



eGOVERNMENT

## European eGovernment Research Network

*Workshop report:*

### **eGovernment Research – Visions and Policies**

**From scenarios to roadmaps, programmes, instruments and evaluation**

*eGOVERNMENT Workshop held in Prague*

*in cooperation with the 5th Eastern European eGov Days 2007*

*Wednesday, 11 April 2007*

*Version 1.0 24 April 2007*

*Authors RCN*

*Dissemination Level: Open*



eGOVERNMENT IST-2004-026575 - Coordination Action  
Project Cofunded by the European Commission under FP6  
Start date of project: 1<sup>st</sup> January 2006, duration 24 months

---

eGOVERNMENT Coordinator: Mrs Madeleine Siösteen Thiel  
Postal Address: VINNOVA, SE- 101 58 STOCKHOLM, Sweden  
Visiting Address: Mäster Samuelsgatan 56  
e-mail: [info@egovernet.org](mailto:info@egovernet.org), Phone: +46 (0)8 473 3000, Fax: +46 (0)8 473 3005  
URL: [www.eGOVERNMENT.org](http://www.eGOVERNMENT.org) - [www.VINNOVA.se](http://www.VINNOVA.se)



## Document Information

**Work package:** WP6: A Common Framework for eGovernment Research Programmes

**Task:** T6.1 – Arrange workshops and expert hearings leading to the proposal of a common European research framework for eGovernment

**Document Id:** eGOVERNET/WP6/T6.1/Workshop report from Prague

**File name:** eGOVERNET Doc6.1 Workshop report from Prague.doc

**Document owner:** RCN (eGOVERNET)

### Document history:

Version	Author(s)	Date	Changes made
0.1	Kim Davis	2007-04-24	Initial draft
1.0	Kim Davis	2007-04-24	Final version

### Review history:

Reviewed by	Date	Validated

## Table of contents

<b>E-GOVERNMENT RESEARCH – VISIONS AND POLICIES.....</b>	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PLENUM SESSION.....	2
<i>Scenarios and key research themes for future eGovernment - Results from eGovRTD2020.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>A Vision of eGovernment Development of Prague and Czech Cities - the Needs for Support of Research and Cooperation.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>The success of eGovernment research in Sweden: The Implementation of e-Me – an student e-passport in Sweden.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Funding eGovernment research in the European Research Area: an overview of different national and regional models.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>From Wimmer to Siösteen-Thiel, hosted by Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.....</i>	<i>7</i>
SESSION 2: ROADMAP, NEW PROGRAMMES, INSTRUMENTS AND EVALUATION.....	7
<i>Session 2a: The e2010 Roadmap – eGovernment Research Focus – New Programmes, New Initiatives.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Session 2b: eGovernment research programmes in the European Research Area: Commonalities and differences in design, management and evaluation.....</i>	<i>7</i>
SESSION 3: VISION AND POLICIES FOR E-GOVERNMENT RESEARCH – SOME	
SUGGESTIONS.....	11
<i>The need and contributions of eGovernment Research for an innovative Europe 2020.....</i>	<i>11</i>
WORKSHOP AGENDA.....	12

# eGovernment Research – Visions and Policies

The eGOVERNET project is building a framework<sup>1</sup> for an open method of coordination<sup>2</sup> of national eGovernment RTD programmes and initiatives, as well as stimulating cooperation among and learning from existing national eGovernment R&D programmes.

## Introduction.

The eGOVERNET project work package 6 is holding a series of five workshops involving key stakeholders of eGovernment research, with the goal to build a common framework for eGovernment research programmes in the European Research Area. The first workshop, held in Barcelona, Spain in October, set the foundation for the Framework through: drawing inspiration from examples of eGovernment research activities; learning the results of the early work on user needs; preliminary understanding of the various support mechanisms available for eGovernment research throughout Europe, and; starting the discussion on what recommendations might be made for the framework.

*Entitled eGovernment Research – Visions and Policies: From scenarios to roadmaps, programmes, instruments and evaluation*, the second workshop was held in Prague on Wednesday the 11 of April 2007 in cooperation with the 5th Eastern European eGov Days 2007

The objectives of the second workshop were to:

- present the results of the eGovRTD2020 project ([www.egovrtd2020.org](http://www.egovrtd2020.org))
- present the results to date of eGOVERNET, and in particular the survey of research programmes on eGovernment in the European Research Area
- discuss commonalities and differences among different countries,
- create a discussion forum on eGovernment research strategy and programmes, in order to build a common framework in the European Research Area on the basis of input from eGovRTD2020 and existing regional and national research strategies

The workshop programme included presentations of the interim results of the eGovnet project, and the final results of the eGovRTD2020 project.

---

<sup>1</sup> Framework - a skeletal structure designed to support or enclose something. Dictionary.com

<sup>2</sup> The open method of coordination or OMC is a relatively new and intergovernmental means of governance in the European Union, based on the voluntary cooperation of its member states. Wikipedia. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open\\_Method\\_of\\_Coordination](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Method_of_Coordination)

The workshop brought together speakers during the plenum session from many levels of eGovernment research activity: on a local and national perspective expressed by *Jaroslav Solc*, Head of Strategic Development Unit, IT Department for the Prague Municipality and on an application perspective from *Mikael Lind* and *Sören Berglund* of Sweden. The results of the 6th Framework project eGovRTD2020 were presented as a roadmap for future directions in eGovernment research. All these speakers filled in information necessary for eGovernment's work that are not covered directly by project members and activities.

In addition to the plenum session, the two parallel sessions were held. They addressed:

- The eGovRTD2020 Roadmap project – eGovernment Research Focus – New Programmes, New Initiatives
- eGovernment research programmes in the European Research Area: Commonalities and differences in design, management and evaluation

## Plenum Session

Karel Aim of the Czech Academy of Sciences welcomed the delegates to the workshop for the Academy and the Research Policy Committee of the Czech Republic. He pointed out that the workshop is something of a relay event, taking the results of one project (eGovRTD2020) into the work of another (eGovernment). Organisation of the workshop was the effort of four countries: the Czech Republic, Norway, Spain and Austria.

Trond Knudsen set the agenda for the day, noting that the workshop was a start for the discussion process with further work done in the afternoon sessions.

Maria Wimmer introduced the eGovRTD2020 project which ended in March but will continue for two months to complete the work. The results will be taken to funding bodies as recommended research areas. The project examined how society and government might appear in fifteen years. Based on a framework melding

- Citizen / society / democracy / economy and market / environment & culture +
- Efficiency, effectiveness / economics / public value +
- Governments and public authorities / political decision making & public services / good governance / legislation, jurisdiction and executive bodies +
- ICT innovations, emerging technologies

The project has developed scenarios that identify a research roadmap for accomplishing or for avoiding negatives that necessitate actions now.

Madeleine Siösteen Thiel of VINNOVA, Sweden, introduced the eGOVERNMENT project by stating that it is an “invisible area network” since eGovernment research is fragmented and frequently embedded in other research areas. An important and “groundbreaking”<sup>3</sup> result of the project is the survey of eGovernment research programmes throughout Europe and their impact.

### ***Scenarios and key research themes for future eGovernment - Results from eGovRTD2020.***

**Melanie Bicking, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany**

eGovRTD2020 focused on scenarios not forecasting with a focus on stimulating open and creative minds to discover what might be needed in the distant future. These scenarios were then classified according to uncertainty and impact with later focus only on those necessitating high impact research. These then went through validation workshops that resulted in “key dimensions”. There were originally 29 scenarios that were distilled to eight. The eight were then placed into dimensions:

1. Trust or distrust in government
2. stable or disruptive environment
3. all inclusive government or government focus on core business (ambient government or service provision)

The eight scenarios can be examined in detail through either the eGovRTD2010 web site or in the overheads that make up the appendices of this report.

#### **Discussion:**

**Identify management** seems to be a major problem commented Frank Bannister of Trinity College, Ireland. Research in this area needs to be done in a more holistic approach, seeing the interactions with other issues such as data privacy, in order to put it together and balanced it. Cultural attitudes also are a serious challenge.

Knudsen commented that the future terrain is not flat and the purpose of the eGOVERNMENT project is to see how government programmes can face these challenges.

From thoughts on the future from researchers, the workshop turned to practitioners.

### ***A Vision of eGovernment Development of Prague and Czech Cities - the Needs for Support of Research and Cooperation***

**Jaroslav Solc, Head of Strategic Development Unit, IT Dept. Prague Municipality**

Solc also talked about “visions” but from another perspective. He first described the complex organisation of the Prague government, noting that the city is not just a pretty face. Prague

---

<sup>3</sup> Review Consensus Report. eGOVERNMENT project. European Commission Review 07.03.2007.

contains one tenth of the national population, is a region (county), has fifty seven districts made up of authorities and governments where twenty two have special roles in the state administration. It is a complicated picture. Prague has a specific responsibility as the richest part of the Czech Republic (under Objective 1) with high computer literacy. There are specific plans for the information society in “only” 2010 for Prague that is not much different from other such plans throughout Europe. Specifically the focus is on infrasture such as broadband, on-line services, integration and interoperability, video surveillance system, city smart card, map services, utility services, special services (culture etc), city standards (data registers) and call centers.

Political will is to use structural funding (objective 2 or 3) to fulfill these goals. Top management is very ambitious. Competitions are held to develop local municipal web sites. Wireless Prague has faced some competition issues with providers (big players vs. small players) and state aid rules so it has been divided into two phases.

Prague cooperates closely with other cities nationally, throughout Europe and internationally. This focuses on good practices and inspiration. They also actively participate in various studies on benchmarking and best practice. The City particularly encourages private/public roles in development.

Research challenges are not particularly unique but for Prague these include: governance and organisational innovation on the political and administrative level (the business of governing), interoperability (technology), broadband and municipal networks (infrastructure), and benchmarking and good/best practice.

**Discussion:**

*Bulk of eGovernment research is coming from the public institutions themselves rather than universities or research institutions. What is needed is for this research to be known by others commented Knudsen.*

*Does your department actually fund research activities?*

Prague “cooperates” with researchers at universities etc but does not “buy services” per se.

*What type of research questions do you support? Are they concrete technical problems or social-economic?*

Technical challenges and organisations issues. How to sell ideas to project management and have examples to show other partners and argue necessary resources needed is a constant challenge.

*Wimmer noted that it is not known who is doing research and who is implementing it, there seems to be a a gulf between. Maybe research is being done, not in the most sophisticated way but with different competences. There is a need to cooperate more to reach synergy.*

## ***The success of eGovernment research in Sweden: The Implementation of e-Me – an student e-passport in Sweden***

**Mikael Lind, University College of Borås and Sören Berglund, University of Umeå, Sweden**

Presented by the “owner” and manager of project, this is an example of a “successful” project funded through an eGovernment programme. e-Me is a service for students and universities that came as a result of the question: How can electronic personal assistant help students? The primary focus was on the student, the *individual* with an ambition: to derive student centric e-services that help students with *daily chores* and *saves time*. If authorities and organizations want to have electronic contact with the student, they must conform to his/her preferences. The student will gain time by being more effective in administrative tasks. Organizations will gain by having a predefined way to connect to the student.

Cartoons illustrated the scenarios developed and were an attractive way to communicate with students.

The project sums up their conclusions:

- Integration is more important than functionality (similar to old video players that offered a lot of complex services that were never used)
- Public and private service integration
- Mobile phone integration important
- Mood is unique, presentation important
- Importance of focusing on customers (students)
- New services identified such as bank, social services
- Core services are calendar and mail aggregation (all email addresses integrated)
- No one wanted to close the pilot

The big challenge now is how to continue? As an eGovernment supplier there are lots of interesting services that are successful but how to proceed? Commercialisation/take up is ALWAYS an issue.

### **Discussion:**

*Must be an amazing system to get a teenager out of bed at 07.00 (Ireland)*

*Osimo: Integration approach, integrate services in platform. You are also providing services that already exist. Do you have plans to reach out? Provide services through other platforms?*

User built services. There is a need to provide protocols in order to squeeze your service into other platforms. You must have connections with others.

*Pizzicannella. Personalised, customised services. Are there priority issues in the service?*

This is easier in Sweden because of personal number system and because people trust their banks for example. In Sweden we work in trust. Challenge is the trust: Can you trust that it is a student? Who is this person accessing eServices? Trust is a big issue for eGovernment applications.

## ***Funding eGovernment research in the European Research Area: an overview of different national and regional models.***

**David Osimo, IPTS, DG JRC, European Commission**

How easy is it to fund eGovernment research in Europe? An overview of how eGovernment research is funded throughout Europe. Cross sector research was included and relevant but neither eLearning nor eHealth as such.

eGovernment research is funded in three streams:

- R&D area including ICT, socio-economic, law
- Information society (eGovernment plans that might include research + impact evaluation of eGovernment)
- Public administration (modernisation and impact evaluation)
- This results in three classifications for eGovernment research programmes:
- DED – dedicated eGovernment programmes
- EXPL – eGovernment mentioned as priority area in a wider programme
- POT – eGovernment as one potential application field of other R&D programmes (i.e. generic technologies and applications, methodologies etc). This is the most common.

Often eGovernment research is done through discretionary money of institutions such as universities and through procurement particularly for policy and socio-economic support.

Most money is spent on implementation rather than on research.

An overview per country of eGovernment research funding can be viewed in the annex of the eGOVERNMENT report.

### **Discussion**

*Athens, Greece. Greece and the Czech Republic have a great deal of money coming from structural funds. The Greek situation is like the new member states since it gets money from development funds (real life implementation) not research funds (research issues both applied and basic) but uses it for eGovernment research. Also a great deal of advanced research is being done through government tender. The issue is where is the stakeholder? Stakeholders are the real municipalities.*

Need to add another classification concerning regional policy stakeholders. As for procurement and tendering is absolutely true.

*What do you really want? Do you need more basic research through research programmes or applied research? And how should it be funded, through structural funds or specific programmes. This is apparent to more and more countries.*

***From Wimmer to Siösteen-Thiel, hosted by Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic***

Karel Aim moderated the passing over of the eGovRTD2010 report to the eGovernment project for further work.

**Session 2: Roadmap, new programmes, instruments and evaluation.**

***Session 2a: The e2010 Roadmap – eGovernment Research Focus – New Programmes, New Initiatives***

**The eGovRTD2020 Scenarios and Roadmap:**

What new Programmes are needed?

Where do we need research?

*Moderated by Prof. Maria Wimmer*

Report from Wimmer. Switzerland is focussing on foresight study includes eGovernment. eGovernment master at University of Lausanne.

Fellow from Turkey. PPU programme.

Technical University of Athens presented ...semantics. European Interoperability framework. What can be transferred to eGovernment.

Need to change from government citizen focus to citizen government interaction focus.

***Session 2b: eGovernment research programmes in the European Research Area: Commonalities and differences in design, management and evaluation***

*Moderated by Karel Aim, ASCR.*

The aim of the session was to find ideas and opportunities for cooperation, focussing on impacts and future developments, highlighting the rationale for eGovernment research funding

### Learning from CISTRANA experience. Mathieu Doussineau

CISTRANA is a coordination action under the 6th framework programme for the Coordination of **IST Research And National Activities**. It is ERA net-like similar to eGOVERNMENT. The final objectives of the project are to:

- Develop a map of the national IST research landscape
- Pinpoint research topic areas and strategic themes where cooperation is essential
- Establish sustainable mechanisms to set up trans-national coordination initiatives

There is a bottom up (stakeholders) and top down (national authorities) approach. A CISTRANA IST Research portal has been set up that is the systematic data collection and exchange of information on national RTD programmes. It has been in operation since 2005([www.portal.cistrana.org](http://www.portal.cistrana.org)).

In CISTRANA's analysis of collected information and exchange of best practices, eGovernment is prioritised sub theme on the policy level. There is lots of participation in eGovernment in the 6FP among the new countries when comparing IST participation and eGovernment.

Similar to findings on eGovernment programmes, CISTRANA has discovered Landscape is very variable there is: no universal definition for what is perceived as a 'programme'; national approaches vary according to whether programme-like instruments are directed at funding basic research or industry-driven research, and: ICT seems to have a multitude of definitions in national contexts - application orientation visible only to a limited extent. Most of the cooperation takes place at the project level through EUREKA-clusters. There are also psychological barrier to cooperation among countries, which should be a research topic in itself.

A major challenge relevant to eGOVERNMENT is sustainability of the portal and its information. The data should be sustained.

#### Discussion

*David Osimo. Action oriented project results.*

Discussing a Cistrana II with the Commission.

Failed to have transnational calls. Over ambitious and limited number of participants. Hard to convince policy makers.

*Trond Knudsen. Will Cistrana II have money to include all countries? What are thoughts and expectations?*

Too early in the process now.

**Regional programme supporting eGovernment research. Sandra Lotti**

Emilia Romagna is a region in the northern part of Italy with a population of approximately 4 million (the same as Ireland and Norway). Regional programme decided upon and designed by regional government and local authorities. Programme 2002-2005 included:

- investments in an efficient public administration to make the whole region more competitive
- creation of a “digital territory” (broadband infrastructure) and fight digital divide
- e-gov projects developed on a regional scale to create an e-gov system
- integrate Information Society initiatives with R&D to develop locally (at regional level) new skills and expertise and support the growth of ICT companies in Emilia-Romagna
- measure results with a dedicated benchmark exercise on regional development of information society

Why was such an initiative undertaken? It was to “provide the regional public administrations with results to be applied to services and infrastructure and have a real up to date e-gov system.”

Results were 10 projects and all but 2 are completed. Public administration projects that dealt with technology and organisation have been considered more interesting to the public and will be used. The results of these projects were immediately adapted because they dealt with how to use ICT within an organisation. Projects have been more expensive than had been foreseen therefore partners needed to come up with funding. Projects funded labour so new jobs were generated (around 300). The programme was very important for the universities because it gave young researchers way to prove themselves and to move from project to start up. This is an important added value in eGovernment project. Projects are now forming into clusters, one in infrastructure and another in services. Clustering gives opportunities to get together then integrate.

ICT has not transformed government. Ultimately it was discovered that what is strongly needed is integration among technological, sociological and administrative research. Need competence centres to provide integration and to help administration understand what it does, what is needed and to help them look forward. This will allow for learning that governing is different. It is now time to begin work on impact evaluation.

**IBBT Belgium experience. Nico Verplancke**

IBBT, the Interdisciplinary institute for Broadband Technology, is a research institute founded by the Flemish Government, focusing on information & communication technology (ICT).

Flanders has ca. 6 million inhabitants and a complex governmental structure. Therefore it is said that if a solution fits in Belgium then it should fit anywhere.

Important issues discovered in their working the past five years is that

- eGov is an artificial domain – it indicates organisational, process and infrastructure changes driven by new technology

- People don't think eGov, they think media, health, ...
- Despite its focus on technology, government generally is at least three years behind in implementation of new technology

A fundamental question is how long do we keep calling it eGovernment? E-Phone, e-TV, ...? Can't we just call it government? Another important issue is that people in the field are often interested but certainly middle management is often under operational performance pressure

### **Discussion**

*Fellow talking about Algeria (Italian I believe) Swiss?*

Multidisciplinary approach is important, sociological, legal and cultural. The transition is going from eGovernment to a knowledge society.

### **R&D for Innovation in the Public Sector in Norway - Overview and Experiences. Trond Knudsen**

The Motivation for innovation in Norway's public sector is to have a broad impact in meeting the increase in services and quality, control growth. This is necessitated by demographic challenges, rising expectations of quality and quantity of public service production and deliverance, supplier sector demands for governmental buyers worldwide, co-development of technology, organization and co-operation and contribution to the renewal of governance and democracy in the global service society

As time was running out the next talk was decidedly brief.

### **Overview of evaluation process. Karel Aim for the eGOVERNMENT project**

Evaluation can be described as a magnifying glass looking at the landscape. The project is looking at a common database of experts on eGovernment along with a dry of harmonised guidelines for evaluators.

## Session 3: Vision and Policies for eGovernment Research – Some Suggestions

### *The need and contributions of eGovernment Research for an innovative Europe 2020.*

**Maria Wimmer.**

A vital contribution of eGovernment research is the advancement of economy and information society. The role of public sector in the market and society is underestimated. Governments need to be supported by methods and technologies to perform work effectively and efficiently. The criteria to achieve this is may be different from private sector business.

#### **Discussion**

Other challenges include:

- Continuing conflicts between easily funded ICT research and application and socio-economic organisational theory research that has a harder time finding research support.
- Interoperability. Old systems cannot cooperate together or information cannot be saved.
- Perhaps a different name, why not just Modern Government? And look at a broad spectrum of issues including eGovernment?
- Measuring the added value of services delivered electronically. Hard numbers are needed to prove the point.
- Application area for technology but not so much for the social science areas. Making it similar to Knowledge Management as to the border between technology and human sciences.

*Maria from David's comments.*

eGovernment needs a holistic approach, interreaction of ICT with citizens and government and within government. What are the core tasks in the public sector and how we can support this with ICT? Trend from business sector, products in public sector are like those in the business sector. Competition from companies to provide services. Discussion is on the public value.

What is the key role of government? As a facilitator for citizens?

## Workshop Agenda

**Date:** Wednesday, 11 April 2007

**Venue:** Novotneho lavka 5, Prague 1

in cooperation with the 5th Eastern European eGov Days 2007

**Moderators:** Trond Knudsen, Research Council of Norway

<b>9:00</b>	Registration and coffee	
<b>9:30</b>	Welcome to Prague and the workshop	<i>Karel Aim, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (ASCR)</i>
<b>9:40</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to the workshop</li> <li>• Introduction to the eGovRTD2020 Roadmap project</li> <li>• Introduction to the eGovernet project</li> </ul>	<i>Trond Knudsen</i> <i>Maria Wimmer, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany</i> <i>Madeleine Siösteen-Thiel, VINNOVA, Sweden</i>
<b>Session 1: Status, Visions and Needs</b> (Plenum)		
<b>10:10</b>	Scenarios and key research themes for future eGovernment - Results from eGovRTD2020.	<i>Melanie Bicking, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany</i>
<b>10:40</b>	"A Vision of eGovernment Development of Prague and Czech Cities - the Needs for Support of Research and Cooperation".	<i>Jaroslav Solc, Head of Strategic Development Unit, IT Dept, Prague Municipality</i>
<b>11:10</b>	<b>Break</b>	
<b>11:30</b>	The success of eGovernment research in Sweden: The Implementation of <a href="#">e-Me</a> – an student e-passport in Sweden	<i>Mikael Lind, University College of Borås and Sören Berglund, University of Umeå, Sweden</i>
<b>12:10</b>	Funding eGovernment research in the European Research Area: an overview of different national and regional models.	<i>David Osimo, IPTS, DG JRC, European Commission</i>
<b>12:50</b>	Official handing over of the eGovernment Roadmap as input for the eGovernet into the formation of a Common Framework for	<i>From Wimmer to Siösteen-Thiel, hosted by Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic</i>

	eGovernment Research in Europe	
<b>13:00</b>	Lunch	
<b>14:00</b>	<b>Session 2: Roadmap, new programmes, instruments and evaluation.</b>	
<b>Session 2a: The e2010 Roadmap – eGovernment Research Focus – New Programmes, New Initiatives</b>		
<b>14:00 – 15:30</b>	<p><b>Contributions by participants:</b> <i>Please send synopsis with application for participation. Contributions should address:</i></p> <p>The eGovRTD2020 Scenarios and Roadmap:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What new Programmes are needed?</li> <li>• Where do we need research?</li> </ul>	<p><i>Moderated by Prof. Maria Wimmer (The eGovRTD2020 Roadmap report may be downloaded from the web: <a href="http://www.egovrtd2020.org/">http://www.egovrtd2020.org/</a> )</i></p>
<b>Session 2b: eGovernment research programmes in the European Research Area: Commonalities and differences in design, management and evaluation</b>		
<b>14:00 – 15:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning from CISTRANA experience – Doussineau</li> <li>• National cases: Lotti, Verplancke, Knudsen, and others</li> <li>• Karel Aim, ASCR: Focus on evaluation processes and methods.</li> <li>• Contributions by selected participants from Member States.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Moderated by David Osimo, IPTS, DG JRC, European Commission.</i></p> <p><i>Rapporteur Karel Aim, Academy of Science of the Czech Republic.</i></p>
<b>15:30</b>	<b>Break</b>	
<b>Session 3: Vision and Policies for eGovernment Research – Some Suggestions</b>		
<b>15:50</b>	Session Reports	<i>Maria Wimmer, Karel Aim</i>
<b>16:10</b>	The need and contributions of eGovernment Research for an innovative Europe 2020	<i>Maria Wimmer, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany</i>
<b>16:50</b>	Final words – A Start of A Discourse	<i>Trond Knudsen and Kim Davis</i>

