Chapter 3

NEED, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Need for the Study

Electronic Governance (e-Governance) has received a tremendous interest world over. Significant amount of money is being put into making e-Governance a reality. A number of Projects are being taken up at various levels, it therefore becomes important to make reasonable means of assessment to see whether the projects have achieved or are going to achieve their planned goals. Proper assessment of these projects gives us crucial learning on the kind of changes needed to be done to make them successful.72

Major investments from Government and the private sector are being made for eGovernance projects. It therefore becomes imperative to be able to make reasonable means of assessment whether the projects are able to achieve (or have achieved) the objective for which they have been taken up.73 In case the projects are able to deliver the objectives, then what can be learnt from it, and if not then what kind of improvements

---
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need to be done to make the necessary corrections, and lastly in case the
project is closed, then what are the lessons learnt? e-Government
projects are not just another IT project or Government projects, which
involve factoring various aspects to meet the desired objectives of the
projects. The complexity adds further, with various stakeholders being
part of these projects. eGovernment can make a valuable contribution to
development. However, at present, the majority of e-government-for-
development projects fail either totally or partially, with very few
successes.

Return on investment is not the primary objective when e-Government
projects are conceived. They are mostly driven to achieve efficiency and
effectiveness in service delivery. Governments run with tight budgets,
hence there is an increasing demand to re-examine their spending
priorities. Further, e-government programmes are subjected to scrutiny
to find out whether they are delivering the payoff as has been promised
or not.\footnote{M P Gupta, Jaijit Bhattacharya, Ashok Agarwal, Evaluating e-Government, Pg. 1, Published in
eGovernance Case Studies; ed Ashok Agarwal, Universities Press, 2007}

In the Indian context, the Electronic Governance (e-Governance) has
received a tremendous fillip in India since the time Government of India
announced National e-Governance Plan (NeGP). Significant amount of
money is being invested into making NeGP a reality, towards which each
of the states of India has developed its own e-Gov Roadmaps. A number
of e-Government Projects are being taken up at various levels. It is with this interest that the Dept. of IT, Govt. of India, with the help of IIM-A and NISG, worked out the e-Governance Assessment Framework (EAF 2.0).75

It is becoming crucial to do a retrospective and answer some of the major concerns76 when implementing e-Government projects, like:

Â Why are we pursuing e-Government project?
Â Do we have a clear vision and priorities for e-Government project?
Â What kind of e-Government project are we ready for?
Â Is there enough political will to lead the e-Government project effort?
Â Are we selecting e-Government project the best way?
Â How should we plan and manage e-Government project?
Â How will we manage resistance from within the Government?
Â How will we measure and communicate progress? And How will we know if we are failing?
Â What should be the relationship with the private sector?
Â How can e-Government project help to improve citizen participation in public affairs?

76 Ibid.
The increased focus on realizing the NeGP, where there is a huge outlay of over Rs. 35000 (INR) crores over the next span of five to seven years, emphasizes the need for having frameworks that provide accurate appraisals about the e-Government projects, to avoid diversion of scarce resources to unfruitful directions. Further, since replication of similar kinds of projects has to be undertaken across the country, it calls for a greater need for the assessment frameworks that help one to learn the factors resulting in the success or a failure of a project. This also provides for a feedback to the stakeholders involved in the project regarding the health of the project.

Numerous assessment frameworks have been developed, especially for the e-Governance project. These have been developed from different perspectives, and maybe they address the assessment needs of the assessment owner at that specific period of time requirement. Some of them have been developed by countries, and others have come up as part of assessment for awards.

Since one of the prime objectives of assessment is to identify the success question of the project – that is whether or not the project would be a success or to identify the reasons as to why a project was a success or failure, it is important to note the views of the various stakeholders involved in the project. To elaborate on the point further, the
expectations form different stakeholder perspective have been identified. Each of the stakeholders would like to assess the project from different perspectives with different priority for each assessment parameter or attribute.

- Service users, who are the end users of e-government services.
- Citizens
- Businesses
- Government or the project owners – political and policy level
- Government employees, of the department owning the project
- Financial institution, the funding agency.
- Public Private Partner, the implementing agency or consortium.
- Government of India (for replication)
- Academics
- Media

The kind of project related expectations of various stakeholders increases the challenge in targeting a holistic and comprehensive assessment. Another dimension could be to selectively choose some of the project indicators and focus exclusively on them while assessing projects, and achieve the desired objectives of assessment. In order to have an assessment done on specific indicators and to observe the variations
from one assessment at one time to another – it is necessary to understand the key challenges and issues in this regard. Some of these have been listed below:

- Different dimensions in categories of e-Government projects
- Lack of clarity on assessment framework
- What are relevant “core indicators”? – there will always be some inherent subjectivity
- Who should do the assessment?
- Time spent on doing an assessment
- High cost associated with information collection
- Depending on framing the questionnaire, there is lack of capacity and uniform methodology for evaluating
- What should be the periodicity of assessments?
- Are we taking learning’s from assessment of good or bad projects? – turning information into knowledge
- Who is interested to learn from assessment?
- Lack of high visibility for assessment reports

We list potential key stakeholders and consider different dimensions of their perspectives and indicators for assessing the success factors of an e-Gov project.

Service users (i.e. the end customers) point of view:
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Cost of availing the Govt. service; Time for delivery of service; Convenience of availing the service; Compliance of RTI (Right to Information) Act; Transparency in Govt. functioning

- **Government point of view:**
  - ROI (Return on Investment); Immediate impact on service users;
  - Internal efficiency – process reforms; Impact on internal employees;
  - Sustainability and long term overall impact

- **Funding Agency point of view:**
  - ROI and business model; Immediate impact on service users

- **Public Private Partner point of view:**
  - ROI and business model; Compliance to Service Levels; Enhancement of service and reach

- **Others stakeholders point of view:**
  - At National Government level from replication perspective; Academics (arriving at what is optimal assessment)

The IIM-Ahmedabad (India) in their study related to impact assessment has identified the following dimensions of outcome for the project\(^{78}\):

a. **Client Stakeholder**:
   - i) **Economic (Direct & Indirect)**
   - ii) **Governance** (Corruption, Accountability, Transparency, Participation)
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iii) Quality of Service (Decency, Fairness, Convenience, etc)

b. Agency (including Partners in implementation) Stakeholder:
   i) Economic (Direct & Indirect)
   ii) Governance (Corruption, Accountability, Transparency, Participation)
   iii) Performance on key non-economic objectives
   iv) Process Improvements

c. Society (Government) Stakeholder:
   i) Economic (Direct & Indirect)
   ii) Governance (Corruption, Accountability, Transparency, Participation, Responsiveness)
   iii) Development Goals
   iv) Attitude to computerization of Government agencies for service delivery

As per Prof Bhatnagar, some of the major benefits expected from two key stakeholders include:

- Reduced transaction time and elapsed time
- Less number of trips to Government offices
- Expanded time window and convenient access
- Reduced corruption - need for bribes, use of influence
- Transparency-clarity on procedures/documents
- Less uncertainty in estimating time needed
• Fair deal and courteous treatment
• Less error prone, reduced cost of recovery
• Empowered to challenge action_greater accountability
• Levy of use charges

Similarly, the benefits expected by the implementing agency, i.e. Government in this case include:

• Reduced cost of delivering service - manpower, paper, office space
• Reduced cost of expanding coverage and reach of service
• Growth in tax revenue-coverage and compliance
• Control of Government expenditure
• Improved image( service, corruption and fraud)
• Improved monitoring of performance and fixing responsibility
• Improved work environment for employees
• Better quality decisions

This kind of classification of the various views of assessment increases the challenge in targeting a holistic and comprehensive assessment while an interesting issue to look at would be to selectively choose some of the views/dimensions and focus exclusively on them while assessing projects, and achieve the desired objectives of assessment. Projects belong to different categories – each demanding a different manner of assessment. Hence, identifying a common set of indicators and then identifying category specific indicators that cover a desired set of
assessment criterion becomes an interesting exercise. It turns out that more often than not, the attempt must be to ensure that there is logical consistency and coherence in the specification of the indicators (or factors) and the respective attributes that make up the evaluation of each of the indicators. Logical consistency becomes meaningless if the scope of assessment is not closed and is kept open, and the attempt should be in identifying definite boundaries for assessment.

Assessment exercise involves a tedious process if the intention is to assess an e-Government project thoroughly, meeting the desired objectives, like: the success as defined by the extent to which it achieved the purpose it was designed for, whether the project is replicable or not, among others. This is because each of the e-Government projects involves a number of stakeholders from whose perspectives the project needs to be looked at, and further it involves a number of parameters and attributes which adds to the amount of effort required in order to make for a reasonably comprehensive assessment. With this in mind, a detailed assessment (DA) framework was envisaged in the E-Governance Assessment Framework (EAF 2.0) developed by the Department of IT, Government of India. In the EAF 2.0, the e-Gov projects with large outlay are characterized into categories - G2C (U/R), G2B, and G2G – in order to make way for separate and customized assessment frameworks for the
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apparently different motivations that the projects in each of these categories have. So, for a comprehensive assessment as per the EAF 2.0, there were frameworks given for the each of the categories, like the DA for G2C (U/R) among others.

It may not necessarily be required to make a DA of projects in all cases, and it may not always be possible to have sufficient resources to do a DA – so there was another tier of assessment in the EAF 2.0 – a Summary Assessment (SA). SA is done using a subset of assessment parameters and attributes from the DA. The SA is to be conducted using data collected from the secondary sources, which help form a base for evaluation. Further, it is suggested that inputs from small representative sample involving all the stakeholders of the eGov project be taken, in order to arrive at the desired outcome, which is to provide “broad insights into the ground realities of the project and provide inputs to sharpen the understanding of the project objectives, identification of stakeholders, control groups, affected groups, etc., and help us refine the data collection instruments.” The point of interest as far as SA as envisaged by the EAF 2.0 is that it could be completed within 2-5 days per project, whereas a DA would require around 4-6 weeks per project.

Now, consider the case that there are around 100 e-Gov projects across the country to be evaluated and rated. The time allocated for assessment
exercise is around 4 months and assuming that a team of 10 people are involved apart from some more people helping them – it is clear that the format to be used, given the EAF 2.0, would be some kind of a of a SA. In such a situation a DA is not possible within the said constraints. Further, if there is another constraint that there is not a possibility of taking the views of the representative sample of all the stakeholders and one is to make an evaluation out of the information and inputs from only one of the stakeholders – and that too the project owners – this presents a tricky position. An SA should be so designed so that its results are not in contradiction to the results of a DA. Slight deviations may be held acceptable.

There is a need for such assessment frameworks which provide tractable means of assessment that gives an “acceptable” assessment specific to the features chosen to be assessed in spite of constraints such as the ones mentioned above. It makes sense to look at this problem of assessment under constraints because that is a matter of reality faced by the teams which work on assessing e-Gov projects. Any progress in arriving at what is “acceptable” above would be desirable. This shall be obtained as learning’s from the experiences.
3.2 Types of Performance Assessment

Assessment of e-Gov projects can be of various types. Each assessment begins with an outline as to the intent behind the assessment. It is this intent which results in the differences in the kinds of assessment. The type of assessments which could be visualized can be of a variety of forms – and most of which could be in terms of different descriptions to the same kind of assessment (in reality) – but the manner in which one puts it – makes the sense of assessment different – hence we have mentioned them separately.

One could think of different assessments depending on the extent of detail one would go in order to assess, as we see in the differentiation between DA and SA in the EAF 2.0. These variations in the assessment outcomes can primarily be attributed to the following factors:

i. details upto which one would go summary assessment or detail assessment

ii. methods used to carry out assessments
   a. Questionnaire
   b. Statistical method
   c. Historical method
   d. By identifying best practices

iii. agency involved for carrying out the assessment, e.g.
   a. Self assessment done by the project implementation team;
b. Self assessment done using a framework suggested by a third party;

c. Self assessment done by third party

iv. Assessing various aspects of e-Governance projects, e.g.

a. Assessment only of the service components;

b. Assessment only of the economic perspective;

c. Assessment of the overall impact of the project

v. Assessment from the perspective of roll-out or replication.

Assessment of e-Gov projects might have to consider some of the aspects which are external to the projects but which are extremely important for the success of the projects – such as the e-Readiness component. In a sense, assessment of an e-Gov project should give sufficient weight to the e-Readiness factor as well, without which it may not make much sense to assess the project. This becomes necessary in order to identify the exact causes of successes or failures of a particular project. This brings another aspect to reason as to why an assessment is being done? One could do an assessment for the sake of identifying how the project could be replicated in a different environment, or one could do an assessment in terms of identifying whether the project is worth pursuing or not.

Since e-Gov projects come in various flavors, assessment cannot be in one-size-fits-all mode. A uniform assessment framework cannot be
applied to a new project, say 6 months old and a 2 year old project. Both would have different dimensions, even if it has to be assessed from the same stake holder’s perspective. At the same time a uniform framework will not be able to assess G2C, G2B, G2G and G2E projects along with the Urban and Rural implementation dimensions. As such assessment needs to done differently, keeping the domain specific indicators and attributes into consideration.

3.3 Challenges and Issues in Performance Assessment

Classification of the various expectations and views of assessment increases the challenge in targeting a holistic and comprehensive assessment. While looking at the challenges and issues, we need to be clear as to what is being assessed and towards what end one is assessing. Since one of the prime objectives of assessment is to identify the success question of the project – that is whether or not the project would be a success or to fix the reasons as to why a project was a success or failure, it is important to note the views of the various stakeholders involved in the project.
Continuing the sequence of meta-theoretic questions and answers\textsuperscript{80}, we ask the questions related to: the periodicity of assessments, the agency or body which is going to assess the e-Gov projects, assessment for whose sake, the intent behind the assessment, and finally give the constraints that are faced by assessment exercises.

\textbf{3.3.1 Who is interested to learn from assessment?}

One of the major objectives of assessment is to learn and develop on the weak areas. However, in reality the assessment results are taken merely to showcase if the project is found to be a good one. It is observed that if the project has not been assessed as a good project, no one looks into the report for improvements in the project. If we have a self-assessment framework, which will be done out of self interest, the project owners’ will always strive to understand and strengthen the weak areas of the project.

\textbf{3.3.2 What are the learning’s from assessment studies?}

Assessments should identify Best Practices. This must be a key objective of assessment and focus should be on identifying the best practices w.r.t. different aspects of eGov project e.g. Business model, PPP model, Change

\textsuperscript{80} Gupta Piyush, Pranav K Vasishta, R K Bagga, Approach and Methodology for Project Assessment Ī CSI-Nihilent e-Governance Award 2006-07, page 39 published in Compendium of eGovernance initiatives in India, Piyush Gupta, R K Bagga, Universities Press
Management strategy, technology architecture, Service levels, etc. Presently, the assessments study the models and practices being adopted in the specific projects and do not have an objective to bring out the best practices from them.

### 3.3.3 What should be the periodicity of assessments?

Different components of assessment can be assessed only after a certain period of deployment of the e-Gov project. A complete assessment on all components cannot be carried out altogether at the same time. Actually, one set of assessment as checklist would be recommended just before the project is being implemented. Subsequently, assessment could be done on yearly basis. This could be considered as an extension to the yearly audit process, and be included as a regular feature of work in office. Since assessment provides critical inputs to the project owners for improvement, it can also act as a stakeholder need assessment tool.

### 3.3.4 Who should do the assessment?

Presently it is being stressed that an external agency should do the assessment in order to get an unbiased view. This agency is primarily dependent on the project owners for all the project related information. Secondly there is a stakeholder survey, which is also conducted by the
third party. The issue is that why not develop a self assessment framework? Since the Government might not have the necessary skills and capacity to conduct the survey, it could be done by a third party. It is necessary to come out of the accountability and controls built only by the third party assessment, and rely on self appraisal. In fact, by providing a self-assessment tool the project owners shall be in a better position to assess the projects on an on-going basis. Moreover they have the assessment indicators and attributes as yardstick for assessing the projects right from the project conceptualization phase; thereby developing efficient and holistic e-Government projects.

3.3.4 Constraints Driving Project Assessment

a) Inadequate Time for Assessment

In order to get a really good and useful assessment of the project, sufficient time not being devoted for the assessment exercise is a challenge to be addressed. It is important to understand that a lot of data and information needs to be collected or provided for an assessment. This is in order to understand the various dimensions of the project. However, in reality adequate seriousness is not given to this exercise by the top policy level officials; and junior officials are given the responsibility to coordinate the assessment exercise. In absence of quality data and information about the project, the assessment does not
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provide the correct view of project and thereby the whole assessment exercise merely becomes another routine chore.

**b) Lack of a comprehensive assessment framework**

One can look at various assessment models being adopted for the eGov projects, which are developed on basis of the objectives set for that specific assessment. Different assessment institutions identify indicators on different dimensions of the project and its stakeholders. Thus, one assessment study report would not give a complete understanding of the project. There is a need to develop an assessment maturity model, maybe based on the Gartner eGov maturity model, and identify only the basic level indicators.

c) **Non-availability of base-line data**

In order to see the improvements over previous systems, it is extremely important to have the data on the functioning of the services prior to implementing the new system. The base line data is basically the as-is processes studied at the project conceptualization phase. In most of the projects, it has been seen that the base-line data was not captured; hence it is taken as a perception of the stakeholder, thereby giving an incorrect assessment of the impact made by the project.
d) Lack of high visibility for assessment reports

It has been seen that most of the time the assessments are done as part mandatory requirement of the project and once the said task requirement is completed, the report is shelved and forgotten. It is not surprising, that the assessment reports are not even seen or read by most of the senior policy level or other stakeholders in the project. In case there is high transparency and visibility given to the assessment report, it will provide sufficient learning for the project owners.

e) Lack of funds required for holistic assessment

As we have seen earlier that a holistic and comprehensive assessment should require varied degree of expertise. This would also involve quite a lot of time resources for the surveys, travel, interviewing, study of secondary data, and analysis. Normally, an in-depth and holistic assessment study would require quite a lot of funding, which is normally unavailable.

Some of the other issues listed by Prof Bhatnagar as part of the Impact study framework are:

• Macro versus Micro Approach - unit of analysis

• Assessment from whose perspective?

---
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• Value and costs - measurability
• Dimensions on which impact can be assessed for different stakeholders
• Can all costs and benefits be monetized?
• How to isolate the effect of ICT use from different interventions?
• Degree of quantification versus qualitative assessment
• Measurement issues: absolute versus change, sampling, questionnaire design, analysis of internal data, triangulation

In 2005, the Center for Technology in Government, US in collaboration with SAP, hosted a consultative workshop on assessing public return on government investments in IT. Key Issues Characterizing the Complexity of Assessing Public ROI for Government IT Investments emerging out of deliberations are listed below:

• Lack of incentives to assess public ROI. There may be no consequences for absence of ROI or other demonstration of results.

• Lack of historical perspective and data. Government tends to be prospective (not retrospective), so it tends to focus on what should be done, but not on what has already been done.

• Governments have trouble harvesting savings, which often get moved around the budget.

---

• There is no straightforward quantitative bottom line value measure for RoI in public sector.
• Government is multidimensional. Non-linear, complex interactions among benefits—hard to measure results and link to specific programs or technologies, i.e., proving the casual relationship between the two.
• RoI requires advanced project management and portfolio management skills that are often lacking.
• Comprehensive RoI analysis can greatly increase transparency of government decisions and investment results. This level of transparency is risky in itself, thereby increasing the probability for embarrassment and criticism leading to loss of support.
• ROI is done in a vacuum. Not focused on the strategic investment.
• Lack of longer-term tracking and assessment makes it difficult to build a measurement model.
• It is hard to evaluate IT ROI elsewhere in the government enterprise because the outcome frameworks (inter-sectors) aren't established.

The research project at the Center for Technology in Government Research suggests the following themes to be explored:\textsuperscript{84}:

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
• Value and impact measurements should take into consideration the cost impacts on other business processes, by elimination or changes in the way we work together.

• Look for efficiency and cost-reduction in non-IT areas. IT is an enabler, and the purpose of IT is to enable other things, including changing the culture of organization, strategies, etc. Thus, it is important to see how IT is enabling returns in other areas.

• Assessment should include attention to how particular IT investment enables IT elsewhere. ROI analysis must get beyond evaluating things on a more traditional basis to include questions of outcomes for broader range of beneficiaries or stakeholders.

• Social cost-benefit analysis and political considerations involve different people making different decisions. It is important to understand how this may impact the IT aspect of ROI calculations.

• Need more attention to risks as well as benefits. Assessment should include attention to particular government sensitivity to risk factors.

• Method development should include system analysis that engages a broad scope of operations. Analysis should include questions about leadership, feasibility, political support as well as results/outcomes, how constituents and opponents will react.

• Focus assessment on question of getting ROI on the programs, not the IT; IT doesn’t deliver the outcomes.
• Portfolio management is a big theme in current discussion of IT management. As applied to public ROI, implies looking at the overall picture, not just a slice of the project.

• While benefits are measured in terms of traditional (financial), political and social factors, risks are measured based on other factors: (1) technical, (2) organizational, (3) time, and (4) political.

• Find relationships between inputs and outcomes. Once indicators are developed cause and effect relationships can be explored using econometric methods.

• Value of IT investment may be enabling change

• Find ways to ensure follow-through in delivery and assessment of government programs.

• Explore what are the attributes of a good public ROI model: measurable in different ways, creates expectations of performance and assessment at both IT and program levels, is integrated with the budget process, and is included in a yearly review.

3.4 Gaps in the existing Performance Assessment framework

There are some more similar issues and challenges pointed out in a study done by IIM Ahemdabad\(^5\) on impact assessment for e-Governance projects:

• Often evaluation studies had been done by agencies that may be seen as having an interest in showing a positive outcome.

---

Different studies of the same project showed very different outcomes, thus indicating a lack of credibility of the results.

Part of the reason for different outcomes was the use of a very small samples and a lack of rigor in sampling in collecting data from clients of the systems. The results could therefore not be easily generated over the entire population of clients.

The studies evaluated the functioning of the computerized system but were not able to assess the difference made by ICT use, as the need for counterfactuals was ignored.

Finally, since different studies did not use a standard methodology, it was difficult to compare the outcome for a project with other projects.

3.4.1 Some of the major gaps in reports produced using the existing assessment frameworks:

1. The assessment indicators in various frameworks/studies are mainly from the project owner perspective or as per expectations of the organization that is getting the assessment done. There is a need to provide a model to link the overall assessment indicators to the initial expectations of various stakeholders.

2. There is very less awareness and felt importance about the assessment frameworks and study reports amongst various stakeholders, especially those conceptualizing and implementing
projects. The reports are not really referred as part of a project conceptualization, or when looking at the best practices.

3. The assessment framework needs to provide scope for self-assessment, and as such provide sufficient value to undertake assessment for further improvements and learning’s. Therefore, there is a need for developing a generic eGovernment project assessment model, for the assessment study report to provide a higher level of value to all its stakeholders.

4. Most of the assessment frameworks are heavily dependent on subjective elements and therefore the assessment results will vary depending on the assessor. This would lead to uncertainty on the success/failure factor of the project.

5. All e-Government projects are being assessed using the same framework. Whereas there shall be projects which have been implemented for more than 3 years, and others that are in the initial first year of implementation. Then there would be projects which are pilots and others in the roll-out phase. All these project in different age-phases shall have different set of indicators for assessment.

One of the key factor that needs to be looked at is how to bring value to assessment exercise for the project owners, and secondly how can it contribute to the continuous improvement of the project in meeting
stakeholder expectations. A model is required that provides four guiding principles to build successful projects:

1. Firstly, incorporate various components that could address the need for application of the performance assessment framework at the initial stage of the project.
2. Secondly, provide an approach to identify assessment indicators and attributes within specified focused structure.
3. Thirdly, there should be an on-going value addition for the various stakeholders of the project.
4. And lastly, provide structured process when conceptualizing the project to build an efficient project to meet the expectations.

3.5 Objectives of Research Study

1. To study the key attributes of some of the performance assessment being used worldwide, especially related to e-Government projects.
2. To study the existing performance models being used in India for e-Government (G2C) projects.
3. To analyze the awareness, usefulness and value that assessment frameworks and performance assessment studies offer to projects.
4. To propose a performance assessment model, primarily for G2C projects that can add value right from the initial stages of a project.
5. To explore opportunity for application of the proposed model and create awareness.
3.6 Research Hypothesis

**H1.** Project stakeholder expectations from an e-Government project differ and should be taken into consideration in an assessment framework.

**H2.** Project team members are not aware of benefits of performance assessment frameworks.

**H3.** Project conceptualization would be better if the assessment frameworks, especially the indicators are identified by project teams during the initial stage of project.

**H4.** Self-assessment approach in the assessment framework would provide an opportunity for the project owners to keep a continuous check on improvements.

**H5.** A structured approach is required for categorizing various assessment indicators and sub-attributes.

3.7 Methodology of Study

1. Literature review and experience on basic understanding of e-Government

2. Literature review of existing National/International assessment framework/models:
i. EAF 2.0 (eGovernance Assessment Framework), NISG & IIM-A, India [2004]

ii. Impact Study model, IIM-Ahemedabad, India[2006]

iii. eGEP - European Model [2006]


v. VAM-DAM model, AGIMO-Australia

vi. A Public Value Framework

vii. Assessment Models associated with Awards:
   a. Stockholm Challenge Awards
   b. Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award,
   c. CII-EXIM Business Excellence Award
   d. e-Award for Excellence in e-Government - Australia
   e. CSI-Nihilent e-Governance Awards [2005-06]


   a. Design of survey questionnaire and conduct.
   b. Data analysis and interpretation.
   c. Conclusion and recommendations.