

# Whatever Happened to Inclusive eGovernment?

Paul Waller

Brunel University London, UK

ITAPA Bratislava 2014



## What Started It?

*By 2010 all citizens, including socially disadvantaged groups, will have become major beneficiaries of eGovernment*

*EU Ministerial Declaration on eGovernment 2005*

# Why?

A response to:

“... [the] underprivileged, who rely on public services (and would benefit most from accessing them on-line)...”

*UN e-Government Survey 2014*

# Who?

Children in care

Unemployed young people

Prolific & Priority Offenders

Disadvantaged families

Immigrant communities

Mental health sufferers

Elderly isolated people

People living in poverty

## But...

“they lack internet access and/or skills.”

*UN e-Government Survey 2014*

**And the transactions put online weren't even relevant to them!**

“In the past decade, countries have given priority to the improvement of services that generate income for government (such as taxation) which, with an average score of 98%, remain the most advanced service cluster.

The registration and the returns cluster currently both stand at 88%. Permits and licenses ... now reach a sophistication score of 83%.”

*EU 9<sup>th</sup> Benchmark Measurement 2010*

## So What did it Mean...?

“Inclusive eGovernment”:

- To improve the lives and life chances of disadvantaged groups through the innovative use of ICT
- To build ICT innovatively into policy design, public service delivery, and information provision to actively include the disadvantaged

**NOT**

- eAccessibility of government web sites
- eInclusion (digital inclusion, access and skills)

# What Happened to the 2010 Target?

The €100.000.000.000 Question

50-50



A. The target was met

B. Not met but good progress

C. Not much progress but momentum

D. It hit a brick wall

# What Happened to the 2010 Target?

The €100.000.000.000 Question

50-50



B. Not met but good progress

D. It hit a brick wall



# What Happened to the 2010 Target?

The €100.000.000.000 Question

50-50



B. Not met but good progress

D. It hit a brick wall

## Why a Brick Wall?

- The services are local not central government: EU representation is central government
- Gap between techies and social service practitioners
- Low technology at point of delivery
- Little managerial choice

eGovernment: remained all about web sites and transactions

# What was done anyway?

## EU:

- i2010 Action Plan
- Roadmap
- Flagships
- Conference streams
- MCE-Gov study [www.mcegov.eu](http://www.mcegov.eu)

## UK:

- eService innovation process
- Resource toolkit
- Implemented projects
- [www.diteam.org.uk](http://www.diteam.org.uk)

# What did we Learn?

- ICT potentially enables 100s of solutions to real social problems
- Political will, managerial courage, legitimate scope for change: **hard to find**
- Capacity and capability: **hard to do**

**These lessons apply to public sector innovation generally**

# What Next?

- Focus on pressures on social services, renew the proposition
- Rephrase the cliché – make it a call for action... for 2025?
- Ground the discussion – cut through the tech & innovation hype e.g. use principles of Demand Management\*

**BUT EVERY LOCALITY IS DIFFERENT**

\* Randle, A. and Kippin, H. 2014, *Managing Demand: Building Future Public Services*, RSA, [www.thersa.org](http://www.thersa.org)

# Whatever Happened to Inclusive eGovernment?

Paul Waller

Brunel University London, UK

ITAPA Bratislava 2014

