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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

This report presents the 7th annual measurement of the progress of online public service delivery across Europe. It features results from the two core measurements of sophistication and fully-online availability of online services, measured across a basket of 20 services assessed from public agencies across 31 countries – the 27 EU Member States, plus Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey (EU27+).

This year the measurement system has been enhanced in recognition of the ever-increasing focus on efficient ‘user-centric’ services. We introduce a 5th level of online sophistication – that of personalisation; the extent to which online service is targeted to user needs. We have also piloted a composite indicator for User-Centricity – comprising a basket of four sub-indicators. Finally, we have assessed national portals as a trusted comprehensive one-stop access to public services.

The report is laid out in three broad areas:

- **Method & Results for Core Indices**: the measurement system, the contribution of country representatives, and discussion on the European and Country level results
- **Method & Results for User-Centric Indices**: discussing the new pilot indices
- **Country Profiles**: Summary results and highlights for each of the countries assessed

Further detail is provided in the Annex, and can be requested from the report authors.

Online services were, for some, an intriguing diversion at the outset of this measurement journey in 2001. They are now a recognised and integral means to deliver the i2010 eGovernment Action Plan. As individuals, we now seek and expect quality and dynamism in online public service delivery. As Government we must also seek to define and deliver that “Gov 2.0” user experience. This is an essential component to European competitiveness and central to achieving Lisbon goals.

So, to the findings...

**Continued Pan-European Progress**: Europe progresses against both of the core measures. Sophistication is on average (EU27+) at 76% approaching the level classified as “Transactional”. This shows advancement from 2006 where services were classified on average as “two-way interaction”. There is however significant variance between the most and least advanced countries, of almost 50% points.

Against the fully-online availability measure, Europe has advanced from 50% in 2006 to 58% in 2007. There is an even more marked variance, of 85%, highlighting the challenge of delivering integrated (‘front-to-back-office’) interoperable services, particularly for cases of devolved government. The most advanced country has now achieved 100% against the criteria for the 20 services measured.

**Country Rankings for Sophistication and Availability**: There is a high correlation now between these two measures. Five countries have achieved performance of 90% or above in both. Austria retains its leadership position, followed by Malta, Slovenia, Portugal and the United Kingdom.
‘Fast Movers’: Portugal has made major progress since 2006. Malta, Slovenia and Estonia stand out as countries that have embraced eGovernment and advanced online service delivery to levels in advance of many ‘old’ member states. Modest size and centralised structure enable rapid advancement. There remain some small new and old states that clearly have not embraced eGovernment to that same degree, and a number of previously progressive ‘old’ countries whose progress has faltered rather over recent years.

Servicing the Needs of Businesses and Citizens: Austria, Malta, Czech Republic and Portugal offer the best sophistication and fully-online availability of public services for their business community. The EU average for the latter measure has advanced modestly (3%) from an already high level in 2006 and now sits at 70%. Sophistication is now at 84%.

Much of the overall progress has been made this year through improvements in citizen services, albeit the gap between citizen and business remains significant. Sophistication sits at 70% (cf business: 84%) and fully-online availability at 50% (cf business: 70%). The gap between leader (Austria: 100%) and last exceeds 90%. There is significant room for improvement, however the sheer number and heterogeneity of citizen services delivered through often devolved government presents countries with serious challenges to achieve high levels of performance. This is not perhaps something that receives the sympathy of the citizen, who expects levels of service frequently experienced in the commercial world.

Service Clusters: Four service baskets are assessed – income generating (for government); registration (e.g. births, company, moving); service returns (e.g. health, social, libraries); and permits and licences (e.g. building, education, passport). Whereas the EU average for fully-online availability of income generating services all sit well above 80%, the other three clusters although showing advancement year-on-year are still at very low performance levels. If governments seek to engage customers they must enable not only the services that deliver funds into government, but also those that deliver value to customers.

User-Centricity: Recognising the advancement in online service delivery we piloted a suite of user-centric measures. These new instruments deliver revealing insights, though less-robust data in comparison with the core measures.

❖ The 3rd Indicator: User-Centricity: We assessed four areas to explore the feasibility of a composite measure for user-centricity for transactional services: These include:

- **Data Security:** “Is there a legally binding eID system in place?” Although 90% of countries have an eID policy, the EU27+ average is only 27% for implementation. Malta, The Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden have been performing above average.

- **Reducing Administrative Burden:** Assessment of ease of data entry, and levels of form pre-population was supported in only 6 countries revealed a great disparity in results. The results are inconclusive.

- **Multi-Channel Access:** “To what extent is there at least one other channel (e.g. call centre, kiosk, mobile, DiTV) available?” 24% of the services offered alternative channels, indicating emerging multi-channel strategies. Bulgaria stands out, with a call service centre available for most online transactional services.

- **Compliance with Accessibility Standards:** Compliance to international standards is poor, with only 5% of sites making this visible (e.g. statement; logo). This is a slight increase on the 2005 figure of 3%.

With an average of 19% the overall results of user centricity e-service delivery measurement stay modest.
National Portals: We assessed availability of the 20 services, personalisation ('my portal'), and consistency of layout. The EU27+ average score is 75%, demonstrating that European governments have invested in delivering quality national portals, as the convenient, trusted, branded route to public services.

Personalisation: the 5th level of sophistication: Reviewing solely those 9 services relevant at this level (pro-active services organised around user needs, typically automated end-to-end, and at times delivered automatically resulting from a previous event), shows an EU27+ score of 36%, with Slovenia standing out with almost 80% of these services in this pro-active state.

Europe continues to make sound progress on the supply of online public services as a key enabler to deliver the i2010 eGovernment action plan and Lisbon goals. Businesses appear in general well served and suitably engaged. Significant progress has been made to improve citizen services. However much remains to do to serve citizens who are increasingly exposed to and versed in web services. Neglect would result in widening the gap between the public and commercial online worlds. Today's challenge is to close that gap – delivering an experience that attracts and fulfils citizen needs, efficiently, consistently, and economically – the “Gov 2.0” experience. An experience that reaffirms trust in public services, and delivers the user-participation required to support a customer-centric, economically viable, and productive Europe.
1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the renewed benchmarking on the progress of online public services in Europe. On behalf of the European Commission Capgemini has measured for the 7th consecutive time the supply of public e-services in Europe.

The provision of high quality public services is one of the keystones of the i2010 programme “A European Information Society for growth and employment”. Public services are playing an important role in the route to an inclusive European society. They also play an important role in the success of the European economy.

The eGovernment policy environment has evolved from “bringing public services online” to a concept of effective and user centric service delivery in an inclusive and competitive European society. Such services are now a recognised and integral means to deliver the i2010 eGovernment Action Plan, across all five priorities:

1. **No citizen left behind**: advancing inclusion through eGovernment so that all citizens benefit from trusted, innovative services and easy access for all
2. **Making efficiency and effectiveness a reality**: significantly contributing to high user satisfaction, transparency and accountability, and a lighter administrative burden
3. **Implementing high-impact key services for citizens and businesses**: by 2010, 100% electronic availability of public procurement with 50% actual usage, and agreements on cooperation on further high-impact online citizen services
4. **Putting key enablers in place**: so citizens and businesses benefit from convenient, secure and interoperable authenticated public service access across Europe
5. **Strengthening participation and democratic decision-making**: employing effective tools for public debate and participation in democratic decision-making

This 2007 measurement is based upon a method that has been modernised, to take into account new technological possibilities and insights. The existing framework has therefore been extended to include a fifth level of sophistication built around pro-activity and personalisation. The measurement also recognises the significant advancement that has been made by countries over the years. The measurements have been extended to assess on the one hand to what extent the services are built around the needs of the “customer” (being citizens and businesses) and on the other hand how easy it is to access these services through the national portal.

Thus in this 2007 benchmark the following indicators have been measured:

- An online sophistication indicator based on a renewed 5 level model;
- An indicator on the number of public services fully available online, where fully available online will continue to be measured on the existing 4 level model. This indicator will allow the evaluation on a historical continue basis;
- User centricity indicators (a composite of four sub-indicators);
- An assessment of national portals that provides an indication of the service integration and consistency and branding of online government.
Since the existing list of services covers reasonably well the different tasks and interactions of the public sector with citizens and businesses, the existing list of services and their definition as a service has not been changed. Historical statistical comparison is however only valid in the case of “fully-online availability” since the sophistication scale has been modified.

The benchmark is based in the first place on the classical “web-based” assessment of more than 5,000 public agencies and 14,000 web pages providing the 20 public services in the 31 participating countries. Collaborative interaction with, and information provided by the representatives of the participating countries is a second and important information source for this study.

The participating countries are the 27 Member States, plus Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey (noted as EU27+). Newcomers in this study are therefore Bulgaria and Romania as new Member States, and Turkey.

In the following chapter we will discuss the two core indicators being (i) sophistication and (ii) fully-online availability. This includes the main changes to the method, together with the country rankings and an analysis by cluster. In the subsequent section we introduce the new indicators, starting with a presentation of the User Centricity indicator and the findings; the National Portals are also discussed. We have added extra considerations about the pro-activity of the services measured. We then discuss each participating country separately with a general comment about the scoring, an assessment of the national portal, and some highlights. Finally the overall conclusions on where Europe stands are summarized.
2 THE CORE INDICATORS

2.1 The method for the core indicators

2.1.1 Online sophistication and fully online availability

The scoring framework

In order to measure the indicator ‘availability of public services online’, an e-service sophistication model was developed. This model illustrates the different degrees of sophistication of online public services going from ‘basic’ information provision over one-way and two way interaction to ‘full’ electronic case handling.

The second indicator – fully available online - is measured on the basis of a two-level framework:

- “no full online availability”: contains stages 0 to 3 of the sophistication framework.
- “full online availability”: status granted to all services that reach a stage strictly above the 3rd stage of the sophistication framework.

This method has been applied on a consistent basis over previous years across a basket of 20 common services to assess the progress of e-Europe.

The enhanced measurement framework

The existing framework has been extended to include a fifth level of sophistication built around pro-activity and personalisation. Thus in this 2007 benchmark the following indicators have been measured:

- An unchanged indicator on the number of public services fully available online, where fully available online will continue to be measured on the existing 4 level model. This indicator will allow the evaluation on a historical continue basis;
- An online sophistication indicator based on a renewed 5 level model;

The 5th level provides an indication of the extent to which the online provision of the 20 common services is based on new models of front and back-offices integration, the reuse of available data and to what degree the idea of pro-active service delivery is embedded. For certain services this means that the applicant receives the service automatically based on a previous registration of an event.

In other words, this 5th level gives in an indication of fully integrated electronic procedures that help reduce ‘red tape’ and improve data consistency; where no other physical action is required on behalf of the applicant.
The new 5th level of sophistication introduces two extra concepts:

- **The idea of pro-active service delivery**, i.e. the government pro-actively performs actions to enhance the service delivery quality and the user friendliness. Examples of pro-activity are: the government warns the user that action could be required, the government pre-fills data in the application forms that it already contains in governmental databases to the extent permitted by law.

- **The idea of automatic service delivery**: the government automatically provides specific services being social and economic rights for citizens (and business), linked to a certain condition of the user. There is no need for the user to request the service.

The model below illustrates the 5th level sophistication concept.

![Figure 1: Sophistication of online services](image)

Until now only the *direct* interaction was taken into account between an applicant – being a citizen or a business, and the governmental service provider – being an administration, agency or private operator to whom the government has outsourced the service delivery.

In the renewed method we introduce the concept of intermediaries and take into account the electronic communication and interaction between the intermediary and the service provider. This concept is relevant for two services: *car registration* and *health services* for which an alternative 4B level is elaborated. This change results in minimal overall impact at a European level for year-on-year comparability, and provides a more accurate picture at a country level.
2.1.2 The 20 common basic public services

Since the existing list of services covers reasonably well the different tasks and interactions of the public sector with citizens and businesses, the existing list of services and their definition as a service has not been changed. Only the number of stages has been reviewed. The table below provides an overview of the 20 basic public services (12 citizens / 8 businesses) that are assessed annually, and their maximum level of sophistication. Details can be found in Annex 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public services for citizens</th>
<th>Maximum stage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income taxes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>previously 4 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job search services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>one extra stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal documents (passports / driver's license)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>previously 3 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car registration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Introduction of a stage 4b (intermediaries and electronic networks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for building permission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration to police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>previously 4 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>previously 3 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment in higher education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of moving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>previously 3 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-related services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Introduction of a stage 4b (intermediaries and electronic networks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sophistication-level of services for citizens
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public services for businesses</th>
<th>Maximum stage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social contributions for employees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate tax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of a new company</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of data to statistical offices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>previously 3 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs declaration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment-related permits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>previously 4 stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public procurement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sophistication-level of services for businesses

In these service definitions and our benchmark, the standard procedure is evaluated, being that which an official inhabitant or business of a nation uses who qualifies for the service. We do not consider appeal procedures, exceptions or other non-standard procedures.
2.2 Results for the core indicators

2.2.1 Sophistication

Europe has achieved an average overall sophistication maturity level that is between “two-way interaction” and “fully transactional”, or more precisely 76%.

The progression in sophistication of services is important compared to 2006, where it reached a level of two-way interaction (electronic forms).

It is even more significant since new Member States have joined the EU and Turkey has also been taken into account in the scoring.

Figure 2: EU achievement on five-stage sophistication model

The overall 76% score achieved on sophistication maturity is the average of all the surveyed countries. The country ranking on this indicator is as follows:
Austria keeps the leadership of the country ranking; the second place goes to Malta and Slovenia, with an equal score of 96%. Slovenia, as a young small Member State has leapfrogged in a way similar to Malta last year.

Modest sizes combined with political prioritisation of the construction of the information systems seem to enable rapid progress.

2.2.2 Full availability online

The supply of fully-online availability services has again increased in Europe, with more than half – 58% – of all services qualifying as such, increasing from 50% in 2006.
Although the figures are historically comparable with regards to the method used, it must be said that the number of countries included in the measurement has steadily been increasing over time. Since the average score of individual countries joining in the measurement was typically below the EU average, it can be considered that the overall progression in Europe is even more significant and broad.

The country ranking shows a strong correlation with the sophistication scores. The amplitude in scores is however bigger, illustrating the higher complexity to achieve the full online availability status.

Sophistication and fully-online availability have a high correlation, as illustrated in the graph below.

Moving up on the sophistication scale can occur by taking each step, one by one. The scores on sophistication are therefore on average higher than the fully-availability online where a service will only be considered online (and receive marks) if it reaches a sophistication superior to stage 3. The Fully-available measure is thus binary ‘1:0’.

It is interesting to see that the gap between the scores becomes larger when looking at the countries in the lower end of the ranking. This emphasises that achieving fully-online availability requires front-office and back-office integration, and a real change in approach to service delivery. Since this typically requires consequent investments and political resolve, it will typically take sustained effort and time to close the gap. Centralised governance structures therefore may typically have an advantage in making swifter change.

---

1 In 2001, the measurement included the 15 EU Member States, plus Iceland and Norway. Switzerland joined the measurement in 2002. With the accession of 10 new Member States in 2004, the number of countries surveyed totaled 28. This year’s measurement includes 2 new Member States (Bulgaria and Romania) and Turkey.
2.2.3 Public service clusters

Clustering services by target groups such as citizens or businesses is one view; however it is also interesting to look at clustering by activity.

The defined clusters classify services as:

- **Income generating**: taxes, social contributions, VAT, customs
- **Registration**: car, company, birth & marriage, moving, statistical data
- **Returns**: health, libraries, procurement, policing, job search, benefits
- **Permits and licences**: building, passport, education, environment
The first focus of governments has been to invest in the income generating services; the result is that the EU average for fully-online availability of income generating services all sits well above 80%. These services had high operating costs due to extensive ‘front-office’ paperwork, where the back-offices were typically running advanced IT systems. A business case for the investment was therefore quick and easy to make, followed by relatively easy implementation.

The other three clusters although showing advancement year-on-year are still at very low performance levels. These services are more heterogeneous in nature, there are many of them, and they are typically offered by (multiple and often smaller) local providers. This setting in comparison to many of the more homogeneous high volume central services (like tax) is a clear reason for the significantly slower progress.
Governments must continue to turn their attention to these three service clusters, and prioritise implementation of those that offer the highest value-add. Returns services typically involve high operational costs, which can be dramatically reduced through e-channels. Particularly job-search services have seen significant investment, in order not only to reduce costs but also to stimulate the labour market. Many other services although climbing up the sophistication ladder, are still mainly paper-based.

If governments seek to engage customers they must enable not only those services that deliver funds into government. The focus is currently on service efficiency / cost control and income improvement. Government should put more emphasis on customer satisfaction by shifting investments towards reducing administrative burden for citizens. This will drive trust – that drives take-up, and thus delivers our ultimate goals.

2.2.4 Target groups: Citizens vs. Business

Sophistication

![Sophistication citizens vs. businesses](image)

Figure 9: Sophistication citizens vs. businesses

Separating the sophistication indicator into services for citizens and for businesses shows that public services for citizens have reached an average of 70%, and public services for businesses reached an average of 84% for the EU27+. 
When compared to the sophistication level of business services there is significant room for improvement for e-Services for citizens. The sheer number and heterogeneity of citizen services presents countries with serious challenges to deliver high levels of performance.

The level of sophistication for businesses scored at 84% which is a high level of sophistication. As the new method comprises only 2 pro-active services for business (statistical data and environment-related permits), there is still room for – measurement of – improvement in pro-active service delivery.

The analysis of the level of sophistication shows a clear difference between citizens and businesses. There is a high level of sophistication generally across the EU27+, however with a tendency to focus on availability and sophistication for businesses.

There are some exceptions – generally the higher overall performers (Finland, Norway, Slovenia, UK) – where sophistication of citizen services are the same as or more advanced than those for businesses.
Fully online availability

Figure 12: Full online availability for citizens: country ranking

Taking a closer look at fully-online availability for the EU27+ shows a large difference between citizens and businesses. The fully-online availability in 2007 for citizens is at 50%. Compared to the previous surveys this is one of the biggest improvements: + 12%-point compared with the survey of 2006.

This means that 50% of services for citizens make it possible for users to access a service via a fully transactional electronic channel.

Needless to say, there is still considerable room for improvement regarding fully-online availability for citizens. Further progress, as shown on the graph above, will demand efforts from a lot of countries.

A notable highlight for this indicator is Austria, the first Member State to achieve a 100% fully-online availability score for all services for citizens.

The fully-online availability for businesses is considerably (20%) higher than that for citizens and stands at 70%. This shows only a modest improvement of 3% to 2006. This rather low improvement is due to the already high level of fully-online availability that was achieved for businesses.

Four Member States, Austria, Czech Republic, Portugal and Malta have achieved 100% fully-online availability for businesses.
Figure 13: Full online availability for citizens: country ranking

Taking a closer look at the evolution of fully-online availability in Europe over the year shows that the gap between citizens and businesses is progressively reducing. Member States are clearly evolving to a higher level of online availability for citizens as well as for businesses. This is an important step as a pre-requisite to support take-up of the services and thus deliver the impact (both economic and user satisfaction) that will be required to meet Lisbon goals.

Figure 14: Full online availability: historical evolution
3 USER CENTRICITY OF ONLINE PUBLIC SERVICES

3.1 Introduction

A composite new “User centricity” Indicator was defined based on four sub-indicators, and piloted in 2007. These explore (personal) data security, administrative burden, channel choice and access, and accessibility standards. Individually, these offer useful insights; collectively they provide a 3rd Indicator to complement the two pure supply side indices of sophistication and full-online availability. Each is elaborated below:

1. Services with legally binding e-ID
   This indicator provides an assessment of user confidence in e-services, in terms of security for the users.
   A legally binding eID is an authentication for citizens or businesses recognized as legally binding by the member state. This recognition is based on the data input by the Member States in the first phase of the survey. Identity Management is a somewhat nascent topic. It addresses the identification, verification, authentication and authorisation of a user. The definitions and interpretations across EU+ countries will take some time to align.

2. Number of data fields requested for transactional services
   The indicator provides a measure of the convenience for the user of e-services. Transactional services delivered fully through the internet should require a low average number of fields to be filled in.
   Multiple use of information implies intelligent use of data, e.g. the use of data from previous contacts with the same authority, or data-sharing between authorities whenever a subject (explicitly) consents (free and informed). This pre-population can significantly reduce administrative burden and offer improved user satisfaction.

3. Multi-channel access to service
   This indicator assesses user-centricity in terms of the possibility for the citizen or business to choose to receive the government service through a variety of channels other than the classic channels (e.g. phone, kiosk, mobile, DigiTV)

4. Site’s compliance with international standards of accessibility
   This indicator measures stated (text or logo) compliance with international accessibility standards. It indicates if users, regardless of physical disabilities, will be able to access online services?
3.2 Detailed results

Piloting the measurement of the new user centricity indicators has provided good learning, and offered some valuable additional results and insights.

The first sub-indicator "Legally Binding eID", assesses "when a service is transactional, is there a legally binding eID system in place". This is relatively easy to measure.

The result indicates that for only 27% of the transactional services a "legally binding" authentication system is in place. (Note: The definition of "legally binding" was based on the input provided by the participating countries, and thus may be subject to different absolute interpretation across countries).

The result is lower than expected, as once a service is transactional there should be an authentication system in place that is recognized as "legally binding" by the government. Data integrity could be eroded by variable or incomplete information provided by the governments. A more in-depth analysis of this specific aspect is recommended.

Interesting to mention is that close to 90% (26/30) of countries surveyed declare to have a policy in place for key enablers such as eID, ten of these were established in 2006 or later.  

The second sub-indicator “Number of data fields” explores the question “How many mandatory and not pre-populated data fields must be completed by the applicant to obtain the transactional service?”

To complete the measurement, government agencies had to provide “dummy user ID’s” to the researchers, in order to access the transactional services. Most of the agencies did not provide these temporary user eIDs. The timetable for publication of the overall survey precluded any alternative means of accessing the full spectrum of EU+ countries.

Those that did provide access (notably Malta, Spain and Belgium) showed a great diversity in number of data fields to be filled in and in types of authentication. The type of information requested varies also between countries, depending on their political landscape.

Future measurement for this indicator requires further discussion with participating countries and / or a revised, potentially decentralised, approach.

Since these results are not sufficiently robust, they have not been taken into account for the composite user centric country ranking.

The third sub-indicator “Multi channel access” was assessed using the research question “Is there at least one other channel, being a call centre, mobile devices, public kiosk, digital interactive TV, mentioned as being operational for the service delivery?”

The overall result for the participating countries is 24%, meaning that for one in four transactional web services a second non-classic channel is mentioned to be available on the web site. This seems a relatively high score and would indicate that governments are taking appropriate action to develop multi-channel access to public services.

A recent survey, the eGovernment Progress report, reveals that twenty countries (20/30) have a multi-channel policy³.

---


³
The fourth sub-indicator “Compliance with accessibility standards” measured using the research question: “Is there any accessibility statement or logo on the online service delivery point referring to international guidelines?”

Only 5% of the assessed sites specifically show one of the WAI logos. This indicates very modest progress compared to 2005, when a report by the UK Cabinet Office (2005) revealed that only 3% of the 436 online public service websites achieved the minimum standard under the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines.

Countries that score more than 10% are Spain, Ireland, Norway and Austria.

Due to the experimental character of these indicators, technical constrains of data gathering and timing a validation process with the member states concerning the user centric results was not feasible.

### 3.3 The “User centricity composite indicator”

The overall results on a country ranking level for the three relevant user centric indicators is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>User Centricity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United states</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: User centricity: country ranking

Three countries score more than 30% user centricity: Bulgaria, Norway and Austria. The high result for Bulgaria is a result of their policy to link call centers as an alternative delivery channels to most of the public services.

---


4 See: the epractice.eu library: http://www.epractice.eu/document/753
3.4 Lessons learned on user centricity measurement

User centricity is a complex topic which is hard to define – and indeed is not defined in its entirety consistently for Europe. The results from this pilot provide a useful basis for further evaluation and development. It must be recognized that web survey methods for such a complex topic will have their limitations. Enhancements could include:

- Implementing bench-learning methods that apply specific indicators to specific services and/or agencies (for example the administrative burden indicator);
- A more decentralized assessment that combines centralized data collection and decentralized data mining at the level of the member states;
- Increasing the number of sub-indicators for user centricity to provide a richer picture.

These options warrant further evaluation.

3.5 Assessment of the national portal

A national portal that gives access to the different services is one way to fight a fragmented public service offering. An improved customer experience can come through a consistent “look & feel” over all government websites, an integrated version management system, a display of services according to personal preferences, presentation modes and many others.

In order to provide a valuable approximation of the quality of the portals we have assessed the national government portals on a selection of aspects to provide insight on:

- the desire and vision about regrouping services and improving their user access and uses
- the customer’s experience, which can be positively correlated to this indicator
- Assessing to what extent back-offices have been integrated across governmental departments.

The most relevant research question was to what extent the twenty basic public services are accessible through the national portal(s). Concretely: how many of the 20 basic public services are available through the portal? In other words are these portals really a gateway for citizens and businesses to reach public services through a nationally organized one stop-channel?

Other aspects assessed concerned “personalization”: to what extent a user can personalize the portal (“my portal” aspect) and are there different entry modes to the portal depending on the profile of the user (citizens, youth, business, etc…).

A last aspect that was assessed was the consistency of the lay-out and branding throughout the portal. A more detailed description of the assessment method can be found in Annex 3.
With a total average score of 75% the result can be considered good: European governments seem to have invested in their national portals as real gateways to provide access to public services.

The most important sub-indicator, being the percentage of the 20 services available through the portals, scores an average of 73%, meaning 73% of the 20 basic public services can be reached directly through the portal.

The indicator concerning personalisation options (Personal email account (e.g. mytaxaccount.xx), Personalized page / login) demonstrates that 61% of the national portals have such feature.

The assessment reveals that 84% of the portal site contains at least two presentation modes: by organization, type of service, life event, user groups and for 84% of the sites the branding is assessed as consistent across the portal.

The results per country are provided in the Country Highlights.

We conclude that the national portals are well developed as user-centric gateways to public service delivery points.

However on the level of the transactional services itself, the agencies, the e-services delivery is still primarily organized around the needs of governmental organization more than around the needs of the users, being citizens and business.
3.6 “Pro-active services” as an indication for user-centricity

An additional analysis has been carried out to evaluate only those online services with “5th stage” sophistication level. Pro-active personalization as we defined it has much to do with user-centricity, i.e. the way the services are organized around the needs of the citizens.

As described in previous chapters a pro-active 5th sophistication level was introduced for nine services:

- Income taxes
- Public libraries (catalogues, search tools)
- Submission of data to statistical offices
- Environment-related permits
- Child allowances
- Medical costs
- Student grants
- Passports
- Driver’s license

The percentage of services reaching the proactive stage is 36%, which means that until now only one third of the relevant e-services reach that level of sophistication.

When analyzing the country ranking for this indicator it is striking that Slovenia, already ranking high for the sophistication and fully online availability, have almost 80% of the relevant services pro-active.

The correlation between “pro-active services” and the user-centric indicator is relatively high, which highlights the link between both: governments attaining high levels of pro-active service delivery are paying more attention to user-centric aspects of their e-service supply.
4 COUNTRY HIGHLIGHTS

1 Austria (A)

Overall results

Austria is the first to achieve a 100% **fully online availability**, which means that for every service measured in this survey, each citizen or business has the possibility to access the service via a fully transactional electronic channel.

Even with the introduction of a renewed method and 5th stage of **online sophistication** measurement, Austria achieved 99%. Progress in sophistication can only be made on child allowances and public libraries.

With this scoring, Austria remains at the top of the web-based benchmark on electronic public services for the second year.

Five out of the seven relevant services achieved the **pro-active** sophistication level (= 71%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, the Austrian score is 31% (EU27+ average being 19%).

The assessment of the Austrian **National Portal** ([http://www.help.gv.at](http://www.help.gv.at)) provides a score of 68% on an average of 75% for the EU27+. The majority of the public services (14 out of 20 relevant services) are accessible through the portal, the “usability” is high and the portal is organized around life events. Personalization option (Personal email account (e.g. mytaxaccount.xx), Personalized page / login) are not (yet) in place.

5 The services and sub-services for whom a level 5 was defined and that exists as a service in this particular country
Country highlights

Austrian citizens no longer need to request certificates for birth or marriages. Due to the Central Register of Residents the authority that needs information now gets it automatically. At the same time they verify the accuracy of the data. However, each citizen has the right to check data about him/her, and update this if necessary by presenting the relevant documents.
2 Belgium (B)

Overall results

Belgium evolves from a **fully online availability** of 50% in 2006, to 60% in 2007. The level of **online sophistication** has also risen to a level of 80%. Belgium has shown a progressive year-on-year advancement from a position some 20% below EU27+ average to now being a few percentage points above.

A closer look at the Belgian results for level of sophistication shows that the services for businesses have a score of 94%. Services for citizens achieve a 71% level of sophistication.

Four out of the nine relevant services achieved the **pro-active** stage 5 sophistication level (= 44%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, the Belgium score is 18% (EU27+ average being 19%).

Belgium’s **National Portal** (http://www.belgium.be) rated high on the different topics that were assessed. The majority of the public services (17 out of 24 relevant services) are reachable through the portal The website was scored at 88%, where the average for the EU27+ is 75%.
Country highlights

The web sites for jobseekers provides a link to a specific application (Front Office Employment, www.autravail.be, www.aandeslag.be) allowing the job seeker (in particular the unemployed persons) to look for which subsidies (or financial help) a company or an employer can receive when hiring (specific) people. This application integrates an overview of all employment stimulating measures in a particular situation, the prior conditions to qualify for these measures and the application procedure to benefit from them.

The application is a guide in the search for information about employment measures provided by the Belgian authorities and institutions. It offers an easy and integrated access to all the available information about the existing federal and regional measures for the promotion of employment.

The Regional Employment Offices’ websites allow users to post their CVs online, browse and search job ads; obtain information about companies / organisations that recruit and about professional training programs. The National Office for Employment (http://www.rva.fgov.be/) provides information for jobseekers, but no job search services.

http://www.aandeslag.be
3 Bulgaria (BG)

Overall results

Bulgaria, as a new Member States, is also a newcomer to this eGovernment online survey, and as a result we provide here a base-line measurement for eGovernment.

The **fully-online availability** indicator for Bulgaria is 15%. The level of **online sophistication** is 67% compared to the European average of 76%?. There is significant room for improvement for both the online sophistication measure, and more particularly full-online availability compared to the EU27+ average.

Three out of the nine relevant services achieved the **pro-active** stage 5 sophistication level (= 33%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, the Bulgarian score is 37% (EU27+ average being 19%).

The **National Portal** of Bulgaria (http://www.government.bg/) however scores very high with 97% scoring on an average of 75% for the EU27+. The vast majority of the public services (22 out of 24 relevant services) are reachable through the portal.

http://www.government.bg/
Country highlights

The National Employment Agency is responsible for providing services to active job seekers. This agency helps for services such as searching for jobs, guidance, qualification and motivation training programs and measures for employment.

The National Employment Agency also provides some services to active employers. A registered job seeker receives an online job listing match based upon his/her profile where the employers receive a list of matching CV’s from job seekers.

http://www.az.govtment.bg/
Overall results

Cyprus has made solid gains each year for the last three measurements in online availability. This year Cyprus reached a fully-online availability figure of 45%; last year availability was at 35%. Cyprus progressively closes the gap with the EU27+ average.

The online sophistication of Cyprus, with the new method taken into account, is at 67%.

Two out of the relevant nine services achieved the pro-active sophistication level ( = 22%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning user centricity, Cyprus scores 8% (EU27+ average being 19%).

The assessment of the National Portal provides a very high score of 98% on an average of 75% for the EU27+. The majority of the public services (22 out of 24 relevant services) are accessible through the portal.

http://www.cyprus.gov.cy/portal/
Country highlights

The Road Transport System (RTS) provides services through the web regarding:
- car registration,
- car information,
- booking of a driver’s license test
- driver’s license availability
- technical inspection of the vehicles
- renewal of citizens’ road tax license through the Internet using credit cards

Registration of vehicles is done at one-stop shops, or using intermediaries i.e. authorized registered car dealers importers. It can be carried out by importers of new cars. Registration of used vehicles can also be carried out by importers (authorized car dealers). Individuals cannot register vehicles directly through the Web (as no individual accounts are maintained), they must be present at the Road Transport Department for registration of their vehicle.

http://rtd.mcw.gov.cy
Overall results

The Czech Republic has made a significant jump from a modest position for **fully-online availability** in 2006 to a 55% score in 2007. Particular progress has been made for services to businesses.

The **online sophistication** of the Czech Republic, with the new method taken into account, is at 71%.

One out of the nine relevant services achieved the **pro-active** sophistication level (= 11%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, the Czech Republic scores 13% (EU27+ average being 19%).

The assessment of the **National Portal** ([http://portal.gov.cz](http://portal.gov.cz)) provides a very high score of 98% on an average of 75% for the EU27+. The majority of the public services (22 out of 24, relevant services) are accessible through the portal.
Country highlights

The Directorate of Czech Customs, the customs service, has used electronic communications since their introduction. Since January 2006, it is possible to send Intrastat reports through the transactions section of the gateway. Intrastat is the Czech Republic system for gathering information on trade in goods between countries in the European Union. VAT registered people and organisations that send goods over the duty free limit are obliged to report this to Intrastat.

The Ministry of Informatics uses the gateway to provide a service for annual statements of postal services to be submitted. All entities providing domestic and foreign postal services are required to report regularly, according to the Postal Services Act.
6 Denmark (DK)

Overall results

Denmark was able to score a level of **online sophistication** of 80% and **a fully online availability** of 63%. Denmark’s progress has however flattened from an upper quartile position over recent years to just above EU27+ average.

There is room for improvement for the **pro-active sophistication** level: only 2 out of the 9 “Level 5” services attain 100%.

Concerning **user centricity**, Denmark scores with 15% below the EU27+ average of 19%.

Denmark has several public portals. There is a website for citizens with access to public services for citizens (www.borger.dk) and one for business (www.virk.dk) with access to all public services for businesses. The assessment of the national portals results in a scoring of 51% and improvements can be made on personalisation of the website and access to the services. Only six out of the 21 relevant services are accessible through the national portal.

Country highlights

To register a new company in Denmark, the Danish Commerce and Companies Agency is the main actor in the process. It provides registration services online and keeps the new company’s data in the Central Business Register – a register containing all necessary data on all businesses within Denmark.

It is possible to register a new company online and after registration changes can be made to the data held in the Central Business Register.
http://www.webreg-portal.dk/home.asp
Overall results

With a level of **fully-online availability of 70%** and **sophistication at 87%**, Estonia scores well in the 2007 survey. The fall back in online sophistication is due to a different appreciation of the fully online availability of certain service providers. Estonia has dropped from overall 2\(^{nd}\) position in 2006 to the upper end of the 3rd quartile. The levels of sophistication for businesses as well as citizens are above EU27+ averages.

Six out of the nine relevant services achieved the **pro-active** sophistication level (= 67%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, Estonia scores with 29% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The assessment of the National Portal ([http://www.riik.ee/en/](http://www.riik.ee/en/)) shows a high scoring of 88% (against the average of 75%). The majority of the public services (17 out of 24 relevant services) are accessible through the portal.

http://www.riik.ee/en/
Country highlights

The Estonian health insurance system is based upon the principle of solidarity. All medical costs incurred are reimbursed by the Estonian Health Insurance Fund. Each patient pays a reduced personal contribution, which is non-refundable. This system is only applicable for those health service providers that have a contract with the Estonian Health Insurance Fund. Where a health service provider doesn’t have this kind of contract, a patient must pay for the service himself. Citizens with access to internet banking or in possession of an eID card can use eServices through the national portal to check the validity of their health insurance, their personal data, the name of the family physician and the payment of sickness benefits.
8 Finland (FIN)

Overall results

Finland's progress for **fully-online availability** has flattened over recent years after a period of significant advancement, albeit making progress during the 2006 to 2007 period of 6% to a score of 67% and in 13\textsuperscript{th} position. The **online sophistication**, with the new method was measured at 82%. The overall sophistication score for citizens is above EU27+ average, however for businesses it is below average.

Five out of the nine relevant services achieved the **pro-active** sophistication level (= 56%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, Finland scores with 23% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The **National Portal** ([www.suomi.fi](http://www.suomi.fi/suomifi/english/index.html)) site scored at the higher end for this rating with a score of 80% against an average of 75%. All 24 public services are accessible through the national portal.

[Graphs showing Finland's fully-online availability and online sophistication]
**Country highlights**

The reimbursement of medical expenses in Finland is available for doctor’s fees, dental care costs and treatment / examination charges. Reimbursement is calculated on the basis of the real costs up to a maximum that is fixed by the Ministry of Health.

Every person with a permanent residence in Finland is entitled to health insurance and receives an insurance card (SII card or Kela-kortti).

9 France (F)

Overall results

France continues to achieve a higher level of **fully-online availability** than average, and advances to a score of 70%, some 12% above average, and in 10\textsuperscript{th} position.

**Online sophistication** of the French survey came out at 87% (6\textsuperscript{th} overall) which is clearly above the European Union average of 75%. The online sophistication for the French services for both citizens and businesses is above the average of the EU27+.

Four out of the nine relevant services achieved the **pro-active** sophistication level (= 44%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, France scores with 25% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The assessment of the National Portal (www.service-public.fr) with a scoring of 67% (with an EU27+ average of 75%) shows that some for improvement. The majority of the public services (16 out of 24 relevant services) are accessible through the portal.

http://www.service-public.fr/
Country highlights

Information and forms for a driving licence in France can be filled in on screen via the website of the French Government. The driving licence application is handled by the local offices of central government of France.

In France the driver’s licence has a certain amount of points. Each citizen has the possibility to log on via a secured website and check the status of his/her points.

http://vosdroits.service-public.fr/particuliers/N370.xhtml
Overall results

Germany’s **fully-online availability** has made very marked increase from 47% last year to a 75% in 2007 to move Germany into 8th position. Needless to say, this is an impressive jump in the benchmark survey.

The survey result for **online sophistication** of websites shows Germany at 84%. The services for both businesses and citizens show a level of online sophistication that is higher than the EU27+ average.

Five out of the eight relevant services achieved the **pro-active** sophistication level (= 63%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning **user centricity**, Germany scores with 19% right on the EU27+. Multi-channel access in particular is quite well developed, with a score of 50%.

The assessment of the **National Portal** ([www.bund.de](http://www.bund.de)) scores 67% against an average of 75% with improvement potential for the number of services accessible through the portal and the possibilities for personalisation.
Country highlights

The system of submitting statistical data, which so far has been based on large-scale surveys, is gradually being transformed into a register-based system. The new system is more flexible, saves costs and reduces the burden on businesses. Where possible, the statistical information is obtained by using other data sources (for example, data of the fiscal and labour authorities), so that existing surveys can be abolished. An element of the business statistics reform is the improvement of electronic work-flows that have been introduced, thus further simplifying the reporting channels for businesses. There are two methods of the statistical offices serving that purpose. Using the IDEV software (Joint Online Data Collection), businesses and respondents can transmit their data electronically to the statistical offices. This allows more rapid and easier handling of the data both within the businesses and in the statistical offices. The statistical offices introduced the software module “eSTATISTIK.core” in spring 2005. This enables data to be supplied direct from the business accounting systems and transmits data to the statistical offices via protected connections.
11 Greece (EL)

Overall results

Greece has made significant advancement over the last year in fully-online availability and sits in the 2nd quartile overall. The assessment of online sophistication results for Greece are 68%, 8% under the EU27+ average.

We note that income generating services have progressed to fully-online availability and sophistication. Other services are still behind, although a comprehensive program could bring significant changes in the near future.

Only one out of the nine relevant services achieved the pro-active sophistication level (= 11%; EU27+ average score being 36%).

Concerning user centricity, Greece scores with 11% below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The National Portal (http://www.KEEP.GOV.GR) shows good results, 88% against a EU27+ average of 75% and with more than half of the public services accessible through it. But the site is still organized around the different ministries in which the citizens have to navigate, although the basic applications are available and can be submitted electronically.
Country highlights

We note that a single eID system is not available and relatively few services offer legally binding authentication. This is however changing at a fast pace. A first initiative is the introduction of digital signatures for documents exchanged between government agencies.

At this moment it is possible to find many application forms and to start the procedure electronically. Some of these can be found on the National Portal, as illustrated on the screenshot hereunder.

http://www.kep.gov.gr
12 Hungary (HU)

Overall results

The Hungarian **fully-online availability** rating has caught up with the EU average between 2004 and 2006, but remains unchanged this year at 50% - now 8% below average and in the second quartile.

**Online sophistication** of services in 2007 scores 70%, somewhat lower than EU27+ average.

This progression to a level just below fully transactional could be an indication that investments have focused on quick wins, and are now facing the bigger challenges in automated and joined-up services.

The **pro-active** sophistication is low, with only one relevant service reaching the fifth level of sophistication.

Concerning **user centricity**, Hungary scores with 6% far below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The National Portal ([http://www.magyarorszag.hu/](http://www.magyarorszag.hu/)) provides a good starting point to online services in Hungary, with most of them accessible through it. Usability is around the EU average, but there are no personalization possibilities and access to the 20 services could be further enhanced. The overall score for the national portal is 77%, at the level of the EU27+ average of 75%.
Country highlights

The National Portal (http://www.magyarorszag.hu) has started to provide some user centric services, at least in their presentation mode / web search structure, although the government is still organized around the different ministries. Most contact and procedural information are also available, and basic application forms can be submitted electronically.

http://www.magyarorszag.hu/
13 Iceland (ISL)

Overall results

Iceland has achieved an overall 68% **online sophistication**, with 50% **fully-online availability**, remaining in 2\textsuperscript{nd} quartile position. Sophistication for businesses is around the EU average, while the sophistication for citizens is clearly below EU27+ average.

**Pro-active** sophistication scores above the EU27+ average, with four out of nine relevant services reaching the fifth level of sophistication.

Concerning **user centricity**, Iceland scores with 25% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

But the overall score of Iceland’s **National Portal** (http://www.island.is) is 53% against an average of 75%. There are no personalisation possibilities, nor can the site be approached through life events.

Country highlights

Custom declarations in Iceland are **only** accepted electronically and a full electronic case management procedure is available. The website for customs declarations (http://www.tollur.is/) also provides possibilities to change the font size, to change colours or to access a secured area. This focus on accessibility is prevalent in Iceland, as illustrated overleaf on the National Portal http://www.island.is
About 90% of Iceland's taxpayers file their income electronically (http://www.skattur.is), with about 30% of them through (intermediary) tax professionals. The taxpayers receive a soft access ID and password, and a program for digital eID’s is running in pilot. Both systems are legally binding. Any taxpayer can consult his declarations, taxations and status for many years back.
14 Ireland (IRL)

Overall results

Ireland is around the EU27+ average for **online sophistication** at 78%. On the other hand it shows an unchanged score of 50% for the **fully-online availability**. Ireland has dropped in the overall rankings from a position in the upper quartile at the outset of EU27+ measurement to the third quartile.

**Pro-active** sophistication scores below the EU27+ average, with only one out of nine relevant services reaching the fifth level of sophistication.

Concerning **user centricity**, Ireland scores with 20% on the level of the EU27+ average of 19%.

The **National Portal** of Ireland (http://www.citizensinformation.ie) is scored at 81% (average of EU27+ is 75%).

Country highlights

Ireland’s national portals for citizens and for businesses can be cited as a best practice within the EU, and has been ranked at the highest level of the assessment model. The sites:

- fully integrate access to all relevant information for the citizens or businesses under one domain. They provide access to most of the relevant services, making it the ideal starting point for all government related searches.
- are organized around different search and presentation modes such as life events or main topics.
- have a consistent visual identity, allowing users to easily navigate,
- have a special focus on accessibility and allows to set display preferences, illustrating the high accessibility scoring in the survey
- are available in multiple other EU languages such as French and Polish.
Ireland has developed an automated tracking system for its passport delivery service. Even if this is not reflected in the scoring, it is expected that the sophistication score will continue to increase during 2007 when the ongoing automation of the service will go live. An additional highlight for Ireland is the choice provided to the citizens, since numerous public services can be accessed through a variety of channels.

The website of the Environmental Protection Agency (http://www.epa.ie/) is particularly well made, and offers comprehensive guidance for companies, citizens and researchers. It is organised around the user’s needs and offers enhanced accessibility to the content.
15 Italy (I)

Italy has made sound progress: it scores a high overall sophistication of 79% and a progression in fully-online availability of 70%, coming from 58% - a substantial move to 11th position.

Pro-active sophistication scores above the EU27+ average, with four out of nine relevant services reaching the fifth level of sophistication.

Concerning user centricity, Italy scores with 20% on the level of the EU27+ average of 19%.

The National Portal offers (http://www.italia.gov.it) access to all of the 24 basic public services, the navigation possibilities could still be improved however all information to find one’s way is present. The scoring in this survey for the National Portal is at 82% against an average for the EU27+ of 75%.

Overall results
Country highlights

- The crime reporting service Denuncia vi@ Web (‘Report a crime vi@ the web’) enables the public to report lost or stolen property online. The aim of the service is to simplify procedures for filing crime reports, making reporting a crime possible at any give time and place.

- The National Portal provides a comprehensive starting point for searches related to the citizen’s services, with different search modes such as life events and themes, with a shortcut to the online services.
Overall results

Latvia has tripled its score for **fully-online availability**, moving from 10% last year to reach 30%. This movement significantly closes the gap with EU27+ average of 58%, and signs are that this will continue to improve next year.

**Sophistication** reaches 54%. Although this is still far below EU27+ average, the progress in terms of the sophistication stage reached last year is notable.

Fifth stage sophistication is not present among any of the relevant services.

Concerning **user centricity**, Latvia scores with 13%, below the level of the EU27+ average of 19%.

The **National Portal** ([http://www.gov.lv/](http://www.gov.lv/)) is quite difficult to navigate, has no alternative presentation or navigation modes, and scores overall 60% against an average of 75% for the EU27+. 
Country highlights

The portal for public libraries is expected to provide an enhanced service, with a centralized database of all information carriers available, searchable by everyone and with the possibility to make a reservation online. This should come online within 2007, but was not functional at the time of the survey.
17 Lithuania (LT)

Overall results

The **fully-online availability** of Lithuania is 35%\(^6\) putting it in the upper end of the lower quartile. **Online sophistication** is 64%, 12% below EU27+ average.

Concerning **pro-active** sophistication two out of eight ("reimbursement of medical costs" being not relevant) services score at stage 5, which is relatively high considering the other overall scores.

Concerning **user centricity**, Lithuania scores with 8% far below the level of the EU27+ average of 19%.

The **National Portal** of Lithuania scores 71% on an average for the EU27+ of 75% which is progressive in comparison with Lithuania’s general standing. Although not all services are accessible, the personalization and targetisation are good. Usability still leaves room for improvement.

\(^6\) The sophistication level of the Public Procurement was corrected to 75% this year. Since this is not considered fully available online, the indicator shows a regression compared to the previous measurement.
Country highlights

The online Income Tax system (http://deklaravimas.vmi.lt/) offers pre-filled forms to registered citizens, with some re-use of data. We cannot yet speak of full cross-administration data sharing, but the idea is present. Integration with back-offices is ongoing, so Lithuanian citizens can expect to see more pre-filled data in the coming years.

http://deklaravimas.vmi.lt/
Overall results

Although Luxemburg still scores below the EU27+ average, its **fully-online availability** has made significant progress from a score of 25% in 2006 to 40% this year. Luxembourg now sits at the cusp of the lower and 2nd quartile.

Overall **sophistication** scores 67%, with 3 out of 9 services scoring at stage 5 (pro-activity / re-use of data), which is in line with the EU27+ average.

Concerning **user centricity**, Luxemburg scores with 4% far below the level of the EU27+ average of 19%. Especially “compliance with accessibility standards” being the presence of logo’s, but also the questions about whether the services are legally binding have caused this low score.

The **National Portal** of Luxemburg scores 57%, on an average of 75% for the EU27+, with room for improvement on the part of usability and personalisation.
Country highlights

Luxembourg has set up an ambitious program to close the gap in the area of eGovernment. This is being done in several phases, of which currently only the “quick wins” have appeared in the scoring. It is expected that the more comprehensive benefits – which also take more time to realize – will be achieved in the coming years.

At the time of the assessment, the national portal was being replaced by a new single virtual access point. Companies and citizens are assisted by wizards, guiding them to and through the steps of public services. This is a layer put in between the end user and the back-office of public administrations, facilitating communication. This does not yet imply a re-design of the underlying administrative processes, even though this will probably be necessary in a subsequent phase in order to achieve stage 5 maturity (re-use, pro-activity).
19 Malta (MT)

Overall results

Malta has continued to make very marked improvement and sits just behind Austria in second place in the country ranking for online sophistication (96%), and for fully online availability (95%). These high scores put Malta into the position of one of the best performing countries with regard to the benchmark indicators used in this survey. The main area for improvement consists in achieving 5th stage sophistication on some services.

Having said this, the Pro-active sophistication scores above the EU27+ average, with six out of nine relevant services reaching the fifth level of sophistication.

Concerning user centricity, Malta scores with 25% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The National Portal of Malta (http://www.gov.mt/) provides access to all the surveyed services and has consistent branding. It provides personalized and targeted access based on user profiles. Malta was able to achieve a score of 98% for its national portal. The EU27+ average is 75%.
Country highlights

The Passport Office has a fully integrated website that allows the application for a passport online together with the online renewal of a passport. Payment is done electronically and all details will be extracted from the electronic identity system. This also includes the submission of the applicant's photo. In addition to the above all those applying online will be notified via SMS / email as a notification service alerting citizens that their passport is about to expire. This alert is sent 3 months prior to expiry to give ample time for the citizen to take action. For those citizens who do not have an electronic identity, this service also offers the facility to download application forms manually. The new passport is issued within four days of the application.

User access to online services through a Government e-ID offers functionality to pre-populate forms automatically with relevant data. The data is accessed from a central common database and is compliant with the Maltese Data Protection legislation. This site has been developed to conform to level 1 WAI standards. It is the Government's prerogative that all Government websites and e-Services have to comply with WAI standards before they are rolled-out to the public.

http://www.passaporti.gov.mt/
Overall results

*Fully online availability* for The Netherlands increased significantly yet again from 53% in 2006 to 63% in 2007, a very significant improvement for the second year. The Netherlands is now placed in the 3rd quartile.

*Sophistication* of online services in the Netherlands scores 83%, 7% above the EU27+ average. What is striking is that the services for citizens scores almost as high as services for businesses. The e-Government development is well balanced between citizens and businesses.

Five out of the nine services defined as *pro-active* “stage 5” services attain the maximum score.

Concerning *user centricity*, the Netherlands score with 29% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The national government portal provides direct access to all of the public services and the usability, targetisation and personalization of the site is very well developed. The Netherlands national portal scores 98% against the EU27+ average of 75%.
Country highlights

In April 2004 a national e-Notice system (www.Aanbestedingskalender.nl) was launched with an official e-tender status, as a result of an initiative involving ten contracting authorities and two special sectors. An e-Tendering system (www.TenderNed.nl) became operational in mid 2006. This web-based application enables national and EU-notification and supports the complete tendering-process up to and including the final contract award.

http://www.tenderned.nl/
21 Norway (NOR)

Overall results

Following a strong increase in 2006 the “fully available online” indicator for Norway increased moderately in 2007, suggesting that fewer new initiatives have been implemented on the level of public online service delivery. Norway drops one place in the overall ranking and now stands in 6th position.

Online sophistication for Norway, based on the new methodology, scores 86%, which is 10% above the EU27+ average, and in 9th position. Of note in Norway is that online public services for citizens and business are equally well developed.

Four out of the nine “stage 5” pro-active services attain the maximum score and thus the pro-active and automated development of public services is well developed in Norway.

Concerning user centricity, Norway scores with 37% far above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The assessment of the national portal shows a positive result: Norway scores 76%, against the EU27+ average of 75%. Most of the basic public services are directly accessible through the national portal, and the personalisation and usability of the portal is well developed.
Country Highlights

Norwegian citizens have the possibility to completely treat the announcement of a change of address within the country online. In 2006 about 28% of citizens who announced a change of address reported this electronically through Altinn.

http://www.skatteetaten.no

98% of students use the internet application process for enrolment in higher education. From 2007 the first group of applicants will be 100% electronically handled. Within 3-4 yrs most applications will be 100% electronically completed.

http://info.samordnaopptak.no/
Overall results

Poland’s “fully-available online” indicator has risen from 20% in 2006 to 25% in 2007, which shows modest progress in online service delivery. Poland remains in the lower quartile.

The assessment of online sophistication of Poland according to the new method shows an average of 53% which is below the EU27+ average. Services for businesses are performing slightly better with 62% against 47% for G2C services.

None of the nine defined pro-active “stage 5” services attain the maximum score. Thus the user-centric pro-active and automated development of online public services stays in a very preliminary stage in Poland.

Concerning user centricity, Poland scores with 13% below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The national portal (http://www.poland.gov.pl/) is well designed with separate entrances for info seekers, travellers and businesses providing information for business development in Poland. It scores 60% in this survey, however none of the basic public services is directly accessible through the national portal. The concept of a portal organised around the needs of citizens has not yet been embraced.

Country Highlights

The Ministry of Finance is developing a system that will enable tax-declaration in an electronic form from 2008.

The Polish Office of Public Procurement (PPO) organised a well developed e-procurement service. The PPO plays a policy making and co-ordinating role for the whole public procurement system. It is an independent unit within the Polish government.

Public tenders are published and available for everybody. Registered public administrations introduce their calls for tenders in the system.
http://www.uzp.gov.pl/
23 Portugal (P)

Overall results

The “fully available online” indicator for Portugal has leapfrogged from 60% in 2006 to 90% this year, indicating a very marked improvement of transactional public service delivery since the 2006 measurement. Portugal now stands 3\textsuperscript{rd} in this ranking.

The assessment of online sophistication of Portugal according to the new method shows an average of 90% which again is high score, far above the EU27+ average, putting Portugal 4\textsuperscript{th} in the ranking. All of the business services attain 100%, while the citizen services stand at 84%.

Five out of the nine defined pro-active “stage 5” services attains the maximum score. Thus pro-active user-centric service delivery is developing well in Portugal.

Concerning user centrity, Portugal scores with 22% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The national government portal (http://www.portaldocidadao.pt/PORTAL/pt) scores 88% (average EU27+ of 75%) and provides direct access to most of the public services. Usability and personalization of the sites is good.
Country Highlights

In Portugal an appointment in a hospital can be made by an intermediary, or a health centre. Those centres are linked with hospitals via an electronic network.

http://www.portaldasaude.pt/portal

The Portuguese online income tax service allows complete online declaration, notification and assessment of personal taxes. The income tax declaration is pre-populated with all relevant data, in conformance with data protection regulations.

24 Romania (RO)

Overall results

The survey indicates that 35% of the services in Romania are **fully available online**. The **online sophistication** indicator scores 57%. Of note is the low level of citizens services interactivity, whilst services for business has an average of 84% at a transactional level. The statistical service attains a **pro-active** "stage 5" level. The social services “Child allowance” and “Student grants” are also at a pro-active level 5.

This leads to the conclusion that, whilst business online services score very well, particular attention is required to develop online citizen services.

Romania presently stands in the lower quartile of the EU27+.

Concerning **user centricity**, Romania scores with 4% far below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The **national portal** ([http://www.gov.ro](http://www.gov.ro)) provides information on regulation and governmental programmes, but no direct access to the basic public services and no personalised access for business and citizens. The scoring is thus rather low at 20%. 
Country Highlights

The edu.ro portal provides an online enrolment system for high schools. Major universities offer the possibility to enroll online. For instance, the Technical University of Cluj-Napoca web page, provides a module for online registration for final exams (bachelor, master diploma) and a module for students attending the courses; for online registration for failed exams, and for improving their marks. (www.utcluj.ro)

The website of the National Institute of statistics is transactional and well developed (http://www.insse.ro/).
**25 Slovakia (SK)**

Overall results

Slovakia scores 35% for **fully-online availability**. This shows a substantial improvement of 15% compared to 2006. 63% of business services are fully transactional, however only 17% are fully-online for citizens.

The **online sophistication** of Slovakian public services scores 57%. The gap between the citizen and business service sophistication is substantial.

Slovakia remains in the lower quartile of EU27+.

The **pro-active** user centric development of services is poor: none of the services attains a pro-active level.

Concerning **user centricity**, Slovakia scores with 8% far below the EU27+ average of 19%.

On the other hand, the assessment of the national portal shows good results: already half of the public services can be accessed through the portal and the usability and personalisation of the site is well developed ([http://www.portal.gov.sk/](http://www.portal.gov.sk/)). The Slovakian national portal scores 83% against an EU27+ average of 75%. 
Country Highlights

In Slovakia students who qualify for the "social stipend" (family income is the main criteria) apply for the grant directly to higher education institutions (HEI). Financial resources are distributed to the HEIs by the Ministry of Education. Some faculties HEIs have specific online services for grant applicants. About 10% of students receive social stipends.

This system is about to radically change in the near future as part of a complex reform of higher education.

http://www.minedu.sk/
Overall results

90% of the basic public services in Slovenia show **fully-online availability**, a remarkable increase compared to 2006, and a substantial increase for the second year. This has moved Slovenia into 4th position on this indicator.

**Online sophistication** of public services scores 96%, with services on average being far beyond the transactional stage. What is striking is the high level of sophistication of services for citizens, being more developed compared to services for business.

Seven out of the nine “**pro-active**” services attain a 100% score, thus pro-active user-centric service delivery is developed far above the European average.

Concerning **user centricity**, Slovenia scores with 22% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The majority of the public services for citizens are accessible through the **national portal**. The national government portal (http://e-uprava.gov.si/e-uprava/) is a best practice in the domain of a personalised, targeted gateway to public service delivery. Slovenia achieved a scoring of 93% for its national portal, the EU27+ average is at 75%.

**Country Highlights**

The online service available through the portal e-uprava offers the possibility to request e-mail notification on the expiry of official documents such as passport, ID, driving license, certificate of vehicle registration and permit for a weapon.
The on-line job search service selects and automatically notifies applicants of vacancies according to the profile given by the job seeker. There are intermediaries such as Job clubs that teach and help job searchers to use the on-line service and also vocational information and counseling centers (CIPS) that provide information about job search services. These centers have computers at their premises available for job seekers. There are two online job search services, both at stage 4 maturity. The first is provided by the Employment Service of Slovenia and the second by the Ministry of Public Administration.

http://www.mddsz.gov.si/
Spain has performed above the EU27+ average in almost all areas measured by this year’s survey of online services. This shows an upturn after a period of limited progress.

The *fully-online availability* score is 70% score, a significant step compared to last year’s 55% and well above the EU27+ average of 58%. *Sophistication* scored 84%, compared with an EU27+ average of 76%. This step change is the result of Spain’s political will to improve these services, investing in them and closely monitoring their progression.

Spain sits in the middle of the third quartile.

The *pro-active* user-centricity measure indicates 5 out of 9 potential services reach the fifth stage of sophistication, which is also clearly above the EU27+ average.

Concerning *user centricity*, Spain scores with 18% just below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The *National Portal* (http://www.060.es/) provides access to 18 of the 20 basic services, with a consistent graphic branding and some personalisation options. Spain’s national portal achieved 70% in this survey against the EU27+ average of 75%.
Country Highlights

Applications for building permission are organized at a local level in Spain. All cities have reached stage 1 maturity (description of the service and contact details), and most of them are at stage 2 (downloadable forms). Some have reached full transactional status, such as the city of Lleida. Citizens there can apply for a building permit and the provision of the service is fully electronic, including delivery.
Overall results

75% of the basic public services in Sweden are **fully available online**. Sweden’s advancement over recent years has been minimal and it has dropped from its leading position in earlier years to be at the lower end of the upper quartile, ranking 7th.

**Online sophistication** of public services scores 87%, in the range above transactional towards pro-active targetisation. What is striking is the high level of sophistication of services for citizens, almost as equally developed as online services for businesses.

Four of the nine “pro-active” services attain a 100% score, thus pro-active user-centric service delivery is developed above the European average.

Concerning **user centricity**, Sweden scores with 20% just above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The majority of the public services for citizens are accessible through the **national portal**. The national government portal ([http://www.sweden.gov.se/](http://www.sweden.gov.se/)) is a best practice in the domain of a personalised, targeted gateway to public service delivery but has room for improvement in usability. The national portal scored at 65% against an average of 75% for the EU27+.
Country Highlights

In Sweden the Child Allowance is a good example of an automated social security service (level 5). When a child is born the hospital sends a birth certificate to the local tax office. If a child is born at home the parents and the child must go to the hospital for a birth certificate. The child is then registered and the Swedish Social Insurance Agency pays the child allowance to the parents automatically.
Overall results

21% of the monitored public services are fully-online available, representing an increase of 10%-points compared with last year. Switzerland tracks the EU evolution of online services, however without closing the gap. As a result Switzerland is at the lower end of the 1st quartile.

Online sophistication of public services in Switzerland scores 60%, this is below the EU27+ average of 75%.

None of the pro-active “stage 5” public services reach 100%.

Concerning user centricity, Switzerland scores with 2% far below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The assessment of the national portal shows good results: almost all the public services are accessible through the portal and the design and access to the 20 services of the site are good. The national portal has a score of 75%, which is exactly on the level of the EU27+ average.
Country Highlights

Currently businesses are implementing a module in their accounting software that allows declaration of social contributions for employees electronically. This procedure generates a maximum benefit for enterprises, because the data can be exported and send automatically from the application to the different social institutions.
Overall results

This is Turkey’s first year within the measurement system. Turkey has achieved a solid base-line result with 50% of public services fully available online; only 8% points below the EU27+ average. Turkey stands at the upper end of the 2nd quartile.

Online sophistication of public services in Turkey scores 68%, this is only 7% point below the EU27+ average of 75%. The sophistication of online services for businesses is above the EU27+ average.

The pro-active user-centric service delivery is developed in line with the European average: three out of the 9 pro-active “level 5” services reach 100%

Concerning user centricity, Turkey scores with 12% below the EU27+ average of 19%.

The majority of the public services are accessible through the national portal and the design and layout of the portal is good. The Turkish national portal scores 72% being close to the EU27+ average of 75%, with room for improvement in the area of personalisation.
Country Highlights

In Turkey a pharmacy automation system allows on-line transactions between pharmacies and the General Directorate of Pension Fund for Civil Servants, the General Directorate of Pension Funds for self-employed and the Social Insurance Institution. Hence, the medical costs are directly settled between the pharmacies and the relevant social security agencies.

The Turkish e-Declaration application provides acceptance of declarations, announcements and appendixes via the Internet. Integration and data exchange with external systems such as banks is also provided. The Internet Tax Office of the Revenue Administration enables taxpayers to follow their tax transactions such as accrual tax, payments-in, etc. These applications are parts of the Tax Offices Automation Project.
31 United Kingdom (UK)

Overall results

89% of the basic public services in the UK are **fully available online**. This shows a marked improvement compared with 2006.

**Online sophistication** of public services scores 90%, in the range above transactional towards pro-active targetisation. The level of sophistication of services for citizens is almost as equally developed as those for business.

The UK now ranks 5\textsuperscript{th} of the EU27+ countries on both indices.

Four of the nine “**pro-active**” services attain a 100% score, thus pro-active user-centric service delivery is developed above the European average.

Concerning **user centricity**, the UK scores with 20% above the EU27+ average of 19%.

The majority of the public services for citizens are accessible through the **national portal**. Direct Gov and Business Link are best practices in the domain of personalized, targeted gateways to public service delivery. The UK national portal achieved a 90% scoring against an average for the EU27+ of 75%.
Country Highlights

The UK is committed to building service delivery around the customer, not the convenience of the provider. In order to drive up the quality of services, the UK has committed to “joining up” government services, rather than expecting the customer to visit many different Government sites. The UK is in the process of transforming its service delivery through Directgov (www.direct.gov.uk) & Business Link (www.businesslink.gov.uk). The intention is that in the future, these sites will become the single sites for citizens & businesses respectively.
5 CONCLUSIONS

Europe continues to progress against both of the core eGovernment indicators:

- "Online sophistication" is on average 76%, at the level classified as "Transactional". This shows advancement from 2006 where services were classified on average as “two-way interactive”;
- Against the “fully-online availability” indicator Europe has advanced from 50% in 2006 to 58% in 2007;
- The variance between the countries remains important

Austria remains at the top of the EU27+ league table with very impressive ratings at or near 100%.

Malta, Slovenia and Estonia again stand out as three of the newer Member States that have embraced eGovernment and achieved continued high levels of online service delivery – well above the average, and in the case of Malta 2nd place for both indices. Estonia has dropped from 2nd to 9th place, however still demonstrates very sound performance.

Portugal is also notable in its move from 11th to 3rd position on the fully-online availability index. Within the bigger countries we can see notable progress in Germany - coming from 19th and moving up to the 10th position- and in the UK, moving up to 5th position, coming from 6th.

The new third indicator for user-centricity which has been piloted this year delivered some revealing insights. We assessed four areas to explore the feasibility of this new composite indicator:

- **Data Security**: Although 90% of countries have a policy for eID, the EU27+ average score for implementation of is only 27%. This could be the result of incomplete information supplied by countries, or a real problem. Further evaluation is warranted.

- **Reducing Data Entry Burden**: This measure has been applied at a decentralised level (eg. in NL), however it is presently challenging to do so at a European level. The results are inconclusive.

- **Multi-Channel Access**: 24% of the services assessed noted alternative channels, which indicates governments are developing multi-channel strategies.

- **Compliance with Accessibility Standards**: The result was poor, indicating only 5% of the sites make specific note of compliance, which is a marginal improvement from the 2005 measurement of 3%.

With an average of 19% the overall results of user centricity e-service delivery measurement stay modest. Three countries score more then 30% user centricity/ Austria, Norway and Bulgaria.

An important lesson learned concerning the method and approach is that to assess aspects of user centricity in depth, the web-based methodology used until now provides a good picture but it has its limitations. Solutions can be

- Implementing bench-learning methods testing specific indicators in a specific services and agencies (for example the administrative burden indicator);
- A more decentralized broader assessment combining centralized data collection and decentralized data mining on the level of the member states;
- or integrating more aspects of user centricity in the concept of the 5th level of sophistication.

The assessment of National Portals:

- The indicators concerning the access to the 20 services through the portal, the possibilities to personalize and access the portal via different profiles and the "branding" of the portal showed good results,
- The average score of 75% demonstrates that European Governments have invested in delivering good national portals.

Europe continues to make sound progress on the supply of online public services as a key enabler to deliver the i2010 eGovernment action plan and Lisbon goals. However much remains to do to serve citizens who are increasingly exposed to and versed in web services. Today’s challenge is to close that gap – delivering an experience that attracts and fulfills citizen needs, efficiently, consistently, and economically – the “Gov 2.0” experience. An experience that reaffirms trust in public services, and delivers the user-participation required to support a customer-centric, economically viable, and productive Europe.
ANNEX 1 DEFINITIONS AND RESULTS OF THE 20 PUBLIC SERVICES

A1.1 Income taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Income taxes</th>
<th>Average of EU27+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of the public service

Income taxes: declaration, notification of assessment

Research definition

Standard procedure to obtain job offerings as organised by official labour offices, no private market initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider does not have a publicly accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to declare income taxes of an employee is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to declare income taxes of an employee in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to declare income taxes of an employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the declaration of income taxes of an employee via the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>The complete income tax declaration and notification of assessment can be treated via the website. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: Pre-filled forms sent to the tax-payer by post will not be taken into account for the quantitative analyse. Only online transactions are measured, qualitative information on alternative delivery modes will be asked and reported separately.

Only online transactions are measured, qualitative information on alternative delivery modes/channels, e.g. by post, will be asked and reported.
A1.2 Job search

Definition of the public service
Job search services by labour offices

Research definition
Standard procedure to obtain job offerings as organised by official labour offices, no private market initiatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider do not have a public accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to obtain job offerings is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to receive job offerings in a non-electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to consult databases with job offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility of an electronic supply of pre-selected jobs related to a given profile of the job searcher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.3 Social security benefits

Definition of the public service

Social security benefits:
- Unemployment benefits
- Child allowances
- Medical costs (reimbursement or direct settlement)
- Student grants

Research definition

Standard procedure to obtain social security benefits
- Unemployment benefit: standard procedure to obtain replacement income in case of unemployment
- Child allowance: standard procedure to obtain child allowance
- Medical costs: standard procedure to obtain reimbursement of costs covered by obligatory medical insurance
- Student grants: standard procedure to obtain student grants for higher education

In the following table, only the definition of the public service “Unemployment benefit” is fully developed, the other three have the same structure.

| Stage 0 | The service provider does not have a publicly accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 4. |
| Stage 1 | The information necessary to obtain unemployment benefits is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider. |
| Stage 2 | The service provider offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to obtain unemployment benefits in a non-electronic way. |
| Stage 3 | The service provider offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to obtain unemployment benefits. |
| Stage 4 | The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the demand for... |
| Stage 5 | Case handling, decision and delivery (ex. payment) of the standard procedure to obtain unemployment benefits are completely treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”. |
## A1.4 Personal document

### Definition of the public service

**Personal documents:** passport and driver’s licence

### Research definition

Standard procedure to obtain an international passport and standard procedure to obtain a driver’s licence for a personal vehicle not for professional use:

In the following table, only the case of the passport-delivery is fully developed, the driver's license-service has the same structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 0</strong></td>
<td>The service provider does not have a publicly accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>The information necessary to obtain an international passport is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to obtain an international passport in a non-electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to obtain an international passport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4</strong></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5</strong></td>
<td>The service provider automatically prompts passport owners about an imminent expiry date (through email, sms, smail or other e-channels).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.5 Car registration

Definition of the public service
Car registration (new, used, imported cars)

Research definition
Standard procedure to register a new, used or imported car.

| Stage 0 | The service provider does not have a publicly accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 4. |
| Stage 1 | The information necessary to register a new, used or imported car is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider. |
| Stage 2 | The service provider offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to register a new, used or imported car in a non electronic way. |
| Stage 3 | The service provider offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to register a new, used or imported car. |
| Stage 4a | The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the registration of new, used or imported cars via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to register a new, used or imported car can completely be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via "paperwork". |
| Stage 4b | Registration of a new, used or imported car is possible through a one-stop "shop", possibly an intermediary, such as for instance an insurance broker, a website, a car dealer, … |

Remark: The term “new/used and imported cars” comprises the total number of registered cars in a country.

The level 4b implies an electronic communication link between the intermediary and the public registration authority for the final registration.

The Member states will have to provide information on the take up of the electronic intermediary system.
A1.6 Building permission

Definition of the public service
Application for building permission

Research definition
Standard procedure to obtain a building or renovation permission for a personal building (regular, initial request, i.e. not taking into consideration contesting and appeal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to obtain a building or renovation permission is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to obtain a building or renovation permission in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to obtain a building or renovation permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat a building or renovation permission via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to obtain a building or renovation permission can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.7 Declaration to police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to make an official declaration of theft of personal goods to the local police is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to make an official declaration of theft of personal goods to the local police in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to make an official declaration to the local police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of the public service
Declaration to the police (e.g. in case of theft)

Research definition
Standard procedure to officially declare a theft of personal goods (ex. car or home burglary) to a local police office.
A1.8 Public libraries

Definition of the public service
Public libraries (availability of catalogues, search tools)

Research definition
Standard procedure to consult the catalogue(s) of a public library to obtain specific information regarding a specific carrier (Book, CD, …).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage0</td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to consult the catalogues of a public library to obtain a specific information carrier is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to consult the catalogues of a public library to obtain a specific title in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to search for a specific information carrier (book, CD…).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage4</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to search for a specific title (book, CD…) and to make an electronic reservation or to obtain an electronic copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage5</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to warn the customer of new arrivals of specific information carriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.9 Certificates

Definition of the public service
Certificates (birth and marriage): request and delivery

Research definition
Standard procedure to obtain a birth or marriage certificate (can be one document out of the National register of persons in some countries).

| Stage 0 | The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a public accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 3. |
| Stage 1 | The information necessary to start the procedure to obtain a birth or marriage certificate is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level. |
| Stage 2 | The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to obtain a birth or marriage certificate in a non electronic way. |
| Stage 3 | The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to obtain a birth or marriage certificate. |
| Stage 4 | The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the delivery of a certificate via the website. The delivered certificate can be a legally binding electronic document (pdf e.g.) No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork” |
| Stage 5 | NOT APPLICABLE |

Remark: A more specific study on integration (sending notifications of birth or marriage to other institutions) between services will be delivered in the future.
A1.10 Enrolment in higher education

Enrolment in higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of the public service

Enrolment in higher education / university

Research definition

Standard procedure to enrol students in a university or another institution of higher education subsidised by an official administrative body in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to enrol students in a university or another institution of higher education is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to enrol students in a university or another institution of higher education in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to enrol students in a university or another institution of higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat the enrolment of students in a university or another institution of higher education via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to enrol students in a university or another institution of higher education can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT APPLICABLE
A1.11 Announcement of moving

Definition of the public service
Announcement of moving (change of address)

Research definition
Standard procedure for the announcement of change of address of a private person moving within the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 0</strong></td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to officially announce a change of address is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to officially announce a change of address in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to officially announce a change of address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4</strong></td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the announcement of change of address of a private person moving within the country online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5</strong></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.12 Health-related services

Definition of the public service

Health related services (interactive advice on the availability of services in different hospitals; appointments for hospitals)

Research definition

Standard procedure to obtain an appointment at a hospital officially recognised by a national, regional or local authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to obtain an appointment at a hospital is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to obtain an appointment at a hospital in a non-electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to obtain an appointment at a hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4a</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the demand of an appointment via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to obtain an appointment at a hospital can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4b</td>
<td>An appointment in a hospital can be made by an intermediary, a GP, via an electronic network that links him with the hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.13 Social contributions

Social contribution for employees

Definition of the public service
Social contributions for employees

Research definition
Standard procedure to declare social contributions for employees affected by corporations

| Stage 0 | The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4. |
| Stage 1 | The information necessary to start the procedure to declare social contributions for employees is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level. |
| Stage 2 | The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to declare social contributions for employees in a non-electronic way. |
| Stage 3 | The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to declare social contributions for employees. |
| Stage 4 | The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat the declaration of social contributions for employees via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to declare social contributions for employees can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork” |
| Stage 5 | NOT APPLICABLE |
A1.14 Corporate tax

**Definition of the public service**
Corporate tax: declaration, notification

**Research definition**
Standard procedure to declare corporate tax for income from normal activities of a corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 0</strong></td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to declare corporate tax is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to declare corporate tax in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to declare corporate tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4</strong></td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat the declaration of corporate tax via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to declare corporate tax can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5</strong></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.15 VAT

Definition of the public service
VAT: declaration, notification

Research definition
Standard procedure for VAT declaration and/or notification for transactions regarding normal activities of a corporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to declare VAT is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to declare VAT in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to declare VAT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat the declaration of VAT via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to declare VAT can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.16 Company registration

Definition of public service as mentioned in the tender of the EC

Registration of a new company

Research definition

Most important registration procedure to start a new company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to register a new company is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to register a new company in a non-electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to register a new company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat the declaration of a new company via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to register a new company can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via &quot;paperwork&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.17 Statistical data

Definition of the public service
Submission of data to statistical offices

Research definition
Standard procedure to submit at least one statistical questionnaire with data to the National Institute for Statistics of the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider does not have a publicly accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Necessary information to submit a statistical questionnaire to the National Institute for Statistics is available on a publicly accessible website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The possibility to download at least one statistical questionnaire from the National Institute for Statistics to submit statistical data exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The possibility of an official electronic form to submit at least one statistical questionnaire to the National Institute for Statistics exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the submission of statistical data to the National Institute for Statistics electronically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Data concerning company revenues already declared to tax administrations do not need to be resubmitted separately to statistical offices and data related to employees (proportion men/women, absenteeism on the work floor…) already submitted to Social Security or Employment administrations are automatically submitted for statistical purposes, the submitter does not need to resubmit data (administration must adapt, not the citizen/enterprises)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: This indicator aims at finding in what way the government is making it easier to submit statistical data and cut company red tape via interoperability of data-sets.
A1.18 Customs declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Custom declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of the public service

Customs declarations

Research definition

Standard procedure for customs declarations related to the normal activities of a corporation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>The service provider do not have a publicly accessible website or The service provider does not qualify for any of the criteria for the levels 1 to 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to declare customs is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to declare customs in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to declare customs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the declaration of customs electronically. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to declare customs can be treated via e-services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.19 Environment-related permits

Definition of the public service
Environment-related permits (incl. reporting)

Research definition
Standard procedure to obtain at least one environment-related permit, delivered at the lowest administrative level, concerning the start of a corporate activity (not taking into consideration contesting and appeal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a publicly accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information necessary to start the procedure to obtain an environment-related permit is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to start the procedure to obtain an environment-related permit in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to start the procedure to obtain an environment-related permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility to completely treat the delivery of environment-related permit electronically. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to obtain an environment-related permit can be treated via e-services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>The service provider offers the possibility for customized and segmented (by sector &amp; size) relevant information on new environmental-related regulation and obligations to businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remark: The fifth level in this definition goes beyond the usually common interaction mode between government and users in the EU member states. Previously one would typically see that legislation was passed and it was the duty of businesses (and citizens) to keep up to date with it. Pro-activity in this case requires the government that change legislation to advise the other party and to provide him with all necessary information to cope with the new situation.

Businesses need to supply relevant information concerning their employees to the authorities. Similarly, governments introducing new legislation would need to notify all those affected. They would also provide them with all necessary information to understand the new situation and a means to become compliant.

This shift is almost a paradigm shift becoming possible thanks to new technology. It would contribute significantly to cut red tape for businesses (monitoring of government legislation) and reduce uncertainty (interpretation of legislation, steps to become compliant, etc…)
A1.20 Public procurement

Definition of the public service

Public procurement

Research definition

Standard procedure for a tender for public procurement, subject to national public announcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>The service provider or the administrative responsible level does not have a public accessible website or the publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level does not qualify for any of the criteria for the stages 1 to 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>The information about the tender is available on a publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to obtain the paper form to tender in a non electronic way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility of an electronic intake with an official electronic form to tender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>The publicly accessible website managed by the service provider or by the administrative responsible level offers the possibility to completely treat the tender via the website. Case handling, decision and delivery of a standard procedure to tender can be treated via the web. No other formal procedure is necessary for the applicant via “paperwork”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2 NATIONAL PORTAL ASSESSMENT

National Portal assessment
We have assessed the national portals taking into account 4 different aspects:

1. Number of basic public services accessible through the national portal

   Research question:
   How many of the 20 basic public services are accessible through the national portal?

   Remarks:
   It is not sufficient if there is a link on the portal site to the service but a real integration of the service and the national portal is necessary

2. Personalisation of the portal

   Research question:
   Does the website provide personalisation options: Personal email account (e.g. mytaxaccount.xx), Personalized page / login

3. Targetisation

   Research question:
   Does the portal site contain at least two presentation modes: by organization, type of service, life event, user groups?

   Remark:
   In addition, an extra research question will be checked: “Does the portal allows “localisation” by making info available by post code”

4. Usability

   Research question:
   Is branding/graphic consistent across the portal?
Scoring rules for the assessment of the national portal

Although no country ranking is foreseen for this assessment, scoring rules where developed to provide an indicative quantitative score of the portal sites.

1. Number of basic public services accessible through the national portal
   a. Ratio calculation:
   Scoring (SI1) expressed in percentage  =
   \[ \frac{\text{Number of public services available through the national portal}}{\text{Number of relevant basic public services}} \]
   b. Weighting:
   The weighting of this item will be 40 / 100 as this is the most relevant indicator of this composite index.

2. Personalisation of the portal
   a. Ratio calculation:
   Scoring (SI2) will be 0 or 100% , depending if portal provides personalisation options (yes / no answer)
   b. Weighting:
   The weighting of this item will be 20 / 100.

3. Targetisation
   a. Ratio calculation:
   Scoring (SI3) will be 0 % if the portal has only one presentation mode. It will be 33% for two personalization modes, 66% for three personalization modes and 100% for four or more viewing modes..
   b. Weighting:
   The weighting of this item will be 20 / 100.

4. Usability
   a. Ratio calculation:
Scoring (SI4) will be 0 or 100%, depending if portal has a consistent graphic interface across the websites (yes / no answer)

b. Weighting:

The weighting of this item will be 20 / 100.

The overall indicative score on a scale of 5 of the national portal will be the weighted average of the scores on these four subindicators.

Scoring in percentage =

\[(0,4 \times SI1) + (0,2 \times SI2) + (0,2 \times SI3) + (0,2 \times SI4)\]
ANNEX 3 CAPGEMINI’S WEB-BASED SURVEY METHOD

The survey-process developed by the Capgemini-team contains 4 modules:

- Landscaping of the governmental structure of the countries
- Sampling of the multiple service providers & identification of URL’s
- Web-based survey and scoring of the websites
- Analysis of the results

The process chart below demonstrates the different modules:

Figure 17: Survey Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Process</th>
<th>Module 1</th>
<th>Module 2</th>
<th>Module 3</th>
<th>Module 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Landscaping</td>
<td>Lists of URLs</td>
<td>Web Search</td>
<td>Provisional Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping of the</td>
<td>Sampling of services</td>
<td>Web-based survey and scoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental</td>
<td>providers &amp; identification of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td>URL’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Validation of results by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>network of governmental contact persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis &amp; reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following paragraphs the different modules will be further described.

Generally there has been a stronger emphasis on thorough validation of the preparation and final results by the member states in the 7th measurement. How this was achieved is described in the following paragraphs.

Module 1 – Political Landscaping:
Screening the governmental structure of the participating countries and listing the service providers

The Capgemini team opted for a bottom-up approach in elaborating the research methodology. The formulated initial question was, from the point of view of an applicant (individual citizen or business): “what is the responsible service provider for the delivery of a particular public service in a specific country?” The websites of these service providers were then defined as the observation units of the research.

In the first phase of the research the network of government experts from the Directorate General for Information Society and Media in each of the 31 countries was consulted to
obtain an overview of the different ways in which the 20 public services are organized and of the variety of internet applications being developed in Europe.

It was required that citizen and business services had to be checked and validated by the responsible contact persons. Questions included:

- a description of the service,
- the level it is organised at,
- a self-evaluation of the sophistication level reached
- a description of the authentication used, it’s legally binding character
- a dummy ID profile and access in order to be able to look behind the authentication.
- Possible alternative delivery channels, intermediary systems and or service bundling

The screening provided a complete overview of the organization of the service providers to be evaluated.

The following screen provides an example of the description of a service (Car registration in Malta) and the steps to follow in order to complete the political landscaping for this eService and validate the results.

The different categories of service providers taken into account are:

- National governmental units
- Regional governmental units
• Cities and municipalities
• Specific multiple service providers:
  - Public libraries
  - Hospitals
  - Universities / Institutes of higher education
  - Police offices.
  - Public insurance companies

Module 2 – List of URLs:
Sampling of multiple service providers and URL identification

As a fully exhaustive survey of the complete lists of all the multiple service providers was not feasible due to logistics, Capgemini elaborated a statistical methodology to draw a representative sample in cases where the number of units was too large. This methodology combines different statistical methods, depending on the size and character of the service providers:

• Stratification
• Systematic sampling with unequal probability
• Random sampling

A combination of stratification and systematic sampling was used for those service providers organized on a specific regional base:

• Municipalities
• Regional authorities
• Local police offices
• Libraries

The weighing methodology that was developed for the systematic sampling also allows the calculation of a scientifically valid aggregate score for the individual websites of multiple service providers. The sampling procedure was executed for each measurement.

The next step in the set-up of the web-survey was the identification of the URL’s of the multiple service providers. To be able to give a maximum guarantee that service providers which were selected to participate in the research and manage an official website participated effectively, Capgemini developed a search strategy that offered a maximum guarantee that each website was found. Also the URL’s were validated by the Member States for their countries.

Module 3 – Web Search:
Web-based survey and scoring of the websites

The URL’s of the service providers were documented in a relational database. This database fed a web-based scoring tool developed by Capgemini to carry out web-surveys.

The research team executing the content analysis and scoring of the URL’s used this web-enabled application. As the number of URL’s to score per country is extensive and the exact interpretation of the different stages is crucial, the tool contains a very precise and structured
procedure. The scoring tool guides the researcher through a well-defined path that leads to a score per service.

Checks and controls are built in and performed at various stages in this research tool to guarantee a maximum level of accuracy in the results.

**Module 4 – Provisional Results: Analyzing and reporting on the core indicators**

About 14,000 search actions were realized corresponding to the number of service providers identified.

The data-base with results is organized on the basis of results measured from the websites of the public services providers. The structure of the data allows the analysis per service and per country as well as by cluster of services (such as registration or returns) or super-cluster (Government to Citizen, Government to Business).

The scoring tool recalculates the scoring of the individual websites as a percentage of the maximum score per public service. When a service is organized on different levels, the final result for each service can not be lower than the average of the regional websites or the result on a national level.

The figure below schematizes the analysis structure:

*Figure 18: The aggregation score per service*

The stages per url/service are recalculated to an overall percentage of online sophistication per service. The number of maximum stages per service is given in table 1 and table 2 of this document.
In case 5 stages are relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average stage</th>
<th>Final score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0,99</td>
<td>0% - 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1,99</td>
<td>20% - 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2,99</td>
<td>40% - 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3,99</td>
<td>60% - 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 4,99</td>
<td>80% - 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the services where the maximum stage set at Stage 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average stage</th>
<th>Final score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0,99</td>
<td>0% - 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1,99</td>
<td>25% - 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2,99</td>
<td>50% - 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 3,99</td>
<td>75% - 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For declaration to the police the maximum stage was limited to Stage 3. The calculation of the percentages is then as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average stage</th>
<th>Final score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0,99</td>
<td>0% - 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1,99</td>
<td>33% - 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2,99</td>
<td>66% - 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final percentage per country is calculated as the average of the percentages of the 20 services for that country. The percentage per country for public services for citizens is the average of the percentage of the services 1 to 12. The percentage per country for public services for business is the average of the percentage of the services 13 to 20.

Translating the scoring results in the binary framework the indicator fully available online is recalculated. Services receiving the maximum stage (according to the previous maximum stages) score 1; services marked at a lower level score 0. The indicator is then calculated as the percentage of services scored as 1 on the total number of analyzed services.

The results were proposed for validation to each member state.