

## Chapter 6

# Next Generation E–Government: Reconciling the E–Participation and Data Protection Agendas

**Maria Moloney**  
*Escher Group Ltd., Ireland*

**Gary Coyle**  
*Escher Group Ltd., UK*

### ABSTRACT

*The evolving model of the Future Internet has, at its heart, the users of the Internet. Web 2.0 and Government 2.0 initiatives help citizens communicate even better with their governments. Such initiatives have the potential to empower citizens by giving them a stronger voice in both the traditional sense and in the digital society. Pressure is mounting on governments to listen to the voice of the public expressed through these technologies and incorporate their needs into public policy. On the other hand, governments still have a duty to protect their citizens' personal information against unlawful and malicious intent. This responsibility is essential to any government in an age where there is an increasing burden on citizens to interact with governments via electronic means. This chapter examines this dual agenda of modern governments to engage with its citizens, on the one hand, to encourage transparency and open discussion, and to provide digitally offered public services that require the protection of citizens' private information, on the other. In this chapter, it is argued that a citizen-centric approach to online privacy protection that works in tandem with the open government agenda will provide a unified mode of interaction between citizens, businesses, and governments in digital society.*

### INTRODUCTION

Social media or Web 2.0 technologies refer to a collection of technologies which help individuals to become active participants in activities like creating, editing, sharing and rating Web content

as well as helping them to form social networks by interacting and linking with each other. Web 2.0 technologies include technologies such as, blogs, wikis, social networking sites, photo-sharing, video and audio sharing, podcasting and many more (Chun S. A., Shulman, Sandoval, & Hovy,

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-6082-3.ch006

2010). The purpose of Government 2.0 initiatives is to use social media to facilitate communication between relevant parties of a community, thereby helping to ensure an e-community is developed more efficiently and effectively (Haughwout, 2009).

However, in the rush to embrace government 2.0, it must not be forgotten that governments must continue to provide *good governance*. Good governance, broadly speaking is about delivery of public sector services in a way that reflects as closely as possible accepted public administration values such as efficiency, security, fairness, integrity, and honesty (Bannister & Connolly, 2011). Government 2.0, while beneficial for enabling citizen participation in many ways, does not provide solutions for communicating with governments when there is a need to keep the information being submitted private and secure. Protecting a citizen's personal information is not only necessary for completing many online eGovernment services, for example submitting tax returns and invoices to the government, but it is increasingly being seen as an essential element for safeguarding the digital identity of citizens. With the ever increasing pervasiveness of ICTs in modern life, governments have a combined responsibility to: 1) engage their citizens online and 2) continue to provide good governance in the form of efficient public services. This includes services that require citizens to submit private information in order to avail of electronic public services.

This chapter explores how governments can embrace Web 2.0 technologies, while continuing to meet the challenges of protecting citizens' informational privacy when providing them with electronic public services. The next section gives an overview of how electronic government has evolved over the years to encompass government 2.0 and m-government. This is followed by a discussion of governments' obligations towards good governance and protecting their citizens informational privacy. The chapter then gives an overview of a conceptual model to guide govern-

ments when adapting their existing e-government function to incorporate a more holistic approach to e-participation of citizens. Following this, details and results of a case study, which uses this conceptual model as a guide for encouraging e-participation are provided. The chapter concludes with a section on future research.

## FROM E-GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT 2.0

The e-Government field emerged in the late 1990's as a context within which to share experiences among public sector practitioners (Grönlund & Horan, 2004). However, the history of computing in government organizations can be traced back to the beginnings of computer history. A literature on "IT in government" goes back at least to the 1970s (Kraemer, Danziger, & King, 1978). This earlier literature focused on IT use within government, while the more recent e-Government literature often focuses on IT use between government departments and the larger community, such as the provision of government services to the citizens (Ho, 2002). While some earlier e-Government issues, such as office automation, may not be highly relevant to research today, many issues still are, for example decision making, service processes, and values (Grönlund & Horan, 2004).

Most definitions of e-Government go beyond the notion of simply providing services to the citizen, to include the use of IT to facilitate both organizational change and the role of government. The e-government literature acknowledges that ICTs, by their nature, can streamline how governments conduct their business and how they communicate with their citizens and clients (Ho, 2002). In this capacity, ICTs serve as useful tools for governments wishing to reform and modernize. At the same time, reforms in public administration often require a review of the administrative, policy and regulatory foundations upon which e-government is built. These reforms in e-government can often

21 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/next-generation-e-government/109497](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/next-generation-e-government/109497)

## Related Content

---

### Different Divisions: A Taxonomy and Examination of the Role of E-Government in the Digital Divide

Frank Bannister and Denise Leahy (2014). *E-Governance and Social Inclusion: Concepts and Cases* (pp. 10-24).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/different-divisions/110305](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/different-divisions/110305)

### An Extended Risk Assessment Model for Secure E-Government Projects

Dionysis Kefallinos, Maria A. Lambrou and Efstahios Sykas (2009). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 72-92).

[www.irma-international.org/article/extended-risk-assessment-model-secure/2072](http://www.irma-international.org/article/extended-risk-assessment-model-secure/2072)

### An E-Government Strategic Planning Framework

Vedmani Sharan (2011). *Stakeholder Adoption of E-Government Services: Driving and Resisting Factors* (pp. 14-26).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/government-strategic-planning-framework/54119](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/government-strategic-planning-framework/54119)

### The Contribution of Colombian Civil Society Organizations to E-Government for the Improvement of Transparency through the Use of Information and Communication Technologies

Julián G. Casasbuenas (2011). *Global Strategy and Practice of E-Governance: Examples from Around the World* (pp. 324-337).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/contribution-colombian-civil-society-organizations/52272](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/contribution-colombian-civil-society-organizations/52272)

### Evaluating Public Programs Implementation: An Exploratory Case Study

Maddalena Sorrentino and Katia Passerini (2010). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 1-13).

[www.irma-international.org/article/evaluating-public-programs-implementation/45737](http://www.irma-international.org/article/evaluating-public-programs-implementation/45737)