

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.51.03.24>

How to Cite:

Pyroha, I., Tokarchuk, L., Perezhniak, B., Nikitenko, L., & Berch, V. (2022). E-democracy: an urgent need or a tribute to fashion? Legal analysis. *Amazonia Investiga*, 11(51), 240-249. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.51.03.24>

## E-democracy: an urgent need or a tribute to fashion? Legal analysis

### Електронна демократія: нагальна потреба або данина моді? Правовий аналіз

Received: February 15, 2022

Accepted: March 15, 2022

Written by:

**Ihor Pyroha**<sup>92</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2798-7795>**Liudmyla Tokarchuk**<sup>93</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9691-148X>**Boris Perezhniak**<sup>94</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4096-0861>**Liliia Nikitenko**<sup>95</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2152-4255>**Veronika Berch**<sup>96</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3837-4724>

#### Abstract

The development of the information society and the strengthening of e-democracy have already become an important priority for many countries around the world at the present stage of development. The implementation of this priority implies open and transparent public administration, and thus the transformation of political institutions and processes and the introduction of new forms of government. It is meaningful to analyze the concept of "e-democracy" and to understand the importance of ensuring this in the mechanism for the democracy of each individual state. The object of research is the legal analysis of e-democracy in view of the legal realities of foreign countries. The aim of the article is a legal analysis of the concept of "electronic democracy", including problematic issues of implementation of this mechanism, in order to understand whether this mechanism is an urgent need, or is a tribute to fashion and trends in the world practice. During the study, the following methods were used: systemic, systemic-functional, comparative, sociological, analysis, synthesis, analogy, observation, classification, statistical analysis.

#### Анотація

Розвиток інформаційного суспільства і посилення електронної демократії вже стали важливим пріоритетом діяльності багатьох держав світу на сучасному етапі розвитку. Впровадження даного пріоритету передбачає відкрите та прозоре державне управління, а отже трансформацію політичних інститутів та процесів та запровадження новітніх форм урядування. Важливо проаналізувати поняття "електронна демократія" та зрозуміти ступінь важливості забезпечення даного в механізмі для демократії кожної окремої держави. Об'єктом дослідження є правовий аналіз електронної демократії з огляду на правові реалії зарубіжних країн. Метою статті є правовий аналіз поняття "електронна демократія", в тому числі проблемних питань реалізації даного механізму, з метою розуміння чи є даний механізм нагальною потребою, чи виступає даниною моді та тенденціям світової практики. Під час дослідження було використано такі методи як: системний, системно-функціональний, порівняльний, соціологічний, аналізу, синтезу, аналогії, спостереження, класифікації, статистичного

<sup>92</sup> Doctor of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Constitutional Law and Comparative Law, Uzhorod National University, Ukraine.

<sup>93</sup> Doctor of Legal Sciences, Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Law of Odessa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine.

<sup>94</sup> Ph. D., Professor of Constitutional Law Department of National University "Odessa Law Academy", Honored Lawyer of Ukraine, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Higher Education of Ukraine, Ukraine.

<sup>95</sup> Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Department of Constitutional, International and Criminal Law, Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, Ukraine.

<sup>96</sup> Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Department of Constitutional Law and Comparative Law, Faculty of Law, Uzhhorod National University, Ukraine.



The article analyzes the phenomenon of e-democracy, identifies the main approaches to understanding it. On the example of international experience the mechanisms of e-democracy and the peculiarities of e-government are identified. There are propositions to improve the domestic legal mechanism for e-government in the article.

**Keywords:** public administration, e-democracy, e-technologies, e-government, electronic court, justice.

## Introduction

The dynamic development of information technology, the spread of the Internet, the global scale of communications contributes to the creation of new social orders, which dictate new strategies for interaction between state and citizens.

The transition to the information society involves the transformation of political institutions and processes, as well as the introduction of completely new forms of government. Thus, the reduction of temporal and spatial barriers caused by the emergence of unknown information and communication tools is accompanied by previously unknown modern requirements for technological support of public administration. Equally important, the world's traditional bureaucratic centralized governance models show the inability to respond on time to constant changes in reality with the necessary speed and optimality, resulting in the search for new strategies for governance and interaction between society and society, and the development of e-democracy.

At the beginning of the XXI century, positive preconditions were created for the synergetic combination of digital and democratic scenarios of social development. Democracy before this period was a product of its time when effective representation was limited by separation in time and space. Today, these barriers are overcome through communication technologies that are asynchronous and global, so democracy can only develop if democratic institutions become more receptive, accessible, accountable, and rooted in the information space. The development and implementation of e-democracy policies by public authorities, and especially local governments, only makes sense if these authorities anticipate that such policies require the use of the Internet and other digital

analізу. У статті проаналізовано феномен електронної демократії, визначено основні підходи до її розуміння. На прикладі міжнародного досвіду визначено механізми забезпечення електронної демократії та особливостей електронного урядування. У статті містяться пропозиції з удосконалення вітчизняного правового механізму забезпечення електронного урядування.

**Ключові слова:** державне управління, електронна демократія, електронні технології, електронне урядування, електронний суд, правосуддя.

technologies to develop and strengthen democratic practices. We are not talking about e-democracy as informatization of administrative procedures, but as a force that can revive and renew the democratic political process, as the only way to create a space of trust and political interaction. Simultaneously, in the era of administrative modernization, the tools of e-democracy must be organically integrated into the structure and culture of government. Without this, the public will consider e-democracy initiatives to be fake and will try to establish their own counter-government communications (Semenchenko, & Dreshpak, 2017).

The use of information technology expands the ability of public authorities to quickly communicate their decisions to the general public, receive quality and timely feedback from citizens, and citizens have the opportunity to participate in the political process, in particular by raising the level of their awareness of current issues, the activities of public authorities and local governments, as well as to offer alternative ways to solve certain problems, to receive quality services.

Thus, in the digital society, one of the mechanisms for developing mutual understanding and achieving a common goal is considered to be e-democracy. However, with inadequate data security, lack of sufficient secure interoperability tools, imperfect legal framework, and the possibility of hacking attacks on management resources and tools, the urgency of implementing e-democracy tools is questionable, due to the negative consequences of such implementation.

Given this circumstance, it is necessary to establish the advantages and disadvantages of e-democracy, the risks of its mechanisms, and

understand whether e-democracy is an urgent need or a trend in world practice.

### Theoretical Framework or Literature Review

As for the theoretical framework of the study the works by the following scholars are devoted to the study of e-democracy: Barikova (2016), Bryzhko, Tsymbalyuk, Shvets, Koval, and Bazanov (2006), Vasylieva (2021), Dekalyuk (2020), Emelyanova, and Loboyko (2020), Ishchenko (2012), Zhovnirchuk, and Kvasyuk (2020), Zolotar (2017), Konashevska and Kiselyova (2017), Konstantinovskaya (2018), Orlovska, Kakhovych, and Kvaktun (2021), Ryabchynska (2021), Semenchenko, and Dreshpak (2017), Solovyov (2015), Chukut (2008), Shchebetun, and Dovgan (2020).

Thus, Barikova (2016) investigated the issue of the effectiveness of e-government. In her work, the author drew attention to the reform of the information sphere in Ukraine given the processes of European integration. In general, the paper uses foreign experience in the legal regulation of e-government and e-democracy, public administration in the field of circulation, and protection of information. The authors studied the prospects of information transformation, given that today information technology and information resources play a prime role in the processes of intellectualization of man and society, in the accumulation of new knowledge, development of culture, education, science. Traditional methods of information support of scientific research are being replaced by new ones. The authors also drew attention to the fact that the information sphere is becoming not only one of the most influential areas of international cooperation but also an object of competition. Countries and regions with a more developed information system, the level of new information relations, pursuing their interests and setting their standards to achieve them, determine the conditions for the formation and operation of information infrastructure in other countries. A less developed country lags in the speed of creating new knowledge and is forced to use information resources, technical, technological, and organizational solutions that are imposed, as a result of which it falls into the web of information dependence. And constant information expansion allows to orient and "dose" its scientific-technological and economic development. Therefore, the maintenance of information security and the development of the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the formation of national

information policy should be considered as a priority and ongoing task of the state.

Promising tools of e-democracy in Ukraine were studied by Vasylieva (2021). According to the researcher, promising tools for e-democracy are e-petitions and public budgets, which contribute to greater public involvement in the development and implementation of public policy, greater transparency, and openness of public administration. However, for the effective functioning of the institute of electronic petitions, it is vital to develop at the legislative level a clear and transparent procedure for the government's response to citizens' petitions, to establish clear control over the process of submitting e-petitions. Regarding the improvement of the organization and work of public budgets in Ukraine, it is necessary to conduct a broad information campaign that will raise public awareness of the exercise of their right to participate in the budget process.

International experience in implementing the concept of e-government was studied by Dekalyuk (2020). But Ishchenko (2012) analyzed the foreign experience of implementing e-government in detail in his work.

Information on statistics, namely the index of local e-democracy in Ukraine, was taken from the work of Emelyanova and Loboyko (2020).

Strategic issues of implementation and development of e-democracy in Ukraine in the context of decentralization were analyzed by Zhovnirchuk and Kvasyuk (2020).

Zolotar (2017) highlighted the question of the boundary between e-democracy and digital dictatorship in his work. The author noted that in a democratic society, the introduction of information technology is designed to intensify democratic processes, provide members of society with greater opportunities and more effective tools for participation in the exercise of power. However, these processes should not be idealized, as there are risks of illegal use of personal data of citizens by private corporations, although a democratic state in such conditions has the legal and economic leverage to influence the offender. While in a non-democratic regime, information technology is used to improve the systems of total control over citizens by the state, the creation of a controlled society and such power cannot be limited in any way.

A detailed analysis of the implementation of the experience of developing e-democracy in Japan

and New Zealand in Ukraine was conducted (Konashevskaya, & Kiselyova, 2017).

Procedural issues related to the introduction of e-government in Ukraine, and their features, were studied by Konstantinovskaya (2018). The author stressed that for the introduction of e-government in Ukraine, there is a need to adopt the necessary laws, develop information infrastructure, create channels of electronic participation in public policy-making, seek investment to finance innovative public administration projects, etc.

Approaches to the definitions of e-government and e-democracy in his work were considered by researcher Mezentsev (2015).

The realities and challenges of the time regarding information democracy were the subjects of a study by Mytko (2014). The author analyzes in detail the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of information democracy, gives an interpretation of basic concepts and terms, defines the structure, functions, and objectives of information democracy for the political system.

A detailed analysis of e-democracy as a tool of public administration was carried out by Orlovskaya, Kakhovych, and Kvaktun (2021).

According to the authors, e-democracy should be understood as a new organizational form of social management, the feature of which is its implementation through information and communication technologies, and this organizational form is expected to implement the ideal form of democratic government making managerial decisions from citizens to their representatives in governing bodies, and takes place directly with the participation of citizens themselves. Also, the authors strongly believe that e-democracy is today the most important technological tool of public administration and administration, which maximizes the participation of civil society in management decision-making processes and humanizes public administration.

Ryabchynska (2021) was interested in the introduction of innovative tools for transparent e-democracy and the peculiarities of the Ministry of Digital Transformation's launch of the Interaction project.

Theoretical aspects of e-government and e-democracy were considered by Semenchenko and Dreshpak (2017).

Foreign theories of e-democracy and problematic conceptual issues of e-democracy in Ukraine were studied by Solovyov (2015). The author pointed out that the legislative consolidation of citizens' access to information initiated the development of e-democracy in Ukraine. The next step was the emergence of a law on electronic petitions, which directly regulates the relevant relations with the participation of citizens. The using of e-petitions in public administration requires further study, first of all, in the following aspects: the extent to which e-petitions reflect the mood of society on particular development issues; petitions of which level (local or national) have the greater support of citizens; the extent to which politicians and public figures can influence (manipulate) by creating e-petitions on public authorities.

The question of the essence and main stages of the implementation of e-democracy was studied by the scientist Chukut (2008). In his work, the author provided definitions of "e-democracy", as well as analyzed domestic and foreign experience in implementing e-government. Also, foreign experience in implementing e-democracy was analyzed by researchers Shchetun and Dovgan (2020).

But despite the considerable amount of research on e-democracy, comprehensive legal analysis of the urgent need for e-democracy or still, it is just a tribute to fashion, has not been conducted. Therefore, there is a need to clarify this issue.

### Methodology

A number of methods of scientific knowledge were used in the work on research, among which are analysis and synthesis, sociological, functional, system method, method of classification, statistical analysis, analogy.

The method of analysis was useful for the study of e-democracy, gradually dividing the study of the theoretical part of the object and the practical, which consists of the analysis of international experience in the use of information technology. Analytical assessment of the processes of information technology implementation makes it possible to identify patterns, according to which it becomes possible to identify particular features of e-democracy as a mechanism for ensuring effective interaction between state and society.

The research of social processes led to the development of the information society, which in turn showed the introduction of information

technology at the state level, including e-democracy and e-government. In addition, the sociological method made it possible to understand the mood of society to implement a special innovation mechanism.

To understand e-democracy as a holistic phenomenon in its system and functions, the functional method was used. This method was used to determine the guidelines for the implementation of e-democracy in different countries and to determine the main role of informatization in democratic processes.

In the future, it was logical to use the method of synthesis, i.e. the location of the analyzed parts alone, grouping by the similarity of features, or building a hierarchical system. Analysis and synthesis acted as fruitful methods of cognition because they were employed simultaneously. The method of synthesis allowed to gather the studied theoretical and practical aspects into a single whole to find the most effective mechanisms for implementing e-democracy.

During the study, a systematic method was used, in which the components of the analysis are considered as parts or elements of a particular holistic formation. These parts or elements, interacting with each other, determine the new, integral properties of the system, which are absent in its individual elements. Thus, the system method as a general scientific method is used in the consistent study of structural links between the achievements of foreign countries in the field of digitalization of public relations and public administration. This method also identifies and systematizes existing knowledge about e-democracy and e-government.

With the help of the method of classification, it became possible to divide the studied objects and phenomena into classes that differ in certain features. The grouping of data facilitated the perception of a large amount of information and made it comprehensive to formulate further conclusions and forecasts. In particular, the method of classification was used in identifying trends in the development of e-government, ways to legislate digital rights.

To create a useful system for the introduction of e-democracy in public life based on the experience of different countries and its transfer, taking into account the domestic peculiarities of the legal system in the complex, it is necessary to examine statistical data. Moreover, the method of statistical analysis was used to assess the object

of study not in isolation, but taking into account the influence of external factors on it.

## Results and Discussion

### *General provisions on e-democracy*

Before analyzing the legal framework of e-democracy and the feasibility of its implementation, it is necessary to provide definitions of "e-democracy".

In retrospect, the term "e-democracy" first appeared in the United States and quickly became commonplace in many parts of the world. Nevertheless, at present, there is no exact data on the authorship and origin of this term. Also, today there is no unambiguous definition of e-democracy. Each country has its approach to the characteristics of this term.

Ukrainian scientists emphasize the periodization of informatization: electrification, computerization, mediatization, and, finally, intellectualization – the process of developing society's ability to generate and perceive knowledge, i.e. increase intellectual potential, including the use of artificial intelligence. Thus, the main goal of social informatization is to build an intellectual society – a society based on knowledge (Semenchenko, & Dreshpak, 2017).

At the same time, in the legislation, according to these scientists, it is methodologically incorrect to use and promote the term "electronic" - e-democracy, e-economy, e-commerce, e-service, e-culture, e-education, and e-medicine. This language borrowing is not the only one, along with "digitalization" and its derivatives – digital democracy, digital signature, digital rights, as well as "cyber-" – cyber democracy, cybersecurity, cyberspace, cybercrime, etc. However, despite this circumstance, the concepts of "e-democracy", "e-commerce", "e-service", etc. are already firmly rooted in scientific and political-legal vocabulary, as evidenced by their use in social, political, legal sciences, as well as in international law and the legislation of the vast majority of developed countries. Moreover, the adjective "electronic" is often replaced by its English counterpart – the prefix "e-": e-democracy, e-voting, e-commerce, e-service, e-education, e-medicine, etc.

Given the above, it is possible to understand what distinguishes e-democracy from the democracy of "pre-digital" society.

Thus, e-democracy involves the participation of citizens in government at all levels (from public authorities and local self-government to self-organization of the population) through information and communication tools. At the same time, e-democracy cannot be considered as a separate policy outside the policy of democratization as such. That is, the existence of e-democracy is possible only if democracy is

provided as such. Simultaneously, if digital mechanisms are added to the “ordinary” democratic processes, such collaboration can significantly strengthen and accelerate democratic processes in all spheres of state life.

Domestic scientist Solovyov (2015) identifies two international approaches to understanding e-democracy (Table 1):

**Table 1.**

*Two international approaches to understanding e-democracy by Solovyov (2015).*

<b>Narrow approach</b>	<b>Broad approach</b>
use of information and communication technologies to ensure (electronic support) the rights of citizens	involvement of the community with the help of modern information technologies in solving various socio-political problems

Regarding the development of e-democracy, it should be remarked that the rapid development of e-democracy in Ukraine has been recognized by the UN since 2016 when Ukraine improved its position in the ranking of e-democracy. The latest results of the study of the UN e-participation index for 2020 show that Ukraine is in the top 50 countries, ranking 46th out of 193 countries. The UN e-Participation Index is part of the UN Global E-Government Survey, which has been conducted every two years since 2001 in UN member states to study the development of e-government (United Nations, 2020).

addition, public consultations and the functioning of the Interaction platform are among the essential and effective e-participation tools implemented in Ukraine. The purpose of the platform is to unite on one site different forms of communication between people and the executive branch, to implement convenient and transparent tools for participation in decision-making at the local and national levels. The task of Interaction is to bring everything into the digital space, simplify procedures and make them user-friendly. In general, the platform will be filled with such services as e-appeals and e-inquiries, e-consultations, e-petitions, e-contests, and government information (news, public reports of top officials) (Ryabchynska, 2021).

Also, at the state level since 2018 the project of the Center for Innovation Development of the study "Index of Local Electronic Democracy in Ukraine" is being implemented. The study for 2020 analyzed 31 cities of Ukraine together with all 22 regional centers (Emelyanova, & Loboyko, 2020). The above studies evaluate the implementation and development of basic e-democracy tools. Analyzing the work done, it was stated that the most common tools in Ukraine are electronic petitions and public budgets. At the same time, they are used both at the national and local levels. The above-mentioned tools of e-democracy help to involve the maximum number of citizens in the decision-making process. Equally necessary tools are the new tools that are currently under development and testing. In particular, in February 2022, the President of Ukraine announced that the Diya launched a "Poll" function among users of the application. The first questions will be simple and will concern the new digital services that have appeared in the Diya (Servant of the people, 2022). However, in the future, the poll will address other issues of state life. The head of state also reminded that direct democracy is one of the key points of his presidential program. In

The above shows that although there is no single definition of e-democracy in the world, there are common approaches that must be followed for its tools and mechanisms to work effectively.

An essential element of e-democracy is the e-justice system. Along with other government and administrative services, e-Justice is one of the elements of e-democracy, which is implemented to ensure accessibility, accountability, effective feedback, and general transparency in the activities of public authorities. Given that the judiciary is a fundamental component of democracy, e-justice can be considered one of the most significant aspects of e-democracy and necessary for judicial reform.

The e-Court project aims to solve the existing problems in the judicial system, namely:

- ensure access to justice through the exchange of electronic documents between all participants in the trial;
- reduce court costs for postal items and production of paper documents;
- improve and accelerate the transfer of judicial documents between courts, etc. (Akimov, 2018).

Therefore, e-justice is aimed at ensuring the quality of justice and significant savings in public funds.

### ***International experience in implementing e-democracy: problematic issues***

For the purpose of the complex legal analysis of electronic democracy, we will consider foreign experience on this question (Table 2).

**Table 2.**

*Implementation of e-democracy in Japan, New Zealand, USA, Switzerland, and Estonia. Data provided by Konashevskaya and Kiselyova (2017); Shebetun and Dovgan (2020).*

No	Country	Approach to e-democracy
1	Japan	<p>The country has an online government system, characterized by its openness and accessibility for all citizens, convenient and easy-to-use technologies, thanks to which the public-government dialogue brings effective results that are important for the development of the whole country. As Japan has experienced many natural disasters, the Internet Relay Program and the Business Continuity Plan (aka All-Year Parliament) have been set up to create a "virtual cloud" with all the resources to communicate. parliament with citizens, where all data, information, appeals on all troubling issues will be stored. When using such a system in combination with a terminal, in the event of a natural disaster or emergency, there will be a "gradual emergency closure" of the system. Thus, using the electronic communications system, the parliament's secretariat estimates that the state will preserve greenery totaling more than 2 million yen a year.</p> <p>Every citizen has a unique opportunity to "attend" parliamentary meetings through a system of point access and synchronization of the conference. Each report must be submitted electronically. Thus, everyone, joining the process online, can see what parliamentarians are saying at conferences, meetings, gatherings. E-democracy tools such as informing and advising citizens, giving them free access to timely material on government portals, having their web pages, etc. An example of how they work in Japan can be found on the Japanese Prem web portal. Prime Minister. To contact the Prime Minister of Japan Shinzo Abe, Japanese citizens simply need to go to the Minister's website and go to his account.</p> <p>The next element in the consideration of e-democracy in Japan is electronic voting. Electronic voting was introduced in the upper house of Japan's parliament in 1998, but due to a power outage, many voters were unable to vote and filed lawsuits. Therefore, electronic voting in Japan is currently abolished and voting is conducted only by ballot (Konashevskaya, &amp; Kiselyova, 2017).</p>
2	New Zealand	<p>New Zealand has shown a high level of e-democracy. An essential tool of e-democracy in New Zealand is the e-parliament. E-parliament refers to legislative, advisory, and debating assemblies at the international, state, regional and local levels; including many stakeholders: parliamentarians, politicians and civil servants, voters (citizens) and the media, etc. An e-parliament website has been set up in New Zealand, where parliamentarians pass laws, discuss important issues, and monitor the Government's activities. Including: how the parliament works, parliamentary business, election committees, deputies, and parties this week in parliament, publications and research, expressions of opinion, visits, history, and buildings, education, parliamentary research, administration. The e-Parliament portal also provides for the submission of electronic petitions by citizens.</p> <p>The next component is the development and operation of government portals. On web portals, every citizen has the opportunity to: consult; request</p>

		information from the government; register and vote in elections; complaint to the government department; find a member of parliament (Konashevskaya, & Kiselyova, 2017).
3	USA	For the first time in the United States, an e-government act has been passed. Experts in the United States are constantly developing several new initiatives aimed at facilitating online voting via the Internet. One example is the Colorado State Secretary S. Gessler's initiative, which works with Everyone Counts to enable voters to vote using iPad technology. The voter only has to press the screen a few times with his finger, making his choice (Shebetun, 2020).
4	Switzerland	The e-Voting electronic voting system is being implemented as part of the Vote électronique strategic project. The strategic perspective of Swiss democracy is the further development of Internet technologies for the direct participation of citizens in government (Shebetun, & Dovgan, 2020). Electronic voting has been used since 2005 in local elections, and since 2007 in parliamentary elections. The effectiveness of such a system was due to the existence of a developed legal framework for digital identification (for digital signatures, certificates, etc.), which came into force in 2002. In the process of voting, the data from the ID card is read. The expression of will is possible via the Internet within the set time for early voting (from 10 to 4 days before election day). The right to change the vote during early voting, both online and by traditional means, is also guaranteed (Shebetun, & Dovgan, 2020).
5	Estonia	

The examination of foreign legislation in e-government and e-democracy fields shows that the development of e-government legislation and democratic mechanisms are a general trend to preserve the features that depend on the political and legal culture. Thus, in some countries, e-government laws are complex. These laws establish the functions of executive bodies in the field of public services in electronic form, determine the procedure for interaction between them in the provision of public services, establish legal mechanisms to ensure information openness of executive bodies. In other countries, e-government is seen only as an opportunity to hold control through the system of electronic coding of information and the exchange of information and documentation via the Internet. In addition, these laws establish people's rights to access information about the activities of the executive branch, as well as the right to access information and communication technologies.

In general, for many countries, the approach in which e-democracy is associated with people with the way citizens participate in the affairs of the state is common. This approach is characterized by some scholars as narrow, as e-democracy is viewed through the prism of only one common feature, such as increasing citizen participation in decision-making by public authorities. On the other hand, e-government is access to resources, closer connections, and relationships, speed of response, new opportunities for both people and the country.

It should also be emphasized that research shows that the development of e-government is accompanied by two opposite trends: on the one hand, the level of openness of executive bodies increases, on the other hand, to protect public interests the state is forced to create information security mechanisms (Dekalyuk, 2020).

Thus, the international regulation of e-democracy shows positive changes in the direction of reforming the legislation of many countries, but such reform is not effective without the introduction of effective security measures.

### Conclusions

1. Thus, given the diversity of views on e-democracy, the general approach is that e-democracy is a new stage in the development of a democratic society. In the age of digitalization, citizens have ample opportunities to use remote means to exercise their rights and freedoms, and the state apparatus of any country seeks to develop remote means of communication for public services, information, and democratic procedures, because digital information technology can increase effective participation citizens in state affairs, help to express their own opinion on the content of decisions taken at the state level, promoting openness of public administration.
2. The experience of using the benefits of e-democracy eloquently shows that the digital rights of citizens are gradually



- improving, and good governance requires data security and uninterrupted operation of all tools.
3. E-democracy is based on: the active delivery of comprehensive, balanced, objective information that allows a clear understanding of the essence of public problems, alternatives, opportunities, solutions in politics; a broad understanding of citizenship, which includes persons and groups of persons permanently residing in the territory of the state, included in political organizations regardless of nationality; citizen participation and involvement of individuals and interest groups (including business communities) in public affairs; empowerment and capacity building – providing citizens with the resources and authority to participate in politics; discussion – a rational debate among peers, in which people openly discuss, support or criticize other points of view.
  4. Digitization processes can play both an essential role in ensuring democracy (if it exists) and create the preconditions for a digital dictatorship in the case of the introduction of digital tools for control, without the goals of democratic transformation.
- Bibliographic references**
- Akimov, A.V. (2018). Electronic democracy as an alternative form of government in Ukraine. *Scientific notes of TNU named by Vernadsky. Series: public administration*, 29 (68), 23-27. Recovered from [http://www.pubadm.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/3\\_2018/7.pdf](http://www.pubadm.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/3_2018/7.pdf)
- Barikova, A.A. (2016). E-government: a new efficiency of government. Kyiv: Jurinkom Inter. Recovered from <https://www.twirpx.com/file/3417637/>
- Bryzhko, V., Tsymbalyuk, V., Shvets, M., Koval, M., & Bazanov, Yu. (2006). E-future and information law. Kyiv: NDTSPI APrN of Ukraine. Recovered from [https://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN\\_TEXT/Zurnal/NO\\_BOOK/E\\_majbutn.pdf](https://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN_TEXT/Zurnal/NO_BOOK/E_majbutn.pdf)
- Chukut, S.A. (2008). E-democracy: essence and main stages. Domestic and foreign experience in implementing e-government. [File PDF] Recovered from [https://ktpu.kpi.ua/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/CHukut\\_Elektronna-demokratiya\\_Etapi-rozvitku\\_9\\_11\\_17.pdf](https://ktpu.kpi.ua/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/CHukut_Elektronna-demokratiya_Etapi-rozvitku_9_11_17.pdf)
- DeKalyuk, O.V. (2020). The concept of e-government in the practice of foreign countries. *Economics and Entrepreneurship*, 4, 43-47. Recovered from [http://www.econom.stateandregions.zp.ua/journal/2020/4\\_2020/10.pdf](http://www.econom.stateandregions.zp.ua/journal/2020/4_2020/10.pdf)
- Emelyanova, A., & Loboyko, S. (2020). Index of local e-democracy in Ukraine. Innovation Development Center. Recovered from <https://cid.center/edemindex/>
- Ishchenko, V.M. (2012). International experience in implementing e-government. *Governance*, 4, 26-30. Recovered from [http://pa.stateandregions.zp.ua/archive/4\\_2012/5.pdf](http://pa.stateandregions.zp.ua/archive/4_2012/5.pdf)
- Konashevska, K.V., & Kiselyova, O.L. (2017). Implementation of the experience of developing e-democracy in Japan and New Zealand in Ukraine [File PDF]. Recovered from [https://ktpu.kpi.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Konashevska\\_Kiselyova\\_Mehanizmi-derzhavnogo-upravlinnya.pdf](https://ktpu.kpi.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Konashevska_Kiselyova_Mehanizmi-derzhavnogo-upravlinnya.pdf)
- Konstantinovskaya, A.K. (2018). Features of the introduction of e-government in Ukraine. *Mechanisms of public administration*, 6, 47-50. Recovered from [http://www.pubadm.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/6\\_2018/12.pdf](http://www.pubadm.vernadskyjournals.in.ua/journals/2018/6_2018/12.pdf)
- Mezentsev, A.V. (2015). E-government, e-democracy - approaches to definitions. *Theory and practice of public administration*, 1, 64–69. Recovered from [http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis\\_nbuv/cgiirbis\\_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRN&IMAGE\\_FILE\\_DOWNLOAD=1&Image\\_file\\_name=PDF/Tpdu\\_2015\\_1\\_13.pdf](http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=2&I21DBN=UJRN&P21DBN=UJRN&IMAGE_FILE_DOWNLOAD=1&Image_file_name=PDF/Tpdu_2015_1_13.pdf)
- Mytko, A.M. (2014). Information Democracy: Realities and Challenges of Time. Lutsk: Tower-seal. Recovered from <https://evnuir.vnu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/9067>
- Orlovska, Yu., Kakhovych, O., & Kvaktun, O. (2021). Electronic democracy as an instrument of public administration and administration: a theoretical record. *Economy and society*, 28, 1-12. Recovered from <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2021-28-53>
- Ryabchynska, L. (2021). Transparent e-democracy: why the Ministry launches "Interaction". *Ukrainian Pravda*. Recovered from <https://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/columns/2021/02/24/7284573/>
- Semenchenko, A.I., & Dreshpak, V.M. (2017). E-government and e-democracy. Kyiv: FOP Moskalenko. Recovered from [https://old.suitt.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Part\\_003\\_Feb\\_2018.pdf](https://old.suitt.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Part_003_Feb_2018.pdf)



- Servant of the people. (2022). Launch of Digital Democracy: President on New Survey Function in Action. Recovered from <https://sluga-narodu.com/start-tyfrovoho-narodovladdia-prezydent-pro-novu-funktsiiu-opytuvannia-v-dii/>
- Shchebetun, I.C., & Dovgan, B.V. (2020). E-democracy: the experience of foreign countries and prospects for its implementation in Ukraine. *Law and society*, 2, 148-153. Recovered from [http://pravoisuspilstvo.org.ua/archive/2020/2\\_2020/part\\_1/26.pdf](http://pravoisuspilstvo.org.ua/archive/2020/2_2020/part_1/26.pdf)
- Solovyov, S.G. (2015). Conceptual foundations of e-democracy: foreign theories and implementation in Ukraine. *Public administration: improvement and development*, 9, 1-25. Recovered from <http://www.dy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=885>
- United Nations. (2020). E-Government Survey. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Public Institutions. Recovered from <https://publicadministration.un.org/en/Research/UN-e-Government-Surveys>
- Vasylieva, A.I. (2021). Promising tools of e-democracy in Ukraine. *Law and public administration*, 1, 176-182. Recovered from [http://pdu-journal.kpu.zp.ua/archive/1\\_2021/28.pdf](http://pdu-journal.kpu.zp.ua/archive/1_2021/28.pdf)
- Zhovnirchuk, Y.F., & Kvasiuk, V.V. (2020). E-government and e-democracy in relation to decentralization in Ukraine: implementation and development strategies. *Investments: practice and experience*, 1, 105-113. Recovered from <http://www.investplan.com.ua/?op=1&z=6981&i=16>
- Zolotar, O.O. (2017). E-democracy and digital dictatorship. *Information and law*, 4(23), 16-25. Recovered from [http://ippi.org.ua/sites/default/files/4\\_6.pdf](http://ippi.org.ua/sites/default/files/4_6.pdf)