THE WORLD EXPERIENCE OF E-GOVERNMENT: TECHNOLOGICAL AND SEMANTIC REQUIREMENTS FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Abstract

This work is considered to the world experience of e-government. Gives experiences of e-government: technological and semantic requirements for information systems in this article.
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The concept of "electronic administrative regulations" is very widely used in modern practice. However, the usefulness and the meaningfulness of the term, as in the case of "public service" is very doubtful.

Firstly, the "regulation" of principle can not be "electronic" because it is a regulation, which required to perform certain actions to certain persons in certain situations, which entails a change in the rights and responsibilities of certain individuals. Second, the conversion of automated regulations written in "natural language", in machine-readable form, does not exist, and are expected to appear in the near future should not be. States from time to time change the technology of its activities. At the same time in any technological revolution the most important principles of law or government that supports the old technology, should be preserved in the transition to the new. Experience is always open to multiple interpretations, which are determined by the difference between the theoretical assumptions and values of researchers. That theoretical assumptions suggest some of the many events related. This value can tell whether a given situation "normal" (and then to this situation it is necessary to adapt, even if it is unpleasant) or "pathology", and then she had to resist. In addition, it is too early to talk about the completion of the transition to e-government in other countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of electron services</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three and more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Percentage (%) of public services available through the websites

The procedure for putting into operation the government sets of requirements for compatibility seems no less important than the content of these vaults, as it depends on how the regulation will be perceived by members of the government and the executors of state contracts. World experience
shows that the effective regulation of state information systems is only possible if its gradual deployment. We must take into account the interests of all market participants: both customers and suppliers. Trying commissioning prescriptive doomed to failure because it will face sabotage as the suppliers who do not want to rebuild the structure of the sentence in accordance with the new requirements, and government officials who have introduced new hard workable rules of information systems will only irritation. You should also take into account not too high a level of preparedness and suppliers, and government customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>The name and contents of step</th>
<th>Duration of phase</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development and publication of the draft set of requirements for the compatibility of public discussion</td>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>Informing employees of public institutions experts, citizens of the impending regulation. Promotion and explanation of the principles, the expansion of the circle of experts. Identification and correction of errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Publication of the first official version of the set of requirements for compatibility</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Pilot projects of the initial accumulation of experience with the practical application of a set of public works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The release of new versions of the vault. The expansion of the scope of the arch is advisable to increase the number of claims</td>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>Improve the management of technology and standardization of data formats used in the state information systems. Reduce costs associated with the provision of interconnection compatibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. The sequence of putting into operation the government's set of requirements on compatibility

The European practice of commissioning of a government set requirements for compatibility is carried out only in a phased manner, and it begins with the popularization stage, where the requirements set are minimal or are advisory in nature. After receiving a set of requirements of a certain notoriety, and there is the experience of its use in a number of pilot projects, the technology expands the scope and the extent of his obligation may be increased. In particular, it is being developed as the UK e-GIF, who for six years has evolved from a 27-page document into a massive system of normative and methodological materials containing versatile information systems requirements for the UK.

An important element of the European practice of input requirements for interoperability in action is the organization of public discussions with experts and stakeholders. During the public comment stakeholders (citizens, companies, representatives of state institutions) to make comments and suggestions on the published draft set of points, which, in their opinion, require correction, addition or elimination. Public discussion allows, on the one hand, to improve the quality and consistency of the documents, on the other - to reduce a possible confrontation regulation after it is put into effect. In discussing the project, you must create a situation that the initiatives set designers, sometimes contrary to the interests of suppliers (which are usually satisfied with the established status quo), found supporters in the community. It is interesting to experience the French founders of the new set of requirements for compatibility RGI, which in 2006 organized a public discussion via the wiki. The discussion in this form is not only easier to all interested parties participate in the discussion, but also increased the popularity of RGI in the IT community, especially among businesses small and medium businesses. Support Society became an ally of the government of France to the commissioning of the "revolutionary" regulation, which has consistently implemented the principle of priority of open standards.
Thus, the existence of a stable relationship between the public authorities and the professional community in the field of IT (represented as the representatives of the companies and experts and individuals that express the interests of the citizens rather than business) is an essential condition for the success of public discussion.

The extremely dynamic development of information technology makes it necessary to frequent revision of codes requirements for compatibility, so I set the one-time effect is not enough. Typically, the release of new versions is no more than twice a year and at least once a year, but in some cases (for example, when a set of requirements for interoperability has a narrow scope and can not be held binding) between two versions of a set can take more time. The number of changes between two versions of a set of, usually depends on the degree of maturity and quality study. It is noteworthy that in version 3.0, developers have tried e-GIF eliminate proprietary formats of the basic requirements for browsers and viewers: mention Internet Explorer and Netscape Navigator have been replaced by the requirement of compliance with the standard HTML 3.2, and proprietary Adobe PDF format has been moved from the section "Basic Specifications" The "More" (the use of which is allowed only in cases where the delivery of public services with the help of basic specification is technically feasible).

Revision flowing arch support, collection and processing of comments and suggestions from market participants carried out a special government body. In the UK, it is engaged in the Cabinet Office, in France - the main directorate of state modernization, subordinated to the Ministry for the Budget, government spending and government functions, and in Germany - the Ministry of Interior. In each case, the public authorities formed a special structural unit, equipped with the necessary expert resources, or seek the services of experts from the private sector. However, as practice shows in England and France, restructuring or change of the responsible authority a negative impact on the cycle of release of new versions of the document and could lead to a revision of the concept of development.

Code requirements for compatibility compiled and positioned so that it is perceived as convenient and useful manual for the correct construction of information systems, not as imposed from above regulation. CCI, SAGA, e-GIF, RGI and European EIF are soundly prepared documents, where the requirements and recommendations set out in accessible language, accompanied by illustrations and tables. The Danish set of requirements stands out because it does not have the paper version: it is implemented only in the form of an interactive website.

But despite some common approaches (vaults compatibility requirements in all cases, so that they were convenient to the reader, not the compiler), one of the most significant differences between the European. Project apart is the mechanism to ensure the implementation of codes of practice.

Interactive public services involve two-way communication between the public authorities and citizens or organizations in electronic form, including having legal consequences.

For the implementation of interactive services is not enough to provide automatic disclosure of relevant information systems. It should also be implemented and reverse feature: acts committed by recipients of services on the portal should make changes directly in the accounting information systems of the authorities. The implementation of this simple properties of the formulation is usually the greatest technological and organizational difficulties.

Portals public services are not the only instrument (channel) of e-government services. Such tools include:

- centers of public services (operator service);
- information kiosks (access terminals with touch screens, located in public places);
- access via mobile terminals (mobile phones, smartphones);
- call centers (telephone access to public services);
- access by remote control the television receiver (in networks interactive digital television).

Administrative data - this data, the composition of which reflects the rights and duties of an individual or organization. In addition to establishing or confirming the rights of administrative data are the basis for the performance of public officials of their duties established by regulations. On the
other hand, the fact that the execution of these functions is also fixed by means of the administrative data. In general, administrative data - is data on individuals, physical objects, facts.

Administrative data have a number of significant differences from other types of data, for example, personal letters, or from data collected by commercial organizations. The most important of them is that on the basis of their decisions affecting the rights and responsibilities of each. In the field of public law, nothing should be done arbitrarily people. All decisions should be made on the basis of regulations that prescribe the specific grounds for the decision-making by public officials.

For example, upon presentation of a national civil servant corresponding documents on family financial insecurity latter shall take a decision on allocation of budget funds. The basis for such a decision will not sympathy for the applicant and it is really difficult economic situation.
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