

## **Editorial,**

Frank Bannister  
Trinity College Dublin, Ireland  
fbnnistr@tcd.ie

This edition of EJEG contains seven quite contrasting papers, each of which contains new insights into different aspects of e-Government.

Marijn Janssen and René Wagenaar address a topic of universal interest: how to reduce the problem (and waste of effort) that arises when several government agencies re-invent the same wheel. This is not just a technical issue of achieving sufficient commonality to be able to share applications, it is also a question of organisation, territory and politics. The Netherlands, with its highly localised form of administration provides a particularly good background for exploring these issues.

Janet Kayaa's paper looks at a part of the globe with much more pressing and fundamental problems. The question of e-Government in Africa is one of priorities. When resources are precious and infrastructure is sparse, focus is critical. Kayaa's paper looks at e-Government developments in three African countries, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. By combining theoretical models with a rich study of practical applications, Kayaa's paper not only provides a template for further studies in this area, but suggests many further opportunities for research.

Adrianos Evangelidis investigates conceptual problems surrounding risk in e-Government using the STEPS - Social, Technical, Economic, Political and Security - classification. He proposes a model called FRAMES – A Framework for Risk Assessment and Modelling in government Services and develops a number of conceptual ideas around this concept. Evangelidis suggests that there are three major socio-technical subsystems that are formed between the modules of the model and that there are differing risks in each of these areas. This paper is a valuable contribution to the emerging debate about the risks of electronic government.

In yet another different part of the forest, Lemuria Carter and France Belanger explore the factors that influence innovation in IT. Having recently been at a IFIP conference on technological innovation, it is interesting to see this lens applied to e-Government. Carter and Belanger compare and contrast e-Government innovation with that in e-Commerce and present a research model on the Perceived Characteristics of Innovation (PCI). Their conclusions on the extent to which various factors influence e-Government take-up have important implications for practice.

Auli Keskinen's paper explores a number of models of e-Democracy including the citizen-oriented, TelevoteETM, multi-phase referendum, citizens' jury and funnel models. She suggests that various models can be used as tools to support the citizen oriented model and used the multiphase referendum as an example. There are, she argues, several challenges facing the citizen orientated model including participation, legal and representation deficits and she asks what type of citizenship models does European society want to develop for what type of decisions?

Georg Aichholzer applies the technique of scenario building to e-Government, looking forward to the year 2010. He argues that as e-Government continues to gather momentum, the evidence suggests that the risks of failure and problems are increasing. One tool for risk reduction is scenario building which enables government to anticipate possible downsides and build more robust strategies. From this, he draws a number of lessons including some of the implications for social inclusion and privacy. Acknowledging the limits of scenario building, Aichholzer nonetheless argues that it has a contribution to make in enhancing development of e-Government in years to come.

Finally, Marieke Koopmans-van Berlo & Hans de Bruijn examine in detail a specific problem, what happens when the citizen opposes government enforced electronic methods. Taking the examples of the digital tachograph and 'weigh-in-motion' with video, they explore the relationship between enforcer and 'victim', i.e. the inspector and the inspectee and argue that this is a relationship of mutual dependency. They argue that e-enforcement does not solve the problem of strategic behaviour completely and that by paying attention to the interests of inspectees, governments are more likely to be successful in e-enforcement.