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Peer Review Objectives

• **Identify the challenges** facing e-government implementers and assess how e-government strategies and solutions contribute to good governance objectives.

• **Publicize e-government innovation** to a broader circle of interested policymakers, practitioners and observers.

• **Further develop the analytic framework** and **working hypotheses** in the OECD E-Government Project.

• **Collect in-depth knowledge** of countries’ e-government effort and best practices for the benefits of OECD members.
Framework for Reviews

- **Drivers for e-government** (public management reform, information society goals...).
- **Barriers** (legal, budgetary, digital divide, infrastructure, competencies).
- **Leadership and coordination** (horizontal and vertical across sectors and tiers of government).
- **Implementation** (management, organisational structures, skills, capacity...).
- **Collaboration frameworks** (CBP, standards, enterprise architecture, inter-connectivity, multi-channel strategies).
- **Outputs and outcomes** (G2C, G2B, G2G...).
OECD Peer Review Process

Research → Survey → Interviews → Analysis → FINAL REPORT

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
Success Factors for OECD Reviews

- **Steering Group** made up of major stakeholders helps to ensure impartial review and fact checking.

- **Peer Reviewers** picked by OECD and country for a broad range of relevant experience.

- **National Commitment** to providing both strategic and logistic support.

- **OECD staff** ensure independence and comparative perspective, grounded in national experience.

- **OECD Methodology** provides total transparency and comparability across country reviews.
Lessons Learned (1)

**Finland (2003)**
- ICT can be a powerful tool strengthening citizen engagement through access to information, consultation and participation in policy-making.
- Lack of explicit targets within agencies and ministries can decrease accountability and make monitoring and evaluation more difficult.

**Norway (2004)**
- Building a regulatory framework that enables rather than impedes e-government is critical to successful e-government.
- Applying ICT to government back office functions (such as public record systems) can bring large benefits.
Lessons Learned (2)

**Denmark (2006)**

- Important to link e-government to wider goals (e.g. public sector modernisation, economic competitiveness).
  - Good e-government strategy sets clear goals, measures achievement, and is driven by strong leadership and co-ordination.

**Mexico (2005)**

- Bridging the digital divide is crucial for service delivery and citizen engagement.
- Digital divide policy needs to focus on improving access to the Internet and provide alternative access channels (call centres, mobile phones, SMS, etc.).
Lessons Learned (3)

**Hungary (2007)**
- Leadership is needed to continue progress and to maintain focus on big picture: how e-government can support strategic and business process goals.
- Focus on reducing barriers to reallocating resources and introducing common business case methodologies.

**The Netherlands (2007)**
- Important to focus broadly on public sector modernisation.
- Extend the building block concept to key e-services and making them mandatory.
- Improve user-focused service delivery through better monitoring and evaluation practices.
Lessons Learned (4)

Turkey (2007)
• Focus on areas that make government more efficient, effective, transparent and accountable such as online high-volume/high-value transactions.
• Broaden and deepen leadership of public sector modernisation.

Belgium (2008)
• Refocus e-government to serve whole-of-public-sector interests and goals.
• Pragmatic outcome focus in e-government implementation important to overcome formal barriers.
Lessons Learned (5)

Portugal (2008)
• Making life simpler for citizens and businesses requires buy-in from the whole public sector.
• Strong political and managerial leadership needed to ensure desired outcomes of administrative simplification supported by e-government.

Denmark (2010)
• Improving cost-savings through a broader societal perspective on efficiency and effectiveness.
• Strengthening the whole-of-public-sector institutional and organisational setup for high-level political and strategic e-government decisions.
Impacts of reviews (1)


- **Mexico** (2005) – OECD findings have justified a decision to invest in developing business case methodologies.

- **Norway** (2005) – OECD report has sparked a review of co-ordination structures and processes.

- **Denmark** (2005) – OECD report has lead to a decision to strengthen and integrate e-government activities in a broader public sector modernisation unit in the Ministry of Finance.
Impacts of reviews (2)

- **Hungary** (2007) – OECD findings lead to a strengthening of central leadership and co-ordination of e-government.

- **The Netherlands** (2007) – OECD findings resulted in a strengthened strategic focus on sharing of e-government resources.

- **Turkey** (2007) – OECD findings have been fed into the new five year strategic development plan for public sector development.

- **Belgium** (2008) – The OECD peer review process and findings improved operational intra-government co-operation.