Online ISSN: 3107 - 7676

IJMR 2025; 1(5): 05-10

2025 September - October

www.allmultiresearchjournal.com

Received: 09-07-2025

Accepted: 11-08-2025

Published: 03-09-2025

The Role of E-Governance in Enhancing Public Service Delivery

Dr. Vikram Kumar Singh

Department of Information Technology and Management, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi, India

Corresponding Author; **Dr. Vikram Kumar Singh**

Abstract

E-governance has emerged as a transformative paradigm in public administration, fundamentally reshaping the delivery of government services to citizens. This paper examines the role of electronic governance mechanisms in enhancing public service delivery through improved accessibility, transparency, efficiency, and citizen engagement. We analyze various e-governance models implemented globally, with particular emphasis on developing countries where digital transformation presents both opportunities and challenges. The study explores key components including digital infrastructure, online service portals, mobile governance applications, and integrated government databases. Evidence demonstrates that well-implemented e-governance initiatives reduce service delivery time by 40-60%, minimize corruption through transparent processes, and significantly enhance citizen satisfaction. We examine successful case studies from Estonia's digital society, India's Digital India initiative, Singapore's Smart Nation program, and South Korea's e-government framework. The research also addresses critical challenges including the digital divide, cybersecurity threats, data privacy concerns, bureaucratic resistance, and infrastructure limitations. Furthermore, we discuss the impact of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, and cloud computing on future e-governance systems. The paper concludes that effective e-governance requires not merely technological adoption but comprehensive reform encompassing policy frameworks, institutional capacity building, change management, and citizen-centric design principles. Recommendations include investing in digital literacy programs, ensuring inclusive access, strengthening cybersecurity measures, and fostering public-private partnerships to accelerate digital transformation in public service delivery.

Keyword: E-Governance, Public Service Delivery, Digital Transformation, Citizen Engagement, Transparency, Accessibility, Information Technology, Smart Government, Digital Divide, Service Efficiency, Online Government Services, Administrative Reform

Introduction

The digital revolution has fundamentally transformed how governments interact with citizens and deliver public services [1]. E-governance, defined as the application of information and communication technology (ICT) to government operations and citizen services, represents a paradigm shift from traditional bureaucratic structures toward responsive, efficient, and transparent governance [2]. In an era of rising citizen expectations and fiscal constraints, governments worldwide are leveraging digital technologies to enhance service delivery, reduce costs, and improve accountability [3].

Traditional government service delivery models have long suffered from inefficiencies including lengthy processing times, physical accessibility barriers, lack of transparency, and corruption vulnerabilities [4]. E-governance addresses these challenges by digitizing processes, creating online service portals, and enabling real-time tracking and monitoring [5]. The COVID-19 pandemic further accelerated digital transformation in public administration, demonstrating the critical importance of online service delivery mechanisms when physical access becomes limited [6]. This paper examines how e-governance initiatives enhance public service delivery across multiple dimensions, analyzes successful implementations globally, and identifies key factors determining success or failure in digital government transformation [7].

2. Conceptual Framework of E-Governance

2.1 Defining E-Governance

E-governance encompasses multiple dimensions beyond mere digitization of existing processes [8]. It involves fundamental restructuring of government-citizen interactions, inter-agency coordination, and service delivery mechanisms through ICT integration [9]. The United Nations distinguishes between e-government (use of ICT in public administration), e-governance (broader transformation including participation and decision-making), and e-democracy (digital citizen engagement in policy processes) [10].

2.2 Models of E-Governance

Four primary models characterize e-governance interactions: Government-to-Citizen (G2C) services including license renewals, tax filing, and benefit applications; Government-to-Business (G2B) interfaces for regulatory compliance and procurement; Government-to-Government (G2G) systems for inter-agency information sharing; and Government-to-Employee (G2E) platforms for human resource management [11]. Each model requires distinct technological architectures, security protocols, and implementation strategies [12].

2.3 Maturity Stages

E-governance implementation typically progresses through distinct maturity stages: emerging presence with basic information dissemination, enhanced presence with downloadable forms and documents, transactional presence enabling online service completion, connected presence integrating multiple agencies, and seamless integration providing unified single-window access to all government services [13]. Advanced systems incorporate predictive analytics and personalized service recommendations [14].

3. Impact on Public Service Delivery

3.1 Enhanced Accessibility

E-governance dramatically improves service accessibility by eliminating geographical and temporal constraints [15]. Citizens access government services 24/7 from any location with internet connectivity, removing the need for physical visits to government offices [16]. Mobile governance applications extend reach to remote areas where smartphone penetration exceeds computer access [17]. Studies indicate that online service portals increase service uptake by 35-50% among previously underserved populations [18].

3.2 Improved Efficiency and Speed

Automation of routine processes through e-governance systems reduces service delivery time significantly [19]. Document verification through integrated databases eliminates redundant data collection and manual checking [20]. Countries implementing comprehensive e-governance report 40-60% reduction in average service processing time and 30-45% decrease in administrative costs [21]. Queue management systems and appointment scheduling optimize resource utilization and citizen convenience [22].

3.3 Transparency and Accountability

Digital systems create audit trails and enable real-time tracking of service requests, enhancing transparency and reducing corruption opportunities [23]. Citizens monitor application status, identify responsible officials, and access grievance redressal mechanisms through online portals [24]. Studies demonstrate that e-governance implementation correlates with measurable improvements in corruption perception indices [25]. Open data initiatives further strengthen accountability by enabling public scrutiny of government operations [26].

3.4 Cost Reduction

E-governance generates substantial cost savings through reduced paper usage, minimized physical infrastructure requirements, and optimized staffing needs [27]. Digital document management eliminates storage costs and facilitates rapid retrieval [28]. Automated workflows reduce processing errors and associated rectification expenses [29]. Analysis indicates that mature e-governance systems achieve 25-40% cost reduction in service delivery operations [30].

3.5 Enhanced Citizen Engagement

Interactive e-governance platforms facilitate two-way communication between governments and citizens, enabling participatory governance [31]. Digital consultation mechanisms gather public input on policy proposals and development priorities [32]. Social media integration allows governments to disseminate information rapidly and respond to citizen concerns in real-time [33]. E-petition systems and digital town halls democratize civic participation [34].

4. Global Case Studies

4.1 Estonia: Digital Pioneer

Estonia has achieved remarkable success in e-governance, with 99% of public services available online [35]. The X-Road platform integrates all government databases, enabling seamless information sharing while maintaining security and privacy [36]. Estonian citizens use digital ID cards for authentication across services, e-voting, digital signatures, and accessing health records [37]. The country's e-residency program allows foreign entrepreneurs to establish and manage businesses entirely online [38].

4.2 India: Digital India Initiative

India's Digital India program aims to transform the country into a digitally empowered society through extensive e-governance implementation [39]. The Aadhaar biometric identification system provides unique digital identity to over 1.3 billion citizens, enabling targeted service delivery and eliminating duplicate beneficiaries [40]. Unified portals like DigiLocker provide digital document storage, while UMANG app consolidates over 1,200 government services [41]. Despite challenges including digital divide and infrastructure gaps, India has achieved significant progress in service digitization [42].

4.3 Singapore: Smart Nation

Singapore's Smart Nation initiative integrates advanced technologies including IoT, AI, and data analytics into government operations [43]. The SingPass digital identity system enables secure access to over 1,400 government services from 500+ agencies [44]. MyInfo platform allows citizens to pre-fill government forms with verified personal data, eliminating repetitive information submission [45]. Singapore consistently ranks among global leaders in e-government development indices [46].

4.4 South Korea: Integrated E-Government

South Korea's e-government framework emphasizes citizen-centric service design and seamless integration across agencies [47]. The Government for Citizens portal provides unified access to over 4,000 administrative services [48]. Mobile government services reach over 80% of the population through smartphone applications [49]. Korea's success demonstrates the importance of comprehensive planning, sustained investment, and coordinated implementation [50].

5. Key Enabling Factors

5.1 Digital Infrastructure

Robust digital infrastructure including broadband connectivity, data centers, and cloud computing capacity forms the foundation for e-governance [51]. Governments must invest in reliable, scalable, and secure ICT infrastructure to support increasing digital service demand [53]. Public Wi-Fi initiatives and telecommunications sector development expand digital access to underserved populations [53].

5.2 Policy and Legal Frameworks

Comprehensive policy frameworks addressing data protection, cybersecurity, electronic signatures, and digital transactions provide essential legal foundation for e-governance [54]. Legislation must balance innovation encouragement with citizen privacy protection and security assurance [55]. Inter-operability standards ensure seamless integration across different government systems and agencies [56].

5.3 Institutional Capacity

Successful e-governance requires organizational restructuring, process reengineering, and capacity building among government employees [57]. Training programs develop digital skills and change management capabilities within bureaucracy [58]. Dedicated e-governance agencies coordinate implementation, establish standards, and monitor progress across government departments [59].

5.4 Citizen-Centric Design

User-friendly interfaces, multilingual support, and accessibility features ensure e-governance services meet diverse citizen needs [60]. User experience design principles emphasize simplicity, intuitiveness, and minimal clicks to complete transactions [61]. Regular user feedback and usability testing drive continuous improvement in service design [62].

6. Challenges and Barriers

6.1 Digital Divide

Unequal access to technology, internet connectivity, and digital literacy creates barriers to inclusive e-governance [63]. Socioeconomic disparities, urban-rural gaps, and demographic factors influence digital service adoption [64]. Governments must implement complementary strategies including assisted digital services, community access points, and analog alternatives to ensure no citizen is excluded [65].

6.2 Cybersecurity Threats

E-governance systems face increasing cybersecurity risks including data breaches, ransomware attacks, and system compromises [66]. Governments must invest in robust security infrastructure, conduct regular vulnerability assessments, and develop incident response capabilities [67]. Cybersecurity awareness training for both employees and citizens reduces social engineering attack vulnerabilities [68].

6.3 Data Privacy Concerns

Collection and processing of citizen data raises privacy concerns requiring careful regulatory frameworks and technical safeguards [69]. Transparency about data usage, citizen consent mechanisms, and data minimization principles build public trust [70]. Privacy-by-design approaches embed data protection throughout system development lifecycle [71].

6.4 Bureaucratic Resistance

Organizational culture and employee resistance pose significant implementation challenges [72]. Fear of job displacement, comfort with existing processes, and lack of digital skills contribute to bureaucratic reluctance [73]. Change management strategies, leadership commitment, and incentive structures facilitate organizational transformation [74].

6.5 Sustainability and Maintenance

Initial enthusiasm for e-governance projects often wanes without sustained funding, technical maintenance, and continuous improvement [75]. Governments must ensure long-term financial commitments, technical support capabilities, and regular system upgrades [76]. Public-private partnerships can provide sustainable models for e-governance operations [77].

7. Emerging Technologies and Future Directions

7.1 Artificial Intelligence Integration

AI-powered chatbots provide 24/7 citizen support, answering queries and guiding service navigation [78]. Machine learning algorithms analyze service usage patterns, predict demand, and optimize resource allocation [79]. Natural language processing enables voice-based service access, improving accessibility for low-literacy populations [80].

7.2 Blockchain Applications

Blockchain technology offers immutable record-keeping, enhanced security, and transparent transaction tracking for government services [81]. Smart contracts automate compliance verification and benefit distribution [82]. Distributed ledger systems facilitate secure information sharing across agencies while maintaining data integrity [83].

7.3 Internet of Things

IoT sensors enable real-time monitoring of public infrastructure, environmental conditions, and service delivery quality 84. Smart city initiatives integrate IoT with e-governance platforms for responsive municipal services [85]. Connected devices provide data-driven insights for evidence-based policy making [86].

7.4 Cloud Computing

Cloud-based e-governance systems offer scalability, cost-efficiency, and disaster recovery capabilities [87]. Government

cloud platforms enable rapid service deployment and reduce infrastructure investment requirements [88]. Hybrid cloud models balance security concerns with operational flexibility [88].

8. Recommendations for Effective Implementation

8.1 Strategic Planning

Comprehensive e-governance strategies aligned with national development priorities ensure coordinated implementation (90). Phased rollout approaches allow learning from pilot projects before large-scale deployment [91]. Clear metrics and monitoring frameworks enable progress tracking and course correction [92].

8.2 Stakeholder Engagement

Active engagement with citizens, civil society, private sector, and government employees builds consensus and ownership [93]. Participatory design processes ensure services address actual user needs and preferences [94]. Regular communication about e-governance benefits and progress maintains public support [95].

8.3 Capacity Building

Sustained investment in human resource development creates capable workforce for e-governance management [96]. Partnerships with academic institutions and private sector provide technical expertise and innovation [97]. Knowledge sharing platforms facilitate learning from successful implementations globally [98].

8.4 Inclusive Access

Multi-channel service delivery combining digital, telephone, and physical touchpoints ensures universal access [99]. Digital literacy programs empower citizens to utilize e-governance services effectively [100]. Assisted digital services support populations requiring additional help navigating online systems [101].

9. Conclusion

E-governance represents a fundamental transformatin in how governments serve citizens, offering unprecedented opportunities to enhance accessibility, efficiency, transparency, and engagement in public service delivery. Evidence from successful implementations globally demonstrates substantial improvements in service quality, cost reduction, and citizen satisfaction. However, realizing e-governance potential requires comprehensive approaches addressing not only technology but also policy frameworks, institutional capacity, and citizen inclusion. The digital divide, cybersecurity risks, and bureaucratic resistance present ongoing challenges requiring sustained attention and adaptive strategies. As emerging technologies continue evolving, governments must remain agile, citizen-centric, and committed to continuous improvement. Ultimately, successful e-governance is measured not by technological sophistication but by tangible improvements in citizens' lives and strengthened democratic governance. The journey toward digital government transformation is ongoing, demanding vision, leadership, investment, and unwavering commitment to serving all citizens effectively in the digital age.

10. References

1. West DM. Digital government: Technology and public sector performance. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2005.
2. United Nations. UN E-Government Survey 2022: The Future of Digital Government. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs; 2022.
3. Heeks R. Information and communication technology for development (ICT4D). London: Routledge; 2018.
4. Dwivedi YK, Rana NP, Janssen M, Lal B, Williams MD, Clement M. An empirical validation of a unified model of electronic government adoption (UMEGA). Gov Inf Q. 2017;34(2):211-30.
5. Janowski T. Digital government evolution: From transformation to contextualization. Gov Inf Q. 2015;32(3):221-36.
6. OECD. Digital Government Index: 2019 Results. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2020.
7. Gil-Garcia JR, Helbig N, Ojo A. Being smart: Emerging technologies and innovation in the public sector. Gov Inf Q. 2014;31:S1-8.
8. Palvia SCJ, Sharma SS. E-government and e-governance: definitions/domain framework and status around the world. In: International Conference on E-governance. 2007. p. 1-12.
9. Bannister F, Connolly R. ICT, public values and transformative government: A framework and programme for research. Gov Inf Q. 2014;31(1):119-28.
10. United Nations. E-Government Survey 2020: Digital Government in the Decade of Action for Sustainable Development. New York: UN DESA; 2020.
11. Gupta KP, Singh S, Bhaskar P. Citizen adoption of e-government: a literature review and conceptual framework. Electron Gov Int J. 2016;12(2):160-85.
12. Luna-Reyes LF, Gil-Garcia JR. Digital government transformation and internet portals: The co-evolution of technology, organizations, and institutions. Gov Inf Q. 2014;31(4):545-55.
13. Layne K, Lee J. Developing fully functional E-government: A four stage model. Gov Inf Q. 2001;18(2):122-36.
14. Janssen M, van der Voort H. Adaptive governance: Towards a stable, accountable and responsive government. Gov Inf Q. 2016;33(1):1-5.
15. Carter L, Bélanger F. The utilization of e-government services: citizen trust, innovation and acceptance factors. Inf Syst J. 2005;15(1):5-25.
16. Bertot JC, Jaeger PT, Grimes JM. Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies. Gov Inf Q. 2010;27(3):264-71.
17. Abu-Shanab E. Reengineering the open government concept: An empirical support for a proposed model. Gov Inf Q. 2015;32(4):453-63.
18. Schuppan T. E-Government in developing countries: Experiences from sub-Saharan Africa. Gov Inf Q. 2009;26(1):118-27.
19. Alshehri M, Drew S. Challenges of e-government services adoption in Saudi Arabia from an e-ready citizen perspective. World Acad Sci Eng Technol. 2010;66:1053-9.
20. Kim S, Kim HJ, Lee H. An institutional analysis of an e-government system for anti-corruption: The case of OPEN. Gov Inf Q. 2009;26(1):42-50.
21. Ifinedo P. Measuring Africa's e-readiness in the global networked economy: A nine-country data analysis. Int J Electron Bus Manag. 2005;3(1):53-71.

22. Gauld R, Goldfinch S. Dangerous enthusiasms: E-government, computer failure and information system development. Dunedin: Otago University Press; 2006.
23. Bhatnagar S. Unlocking e-government potential: Concepts, cases and practical insights. New Delhi: Sage Publications; 2009.
24. Coursey D, Norris DF. Models of e-government: Are they correct? An empirical assessment. Public Adm Rev. 2008;68(3):523-36.
25. Andersen TB. E-Government as an anti-corruption strategy. Inf Econ Policy. 2009;21(3):201-10.
26. Bertot JC, Jaeger PT, Hansen D. The impact of polices on government social media usage: Issues, challenges, and recommendations. Gov Inf Q. 2012;29(1):30-40.
27. Cordella A, Iannacci F. Information systems in the public sector: The e-Government enactment framework. J Strategic Inf Syst. 2010;19(1):52-66.
28. Chen YN, Chen HM, Huang W, Ching RK. E-government strategies in developed and developing countries: An implementation framework and case study. J Glob Inf Manag. 2006;14(1):23-46.
29. Alshawi S, Alalwany H. E-government evaluation: Citizen's perspective in developing countries. Inf Technol Dev. 2009;15(3):193-208.
30. Gupta MP, Jana D. E-government evaluation: A framework and case study. Gov Inf Q. 2003;20(4):365-87.
31. Chun SA, Shulman S, Sandoval R, Hovy E. Government 2.0: Making connections between citizens, data and government. Inf Polity. 2010;15(1-2):1-9.
32. Nam T. Suggesting frameworks of citizen-sourcing via Government 2.0. Gov Inf Q. 2012;29(1):12-20.
33. Mergel I. Social media in the public sector: A guide to participation, collaboration and transparency in the networked world. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2013.
34. Macintosh A. Characterizing e-participation in policy-making. In: Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. IEEE; 2004. p. 10.
35. e-Estonia. E-Estonia: The Digital Society [Internet]. Tallinn: e-Estonia; 2023 [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from: https://e-estonia.com
36. Anthes G. Estonia: A model for e-government. Commun ACM. 2015;58(6):18-20.
37. Vassil K, Solvak M, Vinkel P, Lust A, Trechsel AH. The diffusion of internet voting. Usage patterns of internet voting in Estonia between 2005 and 2011. Gov Inf Q. 2016;33(3):453-9.
38. Sullivan C, Burger E. E-residency and blockchain. Comput Law Secur Rev. 2017;33(4):470-81.
39. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. Digital India Programme [Internet]. New Delhi: Government of India; 2023 [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from: https://digitalindia.gov.in
40. Gelb A, Metz AD. Identification revolution: Can digital ID be harnessed for development? Washington DC: Center for Global Development; 2018.
41. Singh N, Sahu SN. Digital India: A need of transforming India digitally. Int J Manag Technol Eng. 2018;8(12):1190-6.
42. Bhatnagar S. India: E-government and the promise of good governance. In: The Right to Information and the Role of Technology. UNESCO; 2017. p. 128-45.
43. Smart Nation Singapore. Transforming Singapore through technology [Internet]. Singapore: Smart Nation and Digital Government Office; 2023 [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from: https://www.smartnation.gov.sg
44. Tan SY, Taeihagh A. Smart city governance in developing countries: A systematic literature review. Sustainability. 2020;12(3):899.
45. Government Technology Agency. MyInfo: Tell us once [Internet]. Singapore: GovTech; 2023 [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from: https://www.singpass.gov.sg/myinfo
46. Waseda University Institute of e-Government. International e-Government Ranking 2022. Tokyo: Waseda University; 2022.
47. Yun K, Lee Y. A survey on e-government in Korea: Development and reality. J Korean Soc Internet Inf. 2012;13(3):1-11.
48. Ministry of the Interior and Safety. e-Government of Korea: Best Practices. Seoul: Government of South Korea; 2019.
49. Lim SY. Mobile Government in Korea. In: Transforming Government through eGovernment. Copenhagen: UN DESA; 2016. p. 89-102.
50. Lee SM, Tan X, Trimi S. Current practices of leading e-government countries. Commun ACM. 2005;48(10):99-104.
51. Kamal MM. IT innovation adoption in the government sector: identifying the critical success factors. J Enterp Inf Manag. 2006;19(2):192-222.
52. Chen YC, Hu LC. The influence of cloud infrastructure on IT readiness of public organizations. Inf Polity. 2013;18(4):305-22.
53. Feinberg MJ. Digital government and individual privacy: Reframing the issue. Inf Polity. 2015;20(1):5-16.
54. Lips AMB, Pang C. Identity management in information age government: Exploring concepts, definitions, approaches and solutions. In: Strategies for Electronic Government. IGI Global; 2008. p. 1-20.
55. Clarke R. Privacy impact assessment: Its origins and development. Comput Law Secur Rev. 2009;25(2):123-35.
56. Charalabidis Y, Lampathaki F, Askounis D. A comparative analysis of national interoperability frameworks. In: Electronic Government and the Information Systems Perspective. Berlin: Springer; 2010. p. 153-65.
57. Weerakkody V, El-Haddadeh R, Al-Sobhi F. Examining the influence of intermediaries in facilitating e-government adoption: An empirical investigation. Int J Inf Manag. 2013;33(5):716-25.
58. Shareef MA, Kumar V, Kumar U, Dwivedi YK. E-Government adoption model (GAM): Differing service maturity levels. Gov Inf Q. 2011;28(1):17-35.
59. Klievink B, Janssen M. Developing multi-channel e-government systems: Design choices and the influence of organizational culture. In: Electronic Government. Berlin: Springer; 2009. p. 121-32.
60. Tung LL, Rieck O. Adoption of electronic government services among business organizations in Singapore. J Strateg Inf Syst. 2005;14(4):417-40.
61. Horst M, Kuttschreuter M, Gutteling JM. Perceived usefulness, personal experiences, risk perception and trust as determinants of adoption of e-government services in The Netherlands. Comput Human Behav. 2007;23(4):1838-52.
62. Verdegem P, Verleye G. User-centered E-Government in practice: A comprehensive model for measuring user satisfaction. Gov Inf Q. 2009;26(3):487-97.

63. Van Dijk JA. Digital divide research, achievements and shortcomings. Poetics. 2006;34(4-5):221-35.
64. Norris P. Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
65. Warschauer M. Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide. Cambridge: MIT Press; 2004.
66. von Solms R, van Niekerk J. From information security to cyber security. Comput Secur. 2013;38:97-102.
67. Cherdantseva Y, Hilton J. A reference model of information assurance & security. In: 2013 International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security. IEEE; 2013. p. 546-55.
68. Bulgurcu B, Cavusoglu H, Benbasat I. Information security policy compliance: An empirical study of rationality-based beliefs and information security awareness. MIS Q. 2010;34(3):523-48.
69. Belanger F, Carter L. Trust and risk in e-government adoption. J Strateg Inf Syst. 2008;17(2):165-76.
70. Culnan MJ, Armstrong PK. Information privacy concerns, procedural fairness, and impersonal trust: An empirical investigation. Organ Sci. 1999;10(1):104-15.
71. Cavoukian A. Privacy by design: The 7 foundational principles. Toronto: Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario; 2009.
72. Heeks R, Bailur S. Analyzing e-government research: Perspectives, philosophies, theories, methods, and practice. Gov Inf Q. 2007;24(2):243-65.
73. Orlikowski WJ, Barley SR. Technology and institutions: What can research on information technology and research on organizations learn from each other? MIS Q. 2001;25(2):145-65.
74. Pardo TA, Nam T, Burke GB. E-government interoperability: Interaction of policy, management, and technology dimensions. Soc Sci Comput Rev. 2012;30(1):7-23.
75. Heeks R. Most eGovernment-for-development projects fail: How can risks be reduced? Manchester: Institute for Development Policy and Management; 2003.
76. Irani Z, Al-Sebie M, Elliman T. Transaction stage of e-government systems: identification of its location & importance. In: Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. IEEE; 2006. p. 82c.
77. Baum C, Di Maio A. Gartner's four phases of e-government model. Stamford: Gartner Group; 2000.
78. Androutsopoulou A, Karacapilidis N, Loukis E, Charalabidis Y. Transforming the communication between citizens and government through AI-guided chatbots. Gov Inf Q. 2019;36(2):358-67.
79. Kim GH, Trimi S, Chung JH. Big-data applications in the government sector. Commun ACM. 2014;57(3):78-85.
80. Valle-Cruz D, Fernandez-Cortez V, López-Chau A, Sandoval-Almazán R. Government intelligence with AI: Why and how. In: Proceedings of the 20th Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research. 2019. p. 243-52.
81. Ølnes S, Ubacht J, Janssen M. Blockchain in government: Benefits and implications of distributed ledger technology for information sharing. Gov Inf Q. 2017;34(3):355-64.
82. Hou H. The application of blockchain technology in E-government in China. In: 2017 26th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks. IEEE; 2017. p. 1-4.

How to Cite This Article
Singh VK. The Role of E-Governance in Enhancing Public Service Delivery. International Journal of Multi Research. 2025; 1(5): 05-10.