

## Chapter 2.37

# E-Government at Supranational Level in the European Union

**Francesco Amoretti**  
*University of Salerno, Italy*

### INTRODUCTION

The term “e-government” became part of the political vocabulary toward the end of the 1990s. Previously, with the onset of new technologies, it found its place in the wider “semantic container,” the information society. To respond to the United States and Japan’s economic challenge, the European Commission drew up a “White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness, and Employment: Challenges and Ways Forward to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” (the so-called Delors’ White Paper). The construction of the IS is considered one of the five fundamental priorities of the Union to create a “common information area” based on ICTs and telematic infrastructure. E-government was the key element of significant community programmes (i.e., IDA [Interchange of Data between Administrations] and TEN-TELECOM [from 2002 renamed eTen]).

A decisive step toward the development of EU policies for e-government came with the approval, in June 2000, of the Action Plan “eEurope 2002: An Information Society for All.” Guidelines

were fixed for greater use of the Internet, and the initiative “Government online: electronic access to public services, [which] aims to ensure that citizens have easy access to essential public data, [...] [and, in order to improve] efficiency in the public sector, will require a re-thinking of internal organisation and of electronic exchanges between institutions” (Council of the European Union & Commission of the European Communities, 2000, p. 22).

A few months previously, based on numerous EC documents, the Council of Europe of Lisbon indicated an ambitious objective for the European Union: “to become the most competitive and dynamic economy based on knowledge in the world, capable of achieving sustainable economic growth, creating new and better jobs and more social cohesion.” The so-called “Lisbon strategy” to permit Europe to recover the delay accumulated compared to the U.S., was intended to guide community policies up to 2010. It is in this context, interwoven with different and often conflicting pressures (economic competition and social cohesion, market logics, and the language of

rights) that action plans are formulated and policies for e-government implemented in Europe.

## **BACKGROUND: E-GOVERNMENT BETWEEN MARKET-POLITICS**

The context of e-government in Europe is in the dynamic framework of three key issues:

1. The globalisation of the economy and the challenges posed by competitors on the global market
2. The construction of a European identity (enlargement, constitution, the existence of different models for European development and issues relative to the democratic deficit of the EU)
3. The exponential growth of the ICT sector and the Internet

E-government represents a core issue in these areas (i.e., effective implementation should lead through the integrated use of ICTs (3) and together with organisational change, to economic advantages for the public and private sectors (1), and a greater integration of the “European system” (2)).

The vision of e-government at EU level is quite differentiated. The EU strongly promotes open markets and competition while maintaining commitment to specific principles of the European public law tradition and human rights (embraced by the Fundamental Charter of Human Rights, integral to the EU constitutional framework). These factors have significant implications for e-governments policies, which embody the institutional expression of values such as human dignity, participation, and transparency (Van Cuilenburg & McQuail, 2003) to be safeguarded when implementing e-government solutions.

There is evidence that the development of e-government, more than acting as a catalyst for the processes previously described, has played

the role of dependent variable. Thus, European strategies for e-government have been determined by economic and technological considerations rather than social or cultural factors.

If “the simultaneous existence of three divergent approaches—the EU liberal market model, the EU public service model and the EU national-cultural model—to the Information Society confers a unique character on the European communications market” (Venturelli, 2002, p. 79), policy decisions or policy perspectives have ended up being “*mainly technologically and/or commercially driven*” (Servaes & Heinderyckx, 2002, p. 98). Support for this view comes from the structure of many Community position papers (from the Delors White Paper to the Green Book on the Information Society of 1997), where a preference for deregulation and liberalisation endows the private sector with a much larger role (Kaitatzi-Whitlock, 2000) than the public authorities, which retain the residual role of “establishing new rules for the game” (Commission of the European Communities, 1994).

There have been remarkable repercussions on the development of e-government. The Commission has in fact left ample margins for Member States action, not only in terms of the principles of subsidiary and decentralisation, but also in the legal area. The Amsterdam Treaty (1997) gives the Commission no legal authority to intervene in relation to the public administrations of Member States. Consequently, any changes that concern the public administration cannot be imposed *top-down*, but must be *bottom-up*. The EU context is neo-liberal and increasingly market-oriented, although the form that this takes at national level is rather more differentiated than might be suggested (i.e., each country to its own specificities) determined by national political objectives and administrative traditions.

The EU has developed a new form of governance to tackle these new challenges: the open method of coordination (OMC) a soft-law instrument which allows the Union to fix guidelines

7 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/government-supranational-level-european-union/9766](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/government-supranational-level-european-union/9766)

## Related Content

---

### The Emergence of Digital Government: International Perspectives

Laura Forlano (2004). *Digital Government: Principles and Best Practices* (pp. 34-51).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/emergence-digital-government/8382](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/emergence-digital-government/8382)

### Factors of Innovation Management Transformation in Digital Innovation Ecosystems of Russian Companies

Mikhail Khachatryan and Evgeniia Klicheva (2022). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 1-18).

[www.irma-international.org/article/factors-of-innovation-management-transformation-in-digital-innovation-ecosystems-of-russian-companies/315603](http://www.irma-international.org/article/factors-of-innovation-management-transformation-in-digital-innovation-ecosystems-of-russian-companies/315603)

### Municipal E-Government Services in Emerging Economies: The Latin-American and Caribbean Experiences

Manuel Pedro Rodríguez Bolívar, María del Carmen Caba Pérez and Antonio Manuel López Hernández (2012). *Digital Democracy: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 498-526).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/municipal-government-services-emerging-economies/67622](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/municipal-government-services-emerging-economies/67622)

### The Role of Income and Awareness as Moderating Variables on Adoption of Mobile Government Services in Tanzania Rural Areas

Herman Mandari (2021). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 62-79).

[www.irma-international.org/article/the-role-of-income-and-awareness-as-moderating-variables-on-adoption-of-mobile-government-services-in-tanzania-rural-areas/275203](http://www.irma-international.org/article/the-role-of-income-and-awareness-as-moderating-variables-on-adoption-of-mobile-government-services-in-tanzania-rural-areas/275203)

### Perception Differences of Online Voting Between Young and Senior Voters

Anne Powell, Douglas B. Bock, Thomas Doellman and Jason W. Allen (2010). *Politics, Democracy and E-Government: Participation and Service Delivery* (pp. 151-166).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/perception-differences-online-voting-between/42579](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/perception-differences-online-voting-between/42579)