

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF E-GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT IN POLAND IN 2004-2013

ANNA KACZOROWSKA, KATARZYNA CIACH

University of Lodz, Faculty of Management, Department of Computer Science

Poland more than 10 years later than the other European Union (EU) states acted towards informatization of public administration, thanks to which it was possible to share public services with individuals and companies by electronic means. This article will analyze the assessment of our country in the aspect of full online availability and maturity of 20 public services in all editions of the study entitled *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement*. It's a comparative study, in which Poland appeared as a new member of EU in 2004. In the period from 2008 to the 2010, Poland has made a significant progress in most indicators of information society (SPI). However, in 2013 our country is still closer to the end than to the middle of the chain of e-government effectiveness in the EU.

Keywords: information society, informatization of the public administration, IT projects, e-government, government e-services, *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement*

1. Introduction

Building of e-government is an important component of the implementation of the SPI. It is also conditioned by the informatization of public administration and the prevailing laws on the basis of which units in this sector operate. Introduction of e-government in Poland took place primarily in terms of Polish stand as a candidate for accession to the EU and its development occurs as a result of membership in its structures.

The year 1991 is acknowledged as initial for the origin of native SPI. In July that year a report was drawn up on the *Proposal of a strategy of the development and use of the computer science in the Republic of Poland* [1].

From the moment the document entitled *Europe and the society of global information. Recommendations for the Council of Europe* (named the *Bangemann Report* after the surname of one of the authors) the concept of *e-government*, as a component of the *eEurope* initiative [15], permanently filled the issues undertaken in the EU.

The European Commission (UC) defines the e-government term as the „use of information and communication technologies (ICT) in public administration, in strict connection with indispensable organizational change and new skills of public services with the aim to improve the quality of services provided by service administration and to make the process of democratic legitimization of policy wielding more effective” [2].

In Poland the first discussions on the e-government started in 1994, after the *Bangemann Report* had been published, but no sooner than in November 2000 the document *The Global Information Society under Poland's accession to the European Union* appeared [3], worked out according to seven expert evaluations prepared at the request of the Scientific Research Committee (KBN).

According to that document: „Poland should actively and creatively join the pending work on the principles of the future world information order within institutional, servicing and technological means of information infrastructure. Another problem is the lack of social awareness, knowledge and experience as to where to use teleinformation science. One of the State's basic tasks should be to provide an appropriate common education in this field” [24].

Public administration informatization in Poland, determining the functioning of *e-government*, requires coherent strategies - policies constituting the legal frames for rational use of the State budget resources, but mostly those from the EU budget and thus taking advantage of the chances resulting from our membership in the Union.

The goals and priorities of Polish public administration informatization are presented in many strategic documents, such as: *Program of Fighting against Corruption – Anti-Corruption Strategy* [6] (both stages of implementation), *Informatization Strategy in the Republic of Poland – ePoland for 2004-2006* [7], *The Regulation Reform Programme* [8], *Strategy of the Development of Poland 2007-2015* [9], *The State's informatization Plan for 2006* (PIP2006; [10]), *The State's informatization plan for 2007-2010* (PIP2007-2010; [11]), *Strategy of Supporting the Civil Society Development for 2007-2013* [12] and *Strategy of Supporting the Civil Society Development for 2009-2015* [13] and *The Governmental anti-corruption program for 2012-2016* [14].

The effectiveness of the mentioned strategies may be evaluated, among others, according to the results of the cyclic study *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement*. Wherein first of all the effectiveness of the public administration should be understood as the ability to provide e-services actually needed for citizens and businesses.

In 2007 Europe thought about the approaching end of the period of the *Lisbon Strategy* implementation, therefore the need for preparing new policies was noticed, i.e. *e-government* development strategies appropriate for the next planning horizon. All the existing reports of the *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* study were considered as reliable instruments of information policy both at the European level and among the member states. To confirm the intention of undertaking further works on the development of *e-government* by projects management, Wolfgang Schäube - the German minister of the interior at the *eGovernment* conference held in April 2007, in Berlin, said: „every policy initiative becomes sooner or later an ICT project”.

But why is the public e-services development pace higher in some countries and lower in other countries? The results of the *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* research indicate that this largely has its source in institutional environment, i.e. formal (legal and administrative system) and informal (culture and customs) rules of social and economic life.

2. The beginnings and synthetic characteristics of the *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement Survey*

The need to carry out the research on e-government results from the inability to develop any policy to this extent without the knowledge on the present status and determining on its basis the planned development trends. The *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* study in Europe has a cyclic nature and the following detailed goals:

- evaluation of policies, plans and programmes within the e-government,
- analysis of the progress in e-administration and comparison of its effectiveness in individual countries and between them,
- recognition but also control of the EU member states administration achievements,
- motivation of public administration in the EU to improve their activities and modes of e-services provision,
- exchange of knowledge and experiences between administrations of the respective countries.

The first online study on public services in the Internet was prepared by Cap Gemini Ernst & Young at the request of the European Commission, Directorate General

for Information Society. The point of reference in this study was one of the twenty three indicators of e-government, adopted by the EC Council on 30 November 2000, determining the per cent of the basic public services available on-line. This enabled a measurement of the progress in the internet applications development through which the services are provided, compare the effectiveness and identify the best practices in the e-government area among the states considered in the study.

Reports from the study are usually drawn up every year. The first of this cycle was the *Web-based Survey on Electronic Public Services. Results of the first measurement: October 2001* [16]. To prepare it the EC made a list of 20 basic public services, 12 of which were addressed to individual citizens, and 8 to entrepreneurs. They are presented in table 1.

Additionally, for measurement of the public services sophistication the four-level model (information level, the unidirectional interaction level, level of bidirectional interaction, level of personalized transaction) of their sophistication was defined.

Table 1. 20 common public services aimed at individual citizens (12) and businesses (8)

SERVICES AIMED AT		
Ordinal number	INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS	BUSINESSES
1	Income taxes	Social contribution for employees
2	Job search	Corporate tax
3	Social security benefits	VAT
4	Personal documents	Registration of a new company
5	Car registration	Submission of statistical data
6	Application for building permission	Custom declaration
7	Declaration to the police	Environmental permits
8	Public libraries	Public procurement
9	Birth & marriage certificates	
10	Enrolment in higher education	
11	Announcement of moving	
12	Health-related services	

Source: own preparation on the basis of [16, p. 3]

Sophistication of public services available online has a scale from 0 to 100% and if it was estimated for at least 60% it is assumed that a given service is available online. However, the index of full online availability of public services is defined as a percentage of services available online among all twenty public services examined.

Apart from the division of the twenty basic public services into those dedicated to individual citizens and those dedicated to businesses, they were classified

further into four groups (clusters) for which also some statistics are determined. The following four clusters of public services are evaluated:

- income-generating services (income taxes, corporate taxes, custom declaration, obligatory contribution for employees),
- registration services (car registration, registration of a new company, submission of statistical data, birth and marriage certificates, announcement of moving),
- returns (job search, public procurement, health-related services, declaration to the police, social security benefits, public libraries),
- permits and licences (personal documents, permits and certificates, e.g. environmental, enrolment in higher education, permission for building).

The e-government development effectiveness should be visible through offering of public services at higher and higher levels, i.e. shifting from services provision exclusively through making information available to more and more advanced ways of handling official matters.

The results of the *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* study are widely commented by the media and used by various institutions such as, for example, the World Bank. The member states are also recommended to organize national conferences propagating the results of studies, to which the EC representatives and consortium of companies carrying out the study may be invited. Poland planned a ministerial conference (6th European Ministerial Conference on e-administration, entitled: *Trans-border e-administration services for Europeans* was held on 17-18 November 2011 in Poznań) devoted to e-administration to be held in November 2011, during our country's presidency in the EU Council.

3. Analysis and evaluation of polish results in study *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement*

Evaluation of Poland in the European chain of *e-government* effectiveness will result from the analysis – full online availability and maturity of 20 public services (table 2) – based on the indices of a comparative study of electronic administration effectiveness in European countries - *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement*.

This study in the first six editions provided only information about online availability and maturity of 20 basic services of e-administration in the member states. The first seven editions were conducted independently by Capgemini company, whereas two last editions, substantially more comprehensive, were conducted by the consortium of companies Capgemini, IDC, Rand Europe, Sogeti and DTi. The 8th and 9th study [20, 21] apart from the two mentioned indices will also include electronic public procurement, horizontal solutions, analysis of the sequence

of e-administration services needed in specific life situations, such as loss of a job or launching a business activity, qualitative analysis of needs, and monitoring of satisfaction of the entities using the *e-government* services.

Before 2013 Poland participated six times in the *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement*. For the first three years Poland had one of the last positions on ranking lists, both in respect of the index of complete availability on-line of 20 basic public services and index of their maturity.

Perhaps the achievements of our country, or rather the lack of achievements in 2004 may be accounted for by the fact that in May 2004 Poland became the EU member, and as early as in October that year it was subjected to examination. In the aspect of full online availability, in the examination of that year only Latvia obtained a worse result than Poland.

For administrative reasons, in 2005 no examination from the analysed series was carried out. But looking at the report of the World Economic Forum (WEF) report *Global Competitiveness Index 2005-2006* for the period 2005-2006 we can notice that Poland was at that time by five positions higher in the ranking, as compared to the years 2006-2007 (table 2). Lying behind this better position in the ranking are the restrictions imposed then on the labour market, which toughened it and do not allow for an effective decrease in unemployment. According to the definition presented in the reports, the country's competitiveness depends on the productivity perceived as a combination of individual policies and institutions, allowing to increase the rate of return from the resources invested in business activity, which will directly contribute to economic growth in the medium and long period. The criterion of the states classification into respective development stages is in this ranking the GDP *per capita*. In 2006 the decrease in unemployment in Poland was undeniable, but it was rather due to the country's favourable economic situation, and not due to its reforms.

The study of 2006 shows that the public administration is focussed rather on the aspect of using new devices by the clients in contacts with officials than on the provision of new e-services through the Internet. Such an orientation had its source in the priorities of the new *i2010 eGovernment Action Plan* [22]. It assumes that owing to *e-government*, up to 2010 all citizens will be able to easily use services which are safe, more effective, and more corresponding to the global society's needs.

The ranking of 2006 mentions Poland on the positions by 1 place higher, as compared to the previous study launched in October 2004 (the final report of the study was published in March 2005). But this improvement is so insignificant that we cannot speak of any permanent tendency.

Table 2. 20 common public services in Poland in rankings of *e-government* authorized by the EC

TWENTY BASIC PUBLIC SERVICES in Poland as compared to the mean value among all states subjected to the study			
The year when the report was prepared	Percentage of 20 basic services with full online availability (the mean percent of full online availability of 20 basic services among the states covered by the study)	Percentage of online sophistication of 20 basic public services (the mean percentage of maturity of 20 basic public services among the states covered by the study / four- or five-level model of services maturity)	Poland's position in view of full online availability of services, Poland's position with regard to services maturity / number of states participating in the study
2004	10% (41%)	36% (65% / 4 level model)	26 - availability, 27 - sophistication / 28
2006	20% (50%)	53% (75% / 4 level model)	25 - availability, 26 - sophistication / 28
2007	21% (57%)	53% (75% / 5 level model)	30 - availability, 30 - sophistication / 31
2009	55% (69%)	74% (83% / 5 level model)	25 - availability, 24 - sophistication / 31
2010	79% (82%)	87% (90% / 5 level model)	19 - availability, 20 - sophistication / 32

Source: Own preparation on the basis of [17, 18, 19, 20, 21]

The lowest position obtained by Poland in the ranking was the last but one – 30th position, in 2007, for both main indices. Those worst, for Poland, indices could partly have their source in extension of the model which served as a basis for measurement of the maturity of services by a consecutive, higher, level. Such a low position points also to other disturbing phenomena occurring in Polish economy and public administration sector informatization, such as the status of public finances, legal system and technological advancement, as well as the level of inflation and unemployment. Although such changes occurred also in other new members of the EU, yet they did not threaten the general perception of such country as for instance Estonia as one of the best localities for investments.

First of all we should appreciate the greatest improvement of the e-services quality between 2007 and 2009. Surely this was largely due to the activities, undertaken at that time, aimed at increasing the public administration effectiveness, such as working out two PIPs, *Strategy of the Development of Information Society in Poland up to 2013* [25], or financing of the key projects for the e-government development, mostly for the EU's financial means. PIP2007-2010, apart from continuation of the activities launched in PIP2006, stipulated also implementation of platform ePUAP, the main purpose of which was to be the integration of information resources of most of offices in Poland and making the public services available for the citizens and businesses through the Internet. The ePUAP platform was launched, as a pilotage, in April 2008. At the same time legal regulations came in

force which admit the use of the electronic signature and enable filling in PIT returns through the Internet. In 2009 an agreement was signed, enabling the Social Insurance Company (ZUS) to use ePUAP for bilateral communication with clients. This was an important facilitation mostly for business companies, because a lot of administrative charges they have to incur refer to the issues connected with social support packages. Not less important is also the fact that Poland had one more year to get ready for evaluation in 2009, because in 2008 the final report from the analysed study was not published.

Both the main indices of the e-government development were clearly increased over 2007-2009, but the improvement was too slow for Poland to be significantly advanced among the other examined states. In none of the studies on the e-government effectiveness was the total percentage of availability (without the division into clusters of services for citizens and businesses, as presented in table 2) of 20 basic services of public administration in Poland or the percentage of these services maturity higher or equal to the relevant mean percentage among all participating countries. In the case of the relation of online availability to public services maturity an exceptional situation occurred in the study of 2009, when for the first time in services advancement Poland was awarded the 24th position, and evaluation of online availability classified our country on the 25th place. How can we explain this? The circumstance which supports such a scenario was the 2009 recession which affected 26 EU countries, though was more lenient with Poland. Owing to appropriate policies undertaken towards increasing informatization cohesion in this sector in Poland, in 2009 the public services online availability was increased by as many as 34 PP, in comparison to 2007, and the degree of their advancement was increased by 21 PP (in 2007 this index amounted to 53%). This good evaluation of maturity was surely affected by a high grade obtained in the measurement of the process of electronic public procurements, higher than the mean value for EU27+.

Due to the Union's recession and fast economic growth in Poland, in 2010 Poland reached the 19th place in respect of full online availability (increase by 6 positions, as compared to the previous study) and 20th place (by 4 positions better than that of 2009) in respect of the advancement of services. Such results approximated us to the Union's average national income per capita and reflect quite unexpected achievements of our – 6 years' at the time – presence in the EU.

In 2004 and 2006 mainly the issue of the difference between Poland's and European Union's economic growth rate was considered. Simple calculations were then made, consisting in extrapolation, the EU's and Poland's economic growth rate curves were extended, and then expectation not of several, but several dozen years Polish income convergence with the Union was formulated. The forecasts assumed that in the initial period the growth rate would be higher in Poland. Later, after 20 – 30 years, it was to be decreasing but still reaching a higher level than in richer EU countries. These projections are drastically verified now by the world's

crisis, observed even in the EU's most developed countries, which may lead to long-term decreases in these countries' economic growth.

In the 9th study of the e-government effectiveness the Polish administration's informatization appeared to be only slightly worse than the average outcome among the examined states. Almost 80% of analysed public services were considered as fully available online. The Polish public services maturity index was calculated at 87%, which was also a result only slightly diverging from the mean value.

In 2007 in Europe a further development occurred within the two main indices. The services maturity was estimated on average as 75% among EU27+ and reached the level defined as the transaction level. This points to a higher advancement, as compared to the year 2006, because then the mean level of services sophistication was qualified to level 3 – bidirectional interaction. However, a great difference (almost 50%) was observed between the most and the least advanced countries.

With regard to full availability *on-line* EU27+ advanced from 50% in 2006 to 57% in 2007. There is another, more distinct divergence (85%) between the countries having the highest and the lowest availability *on-line*, which points to the appearance of the challenge of supplying the integrated (*front-to-back-office*), interoperational services, especially in the case of the states having a decentralized management system.

In the 7th study there is a high correlation between the two main measures: online availability and maturity of offered services. Five countries achieved the level of 90% (Portugal, Great Britain) and above (Austria, Malta, Slovenia) for both measurements.

At the beginning of the Polish „measurement way” in European e-government study a great differentiation of results between the participating countries was noticeable. On the other hand, the results of 2007 present e-services already as the recognized and complex means to meet the liabilities of *i2010 eGovernment Action Plan* [22]. The citizens of individual countries expected and sought then the quality and dynamism in the provision of public services online. Instead, the governments of these countries, having the data about the users' experience in using services *Web 2.0*, had to aim at the development and accomplishment of concept *Gov 2.0*, acknowledged as the main one in achievement of the Lisbon strategy goals and a significant element of Europe's competitiveness.

The existing results for Poland for all the years of participation in the study were always below the European mean value. In 2007 the greatest deviation from the mean value was noted, by 36 PP in the case of the full online availability index and by 29 PP in 2004 – with reference to the maturity of the estimated public services.

Analysing our internal progress according to the two main indices of the study we can notice that:

- 1) the full online availability index between consecutive editions was increasing respectively by 10 PP (editions from the years 2004 to 2006), 1 PP (2006-2007), 34 PP (2007-2010) and 24 PP (during 2010-2012),
- 2) the index of advancement of 20 basic public services between the indicated editions formed the following PP sequence {17, 0, 21, 13}.

Hence the observation that the total rate of the development of Polish e-government, starting from the first ranking lists of 2004, was increasing faster in the initial years and slower in the last years.

In the last but one [21] of the existing studies of European e-government, Poland with the index of the average maturity of twenty basic public services estimated as 87%, compared with 90% as the mean value among the tested states and index of full online availability at the level of 79%, took only somewhat lower position than the mean value for EU27+ amounting to 82%. The improvement observed in 2010 was no longer of a one-time type (as the one noted in 2006), so it may be a manifestation of a more durable tendency. If such a tendency is maintained and the negative image of public administration is broken, Poland's position in European ranking of e-government effectiveness should be systematically improving.

The conditions necessary for full online availability and increasing maturity of public administration e-services are horizontal information solutions constituting a basis for e-government applications. The last but one, i.e. the 9th study *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* [21] confirmed the presence, in Poland, of legal bases to use the national basic reference registers, use of electronic payments (monitoring at the national level) and identified the one-time registration system as that monitored at all 3 levels (national, regional and local) of public administration. But Poland still lacks six (of nine) horizontal solutions: electronic identity, safe repository of electronic documents and data, open standards for e-administration application, guidelines related to the architecture of systems, catalogue of horizontal solutions and a safe exchange of documents and electronic data.

The latest report on public services online has subtitle *Digital by Default or by Detour* [23]. It states that public services must be designed and delivered not in administration-centric but in a customer-centric manner. The new benchmark framework was used in order to align it with the policy priorities of *the Digital Agenda for Europe* [25] and the current *eGovernment Action Plan* (AP). One of four priorities of AP is „results driven government”. „The results are based on a survey sample of more than 28 000 internet-using respondents in 32 countries who were questioned for this study”, [23, p. 18] and were named EU-27+.

„Results driven government” evaluates the efficiency and effectiveness of government on the basis of synthetic indicate *Effective Government*. It’s building is shown in table 3.

Table 3. Indicators building the *Effective Government Benchmark* and values of its components for Poland versus EU-27+

EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT – Poland / EU-27+			
EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT – 18% / 26%			
eGovernment efficiency – Poland / EU 27+		eGovernment impact – Poland / EU 27+	
eGovernment efficiency – 39% / 40%		eGovernment impact – 64% / 71%	
User Satisfaction – Poland / EU-27+	Fulfillment of expectations Poland / EU-27+	Likelihood of re-use Poland / EU-27+	Perceived benefits Poland / EU-27+
Top level satisfaction scores (8-9-10) across 19 life situations	% „better” and „much better than expected”	% „likely” and „very likely” to re-use	% „agree” and “strongly agree” with 8 perceived benefits”
37% / 38%	42% / 41%	83% / 86%	45% / 56%

Source: Own preparation on the basis of [26, p. 73]

The synthetic indicator *eGovernment efficiency* is an average of e-government users satisfaction and fulfillment of expectation. While *eGovernment impact* is average of *Likelihood of re-use* and agreement with *Perceived benefits*. *Effective Government* is the most synthetic benchmark and is counted according to formula (1):

$$\text{Effective Government} = \text{average of (eGovernment efficiency and eGovernment impact)} * \text{percent of e-governmen Users scaled on 100} \quad (1)$$

The effective government shows the extent to which governments succeed in satisfying their online users and achieve re-use and fulfilled expectation.

5. Conclusions

Poland, despite of 13 years of activities aimed at the public administration informatization is presently counted among the least developed countries of extended EU in the e-government area. Our country so far has not achieved the total grades of online availability and maturity of e-services higher than average among all participants. However, when analysing our results we should consider several issues. Firstly, we should remember that the mean value for the two basic indices of the study *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* is overestimated by West-European countries and underestimated by such countries as Bulgaria, Romania or Croatia. Secondly, we should remember that the States for which the indices values are initially lower find it easier to achieve a faster growth, as compared to the States where these indices were high before. Thirdly, we should know that the

main source of the means to finance administration informatization in the present and previous financial perspective were the EU structural funds, and in the future financial perspective covering the years 2014-2020 it will be mostly the Cohesion Fund (CF). It is also an instrument of the EU's Structural Policy but does not rank among structural funds. The CF resources are earmarked for the member states in which the GDP per capita is lower than 90% of the mean value in the EU states and which prepared a programme aimed at meeting the criteria of convergences established in the *Treaty establishing the European Community* [5, art. 104].

The results of all analysed editions of *eGovernment Benchmark Measurement* show that the European e-government is much more convergent in geographic respect from the EU extension in 2004, because both the „old” and „new” Europeans live in the countries known as the leaders of electronic administration. The loophole in the development of e-government was diminished between the „old” 15 European countries and „new” EU members, but not all of them. So the differentiation between the „old” and „new” members of the EU seems to be irrelevant, but only with reference to such countries as: Malta, Slovenia, Estonia or Latvia.

Significant for the development of national e-government is the lack of experience in projects management, having no vision of the development of electronic administration, and non-priority treatment of offices informatization.

The inner attractiveness and international competitiveness of the country in the public e-services area is based on several pillars. Public administration is one of them. Of the elements which develop it, special attention is due to the institutional environment, especially the legal system which should enable a long-term planning and public finances status.

In Poland the services for business entities always achieved a higher maturity, as compared to those addressed to natural persons (table 2). We already have a relatively comprehensive offer of simple public e-services dedicated to citizens. Therefore, public administration in Poland should provide higher subsidies for the development of complex services for individual citizens, characterized by a high level of sophistication and enabling complete fixing of a concrete official matter.

Because of the lack, for the whole country, of a cohesive informatization policy, the Electronic Platform of Public Administration Services (ePUAP) contains only 60 services, whereas the list of matters which can be fixed using it contains 394 items (as per the 20th January 2012 [4, s. 8]).

The existing legal conditions also confine the public administration informatization capabilities, justifying the need to supplement and modify them so as to follow faster the development of modern ICT, as completely as possible meet the needs of its clients who know how to use such technologies and meet the EU's demands within the provision of e-services.

Apart from the quality of services for corporate and natural entities, decisive about the public administration effectiveness are: the degree of its independence of

political influences and the quality not only of formulated but mostly of implemented policies.

Poland's political stability is perceived positively, but the quality of public services obtains the grades from lower parts of rankings. The clearly lower evaluations refer first of all to health protection and administration's capabilities within the fast and valid decision-taking related to its clients.

Particularly important, in the e-government aspect, are legal acts by virtue of which the public administration offices may conduct e-activity. The judiciary's independence, its flexibility and fast establishment of legal regulations surely affect the costs of implementation and development of electronic administration.

The regulatory environment in Poland, due to the time and funds indispensable for passing through administrative procedures should be evaluated as unsatisfactory. Despite positive reforms, e.g. those simplifying the company registration process, enterprises' bureaucratic burdens in this sphere have not been changed significantly. On the other hand, such services as obtaining a building permission and use of the building in Poland belong to poorly effective services not only in Europe but worldwide, because they are defined as particularly time-consuming and expensive.

But the purpose of the development of *e-government* services in Poland are not the latest ICT in public sector. Computer science, or rather informatization, should be treated merely as an instrument enabling an on-going improvement of the effectiveness of the functioning of public administration, including the activities associated with the provision of e-services for the Polish society.

Presently effective government aims to the extent to which governments meet the expectations of citizens that use public services and succeeding in convincing them to return to use e-government services.

REFERENCES

- [1] Polskie Towarzystwo Informatyczne (1991) *Propozycja strategii rozwoju informatyki i jej zastosowań w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Urząd Rady Ministrów RP, Warszawa.
- [2] Commission of the European Communities (2002) *eEurope 2005 – An Information Society for All – Action Plan*, Brussels,
http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/2002/news_library/documents/eeurope2005/eeurope2005_en.pdf
- [3] Komitet Badań Naukowych (2000) *Spółeczeństwo globalnej informacji w warunkach przystąpienia Polski do Unii Europejskiej*, Warszawa,
<http://kbn.icm.edu.pl/cele/index1.html>
- [4] Kaczorowska A. (2013) *E-usługi administracji publicznej w warunkach zarządzania projektami*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.

- [5] Rozporządzenie Rady nr 1164/94/WE (znowelizowane rozporządzeniami z czerwca 1999 r. nr 1264/1999 oraz nr 1265/1999).
- [6] Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych i Administracji (2005) *Program Zwalczenia Korupcji – Strategia Antykorupcyjna II etap wdrażania 2005 - 2009*, http://search.babylon.com/?q=Program+Zwalczenia+Korupcji+%E2%80%93+Strategia+Antykorupcyjna+II+etap+wdra%C5%BCania+2005-2009&babsrc=HP_ss&s=web&rlz=0&as=0&ac=0.
- [7] Frydrych A. (2006) *Uwagi do projektu dokumentu "ePolska - Strategia rozwoju społeczeństwa informacyjnego w Polsce na lata 2001 – 2006"*, Polska Izba Informatyki i Telekomunikacji, www.piit.org.pl
- [8] Ministerstwo Gospodarki (2006) *Program Reformy Regulacji*, http://www.mg.gov.pl/NR/rdonlyres/8B7D02A4-0E03-47D9-8A9E-E0157C8F26A9/56451/ProgramReformyRegulacji_20062008.pdf.
- [9] Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego (2006) *Strategia Rozwoju Kraju 2007-2015*, http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/polityka_rozwoju/srk/strony/strategia_rozwoju_kraju_2007_2015.aspx.
- [10] *Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów w sprawie Planu Informatyzacji Państwa na rok 2006* (2006), Dz. U. nr 147, poz. 1064.
- [11] *Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów w sprawie Planu Informatyzacji Państwa na lata 2007-2010* (2007), Dz. U. nr 61, poz. 415.
- [12] Ministerstwo Polityki Społecznej (2005) *Strategia wspierania rozwoju społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na lata 2007-2013*, <http://www.msap.pl/npr/dokumenty%20strategiczne/strategia%20rozwoju%20spolecznstwa%20obywatelskiego.pdf>.
- [13] *Strategia wspierania rozwoju społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na lata 2009-2015* (2008), <http://www.mpips.gov.pl/userfiles/File/pozytek/SWRSO%202009-2015.pdf>.
- [14] Ministerstwo Spraw Wewnętrznych i Administracji (2010) *Rządowy program przeciwdziałania korupcji na lata 2012-2016*, <http://antykorupcja.edu.pl/index.php?mnu=12&app=docs&action=get&iid=13621>.
- [15] Commission initiative for the special European Council of Lisbon (2000) *eEurope - An information society for all*, Lisbon, http://eurlex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=1999&nu_doc=687
- [16] Cap Gemini Ernst & Young (2001) *Summary Report. Web-based Survey on Electronic Public Services. Results of the first measurement: October 2001*, European Commission, DG Information Society, http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/2002/documents/CGEY%201st%20measurement.pdf
- [17] Capgemini (2005) *Online Availability of Public Services: How is Europe Progressing?* w: *Web Based Survey on Electronic Public Services. Report of the Fifth Measurement*, European Commission, Directorate General for Information Society and Media, http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/online_pub_serv_5th_meas_fv4.pdf

- [18] Capgemini (2006) *Online Availability of Public Services: How Is Europe Progressing?* w: Web Based Survey on Electronic Public Services. Report of the 6th Measurement, June 2006,
http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/benchmarking/online_availability_2006.pdf
- [19] Capgemini (2007) *The User Challenge. Benchmarking The Supply of Online Public Services. 7th Measurement*, Directorate General for Information Society and Media,
http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/benchmarking/egov_benchmark_2007.pdf
- [20] Capgemini, IDC, Rand Europe, Sogeti and DTi (2009) *Smarter, Faster, Better eGovernment. I2010 Information Space Innovation and Investment in R&D Inclusion*, in: eGovernment Benchmark Survey 2009, European Commission, Directorate General for Information Society and Media,
http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/eeurope/i2010/docs/benchmarking/egov_benchmark_2009.pdf
- [21] Capgemini, IDC, Rand Europe, Sogeti and DTi (2011) *Digitizing Public Services in Europe: Putting Ambition into Action. 9th Benchmark Measurement*, in: eGovernment Benchmark Survey 2010, European Commission, Directorate General for Information Society and Media, <http://www.epractice.eu/en/library/5283331>
- [22] Communication from the Commission, of 25 April 2006, *i2010 eGovernment Action Plan - Accelerating eGovernment in Europe for the Benefit of All* COM(2006) 173 final,
<http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0173:FIN:PL:PDF>
- [23] Capgemini, Rand Europe, IDC, Sogeti, Danish Technological Institute (2013) *Public Services Online. Digital by Default or by Detour. Assesing User Centric eGovernment performance in Europe – eGovernment Benchmark 2012*, in: Final Insight Report, European Commission, Directorate General for Communications Network, Content and Technology.
- [24] Lubacz Józef (1998) *Infrastruktura informacyjna opcje i dylematy rozwoju*, in: Materiały konferencji Polska wobec wyzwań społeczeństwa informacyjnego: aksjologiczne i społeczne dylematy integracji z Unią Europejską, Wydawnictwa Instytutu Rozwoju i Studiów Strategicznych, seria: “Raporty, z. 67, Warszawa 1998.
- [25] European Commission (2010) *Europe 2020. A European Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*, COM(2010) 2020, Brussels,
http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/documents/pdf/20100303_1_en.pdf
- [26] Capgemini, Rand Europe, IDC, Sogeti, Danish Technological Institute (2013) *Public Services Online. Digital by Default or by Detour. Assesing User Centric eGovernment performance in Europe – eGovernment Benchmark 2012*, in: Final Background Report, European Commission, Directorate General for Communications Network, Content and Technology.