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PROLOGUE

This is the fourth in a series of five reports assessing international developments in the policies and public administration issues now driving e-government and e-governance. As e-government principles and practices have been applied in the past few years it has been clear that fundamental governance issues determine the workability of the application of e-services delivery and e-programs. This report addresses the differences between e-government and e-governance in our growing global information society. The terms e-government and e-governance are often used interchangeably in discussions and analyses of how governments are approaching their relationship with the citizenry through the applications of information and communication technologies to fulfill their duties as governing bodies and to better serve the public.

Thus, the fourth report in this series distinguishes between the two terms. Overall, the paper assesses the role of government and separates out how governance is distinguished from government. We conclude in this paper that government and governance are both about getting the consent and cooperation of the governed. But whereas government is the formal apparatus for this objective, governance is the outcome as experienced by those on the receiving end. E-government can be a more productive version of government in general, if it is well implemented and managed. E-governance can evolve into participatory governance if it is well supported with the appropriate principles, objectives, programs and architectures.

These reports to date represent guidelines for policy implementations for e-government that can be used by governments, whether they are developed or developing countries.

Report number five, which is to follow will be an analysis and assessment of the e-democracy and e-participation movement and how government is responding to this new trend. Networked communities are quickly evolving through the Internet and, increasingly, citizens are using the new technologies to organize themselves so their voices can be heard and also to develop tools to attempt to influence government policy and programs at the political and public administration level.

The current report was prepared under the auspices of the Commonwealth Secretariat, London, UK and the Telecommunications and Informatics Services of Public Works and Government services Canada. William Sheridan, policy analyst, Informetrica Inc, Ottawa and Research Fellow for CCEG, and Cathia Gilbert, of CCEG, are thanked for their contributions to the preparation and writing of this report.
INTRODUCTION

“Government’s foremost job is to focus society on achieving the public interest”

“Governance” is a way of describing the links between government and its broader environment – political, social, administrative.”

There have been some suggestions in different jurisdictions in Canada and other countries recommending that the definitions we are seeing emerge as a result of the applications of Information and Communications Technologies in Government (ICTs), and the way the terms are being described, that is e-government, e-governance and e-democracy, should no longer be used, nor should definitions for these new constructs be attempted. This approach is subject to debate and exploration rather than outright rejection of any definitions. A case can be made that it is through the development of terminology that a subject matter can be evolved.

Putting the “e” on services, such as e-health, e-participation, e-voting, e-environment or e-weather, for example, serves as a guide to the wider subject matter of e-government and e-governance, that can, in time, be imprinted on the public mind. More importantly, the use of terms such as e-government, e-governance and e-democracy, leads to the creation of an identifiable discipline. This then widens the development of the subject beyond the parameters of simply government boundaries to the larger spheres of civil society, associations, unions, the business community, international organizations and the academic world.

A moving away from definitions of what government is doing in the “e” world only leads to a lessening of accountability of the activities in which any government is engaged. In society, it is the identifying of concepts through words and phrases that leads to cohesion and order. Subject matters create an ambience between stakeholders throughout the society. For example, “public transportation” or “environmental” issues are phrases understood by citizens who then relate them in their minds to the mass movements of our times. This is the way e-government must go. To move away from this identification that has been communicated through government websites, at the political level and in the media, can only lead to confusion.

Attempts to redefine e-government, e-governance and e-democracy, would only create a disservice to the public. We need to keep the current framework so that society knows the goal that government is trying to achieve. In time, technologies will change the way society shapes itself and this will lead to a widening of this subject matter into new spheres. At that point a new nomenclature will arise reflecting the change articulated in future generations. But this new nomenclature will only be an extension of the discipline that began to evolve in the late twentieth century. The danger in this time of modernity is the urge to move with the latest “craze” or “fad”. It is the job of governments to maintain stability at times of great change in which we are now living. Part of this stability is being forward thinking while keeping rooted in acceptable principles and processes.
Government, governance and democracy have been with us for a long while. By adding the “e” to these words we maintain a stream of thought and a conceptual framework with which the public can relate. Governments are not in the business of creating fads.

For these reasons, this paper seeks to explore the concepts of e-government and e-governance and to separate out how these two terms differ and how workable they are in our new digital environments. As will be seen in this paper many international organizations have come to accept these terms, and they, and other respected thinkers and authors, are contributing to this important process of change.

This paper looks at the nature of government and governance. Particular focus, and much of the paper, is devoted to how one approaches these terms in the context of public administration. The paper then ties them together in the context of the emerging “e” environments. The purpose here is to create clarity in relation to these terms precisely because e-government and e-governance have been used so interchangeably. Such clarity could lead to a greater depth of exploration of the subject matter and assist in the development of the internal process of government, and the impacts these processes and subsequent delivery mechanisms are having on individual citizens and groups overall (governance).

E-democracy and online consultations are dealt with in the last part of this paper, as e-democracy is actually the natural extension of e-governance. In pre-Internet times interactions between governments and targeted institutions, groups and society were an important part of policy development. Now, with these new tools, more citizens and stakeholders can be embraced into the process. However, as will be explored in the final Report of this series, this is not going to be an easy progression and many changes (in both the government and society at large) will need to occur before any major engagements take place.

The Canadian governments, at the federal and provincial levels, are making tentative first steps. Research of the activities of our governments and many others around the world, and of international organizations, shows that much is to be done to move into this new form of governance. Governments on the whole are aware of the changing expectations of their citizenry, and the desire by especially not for profit groups, and emerging e-democracy groups, to have a say in the evolution of government policy. This is a serious governance issue that many governments are now facing. How governments deal with this could very well determine future relationships between government and the citizenry.

This paper is an exploration of the issues and a contribution to the growing debate on the future of e-governance.
E-GOVERNMENT vs. E-GOVERNANCE

The terms “government” and “governance” are currently in widespread use, sometimes interchangeably. It is important to develop a distinction between the two. Thus, this paper will explore both the overlap as well as the conceptual distinctions that these two concepts embody, because there are different implications for electronic versions of each.

Conceptual Clarification

Professor Donald F. Kettl’s recent book, *The Transformation of Governance*, on the historical analysis of American public administration provides some good discussion on government and governance. Government is an institutional superstructure that society uses to translate politics into policies and legislation. Governance is the outcome of the interaction of government, the public service, and citizens throughout the political process, policy development, program design, and service delivery.

Framing the Comparison

Governments are specialized institutions that contribute to governance. Representative governments seek and receive citizen support, but they also need the active cooperation of their public servants. Governance is the outcome of politics, policies, and programs. This paper will focus on the distinction between government and governance, particularly as manifest in e-government and e-governance.

The table below summarizes the characteristics of both conventional and electronic government and governance that Kettl has identified in his research. Within the category of GOVERNMENT in the table below, are included both program design and service delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>superstructure</td>
<td>functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions</td>
<td>processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules</td>
<td>goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles</td>
<td>performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outputs</td>
<td>outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>E-Governance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic service delivery</td>
<td>electronic consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic workflow</td>
<td>electronic controllership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic voting</td>
<td>electronic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electronic productivity</td>
<td>networked societal guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Networks

The spread of electronic mail and the World Wide Web has been quite dramatic over the last decade. E-mail allows instantaneous global communications for anyone with a connection to the Internet. E-mail has been the killer application of this decade but the rapid growth of spams in the last few years is creating administrative headaches for public and private sector organizations alike. There are numerous technological solutions for e-mail spam. However, many governments are also considering legislation to stem the proliferation of messages flooding all our e-mail boxes. Spam is currently an important governance issue as it does effect the way public can answer back to government agencies and departments.

The World Wide Web enables global document and image distribution, again for anyone with a connection to the Internet.

Before widespread use of either e-mail or the Internet, Christopher Hood developed a model of government (in his book Tools of Government published in 1983) that demonstrated that most government work actually consisted of information processing. Not surprisingly then, governments have taken to electronic networks in a big way, proclaiming better service delivery, and continuing cost declines as their rationale.

Political activism has also moved onto the Internet, as public interest groups, community organizations, voluntary organizations, and special interest groups use the electronic network to propagate their messages and help coordinate their activities. These endeavours are also largely information-based, and are now being described as “community informatics” by Michael Gurstein. The use of the Internet by thousands of individuals and groups around the world for political activism and a tool to influence the electoral system and government policy has become an important part of the e-democracy equation.

**THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNMENT**

The institution of government involves a narrower range of considerations than the wider functions of governance. What follows is an elaboration on the six characteristics of government from the above table.

**Superstructure**

The concept of a superstructure comes from mechanical engineering and refers to the structural skeleton of a building or a ship. The term was borrowed by 19th century
political economists to serve as a metaphor for the institutional framework of society. Their use of this metaphor was meant to convey the concepts of dominance, orderliness, and permanence. The public acceptance of these concepts helps governments to rule.

Governments are formally constituted, and are situated at the top of the political food-chain. They are bureaucratically organized, and usually constitutionally legitimated. Sociologist Max Weber proposed that this constitutional legitimation gave governments a monopoly in terms of societal control. Most social scientists agree, but the veracity of this observation is questionable, though it is self-evident that society cannot operate without governments.

What being at the top of the political food-chain means for governments is that they serve as both the highest forum for policy making within their jurisdictions, and as the final court of appeal within their jurisdictions for dissenters to those policies. Most of the work of governments however consists of actually implementing policies through programs that deliver services.

As the social infrastructure has grown increasingly complex and risky throughout the modern era, governments have adopted more and more responsibilities. Systems for public health, environmental management, transportation regulation, telecommunications planning, and social services have all been put in place. Both operational standards and conflicts of interest have required that the governmental superstructure actually be consolidated to enable program effectiveness.

The government's position of societal superstructure creates an ironic dilemma for it. On the one hand, technical requirements for regulation are obvious to those who participate in operating any part of the social infrastructure. For example, this ranges all the way from the presence of traffic rules to the need for planning of transportation system upgrading and expansion.

However, individuals and groups within society evaluate governmental compliance requirements in terms of their own situations (i.e., their own particular needs and wants). The reason politics has been defined as "the art of compromise" is that governments often face the need to resolve discrepancies between people's desires to achieve their own ends and infrastructure requirements for operational effectiveness.

Decisions

United States President Harry Truman's maxim that "The buck stops here" summarized quite nicely the point that governments must take decisions to authorize actions. There are a multitude of situations that require government decisions, and a variety of types of decisions that governments can render. Both the longevity and the implications of government decisions have become progressively less certain as the aforementioned uncertainty and risk in society have grown.
National decisions will involve policies and/or programs that have society-wide impacts. In these cases the possibility of regional differences may require that negotiations be undertaken with local governments or groups so that program delivery can be customized to different circumstances. International decisions, either bilateral or multilateral, may require even more perseverance and diplomacy than those that are confined to a government's national sovereignty.

Decisions that are confined to a particular policy, program, department, region, or group, will usually be easier to frame, negotiate, and finalize. To the extent that considerations are more narrowly circumscribed, the issues, the implications, and the consequences will likely also be more manageable. The caveat to this judgment is "all things being equal". Unfortunately the unexpected can occur, when a previously insignificant occurrence suddenly acquires disproportionate importance "out of the blue", often because of a change in its political salience. Even for these situations there are now coping skills. vi

Joint decisions that need to be agreed between various levels of jurisdiction (i.e., national, regional, municipal, etc.) can also be particularly tricky to arrive at. Different levels of government usually guard their assigned powers and responsibilities, and are often concerned that joint decisions will be treated by other governments as an excuse or opportunity to encroach on the rightful domains of their negotiating partners. If however, a government is for any reason reluctant to take a decision it knows is necessary, it may be more than willing to use a joint agreement.

Partnerships between governments and other individuals or groups in civil society, are the newest version of collaborative decisions. Governments may lack the money, personnel, or expertise to implement decisions they desire, or they may face constitutional limits regarding what they can impose without the consent of the governed. These kinds of government decisions are becoming the fastest-growing type in today's policy environment. vii Examples of input from outside government are these Reports, which look at the information policy aspects of e-government. These studies present intellectual content that could assist in e-government policy and program development.

Rules

The quintessential feature by which the sociologist Max Weber characterized government bureaucracy, was the existence of formal rules for all procedures. For Weber, the development of these rules was the hallmark of modernity. Prior to the modern era, governments had been organized either on the basis of traditional deference, or a leader's charismatic persuasiveness. These alternatives may have served their purposes in their times, but both were arbitrary and unreliable in the modern environment that required rationality. viii

Although some bureaucratic rules have recently been subject to reconsideration, most of the major rules remain in place. An important section of these rules concerns personnel staffing, that is to say:
(1) recruitment,  
(2) hiring,  
(3) promotion,  
(4) discipline, and  
(5) firing.

To overcome nepotism and favoritism, these five procedures were given rules based on credentials and performance. The result is that over the years governments were staffed with far more qualified people than before these type of rules came into effect. Better qualified staff however, has not always produced better policies.

A more recent rule is that requiring "evidence-based policy-making". This is actually just contemporary wording for an older rule, namely that "good reasons" had to be given for decisions. As often as not though, the previous "good reasons" were either ideological (the public services’ ethnic, or economic, or religious beliefs), or political (the opinions of organizational superiors, elected members, special interests, etc.). Now that the mass media reports on government shortcomings more readily, (and more often erroneously and in sensationalist terms with hidden agendas attached) attempts are being made to forward policies with the "evidence" that real needs exist requiring appropriate government actions. ix

Another important section of government rules concerns provisions to limit partisan political interference in program design and delivery. The audiences for which government programs are properly intended are categories of persons, not the favoring or disfavoring of specific individuals. Since there have been repeated violation of these rules when the opportunity appears to arise to do so undetected, a series of ever more stringent protocols have been put in place to limit these possibilities. There is less patronage and interference as a result, although some critics still claim corruption.

Rules that are the bane of every bureaucrat's existence are those for assessment and evaluation. What things are done, what things are not permitted, how things are done, how things are not to be done, when things can or cannot be done, where things can or cannot be done, even why things can or cannot be done, are all subject to assessment (estimation of consequences) and evaluation (estimation of effectiveness). Actions that are harmless or even acceptable in some respects may be unacceptable in general because of contravention of some narrow rule. This is undoubtedly the source of the accusation that governments are "hide-bound".

When Weber outlined his theory of rule-governed bureaucracy, the situation he depicted seemed relatively straightforward – rules were established to govern organizational behaviour, and it was the duty of public servants to obey them. After almost a century of working under and reflecting upon this theory however, we now know better. As rules have proliferated so has the possibility of conflicts between rules. Judgment is required on which rule (or rules) apply in a situation, and how strictly to abide by their provisions. People can either "hide behind the rules" or use them to innovate – and they do.
Roles

One of Weber's meta-rules was that the powers and prerogatives of bureaucratic office were attached to the role in the organization, not to the person occupying the position. The rationale for this seemed obvious when Weber explained it (organizational procedures should be impersonal to avoid favoritism), but in practice it has turned out to be much harder to actually ensure. Initially the preference for the "personal touch" was attributed to the persistence of traditional or charismatic attitudes.

Not until the third generation of organizational studies did social scientists realize that any initiative taken by anyone within the bureaucracy still required the exercise of some display of leadership, whether limited or extensive. But once the quality of leadership surfaces, the personal component becomes as important as the professional component. The sociologist Max Weber must now be re-interpreted to mean that leadership action should not be based exclusively or predominantly on personality, but should rather blend professional competence and personal attributes to the extent needed to ensure followership.

This complicates the rule of roles considerably. When candidates are being considered for recruitment, hiring, evaluation, or promotion, what is the appropriate trade-off between personal qualities and professional qualifications? What if a less professionally qualified candidate with a better personal touch inspires better performance from his or her colleagues than a more qualified but less personable candidate? Urban legends allude to this dilemma quite frequently. Nevertheless, personnel management within the public sector still does not always formally recognize any such problem.

Another irony of the roles rule is that many candidates who are recruited on the basis of specific credentials and expertise are subsequently not assigned work that matches their qualifications. In the days of empire, the British public service was notorious for the view that a university graduate with whatever degree was a good candidate for any assignment, regardless of task requirements. The theory was that a degree was really a certificate in flexible thinking, so the appointed persons could simply manage their groups and assign technical tasks to subordinates (an eminently "civilized" arrangement).

Now that knowledge workers are expected to master multi-tasking, governments seem to be trying to re-invent the "special generalist" (or is it the "general specialist"?)? Once again however, newly acquired knowledge about the psychology of work shows why this "one size does all" approach is short-sighted. Effective work at particular tasks requires a rhythm of both schedule and duration – there is a certain "concentration" needed to do a good job. Lack of concentration can result in both poor performance and increased burnout.

The new focus of roles in government work is on teams. Permanent assignments are being replaced by temporary teams with a mission that begins and ends within a particular timeframe. Effective teams are composed of those with both complementary skills and personalities. There are now templates for effective team-building, and they
are being used in governments as well as elsewhere. This approach has gained currency as emphasis has shifted from on-going programs to new implementations.

**Implementation**

Many proposals within governments have simply gathered dust on the shelf rather than becoming the basis for programs or services. Auditors often find examples of this situation and criticize the practice as a waste of money. When posteriori evaluations are conducted the reasons most often cited are either "lack of political will" or "lack of sufficient resources".

In Systems Analysis a methodological rule has developed concerning project completion that could just as fruitfully be applied to Policy Analysis: *Every solution must include a migration path* (how to get from here to there). The rule of thumb is that any solution without a migration path is no solution at all. One of the hallmarks of a quality solution is the identification of a number of alternate paths for the necessary migration.\(^\text{x}\)

In Policy Analysis the "migration path" is the implementation plan. If policies or programs are designed well, they can usually be implemented in whole or in part, in multiple phases or a single push, by an internal team or in partnership with those from different parts of government, other governments, or outside of government. These various possibilities are the source of alternate implementation plans, but no plan at all can lead to the charge that governments are ineffective organizations.

The major challenge that governments have with implementation is the risk of project failure and/or cost overruns. Since governments are publicly accountable for their choices, their main performance criterion is dependability. In response to this concern governments have recently developed Risk Management tools consisting of risk assessment check-lists and risk insurance provisions. In some cases however, the result has been to make government decision-makers even more cautious and less innovative.

In this respect, one "lesson learned" which is now almost universally adopted is to avoid "big-bang" implementations. Trying to implement a change, especially a large one, all at once, is far too risky, given some spectacular failures now on record. Instead preference is given to the development of prototypes, pilot projects, and demonstration projects. This seems far more sensible given the dependability criterion, because the impact of mistakes can be limited in their scope, and improvements can be adopted as experience is gained.

**Outputs**

Because program evaluation is one of the major concerns of government activity, focus has steadily shifted to measures of output to gauge both efficiency and productivity. There are a variety of outputs that governments measure. One is case-load: the number
of assignments per person, the length of time to completion, and the type of results produced, are standard types of measures. This is a version of labor productivity.

In what is now being touted as the “knowledge” driven society, in which the “knowledge worker” is paramount, it is important to put this new paradigm into a conceptual framework. Since most government outputs consist of knowledge work, equipment use is another output measure. Use of a desk-top or mainframe computer, types of software applications applied to an assignment, duration of computer use, and the kind of data transformation produced, are all logged. This is a version of equipment productivity, whereby an assessment can be made as to whether or not adequate technology is in use, and if it is being used competently. xiii

Wider measures include the size of the staff, personnel turnover, the average duration of assignments, the ratio of supervisors to workers, and the aggregate rate of assignment completion. All of these measures give an indication of the rate of activity, so that comparisons can be done between similar workers or similar units. Pay scales and promotion prospects are often designed to reward improvements in these rates.

What is much more difficult to record, measure, or evaluate is the effectiveness of the government employees' activities. Part of the problem centers on what measures of effectiveness are appropriate. Should the major emphasis be on inputs, that is to say, size of staff, qualifications of staff, salaries paid, and equipment available? Or should the focus be on throughputs, which include hours worked, supervision needed, equipment used, and supplies consumed? Then again, perhaps outputs themselves are the best measures, such as tasks accomplished, cases completed, decisions taken, and actions initiated. There are rationales for, and defenders of each of these alternatives, and what one measures determines the results one gets.

What experience has demonstrated is that the only method of measurement which does consistently produce improvement is that which assesses the entire value-chain within the organization, from inputs, including throughputs, to outputs. xiii Although efficiencies can be gained for particular activities, many of these have already been achieved. The most room for improvement now is with the flow of tasks and assignments between people. The rate of output from groups has previously been slowed by poor transfer procedures between those collaborating on an assignment. As we will see below, e-government addresses this situation.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNANCE

The function of governance involves a broader range of considerations than the structures of government. What follows is an elaboration of the six characteristics of governance from the above table.
Functionality

As Kettl has observed, "Governance" is a way of describing the links between government and its broader environment – political, social, and administrative. Each of these dimensions forms a side of the "governance triangle". All of the other characteristics of governance are just aspects of its functionality, which we will preview in this section, and then elaborate in more detail in further sections. The concept of functionality, as R.A.W. Rhodes has stated it in “Understanding Governance”, refers to the effects that are produced as a result of the procedures used. The function of social governance is to direct the achievement of collective objectives.

Governance is distinct from government in that it concerns longer-term processes rather than immediate decisions. Governance is a set of continuous processes that usually evolve slowly with use rather than change dramatically (as with a change of government). There are three categories of processes to cover the interactions between the government, the public service, and the citizenry. The engagement process covers the interaction between citizens and government; the consultation process covers the interaction between public servants and citizens; and the implementation process covers the interaction between the government and the public service.

The result of the governance focus on processes instead of decisions is that the primary concern is goals rather than rules. In the perspective of governance what is important is the objective rather than the rules of behaviour for achieving it. Various levels or locales of jurisdiction may pursue the same goals with distinct instruments, different priorities, and alternate agendas. This is often both unsurprising and inevitable – even those "singing from the same hymn-book" may do so in a different key, to a different accompanying instrument. The goals of governance cannot really be achieved by micro-management, because there are no means of detailed enforcement.

In contra-distinction to the formal roles within government, governance processes are oriented to performance. Specific tasks are not necessarily assigned to specific roles because the point is for everyone to "pitch in" and work toward the common goal. The main concern is the purpose of the various governance processes, and numerous people in various roles can provide an assortment of contributions depending on their circumstances.

Governance takes the larger view of social objectives, so it involves the coordination of efforts rather than the implementation of specific programs. How it all fits together is more important than exactly who does what to whom by which means. This is the systemic perspective as opposed to a focus on the individual practice, or player, or process.

The "bottom line" for governance is outcomes rather than the outputs of government. One dramatic way of illustrating this point is to word it as follows: whereas the point of government outputs is the effort expended, the point of governance outcomes is the effects produced. One of the reasons people are often impatient with governments is
because, despite the reports of great efforts expended, the results produced (the outcomes) are often unacceptable from the point of view of the citizenry. People who want to "re-invent government" are hoping that those in government will adopt a new focus on outcomes to replace outputs.

**Processes**

Some experts and writers contend that many knowledge workers within governments are resistant to assignments to "manage processes" rather than to deal with "substantive issues". But since government is not a single-issue or a single-instance exercise, ongoing processes are what governance is all about. What the source of the aversion seems to be is that the processes are often standardized in such a routinized way that they become exceedingly boring very quickly.

This kind of habituation is not necessary for governance to be effective – it arises instead from an inappropriate way to try and ensure compliance to centralized control.\(^\text{xvi}\) The consequence however, is that flexibility is slowly squeezed out of governing processes as rules are proliferated to cover more and more eventualities. The assumption is that this will protect those in positions of responsibility from being held accountable (and punishable) for anything that can be construed as politically discreditable.\(^\text{xvii}\)

This is where the concept of governance could provide some positive guidance to the institutions of government. If governing processes were directed by flexible guidelines rather than minute rules, and if those on the front line were permitted to respond to unforeseeable particulars in a creative way, the larger aim of policy and program improvement may be more favourably achieved. To anticipate a little, the rationale for governing processes would be better to emphasize outcomes over outputs, even within government.

The Engagement Process consists of citizens and interest groups interacting with government representatives.\(^\text{xviii}\) Elections are one example of this, and lobbying legislators is another. More recently there have been increased attempts to engage citizens in a policy dialogue with government members on specific issues (i.e., proposals for new laws, or policy frameworks, etc.). In these attempts there have been some encouraging successes, and some discouraging failures. One lesson learned from all of these experiences is that a "free-for-all" approach will not work – effective citizen engagement requires that the process be managed to maintain focus and momentum.

The Implementation Process concerns the transformation of laws and policies into procedures and programs. In terms of governance, the two major concerns are efficiency and effectiveness. Organizational process re-engineering could automate much of this work, and reduce the personnel requirements considerably. What would be needed however, would be more reliance on electronic methods.\(^\text{xix}\)
The Consultation Process involves direct contact between the public service, and citizens and interest groups. In the case of interest groups, they have sought and gained access to bureaucrats for decades. What is changing is that individual citizens and community groups are now beginning to obtain similar access even if in limited numbers at this point in time. By no means are all citizens interested in exercising this opportunity, nor are all government agencies interested in extending it, but the General Accounting Office of the United States government has found that acceptance of this change on both sides is on the rise. This process helps citizens to actually shape regulations, in a small way. As will be seen in sections below, and in the Final Report of this series, results are very limited to date. The process of on-line consultations is very much a top-down process controlled by public sector organizations.

**Goals**

Because governance focuses on goals rather than rules it does not mean that the situation is any easier to understand or deal with. Goals are often based on values, and in today's diverse society, value consensus can be difficult to find or build. Instead, just as there are conflicts of values, so there are conflicts of goals. Nobel Prize winning economist Kenneth Arrow's famous theorem showed that there is no rational way to calculate majority support amongst conflicting goals and groups.

Policy analysts and media commentators often refer to a mythological political entity called "Public Opinion" to build or demolish arguments, but citizens' views are far more likely to be distributed across a variety of dimensions such that grouping would bring together completely different people on disparate issues. People can be economic liberals, cultural radicals, and religious traditionalists, or any other combination, all at once. Nevertheless, those who want to shape social goals must be prepared to commit the time and effort in governance processes.

Participating in governance to shape social goals can be very time-consuming. One of the reasons more people do not do it is that they have jobs, families, and leisure activities, all of which usually take priority. One of the reasons interest groups do sustain their efforts to shape social goals is that they select those issues and policy areas where their interests are directly involved. Whether their objectives are economic, cultural, ideological or personal, citizens who do engage themselves regard it as worth their while to "sit at the table" and to persist in their efforts to achieve what they want.

In these circumstances, the prospects for democracy become more complicated. Even if electoral districts were approximately the same size so that "one person-one vote" could be realized, those who are unequally endowed with resources are more likely to be able to afford to devote the time between elections to continuing the political pursuit of their goals. That is why electronic opportunities to promote social goals are now getting increased attention - e-participation could lower costs and increase convenience.
Performance

One of the truisms of business management is that customers don't care how either the production process or the "back office" works as long as they get good products at acceptable prices. Business performance has now been extended to include social and environmental objectives, but customers still usually focus on the deliverables rather than the methods. In a general sense, citizens are the same way when approaching government for services.

However, special interest critics try to hold governments accountable for all of their performance. Nevertheless, much of this criticism is ignored because it doesn’t perturb the public’s sense of acceptable governance. Studies have revealed that the public is not always scrupulously fair in its judgments, but often simply wants “a good show” in the public arena of politics. A Canadian politician once mused that what the public wants to know is “who’s minding the store”, and are they doing so in a reasonably honest and competent manner. If the public is satisfied in this respect, then they judge the prevailing performance of governance to be satisfactory.

Government officials and public servants are often left puzzling over “What does the citizenry really want?” Regarding the superimposed temporary fads, the answer seems to be that public wants are as changeable as the issues themselves. If the media issue of the day is “efficiency” then opinion polls will show a widespread concern for waste and demands for better performance. As the focus subsequently changes, so will public demands. However, the honesty and competence expectations are perennial. Public health, national security, a prosperous economy, a safe environment, and other issues of this kind are the “bread and butter” of governance, and negligence is not usually tolerated for very long.

Coordination

The reason the public revels in superficial political fads but resonates with honest and competent performance is that it finds the minutiae of government boring but the larger coordination issues of governance compelling. People pay for governance just as they pay for commerce, and they want “value for their money” in both cases. What that value consists of, is often misunderstood and/or misrepresented by government officials and public servants, as well as the media.

The particulars of government operations require too much expertise to be readily understood by most members of the public. What does count for the public is their perception of the general quality of life. Analogously, to the situation with businesses, this means good services at acceptable costs (taxes and user fees). The expectation of competency covers “good services”, and the expectation of honesty covers “acceptable
costs”. When the public begins to feel either cheated or jeopardized they can suddenly begin to follow arguments and chains of events extraordinarily well.

One of the regrettable consequences of the bureaucratic mentality that Max Weber described is that the process of rationalization is pervading more and more aspects of modern life. By rationalization Weber meant the frame of mind wherein systematic and standardized procedures (the means) were being used to justify outcomes (the ends). In other words, “if the game is played by the rules [whether the game be business, politics, love, or war], then the results are acceptable no matter what the consequences”. This is the use of procedural rationality used to subvert the aim of substantive rationality.

Paul Strassmann, one of the most respected information technology consultants in the United States, has conducted a number of empirical studies that show that the major cause of organizational malfunction is neither knowledge worker intransigence nor support staff sabotage, but rather persistent management missteps and ineptitude. His findings apply to government as much as to business. The public mandate for governance is to be as productive as feasible while being as unobtrusive as possible. That is why e-governance has such promising prospects.

Outcomes

During the American presidential campaign in the 1992 election the incumbent was using his success in foreign affairs to make his pitch for re-election, and the world saw the first of the signs at a protest march with the slogan "It’s the economy, stupid!” Jobs and prosperity are the outcomes that most people in most developed countries want, regardless of the party in power, or the political situation abroad, or the special pleadings of interest groups.

Governments that are properly "minding the store" realize this first priority, and work to create the conditions to make it happen. Just as any other public concerns are super-imposed fads on the top of "jobs and prosperity", so the other agendas of elected and appointed government officials are also super-imposed on top of their basic mandate. The social psychology of the modern world's political economy instills in people the belief that they are entitled to a relatively prosperous, secure existence, and that the major social institutions around them have an obligation to ensure that this happens.

Another briefly notable politician of the 1990s floated his concept of a "Contract with the People" as part of his party's campaign strategy. The "Jobs and Prosperity" expectation has actually been an implicit contract between the public and its governments in developed societies since the Great Depression of the 1930s. In the view of the majority of citizens, governance succeeds to the extent that it delivers on that contract.

Those in government often tend to confuse how they govern with why they govern. As suggested previously, this is an attempt to replace substantive rationality (outcomes) with procedural rationality (processes). Both are important, but for the public (which is the
audience that counts) outcomes are far more important. Some analysts claim a propensity on the part of government officials to replace “why” by “how” on most occasions where they can display discretionary behaviour. In other words, given a choice, those in government will usually focus on what they want rather than what the citizenry wants. xxvi

Perhaps this is where the logic of "disintermediation" can be lifted from business and applied to governance. If templates for routinized decision-making could be developed for governance, and these could be loaded onto the Net, these aspects of governance could be built right into the social infrastructure and the arbitrary choices of government officials could be eliminated. Through componential software design, revisions in such templates could be deployed overnight from a single, secure source once such changes have been authorized and designed. Is this the direction in which e-government and e-governance are headed?

**THE CHARACTERISTICS OF e-government**

Governments are the societal superstructure for politics, policies, and programs. So what does digitizing that superstructure and putting it online do to the quantity and quality of government?

**Electronic Service Delivery** xxvii

Governments can query, inform, and transact with the public over electronic networks. Since the public began to use the Internet for leisure and business, governments have been progressively migrating their service delivery onto electronic platforms. In the early days of the Internet this was justified as a great source of cost-savings. Many programs that involved information outreach were experiencing cost escalation as publishing, printing, and distribution costs continued to rise. Instead of cutting such efforts entirely during the period of down-sizing, the "webification solution" allowed documents to be posted on the World Wide Web with savings of as much as 75% of previous costs.

The shortcoming of this solution was the "digital divide" – only those with Internet connections could access the digitized documents. If most of the distribution went to government departments, other governments, businesses, or professionals, they already had or could readily acquire an Internet connection. Others less fortunate (lack of funds or lack of available interconnection points) began to claim they were being discriminated against. Hence began government sponsorship of attempts to expand access and/or provide it for free (via freenets or community portals), such as the widely successful Community Access Program in Canada, and similar programs in other countries. These programs are clear attempts to provide opportunities to engage all of the citizenry in the nation into the benefits of cyberspace through efforts to bridge the digital divide.
Many of the initial webification solutions were quite primitive, with poor information layout, inadequate navigation provisions, no support for the impaired, slow electronic responses, occasional disruptions in service, periodically outdated content, and little or no "back office" support. Criticism from a wide spectrum of users prompted improvements such as "common look and feel" standards, better information architecture, feedback provisions, and manual or dynamic content updating.

When people began to pay taxes and user fees online, fill in questionnaires, apply for jobs in the public service, send e-mails to elected officials or public servants, and download documents, they became somewhat more satisfied, and governments in turn could begin to call their Internet efforts a success. But as services improved, public expectations for online government capabilities increased. Now citizen users want (and get) search engines on government websites, responses to their e-mail queries within a set time limit, instant access to electronic public documents as soon as they are released, and opportunities to purchase chargeable information with a credit card or account.

What else does the public want over the Internet that their governments could provide?

- Access by a person to all the personal data on that person that is held in government data banks. So far this is limited by security, privacy, and confidentiality concerns.

- Access to all government documentation of all kinds by anyone. At present the storage and retrieval costs are prohibitive, and there are also security, privacy, and confidentiality concerns here as well.

- Information architecture that permits one-stop-shopping for all information from all governments in a simple thematic directory. There are also cost constraints, and no known technology to integrate, index and search all of this information.

**Electronic Workflow** xxviii

The kinds of templates that the public wants on the Internet to complete its transactions with government can also be the basis for automating the internal workflow that constitutes most of government "back office" activity. At present this is handled within the public service by attaching documents to e-mails for collegial circulation. This is certainly better than nothing, or than walking the document around to recipients – but it is not adequate, given the needs on the one hand, and the capabilities of advanced networks on the other.

There are some sophisticated templates currently designed and deployed throughout government intranets. There should be the same standardized set for every type of transaction located in every government department and agency. Just as with "business rules", there is the potential to develop "administrative rules" to routinize 80% of this
information processing and decision-making. Rationalizations that these procedures are unique are simply premised on a failure of either design or re-engineering.

There are also larger issues in this area that involve security, privacy, and confidentiality. Effective policy analysis and program design must be evidence-based using comparative data. Only that way can alternate expenditures or measures be rated as to unit-cost, efficacy of impact, cost-effectiveness, and cost-benefit assessment. To do this however, all government data from all departments and agencies would need to be held in a centralized repository within which data mining and program scenarios can be performed.

Most additional improvements in policy analysis, program design, and service deployment will only come from automated data processing and integrated data repositories. The components of networks have already been almost fully optimized. There are many more workflow productivity gains to be had, but only from improvements at the systemic level. To satisfy security, privacy and confidentiality concerns, planning data must be stripped of its personal particularities - it must be aggregated by category and safeguarded by rigorous information stewardship provisions. This is not nearly as onerous as it sounds – the primary hesitation is, once again, the arbitrary control prerogatives that departments and agencies would have to relinquish to make this type of solution workable.

**Electronic Voting**

In regards to electronic voting there is the potential for designing an effective ballot based on a template similar to an electronic form. Choice options could be designed into such ballots so that only one alternative per category could be entered (so the category would either be left blank or have one entry).

In the case of balloting however, the concerns over security, privacy and confidentiality are actually more worrisome than with most other electronic interactions. An elected official in the United States was once overheard to claim he knew the way every single member of his constituency had voted, and to prove his point went on to name off street after street of results! Whether this was authentic or just hype, it is a basic fear of many voters, the reason being that the official then went on to explain that he spared no effort to reward his supporters and punish those who hadn’t voted for him.

If the suspicion arises that the record of electronic voting can be accessed by candidates, voters are unlikely to trust the process enough to agree to use it. The challenge for any proposal to increase electronic voting is to build sufficient public trust in the security of the record of results.

**Electronic Productivity**
The rationale for e-government is better operations at lower cost, i.e., productivity. Despite the forecasts of marxists and anarchists, there does not seem any prospect of the "withering away of the state" within the foreseeable future. The social need to ensure public health and safety, national security and crime control, economic prosperity and environmental sustainability, will all guarantee the presence of governments and their active involvement in our lives, whether visibly or "behind the scenes".

What we can and do expect however, is improved efficiency in the results we get from our expenditures. Another of sociologist Max Weber's insights was that universities could act as "think tanks" for society, to develop ideas and proposals on ways to accomplish social improvements. The result of a better-educated public since Weber's time is that, in terms of suggestions for improving government, more and more people feel entitled and empowered to express their views.

In these circumstances, governments that rule with the consent of their publics cannot afford to ignore or dismiss their constituents' proposals. Whether governments actually use the inputs from their publics is another question. Some critics claim that what occurs may be termed "impression management" wherein a show is made of the comments received but then only minor adjustments are likely to occur.

Nevertheless, the public does want more (services) for less (taxes), and on the political level the possibility of shifting party allegiances exist if citizens are unhappy with current government policy. Given this reality, electronic productivity seems by far the best way for governments to achieve the trade-offs between increasing expectations and diminishing resources. But there are unintended consequences of this trend – as the performance of consumer electronic products improves, people will want the new capabilities applied to government, just as has happened already. Electronic technologies are playing a large role in shaping the mind-set of citizens, and they will want that mind-set reflected in social governance. For their part, governments will continue to be faced with the challenge of keeping up with the new technological advancements.

**THE CHARACTERISTICS OF e-governance**

Governance is the societal synthesis of politics, policies, and programs. So what does digitizing this synthesis and having it online do to the quantity and quality of societal outcomes?

**Electronic Engagement**

The possibilities for the public to engage in the policy process via electronic networks range all the way from sending elected officials an e-mail to creating a distinct conferencing facility (e-mail box, document repository, chat room, etc.) for each major policy initiative (whether a new policy, or changes in an existing policy). Considered on a global basis, there have been some examples of almost every degree of involvement
and combination of elements that one can imagine, although full-fledged electronic engagement is still not very frequent.

Electronic citizen engagement is an area in which examples are so varied, and changing so quickly that any list of current practices would be out of date between the time it was compiled and the time it was published. More useful would be an outline of effective practices that could be used to direct the design of future efforts. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has proposed just such a list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) start planning early</td>
<td>duration, participants, preparatory info, format of acceptable inputs, utilization of acceptable inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) demonstrate commitment</td>
<td>high-level support, outline purpose, agree to publish results, explain utilization intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) guarantee personal data protection</td>
<td>assure and insure data security, data privacy, data confidentiality and even anonymity (if desired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) tailor your approach to fit your target group</td>
<td>select suitable participants, customize sessions to suit group, provide additional support when appropriate (disability, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) integrate online engagement with traditional methods</td>
<td>use such complementary methods as public roundtables, focus groups, and dedicated web sites to provide multiple channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) test and adapt your tools</td>
<td>before launching ensure tools (software, questionnaires, etc.) actually work, and modify based on user suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) promote your online engagement</td>
<td>use press conferences, advertising, links to websites, e-mails, and posters to create awareness and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) analyze the results</td>
<td>commit the wherewithal (time, resources, expertise) to assure that the results are understood and interpreted for use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) provide feedback</td>
<td>publish results of the online engagement as soon as possible, spell out next steps, explain uses of engagement inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) evaluate the engagement process and its impacts</td>
<td>do a &quot;lessons learned&quot; after the engagement process to assess choice of participants, level of satisfaction, quality of inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These guidelines will enable agenda-setting, analysis, synthesis, implementation and monitoring, the five stages in the OECD policy-making paradigm.
Electronic Consultation

This is the part of governance that refers to interaction between public servants and the citizenry and interest groups. As stated in the earlier section on e-governance, contact between the public service and interest groups has been on-going for years. But two recent developments have come together to produce something quite extraordinary:

(1) ordinary citizens now have the potential to participate in rule-making (crafting regulations); and
(2) electronic rule-making has gained a foothold in the U.S. national government.

(Note: International Tracking Report number 5 in this series will examine more extensively the current state of e-democracy and on-line consultations.)

The prospects for public consultation in electronic rulemaking are now so promising that the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University has set up a separate section of their Regulatory Policy Program to track e-rulemaking, and contribute to its development. One of the scholars involved in the tracking of these developments, Gary Coglianese, has summarized the state of the art in a paper prepared this year.

According to his review, e-rulemaking does have great promise, but at this early stage it raises more questions than it answers. Following are the issues he identifies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Rulemaking's Potential for Change</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mobilization</td>
<td>do more people get involved in the rulemaking process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution</td>
<td>who is involved (ordinary citizens or special interests)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>are there regulars and occasional participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>do people learn from the e-rulemaking experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tone</td>
<td>does tone, style or emphasis of expression change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas</td>
<td>are the ideas diverse; do they change during the process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict</td>
<td>are conflicts mitigated or exacerbated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceptions</td>
<td>how do people feel toward others and the government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spillovers</td>
<td>are there carry-overs to other areas of politics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td>does e-rulemaking change groups that participate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-Rulemaking's Potential Impact on Government

| time                               | does the rulemaking timeline expand or contract? |
| cost                               | does e-rulemaking require more or less staff? |
| response                           | how do public servants respond to public input? |
| role                               | does the role of public decision-maker change? |
| agency deliberation                | will transparency promote or inhibit staff deliberation? |
| outcomes                           | does e-rulemaking give better decisions, behaviours, results? |
These questions are all good ones, and we can only guess at the answers – the process has not been practiced or studied enough to be definitive. However, this probably is the "wave of the future" and the answers from studies should help in improving the design of both participation and regulations.

Electronic Controllership xxxv

Controllership consists of protocols used to manage the cost, performance, and services of an organization. In electronic controllership the capability is placed on a network, thereby reflexively managing the network's infrastructure and content. There are two aspects to successful controllership, both of which much be optimized and integrated to achieve full benefits, namely hardware configuration, and software customization.

To effect controllership all informatics and telematics hardware must be interconnectable into a single system. All plugs, sockets, amperage, voltage, and signal and electron flows must be compatible. As an example, prior to World War I, each light bulb manufacturer had a unique socket to lock-in users to their particular products. Only with the governments' organization of the war effort were socket sizes standardized to a few functional alternatives. Yet today each brand of cell phone still has a different receptacle size for its re-charger. Purchasing protocols should include standardized interconnectors.

Capacity should also be standardized. Employee e-mailboxes should have similar storage space, all Internet connections should have the same baud rate, and attached documents should all have the same byte-limit on their size. What does any of this have to do with e-governance? Electronic technologies are playing a large role in shaping the mind-set of citizens, and they will want that mind-set reflected in social governance. It works the other way too – the psychology of standardized platforms helps to instill the psychology of systematic governance. And as both the providers and the beneficiaries of governance agree, when it comes to governance, reliability is a primary directive.

Governance software should also be standardized, whether it be operating systems or application programs. The transition to componential design is now well advanced, which makes this standardization easier to accomplish. In componential design, individual functions are located in modules that consist of logic, data, and an interface. Functions are decomposed to keep module size within manageable proportions. Any upgrades or extensions can be deployed from a management console to all users throughout the network. Only the specific modules being changed will be affected during such deployments.

The other aspect of software design that needs standardization to accomplish controllership is the use of extensible markup language (XML) for file formats and document layouts. XML is a "meta-language" with structuring rules for text, graphics, pictures, video, and sound bytes. It is used on the Internet, and can be incorporated into each and every software application. Recently a version of XML has been developed that
is a business reporting language. Another version of XML needs to be developed for a poli
tical reporting language – that way all forms of government can have standard configura
tions as well as semantic standards for clarity and meaningfulness.

Such electronic controllership is the formation towards which e-governance is evolving. So far that evolution has been haphazard, bringing both advantages and disadvantages. The disadvantage is that the process has been slow and chaotic. The advantage is that a range of new “systems”, on the nature of work in the workplace, have been put in place. Such changes are resulting in increased efficiencies and better services to the citizen along with the capabilities to engage the citizen in the processes of government decision-making and policy evolution. As network capabilities in this regard become more apparent however, some major decisions will have to be taken about the acceptable purpose and allowable methods of this controllership. Implicit in these considerations is the mission of governance itself, the final feature on the e-governance list.

Networked Societal Guidance

Who watches the watchers, who governs the governors? This has been a central question of political analysis, as far back at least as the Ancient Greeks. The concept of distribution of powers, between branches within a government, and between jurisdictions within a country, has gone part way to answering this question. Those who are competing for power will watch each other, either to keep everyone honest or to expose the illicit practices of competitors. The rise of the mass media served to inform public opinion of such infractions much more quickly and thoroughly than when all news traveled by word of mouth. Recently the Internet has become an even speedier vehicle for such disclosures.

Beyond just exposing scandalous misdeeds however, the Internet promises a far more profound possibility: each and every citizen so interested can receive instant information updates on the current conditions of governance, and give either feedback or guidance to the governance system through online policy and rulemaking development facilities. When Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau advocated "participatory democracy" 35 years ago, he was simply engaging in political wishful thinking, because the wherewithal to implement such an arrangement did not exist then. But now that we do have the Internet, there is a greater challenge to share more and more information with the public in order to contribute to the knowledge society.

In reality, what we are waiting for are two "success conditions" needed for participatory democracy. Firstly, there is a need for government (elected officials and public servants) to adjust to an entirely different paradigm of power based on network distribution rather than hierarchical ranking. This new political configuration will not be a radical egalitarian arrangement – not all nodes on the network are equal. But with everyone on the network, access, security, privacy, confidentiality, feedback, response time, and fair use, will all have to be defined and managed very differently than in the previous paradigm. It is important for governments to vigorously engage in this transaction in
order to counter growing cynicism from citizens who are seeing benefits of these new
technologies in their private and working lives and want similar results when dealing
with government.

Secondly, the architecture of participatory governance will have to be designed, built, and
operated to provide the kind of functionality the public will want. All the issues and
questions raised by Coglianese about e-rulemaking will have to be addressed to
participatory governance. Preliminary designs will be proposed, prototyped, deployed,
and then revised as users try them and make suggestions. It could take anywhere
between a year and a decade, once the process gets started. Getting started may also take
a year or a decade, but the logic of the eventual emergence of participatory governance
seems inevitable if both democracy and networking continue to receive the degree of
social support that they have so far.

CONCLUSION

As stated at the beginning of this paper, it will be important for government to continue
to use the nomenclature of e-government, e-governance and e-democracy for a number of
reasons. This is a growing subject matter and it is essential that governments create
harmony and consistency in any evolutions being undertaken. The growth of ICTs and
programs, implementing old and new technologies, requires a continuous stream that can
be understood by the public.

This point becomes evident when assessing and comparing the six milestones of
government and the six milestones of e-governance, as set out above in this paper (p.6).
These pillars of public administration, evolved and articulated over the past three to four
centuries, have created a professional and modern public service. This evolution has
come about through careful debate, trial and error and implementation. Change as has
been needed as public service organizations around the world grew to cope with the
challenges of the modern world. Public Administration as a discipline is recognized and
accepted in academic and public sector institutions worldwide. The pillars of e-
government and e-governance are now being defined and considered as the natural
extensions of the sound methodologies of how government organizations should be run.
It is recognized that while the rapid evolution of new technologies have created
challenges for all governments, sound administrative principles are the order of the day.

It is not a question of throwing out all that public sector has developed over the past
hundreds of years but rather taking the tried and true principles of public administration
and applying them to the “e” world. Governments by nature are conservative
organizations and slow to adapt to change. In the private sector slowness in adapting to
change can be disastrous for a company who may have to close up shop because of poor
administration, bad administrative practices, errors in judgment about changes within
their company, or misreading of the public mood. Companies are very much subject to
the winds of change.
Governments are the reverse. Governments are the stable point in a society. It doesn’t matter how much cynicism might come from certain quarters of the media or the public at large, governments do not dissolve. Political parties are subject to mood swings and changing loyalties in the public but, in all strong democracies, it is a change of political parties that become the “elected” government. The public administration continues and does not go away because a new political party takes office. This does not mean that accountability, trust and openness with the government are not important. What is the most important fact is that government is perceived, and continues to be perceived, as the bedrock of society. This is another good reason why the transition to e-government, e-governance and e-democracy is a smooth one, but does not send a message that somehow government as we have known it is now gone and a new order has emerged. It is another argument as to why the nomenclature must be kept so that changing needs and expectations (coming from the public) are presented in a recognizable way.

This paper has dealt with the overarching issues of “government” and “governance” in relation to the transition to new forms of government. The purpose is not to send a message that somehow government has changed in a radical or fundamental way. Such changes only come when societies have revolutions (and even these are philosophical in nature as to what government should be) or when there are deep discussions and debate in society over the years to change the nature of government. Thus, the important principles articulated in this paper are put forth as a means and a method to which governments can go forth into meeting the new challenges of the digital world while being rooted in the strengths of its past.

Government and governance are both about getting the consent and cooperation of the governed. But whereas government is the formal apparatus for this objective, governance is the outcome as experienced by those on the receiving end. E-government can be a more productive version of government in general, if it is well implemented and managed. E-governance can evolve into participatory governance if it is well supported and architected. What stands in the way of good e-government and e-governance is establishment resistance from many who do not wish to change the status quo, and public cynicism, the latter being a much larger issue above and beyond e-government and e-democracy. Given the way that technology developments are currently shaping public expectations however, citizens will continue to expect more as new states of technologies evolve. The transition to participatory governance will probably be slower, messier and costlier than it need be, but democracy always has been somewhat chaotic.

---
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