MODERN TRENDS IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ACTIVITIES

[a]NATALIIA TKACHOVA, [b]VOLODYMYR SAIENKO, [c]IVAN BEZENA, [d]OKSANA TUR, [e]IVAN SHKURAT, [f]NATALYA SYDORENKO

[a]Department of Theory and Practice of Management, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Kyiv, Ukraine, [b]Department of Innovation Management, Faculty of Economics and Pedagogical, Academy of Management and Administration, Opole, Poland, [c]Department of Social and Humanitarian Education, the Communal Institution of Higher Education «Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education» of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Council, Dnipro, Ukraine, [d]Department of Humanities, Culture and Art, Kremenchuk Mykhailo Ostrohradskyi National University, Kremenchuk, Ukraine, [e]Department of Management, Institute of Personnel Training of the State Employment Service of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, [f]Department of Management, Institute of Personnel Training of the State Employment Service of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine
email: [a]tkachovastar@gmail.com, [b]saienko22@gmail.com, [c]ivanbezen@ukr.net, [d]oktur@ukr.net, [e]ishiva@ukr.net, [f]sidnat@ukr.net

Abstract: One of the important roles of public administration is to provide quality public services to citizens and businesses. Digital governance in public administration has been used to ensure dynamic economic performance as well as the well-being of society. E-government and digital governance are the most important current trend in public administration reform at the local and state levels. The aim of the research is to establish the pattern of e-government and digital governance of local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe), based on reports E-Government Development Index, E-Participation Index and OECD Digital Government Index and by conducting regression analysis and analysis of results correlation forces.

Keywords: e-government, digital government, local governments, Eastern European countries.

1 Introduction

An intensive development of information and communication and digital technologies has led to their use in almost all spheres of public life, including public administration, which has significantly changed the way public administrations interact with their citizens and led to the development of e-digital and digital government. This process is not just a technological solution, but also a modern innovative concept of public administration, a significant lever of mass transformation in society, especially in the field of decentralization of power and its interaction with business (Volik et al., 2019).

E-government and digital governance are defined as the provision of public information and services to citizens via the Internet or other digital means (Yadav et al., 2019; Rana et al., 2015; West,2004), and is currently a very important aspect of management (Morgeson et al., 2010). E-government combines government use of information and communication and digital technologies with organizational change to improve its structure and functioning and is of great interest in research on public administration of local governments (Twizeyimana, Andersson, 2019). E-government and digital governance of local governments involves technological change, as well as the latest leadership styles, innovative decision-making processes, different ways of organizing and providing services and modernized concepts for citizens (Gil-Garcia et al., 2017; Rodríguez et al., 2020). E-government seeks to make public institutions more transparent and accountable (Pérez-Morote et al., 2020). The European Commission recognized the importance of the digital transformation of the country in 2006 and is currently implementing the EU Action Plan on e-Government for 2016-2020 (EC, 2016) and the European Digital Strategy for the period 2020-2025 (EC, 2020a). The process of implementing e-digital governance is not simple and depends on a number of factors, so in each country e-government is at different stages of implementation (Volik et al., 2019). The role of e-government and digital governance and its innovative solutions has become even more important after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, when face-to-face interaction is virtually impossible due to social distancing measures. In this context, recent data show an overall increase in the development of e-government and digital governance in the EU. However, despite impressive progress in modernization and digitization, the governments of Eastern Europe or the new EU Member States need to do much more to catch up with the EU's average level of digital maturity (Ravšelj et al., 2020).

The aim of the study – to establish regularity on the state of implementation of e-digital governance of local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe), based on the reports of the E-Government Development Index, E-Participation Index and OECD Digital Government Index and by conducting regression analysis and correlation analysis communication.

1.1 Research objectives of the article

- To analyze the reports of the E-Government Development Index, E-Participation Index and OECD Digital Government Index to determine the status of e-government and digital governance.
- To analyze the level of use of e-government and digital government services based on the key results of the correlation force.
- To establish an assessment and conduct an ongoing analysis of the effectiveness of the implementation of e-digital governance in local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe).
- To analyze statistical information to distinguish the characteristics of the level of development of digital services in Eastern Europe in 2019.
- To conduct a regression analysis to reflect the dependence of the state of effectiveness of e-government and digital governance in local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe), based on the results of the volume and quality of online services and the state of telecommunications infrastructure.

2 Literature review

The researchers analyze the impact of information and communication and digital technologies on the public sector from different points of view, which is reflected in bibliographic reviews and meta-analyzes, covering definitions, scope, methods and recommendations (Madsen et al., 2014), citizen orientation (Rana et al., 2013; Brainard, McNutt, 2010), stage models (Lee, 2010), and the quality of these services (Sá et al., 2016). A lot of research is being done, however Wirtz and Daiser (2016) point out in their meta-analysis of empirical research on e-government and digital governance that there is still a shortage of authoritative quantitative empirical approaches in the literature, and this topic is still perceived as a young field of research. According to research by Moon et al. (2012), e-government offers new opportunities and benefits for various stakeholder groups, such as government agencies (G2G), citizens (G2C) and business organizations (G2B). Digital interaction with citizens is a particularly difficult problem, as population behavior can change over time (Wirtz, Kurtz, 2016).

The interpretation of the term "e-digital governance" is quite broad and divergent. The general definition describes e-digital governance as the use of information, communication and digital technologies to transform government to increase accessibility, efficiency and accountability. According to the interpretation of the United Nations (UN), e-government and digital governance is the use of information and communication and digital technologies and its use by the government to provide information and public services to people (UN, 2004). On the other hand, the European Union (EU) defines e-government and digital governance as the use of information and communication and digital technologies in public administration, combined with

organizational change and new skills to improve public services and democratic processes and strengthen public policy support.

E-government and digital governance here not only represents the direction of modernization of public administration, but also is discussed as a tool for modernization of public self-government (Pomahač et al. 2013). UN and OECD emphasize the role of e-digital governance in providing significant opportunities for the transformation of public administration into an instrument of sustainable development (OECD, 2006; UN, 2004). Involvement of information and communication and digital technologies in the activities of public self-government bodies is a standard part of the modernization of public administration today in both developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Significant role is given primarily to Internet access for the public. The role of web technologies for the provision of public services is especially highlighted. The promotion of new technologies in public electronic services has many advantages. They are the opposite of traditional structures, non-hierarchical, two-way and available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This nature of public services on the Internet helps citizens to search for information in a more convenient way, and not only during the work of public self-government bodies (Tichý, 2012).

The interactivity of the Internet is expected to improve government accountability as it makes the government more sensitive to the needs and demands of citizens. In the EU, e-digital governance has a high priority in modernizing the governance of public self-government bodies (Ardielli, Haláskova, 2015). E-government is one of the measures aimed at taking advantage of information and communication and digital technologies throughout Europe. In times of significant constraints on public resources, information and communication and digital technologies can help the public sector find innovative ways to provide services to citizens, while increasing efficiency and reducing costs (EC, 2015).

Frost and Lal note that research on e-government and digital governance emphasizes the adoption of these technologies by governments to deliver services effectively. However, the adoption of e-government and digital governance has not been successful in all developing countries, because the links between them and the actual policy-making process or professional practice in such countries are not taken into account (Frost, Lal, 2018). Twizeyimana and Andersson focus on the fact that the benefits of e-digital governance are not only to improve the quality of public services provided to the population, but also to increase the administrative efficiency of government agencies, local governments, ethical behavior and professionalism of their employees, increase citizens' trust in the government and improvement of the social situation in the state.

Hussain and Ali note that the financial and economic crisis that began in 2008 has forced the government and the private sector to focus on finding ways to save money and provide quality public services (Hussain, Ali, 2015). According to Saab et al., one of the benefits of e-digital governance is the reduction of government maintenance costs, and citizens can apply for services where relevant civil servants can provide them and receive payment for their work (Saab et al., 2019).

Researchers also focus on the ability of e-government and digital governance tools to influence the level of corruption in the country. Thus, Talab et al. concluded that it is advisable to introduce e-government to prevent the growth of fraud and corruption (Talab et al., 2019). In turn, there is an opposite position, namely, Khan and Krishnan, emphasize that the high level of corruption in the state negatively affects the implementation of e-digital governance (Khan, Krishnan, 2019). Ammar et al. described the lack of security and confidentiality, public distrust, lack of resources, digital divide, inadequate governance, lack of awareness, legal barrier and lack of necessary infrastructure as factors that inhibit the introduction of e-digital governance (Ammar et al., 2018).

The analysis presented in this article covers the following 11 Eastern European countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. This distinction was the result of a classification provided by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and was used in an article (OECD, 2001). It should be noted that the countries of Eastern Europe, depending on the accepted criteria, also include Belarus, Ukraine, Serbia, Macedonia or Kosovo (which is not recognized by some countries).

According to the theoretical approach, assessing the effectiveness of e-digital governance by citizens is important in deciding to use instruments provided by the government. Research by e-government and digital government researchers has empirically demonstrated this idea both in a specific area of e-government (Zheng, Schachter, 2017) and for more general information and communication and digital technologies for local government services (Sepasgozar et al., 2019). Therefore, the development and promotion of e-government and digital governance portals is a tool of strategic management that influences the perception of citizens. The quality of e-government and digital governance is a visible consumer-oriented signal that can be used to convey government capabilities and concerns about the needs and demands of citizens. Comparability of e-government and digital governance performance indicators means that they are central in conducting interstate comparisons of information and communication and digital technology development, monitoring the global digital divide and establishing appropriate policy indicators (Pérez-Morote et al., 2020). Thus, a review of recent scientific publications shows the emphasis on the advantages of e-government over traditional government and the reasons that hinder the implementation of e-digital governance in many countries around the world (Volik et al., 2019).

Thus, e-government and digital governance of local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe) are reflected in the publications of scientists in the form of practical research and theoretical research, but the issue is relevant and open for further research.

3 Materials and research methods

The realization of the aim of this research requires the use of such methods of investigation as:

- systematization of reports E-Government Development Index, E-Participation Index and OECD Digital Government Index to determine the state of e-digital governance;
- system and logical analysis, a method of synthesizing information on the level of use of e-government and digital government services based on the key results of the correlation force, which is calculated taking into account the coefficient of determination between digital skills and penetration;
- summarizing statistics published by governments and reporting organizations to assess and assess the effectiveness of e-government and digital governance in local governments (for example in Eastern Europe), based on E-Government Development Index, E-Participation Index and OECD reports Digital Government Index.
- comparison method to distinguish the characteristics of the level of development of digital services in Eastern Europe in 2019.

To display depending on the state of efficiency of e-government and digital governance in local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe), based on the results of the volume and quality of online services and the state of development of telecommunications infrastructure, regression analysis was applied.

4 Results

According to statistics based on the E-Government Development Index in 2020, Table 1 shows the further improvement of global trends in e-government and digital governance in Eastern Europe and the transition of many countries from lower to higher levels of EGDI. All countries have very high E-Government Development Index (EGDI) values from 0.75 to 1.00 compared to 2020, the first three positions in this group are occupied by Estonia, Lithuania and Slovenia, respectively (see Table 1).

Table 1: The E-Government Development Index in 2010-2020

E-Government Development Index	2020	2018	2016	2014	2012	2010
Bulgaria (Rank)	44	47	52	73	60	44
Bulgaria (Value)	0.79800	0.71770	0.63764	0.54209	0.61315	0.55902
Croatia (Rank)	51	55	37	47	30	35
Croatia (Value)	0.77450	0.70180	0.71624	0.62817	0.73284	0.58580
Czech Republic(Rank)	39	54	50	53	46	33
Czech Republic(Value)	0.81350	0.70840	0.64537	0.60695	0.64914	0.60602
Estonia (Rank)	3	16	13	15	20	20
Estonia (Value)	0.94730	0.84860	0.83344	0.81796	0.79873	0.69653
Hungary (Rank)	52	45	46	39	31	27
Hungary (Value)	0.77450	0.72650	0.67455	0.66374	0.72014	0.63147
Latvia (Rank)	49	57	45	31	42	37
Latvia (Value)	0.77980	0.69960	0.68100	0.71775	0.66040	0.58261
Lithuania (Rank)	20	40	23	29	29	28
Lithuania (Value)	0.86650	0.75340	0.77467	0.72709	0.73329	0.62952
Poland (Rank)	24	33	36	42	47	45
Poland (Value)	0.85310	0.79260	0.72108	0.64822	0.64414	0.55822
Romania (Rank)	55	67	75	64	62	47
Romania (Value)	0.76050	0.66710	0.56114	0.56315	0.60595	0.54791
Slovakia (Rank)	48	49	67	51	53	43
Slovakia (Value)	0.78170	0.71550	0.59154	0.61478	0.62918	0.56387
Slovenia (Rank)	23	37	21	41	25	29
Slovenia (Value)	0.85460	0.77140	0.77691	0.65054	0.74921	0.62426

Source: Compiled by the authors based on official data of The United nation (2020)

Because Estonia is considered to be one of the fastest-growing countries in the world. Estonian citizens can do almost anything on the Internet, except for a few things, such as marriage or divorce, the sale or purchase of real estate. X-road (centralized distributed layer of data exchange between information systems), a multi-channel communication protocol designed to provide online services, provides features such as digital identity, e-voting, e-taxation and e-business. Eesti.ee is a universal service of state information and electronic services. The country also has a Civil Society Development Strategy, which involves citizens in the development of policies and legal acts. For example, the community initiative portal rahvaalgatus.ee allows citizens to write proposals, hold discussions.

Since 2016, countries in the E-Participation Index have been assigned to one of four groups in the E-Participation Index based on the corresponding E-Participation Index (EPI) values. Eastern European countries belong to the group with a high EPI value with results from 0.50 to 0.75, and countries with a very high EPI value with results from 0.75 to 1.00. Estonia has an EPI value of 1.0, which means that all e-participation functions assessed in the study are present in the country. Because the EPI is built independently of each study, moving countries from one EPI group to another over time cannot be interpreted as direct progress or regression. However, because the EPI is based on a simple additive scale, the distribution of EPI values by country and to some extent over time can be analyzed trends (Table 2).

Table 2: The E-Participation Index 2010-2020

E-Participation Index	2020	2018	2016	2014	2012	2010
Bulgaria (Rank)	23	35	43	122	134	39
Bulgaria (Value)	0.89290	0.87080	0.69492	0.25490	0.02630	0.30000
Croatia (Rank)	23	57	25	97	53	25
Croatia (Value)	0.89290	0.76970	0.77966	0.33333	0.28950	0.45714
Czech Republic(Rank)	65	92	76	122	56	86
Czech Republic(Value)	0.72620	0.61800	0.55932	0.25490	0.26320	0.12857
Estonia (Rank)	1	27	22	22	8	9
Estonia (Value)	1.00000	0.91010	0.81356	0.76470	0.76320	0.68571
Hungary (Rank)	75	69	91	75	36	36
Hungary (Value)	0.67860	0.70790	0.49153	0.45098	0.44740	0.31428
Latvia (Rank)	93	75	84	24	66	45
Latvia (Value)	0.58330	0.68540	0.52542	0.70588	0.21050	0.27142
Lithuania (Rank)	64	51	17	33	30	19
Lithuania (Value)	0.73810	0.80340	0.83051	0.64705	0.52630	0.52857
Poland (Rank)	9	31	14	65	75	51
Poland (Value)	0.96430	0.89330	0.88136	0.49019	0.18420	0.24285
Romania (Rank)	46	69	60	71	109	64
Romania (Value)	0.80950	0.70790	0.62712	0.47058	0.07890	0.18571
Slovakia (Rank)	70	50	82	40	89	117
Slovakia (Value)	0.70240	0.80900	0.54237	0.62745	0.13160	0.07142
Slovenia (Rank)	29	48	37	84	66	20
Slovenia (Value)	0.85710	0.81460	0.72881	0.39215	0.21050	0.51428

Source: Compiled by the authors based on official data of The UN (2020).

Statistics from several Western countries show that residents who are satisfied with public services are nine times more likely to trust the government as a whole. Table 3 of Eastern European countries shows that almost all of them either have already implemented digital services or are currently implementing them. Among Eastern European countries, Slovenia, Estonia and the Czech Republic occupy the leading positions, while Bulgaria, Romania and Poland occupy the last positions. The biggest problems of implementation in Eastern Europe are electronic payments, electronic invoices and the compatibility of the data collected by them (see Table 3).

Table 3: Development level of digital services in the countries of the Eastern Europe (2019)

Country	e-ID and trust	e-procurement	e-invoicing	e-payment	e-registries	Data exchange	Inter-operability
Bulgaria							
Croatia							
Czech Republic							
Estonia							
Hungary							
Latvia							
Lithuania							
Poland							
Romania							
Slovakia							
Slovenia							

Source: Compiled by the authors based on official data of The McKinsey & Company (2020).

Notes: 1) e-ID and trust – availability of reliable documents and authorization framework; e-procurement – platforms and digital environments that digitize the activities of public procurement; e-invoicing – solutions that allow you to receive and automatically process electronic invoices; e-payments – dedicated infrastructure for payments and other related services; e-registries – digitization of public information and sources of knowledge; data exchange – platforms and solutions designed for data exchange between government agencies; interoperability – the ability of systems to use information from different authorities/government agencies.

2) - implemented; - partially implemented/in progress; - not implemented.

However, there are many effective and proven digital public services in Eastern Europe. For example, the Hungarian government introduced a multifunctional platform for local government between 2017 and 2019, replacing outdated technologies. Services include a real estate cadaster system, a local tax system, a document management system and a commercial register. Another example – "Trusted profile" in Poland. Users can access government services using their bank account information online, providing access to social security, tax information and company registration procedures in an electronic signature system. The goal is to create a digital universal service for public services. Like other EU countries, Eastern European countries are required to digitize their services under the Gateway initiative launched by the European Commission. The main results of this initiative include providing information on the various rules and rights that citizens and businesses have within the single market of the European Union. Thanks to this project, they will be able to access instructions on how to perform various administrative procedures, 21 of which will be fully available online by 2023.

The progress in e-government and digital governance correlates with other factors, such as citizens' preferences and digital skills, public policy and the characteristics of the digital context. Most relative indicators are correlated with absolute figures for digitization and penetration, with the exception of openness. Table 4 shows the correlation force calculated taking into account the coefficient of determination (R ^ 2). When considering penetration, the correlation is stronger with relative indicators for digital skills, information and communication technologies (ICT) use, and quality. In general, it seems that countries with a high level of use of e-government services are countries with experienced citizens and a large number of daily Internet users (see Table 4).

Table 4: Relative indicators (Penetration and Digitization) (2020)

	User characteristics		Government characteristics		Context characteristics	
	Digital skills	ICT usage	Quality	Openness	Connectivity	Digital in the private sector
BG	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
CY	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
CZ	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
EE	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
HU	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Low
LV	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	Low
LT	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
PL	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
RO	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low
SK	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium
SI	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

Source: Compiled by the authors based on official data of The EC (2020b).

Notes:

R ^ 2	Low	10% – 20%	Medium	20% – 35%	High	> 35%

Thus, the positive correlation between digital skills and penetration in Romania, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia prevails. Each of these countries has a higher penetration rate than would be expected given their level of digital skills. On the other hand, a higher level of penetration could be expected for the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, etc., given the level of digital skills.

The OECD Digital Government Index (DGI) is an important lever of the OECD's work on digital government and public

sector data. DGI monitors the adoption of strategic approaches, policy levers, mechanisms for implementing and monitoring digital government policies in OECD member countries and partner countries. Among the countries of Eastern Europe, the ranking includes such countries as Slovenia, Estonia, Lithuania, the Czech Republic and Latvia (see Table 5).

Table 5: The Digital Government Index in 2019

	Digital by design		Data-driven public sector		Government as platform		Open by default		User-driven		Proactiveness		Composite score	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Slovenia	0.54	16	0.36	22	0.64	11	0.72	8	0.56	9	0.25	26	0.513	17
Estonia	0.52	18	0.47	15	0.44	23	0.65	16	0.39	20	0.39	20	0.478	18
Latvia	0.48	23	0.35	24	0.38	26	0.66	14	0.32	24	0.66	2	0.474	19
Czech Republic	0.51	20	0.29	29	0.48	19	0.78	3	0.36	22	0.18	29	0.434	22
Lithuania	0.43	25	0.5	11	0.34	28	0.51	29	0.26	28	0.34	22	0.397	27
OECD	0.55		0.44		0.54		0.64		0.47		0.42		0.501	

Source: Compiled by the authors based on official data of The OECD (2020).

Only a few countries are moving towards a mature digital government. Although most countries have established institutional models that provide the necessary political and operational support for digital government reforms, much effort has been made to fully uncover the benefits of digital government and go beyond e-government.

Table 6 shows the results of regression modeling to determine the dependence of the state of effective implementation of e-digital governance in local governments (for example, Eastern European countries (shown in Table 1), based on the results of the volume and quality of online services, Online Service Index, and OSI) and the state of development of telecommunication infrastructure (Telecommunication Infrastructure Index, TII) (UN, 2020):

$$Effectiveness\ implementation\ of\ e-digital\ governance = (0{,}001) + 0{,}774 * \text{Volume and quality of online services} + 0{,}799 * \text{Condition of development of telecommunication infrastructure}$$

Therefore, efficiency of introduction of e-digital governance in local self-government bodies (on the example of Eastern European countries) depends on current results of the volume and quality of online services and the state of development of telecommunications infrastructure. The model parameters are statistically significant, as indicated by t Stat in size10.643 and 21,460 and a P-value in size 0.000002 and 0.0000000049.

Table 6: The results of regression modeling

Regression Statistics								
Multiple Regression	0,03							
Regression Square	0,00							
Adjusted Regression Square	0,89							
Standard Error	0,11							
Observations	11							
ANOVA								
	df	*SS*	*MS*		*F*		*Significance F*	
Regression	1	0,0001	0,0001		0,0080		0,9307	
Residual	9	0,1138	0,0126					
Total	10	0,1139						
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*	*Lower 95,0%*	*Upper 95,0%*
Intercept	0,001	0,011	0,089	0,931	-0,023	0,025	-0,023	0,025
Volume and quality of online services	0,774	0,073	10,643	0,000002	0,609	0,938	0,609	0,938
Condition of development of telecommunication infrastructure	0,799	0,037	21,460	0,0000000049	0,715	0,883	0,715	0,883

Source: Compiled by the authors based on official data of The UN (2020)

The value of the coefficient of determination indicates that the regression model by 89% reflects the direct dependence of the state of effectiveness of e-government and digital governance in local governments (on the example of Eastern Europe), based on the results of the volume and quality of online services and the state of telecommunications infrastructure. This analysis indicates that there are still a small number of other factors influencing efficiency of introduction of e-digital governance in local self-government bodies (on the example of Eastern European countries), which are not included in the regression model.

5 Discussion

Digital technologies have had a profound impact on social and economic realities, including public administration and local government management. The Internet has significantly affected the relationship between public administration, citizens and businesses, which has paved the way for the emergence and development of a new model of public administration called e-digital governance, in which digital technology is at the heart of government organizational structures (Ravšelj et al., 2020).

The analysis of e-digital governance still reflects a growing open field that provides many opportunities for research. E-government and digital governance are becoming mandatory in many countries as part of the transformation of public services, and citizens are thus forced to interact with the government through programs, so the development of digital skills is becoming increasingly important (Rodríguez et al., 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the inevitable transition to online channels, creating more impetus for far-reaching transformations of the economy and society at large (McKinsey & Company, 2020). Research shows that e-

government and digital governance of local governments today are needed to provide fast and quality services for citizens and companies. The EU has therefore recognized the importance of e-digital governance and its potential beneficial effects on the business environment in their latest development strategies (EC, 2016; EC, 2020a).

A review of the available literature shows that the EU has improved the level of e-government and digital governance of local governments in recent years. The digital progress of Eastern European countries in improving the development of e-government and digital governance of local governments is higher than in the new EU member states. However, Eastern European countries are still lagging behind developed countries, so they need to implement processes in public administration to catch up with them, and therefore the average level of maturity of EU digital technologies. However, this is a problem for some Eastern European countries, as they face various problems related to limited financial resources, lack of adequate digital infrastructure and insufficient capacity. However, some of these countries also face specific barriers to issues such as digital inclusion, data privacy and cybersecurity (UN, 2020).

Digitization of public services has a number of benefits for citizens and businesses, namely, digital public services can significantly reduce the administrative burden on citizens and companies, which in turn increases the transparency of decision-making and reduces the risk of corruption. Accordingly, the development of e-government and digital governance of local governments in Eastern Europe, thus, has a positive impact on government efficiency, quality of regulation and ease of doing business (Ravšelj et al., 2020).Thus, e-government and local government in Eastern Europe will face new challenges, as the potential in the information technology and digital space is quite high, but not sufficiently implemented, in-depth research, which will lead to increased attention to improving the process of public service delivery.

6 Conclusion

As a result of the analysis of e-government and digital government of local governments in Eastern Europe, it was found that a country like Estonia has become a role model, so this topic is becoming increasingly important. An example from Estonia has shown that e-government and digital governance are most accepted in small countries that have overcome a dysfunctional past communication infrastructure, with a young population that has high confidence in public institutions.The level of e-government use is higher in older societies. Obviously, the argument of confidence is supported by empirical evidence. Where citizens have a high level of trust in their legal institutions, the interaction of e-government is high. The success story of Estonian digital modernization is clearly not widely used in Europe. Therefore, it is necessary to change the attitude of government officials and citizens to e-digital governance of local governments. Because e-government and digital governance of local governments are a useful tool to reduce the financial costs of public administration, as well as benefits for residents in the form of time savings. This area remains a major challenge for the countries of Eastern Europe in the future.

The practical significance of this research is that the conclusions and recommendations developed by the author and proposed in the article can be used to: avoid institutional and national challenges in the implementation and implementation of e-digital governance of local governments in Eastern Europe. Further research can be aimed at improving e-digital governance of local governments in Eastern Europe, which will stimulate and improve the activities of state institutions in the information technology and digital space, which will provide quality public services to citizens and businesses. Empowerment and the widespread use of innovative, research approaches and the avoidance of institutional and national challenges for e-government and digital governance of local governments can be the basis for future strategies.

Literature:

1. Ammar, S.M., Shih-Chih, C., & Chung-Wen, H.: *The barriers of e-government success: An empirical study from Jordan.* International Journal of Managing Public Sector Information and Communication Technologies. 9 (2). 2018. pp. 1-18. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3498847
2. Ardielli, E., Haláskova, M.: *Assessment of E-government in EU countries*. 22. 2015. pp. 4-16.
3. Brainard, L.A, McNutt, J.G.: *Virtual Government – Citizen Relations*. Adm. Soc. 42. 2010. pp. 836–858.
4. European Commission (EC), (2015). How is your country with digital transformation? The new numbers indicate how the road to digital Europe has turned upside down. Press Release Database. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/cs/IP_15_447
5. European Commission (EC), (2016). EU e-Government action plan 2016-2020. Accelerating the digital transformation of government, 19 April 2016, Brussels.
6. European Commission (EC), (2020a). A European strategy 2020-2025. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 19 February 2020, Brussels. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0698
7. European Commission (EC), (2020b). eGovernment Benchmark 2020. eGovernment that works for the people. Retrieved from: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/egovernment-benchmark-2020-egovernment-works-people
8. Frost, D., & Lal, B. (2018). E-government project design in developing countries. In International Working Conference on Transfer and Diffusion of IT. pp. 155-176. Springer, Cham.
9. Gil-Garcia, JR, Dawes, SS, Pardo, TA (2017). Digital government and public management research: Finding the crossroads. Public Manag. Rev., 20, 633–646.
10. Hussain, W., & Ali, A. (2015). Impact of e-government services on private sector an empirical assessment model. International Journal of Managing Information Technology, 7 (3), 19-33. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281808580_Impact_of_EGovernment_Services_on_Private_Sector_An_Empirical_Assessment_Model
11. Khan, A., & Krishnan, S. (2019). Conceptualizing the impact of corruption in national institutions and national stakeholder service systems on e-government maturity. International Journal of Information Management, 46 (1), 23-36.
12. Lee, J. (2010). 10-year retrospect on stage models of e-Government: A qualitative meta-synthesis. Gov. Inf. Q., 27, 220–230. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0740624X10000249
13. Madsen, C.Ø., Berger, JB, Phythian, M. (2014). The Development in Leading e-Government Articles 2001-2010: Definitions, Perspectives, Scope, Research Philosophies, Methods and Recommendations: An Update of Heeks and Bailur. In Proceedings of the Lecture Notes in Computer Science; Springer Science and Business Media LLC: Berlin, Germany. Volume 8653, pp. 17–34. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266675916_The_Development_in_Leading_e-Government_Articles_2001-2010_Definitions_Perspectives_Scope_Research_Philosophies_Methods_and_Recommendations_An_Update_of_Heeks_and_Bailur
14. McKinsey & Company. (2020). Digital Challengers in the next normal Central and Eastern Europe on a path to digitally-led growth. Bucharest: Digital McKinsey.
15. Moon, MJ, Lee, J., Roh, C.-Y. (2012). The Evolution of Internal IT Applications and e-Government Studies in Public Administration. Adm. Soc., 46, 3–36.
16. Morgeson, FV, VanAmburg, D., Mithas, S. (2010). Misplaced Trust? Exploring the Structure of the E-GovernmentCitizen Trust Relationship. J. Public Adm. Res. Theory, 21, 257–283.
17. OECD. (2006). E-Government Project – Proposed Outline for Assessing E-Government Benefits. Retrieved from: https://www.oecd.org/COMNET/PUM/egovproweb.nsf/viewHtml/index/.
18. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2001). Central and Eastern European Countries

(CEECs). Retrieved from: https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=303 .
19. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). OECD Digital Government Index (DGI). Retrieved from: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/b00142a4-en.pdf?expires=1628471227&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=C71D23F81657E2111FD66D95E82625D3
20. Pérez-Morote, R., Pontones-Rosa, C., Núñez-Chicharro, M. (2020). The effects of e-government evaluation, trust and the digital divide in the levels of e-government use in European countries, Technological Forecasting and Social Change, Elsevier, vol. 154 (C). Retrieved from: DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2020.119973.
21. Helper, R. et al. (2013). Public administration. 1st ed. Prague: CH Beck. 336 p.
22. Rana, NP, Dwivedi, YK, Lal, B., Williams, MD, Clement, M. (2015). Citizens' adoption of an electronic government system: Towards a unified view. Inf. Syst. Front. 19, 549–568. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284560546_Citizens'_adoption_of_an_electronic_government_system_towards_a_unified_view
23. Rana, NP, Dwivedi, YK, Williams, MD (2013). A meta-analysis of existing research on citizen adoption of e-government. Inf. Syst. Front. 17, 547–563. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257574593_A_meta-analysis_of_existing_research_on_citizen_adoption_of_e-government
24. Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N., Aristovnik, A. (2020). E-government and administrative simplification for businesses: challenges and opportunities for Central and Eastern European countries. Ljubljana, December 2020. 43 p. https://zavod14.si/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Knji%C5%BEica_Challenges-and-Opportunities_A4_2.pdf
25. Rodríguez, HL, Navio-Marco, J., Gómez, LM (2020). Citizens' Involvement in E-Government in the European Union: The Rising Importance of the Digital Skills. Sustainability. 12. 6807. Retrieved from: 10.3390/su12176807.
26. Sá, F., Rocha, A., Cota, MP (2016). From the quality of traditional services to the quality of local e-Government online services: A literature review. Gov. Inf. Q., 33, 149–160.
27. Saab, F., Lira, WRC, De-Souza, AC, Bermejo, PH, & Borges, GHA (2019). Public management and technology: How can e-government strategies contribute to greater efficiency in public expenditures? Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, 797 (1), 457-470. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-13-1165-9_43
28. Sepasgozar, SM, Hawken, S., Sargolzaei, S., Foroozanfa, M., (2019). Implementing cytencecentric technology in developing smart cities: a model for predicting the acceptance of urban technologies. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change, 142, 105–116. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.09.012 .
29. Talab, HR, Maki, MI, Mohammed, YN, Flayyih, HH, & Ibrahim, AM (2019). The role of e-Government on corruption and its impact on the financial performance of the government: An empirical analysis on the Iraqi government. Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences, 14 (4), 1349-1356.
30. Tichý, O. (2012). Information and Communication Technologies their Benefits for Medium and Large-Sized Enterprices. In Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Vol. XVIII, Iss. 24 (2/2012), pp. 199-211. https://dk.upce.cz/handle/10195/49530
31. Twizeyimana, JD, & Andersson, A. (2019). The public value of E-Government: A literature review. Government Information Quarterly, 36 (1), 167-178. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331092224_The_public_value_of_E-Government_-_A_literature_review
32. Twizeyimana, JD, Andersson, A. (2019). The public value of E-Government — A literature review. Gov. Inf. Q., 36, 167–178.
33. UN. (2020). E-Government Survey 2020. Digital Government in the Decade of Action for Sustainable Development. With addendum on COVID-19 Response. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/2020_un_e-government_survey_full_report.pdf.
34. UN. Global E-Government Readiness Report. (2004). Retrieved from: https://maintenance.un.org/ .
35. Volik, V., Lozhmets, Y., Davydova, O., Sprynchuk, S., Shvets, D. (2019). Electronic governance in Ukraine and Estonia current situation and prospectives. Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues. Volume 22, Special Issue 2, pp. 1-5. https://www.abacademies.org/articles/electronic-governance-in-ukraine-and-estonia-current-situation-and-prospective-8184.html
36. West, DM (2004). E-Government and the Transformation of Service Delivery and Citizen Attitudes. Public Adm. Rev. 64, 15–27.
37. Wirtz, BW, Daiser, P. (2016). A meta-analysis of empirical e-government research and its future research implications. Int. Rev. Adm. Sci., 84, 144–163. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0020852315599047
38. Wirtz, BW, Kurtz, OT (2016). Determinants of Citizen Usage Intentions in e-Government: An Empirical Analysis. Public Organ. Rev., 17, 353–372. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297765552_Determinants_of_Citizen_Usage_Intentions_in_e-Government_An_Empirical_Analysis
39. Yadav, J., Saini, AK, Yadav, AK (2019). Measuring citizens engagement in e-Government projects — Indian perspective. J. Stat. Manag. Syst. 22, 327–346. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09720510.2019.1580908
40. Zheng, Y., Schachter, HL (2017). Explaining citizens' E-participation use: the role of perceived advantages. Public Org. Rev. 17 (3), 409–428. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-016-0346-2.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AH