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Changing Societies

1. **Face-to-Face Society**
   Rome, Athens, Vikings, Italian/German city states, Swiss Landsgemeinde

2. **Territorial Society**
   French Revolution, United States,

3. **Global Society**
   Information, Communication und Transaction Worldwide over the Internet
Government as a Platform

1. “How does government become an open platform that allows people inside and outside government to innovate?”

2. “How do you design a system in which all of the outcomes aren’t specified beforehand, but instead evolve through interactions between government and its citizens, as a service provider enabling its user community?”

3. “If government is a platform, how can we use technology to make it into a better platform?”
Government as a Platform

- Easy access to information – Open Data, APIs
- Encourage Innovation – Open Standards, Open Source
- Start small and simple – Lean Development, Minimum Viable Products
- Decrease barriers to participation – Open By Default, Choice Architecture
- Learn – Agile development, Code Sharings

(O'Reilly 2011)
Government as a Platform

Seven Principles of GaaP
• Open Standards Spark Innovation and Growth
• Build a Simple System and Let It Evolve
• Design for Participation
• Learn from your ‘hackers’
• Data Mining Allows You to Harness Implicit Participation
• Lower the Barriers to Experimentation
• Lead By Example

(O'Reilly 2011)
Government as a Platform

Where does Estonia Succeed on the GaaP Model?
• Openness – Estonia is ‘Open By Design’
• Simplicity – ‘Digital by Default’
• Participation – ‘Citizen Centric Society’
• Leading By Example – ICT Innovation in Government
Government as a Platform

Where could Estonia improve according to the GaaP Model?

• Learn from your hackers – ‘Top-Down’ Governing in Estonia
• Data mining – X-Road and legal environment impedes data mining
• Experimentation – Officials discouraged from trying new ideas
Definitions

• Co-Creation - The involvement of citizens in the initiation and/or the design process of public services in order to (co)create beneficial outcomes (Voorberg, Bekkers, & Tummers, 2014);

• Co-Production – “The process through which inputs used to produce a good or service are contributed by individuals are not “in” the same organization” (Ostrom, 1996)
Government as a Platform – Government to Citizen Co-Creation

- Dissemination of information is cheap
- Government gathered data was paid for by the public, they should have access to it
- Data can be used to create new services which help improve decision making, productivity, and well-being
- Platform is exploited by other stakeholders, government not responsible for development
- Decreases Barriers to Co-Creation

(Linders 2012)
Government as a Platform – Government to Citizen Co-Creation

Three Stages:
• Design
  Design and Planning of new services
• Day-to-Day Execution
  Delivery and execution of service
• Monitoring
  Monitoring and evaluation of service – aims to identify areas of improvement and effectiveness

(Linders 2012)
Government as a Platform – Government to Citizen Co-Creation

Design ("Information and Nudging")
• Traditional: Brochure, Health Label Cigarettes
• ICT-Facilitated: Crime Mapping, Data Mining

Execution ("Ecosystem Embedding")
• Traditional: Academic Alliance, Embedded Community Health Workers
• ICT-Facilitated: GPS, Gov Open Sourcing

Monitoring ("Open Book Government")
• Traditional: Freedom of Information Act, Fed Register, Bulletin
• ICT-Facilitated: Data.gov, Recovery.gov

(Linders 2012)
Types of Co-Creation: Citizens as ...

1. ... a (co-)initiator

2. ... a co-designer

3. ... a co-implementer
Examples of Co-Creation

Co-Initiation
• https://petitions.whitehouse.gov
  Citizen input leads to government response
• http://www.checkmyschool.org/
  Concerned parents came together with government to create a new school monitoring service
Petition the White House on the Issues that Matter to You

Create a Petition
Call on the White House to take action on the issue that matters to you.

Gather Signatures
Share your petition with others, build a community for the change you want to make.

100,000 Signatures in 30 Days
Get an official update from the White House within 60 days.

How Petitions Work
Examples of Co-Creation

Co-Design
• Open Source Software
• GitHub
  o Open source development, all users are able to pull the code, make changes, and commit
Co-Created Open Data Driven Public Service: Estonia Example
Examples of Co-Creation

Co-Implementation
http://www.wesenseit.com/applications/
Citizens use sensors to help supplement government flood watch observations.

http://www.ipaidabribe.com/
Citizens using public services are able to report if they paid a bribe or not.

http://www.anna-teada.ee/
Citizens report issues via application, responsible government agency addresses issues
ADD A REPORT

Your quest to fight corruption starts now

ADD REPORT DESCRIPTION

I PAID A BRIBE
Did you pay a bribe to get your work done at a government office? Tell us why you paid a bribe, to whom you paid a bribe and when you paid. We will share your report with the media, Central Vigilance Commission and take action based on your report.

I AM A BRIBE FIGHTER
Did you say 'No' when you were asked for a bribe? Tell us your story. We would like to honour and celebrate you for standing up against corruption. We will share your story with millions of people around the world and inspire them to take a stand.

I MET AN HONEST OFFICIAL
Did you meet the good guys in the system? Tell us about these honest officers who did their job without asking for a bribe or taking a bribe. We will celebrate these officers so that they can inspire other officers like them to not take a bribe.

CHOOSE

CHOOSE

CHOOSE
Lean Development Cycle
Lean/agile co-creation of data-driven public services

Legend:

- Citizen
- Business
- Government
- Open Data

Discover → Test → Develop → Design → Discover
Data-Driven Public Service  Co-Creation

- Data-driven public service
- Traditional public service
- Co-created data-driven public service
- Co-created public service
TROPICO is an international Horizont 2020 research consortium investigating how public administrations are transformed to enhance collaboration in policy design and service delivery, advancing the participation of public, private and societal actors. It will analyse collaboration in and by governments, with a special emphasis on the use of information and communication technologies (ICT), and its consequences from a comparative perspective.
Gaps in existing research

Normative bias in e-participation literature -> need for reliable empirical data

Techno-centric focus of e-participation research vs failures of e-participation initiatives are often linked to societal, organizational and administrative factors rather than technical aspects -> focus on the „non-technical“ side of e-participation

„Demand“ and „supply“ sides of e-participation research:
 „Demand-side“: most existing research on the use of Internet, demographic and socio-economic background of users, digital divide, trust in e-participation, etc.
 „Supply-side“ of e-participation: the national, organizational and administrative context of e-participation platforms -> little research, focus here

Single-platform case studies -> need for comparative research
Aim of the study:

To empirically uncover how are e-participation initiatives administered and what are the organizational features and challenges associated with the implementation of e-participation practices

Research questions:

How are e-participation initiatives launched and institutionalized?
How are e-participation initiatives organized and administered?
How are e-participatory processes designed and implemented?
What are the success factors in organizing and administering e-participation initiatives?
Method

Exploratory research
Seven European countries: Estonia, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Scotland and Spain

**Qualitative case study method, two stages:**
1) in-depth single-country case studies
2) comparative analysis

**Case selection strategy:**
portals which connect stakeholders with the public sector via an online platform which is open and transparent;
cases that were designed for long-term or permanent collaboration and which had been in operation for at least a year;
the portals had to be (co-)administered by some branch of the government;
the portals had to include a deliberative element which had to feed into the policy-making process.
cases from different administrative levels (national, regional, local)

**Data collection** based on a common case study protocol:
Desk research
Semi-structured interviews (8-13 per case)
Analytical model for case studies

**National context**
- Cultural-historical
- Socio-economic
- Politico-administrative
- Legal
- Digital governance
- Civil society
- Lesson-drawing

**Organizational factors**
- Ownership
- Administration
- Partners
- Internal collaboration
- Funding
- Human resources
- Organizational processes
- Organizational culture

**Individual factors**
- Leaders
- Formal actors
- Informal actors
- Administrators

**E-participation initiative**
- Goals
- Scope
- Chronology
- Legal framework
- Technical features

**Evaluation of the e-participation initiative**
- Performance indicators
- Democratic legitimacy
- Transparency of the process
- Influence on policy design
- Influence on external collaboration
- Successful practices
- Failures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name of the platform</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Active since</th>
<th>Top-down vs bottom-up inception</th>
<th>Administrative level</th>
<th>Branch of government</th>
<th>Degree of institutionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Parlement et Citoyens</td>
<td><a href="http://www.parlement-et-citoyens.fr">www.parlement-et-citoyens.fr</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>meinBerlin</td>
<td><a href="https://mein.berlin.de">https://mein.berlin.de</a></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Local/District</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>De Stem van West</td>
<td><a href="https://stemvanwest.amsterdam.nl/">https://stemvanwest.amsterdam.nl/</a></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Minsak.no</td>
<td><a href="https://www.minsak.no">https://www.minsak.no</a></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Regional/Local</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>We asked, you said, we did</td>
<td><a href="https://consult.gov.scot/we_asked_you_said/">https://consult.gov.scot/we_asked_you_said/</a></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Decide Madrid</td>
<td><a href="https://decide.madrid.es/">https://decide.madrid.es/</a></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drivers for the establishment of e-participation platforms:

Internal: *incremental improvement of policy-making* processes to increase citizens’ participation in policy design and ultimately trust in political institutions (→ top-down) or *chance events* (EE, FR) (→ bottom-up)

External: minor impact, Open Government Partnership (EE, FR, SC), D-CENT (NL, ES)

**Top-down vs bottom-up** establishment:

→ determination of responsible units for running the platforms

Bottom-up cases (EE, FR): non-governmental founders

Top-down cases: government units

→ ownership and accountability

→ integration of e-participation results into policy-making processes

→ funding, sustainability
Different levels of participation
(based on Nabatchi 2012)

INCREASING LEVEL OF SHARED DECISION AUTHORITY

INFORM
- One-way process
- Informing citizens
- Educating citizens
- No shared decision-making

CONSULT
- Asking for citizens’ input
- Citizens provide feedback
- No guarantees on impact on policy design
- Minimal or no shared decision-making

INVOLVE
- Decisions reflect citizens’ proposals
- Regular feedback to citizens
- Final decisions made by public authorities
- Low to moderate shared decision-making

COLLABORATE
- Partnership
- Citizens can provide alternative solutions
- Citizens involved in the identification of preferred solution
- Moderate to high shared decision-making

EMPOWER
- Citizens make final decisions
- Government implements these decisions
- Citizens can decide over certain resources
- Highest level of participation
Success factors of e-participation

A model of 23 e-participation success factors (based on Panopoulou et al. 2014):

Technology-based success factors: integration and compliance; security and privacy; technology advances/constraints; good practice.

Demand-based success factors: user needs and expectations; value for citizens; digital divide; disabled and desired target groups/user training.

Supply-based success factors: vision/strategy; scope and goals; policy and legal environment; support from government/management; management and planning; funding; organizational structures, processes and data; organizational culture and collaboration; value for government/organization; employee training; participation process, policy-making stage and roles; change management; leader/champion; promotion plan; monitoring and evaluation plan; and sustainability.
Conclusions

GaaP – driving co-created data driven public service creation

• New model emphasizes lean and agile development
New services can be delivered quickly, effectively, and efficiently
• GaaP services are able to rapidly deal with user feedback and critiques
• E-Participation success factors are technology (integration and compliance), demand-based (user needs and expectations), supply-based (vision-strategy, policy and legal environment)
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