



EUR e GOV

Innovative and adaptive pan- European services for citizens in 2010 and beyond

Pan-European
eGovernment
services: An
assessment of their
potential based on
the GPF and IDABC
good practice
framework

(Deliverable WP2.D1)

June 28 Final

Prepared for DG Information Society &
Media of the European Commission

<http://www.euregov.eu/index.html>

Summary

This report is part of the EUREGOV project on ‘Innovative adaptive pan-European eGovernment services for citizens’, commissioned by the Directorate-General Information Society of the European Commission. It provides the results of Internet research and a survey of good practice cases of European eGovernment services. The objective of this research was to identify Pan-European eGovernment Services (PEGS) for citizens with a high impact on EU objectives, such as economic growth (or other economic benefits, e.g. cost savings), eInclusion, improvement of quality of life, or improvement of service provision through better service products or organisational and technological innovations.

Since applying a strict definition of PEGS turned out that, apart from information and conflict resolution services provided by the European Commission, there are no PEGS. For this reason, a more flexible definition of PEGS has been developed that allowed to capture existing PEGS as well as services that are supplied on local, regional or national levels but bear a potential to expand geographically or contain elements that appear meaningful for the development of PEGS:

Pan-European eGovernment Services (PEGS)

- a) are provided by or on behalf of European public sector entities
- b) at local, regional, national, or supra-national level
- c) by means of interoperable trans-European telematic networks (e.g. the Internet)
- d) in order to perform public administration tasks, including provision and exchange of information and provision of participation opportunities for citizens
- e) that meet a demand of other public entities and particularly demand of other citizens at any geographic level
- f) for “material” services as well as for the generation of civic attitudes that address pan-European tasks or improve citizens' identification with the EU
- g) with the potential to be extended towards a majority of EU member states (instead of, for instance, only in countries with the same language, like UK and Ireland or Germany and Austria)
- h) by either being designed to expand or by containing elements (of, for instance, service integration, interoperability, or eInclusion) that could feed in the design of future eGovernment services on pan-European level

Based on this definition and related to the i2010 Benchmarking Indicators and the eGEP Measurement Framework, following criteria have been applied in order to select a list of 12 PEGS for further examination in case studies:

- Generating civic attitudes (towards pan-European scope)
- Capacity to expand geographically or to be transferred easily to other countries
- Big scope of users
- Strong benefits for users
- Process innovation
- Product innovation
- Technological innovation
- Technological standard / diffusion of new technologies
- Economic factors (cost savings, productivity gains, spill over effects)
- Degree of service integration
- Reduction of bureaucratic burden for PAs and citizens

Following 12 eGovernment services turned out to be meaningful for the further examination of the potential of PEGS:

- HELP.gv.at
- Medi@komm-Transfer
- NETC@RDS (as part of EHIC)
- e@SY Connects
- Belgian Social Security
- Generalitat en Red (GENRED)
- Learndirect Scotland
- SOLVIT
- European Consumer Centres Network (ECC-Net)
- Malopolska Gateway
- Your Europe
- European Employment Services (EURES)

The main findings of this baseline survey of eGovernment surveys in Europe are:

1. The number of existing PEGS is quite low at current, but there is a great potential for PEGS through service bundling and networking of different PAs. Existing HI-PEGS are provided by the EC and seem to focus on two sorts of services, information services and conflict resolution.
2. We identified at least two different development paths of PEGS: While all existing PEGS have been created by the European Commission on European scope right from the outset, the observed trends towards service bundling and networking of PAs imply that there is an opportunity for PEGS to develop from best practice transfer of national eGovernment solutions to other countries.
3. Existing PEGS usually have a European institution as front and national institutions in MS as back office; implying that scope and depth of services provided by the European institution are limited because a good part of the overall service provision is performed by institutions in

MS. The 7 national eGovernment services that have been selected bear however elements that could serve as building blocks for the creation of HI-PEGS.

4. The 12 selected eGovernment services allow insights in how eGovernment services in Europe strive to achieve different EU objectives.

The current situation requires from research not only to focus on existing PEGS but also to envisage the potential for PEGS to develop / advance in future, i.e. the ways in which PEGS might emerge and improve within the existing set of national and pan-European eGovernments. We decided therefore that the cases studies should not focus on a few selected PEGS but cluster around themes. The clusters will have one main case and a number of supporting “case notes”¹. The idea is to flesh out how to build on an existing PEGS (Solvit) and make it more valuable, through adding services; how to take a national scheme to trans- or pan-European level; explore incentives and processes for (centrally) developing truly citizen oriented PEGS; see how local actors collaborate across Europe, though shared interests and concerns.

As the most meaningful themes with regard to EU objectives and the i2010 benchmarking indicators we identified objectives of the EU Service Directive (especially Article 8), reduction of administrative burden, improved service provision for mobile citizens (health services), and eInclusion.

Following clusters of eGovernment services appear to be most illustrative with regard to these thematic priorities:

- EU Services Directive: HELP.gv.at & Media@Komm-Transfer
- Reduction of administrative burden: SOLVIT & Belgian Social Security
- Improved service provision for mobile citizens: NETC@RDS (& EHIC)
- eInclusion: e@SYConnects

¹ We understand “case study” as an in-depth analysis of an eGovernment service that covers all relevant aspects of PEGS generation and improvement, while “case notes” focus only on selected features of an eGovernment service that help to analyse aspects that cannot be studied sufficiently in the case study (because the main case does not show this feature or because the feature seems to occur in different variants).

Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.Contents

Summary	2
Contents.....	5
Preface.....	7
Glossary.....	9
1. Background – Towards an Operational Approach for the Development of PEGS.....	11
2. Potentials of PEGS: A Comparison of HI Performance of Pan-European eGovernment Services and National eGovernment Services.....	18
2.1. Provision of services that resemble “material goods”.....	18
2.2. Big scope of users benefiting from the service	19
2.3. Strong benefits for users (PAs, citizens, businesses)	19
2.4. eInclusion.....	19
2.5. Process innovations	19
2.6. Technological innovations	19
2.7. Big scope of adoption of new procedures and technologies.....	19
2.8. Cost savings, productivity gains, or spill over effects.....	19
2.9. High degree of service integration.....	20
2.10. Reduction of bureaucratic burdens for PAs, citizens, and businesses	20
3. Criteria for the selection of case studies.....	21
3.1. Generating civic attitudes (towards pan-European scope)	21
3.2. Capacity to expand geographically or to be transferred easily to other countries.....	21
3.3. Big scope of users.....	21
3.4. Strong benefits for users.....	22

3.6. Process innovation	22
3.7. Product innovation	22
3.8. Technological innovation	22
3.9. Technological standard / diffusion of new technologies	23
3.10. Economic factors (cost savings, productivity gains, spill over effects)	23
3.11. Degree of service integration	23
3.12. Reduction of bureaucratic burden for PAs and citizens.....	23
3.13. Additional selection criteria.....	23
4. List of Proposed PEGS and eGovernment Services for Case Studies.....	24
4.1. HELP.gv.at	28
4.2. Medi@komm-Transfer.....	28
4.3. NETC@RDS.....	30
4.4. e@SY Connects.....	31
4.5. Belgian Social Security	32
4.6. Generalitat en Red (GENRED)	33
4.7. Learndirect Scotland	34
4.8. SOLVIT.....	35
4.9. European Consumer Centres Network (ECC-Net)	37
4.10. Malopolska Gateway.....	38
4.11. Your Europe.....	38
4.12. European Employment Services (EURES)	40
5. Conclusions: Building Thematic Clusters for the Exploration of the Impact of PEGS	41
5.1. Main findings	41
5.2. Thematic priorities and eGovernment service clusters for case studies.....	42
5.3. Guidelines for case studies	44
Appendix I: PEGS in the eGOV-GPF and DGINFSO-GPF	48
Appendix II: Guideline for Internet Research and Telephone Surveys.....	59
Appendix III: Profiles of the 12 Selected eGovernment Services and PEGS	62

Preface

The preliminary objective of this report was to select existing PEGS for citizens for the purpose of conducting case studies and to identify those with highest expected impact. The case studies were meant to better understand how PEGS work in practice and to validate an impact assessment framework for PEGS. However, in applying a strict PEGS definition to the biggest eGovernment services repositories in Europe, the eGovernment Good Practice Framework (eGOV-GPF)² and the Good Practice Framework database provided by DG INFSO (DGINFSO-GPF)³, the project found that no PEGS existed other than information services provided by the EC.⁴ The project thus decided to change the objective and the definitions to focus on different aspects of PEGS development; i.e. what mechanisms exist to scale up or transform existing eGovernment services to a pan-European level. The current objective of this report is to select existing cases to help understanding mechanisms for developing Pan-European eGovernment Services (PEGs) for the citizen and to identify services that could be delivered at the PE level and would have significant

² <http://www.egov-goodpractice.org>

³ http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/egovernment_research/gpf/-index_en.htm

⁴ Information on these eGovernment services was gathered through Internet research and telephone interviews. 289 eGovernment services listed in the database of the eGovernment Good Practice Framework and 65 cases listed in DG INFSO's database were scrutinised until January 2007. Many of the eGovernment services in both databases overlap, so that the total of cases that were examined is 318. By the time of writing this paper, the European eGovernment Good Practice Database lists 300 cases. However, none of the 11 cases that were excluded from the analysis seems to match the criteria for being selected as a case study. These criteria are presented in the following sections of the paper. Apart from the eGovernment Services of the two GPF databases, PEGS provided by the European Commission have also been included in the analysis. The change of the objective of this report meant to include eGovernment services that are provided below pan-European level (i.e. eGovernment services provided on supra-national, national, regional and local level) that bear the potential to expand to pan-European level in the future or feature characteristics that appear to be meaningful for the advancement of such services towards PEGS or for the creation of new services as PEGS. Existing PEGS are considered to provide insights in the structure, functioning and sustainability of such advanced eGovernment services. eGovernment services that have not (yet) reached pan-European scope have been proposed for closer examination only if they provide lessons to learn or contain elements that could serve as building blocks for the development of PEGS.

impact. It also identifies what existing services may have high impact if delivered at PE level.

This report applies definitions and concepts developed in other work streams of the project. The assessment of High Impact follows the IPAT methodology as developed in the “Domain Mapping and Impact” report (Cave & Simmons 2006) that describes the general rationale of eGovernment services and the IPAT (Impact = Population x Activity x Time) technique for measuring their impact. PE definitions have been derived from the work on PEGS indicator development in the framework of the annual eEurope benchmarking exercise.

The IPAT concept is applied in order to secure that the eGovernment Services we envisage for further research have a high potential for delivering impacts with regard to achieving or progressing towards EU objectives, such as economic growth (or other economic benefits, e.g. cost savings), eInclusion, improvement of quality of life, or improvement of service provision through better service products or organisational and technological innovations.

This report provides a selection of clusters of advanced European eGovernment services that show a strong potential for and impact on existing and developing pan-European eGovernment services (PEGS). These clusters will later be further examined in case studies. These case studies will feed directly into two other tasks of the project, the “Impact Assessment Framework” and the creation of a PEGS-related “Decision-making Model”.

Glossary

eGOV-GPF

European eGovernment Good Practice Framework (<http://www.egov-goodpractice.org>)

DGINFSO-GPF

Good Practice Framework database provided by DG INFSO (http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/egovernment_research/gpf/index_en.htm)

EHIC

European Health Insurance Card

G2B

Government-to-business services

G2C

Government-to-citizen services

G2G

Government-to-Government services

HI

High impact

ICT

Information and Communication Technology

I PAT

Impact (I) on the natural environment equals the product of population (P), affluence (A) (or per capita income) and technology (T).

MS

Member States of the European Union

PA /PAs

Public administration / Public administrations

PEGS

Pan-European eGovernment Service(s)

1. Background – Towards an Operational Approach for the Development of PEGS

The European Parliament⁵ understands PEGS as “cross-border public sector information and interactive services, either sectoral or horizontal, i.e. of cross-sectoral nature, provided by European public administrations to European public administrations, businesses, including their associations, and citizens, including their associations, by means of interoperable trans-European telematic networks.”

In practice, PEGS must be understood in a broader sense. For instance, the DGINFSO GPF, which classified 12 eGovernment services as PEGS, understands “pan-European” as the final level of a geographical hierarchy from “local” over “regional and federal” and “national” to “pan-European”. In this sense it is sufficient to be classified as PEGS when, for instance, services are provided in foreign languages (for foreign citizens), the website is frequented by visitors / users from other countries, or services are provided to citizens working abroad.⁶

The occurrence of PEGS (as referred to in the two GPF databases) at current is very low, the eGOV-GPF contains only ten and the DGINFSO-GPF only 12 such cases.⁷ This appears to be due to the fact that government services are usually bound to national law and therefore rather provided on local, regional, and national level than on cross-border or even pan-European level. With regard to the purposes of this study, which focuses on eGovernment services for citizens, the incidence of PEGS becomes even more limited when eGovernment services that offer services only to other PAs or to businesses would be excluded from the analysis.

When assessing the examples of existing PEGS in the DGINFSO-GPF and the eGOV-GPF, it appears as if PEGS are generated as pan-European eGovernment services from the outset rather than evolving gradually from local, regional, or

⁵ European Parliament (2004): Article 3b of the Decision 2004/387/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on 21st of April 2004. For a more detailed discussion of definitions of PEGS see

⁶ A list and discussion of all eGovernment services that are classified as PEGS in the eGOV-GPF and the DGINFSO-GPF is provided in appendix I.

⁷ See appendix I.

national services in one or more countries.⁸ Often they must be considered as experiments or pilots more than as fully operating government services. Many of these pilots aim at the provision of information or ease of communication and participation but do not provide the citizens with “substantial” services that can be provided by eGovernment services on national, regional, or local level, such as tax paying or reception of pensions or other social benefits.

The main objective of this project is to help understanding the conditions and mechanisms of “the “pan-Europeanization” of public services. If a Member State makes its services available to its own citizens living elsewhere in another Member State, or to citizens of other Member States (even if only by providing public information in different languages), this will effectively contribute to the pan-Europeanization of public services – even when the Member State acts completely unilaterally, not cooperating or interacting with other Member States an/or EU administrations.” (Weehuizen 2007: 11). As Weehuizen (2007: 11-14) points out, PEGS can be provided by either national public administrations or EU public administrations but do not necessarily have to be provided by a pan-European provider. In addition, PEGS must be accessible at least for a substantial part of Europe and therefore they are “by nature” cross-border services, but not all cross-border services can be considered as PEGS, for instance if they lack exchange of information via interoperable networks.

In order to better capture the conditions and mechanisms of PEGS the project team therefore decided to abandon these existing PEGS (as referred to in the eGOV-GPF) and to focus on eGovernment services that

- are provided as PEGS to all or a majority of EU Member States by the EC but not included in the two GPF databases or
- that are provided on local, regional, or national level but either bear the potential to become pan-European in future (i.e. they are designed to be extended allow further extension of their on geographical coverage / scope) or
- comprise aspects of eGovernment service design that appear useful to be adopted for PEGS⁹

Since the project focuses on PEGS that have high impact (HI-PEGs) on EU objectives, PEGS must be chosen on the basis that they are expected to have a substantial impact on

⁸ This applies, for instance, to following eGovernment services listed in Appendix 1: eVote, eACE, Environmental eServices for Citizens, ESTRELLA, Pan European Integrated Parliamentary Portal, RISER, and EDEN. An exception might be provided by eMayor, which aims at developing pan-European eGovernment infrastructures in a bottom-up approach.

⁹ The latter two points allow including some eGovernment services that the DGINFSO-GPF considers as PEGS, though we do not classify them as such since they do not meet the criteria of our definition. We indicate in appendix 1 which eGovernment services from the DGINFSO-GPF have been included.

- achieving EU objectives (such as economic growth - or other economic benefits, e.g. cost savings -, eInclusion, improvement of quality of life, or improvement of service provision through better service products or organisational and technological innovations) and/or
- delivering wide benefits to large numbers of citizens (e.g. by offering eased and improved social security services to all)
- or deep benefits to specific groups (e.g. by providing information services and participation opportunities to groups of people that were previously excluded from these services)

This approach to HI-PEGS takes into account the fact that most government services develop on local, regional, and national level, but that these may be expanded to a broader geographical scope once they have demonstrated their effectiveness and sustainability. We are aware that the critical aspect of PEGS is the cross-border and interoperability complexity and that it is unlikely that national services will bear cross border elements. However, many approaches to improve the efficiency of government services include integration of a multitude of services and technologies, so that interoperability is an issue for services at national, regional or local level, too. Often, these product and technological changes or innovations must master organisational challenges. Therefore, advanced eGovernment services on national scope might provide hints to which elements should be combined if a PA or a group of PAs wants to establish HI-PEGS. Finally, some of these advanced eGovernment services aim at a broader take up in the public sector, so that though there might not be a cross-border element in the service it might nevertheless help to understand the conditions under which existing services expand their geographical scope. With regard to raising citizens' awareness of or need for eGovernment services on a broader geographical scope, we consider eGovernment services that help generating or increasing civic attitudes as a valuable means when these civic attitudes go beyond the limits of the geographical district that is administered by the PA that offers a service.

For the purpose of this project, we therefore apply following definition of PEGS¹⁰:

Pan-European eGovernment Services (PEGS)

- a) are provided by or on behalf of European public sector entities
- b) at local, regional, national, or supra-national level
- c) by means of interoperable trans-European telematic networks (e.g. the Internet)
- d) in order to perform public administration tasks, including provision and exchange of information and provision of participation opportunities for citizens
- e) that meet a demand of other public entities, citizens, and businesses at any geographic level
- f) for “material” services as well as for the generation of civic attitudes that address pan-European tasks or improve citizens' identification with the EU
- g) with the potential to be extended towards a majority of EU member states (instead of, for instance, only in countries with the same language, like UK and Ireland or Germany and Austria)
- h) by either being designed to expand or by containing elements (of, for instance, service integration, interoperability, or eInclusion) that could feed in the design of future eGovernment services on pan-European level

This definition contains a geographical and a technological dimension and emphasizes aspects of service evolution (in the sense of evolving into pan-European scope) and the generation of civic attitudes on pan-European scope.¹¹

A point that deserves some consideration is how to secure PEGS to have high impact on EU policy objectives and on citizens' life. Like with “PEGS”, the term

¹⁰ In every-day context, PEGS can simply be defined as eGovernment services that provide high impact on European scope. Our proposed definition is an academic one that is necessary for the EUREGov project in order to define the field of research in a clear-cut way that allows distinguishing unequivocally between eGovernment services that appear meaningful for the further development of PEGS and those that appear not meaningful.

¹¹ This definition deviates from but does not contradict to the definition of PEGS as provided by Weehuizen (2007: 12). Weehuizen's definition focuses on the kind of collaboration between governments in order to provide PEGS, whereas the definition used in this report focuses on geographical, technological and evolutionary features of PEGS in order to grasp their conditions and mechanisms.

“high impact” also lacks a clear-cut definition. The IPAT concept¹² provides a framework for the assessment of impact of eGovernment services. For the purpose of this report, the IPAT concept has been detailed with regard to concrete distinguishable factors that relate to the i2010 Benchmarking Indicators¹³ and the eGEP Measurement Framework¹⁴. Though the factors we selected comply to the eGEP measurement framework they do not need to reach the same level of detail. For instance, for the purpose of this project it was only to consider whether or not an eGovernment service addresses explicitly and achieves actually the inclusion of socially disadvantaged groups, whereas it turned out to be unnecessary to know which exact group the service addresses and how the objective is pursued on the technological and organisational level. We also considered only whether or not the service was aligned with technological, organisational, or product innovations, but did not check for compliance with international accessibility standards or for detailed measures of efficiency of the service or user satisfaction. Table 1 indicates how the selection criteria we applied in this study relate to the eGEP measurement framework.

Table 1: Case study selection criteria and eGEP measurement framework

eGEP Measurement Framework		Case Studies Selection Criteria
Efficiency	Cashable financial gains	Economic factors (cost savings, productivity gains, spill over effects)
	Better empowered employee	n/a
	Better organisational and IT architectures	Process innovation
		Technological innovation
Democracy		Degree of service integration
	Openness	n/a
	Transparency and accountability	Technological standard / diffusion of new technologies
Effectiveness	Participation	Generating civic attitudes (towards pan-European scope)
	Reduced administrative burden	Reduction of bureaucratic burden for PAs and citizens
	Increased users' value and satisfaction	Product innovation
		Strong benefits for users
	More inclusive public services	Big scope of users 15
		Capacity to expand geographically or to be transferred easily to other countries

It must be recalled in this context that the design of this study strived to secure these objectives by focussing on services that have been incorporated in a Good Practice Framework, which indicates that these services meet most of these requirements, though to varying degrees. The PEGS provided by the European

¹² EureGov Domain Mapping and Impact Report (Cave & Simmons 2006)

¹³ <http://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-a&rls=org.mozilla%3Ade%3Aofficial&channel=s&hl=de&q=i2010+benchmarking+indicators&lr=&btnG=Google-Suche>

¹⁴ http://217.59.60.50/eGEP/Static/Contents/final/D.2.4_Measurement_Framework_final_version.pdf

Commission have been selected because they are the only eGovernment services at current that are provided to all MS. With regard to the geographical scope (pan-European-ness) they provide thus the state of art of PEGS design and provision. In order to be able to capture a broad variety of eGovernment services that might achieve impact in different ways and in different areas of the society or economy, we would like to apply a dynamic and adaptive concept of “high impact” that allows to evaluate different aspects of eGovernment services that might appear variably important in different contexts.

High impact (HI) could thus be achieved

- through provision of services that provide more than pure information, i.e. “material goods” such as monetary benefits or entitlements (regarding pensions, social benefits, or licenses, for instance) [A]
- through coverage of a large number of citizens (scope of users benefiting from the service) [P] [T]
- through provision of “best practice” solutions that can be adopted by other PAs (scope of providers benefiting from the service) [P] [T]
- through including groups of people who were previously excluded from usage of / benefiting from a government service (eInclusion) [P] [A]
- through facilitating existing procedures of service provision (process innovation) [A] [T]
- through developing or adopting new technologies, such as Content Management Systems or Document Management Systems that adapt to the specific needs of PAs (technological innovation) [A]
- through cost savings, productivity gains, or spill over effects (usually generated by process or technological innovation in the public sector) [A]
- through unifying services that are provided by different public authorities in one (“virtual”) PA (service integration, such as “one stop shops”) [T] [A]
- through reducing bureaucratic burdens for PAs and citizens, e.g. by standardising forms or integrating tasks at the PA level so that citizens have less forms to fill out or the amount of document exchanges between different PAs can be reduced [A]

All the factors in our definition can be allocated to the IPAT elements: people [P], activity [A], or time / frequency of use [T] and are earmarked in this sense. We are aware that this is neither a clear-cut nor a comprehensive definition of “high impact”, but this dynamic definition allows distinguishing interesting eGovernment services from those that can be ignored with regard to the purposes of the EUREGov project.

The following sections describe the criteria that derived from our definition of PEGS and HI and a selection of cases of good practice eGovernment services that appear groundbreaking for the evolution of HI-PEGS.

2. Potentials of PEGS: A Comparison of HI Performance of Pan-European eGovernment Services and National eGovernment Services

As pointed out in the introductory section, the purpose of this report is to identify a number of PEGS and eGovernment services that appear to be instructive for the future development of PEGS. With regard to the factors we consider to generate HI it must be assumed that the capacity of eGovernment services to perform well along these criteria decreases with growing coverage of languages and cultures and spatial and administrative distance to the legal and social systems on the level of nation states. Most government services are defined, produced and distributed at the level of the nation state and its administrative subdivisions. We would therefore like to start this section with a comparison of the performance capacities of PEGS as compared to advanced¹⁵ eGovernment services along these criteria before we explain how these selection criteria have been applied.

In principle, in comparison to national eGovernment services PEGS appear limited with regard to factors that depend on the existence of a legal system for the redistribution of entitlements and monetary goods (tax, social security benefits). However, the following comparison suggests that PEGS bear a great potential for increasing the scope of users benefiting from eGovernment services, cost savings, productivity gains, spill over effects, increased service integration, and reduction of bureaucratic burdens for citizens, businesses, and public administration.

2.1. Provision of services that resemble “material goods”

As mentioned above, “material goods”, especially monetary goods like unemployment benefits, tax reductions, pensions etc. can hardly be distributed on pan-European scope because of the lack of a pan-European tax and social security system. Entitlements however are already distributed on pan-European scope, either based on European law (such as labour protection rights or economic rights such as the right to establish a company throughout

¹⁵ As indicated by their incorporation in a GPF.

EU Member States) so that in this regard the performance of PEGS appears not structurally lower than those of eGovernment services provided on national scope.

2.2. Big scope of users benefiting from the service

To cover a big scope of users appears to be easier to achieve for PEGS since they are designed for covering people in different countries and with different languages, whereas eGovernment services on national level provide their services only to their population on national, regional or local level.

2.3. Strong benefits for users (PAs, citizens, businesses)

By and large, the degree to which users may benefit from a service results from the quality of the service and the kind of the service. The first aspect should be independent of whether the service is provided on national or pan-European scope, whereas the second aspect may depend on the geographical scope because nation states have a large set of material and immaterial services to distribute of which many cannot be expanded to users in other countries because of legal constraints

2.4. eInclusion

e-Inclusion should be an integral element of eGovernment services at any geographical level, regardless of whether they are provided in a nation state or on pan-European scope

2.5. Process innovations

Due to the broader range of services provided on national level the field for process innovations appears larger on national than on pan-European scope. This appears to be a quantitative but no qualitative difference – eGovernment services provided on pan-European scope also strive to apply the state of the art of process organisation.

2.6. Technological innovations

eGovernment services strive to use and / or develop newest technologies, regardless of the geographical scope on which the service is provided.

2.7. Big scope of adoption of new procedures and technologies

Due to the larger field for process and technological innovations on national scope it appears likely that more adoption takes place on national scope, but pan-European eGovernment services also rely on the adoption of at least those organisational or technological solutions that facilitate covering users in different MS. Pan-European eGovernment services can define or help to find standards for generic eGovernment services (i.e. those independent from specifics of national law and tax and social security systems) that can be adopted by national eGovernment services in MS.

2.8. Cost savings, productivity gains, or spill over effects

Basically, the broader the geographical scope on which an eGovernment service is provided, the bigger could be the impact on cost, productivity gains and spill-

over effects; but this impact of pan-European eGovernment on the European economy services must be compared to the sum of all effects of national eGovernment services on local / national economies. The potential provided by PEGS in this regard has yet not been explored.

2.9. High degree of service integration

Service integration in European eGovernment services is an explicit policy goal of the European Commission, as expressed in Article 8 of the Commissions Service Directive. Due to the broader range of services provided on national scope the field for service integration on this geographical level is larger than on pan-European level, but the potential for efficiency gains and other economic, social and administrative advantages through shifting services from national to European level and integrating them in pan-European eGovernment services is yet to explore

2.10. Reduction of bureaucratic burdens for PAs, citizens, and businesses

in principle, all eGovernment services have the potential to reduce bureaucratic burdens, regardless of their geographical scope; pan-European eGovernment services however provide new means for redistributing work across national and supra-national PAs, thus increasing the potential for a reduction of bureaucratic burdens in MS as well as across countries

3. Criteria for the selection of case studies

We discuss here criteria that derive from our definition of HI-PEGS in section 1. The aim is to develop criteria that capture both, existing HI-PEGS as well as eGovernment services that do not provide HI-PEGS but bear the potential to become HI-PEGS in future or that provide building blocks for the creation of new HI-PEGS.

The selection of eGovernment services for in-depth analyses through case studies must be led by criteria that relate to the factors that generate high impact. In section 1 we identified already a number of factors of high impact. In the following we explain how these criteria have been applied in order to identify relevant eGovernment services for case studies.

3.1. Generating civic attitudes (towards pan-European scope)

As described above, civic attitudes are often constricted to the administrative district in which citizen might exercise political participation and power. Therefore, the generation of civic attitudes through interaction between PAs and citizens is an important precondition for the development and implementation of new eGovernment services. HI-PEGS require a civic attitude that exceeds the scope of traditional administrative districts, therefore those eGovernment services that contribute to a better awareness of Europe as a political space in which each individual citizen is able to participate in political life and to exercise political power is considered to achieve HI.

3.2. Capacity to expand geographically or to be transferred easily to other countries

For the evolution of existing eGovernment services towards HI-PEGS it is extremely important that they are able to grow on regional scope or to be transferred easily to other countries or service domains. Thus, eGovernment projects that are designed in order to grow or to be transferable are expected to have a high impact and to help identifying critical success factors for the creation of HI-PEGS. Usage of open standards is valued positively in this context.

3.3. Big scope of users

This criteria must be met by all eGovernment services that will be selected for case studies. The scope of users is dependent on the geographical administrative district that is covered by an eGovernment service. HI-PEGS

should provide services that meet a sufficiently high demand within the populations of a majority of EU member states.

3.4. Strong benefits for users

There are cases where the service provided by a PA does not cover a big part of the population, but those who are provided with the service benefit significantly from it. For instance, land register services are not relevant for all inhabitants of an administrative district, but solutions that limit the complexity and opaqueness of issues related to purchasing or selling real estate would provide a great advantage for those who rely on this service.

3.5. eInclusion

eInclusion is per se a valuable goal because it helps integrating groups of people that are excluded so far from participating in political life and benefiting from certain government services. Therefore, whenever an eGovernment service defines eInclusion as one of its objectives and can prove that it achieves advancement in this respect the eGovernment service will be classified as a high impact.

3.6. Process innovation

This criterion relates to the opportunities provided by ICT to organise and maintain government services in a new way that allows integrating services that have formerly been offered separately and possibly from different PAs, to ease interaction between citizens and PAs, and / or to accelerate the speed in which procedures are completed. We distinguish roughly between a low degree of process innovations, which is ascribed to projects that mainly transfer existing services from desk to computer / the Internet, and a high degree of process innovation, which is ascribed to an eGovernment service when the division of work and / or, the organisational structure of the institution that provides the service change significantly. A change of the organisational structure of the service is, for instance, given when instead of one institution that originally provided the service two or more institutions have to collaborate in order to provide it.

3.7. Product innovation

High impact is given when new services are created or when the nature of the provided service changes substantially. The nature of the service that is provided by an institution can change significantly through integrating different services, so that instead of one separate service now the service is provided together with advice services or other services.

3.8. Technological innovation

eGovernment services are typically aligned with a change of technology that is used for the service provision, e.g. software, networks, and the like. Technological innovation is given when a PA develops new ambitious technological solutions, whereas developments that lead to basic changes in the software and hardware equipment and architecture of the PA that provides the eGovernment service do not suffice to become qualified as "technological innovation".

3.9. Technological standard / diffusion of new technologies

This criterion relates to the usage of ICT. PAs that use the latest ICT and have to adapt to new technological standards regularly are considered to achieve high impact because they contribute to the take up and dispersion of new technologies within the public sector. This criterion rewards if a PA manages to develop procedures or technologies (including standards) that are taken up and adopted by many other PAs or organisations outside the public sector. Fast and broad adoption of new procedures and technologies indicate that these technologies and procedures might also be helpful for the creation of HI-PEGS.

3.10. Economic factors (cost savings, productivity gains, spill over effects)

This criterion rewards if a PA manages to achieve significant positive economic effects through its eGovernment project. How these positive economic effects can be achieved is a crucial factor for the successful implementation and especially sustainability of newly-created HI-PEGS.

3.11. Degree of service integration

The more services are integrated in one (virtual) PA the more convenient is it for citizens to find the right information, to interact with public administration and to perform administrative procedures. Problems that occur with the process of implementing enhanced service integration might be also typical for problems that would occur with the generation of HI-PEGS. Therefore, the higher the degree of service integration the more impact is ascribed to an eGovernment service.

3.12. Reduction of bureaucratic burden for PAs and citizens

This criterion is strongly related to service integration and technological and process innovations. It remunerates effects of these factors that citizens and PAs perceive as an ease of life or work.

3.13. Additional selection criteria

With regard to the arguments that led to the operational definition of HI-PEGS following factors appear useful to be added to the list of selection criteria:

- generating civic attitudes on pan-European scope (or at least on a scope that exceeds the administrative sphere of the PA that provides the service)
- capacity to expand geographically or to be transferred easily to other countries

4. List of Proposed PEGS and eGovernment Services for Case Studies

In the following the 12 eGovernment services – including 5 PEGS provided by or through the European Commission – that turned out to have the highest impact are listed and described.

Based on the selection criteria discussed in the previous section a model has been developed in order to rank the impact of relevant eGovernment services and PEGS along these criteria. The model evaluated the 12 criteria as follows:

1. Generating civic attitudes: yes= 3 points, no= 0 points
2. Capacity to expand geographically: no = 0 points, low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, high = 3 points, supra-national level = 5 points, pan-European = 10 points
3. Scope of users: small = 1 point, medium = 2 points, big = 3 points
4. Benefits for users: low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points
5. eInclusion: not explicitly mentioned = 0 points, explicitly mentioned = 3 points
6. Process innovation: low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points
7. Product innovation: low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points
8. Technological innovation: low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points
9. Technological standard / diffusion: low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points
10. Economic benefits: : low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points
11. Degree of service integration: : low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points

12. Reduction of bureaucratic burden: : low = 1 point, medium = 2 points, strong = 3 points

eGovernment services that contribute significantly to the improvement of democratic participation and the inclusion of disadvantaged and handicapped persons receive a bonus because the telephone interviews carried out for the survey of eGovernment services have revealed that these capacities have a strong impact on acceptance through citizens and integration effects. Also, eGovernment services that are provided cross-border or on pan-European scope receive a bonus because they mastered language problems and because cross-border provision is a core characteristic of PEGS. Overall, eGovernment services provided on local, regional, or national level could achieve a maximum of 36 points, eGovernment services on supra-national level could achieve a maximum of 38 points, and PEGS could achieve a maximum of 43 points. The bonus for supra-nationality and pan-European-ness is due to the fact that such services are more difficult to organise and therefore often do not offer the same broad variety of services that eGovernment services on national level can offer. The bonus is therefore necessary to balance this structural disadvantage.¹⁶ Table 1 below shows the 12 eGovernment services – seven selected from the eGOV-GPF or DGINFSO-GPF and five PEGS provided by or through the European Commission – that turned out to have the highest impact as compared to other eGovernment services in the two GPFs or other PEGS provided by or through the European Commission. The following sections describe and discuss each of the selected eGovernment services.¹⁷

¹⁶ This does not imply that supra-national services and PEGS are not able at all to provide a broad variety of services. Indeed, there is a supra-national eGovernment service and a PEGS among the three top ranked services in table 1. However, to achieve such broad variety of services on cross-country level requires more effort than on national level.

¹⁷ Additional information on these services is provided in the short profiles in appendix III.

Table 2: 12 eGovernment services and PEGS with the highest impact

		HELP.gv.at		Media@komm-Transfer		Netc@rds	
		Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points
1	Generating civic attitudes	Yes	3	Yes	3	No	0
2	Capacity to expand geographically	Strong	5	Strong	3	Strong	10
3	Scope of users	Big	3	Big	3	Small	1
4	Benefits for users	Strong	3	Medium	3		3
5	eInclusion	Yes	3	Not explicitly mentioned	0	Not explicitly mentioned	0
6	Process innovation	Strong	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
7	Product innovation	Medium	2	Medium	2	Medium	2
8	Technological innovation	Strong	3	Strong	3	Medium	2
9	Technological standard / diffusion	Strong	3	Medium	3	Medium	2
10	Economic benefits	Medium	2	Strong	3	Medium	2
11	Degree of service integration	Very high	3	Very high	3	Very high	3
12	Reduction of bureaucratic burden	Very high	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
	Total ranking points		36		32		31

(Table 2 continued)

		e@SY Connects		Belgian Social Security		Generalitat en Red	
		Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points
1	Generating civic attitudes	No	0	No	0	Yes	3
2	Capacity to expand geographically	Medium	3	Strong	5	Medium	2
3	Scope of users	Big	3	Big	3	Big	3
4	Benefits for users	Strong	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
5	eInclusion	Yes	3	Not explicitly mentioned	0	Not explicitly mentioned	0
6	Process innovation	Strong	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
7	Product innovation	Medium	2	Medium	2	Medium	2
8	Technological innovation	Strong	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
9	Technological standard / diffusion	Strong	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
10	Economic benefits	Strong	2	Strong	3	Medium	2
11	Degree of service integration	Very high	3	Very high	3	Very high	3
12	Reduction of bureaucratic burden	Medium	3	Very high	3	Very high	3
	Total ranking points		31		31		30

(Table 2 continued)

		Learnirect Scotland		Solvit		European Consumer Centres Network	
		Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points
1	Generating civic attitudes	No	0	Yes	3	Yes	3
2	Capacity to expand geographically	Medium	2	Strong	10	Strong	10
3	Scope of users	Big	3	Small	1	Big	3
4	Benefits for users	Strong	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
5	eInclusion	Yes	3	Not explicitly mentioned	0	Not explicitly mentioned	0
6	Process innovation	Strong	3	Low	1	Low	1
7	Product innovation	Low	1	Low	1	Low	1
8	Technological innovation	Strong	3	Low	1	Low	1
9	Technological standard / diffusion	Strong	3	Low	1	Low	1
10	Economic benefits	Strong	3	Medium	3	Strong	3
11	Degree of service integration	Medium	2	Low	1	Low	1
12	Reduction of bureaucratic burden	Strong	3	Strong	3	Low	1
	Total ranking points		29		28		28

(Table 2 continued)

	Malopolska Gateway		Your Europe		EURES	
	Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points	Characteristics	Ranking points
Generating civic attitudes	No	0	Yes	3	No	0
Capacity to expand geographically	Big	3	Strong	10	Strong	10
Scope of users	Big	3	Big	3	Medium	2
Benefits for users	Medium	3	Strong	3	Strong	3
eInclusion	Not explicitly mentioned	0	Not explicitly mentioned	0	Not explicitly mentioned	0
Process innovation	Strong	3	Low	1	Low	1
Product innovation	Medium	2	Low	1	Low	1
Technological innovation	Medium	2	Low	1	Low	1
Technological standard / diffusion	Strong	3	Low	1	Low	1
Economic benefits	Strong	3	Low	1	Strong	3
Degree of service integration	Very high	3	Low	1	Low	1
Reduction of bureaucratic burden	Strong	3	Medium	2	Strong	3
	Total ranking points	28		27		26

4.1. HELP.gv.at

HELP.gv.at¹⁸ is an Internet platform initiated by the Austrian federal government and administered by the chancellor's office. It provides its services to everyone who has to deal with Austrian authorities and institutions. It is organised as a "one-stop-shop" covering about 150 life-events (birth, marriage etc.) as well as topics like "housing" or "starting a business". HELP.gv.at is offered in German and English language and addresses Austrian citizens as well as people from other countries who live and / or work in Austria or who have any kind of interest in this country (it is thus a supra-national eGovernment service). The architecture and technology of HELP.gv.at is offered to organisations in other European countries and, according to those who are responsible for the project, it has thus become one of the leading eGovernment applications in Europe.

The top position in the ranking is explained by the fact that HELP.gv.at combines a high degree of service integration and information provision with strong technological and product innovations and political objectives like eInclusion. Generating civic attitudes is encouraged through a "questions & suggestions" forum. The capacity to expand geographically is quite strong because the service is already provided in two languages (German and English) and addresses nationals as well as Austrians abroad or citizens of other states who have to deal with Austrian authorities. HELP.gv.at covers a very big scope of users because it has become the main contact point for citizens in Austria when they have to deal with public administration. The benefits for users are very strong because HELP.gv.at reduces search costs for citizens and businesses and provides fast and comprehensive information on all relevant issues that play a role in the G2C and G2B interaction. Barrier-free provision of the services was a very important objective when HELP.gv.at was created, so that it directly aims at including handicapped and disabled people. The high degree of service integration was aligned with a high degree of process innovation, whereas the degree of product innovation remained medium since the task was mainly to integrate and bundle services of which most existed already before HELP.gv.at came into life. As a result, bureaucratic procedures could have been eased. The technological impact of HELP.gv.at is also high because it is based on open standards and uses latest technologies in order to keep content and quality of the provided services up to date. The website provides the possibility to perform a number of services completely electronically, which helps to reduce cost for government institutions as well as for citizens and businesses.

4.2. Medi@komm-Transfer

MEDIA@Komm-Transfer¹⁹ is an initiative of the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour. It builds upon the Media@Komm initiative (1999-2003) that developed more than 300 advanced eGovernment solutions for German municipalities. While Media@komm aimed at developing such solutions, Media@komm-Transfer aims at developing *transferable* best-

¹⁸ English website: <http://www.help.gv.at/Content.Node/HELP-FC.html>

¹⁹ <http://www.mediakomm-transfer.de>

practice concepts while taking into account established e-government standards and proven procedures. As declared on the project description provided at the eGOV-GPF, “this also includes the expansion of international contacts and co-operation to promote the digital integration of Europe.”²⁰ With regard to serving citizens' needs it probably cannot compare to the other eGovernment services that are discussed here, but since it intends to harmonise the development of local e-government and establish it across the country through the transfer of best practices and know-how it provides a very instructive showcase of how procedures, technologies, and services that are developed in one PA can be implemented in other PAs, regions, and countries. The project is now in the state of finalisation. Basis of MEDIA@Komm-Transfer are 20 local authorities (“transfer municipalities”) from across Germany that have founded an e-government network. The consulting company Capgemini has been selected (from bidders in response to a pan-European tender) as “transfer agency” in order to control and co-ordinate the activities in the transfer municipalities. In practical terms, Media@komm-Transfer harmonises ideal concepts, procedures, and technical aspects such as formats for data exchange, links developments that have been made in parallel and without knowledge of each other (under the given legal, political, and technical conditions), and improves thus the interoperability of e-government procedures. The harmonisation covers the following topics:

- eGovernment components (e.g. geo-information systems, e-procurement)
- components for Internet portals (e.g. content management systems)
- operational applications (e.g. citizens register, commercial register)
- Internal services (e.g. electronic reporting)
- citizen participation (e.g. participation procedures)

Since Media@komm-Transfer aims at harmonising opportunities for citizens to participate in political life the project contributes to the generation of civic attitudes. To develop transferable eGovernment solutions is the main goal of Media@komm-Transfer, therefore it has a very strong capacity to expand geographically. According to our interlocutor from the transfer agency, the scope of users in the transfer municipalities is big (several thousands of users in each municipality). The benefits for citizens as well as for PAs are strong because it reduces waste of development efforts (by harmonising existing solutions for the same problem and by avoiding future unintended parallel developments) and for citizens government services become faster and easier and more transparent (because of the harmonisation efforts differences in the handling of, for instance, inquiries are reduced). Like with many other eGovernment services that are discussed here, product innovations (i.e. innovations on services) do not play an important for Media@komm-Transfer, whereas technological and process innovations provided a crucial challenge in order to achieve the projects goals of harmonising different services at different locations and / or to integrate different services from different locations into a

²⁰

Quoted from http://www.egov-goodpractice.org/gpd_details.php?&gpdid=178

bundle of services at one location. The degree of service integration is thus very high, which led to a reduction of bureaucratic burden for citizens and in G2G transactions.

4.3. NETC@RDS

Among the PEGS that were included in the proposals for case studies, NETC@RDS²¹ appears to be the one with the highest impact. On the website, the aims of NETC@RDS are described as follows: The "... project aims to improve the access of mobile European citizens to the national health care systems using advanced smart card technology. It also aims to implement and evaluate technical solutions for the European Health Insurance Card elektronification and for improving additional services such as the inter-European health costs clearing/billing processing." At current, the NETC@RDS project is in phase 2 of four development phases (initial market validation - full market validation - initial deployment - full deployment). The aim of the second project phase is to "... simultaneously define, demonstrate and evaluate new associated administrative processes for use by public health insurance and health care service providers (e.g. hospitals, ambulatory care) when providing necessary health care and/or immediate care services to European Member State residents travelling or temporarily resident outside their home country but inside the E.U. It will also establish and demonstrate practical technical interoperability for use of different national cards at the NETC@RDS pilot sites."

Due to its limitation on health services, NETC@RDS does not intentionally contribute to the generation of civic attitudes. It is provided across Europe, but at current only accessible in pilot regions in Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Finland. Users can make use of the service in their mother tongue. It thus has already demonstrated its strong capacity to expand geographically. The scope of users limited by the fact that the service can only be engaged when one is travelling or temporarily resident outside his or her home country and when he or she stays in one of the pilot regions. The scope of users will however enormously grow once the third and fourth phase of the project are completed. The strong benefits for users are evident: Besides easy access to health care services the coordinators expect NETC@RDS to provide a reliable source of information for health care provider front office staff checking insured entitlement or initiating interstate billing/clearing procedures. eInclusion is not explicitly mentioned as a goal of NETC@RDS, but its services are of course offered to disabled, too. While service integration and thus process innovation must be considered as quite high, product and technological innovations are yet in a planning phase. The consortium envisages the development and use of a common administrative electronic dataset for improved health insurance providers back office billing/clearing work-flow applications and further modernization of post-processing activities, but these are not yet realised. Once the service is fully operable it will be possible to perform the full service electronically (after getting directly in touch with physicians, hospital staff etc.). At current it is only possible for the end user to

²¹ <http://www.netcards-project.com/index.php>

obtain forms electronically. For those who can already use NETCA@RDS it helps a lot to ease and reduce bureaucratic procedures.

4.4. e@SY Connects

e@SY Connects (e@SY = Electronic services for South Yorkshire)²² is a project of the local governments (Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield) in South Yorkshire, UK. Besides these local authorities, the e@SY Connects consortium consists of health authorities, emergency services (Ambulance, Fire and Police), voluntary sector, the Regional Development Agency (Yorkshire Forward), South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, a job centre, and many other partnering organisations. Since this region shows a below average usage of ICT within the population e@SY Connects was introduced in order to ensure all citizens have equal access to citizen information and services and no one is socially excluded. The aim was "... to design a simple to use system and provide a front-end interface that non-computer users could use to access information and interactive services. The e@SY Connects approach enables people with no knowledge or experience of using Web/Internet services the ability to access the information and services".²³ The devices that are applied in order to provide those with no or insufficient computer experience access to information are mainly mobile phones and digital TV (DiTV).

e@SY Connects does not contribute to the generation of civic attitudes that go beyond the local area that is administered by the four local authorities. The scope of users is big, as e@SY Connects has become a vital information channel "for many thousand people" (project representative) in Yorkshire. The benefits for users as well as for providers is obvious; as e@SY Connects has allowed the involved public and private agencies "... to identify and meet more effectively the needs of the people and businesses they serve across existing boundaries".²⁴ The expert we were talking to believes that it would probably be easier to expand e@SY Connects geographically through growth within the region and then spreading it across the country than to take it and to implement it somewhere else, since the technology and the service organisation behind e@SY Connects requires some learning efforts before it can be implemented. In addition, e@SY Connets is provided in English only, so that an adoption in another country would require to translate its documents. Nevertheless, in principle a transfer to other regions and countries is possible. Indeed, e@SY Connects has currently been involved in a number of sharing best practice, shared services and development activities with representatives of authorities within the region (North Yorkshire County Council) as well as of foreign countries (China), which appears to be a proof of its transferability. eInclusion is a major goal of e@SY Connects. The technological innovation has been considered quite strong, as the interplay between Internet, mobile phone,

²² <http://www.easyconnects.org.uk/>

²³ Quoted from the project description provided at the eGOV-GPF: http://www.egov-goodpractice.org/gpd_details.php?gpdid=1913#descriptionsection

²⁴ Quoted from the latest executive summary, available at <http://www.easyconnects.org.uk/pdf/1106.pdf>

digital TV and traditional information channels had to be created from scratch, there was no operational solution available when the project started in 2001. The technology is very advanced and, according to a representative of the project, always up to date. The usage of open standards facilitates the integration of different services and applications. Product innovation was less an issue than technological innovation, as the main task was to integrate different information channels and providers. The degree of service integration is therefore considerable, which comes along with a reduction of bureaucratic burden.

4.5. Belgian Social Security

The Crossroads Bank for Social Security and the National Office for Social Security together have initiated a project to improve collaboration and digital data exchange between more than 2000 social security institutions in Belgium.²⁵ The network encompasses private companies and PAs. The aim of the project was to combine back office integration and an ePortal solution in an effective way in order to provide improved services to citizens, companies and public institutions. The portal contains numerous integrated services, over 4,000 pages of information and 40 operational transactions. "All the institutions connected to the network can mutually consult their databases and exchange up to 190 different types of electronic messages. In 2006, more than 511 million messages were exchanged, which saved as many paper declarations or certificates."²⁶ Basis of the portal is, on the one hand, the individual identification number for citizens, which exists in Belgium since 1991, and the social identity card (SIS card), which is an official memory chip card, on which the single identification number can be read visually or electronically and which the citizen can use for identification purposes at each direct or indirect (e.g. through his employer) contact with the social sector. At current, the SIS card becomes subsequently replaced by a more general electronic identity card (EID card), containing private keys and certificates used for electronic authentication and the generation of electronic signatures.²⁷ On the other hand, the service is based on the single identification number for companies, which all Belgian companies and their plants have received since January 2003. The service is provided in French, Dutch, and German and is offered to nationals, Belgian citizens who work abroad but are still related to the Belgian social security system, and to citizens of other countries who work in Belgium. It is thus provided on supra-national level. The system is offered to other countries.

This eGovernment service does not contribute to the generation of civic attitudes. It is provided on supranational level and in three different languages, and it is at current already offered to other countries to be implemented there, too. The scope of users is big because all companies have to notify the social

²⁵ <https://www.socialsecurity.be/>

²⁶ Quoted from project description at eGOV-GPF, available at http://www.egov-goodpractice.org/gpd_details.php?&gpdid=268#descriptionsection

²⁷ By July 2005, one million of these cards have been issued, and by the end of 2009 all Belgian citizens should have one.

security institutions about their employees through this system. Today more than 220,000 employers in Belgium use the ePortal. Our interlocutor pointed out that more important than the number of users is the number of messages that can be performed. In 2006, 511 million messages were exchanged. The benefits of the ePortal are also obvious, as 511 million paper declarations or certificates could be saved in 2006, which would have been sent by mail to the citizens if the ePortal wouldn't have existed. Employers benefit from this system because they do not have any longer to reproduce the social security data manually. For (employed) citizens and inhabitants from other countries the benefits are more indirect, as they are not directly involved in the system. However, transactions are much faster than a paper-based system and the technology is said to improve security and reliability of transactions. eInclusion is not an explicit issue of the ePortal. While the Crossroads Bank for Social Security did not have to invent new products, the processes relating to performing social security transactions and the organisational structures in the back offices of the social security institutions underwent fundamental changes. Also, the technology has changed a lot. For security and reliability reasons the ePortal relies on technology that is always up-to date. Many transactions can be performed fully electronically. In order to enable all actors in the field of social security to join the network and to make all kinds of documents processable the ePortal is based on open standards. The degree of service integration is very high, as all social security-related services are covered by the ePortal. As described above, PAs as well as employers experience a strong reduction of bureaucratic efforts through the ePortal.

4.6. Generalitat en Red (GENRED)

Generalitat en Red²⁸ is an e-Administration project in the Valencian Regional Administration. "An e-Administration platform was designed and constructed to include electronic presentation of signed forms and documents, telematic payments, remote inbound and outbound registration, links with management systems and electronic notification. The legal standards that support the platform were developed, and 219 telematic services have been started up, 83 of them with electronic signature, aimed at citizens and companies."²⁹ The ePlatform provides information and services in Spanish and the regional dialect.

The regional government considered improvement of the quality of life of its citizens as a main goal of its initiative, which includes better provision of citizens with information and opportunities to participate in political life. Due to its limitation on Spanish and the regional dialect a representative of the project saw chances for expanding the service primarily on the national level. However, the project found best practice solutions for the integration of very different services with varying degrees of requirements regarding security and reliability. He therefore didn't see severe technological obstacles to implement the GENRED ePlatform in other countries. The scope of users is big, especially

²⁸ <http://www.tramita.gva.es/difusion/index.jsp>

²⁹ Quoted from project description as provided at the eGOV-GPF, available at http://www.egov-goodpractice.org/gpd_details.php?&gpdid=310#descriptionsection

since many services like tax paying can be performed fully electronically and thus save citizens a lot of time and efforts. eInclusion is not an explicitly mentioned objective of the GENRED project. Since the task was to integrate different existing services rather than to develop new services the degree of product innovation was not very high. However, technological and process innovations were considerable, though many have been developed in an earlier eGovernment project on which GENRED could build upon. The technology used for the GENRED platform uses open standards in order to secure a maximum of interoperability. As the representative of the project pointed out, neutrality of the technology so that everyone who wants to join the platform can do that was a major goal of GENRED. The regional government as well as citizens (and businesses) save time and paperwork when using the GENRED ePlatform, i.e. GENRED results in reduced bureaucratic efforts. As described above, the level of service integration is very high (though still growing).

4.7. Learndirect Scotland

Learndirect Scotland³⁰ is a cornerstone of the Scottish Executive's strategy to promote lifelong learning, skills, employability and competitiveness, administered by the Scottish University for Industry (SUI). Learndirect Scotland's infrastructure consists of a network of 500 quality-assured, client-focused learning centres, a national database of over 100,000 quality-assured learning opportunities, a range of national information and advice helplines, a team of field-based support staff who assist learning centres and small businesses to engage more effectively and efficiently with their clients.³¹ What is considered to be unique with Learndirect Scotland is described in the eGOV-GPF project description³²: "... the synergy created by bringing together best of breed technologies and organisational and individual support mechanisms which fully address the needs of (...) citizens. Instead of implementing a single technology solution in isolation (...) a holistic view of (...) individual and business clients needs..." is taken. Learndirect Scotland is well accepted in the region, as proved by almost two million individual enquiries about education and training and 56,000 business enquiries by 2006. A main issue is to raise awareness of and demand for learning. The coordinators try to achieve this goal through a number of different activities, such as TV and radio advertisements (also in languages of people from other countries, like India) or a campaign promoting volunteering as a learning opportunity. Courses offered by Learndirect Scotland cover all fields that are relevant with regard to employability and range from computer courses (e.g. European Computer Driving Licence – ECDL) over languages to counselling, art, and psychology.

Generating civic attitudes, though subject to some courses, is not an explicit objective of Learndirect Scotland. It is bound to collaboration of regional actors, but (as can be seen from its campaigns and the structure of collaborating institutions) it is possible to include people who are not speaking

³⁰ <http://www.lds4partners.com/>

³¹ See <http://www.lds4partners.com/Whoarewe/>

³² http://www.egov-goodpractice.org/gpd_details.php?&gpdid=1764

English and to integrate organisations that deal with different target groups (e.g. foreigners, handicapped, illiterates, women, long-term unemployed etc.). Thus, Learndirect Scotland is not providing an application that can easily be taken up by others or transferred to other regions, but once the organisational preconditions are met it would probably work with the same success in other regions or countries, according to a project representative. As described above, the scope of users is very big. The benefits of learning are obvious. As our interlocutor pointed out, the project team did not have to invent on products (e.g. courses) but to integrate processes and to find a technological solution for the network architecture of the institutions that collaborate in Learndirect Scotland. Technology enhanced services play a role in helping the learner identify the most appropriate learning solution for their particular needs (from the database) and to access and complete this learning solution. Technology is also used for tracking and documenting the learners' progress and learning history (Skillnet). For transferring these details to other systems the Learner Information Package (LIP) server has been developed. Though services of many different providers have been integrated for the purposes of Learndirect Scotland the degree of service integration appears to be medium as compared to other services discussed in this paper. Learndirect Scotland had to integrate services that are more or less similar, whereas other PAs had to integrate very different services. For those who rely on educational services, Learndirect Scotland provides a strong reduction of bureaucratic burden, as for instance the database helps to reduce search cost.

4.8. SOLVIT

SOLVIT³³ “is an on-line problem solving network, coordinated by the European Commission and operated by the EU member states, in which MS work together to solve without legal proceedings problems caused by the misapplication of Internal Market law by public authorities. There is a SOLVIT centre in every European Union Member State (as well as in Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein) so that everyone who has to complain about a PA can address this issue in his mother tongue.”³⁴ SOLVIT is intended to help with handling complaints from both citizens and businesses. The SOLVIT centres are part of the national administration and are committed to providing real solutions to problems within ten weeks. Using SOLVIT is free of charge. The role of the European Commission – apart from coordinating SOLVIT – is to provide database facilities and, when needed, to speed up the resolution of problems. The Commission also passes formal complaints it receives on to SOLVIT if there is a good chance that the problem can be solved without legal action. When a case is submitted to SOLVIT, the local SOLVIT Centre first checks the details of the application to make sure that it does indeed concern the misapplication of Internal Market rules and that all the necessary information has been made available. It will then enter the case into an on-line database, and it will be forwarded automatically to the SOLVIT Centre in the other Member State where the problem has occurred. The two SOLVIT Centres work together to try to solve the problem and the home SOLVIT centre will

³³ http://ec.europa.eu/solvit/site/index_en.htm

³⁴ Quoted from project website.

keep the complainer informed of progress. The complaint is not obliged to accept the proposed solution but cannot challenge it formally through SOLVIT. If a problem goes unresolved, or the complainer considers that the proposed solution is unacceptable, he or her can still pursue legal action through a national court or lodge a formal complaint with the European Commission. “The policy areas SOLVIT has mostly dealt with so far are:

- Recognition of Professional qualifications and diplomas
- Access to education
- Residence permits
- Voting rights
- Social security
- Employment rights
- Driving licences
- Motor vehicle registration
- Border controls
- Market access for products
- Market access for services
- Establishment as self-employed
- Public procurement
- Taxation
- Free movement of capital or payments”³⁵

Since SOLVIT cares for people who might get disappointed from the EU because of a PA in another country discriminating them, its contribution to the generation of civic attitudes on European level is considerable. As a PEGS it demonstrated its capacity to cover pan-European scope. The scope of users is small, but those who use SOLVIT can benefit a lot since it helps to avoid time- and money-consuming legal action and it helps much faster to solve a problem than a formal complaint. SOLVIT thus helps a lot to reduce bureaucratic efforts. eInclusion is not explicitly mentioned as an issue of SOLVIT. The economic benefit is because of the small scope of users considered to be medium, though it might be substantial for individuals and companies that use SOLVIT's service. Like the other PEGS (except for Netc@rds), the degree of technological, product and process innovations appears comparably low.

³⁵ Quoted from http://ec.europa.eu/solvit/site/about/index_en.htm. The persons in charge for the project point out that “this is not an exhaustive list. SOLVIT will consider any case that meets the criteria above.”

4.9. European Consumer Centres Network (ECC-Net)

ECC-Net³⁶ evolved from a merger of two previously existing networks: the European Consumer Centres (Euroguichets), which provided information and assistance on cross-border issues; and the European Extra-Judicial Network (EEJ-Net), which helped consumers to resolve their disputes through alternative dispute resolution schemes (ADRs) such as mediators or arbitrators. ECC-Net is an EU-wide network to promote consumer confidence by advising citizens on their rights as consumers and providing easy access to redress, particularly in cases where the consumer has purchased something in another country to his/her own (cross-border). The aim of the European Consumer Centres is to provide consumers with a wide range of services, from providing information on their rights to giving advice and assistance with their complaints and the resolution of disputes. The European Consumer Centres provide a broad variety for both, consumers and policy-makers, ranging from information of consumers about the opportunities offered by the Internal Market, advice for individuals in pursuing cross-border complaints, over co-operation with each other and with other European networks such as the FIN-NET (Financial Network), SOLVIT (see below) and the European Judicial network in civil and commercial matters, conducting cross border comparisons of prices, legislation and other issues of consumer concern, and provision of the European Commission with important "grassroots" information on consumer concerns. ECC-Net is a multilingual PEGS.

Facing the broad variety of information services and the advice on European legislation and consumer rights that ECC-Net provides to citizens, especially its Consumer Education Projects,³⁷ ECC-Net contributes considerably to the generation of civic attitudes on pan-European scope. At current, ECC exist in 26 European countries,³⁸ where consumers can express their complains and claim their rights in their respective mother tongue. ECC-Net thus provides a PEGS with a very big scope of users, as services are provided to everyone in the 26 countries. The benefits for users are evident, as consumers themselves are hardly able to claim and put through their rights if there was no such organisation and policy-makers rely on institutions that gather cross-country experience in the field of consumer rights and protection. eInclusion is not an explicitly mentioned objective of ECC-Net. Since the network operates on the principle of collaboration between the single ECC, the degree of product and technological innovation is comparably low, as well as the requirements from technological standards. Economic benefits for consumers are however high. Since ECC-Net provides assistance but has no direct influence of process organisation, the impact on bureaucratic burdens must be considered low as compared to the other eGovernment services that are compared for the purpose of this report.

³⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/redress/ecc_network/index_en.htm

³⁷ An overview of this is provided at http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/publications/-consedu_en.pdf

³⁸ A list of European Consumer Centres is available at http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/redress/ecc_network/ecc_network_centers.pdf

4.10. Malopolska Gateway

The Malopolska Gateway³⁹ is a regional e-Administration System initiated and administered by the Marshal's Office of the Malopolska Region in collaboration with the Federal Minister of Science and Information Technology. The uniform information and service platform is intended for all kinds of local administration in the region and is implemented through collaboration of 280 autonomous local governments and other public administration bodies. It aims at integrating all information systems used in public life, bringing them together on one platform and making them available in a simple, continuous and easily accessible manner. The service is provided in Polish, offering it in Russian language is envisaged. Malopolska Gateway is a pilot project for the implementation of such eGovernment solutions throughout Polish PAs. Main objectives of Malopolska Gateway are to provide access to public services, to extend the information and training content of the Malopolska Gateway portal (by thematic modules, building an information base about the region, starting an e-learning platform, introducing e-learning courses), to provide access to information standards for Internet solutions, and to integrate the Malopolska Gateway with the information systems of other administration offices. Overall, Malopolska Gateway offers citizens and businesses access to 102 standardised procedures. Some procedures can be performed fully electronically with secure data transfer and a qualified electronic signature. The coordinators point out that Malopolska Gateway is a universal e-administration system for both small and big entities and that each citizen can use the advanced online services regardless of the internal infrastructure of the public administration offices. Open standards play therefore a very important role.

Due to its limitation on regional scope Malopolska Gateway does not contribute considerably to the generation of civic attitudes that go beyond this scope. It is designed as a pilot for Polish PAs in general and bears thus a strong capacity to expand geographically, though implementation in other countries requires to translate the documents on which the portal and services are based. The scope of users is big since all citizens in the region who use the Internet for their transactions with PA go through the Gateway. The benefits for users are high because the portal reduces search cost and allows a direct interaction between citizens and PAs. Like with most of the other cases, eInclusion is not mentioned explicitly as an objective of the project. Process innovation is strong, while technological and product innovations are on medium level. The degree of service integration is very high, which led to a substantial reduction of bureaucratic efforts.

4.11. Your Europe

Your Europe⁴⁰ is an initiative of the European Commission's IDABC programme.⁴¹ It is a multilingual public information service portal for citizens

³⁹ <http://www.malopolskie.pl/>

⁴⁰ <http://ec.europa.eu/youreurope/>

⁴¹ <http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/en/chapter/5875>

and enterprises intending to carry out cross-border activities within the European Union. Since PAs, whether national or European, operate differently, Your Europe aims at facilitating access and use of European PAs for those unaccustomed to the administrative procedures of different countries by means of pooling all this information into one single entry-point online. A related objective is to support a continuously increasing mobility for citizens and enterprises and to contribute to better integration across Europe. Services provided for citizens include moving to a new country, information on schooling, social security and finding employment. Services for enterprises provide details on accounting regulations, public procurement opportunities, taxation laws, etc.⁴² Content is supplied by both the European institutions and national governments. The Commission defines the strategy of the portal with the active involvement of the member states.⁴³ "The strategy consolidates the user-centred approach of the portal on the basis of well-defined user groups and foresees multiple access points at European, national and local level. It stresses the synergy of the two-way relationship between central EU and country level and lays the foundations for the creation of a virtual European Union Administration. Linguistic policy, co-operation with related initiatives at EU and country level and the high-level content structure for the portal are also taken into consideration by the strategy."⁴⁴ The Your Europe portal was launched in February 2005 and attracted more than six million people during its first year. Citizens and businesses benefit from Your Europe because from a single entry-point, they can access relevant information in their own language and interact with national administrations other than their own, overcoming barriers to mobility and integration in Europe.

Your Europe contributes to the generation of civic attitudes on European scale (because citizens and employers learn how PAs in other European countries work and how to interact with them). Since it is a PEGS it demonstrates a strong capacity to expand geographically. As described above, it covers a big scope of users who benefit a lot from the information and the ease of access to information. The reduction of bureaucratic burden is considered to be medium because Your Europe provides mere information but does not help with procedures. For the same reason the need for technological, product, and process innovations is less pronounced than featured by the eGovernment services and PEGS that have been considered so far.

⁴² In addition, customised services in support of both citizens and enterprises like the Citizen's signpost offered under the Europa server and the SOLVIT network are also available through the portal.

⁴³ This strategy is periodically revised to take into account new developments and the latest trends and findings for eGovernment portals. The last revision was made in January 2005.

⁴⁴ Quoted from IDABC's website on Your Europe: <http://ec.europa.eu/idabc/en/document/2065/5875>

4.12. European Employment Services (EURES)

EURES⁴⁵ is a cooperation network of European employment services and related organisations designed to facilitate the free movement of workers within the European Economic Area and Switzerland. Partners in the network include public employment services, trade unions and employers' organisations. The network is coordinated by the European Commission. The main objectives of EURES are to inform, guide and provide advice to potentially mobile workers on job opportunities as well as living and working conditions in the European Economic Area, to assist employers wishing to recruit workers from other countries, and to provide advice and guidance to workers and employers in cross-border regions. It offers job vacancies in 31 European countries and allows people who are looking for a job to upload their CVs in a database where it can be accessed by employers. Applications can be sent by email directly to employers (if these support this opportunity). EURES also provides country-specific information on living and working conditions and allows to look for learning opportunities in European countries. EURES services are provided in all MS languages.

As illustrated in table 1, EURES scores mainly in its capacity to expand geographically (because it's a PEGS), in the two benefits items and in reduction of bureaucratic burden (because it provides specific information on countries and enables thus disburdens job seekers and employers from trying to get much of this information from their national PAs).

⁴⁵

<http://ec.europa.eu/eures/>

5. Conclusions: Building Thematic Clusters for the Exploration of the Impact of PEGS

This section reviews the 12 eGovernment services proposed for further analysis with regard to thematic priorities deriving from European policy goals, such as expressed in the i2010 Benchmarking Indicators. Along these thematic priorities we cluster those of the 12 eGovernment services that appear to be most illustrative for exploring how PEGS can contribute to achieve these policy goals.

5.1. Main findings

The main findings of this baseline survey of eGovernment surveys in Europe are:

5. The number of existing PEGS is quite low at current, but there is a great potential for PEGS through service bundling and networking of different PAs. Existing HI-PEGs could only be found when eGovernment services provided by the European Commission were considered. Except for NETC@RDS, they all have in common that they do not innovate considerably on eGovernment service products, technology, or processes – at least not to the same degree as compared to other advanced eGovernment services on supra-national, national, regional or local level. They seem to focus on two sorts of services, information services and conflict resolution. One reason for the limited degree of service integration might be that there is no equal quantity of services to be provided to citizens on pan-European level as compared to lower geographical and administrative levels, where, for instance, tax and social security systems exist. Another reason might be that there is a kind of trade-off between a high degree of service integration and the provision of services with a multilingual application. The case studies will therefore have to evaluate the chances for HI-PEGs with a stronger degree of service integration to evolve from the existing ones.
6. We identified at least two different development paths of PEGS: While all existing PEGS have been created by the European Commission on European scope right from the outset, the observed trends towards service bundling and networking of PAs imply that there is an opportunity for PEGS to develop from best practice transfer of national eGovernment solutions to other countries. For instance, HELP.gv.at provides a best practice case that could be transferred (and actually is

already offered) to other countries, so that a PEGS could emerge from this kind of best practice transfer. SOLVIT, as an example for a different way of PEGS generation, has been set up by the European Commission and EU MS on European scale, with a limited scope and depth of service provision but a potential to grow in these dimension in future if more services can be integrated and the distribution of work between EU and MS can be intensified.

7. Existing PEGS usually have a European institution as front and national institutions in MS as back office; implying that scope and depth of services provided by the European institution are limited because a good part of the overall service provision is performed by institutions in MS. The 7 national eGovernment services that have been selected bear however elements that could serve as building blocks for the creation of HI-PEGS, such as a high degree of service integration or a strong potential to expand geographically. Many of these eGovernment services bundled services previously provided from different PAs and / or formed networks of different PAs.
8. The 12 selected eGovernment services allow insights in how eGovernment services in Europe strive to achieve different EU objectives. NETC@RDS, for instance, stands for eGovernment services improving the provision of health services to mobile citizens, Belgian Social Security represents solutions for reducing administrative burdens for citizens and businesses.

5.2. Thematic priorities and eGovernment service clusters for case studies

The current situation requires from research not only to focus on existing PEGS but also to envisage the potential for PEGS to develop / advance in future, i.e. the ways in which PEGS might emerge and improve within the existing set of national and pan-European eGovernments. We decided therefore that the cases studies should not focus on a few selected PEGS but cluster around themes. The clusters will have one main case and a number of supporting “case notes”⁴⁶. The idea is to flesh out how to build on an existing PEGS (Solvit) and make it more valuable, through adding services; how to take a national scheme to trans- or pan-European level; explore incentives and processes for (centrally) developing truly citizen oriented PEGS; see how local actors collaborate across Europe, though shared interests and concerns.

As the most meaningful themes with regard to EU objectives and the i2010 benchmarking indicators we identified

⁴⁶ We understand “case study” as an in-depth analysis of an eGovernment service that covers all relevant aspects of PEGS generation and improvement, while “case notes” focus only on selected features of an eGovernment service that help to analyse aspects that cannot be studied sufficiently in the case study (because the main case does not show this feature or because the feature seems to occur in different variants).

- Objectives of the EU Service Directive, especially Article 8 on the creation of one-stop-shop-portals
- Reduction of administrative burden
- Improved service provision for mobile citizens, especially in the field of health services
- eInclusion

Following clusters of eGovernment services appear to be most illustrative with regard to these thematic priorities:

EU Services Directive: HELP.gv.at & Media@Komm-Transfer

- HELP provides a best practice model of a one stop shop and thus provides a good example of how eGovernment services meet the requirements demanded by article 8 of the Service Directive (LEGALPEGS). Its path of expansion into a PE-dimension is determined by implementing the solution (with some adaptation to country specifics) in other countries (“growth by transfer”). HELP is already offered to other states and provides thus an example for a national portal that could become a European eGovernment standard (HELPEUROPE). In this regard, the case study should focus on countries that are interested in adopting this solution or that have already decided to adopt it. Since HELP was developed in a state with federal constitution, with a high degree of service integration as one of its main features. HELP therefore also provides a good example for studying problems and benefits of “growth by integration” on the national level (FEDERALPEGS).

Since the Media@Komm-Transfer project in Germany has been established particularly in order to analyse and overcome obstacles aligned with transferring eGovernment solutions with a high degree of service integration to other PAs we propose to examine HELP in combination with Media@Komm Transfer, whereby HELP should provide the main case and Media@Komm-Transfer should serve as “case note” providing input for the examination of transfer problems and solutions.

Reduction of administrative burden: SOLVIT & Belgian Social Security

These eGovernment services provide two good examples of how eGovernment services can facilitate administrative processes (“ADMBURDENPEGS”). SOLVIT shows the typical organisational structure of existing PEGS, with a European front desk and back offices in MS. It offers the opportunity to examine how PEGS can improve their services for citizens, PAs, and businesses. We see a higher degree of service integration as a precondition and cornerstone of such an improvement (SOVIT+). One of the preconditions for such a shift of

services might be a clear legal framework for decision-making. In the case of the Belgium Social Security System, PAs as well as employers and citizens benefited directly from accelerated and improved processing through establishing a platform for the exchange of data between different actors in the field of social security. The solution is offered to other countries to be implemented there, too (“growth by transfer”).

Belgian Social Security would provide an example for the provision of “material” social security services, the PEGS would provide examples for exchange of information and processing transactions across borders. Such a combined approach may enable the research team to find solutions for eGovernment services like Belgian Social Security to expand into PE dimension without losing their “material” character and, respectively, for existing PEGS to advance from the limitation on information provision and conflict resolution and to provide “material” services.

Improved service provision for mobile citizens: NETC@RDS (& EHIC)

NETC@RDS provides an example of an existing PEGS combining a multitude of different actors (PAs, health insurance companies, other companies, hospitals, doctors) in order to perform its service. It addresses mobile citizens and relies on mastering fundamental organisational and technological challenges. NETC@RDS is designed to become a full-fledged PEGS in the field of health services, i.e. it provides an example of how existing PEGS can make the step from EU front-desk and MS back-offices to a fully operational service based on standardised and automatic processes.

eInclusion: e@SYConnects

eInclusion is one of the major policy goals in Europe, and e@SYConnects provides one of the most advanced and successful examples of how eGovernment services can master this challenge. Though it is based on a region (South Yorkshire, UK) it proved already that its transfer to and application in other regions is possible. The transfer is obviously mainly dependent on mastering the technology that is needed to operate this information service. In principle, there is no limitation towards a pan-European implementation of such a service.

5.3. Guidelines for case studies

The following describes the general direction and core research questions for the case studies. It will be part of the case studies to develop cluster-specific methodologies.

Case studies should focus on revealing which services appear to be most efficient to bundle in order to increase citizens' benefits and acceptance and thus to improve the potential to increase the geographical scope of

eGovernment services. Another objective of the case studies is to find ways how the prevailing organisational structure of existing PEGS, with back office(s) in MS, can be overcome or advanced in a way that the scope and depth of services provided by pan-European PAs improves. PEGS that do not rely so much on PAs in MS as it is the case for existing PEGS today would probably be able to help achieving at least some EU objectives more directly, and they could also contribute to a more effective distribution of work between governments in Europe. Precondition for such an advancement of PEGS is a win-win situation, i.e. both, pan-European and national PAs, should benefit from such a change. In order to find examples of how such win-win situations can be achieved, the incentive structure for PEGS must be made visible, on European as well as on MS level. Core interest of this part of the study is to find out what PAs, citizens, and businesses need that can be better provided by PEGS than by national eGovernment services.

In order to explore the potential of such win-win situations, case studies should not only envisage the European institution that serves as front end but also include the “back offices” in the MS and examine their willingness and readiness to transfer power and resources to European institutions. Since user satisfaction is a critical issue for any eGovernment service, case studies of existing PEGS must also examine how users could benefit from such an organisational change.

It appears useful for the case studies to distinguish between different types of geographical growth, for instance between growth by integrating more and more services and more and more surrounding areas of the administrative district in which the service was initially developed (growth by integration) and growth by transferring the service to other administrative districts (growth by transfer). What might be learned from such an approach is if there is a potential for eGovernment services like HELP.gv.at to be taken up and implemented in other European countries and to create thus a kind of “standard application” for highly integrated eGovernment solutions that could gradually lead to a common eGovernment infrastructure for EU member states. Such a common infrastructure, provided with the opportunity to be linked in networks, might lead to a different form of PEGS that is not coordinated by one PA or a small network of PAs, but by a complex interplay of hundreds or even more PAs throughout Europe.

This kind of PEGS would constitute a synthesis of the advanced highly integrated eGovernment services we found on national and regional level and the network solutions with low service integration and technological requirements that we found at the level of existing HI-PEGS. Therefore, case studies of eGovernment services that are provided across country borders or that are transferred to different MS (through the “export” type of growth by transfer) should examine what kind of interaction are established between transferring PAs and those PAs implementing the eGovernment solution in the course of the transfer and after implementation. Mutual technical assistance and collaborative advancement of such services might be a means to establish PEGS based on technological and procedural standardisation across MS. In this regard, factors that work as a driving force towards the harmonisation of national eGovernment services should be identified in the case studies.

Key issues to be examined in case studies across all kinds of eGovernment services are

- project design (technology and architecture, timelines, functionalities, entitlements, shift of responsibilities, standards, technical support, inclusion of PAs)
- reasons for service integration (opportunities and barriers)
- relevant actors and opponents
- adaptation issues in transfer and implementation processes
- time frames of transfer / implementation
- barriers, cost and benefits
- decision making within and across PAs
- actors' awareness of needs and / or opportunities to make an eGovernment solution transferable
- reasons to transfer / reasons to implement eGovernment solutions (success factors, incentives for PEGS)
- perception of the role of citizens in the context of developing / transferring / implementing eGovernment solutions

MERIT

Appendix I: PEGS in the eGOV-GPF and DGINFSO-GPF

The European eGovernment Good Practice Framework database categorises following eGovernment services as pan-European (text on the projects (blue) is quoted from the website and does not reflect the authors' opinion):

1. e-Vote: Vote for the EU YOU Want

An initiative of the Greek Presidency of the European Union to enhance and expand e-democracy across the EU. This innovative online voting project aims to use the latest technology to give citizens new ways to participate in ongoing debates and decisions about the key issues facing the Union today, as it prepares to undertake the biggest enlargement in its history.

By visiting the website evote.eu2003.gr any citizen can vote on the important issues that affect their everyday lives, share and compare their ideas and opinions with other Europeans in real time, and make specific suggestions about the current and future EU. The project comprises six questionnaires, or "e-Votes", on specific themes: The EU Today, The EU's Role in the World, The Future of the EU, The Lisbon Agenda and Beyond, Immigration and Asylum and Sustainable Development. Additionally, there will be special votes on breaking news and topical issues relating to the agenda of the Greek Presidency, such as the Iraq crisis and drug policy. As of 9th April, 2003, 141.000 citizens have already participated in e-Vote.

Result of analysis: This service doesn't exist anymore (no website, no telephone number)

2. eACE Expediting Adoption of e-working Collaborative Environments

An EU-funded FP6 research project that takes issue with the new possibilities offered by the new ICTs and their potential to bring innovation through new collaboration structures and patterns of peer-to-peer communication. To ensure that this potential is realised and capitalised, eACE principal goal is to identify and thoroughly understand the dynamics of these new collaboration structures and patterns of peer-to-peer communication and the socioeconomic benefits and implications of these dynamics for current and future EU-level policy developments, including policy initiatives in the context of i2010 which comprises the current EU-level policy framework in the Information Society domain.

Result of analysis: Wrong target group (G2G only), project aims rather at developing infrastructure for cross-border eGovernment services than on service provision.

3. Electronic Government Innovation and Access

Project in the context of the European Commission's co-operation program @LIS "Alliance for the Information Society" to accelerate the development of the Information Society in Latin America and to reinforce the partnership between the European Union and Latin America. The project aims to implement an eGovernment demonstration system in order to allow the access of citizens, through the Internet to integrated public services, at several levels: local (municipalities), regional (state governments) and federal. The demonstrator will be launched initially in São Paulo (Brazil) and exploitation to other Brazilian states as well as to Peru is foreseen.

Result of analysis: Wrong geographical area (outside Europe).

4. eMayor - Creating secure web services for Small and Medium sized Government Organisations (SMGOs)

The eMayor objective is to develop and implement an open, secure and affordable eGovernment platform for Small and Medium Government Organisations (SMGOs) in order to support secure communications between municipalities and between municipalities, businesses and citizens. The main goal of eMayor is to provide a practical solution towards digital government services, by developing a scalable platform

and exploring technical, legal, policy and societal aspects needed to perform secure eGovernment transactions.

eMayor has become a new platform for implementing secure e-government services, including G2C as well as G2B services and G2G services in a cross-border context. eMayor supports composed/cross-organisational transactional services, i.e., services that consist of a number of individual transactions that take place at a national or cross-border level without the need of a centralized service, centralized security provision or secured network.

The eMayor platform introduces also a number of added value features such as translation, e-authentication/e-identification procedures, legacy integration, etc. supporting different European solutions for smart-cards in order to make it useful for cross-border users.

Result of analysis: Project seems to provide a good example for a case study but it ended in February 2006. People who were involved in the project (Deloitte Netherlands; Fraunhofer Fokus, Germany) could not be reached.

5. Environmental eServices for Citizens

FP5-Projects APNEE and APNEE-TU (Air Pollution Network for Early warning and on-line information Exchange in Europe) - Take-Up Trials designed customizable information services to reach the citizen that draw upon various information channels, i.e. mobile technologies, voice servers, interactive portals for the Internet, as well as street panels.

Result of analysis: Website is not maintained since April 2006; project ended in 2004. Apparently project does not exist anymore.

6. ESTRELLA European project for Standardized Transparent Representations in order to Extend Legal Accessibility

The European project for Standardized Transparent Representations in order to Extend Legal Accessibility (Estrella, IST-027665) aims to develop and validate an open, standards-based platform allowing public administrations to develop and deploy comprehensive legal knowledge management solutions, without becoming dependent on proprietary products of particular vendors. Estrella will support, in an integrated

way, both legal document management and legal knowledge-based systems, to provide a complete solution for improving the quality and efficiency of the determinative processes of public administration requiring the application of complex legislation and other legal sources. Estrella will facilitate a market of interoperable components for legal knowledge-based systems, allowing public administrations and other users to freely choose among competing development environments, inference engines, and other tools.

Result of analysis: Wrong target group (G2G only), project aims at building a part of the infrastructure that is necessary for operation eGovernment services on cross-border level.

7. P2P_MajorEvents

The objective of the project is to test and deploy mobile P2P services for the delivery of public information in the context of Major Events (business fairs, sport events, cultural events)

Result of analysis: Pure information provision. Project started only in September 2006, so far no meaningful results available for re-analysis with regard to purposes of EUREGov.

8. Pan European Integrated Parliamentary Portal

The fast computerization process has a deep impact on the way the legislative institutions interact both with the electorate and with the civil society. Realizing the Internet great potential, the national parliaments in many countries chose to present certain information on the national parliamentary sites. The number of such sites keeps increasing day by day. The fact that the countries belong to and are integrated in the European Union require a certain standard of the information that appear on these Internet sites and of the services related to the communication between the member and the candidate countries. The development of a portal for European Integration at IPU - Inter-Parliamentary Union (www.ipu.org) – standards, would determine stronger cooperation relations between the European countries parliaments.

Result of analysis: Wrong kind of eGovernment service (pure standardising project) aiming at provision of infrastructure for cross-border services. No Website!

9. PRIME - Privacy and Identity Management for Europe

Information technologies are becoming pervasive and powerful to the point that privacy of citizens is now at risk. In the information Society, individuals want to keep their autonomy and retain control over personal information, irrespective of their activities. The widening gap on this issue between laws and practices on the networks undermines trust and threatens critical domains like mobility, health care and the exercise of democracy.

Vision: users can act securely and safely in the Information Society while keeping sovereignty of their private sphere.

PRIME is an European RTD Integrated Project under the FP6/IST Programme. It addresses research issues of digital identity management and privacy in the information society. The project started on 1 March 2004 and will last for four years.

Result of analysis: Though it addresses citizens as part of the target group this project does not appear to match the criteria for being selected as a case study. It aims at developing a tool for enhancing privacy protection in Internet-based interactions, which is too generic.

10. Registry Information Service on European Residents

Verification of address information by accessing civil registries is one of the most frequented services offered by public administrations of the EU Member States. However companies and citizens who want to gather information from a foreign civil registration office face a complex situation of responsibilities, idiosyncratic requirements and language barriers. The Registry Information Service on European Residents (RISER) will change this by setting-up a central web-service for collecting inquiries, distributing them to the responsible authorities and delivering the results to the customer. Therefore RISER will become one of the first Trans-European eGovernment services for Business and

Citizens. The project is supported by the eTEN-Programme 2003 of the European Commission.

The objective of the Registry Information Service on European Residents is to create a Trans-European eGovernment service offering official address information to companies and citizens. The service communicates with customers and data suppliers via a secure internet infrastructure based on open standards. The service offers a single point of access to population registers in the EU Member States of the European Union via internet and complies with the national regulations in civil registration and data security. The RISER portal www.riser.eu.com provides multilingual access and standardised payment procedures to the customer following the concept of One-Stop-Government.

Result of analysis: Pure information exchange; addresses rather G2B and G2G than G2C, i.e. citizen-centricity is not visible.

The DG INFSO Good Practice Framework qualifies the following 12 eGovernment services as PEGS, which – if not otherwise indicated - do however not match the definition of PEGS as developed for the purpose of this project (text on the projects (blue) is quoted from the website and does not reflect the authors' opinion):

1. HELP

HELP is an initiative of the (Austrian) Federal Chancellery which has become one of the leading eGovernment applications in Europe. HELP – the virtual guide to Austrian authorities, offices and institutions, offers citizens information about official procedures, deadlines and fees, and makes forms available for downloading. To support this initiative, a large number of services and information is available, targeted at approximately 150 life events.

(This service is part of the list proposed for case studies in this report.)

2. Belgian Social Security

eGovernment in Belgian social security, a successful combination of back office integration and an ePortal solution. This case is an example of a major business process re-engineering carried out by about 2,000 social security institutions. Their close collaboration led to the implementation of a network for electronic information exchange which includes public and private institutions from different levels of

government (national, regional and local). Network access is progressively extended to other departments and institutions, amongst others the institutions of the regions and communities and private companies offering services of general interest. All the institutions connected to the network can mutually consult their databases and exchange up to 169 different types of electronic messages. In 2002, 242.5 million messages were exchanged, which saved as many paper declarations or certificates.

(This service is part of the list proposed for case studies in this report.)

3. EDEN – Employment Data Exchange Network

In order to improve the current EURES system, FOREM (B) proposed the setting up of EDEN in partnership with ANPE (F) and the Directorate of Labour (N), with the support of ADEM (L) and IEF (P). EDEN has been co-financed by European Commission through Directorate-General for Employment. The current EURES system just displays vacancies and only gives a partial view of the employment market, while EDEN seeks to provide a common platform for the display, dissemination, exchange and processing of European vacancies and CVs, using standard tools for automatic trans-coding from and to the internal formats of each PES using a common standard. The matching of CVs to vacancies gives a higher added value to individuals and employers. In addition, PES can improve the transparency of the employment market at European level, which can also improve both the flexibility and flow of the employment market. EDEN allows direct access to users, who are able to introduce data and consult the system in their own language. The EDEN system provides users with data registered in the system in another European language, translated into their own mother tongue.

Result of analysis: This eGovernment service seems to match the EUREGov definition of PEGS, but analysis of this case showed that it is apparently not operating anymore, since there is no website and a Google search fails also to find any website of this project that offers the described service. Moreover, it seems that it was only available in English, French, and German, which contradicts the scope of languages as that is described in the case summary.

4. DanmarksDebatten

DanmarksDebatten is at the heart of a plan to develop a citizen-centred approach to eGovernment. The overall objective was to establish a democratic forum where citizens, public administration and politicians could engage in debates. A key task was to create a common platform for all public debates taking place within the public sector whether at local, regional or national level. Using the internet and portal technology, a range of players representing citizens, institutions and government are

consulted on issues affecting them. The project seeks to further enhance local democracy by allowing debates nationally as well as locally and by giving politicians the opportunity to dialogue directly with the electors.

5. ETHICS Electronic Tendering

National Procurement Ltd., Denmark (SKI), is owned by the Danish Ministry of Finance and the Danish Association of Local Authorities. Their mission is to coordinate procurement, perform tenders and negotiate framework contracts on behalf of all Danish public agencies. Since 1995, SKI has actively developed and implemented ETHICS and concurrently trimmed workflow, procedures and organisation. Since 2002, the system has been fully operational and covers planning, the drafting and publication of tenders, the management of all processes relating to the issuing and running of on-line tenders in a secure way – based on the latest technology and digital certificates. It also assists in the team which supports the final decision making and the award process and which consists of external specialists, advisers and users.

6. Bremen Online

Bremen On-line Services aim to develop eGovernment and to enable on-line transactions and payments in a secure and legally binding way. Targeting all citizens, businesses and intermediaries (lawyers, tax consultants, etc.) from the outset, the latter have become the prime users. The quality of service has increased due to the elimination of paperwork from government communications. Significant savings have been achieved both by lawyers and companies on the one hand and by the administration's agencies on the other. The project has been fully operational for two years, with new services being added continuously. It uses electronic signatures for authentication and is implemented using OSCI (On-line Services Computer Interface), an open communications standard which is in line to become the de facto standard for on-line transactions in Germany. The project is carried out in an innovative public private partnership by the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen together with regional and national partners from the private sector.

7. e-Vote for the EU YOU want

see the section on the eGOV-GPF

8. eJPA – eJustice Point of Access

eJPA is an enabling infrastructure implemented by the Ministry of Justice in Italy. Its implementation allows interaction between citizens, businesses and other national public agencies with the services provided by the Justice Administration (eJustice services) to take place in a secure, standard and consistent way. eJustice is a key component for European competitiveness: Currently, issues relating to justice are usually subject to processes that lead to lengthy proceedings, and there is often interoperability between different national justice systems. These factors are major barriers to European integration and to the social and economic development of European countries.

9. STRADA - Sistema di TRAnsito Doganale Automatizzato

STRADA (Sistema di TRAnsito Doganale Automatizzato) is an Italian ICT application designed within the framework of the EU project which was set up to automise all customs transit operations. Countries which have participated in the project include: the 15 EU Member States and all signatory countries – including new members – of the Visegrad and EFTA Agreements. The application which enables the inter-networking with all customs administrations has been implemented through a network of interactive protocols between the departure and destination offices and – when necessary – all other customs offices en route.

Result of analysis: Wrong type of service and target group (G2G).

10. Primar Stavanger, electronic navigation for sea transport

European cooperation for the provision of a consistent, timely and reliable Electronic Navigational Chart (ENC) service for sea transport, operationally compliant with international maritime safety codes, and which meets all relevant standards and regulations issued by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and the International Hydrographic Organisation (IHO). Core Aim: Through authorised distributors, to provide the maritime community with an ENC service recognised for its quality, user-friendliness and overall contribution to maritime safety and efficiency. The Solution: The IHO has developed a prototype official electronic navigation chart (ENC) for use on board ships. It is based on ECDI technology and can be used as a sole means of real time navigation, without the use of updated paper charts. The product, Primar Stavanger, has been hailed as one of the major achievements for maritime safety. Primar Stavanger started its operation in April 2002 with 5 member nations. This cooperation has now been successfully extended to include ENC information from 9 nations. Negotiations are currently taking place to include more nations from Europe and other parts of the world. The overall objective is to export the technology and expertise and experience behind it to other

geographic regions worldwide and establish an integrated virtual global ENC service.

Result of analysis: Wrong type of service.

11. SOMCET-Net – Transport Optimisation for eBusiness

SOMCET-Net is a modern, integrated, intelligent and interactive support for vehicle monitoring, route optimisation and an interactive tool for electronic commercial transactions (requests, offers, and orders). The project is coordinated by the National Institute for Research and Development, ICI. The CEPETET research centre for electronics in transport from Politehnica developed the system, the user is the National Union of Road Transport of Romania, representing more than 1,800 carriers. The system has been developed by integrating GPS, GIS, GSM, SQL SERVER 2000, graphic interfaces, optimisation algorithms and ASP-NET, and provides Web services for all the actors involved in the transport sector, transport clients and transport service providers. The system allows transport requests, as well as offers and orders management and tracing based on selection keys created dynamically by the user. It supports the negotiation process and transport contact set up between the business partners, automatic route optimisation with route visualisation on the digital map, as well as location and real time survey of the means of transport and its principal characteristics using GPS, GSM, and GIS technologies. The use of digital maps to represent the locations together with descriptive information makes the information more visible

12. 3IP – 3 islands partnership, Islay, Jura and Colonsay

This submission concerns the implementation and management of the provision of eServices to remote islands in Scotland with sparse populations. Argyll and Bute Council is a Unitary Local Authority. Situated in the south west Highlands and Islands of Scotland, it covers the second largest geographical area of any Scottish local authority, stretching for over 100 miles from north to south and 90 miles from west to east. It boasts 26 inhabited islands and over 3,000 kilometres of coastline as well as six main centres of population, a good example of a polycentric spatial development pattern. Although the administrative area of Argyll and Bute covers 690,900 hectares “almost a tenth of the total area of Scotland” it has a population of just 91,300, which is less than 2% of the population of Scotland. This gives Argyll and Bute an extremely low population density with a mere 13 persons per km². The aim of 3IP is to enable people to access local, regional, national and international services without the need for extensive and expensive travel. It uses technology to overcome the disadvantages that remoteness, isolation and sparsity of population can often bring. It is customer-focused and delivers a joined-up approach to public services

and indeed to private ventures, such as the ability to demonstrate goods to a distant retail market.

Appendix II: Guideline for Internet Research and Telephone Surveys

Name _____ of _____

PA: _____

—

Country: _____

_____ PEGS []

1. Purpose of the eGovernment service?
2. Actors (PAs, coordinators etc.)
3. When was the service established?
4. Is the service also offered in other languages? In which languages?

5. Which kind of service do you offer?
 - a) Information service ()
 - b) Procurement service ()
 - c) Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens) ()
 - d) Data exchange service ()
 - e) Legal service ()
 - f) Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.) ()
 - g) Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA ()
 - h) Project/workflow/collaboration management services ()
 - i) Document management (document flow, CMS) ()
 - j) E-learning services ()
 - k) Geo-information service ()
 - l) Social services ()

6. Is your organisation collaborating with other public administrations in order to provide the service?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes, in the country ()
 - c) Yes, in other European countries ()
7. Is the service used by users from other European countries?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes ()
 - c) I don't know ()
8. If answer is no: Do you think it's possible that your service can be extended into other European countries within the next 2-5 years?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes, within the next two years ()
 - c) Yes, within the next 5 years ()
9. If answer is yes: Are there concrete plans, contacts, or demand for such an extension into other countries?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes ()
 - c) Don't know ()
10. Could other public administrations benefit from your experience and adopt technology or process organisation from you in order to provide online services?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes ()
 - c) Don't know ()
11. Whom do you offer the service?
 - a) Other public administration ()
 - b) Citizens ()
 - c) Businesses ()
 - d) Citizens and businesses ()
 - e) All ()
12. To which degree can users perform the offered services online?:
 - a) Not at all ()
 - b) Basic information can be obtained online ()
 - c) Forms can be downloaded ()
 - d) Forms can be filled out and submitted ()
 - e) The service is completely performed online ()
13. How many users do you have by now?

14. Is the number of users per month increasing, decreasing, or constant over time?
 - a) decreased ()
 - b) constant ()
 - c) increased ()

15. Do you have feedback from users how satisfied they are with the service?
 - a) no ()
 - b) Yes, very satisfied ()
 - c) Yes, satisfied ()
 - d) Yes, unsatisfied ()
16. Did the implementation of the service require organisational changes in your public administration?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes, a lot ()
 - c) Yes, some ()
 - d) Don't know ()
17. Do you generally use newest technology in order to provide the service?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes ()
 - c) Don't know ()
18. Is the software that you use in order to perform the service interoperable with other software (open standards)?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes ()
 - c) Don't know ()
19. Does the provision of the service require electronic identity management, i.e. Do you ask users to register and are you able to recognise users when they visit the website repeatedly?
 - a) No ()
 - b) Yes ()
20. How do you evaluate the costs for the provision of the service in relation to its usability?
 - a) The costs are very high ()
 - b) the costs are relatively high ()
 - c) the costs are low ()
 - d) Don't know ()

Appendix III: Profiles of the 12 Selected eGovernment Services and PEGS

HELP.gv.at

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	X
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	X
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	X

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	X

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	(X)
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	X

Media@komm-Transfer

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	X
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	X
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	X

1	Local	
2	Regional	X
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	X
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

NETC@RDS

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	X
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	X
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	X

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	X

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	X
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

ea@SY Connects

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	X
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	X
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	X
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

Belgian Social Security

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	X
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	X
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	X

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	X

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	(X)
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	X

Generalitat en Red (GENRED)

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	X
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	X
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	X
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	X

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	X

1	Local	
2	Regional	X
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	X

Learndirect Scotland

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	X
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	X
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

SOLVIT

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	X
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	X

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	X
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

European Consumer Centres Network - ECC-Net

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	
5	Legal service	X
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	X

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	X
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

Malopolska Gateway

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	X
5	Legal service	X
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	X
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	X
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	X
10	E-learning services	X
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	X

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	X
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	X

Your Europe

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	
5	Legal service	
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	X

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	X
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

European Employment Services - EURES

1	Information service	X
2	Procurement service	
3	Communication/participation platform (for administration, businesses, or citizens)	X
4	Data exchange service	
5	Legal service	X
6	Public services provision (tax payment, social assistance, registration, etc.)	
7	Assessment and evaluation services, quality standards and QA	
8	Project/workflow/collaboration management services	
9	Document management (document flow, CMS)	
10	E-learning services	
11	Geo-information service	
12	Social services	

1	Service for Citizens	X
2	Service for Businesses	X
3	Service for other Public Administration	

1	Local	
2	Regional	
3	National	
4	Supra-national	
5	Pan-European	X

0	No publicly available website	
1	Basic information on services is provided	
2	Website provides possibility to obtain forms etc.	
3	Website provides possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form	X
4	Website provides possibility to perform a service completely electronically	

MERIT