are segmented.
- Government services are not aimed only at individuals – education, planning, defence etc. are for the benefit of society and identifying who represents the user can be a complex process.
- Aim to be proactive with service delivery – for example Belgium Social Service proactive assessment of eligibility for benefits.
- Understand how self-service is being used increasingly in the retail sector: for example self-booking of travel, self-checkout at supermarkets.
- Ensure that user satisfaction surveys are repeated regularly.
- Learn from the analysis of retail customer behaviour.
- Learn from the popularity of 'self-seeded' services such as Wikipedia or eBay

Conclusions and key messages

The discussions underlined the considerable **heterogeneity** in organisational and citizen culture throughout Europe. However, what are the common organisational and governance processes that impact on the development of excellent eGovernment services? Whilst there was a reflexive, critical, and conceptual discussion of these issues during the workshop, there was perhaps a tendency for the debate to not go beyond discussing the automation of government processes. There were few occasions where a **radical evaluation of citizen needs** was debated. For example, while the use of multiple channels was articulated well, it was not critiqued in depth.

Business constantly experiments with **service delivery channels**, often dropping channels quickly, and it can be selective with customer segmentation. How can eGovernment successfully learn from commerce about the flexible, but successful, use of multiple-channels? Given the need for accessibility of services, are there any successful examples of government *replacing* a channel by the use of e-government? How can customer needs be modelled and forecasted by government, in the same way that the retail sector works together to model the 'stores of the future'[4]?

Choice as a customer of business services is more diverse than choice as a customer of government services, but choice is usually sub-optimal. Businesses can choose customers by segmenting and prioritising them, and customers can choose between businesses. Government cannot easily decide to ignore its customers, and has to resort to rationing approaches such as waiting lists, although ICTS can potentially empower the customer to choose and the money follows the citizen choice. It can also adopt strategies to 'offload' risk, for example Public Private Partnerships, or privatisation (any 'problems' with service delivery and price for privatised utilities is therefore not the 'fault' of government).

Listening to citizens. There is only so much time that elected representatives, and government employees, have to listen and communicate. Should we emphasise more the '**understanding of citizen needs**', for example using the widest variety of information and knowledge available from all sectors[5]? It was agreed that there existed a substantial body of evidence already which might usefully be exploited to provide more information on citizens needs and their preferences.

ICT literacy for public servants was mentioned several times in the meeting, often in the context of public servants needing more ICT skills. What evidence supports this? Public servants in the policy area often are well/highly educated, are from socio-economic groups who have excellent ICT usage. Is the issue more that the public servants are not given the right organisational context within which to use their skills? It seems more likely that the issue is around confidence in use of ICT, or in the way change projects or initiatives are designed and by whom, rather than some basic gap in technical knowledge for example.

In some **New Member States** it may be more difficult to promote a citizen-centric approach in an environment where priority may be given to more basic needs in terms of penetration of service delivery and upgrading to a basic technical standard. This issue needs further consideration in terms of the study attempting to articulate common strategic approaches with resonance across all Member States.

Participants generally identified strongly with the need to transform government organisations, and understood how private sector mechanisms could inform government. However, there was less clarity about how government also can inform the private sector about customer centricity and organisational reform – this was a priority in Think Paper 1. How can the 'consumer culture' (noted in Think Paper 2) be put into a balanced context with the obligations

---

[4] http://www.future-store.org
[5] See, for example, the integration of government and commercial data to provide insights into customer needs for the public sector: http://www.business-strategies.co.uk/Public%20sector/Health.aspx

of citizenship – a key issue surrounding the joining up of citizen data for integrated service delivery, and potential threats to privacy.

6. Innovations and possibilities – The Athens Workshop

The second workshop used a series of real-life case studies to explore how a systematic understanding citizen-consumers can be developed and inform the design of efficient and effective e-public services.

Exploring citizen and service typologies

On the issue of typologies and segmentation of citizens and their needs there were as many criticisms of typologies as there was support. Should we have typologies, or do we need to understand each service and user differently? There may be 'emergent typologies', where user groups emerge, form, and coalesce around services. Therefore there was a focus on the importance of Intermediaries (local and social) to help people access services, creating and maintaining citizens' trust in government, the shaping of consumption practices, and the complex nature of behaviour and emotion in consuming services.

The discussion also raised the question of achieving a balance between "proactive" and "reactive" profiling of the citizen-customer. What seemed to emerge was the need for an iterative approach based on a combination of giving citizens the opportunity to opt-into certain "individual" services, but also allowing some degree, where justified and evidenced, for using broad user categories. This should be underpinned by implementing a learning culture where results and feedback inform service development, even to quite a detailed level.

However, if services need to be emergent in the context of use, and to be aligned to social realities, then tensions are introduced, such as how to balance experimentation (which can lead citizens to expect constant uncertainty) with the potential attrition of trust? Where the citizen benefits are very visible there is a greater realisation by citizens of real public value – for example with rubbish collection, where a drain cleaner precedes the recycling and rubbish collection, and then a street cleaner follows the collections to ensure that rubbish has not been left to litter the street.

Where the public value is less direct there are challenges – for example in a recent initiative in the UK to improve the quality of school meals (there is education justification for this, since better nutrition enhances ability to learn), yet where many schoolchildren refused to eat the food, and some parents thought that by only providing 'healthy' food, the schools were reducing 'choice'.

Social inclusion should be a key pillar of any strategy. Some services have to be targeted in different ways, since there are differences between benefits and obligations (tax versus benefits). Understanding the 'emotion' of service consumption needs to move up the policy

agenda, in the same way it has become prioritised in the business sector in marketing –
evolutionary psychologists for example are providing important insights into customer
behaviour.

A critical challenge is about creating citizen-centric organisational designs in the public
service, especially where pre-existing silos, and functional segmentation, present significant
legacy challenges. Therefore do we reorganise or die? Methodologies such as Business
Process Reengineering need to be considered also in the context of corporate social
responsibility, and not just in economic cost-benefit terms.

Risks involve losing knowledge about your citizen landscapes (you store and structure
information, but not knowledge), therefore creating new exclusions. The issue of
measurement, versus understanding, also was evident in discussions about metrics and
performance targets. There was general support that micro-measurement of performance can
degrade important local autonomy.

The use of the term 'choice' by politicians in still problematical. We cannot simply equate the
term with the private sector use. We can select another private sector provider, but we cannot
withhold taxes if we regard a public service as being bad. We can withhold vote, but the mayor
of a municipality is not always the CEO or CFO.

There was a strong technology lesson emerging from the presentations, which emphasises
that we first need to focus on 'appropriate' (rather than 'advanced' or 'blue skies') technologies
that are familiar to citizens. We should disengage technical devices from eGovernment policy,
and focus on the processes that deliver citizen value. The voting example from Brazil, and
ATMs in Portugal show that the use of technological 'gold-plating' (where an advanced
technical device is used, but only a tiny element of its functionality is utilised) is not necessarily
required.

On the issue of self-service applied to public services, again, the usefulness and effectiveness
will depend largely on context – some functions lend themselves to it and some do not. It does
seem clear that while some elements of self-service can be achieved, the extent to which this
can apply, especially to "emotional" services, may be limited. In many, the simplest of self-
service functions have already been implemented.

PART D: PRINCIPLES

7.Context and strategies

Important pointers emerged in Athens to help shape the next phase of the project, and in particular to provide a framework for the third workshop:

- First, with eGovernment we are dealing with the channel delivery of complex, and emotionally-laden services, so what does effectiveness and efficiency mean for such services?

- Second, trust and transparency are pre-requisites for citizens in the consumption of services. With business services we can move rapidly to another service provider if we feel that the existing provider is not to be trusted. With government that is not possible, so any degradation of trust can create emotional disruption in the consumption of services. Freedom of information, consistency and honesty (indeed – what we have come to regard as the 'standards of public life') are as much part of the citizen-centric relationships are service integration and interfaces.

- Third, can we find business models that provide a clearer indication of how the best practices of business are combined with the best practices of governance? Perhaps the corporate governance of employee-owned companies (the Co-op, or in the UK the John Lewis Partnership) could provide exemplars? This would help us move towards the scoping of two fundamental organisational and citizen/societal 'health-checks' in the development of services that deliver public value.

Taking these into account, and drawing on the wider evidence collected throughout the study, we propose a series of four strands for use as a framework to develop a set of "principles" of citizen-centric eGovernment:

Strand A: Trust, transparency and openness. This strand focuses on 'people'.
Strand B: Engagement. This strand focuses on 'processes'.
Strand C: Flexibility and agility. This strand focuses on 'structures'.
Strand D: Effectiveness. This strand focuses on 'rewards and benefits'.

These will be used to structure discussion at the third cc:eGov workshop in Aarhus. As a starting point for participants, we present below a series of debating points for each of these strands.

8. Strand: Trust, transparency and openness

The quality of the relationship between citizens and government appears to be an important underlying determinant of success in eGovernment initiatives. A number of dimensions are apparent, including trust in the government to handle confidential data properly, transparency of motivation and openness about the impacts of change. This dimension also extends to issues of fairness – in tax collection for example. Is it justified to say that without trust, transparency and openness eGovernment is destined for failure? Are there examples where "government knows best?" Perhaps cultures in different countries play a large part in what is possible.

9. Strand: Engagement

eParticipation in particular offers the prospect to improve the decision-making processes that determine how public services are designed, delivered and paid for. Greater availability and accessibility of information, together with the provision of opportunities for citizens to express choices and preferences, means that attention is focussed on issues that have the greatest potential to improve the quality of people's lives, and citizens have a clearer view of prioritisation and allocation of resources. Decision-making processes can be re-designed or established, with the aid of ICTs, in ways that were not possible before. Such developments help people engage with the decision-making process, which has benefits even if they don't "get what they want", or does the process risk leading to communication overload and more citizen frustration? Schemes designed to increase involvement tend to be most successful at the local level.

10. Strand: Flexibility and agility

We know that new technologies are often central to radical business re-engineering, revolutionising commercial and business transactions. New business and financial models go hand in hand, providing improved flexibility and agility in customer service. While migration of these models to the public sector may be considered unwise, since citizens are not the same as consumers, so what key lessons can be learned? Public services can be re-designed to overcome traditional "silos" and better align them with citizens needs. How can this be used to produce a virtuous cycle, where public service workers are more motivated and in many job losses are avoided, permitting re-allocation of staff resources and further performance improvements?

11. Strand: Effectiveness

A more effective public service will be a more citizen-centric public service that delivers measurable public value. The rewards and benefits of successful change accrue to both governments and citizens, but to differing degrees in different cases. Cost savings are often the primary driver for governments, but public value is perhaps a better measure for citizens. What are the real benefits to service users? Improved customer responsiveness, reduced personal administrative burden (form-filling), re-allocation of resources to front-line services, better value for money, more joined-up services and a better overall experience might be some of these. Knowing that service provision goes beyond simply delivering the cheapest service possible must surely count; together with addressing issues of fairness and equitable treatment of all citizens.

12. Working towards guidelines for citizen-centric organisational change

For this project there now is the challenge to provide a coherent linkage between the qualitative material we have gathered through Workshops and Interviews, and the quantitative studies that have been produced by other projects into the performance of eGovernment. The qualitative material largely addresses the political, societal, and customer-demand contexts, whereas the quantitative material largely addresses the production and availability aspects of eGovernment, with some metrics also examined usage.

The table below brings together 14 metrics from 11 organisations that cover themes from ICT sophistication, eGovernment readiness and usage, trust and transparency, and the 'cost' of government (taxation). Since the Interviews have identified trust and transparency as strong underpinning factors in the relationship between citizen and government, do these variables provide a quantitative basis for the Interview outcomes?

Annex 1, at the end of this document, has the table of data and details about each variable.

Annex 1: Quantitative measures

Country	A TaxLab	B TaxGDP	C Corrup	D Network	E eGovBr	F eGovSoph	G eGovAv	H eReady	I ConBusAd	J eGovIndiv	K eGovEnt	N Peace	O Maturity	P EdelmanGov
Austria	40.7	43.6	8.6	5.17	30.6	95	83	8.39	9.1	33	81	1.483		
Belgium	43	47.7	7.3	4.93	28.4	74	47	7.9	7.95	30	59	1.493	46	
Bulgaria		34.8	4	3.53	26			5.01	4.45	8	46	1.936		
Cyprus	23.1	36.2	5.6	4.12	28.3	66	35			13	44	1.915		
Czech Republic	41.5	36.3	4.8	4.28	31.7	61	30	6.32	6.7	17	76	1.524		
Denmark	37.4	51.2	9.5	5.71	31.8	85	63	8.88	9.15	43	87	1.377	56	
Estonia	37.6	31	6.7	5.02	34	90	79	6.84	7.6	29	69	1.684		
Finland	41.9	44	9.6	5.59	35.6	85	61	8.43	8.9	47	93	1.447	54	
France	42.4	45.8	7.4	4.99	34.7	85	65	7.77	8.15	26	66	1.729	55	26
Germany	39.2	40.2	8	5.22	41.5	74	47	8	8.45	32	49	1.523	48	24
Greece	37.9	36.7	4	3.98	28	62	30	6.31	6.2	9	84	1.791		
Hungary	40.8	38.6	5.2	4.33	30.5	81	50	6.16	7	17	45	1.575		
Ireland	26.3	32.2	7.4	5.01	41.9	84	50	7.86	8.25	26	84	1.396	46	37
Italy	42	40.8	4.9	4.19	32.9	80	58	7.45	7.6	16	87	1.724		32
Latvia	36.3	29.6	4.7	4.13	30.6	47	10	5.88	5.5	25	40	1.848		
Lithuania	37	29.2	4.8	4.18	28.3	68	40	5.76	6.35	13	76	1.788		
Luxembourg	29	39.1	8.6	4.9	30.7	60	25			46	83			
Malta	23.9	37.7	6.4	4.52	33.6	92	75	7.56	8.15	16	68			
Netherlands	31	39.2	8.7	5.54	37.4	79	53	8.5	8.65	52	70	1.62	50	66
Norway	38.9	45	8.8	5.42	35	90	72	8.35	8.9	57	74	1.357	54	
Poland	34.6	34.2	3.7	3.69	30.1	53	20	5.8	5.8	6	61	1.683		17
Portugal	29.8	36.3	6.6	4.48	31.3	83	60	7.14	7.35	17	60	1.481	34	
Romania		28.8	3.1	3.8	30.2			5.32	4.95	3	39	1.682		
Slovakia	36.5	29.5	4.7	4.15	32.3	51	20	5.84	6.35	32	77	1.571		
Slovenia	37.8	40.7	6.4	4.41	31.8	87	65	6.66	7.2	30	75	1.539		
Spain	29.4	36.4	6.8	4.35	40.6	79	55	7.29	7.35	25	58	1.633	45	40
Sweden	45.9	52.1	9.2	5.66	38.3	90	74	8.85	9.35	52	80	1.478	49	57
UK	24.8	38.6	8.6	5.45	42.6	89	71	8.59	9.25	24	52	1.898	48	16

Variable A: Implicit tax rate on labour employed 2005
Source: Eurostat[6]

Variable B: The total amount of taxes and social contributions as a % of GDP 2005
Source: Eurostat[7]

Variable C: Corruption Perception Index 2006
Source: Transparency International[8]

> "*The CPI ranks more than 150 countries by their perceived levels of corruption, as determined by expert assessments and opinion surveys*".

Variable D: Networked Readiness Index (NRI) 2006-2007
Source: World Economic Forum[9]

> "*Networked Readiness Index (NRI) to measure the degree of preparation of a nation or community to participate in and benefit from ICT developments. The NRI is composed of three component indexes which assess: - environment for ICT offered by a country or community; readiness of the community's key stakeholders (individuals, business and governments); usage of ICT among these stakeholders*"

Variable E: eGovernment Ranking 2006
Source: Insidepolitics.orb (Brown University)[10]

> "*Websites are evaluated for the presence of various features dealing with information availability, service delivery, and public access. Features assessed included the name of the nation, region of the world, and having the following features: online publications, online database, audio clips, video clips, non-native languages or foreign language translation, commercial advertising, premium fees, user payments, disability access, privacy policy, security features, presence of online services, number of different services, digital signatures, credit card payments, email address, comment form, automatic email updates, website personalization, personal digital assistant (PDA) access, and an English version of the website*".

Variable F: eGovernment Online Sophistication Index 2006
Source: Cap Gemini[11]

> "*In order to measure the indicator "availability of public services online", an e-service sophistication model was developed used This model illustrates the different degrees of sophistication of online public services going from 'basic' information provision over oneway and two way interaction to 'full' electronic case handling. Online sophistication: The level of online availability of the basic public service*.

Variable G: eGovernment Fully Available Index 2006

---

[6] http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/extraction/evalight/EVAlight.jsp?A=1&language=en&root=/theme2/gov/gov_a_tax_itr
[7] http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=STAT/07/41&format=HTML&aged=0&language=en&guiLanguage=en
[8] http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/global/cpi
[9] http://www.weforum.org/en/initiatives/gcp/Global%20Information%20Technology%20Report/index.htm
[10] http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt06int.pdf
[11] http://www.capgemini.com/resources/thought_leadership/2006_online_availability_of_public_services/

Source: Cap Gemini[12]

> "*In order to measure the indicator "availability of public services online", an e-service sophistication model was developed used This model illustrates the different degrees of sophistication of online public services going from 'basic' information provision over oneway and two way interaction to 'full' electronic case handling. Fully available online: The total number of basic public services that are fully (=100%) available online".*

Variable H: EIU e-readiness Index 2007

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit[13]

> "*The EIU e-readiness rankings for 2007 ranked 69 countries in terms of six criteria. In order of importance, these are: consumer and business adoption; connectivity and technology infrastructure; business environment, social and cultural environment, government policy and vision; and legal and policy environment*".
>
> "*1. Connectivity and technology infrastructure Weight in overall score: 20% 2. Business environment Weight in overall score: 15% 3. Social and cultural environment Weight in overall score: 15% 4. Legal environment Weight in overall score: 10% 5. Government policy and vision Weight in overall score: 15% 6. Consumer and business adoption Weight in overall score: 25%*"

Variable I: EIU e-readiness Index component Consumer and business adoption 2007

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit[14]

> "*6. Consumer and business adoption. Weight in overall score: 25%" Category description: If connectivity, societal adoption, and legal and policy environments are necessary enabling platforms for e-readiness, then the actual utilisation of digital channels by people and companies is a measure of successful implementation. The Economist Intelligence Unit looks at the amount that businesses and consumers spend on accessing ICT services and their adoption levels of e-commerce. This year the Economist Intelligence Unit has also re-oriented the category to include analysis of the availability of digital channels for accessing government services".*

Variable J: Percentage of individuals who have used the Internet, in the last 3 months, for interaction with public authorities 2006

Source: Eurostat[15]

Variable K: Percentage of enterprises which use the Internet for interaction with public authorities 2006

Source: Eurostat[16]

Variable L: Well-Being Index 2004

Source: University of Cambridge, Department of Economics

> "*First, we assess the determinants of well-being using a multilevel modelling approach using data at the national, regional and individual levels. Second, we have extended*

---

[12] http://www.capgemini.com/resources/thought_leadership/2006_online_availability_of_public_services/
[13] http://globaltechforum.eiu.com/index.asp?layout=rich_story&channelid=4&categoryid=29&doc_id=10599
[14] http://globaltechforum.eiu.com/index.asp?layout=rich_story&channelid=4&categoryid=29&doc_id=10599
[15] http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=0,1136250,0_45572555&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL
[16] http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=0,1136250,0_45572555&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

the model to account for the effects of social interactions within each group, as well as intrinsic socio-demographic indicators and higher-level exogenous contextual factors".

Variable M: Public Administration Spend on IT per person, adjusted by GDP Per Head
Source: eGovernment Economics Project[17]

Variable N: Global Peace Index 2007
Source: Vision of Humanity Project[18]

"*This project has approached the task on two fronts— the first aim is to produce a scoring model and global peace index that ranks 120 nations by their relative states of peace using 24 indicators. The indicators have been selected as being the best available datasets that reflect the incidence or absence of peace, and contain both quantitative data and qualitative scores from a range of trusted sources. The second aim is to use the underlying data and results from the Global Peace Index to begin an investigation into the relative importance of a range of potential determinants or "drivers" that may influence the creation and nurturance of peaceful societies, both internally and externally*".

Variable O: 2005 eGovernment overall maturity scores
Source: Accenture[19]

"*Our scoring this year consists of two components, each with a weighting of 50 percent. The first is service maturity, which measures the level to which a government has developed an online presence. Service maturity takes into account service breadth (the number of national services available online) and service depth (the level of completeness at which the service is offered (publish-, interact- or transact-level service). The second component is customer service maturity, which measures the extent to which government agencies manage interactions with their customers (citizens and businesses) and deliver service in an integrated way. Our customer service maturity score considers how well governments have addressed the four dimensions of leadership in customer service: citizen-centered, multi-channel, cross-government service delivery and proactive communications about the services to the citizens and businesses that are the end recipients*".

Variable P: Trust Barometer 2007 - Trust in Government in general
Source: Edelman[20]

"*The 2007 Edelman Trust Barometer is the firm's eighth trust and credibility survey. The survey was produced by research firm StrategyOne. The survey was conducted by a 30-minute telephone survey conducted in October - November 2006. The survey population included respondents who are between the ages of 35 and 64; college educated; in the top 25% of household income nationally; report a significant interest and engagement in the media, economic, and policy affairs. The nations represented include United States (400 respondents), China (300), United Kingdom (150), Germany (150), France (150), Italy (150), Spain (150), the Netherlands (150), Sweden*

---

[17] http://82.187.13.175/eGEP/Static/Contents/final/D.1.3Expenditure_Study_final_version.pdf
[18] http://www.visionofhumanity.com/rankings/
[19] https://www.accenture.com/NR/rdonlyres/081E84B0-E655-4F9B-95DF-94A3F34B09FA/0/leadership_customerservice.pdf
[20] http://www.edelman.com/trust/2007/

(150), Poland (150), Russia (150), Ireland (150), Mexico (150), Brazil (150), Canada (150), Japan (150), South Korea (150), and India (150)".