To order raw e-government data, visit http://www.InsidePolitics.org/egovtdata.html

Global E-Government, 2006

by Darrell M. West
67 George St.
Center for Public Policy
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island 02912-1977
United States
Darrell_West@brown.edu
(401) 863-1163
www.InsidePolitics.org

Darrell M. West is the John Hazen White Professor of Public Policy and Political Science at Brown University and author of Digital Government: Technology and Public Sector Performance *(Princeton University Press, 2005)*

August, 2006

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In this report, I present the sixth annual update on global e-government. Using an analysis of 1,782 government websites in 198 different nations undertaken during Summer, 2006, I investigate electronic government. Among the significant findings of the research are:
1) 29 percent of government websites offer services that are fully executable online, up from 19 percent last year.
2) 94 percent of websites this year provide access to publications and 72 percent have links to databases.
3) 26 percent (up from 18 percent in 2005) show privacy policies, while 14 percent have security policies (up from 10 percent in 2005).
4) 23 percent of government websites have some form of disability access, meaning access for persons with disabilities, up from 19 percent in 2005.
5) Countries vary enormously in their overall e-government performance based on our analysis. The most highly ranked nations include South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, the United States, Canada, Britain, Ireland, Germany, Japan, and Spain.

A Note on Methodology

The data for our analysis consist of an assessment of 1,782 national government websites for the 198 nations around the world (see Appendix for the full list of countries). We analyze a range of sites within each country to get a full sense of what is available in particular nations. Among the sites analyzed are those of executive offices (such as a president, prime minister, ruler, party leader, or royalty), legislative offices (such as Congress, Parliament, or People's Assemblies), judicial offices (such as major national courts), Cabinet offices, and major agencies serving crucial functions of government, such as health, human services, taxation, education, interior, economic development, administration, natural resources, foreign affairs, foreign investment, transportation, military, tourism, and business regulation. Websites for subnational units, obscure boards and commissions, local government, regional units, and municipal offices are not included in this study. The analysis was undertaken during June and July, 2006 at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. Tabulation for this project was completed by Claire de Jong, Amy Chang, Mariya Moeva, Sara Sharaf, Robert Newcomb, and Feryaz Ocakli. National government website addresses can be found at www.InsidePolitics.org/world.html.

Websites are evaluated for the presence of various features dealing with information availability, service delivery, and public access. Features assessed included the name of the nation, region of the world, and having the following features: online publications, online database, audio clips, video clips, non-native languages or foreign language translation, commercial advertising, premium fees, user payments, disability access, privacy policy, security features, presence of online services, number of different services, digital signatures, credit card payments, email address, comment form, automatic email updates, website personalization, personal digital assistant (PDA) access, and an English version of the website. Where national government websites are not in English, our research team employed foreign language readers to evaluate government websites.

Online Information

In looking at specific features of government websites, we want to see how much material was available that would inform citizens. Most agencies have made extensive progress at placing information online for public access. Ninety-four percent of government websites around the world offer publications that a citizen can access (up from 89 percent in 2005), and 72 percent provided databases (up from 53 percent last year).

Percentage of Websites Offering Publications and Databases

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Phone Contact Info.	70%	77%	--	--	--	--
Address Info	67	77	--	--	--	--
Links to Other Sites	42	82	--	--	--	--
Publications	71	77	89	89	89	94
Databases	41	83	73	62	53	72
Audio Clips	4	8	8	12	9	13
Video Clips	4	15	8	13	11	14

Most public sector websites do not incorporate audio clips or video clips on their official sites. Despite the fact that these are becoming much more common features of e-commerce and private sector enterprise, 13 percent of government websites provide audio clips and 14 percent have video clips.

Electronic Services

For e-government service delivery, we look at the number and type of online services offered. Features are defined as services only if the entire transaction can occur online. If a citizen has to print out a form and then mail it back to the agency to obtain the service, we do not count that as a service that can be fully executed online. Searchable databases count as services only if they involved accessing information that result in a specific government service response.

Of the websites examined around the world, 29 percent have services that are fully executable online, compared to 19 percent in 2005, 21 percent in 2004, 16 percent in 2003 and 12 percent in 2002. Of this group, 14 percent offer one service, five percent have two services, and 10 percent have three or more services. Seventy-one percent have no online services.

Number of Online Services	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
None	92%	88%	84%	79%	81%	71%
One	5	7	9	11	8	14
Two	1	2	3	4	3	5
Three or more	2	3	4	6	8	10

North America (including the United States, Canada, and Mexico) is the area offering the highest percentage of online services. Seventy-one percent (up from 56 percent last year) had fully executable, online services. This was followed by Pacific Ocean Islands (48 percent), Asia (42 percent), Western Europe (34 percent), and the Middle East (31 percent). Only 11 percent in Russia/Central Asia and in Central America, and 9 percent in Africa offer online government services.

Percentage of Government Sites Offering Online Services by Region of World

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
North America	28%	41%	45%	53%	56%	71%
Pacific Ocean Islands	19	14	17	43	24	48
Asia	12	26	26	30	38	42
Middle East	10	15	24	19	13	31
Western Europe	9	10	17	29	20	34

Eastern Europe	--	*2*	*6*	*8*	*4*	*12*
Central America	4	*4*	*9*	*17*	*15*	*11*
South America	3	*7*	*14*	*10*	*19*	*30*
Russia/Central Asia	2	*1*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*11*
Africa	2	*2*	*5*	*8*	*7*	*9*

Common services included the following: registration for user privileges, as well as registering to access things on your account, reporting accidents, fraud, or corruption, filling taxes online, ordering tourist services, ordering publications, agency job applications, payment for telecom services, and complaint forms.

Countries featuring innovative or novel services are Australia: viewing rebates, child care benefits, and making repayments, Zambia: offers free e-mail registration, dating service, pen-pal service, Vatican: make donations to the Holy Father online, Australia: Employment has WageNet: a website that has been designed to help you locate award information that is relevant to you, Taiwan: eLearning, a program for people to learn online, El Salvador: educational services that helps people become acquainted with computers and the internet, and Luxembourg: mySchool offers e-assistance, help with homework, test prep.

One feature that has slowed the development of online services has been an inability to use credit cards and digital signatures on financial transactions. On commercial sites, it is becoming a more common practice to offer goods and services online for purchase through the use of credit cards. However, of the government websites analyzed, only 4 percent accept credit cards and 1 percent allowed digital signatures for financial transactions.

Privacy and Security

Having visible statements outlining what the site is doing on privacy and security are valuable assets for reassuring a fearful population to make use of e-government services and information. However, few global e-government sites offer policy statements dealing with these topics. Only 26 percent (up from 18 percent in 2005) of examined sites have some form of privacy policy on their site, and 14 percent have a visible security policy (up from 10 percent). Both of these are areas that government officials need to take much more seriously. Unless ordinary citizens feel safe and secure in their online information and service activities, e-government is not going to grow very rapidly.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Privacy	6%	14%	12%	14%	18%	26%
Security	3	9	6	8	10	14

In order to assess particular aspects of privacy and security, we evaluated the content of these publicly posted statements. For privacy policies, we look at several features: whether the privacy statement prohibits commercial marketing of visitor information; use of cookies or individual profiles of visitors; disclosure of personal information without the prior consent of the visitor, or disclosure of visitor information with law enforcement agents.

In general, we found weak protections of visitor privacy. For example, only 20 percent of government websites prohibit the commercial marketing on visitor information; just three percent prohibit cookies, 18 percent prohibit sharing personal information, and 22 percent share information with law enforcement agents. And in regard to security policies, 5 percent indicate that they use computer software to monitor traffic.

Disability Access

We tested disability access by examining the actual accessibility of government websites through the automated "Bobby 5.0" software produced by Watchfire, Inc. (http://bobby.watchfire.com). This commercial firm offers software that tests websites against standards of compliance with the standards recommended by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).

For our test, we used the Priority Level One standard and evaluated each government agency regarding whether it complies with the W3C guidelines. Sites are judged to be either in compliance or not in compliance based on the results of this test. According to our Bobby analysis, 23 percent of government websites are accessible to the disabled, up from 19 percent last year and 14 percent in 2004.

	2004	**2005**	**2006**
Disability Access	14%	19%	23%

Foreign Language Access

Fifty-two percent of national government websites have foreign language features that allow access to non-native speaking individuals, up slightly from the 49 percent last year. By foreign language feature, we mean any accommodation to the non-native speakers in a particular country, such as text translation into a different language. Many have no language translation on their site other than their native tongue. Seventy-eight percent offer at least some portion of their websites in English.

	2001	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Foreign Language Translation	45%	43%	51%	50%	49%	52%

Ads, User Fees, and Premium Fees

Many nations are struggling with the issue of how to pay for electronic governance. When defining an advertisement, we eliminate computer software available for free download (such as Adobe Acrobat Reader, Netscape Navigator, and Microsoft Internet Explorer) since they are necessary for viewing or accessing particular products or publications. Links to commercial products or services available for a fee were included as advertisements as were banner, pop-up, and fly-by advertisements. As shown below, only 3 percent of government websites in 2006 rely on ads.

Among the types of advertisements that we found included telecom ads on the Afghanistan Commerce site (Roshan GSM company, Afghan Wireless, ISPS, FedEx/DHL, and wireless vendors like Huawei/Siemens); commercials on tourist sites (such as airlines, hotels, resorts, rental cars, and travel agencies); accounting firms on tax preparation sites, and investing ads on China's site (such as commercials for ChinaExpo 2006, CCPITinvest.org, asia-styles.com, China.com, gdfair.com, matrade.gov.my, China AG Trade fair, Vietnamtradepoint.com, bj-furnifair.com, and easternstudiesdatabase.com).

Some government websites had annoying pop-up ads. This included (Guatemala – Finance, Jamaica) and ads that followed the page (China – Customs); Search engines: Google ads on Comoros, and Lycos on the Djibouti Tourism site (ads for online casinos and a dating service).

Government websites that featured interesting ads were: a business classified section (Solomon Islands – Commerce), Jamaican Emergency Management site has an ad for a Caribbean cement company, Mongolia (Tourism) has advertisement for Visa to promote credit card usage.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Ads	4%	8%	2%	4%	4%	3%
User Fees	--	1	0.2	1.3	2	1
Premium Fees	--	0	0.2	0.7	1	0.2

In general, user fees remain relatively scarce among the sites we examined. Most services and databases could be completed or obtained by mail or in person at no additional charge. The few that were found (1 percent of all sites) included charges applied in order to access publications or databases, or to register for a particular database. Less than one percent of sites had premium sections that charged fees.

Sites with user fees included the Australia Department of Treasury and the Department of Foreign Affairs, the Great Britain Patent Office, and Ireland's Trade/Employment (FOI request form). Sites with premium fees included the Oman Commerce + Industry site and the Vietnam News Agency (subscription fee to access news archives).

Public Outreach

E-government offers the potential to bring citizens closer to their governments. Regardless of the type of political system that a country has, the public benefits from interactive features that facilitate communication between citizens and government. In our examination of national government websites, we look for various features that would help citizens contact government officials and make use of information on websites.

Email is an interactive feature that allows ordinary citizens to pose questions of government officials or request information or services. In our study, we find that 91 percent of government websites offered email contact material so that a visitor could email a person in a particular department other than the Webmaster.

Percentage of Government Websites Offering Public Outreach

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Email	73%	75%	84%	88%	80%	91%
Search	38	54	--	--	--	--
Comments	8	33	31	16	37	33
Email Updates	6	10	12	16	16	19
Broadcast	2	2	--	--	--	--
Website Personalization	--	1	1	2	2	6
PDA Access	--	--	2	1	4	1

Thirty-three percent offer areas to post comments (other than through email), the use of message boards, and chat rooms, up from 16 percent the preceding year. Websites using these features allow citizens and department members alike to read and respond to others' comments regarding issues facing the department.

Nineteen percent of government websites allow citizens to register to receive updates regarding specific issues. With this feature, web visitors can input their email addresses, street addresses, or telephone numbers to receive information about a particular subject as new information becomes available. The information can be in the form of a monthly e-newsletter highlighting a prime minister's views or in the form of alerts notifying citizens whenever a particular portion of the website is updated.

Six percent of sites allow websites to be personalized to the interests of the visitor, and one percent provide personal digital assistant (PDA) access. Some sites have started to take advantage of mobile phone access (WAP). This is a good way to adapt local technology to digital access.

Top E-Government Countries

In order to see how the 198 nations ranked overall, we create a 0 to 100 point e-government index and apply it to each nation's websites based on the availability of publications, databases, and number of online services. Four points are awarded to each website for the presence of the following features: publications, databases, audio clips, video clips, foreign language access, not having ads, not having premium fees, not having user fees, disability access, having privacy policies, security policies, allowing digital signatures on transactions, an option to pay via credit cards, email contact information, areas to post comments, option for email updates, option for website personalization, and PDA accessibility. These features provide a maximum of 72 points for particular websites.

Each site then qualifies for a bonus of 28 points based on the number of online services executable on that site (one point for one service, two points for two services, three points for three services, and on up to twenty-eight points for twenty-eight or more services). The e-government index runs along a scale from zero (having none of these features and no online services) to 100 (having all features plus at least 28 online services). Totals for each website within a country were averaged across all of that nation's websites to produce a zero to 100 overall rating for that nation.

The top country in our ranking is South Korea at 60.3 percent. This means that every website we analyzed for that nation has more than half of the features important for information availability, citizen access, portal access, and service delivery. Other nations that score well on e-government include Taiwan, Singapore, the United States, Canada, Britain, Ireland, Germany, Japan, and Spain. The Appendix lists e-government scores for each of the 198 countries, plus comparisons between 2005 and 2006.

Differences by Region of World

There are some differences in e-government by region of the world. In looking at the overall e-government scores by region, North America scores the highest (43.1 percent), followed by Asia (35.9 percent), Western Europe (35.2 percent), Pacific Ocean Islands (32.4 percent), Russia and Central Asia (30.6 percent), Middle East (29.4 percent), Eastern Europe (29.2 percent), South America (28.0 percent), Central America (25.0 percent), and Africa (24.3 percent).

E-Government Ratings by Region

	2001	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
North America	51.0%	60.4%	40.2%	39.2%	47.3%	43.1
Western Europe	34.1	47.6	33.1	30.0	29.6	35.2
Eastern Europe	--	43.5	32.0	28.0	27.1	29.2
Asia	34.0	48.7	34.3	31.6	37.3	35.9
Middle East	31.1	43.2	32.1	28.1	27.4	29.4
Russia/Central Asia	30.9	37.2	29.7	25.3	25.0	30.6
South America	30.7	42.0	29.5	24.3	25.9	28.0
Pacific Ocean Islands	30.6	39.5	32.1	29.9	27.9	32.4
Central America	27.7	41.4	28.6	24.1	24.1	25.0
Africa	23.5	36.8	27.6	22.0	22.0	24.3

Conclusion

Governments around the world are making progress on integrating digital technology into their operations. Australia, for example, does a tremendous job being consistent with page design

between the agencies, yet still having enough variation in design (i.e. color, graphics) to make each site unique. More countries should follow the design and navigational suit of this international leader. In addition, Great Britain deserves credit for *clearly* marking which services are e-services that can be fully executed online as opposed to sites just having downloadable forms (which some countries promote as electronic services even though they are not fully executable online).

But there remain several problems that create user confusion. Among these are the use of different web designers for various parts of web pages; related agency pages that are not connected; having the same services offered on multiple places of the same site; having a new window open every time something is clicked on; ad clutter that makes navigation difficult; and sites lacking full foreign language translation of the website.

There also are technological issues that frustrate citizens. This includes pages not loading correctly (e.g. Zimbabwe), links not functioning properly (e.g. Venezuela), pages taking an extremely long time to upload (e.g. Vanuatu), sites with overly sophisticated language (e.g. Vatican), websites of very small countries designed for tourists/investors rather than its own citizens (e.g. Vanuatu), extremely small font size (e.g. Uruguay agriculture and Switzerland foreign affairs), webpages designed for investors/tourists being of much higher quality than those designed for a country's own citizens, and websites with disclaimers to protect government agencies, but no privacy/security policies to protect users (e.g. Trinidad and Tobago).

Based on our research, there are several recommendations that we feel would improve digital government.

1. Improve design in general (hire one web designer for all government pages to create more consistent looks, offer one location in which to complete offered services, publicizing services on related sites, and avoiding gaudy colors that are difficult to see)

2. Use faster loading speeds on web pages (splice images in order for the page to load faster and use frames to increase loading speed of pages)

3. All portals should have links to their ministries' websites and there should be clear connections between pages within an agency, or between pages of different agencies

4. Make navigation easier by reducing ad clutter, not having links to internal pages open in a new window, and fixing typos.

5. Completely translate the whole page of a site

6. Avoid pop-up ads on government websites. If you are a government website, having pop-up ads is incredibly de-legitimizing because of its overt commercialization of the site.

7. Sites with user services should have a privacy policy and encrypted pages to demonstrate an increased interest in protecting site users and citizens rather than simply protecting the government's interests. There should be an increased focus on developing privacy and security policies for users of government websites, rather than simply legal disclaimers or copyrights that protect the government agencies and site developers

8. There should be greater sensitivity to the level of language and the vocabulary used on government websites because sophisticated language and difficult words may deter users or citizens with low education levels or foreign native languages from using the sites

9. Although financial and technical resources for e-government in small countries may be very limited, there should be an increased effort to tailor government websites to citizens' usage, not just foreign investors.

10. Spamming in forums should be monitored. For example, Djibouti's tourism forum has been hacked and the site has ceaseless pop-ups laced with profanities.

11. E-mail contact information should become more visible and countries should consolidate some categories to ease the number of links on the front pages.

12. FAQ sections on government websites should provide a form or some means of contact for new FAQ questions.

13. There needs to be more frequent updates of web pages. If a citizen or user notices that a website has not been updated or maintained recently, they may feel like most of the information is outdated,

and may not even bother to check out the website. It is important to fix information, links, and update citizens on the goings within the ministry or country. Fiji's website, for example, has not been updated since the SARS outbreak of a few years ago.

14. In many countries, there is a discrepancy between the content of sites written in native and foreign languages. There should be a stronger effort to translate more of their websites and add more content to other parts of the web.

Appendix

Table A-1 E-Government Rankings by Country, 2006 (from highest to lowest performing)			
South Korea	60.3	Taiwan	49.8
Singapore	47.5	United States	47.4
Canada	43.5	Great Britain	42.6
Ireland	41.9	Germany	41.5
Japan	41.5	Spain	40.6
Dominica	40.0	Australia	39.9
Sweden	38.3	New Zealand	37.6
Netherlands	37.4	Switzerland	36.9
Azerbaijan	36.0	North Korea	32.0
Finland	35.6	Hong Kong	35.4
Ukraine	35.0	Norway	35.0
France	34.7	Qatar	34.5
Swaziland	34.0	Estonia	34.0
Turkey	33.7	Kazakhstan	33.6
Malta	33.6	Vatican	33.5
Libya	33.0	Liechtenstein	33.0
Macedonia	33.0	Italy	32.9
Chile	32.9	Malaysia	32.7
Slovakia	32.3	Brazil	32.1
Monaco	32.0	Tuvalu	32.0
Bhutan	32.0	Ecuatorial Guinea	32.0
Russian Federation	31.9	Slovenia	31.8
Denmark	31.8	Czech Republic	31.7
Georgia	31.4	Portugal	31.3
Serbia and Montenegro	31.3	Syria	31.2
Nigeria	31.1	Iceland	31.1
St. Lucia	31.0	Peru	30.8
Luxembourg	30.7	Latvia	30.6
Austria	30.6	Hungary	30.5
Phillippines	30.4	Nepal	30.3
Romania	30.2	Egypt	30.2
Poland	30.1	Belarus	30.0
Bahrain	29.6	Arab Emirates	29.5
Israel	29.4	Sudan	29.3
Mexico	29.3	South Africa	29.2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	29.1	Pakistan	29.1
Maldives	29.0	Mongolia	29.0
Eritrea	29.0	China (People's Republic)	28.8

India	28.7	Jordan	28.7
Lebanon	28.7	Colombia	28.6
Kuwait	28.5	Belgium	28.4
Lithuania	28.3	Cyprus (Republic)	28.3
Oman	28.1	Laos	28.0
Bangladesh	28.0	Sri Lanka	28.0
Tajikistan	28.0	Bolivia	28.0
Croatia	28.0	Cyprus (Turkish Republic)	28.0
Ghana	28.0	Greece	28.0
Guatemala	28.0	Guinea-Bissau	28.0
Haiti	28.0	Saudi Arabia	27.9
Kenya	27.5	Ecuador	27.5
East Timor	27.4	Iran	27.3
Panama	27.0	Uzbekistan	27.0
Iraq	27.0	Brunei	26.8
Afghanistan	26.7	Benin	26.7
Angola	26.7	Tunisia	26.4
Jamaica	26.4	Argentina	26.1
Mauritania	26.0	Nicaragua	26.0
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	26.0	Zimbabwe	26.0
Bulgaria	26.0	Seychelles	25.5
Myanmar	25.3	Paraguay	25.3
Armenia	25.3	El Salvador	25.3
Fiji	25.3	Senegal	25.1
Marshall Islands	25.0	Vietnam	25.0
Congo (Republic)	25.0	Algeria	24.6
San Marino	24.3	Morocco	24.2
Uruguay	24.2	Liberia	24.0
Moldova	24.0	Mozambique	24.0
Bahamas	24.0	St. Kitts	24.0
Sierra Leone	24.0	Somalia	24.0
Suriname	24.0	Turkmenistan	24.0
Albania	24.0	Andorra	24.0
Congo (Democratic Republic)	24.0	Côte d'Ivoire	24.0
Gabon	24.0	Gambia	24.0
Guyana	24.0	Antigua and Barbuda	23.7
Mauritius	23.7	Zambia	23.5
Thailand	23.4	Trinidad and Tobago	23.4
Yemen	23.4	Rwanda	23.3
Venezuela	23.2	Cambodia	23.2
Cuba	22.7	Uganda	22.5
Kyrgyzstan	22.4	Djibouti	22.1
Samoa	22.0	Belize	22.0
Botswana	22.0	Cape Verde	22.0
Cook Islands	22.0	Dominican Republic	22.0
Ethiopia	22.0	Namibia	21.4
Micronesia	21.0	Papua New Guinea	21.0

Honduras	20.8	Malawi	20.7
Madagascar	20.0	Mali	20.0
Niger	20.0	Niue	20.0
Palau	20.0	Barbados	20.0
Somaliland	20.0	Vanuatu	20.0
Comoros	20.0	Costa Rica	20.0
Indonesia	20.0	Cameroon	19.0
Solomon Islands	18.0	Tanzania	17.5
Burkina Faso	17.0	Lesotho	16.7
São Tomé and Príncipe	16.0	Togo	16.0
Tonga	16.0	Central African Republic	16.0
Grenada	16.0	Guinea	16.0
Nauru	12.0	Kiribati	12.0
Chad	9.0	Burundi	8.0

Table A-2 E-Government Country Ratings, 2005 and 2006		
Country	2005	2006
Afghanistan	25.3	26.7
Albania	28.4	24.0
Algeria	26.0	24.6
Andorra	29.0	24.0
Angola	22.7	26.7
Antigua and Barbuda	28.0	23.7
Arab Emirates	30.1	29.5
Argentina	26.3	26.1
Armenia	24.0	25.3
Australia	35.1	39.9
Austria	28.0	30.6
Azerbaijan	24.0	36.0
Bahamas	34.0	24.0
Bahrain	31.0	29.6
Bangladesh	24.0	28.0
Barbados	18.7	20.0
Belarus	24.0	30.0
Belgium	24.6	28.4
Belize	31.0	22.0
Benin	29.3	26.7
Bhutan	18.0	32.0
Bolivia	16.0	28.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	28.6	29.1
Botswana	27.0	22.0
Brazil	28.5	32.1
Brunei	29.0	26.8
Bulgaria	24.0	26.0
Burkina Faso	22.4	17.0
Burundi	28.0	8.0
Cambodia	24.0	19.0

Cameroon	16.0	19.0
Canada	43.3	43.5
Cape Verde	20.0	22.0
Central African Rep	20.0	16.0
Chad	32.0	9.0
Chile	32.1	32.9
China (People's Rep)	44.3	28.8
Colombia	29.0	28.6
Comoros	20.0	20.0
Congo (Republic)	20.0	25.0
Congo (Democratic Republic)	28.0	24.0
Cook Islands	28.5	22.0
Costa Rica	20.0	20.0
Côte d'Ivoire	24.0	24.0
Croatia	24.2	28.0
Cuba	19.1	22.7
Cyprus (Turkish Rep)	20.0	28.0
Cyprus-Republic	27.1	28.3
Czech Republic	28.6	31.7
Denmark	29.7	31.8
Djibouti	21.9	22.1
Dominican Republic	24.0	22.0
Dominica	29.0	40.0
East Timor	28.7	27.4
Ecuador	24.4	27.5
Egypt	27.8	30.2
El Salvador	25.0	25.3
Equatorial Guinea	16.0	32.0
Eritrea	24.0	29.0
Estonia	32.0	34.0
Ethiopia	24.0	22.0
Fiji	24.1	25.3
Finland	32.0	35.6
France	28.5	34.7
Gabon	22.0	24.0
Gambia	26.0	24.0
Georgia	21.3	31.4
Germany	35.3	41.5
Ghana	28.0	28.0
Great Britain	34.3	42.6
Greece	25.1	28.0
Grenada	16.0	16.0
Guatemala	21.0	28.0
Guinea	20.0	16.0
Guinea-Bissau	32.0	28.0
Guyana	20.0	24.0
Haiti	28.0	28.0
Honduras	20.2	20.8

Hong Kong	46.2	35.4
Hungary	24.4	30.5
Iceland	29.3	31.1
India	24.8	28.7
Indonesia	24.0	20.0
Iran	30.7	27.3
Iraq	26.8	27.0
Ireland	34.6	41.9
Israel	31.0	29.4
Italy	28.3	32.9
Jamaica	25.5	26.4
Japan	28.3	41.5
Jordan	27.5	28.7
Kazakhstan	23.0	33.6
Kenya	20.7	27.5
Kiribati	12.0	12.0
Korea (Democratic Republic)	16.0	32.0
Korea (Republic)	26.2	60.3
Kuwait	27.0	28.5
Kyrgyzstan	23.0	22.4
Laos	28.0	28.0
Latvia	26.6	30.6
Lebanon	27.3	29.7
Lesotho	14.7	16.7
Liberia	28.0	24.0
Libya	24.0	33.0
Liechtenstein	31.0	33.0
Lithuania	26.1	28.3
Luxembourg	26.8	30.7
Macedonia	32.0	33.0
Madagascar	28.0	20.0
Malawi	21.3	20.7
Malaysia	20.8	32.7
Maldives	25.8	29.0
Mali	16.0	20.0
Malta	28.8	33.6
Marshall Islands	24.0	25.0
Mauritania	24.0	26.0
Mauritius	20.9	23.7
Mexico	29.7	29.3
Micronesia	21.0	21.0
Moldova	28.0	24.0
Monaco	24.0	32.0
Mongolia	28.0	29.0
Morocco	24.6	24.2
Mozambique	24.0	24.0
Myanmar	25.3	25.3
Namibia	21.0	21.4

15

Nauru	20.0	12.0
Nepal	26.9	30.3
Netherlands	31.4	37.4
New Zealand	30.4	37.6
Nicaragua	23.6	26.0
Niger	16.0	20.0
Nigeria	25.4	31.1
Niue	20.0	20.0
Norway	29.2	35.0
Oman	26.0	28.1
Pakistan	25.5	29.1
Palau	16.0	20.0
Panama	23.5	27.0
Papua New Guinea	17.1	21.0
Paraguay	22.0	25.3
Peru	27.1	30.8
Philippines	27.0	30.4
Poland	25.9	30.1
Portugal	28.7	31.3
Qatar	30.1	34.5
Romania	26.4	30.2
Russia	24.2	31.9
Rwanda	20.9	23.3
Samoa	20.8	22.0
San Marino	19.3	24.3
São Tomé and Príncipe	16.0	16.0
Saudi Arabia	27.4	27.9
Senegal	23.4	25.1
Serbia and Montenegro	28.1	31.3
Seychelles	19.7	25.5
Sierra Leone	24.0	24.0
Singapore	54.5	47.5
Slovakia	28.4	32.3
Slovenia	28.6	31.8
Solomon Islands	14.0	18.0
Somalia	12.0	24.0
Somaliland	20.0	20.0
South Africa	24.5	29.2
Spain	26.0	40.6
Sri Lanka	24.0	28.0
St. Kitts	24.0	24.0
St. Lucia	29.0	31.0
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	24.0	26.0
Sudan	18.7	29.3
Suriname	16.0	24.0
Swaziland	29.0	34.0
Sweden	28.2	38.3
Switzerland	31.2	36.9

Syria	30.0	31.2
Taiwan	57.2	49.8
Tajikistan	20.0	28.0
Tanzania	15.2	17.5
Thailand	24.1	23.4
Togo	20.0	16.0
Tonga	28.0	16.0
Trinidad and Tobago	24.4	23.4
Tunisia	23.6	26.4
Turkey	27.7	33.7
Turkmenistan	20.0	24.0
Tuvalu	29.0	32.0
Uganda	25.5	22.5
Ukraine	25.8	35.0
United States	50.5	47.4
Uruguay	23.2	24.2
Uzbekistan	24.0	27.0
Vanuatu	16.0	20.0
Vatican	34.5	33.5
Venezuela	23.5	23.2
Vietnam	27.0	25.0
Yemen	22.9	23.4
Zambia	24.1	23.5
Zimbabwe	20.0	26.0

Table A-3 Individual Country Profiles for Selected Features, 2006						
	Online Services	*Publications*	*Data bases*	*Privacy Policy*	*Security Policy*	*W3C Disability Accessibility*
Afghanistan	0%	100%	67%	0%	0%	0%
Albania	0	100	9	0	0	0
Algeria	0	93	0	0	0	0
Andorra	0	100	0	0	0	0
Angola	0	100	0	0	0	0
Antigua	29	71	0	14	14	0
Arab Emirates	42	100	92	8	8	0
Argentina	7	100	57	7	0	0
Armenia	0	100	33	0	0	0
Australia	45	100	87	97	65	65
Austria	20	80	100	20	0	40
Azerbaijan	0	100	100	0	0	0
Bahamas	0	100	0	0	0	0
Bahrain	25	75	100	0	13	0
Bangladesh	0	100	67	0	0	33
Barbados	0	100	33	0	0	0
Belarus	0	100	100	17	0	33
Belgium	0	100	36	18	18	55
Belize	0	100	0	0	0	0
Benin	0	100	33	0	0	0

Bhutan	100	100	100	100	0	0
Bolivia	0	100	100	0	0	0
Bosnia	13	100	75	0	0	0
Botswana	0	100	50	0	0	0
Brazil	47	93	100	0	0	13
Brunei	40	80	20	0	0	0
Bulgaria	0	100	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	0	75	0	0	0	0
Burundi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cambodia	0	80	60	0	0	0
Cameroon	0	100	0	0	0	0
Canada	57	100	90	100	97	77
Cape Verde	0	100	50	0	0	0
Central Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chad	100	0	0	0	0	0
Chile	100	100	77	31	8	0
China-Mainland	35	100	100	0	0	4
China -Taiwan	62	100	100	85	85	73
Colombia	25	100	100	0	0	13
Comoros	0	100	100	0	0	0
Congo-Dem Rep	0	100	0	0	0	0
Congo-Rep	100	100	100	0	0	0
Cook Islands	0	100	50	0	0	0
Costa Rica	0	100	0	0	0	0
Cote d'Ivoire	0	100	100	0	0	0
Croatia	0	100	100	0	0	0
Cuba	0	100	67	0	0	11
Cyprus-Rep	38	100	63	0	0	0
Cyprus-Turk	0	100	0	0	0	0
Czech Rep	0	93	80	7	0	67
Denmark	7	100	64	0	0	57
Djibouti	11	89	33	0	0	0
Dominica	100	100	0	0	0	0
Dominican Rep	0	100	50	0	0	0
East Timor	0	71	14	57	43	0
Ecuador	62	100	77	8	8	8
Egypt	29	88	41	12	0	6
El Salvador	25	100	75	0	0	0
Eq Guinea	0	100	0	0	0	0
Eritrea	100	100	0	100	100	0
Estonia	0	100	100	0	0	0
Ethiopia	0	100	0	0	0	0
Fiji	13	100	63	13	13	13
Finland	20	100	100	20	0	47
France	42	100	84	13	0	23
Gabon	0	100	50	0	0	0
Gambia	0	75	75	0	0	0

Georgia	20	100	100	0	0	0
Germany	50	100	88	50	13	75
Ghana	0	100	100	0	0	0
Great Britain	64	96	89	86	43	75
Greece	0	100	38	13	0	0
Grenada	0	100	0	0	0	0
Guatemala	0	100	100	25	25	0
Guinea	0	0	100	0	0	0
Guinea-Bissau	0	100	0	0	0	0
Guyana	0	100	100	0	0	0
Haiti	0	100	0	0	0	0
Honduras	17	100	33	0	0	0
Hong Kong	37	100	95	21	16	42
Hungary	21	93	43	29	7	29
Iceland	0	100	78	0	0	100
India	28	100	94	6	0	0
Indonesia	0	100	0	0	0	0
Iran	0	100	100	0	0	0
Iraq	0	75	100	0	0	0
Ireland	50	100	100	89	17	94
Israel	7	100	87	7	0	0
Italy	11	100	72	17	0	61
Jamaica	0	94	65	29	6	0
Japan	70	100	100	80	20	75
Jordan	14	100	100	0	0	0
Kazakhstan	13	100	88	0	0	25
Kenya	17	75	67	0	0	0
Kiribati	0	0	0	0	0	0
Korea, North	100	100	100	0	0	0
Korea, South	85	100	100	85	15	15
Kuwait	17	92	83	0	8	8
Kyrgyzstan	0	80	40	0	0	0
Laos	0	100	100	0	0	0
Latvia	13	88	63	0	0	0
Lebanon	22	87	52	4	4	0
Lesotho	0	33	17	0	0	0
Liberia	0	100	0	0	0	0
Libya	100	100	0	100	100	0
Liechtenstein	100	100	0	100	0	0
Lithuania	0	100	83	0	0	0
Luxembourg	22	94	83	56	0	33
Macedonia	100	100	100	0	0	0
Madagascar	0	50	0	0	0	0
Malawi	0	83	33	0	0	0
Malaysia	44	89	44	11	11	0
Maldives	20	100	40	20	20	0
Mali	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malta	60	100	100	100	0	20
Marshall	100	100	0	0	0	0

Islands					
Mauritania	0	100	0	0	0	0
Mauritius	0	100	92	0	0	0
Mexico	40	100	65	0	0	0
Micronesia	100	100	0	0	0	0
Moldova	0	100	0	0	0	0
Monaco	0	100	50	0	0	0
Mongolia	20	100	60	0	0	20
Morocco	11	89	67	0	0	0
Mozambique	0	100	100	0	0	0
Myanmar	0	33	100	0	0	0
Namibia	8	75	50	17	0	0
Nauru	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nepal	5	95	75	5	0	35
Netherlands	72	100	79	59	3	55
New Zealand	93	100	100	79	46	64
Nicaragua	13	94	69	0	0	0
Niger	0	100	0	0	0	0
Nigeria	29	100	86	14	0	0
Niue	0	100	0	0	0	0
Norway	13	97	70	3	3	57
Oman	10	85	80	0	5	0
Pakistan	27	86	77	27	14	0
Palau	0	100	0	0	0	0
Panama	28	94	72	11	0	0
Papua New Guinea	20	60	60	0	0	0
Paraguay	0	93	67	0	0	0
Peru	20	100	100	15	0	0
Philippines	33	100	85	22	15	15
Poland	13	96	83	8	4	13
Portugal	17	100	100	28	6	17
Qatar	64	64	82	18	9	18
Romania	6	100	82	0	6	0
Russia	6	100	100	12	0	12
Rwanda	10	100	40	0	0	10
Sao Tome	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Kitts/Nevis	0	100	33	33	33	0
St. Lucia	0	100	100	50	25	25
St. Vincent	0	50	0	100	0	0
Samoa	0	75	50	25	0	25
San Marino	33	100	67	0	0	0
Saudi Arabia	33	89	94	0	0	0
Senegal	0	100	71	57	0	0
Serbia and Montenegro	7	100	67	0	0	0
Seychelles	17	83	33	17	17	17
Sierra Leone	0	100	100	0	0	0
Singapore	87	90	63	100	100	20

Slovakia	26	95	89	16	16	21
Slovenia	18	100	86	11	11	7
Solomon Islands	0	100	0	0	0	0
Somalia	0	100	0	0	0	0
Somaliland	0	100	0	0	0	0
South Africa	17	100	100	24	14	14
Spain	48	100	83	57	43	43
Sri Lanka	0	100	100	0	0	0
Sudan	0	100	33	0	0	0
Suriname	0	50	50	50	50	0
Swaziland	0	100	50	100	0	0
Sweden	30	96	48	100	0	70
Switzerland	69	100	81	50	4	42
Syria	0	100	100	0	0	0
Tajikistan	0	100	100	0	0	0
Tanzania	0	48	33	0	0	0
Thailand	0	100	29	0	0	0
Togo	0	100	0	0	0	0
Tonga	0	100	0	0	0	0
Trinidad	0	93	36	29	14	0
Tunisia	0	100	40	0	0	0
Turkey	100	100	100	0	4	0
Turkmenistan	0	100	50	0	0	0
Tuvalu	0	0	0	0	0	100
Uganda	0	88	13	0	0	0
Ukraine	22	100	100	0	0	22
United States	89	98	77	82	75	54
Uruguay	17	92	42	8	0	0
Uzbekistan	33	100	67	0	0	33
Vanuatu	0	100	0	0	0	0
Vatican	100	50	0	0	0	50
Venezuela	0	100	10	0	0	0
Vietnam	0	100	63	0	0	13
Yemen	0	86	86	0	0	0
Zambia	0	100	75	0	0	0
Zimbabwe	0	100	50	0	50	0

Table A-4 Individual Country Profiles for Selected Features, 2006					
	For Lang	*Ads*	*User Fee*	*Comments*	*Updates*
Afghanistan	100	33	0	0	33
Albania	100	0	0	9	9
Algeria	100	0	0	29	0
Andorra	100	0	0	0	0
Angola	0	0	0	33	33
Antigua	100	29	0	14	0
Arab Emirates	75	8	0	17	8
Argentina	21	0	0	14	7

Armenia	100	0	0	0	0
Australia	6	3	6	42	45
Austria	100	0	0	0	0
Azerbaijan	100	0	0	0	0
Bahamas	0	0	0	100	0
Bahrain	88	0	0	13	13
Bangladesh	100	0	0	17	0
Barbados	0	0	0	0	0
Belarus	83	0	0	50	0
Belgium	64	0	0	18	0
Belize	0	0	0	25	25
Benin	100	0	0	33	0
Bhutan	100	0	0	0	0
Bolivia	0	0	0	0	0
Bosnia	100	0	0	0	25
Botswana	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil	20	0	0	20	13
Brunei	100	0	0	60	0
Bulgaria	100	0	0	25	25
Burkina Faso	0	0	0	25	0
Burundi	0	100	0	0	0
Cambodia	80	0	0	20	0
Cameroon	0	0	0	25	0
Canada	0	3	0	23	57
Cape Verde	0	0	0	0	0
Central Africa	0	0	0	0	0
Chad	0	100	0	0	0
Chile	8	0	0	62	8
China-Mainland	61	30	0	35	9
China -Taiwan	100	4	0	54	23
Colombia	0	0	0	50	13
Comoros	0	100	0	0	0
Congo-Dem Rep	100	0	0	0	0
Congo-Rep	0	100	0	100	0
Cook Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Costa Rica	0	0	0	0	0
Cote d'Ivoire	100	0	0	0	0
Croatia	100	0	0	0	0
Cuba	33	0	0	11	0
Cyprus-Rep	100	13	0	25	0
Cyprus-Turk	100	0	0	100	0
Czech Rep	80	0	0	13	13
Denmark	100	0	0	0	50
Djibouti	0	11	0	22	0
Dominica	0	100	0	0	0
Dominican Rep	0	0	0	0	0
East Timor	100	0	0	29	0

Ecuador	0	0	0	23	15
Egypt	94	6	0	29	0
El Salvador	13	0	0	38	25
Eq Guinea	100	0	0	100	0
Eritrea	0	0	0	0	0
Estonia	100	100	0	50	100
Ethiopia	100	0	0	0	50
Fiji	0	13	0	25	13
Finland	100	0	0	67	27
France	48	0	0	35	45
Gabon	50	0	0	0	0
Gambia	0	0	0	25	25
Georgia	100	0	0	40	20
Germany	63	0	0	63	38
Ghana	0	0	0	100	0
Great Britain	0	0	7	46	50
Greece	100	0	0	13	25
Grenada	0	0	0	0	0
Guatemala	0	25	0	25	25
Guinea	0	0	0	0	0
Guinea-Bissau	0	100	0	100	100
Guyana	0	0	0	0	0
Haiti	100	0	0	0	100
Honduras	0	0	0	17	0
Hong Kong	100	0	0	0	11
Hungary	100	0	0	14	29
Iceland	100	0	0	6	0
India	0	0	0	28	6
Indonesia	0	0	0	0	0
Iran	50	0	0	0	0
Iraq	100	0	0	0	0
Ireland	6	0	6	61	56
Israel	100	0	0	7	47
Italy	33	0	0	17	39
Jamaica	0	12	0	35	18
Japan	100	10	0	15	35
Jordan	86	0	0	14	0
Kazakhstan	63	0	0	88	63
Kenya	100	0	0	25	17
Kiribati	0	0	0	0	0
Korea, North	0	0	0	0	0
Korea, South	100	8	23	100	92
Kuwait	67	0	0	0	8
Kyrgyzstan	80	0	0	0	0
Laos	100	0	0	0	0
Latvia	100	0	0	63	25
Lebanon	96	4	0	26	13
Lesotho	0	0	0	17	0
Liberia	0	0	0	100	0

Libya	100	0	0	0	0	
Liechtenstein	100	0	0	0	0	
Lithuania	100	0	0	0	25	
Luxembourg	17	0	0	44	39	
Macedonia	100	0	0	100	0	
Madagascar	50	0	0	0	0	
Malawi	0	0	0	0	0	
Malaysia	89	0	0	78	11	
Maldives	100	0	0	0	0	
Mali	100	0	0	0	0	
Malta	0	0	0	60	0	
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0	0	
Mauritania	100	0	0	50	0	
Mauritius	0	0	0	0	0	
Mexico	50	0	0	55	10	
Micronesia	0	0	0	0	0	
Moldova	100	0	0	0	0	
Monaco	100	0	0	50	0	
Mongolia	100	20	0	60	0	
Morocco	22	0	0	0	0	
Mozambique	50	0	0	0	0	
Myanmar	100	0	0	33	0	
Namibia	0	0	0	8	0	
Nauru	0	0	0	0	0	
Nepal	100	0	0	45	5	
Netherlands	100	0	0	48	17	
New Zealand	4	0	0	46	18	
Nicaragua	13	0	0	31	0	
Niger	0	0	0	0	0	
Nigeria	14	0	0	71	0	
Niue	0	0	0	0	0	
Norway	100	0	0	67	7	
Oman	80	20	0	20	5	
Pakistan	5	0	0	50	14	
Palau	0	0	0	0	0	
Panama	17	0	0	44	6	
Papua New Guinea	0	0	0	30	0	
Paraguay	7	0	0	47	7	
Peru	25	0	0	60	25	
Philippines	4	0	0	70	7	
Poland	100	0	0	21	8	
Portugal	28	0	0	11	22	
Qatar	82	9	0	9	18	
Romania	94	0	0	35	12	
Russia	35	0	6	71	24	
Rwanda	0	0	0	40	0	
Sao Tome	100	0	0	0	0	

St. Kitts/Nevis	0	0	0	0	0
St. Lucia	0	0	0	50	25
St. Vincent	0	50	0	100	0
Samoa	0	50	0	25	0
San Marino	0	0	0	33	0
Saudi Arabia	56	0	0	0	17
Senegal	0	0	0	14	0
Serbia and Montenegro	100	0	0	53	27
Seychelles	0	0	0	33	0
Sierra Leone	0	0	0	0	0
Singapore	3	0	0	97	40
Slovakia	100	0	0	32	0
Slovenia	96	4	0	21	4
Solomon Islands	0	50	0	0	0
Somalia	100	0	0	0	0
Somaliland	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa	0	0	0	45	10
Spain	87	0	0	26	22
Sri Lanka	100	0	0	0	0
Sudan	100	0	0	33	0
Suriname	50	0	0	0	0
Swaziland	0	0	0	100	100
Sweden	100	0	0	0	52
Switzerland	88	4	0	42	38
Syria	60	0	0	20	80
Tajikistan	100	100	0	100	100
Tanzania	0	0	0	0	0
Thailand	100	0	0	14	0
Togo	0	100	0	0	0
Tonga	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad	0	7	0	14	7
Tunisia	100	0	0	0	20
Turkey	61	9	0	13	17
Turkmenistan	100	50	0	0	0
Tuvalu	100	0	0	100	0
Uganda	13	0	0	38	13
Ukraine	78	0	0	78	44
United States	59	0	0	59	43
Uruguay	25	0	0	8	0
Uzbekistan	67	0	0	33	0
Vanuatu	100	0	0	0	0
Vatican	100	0	0	0	0
Venezuela	10	0	0	30	10
Vietnam	100	38	0	0	13
Yemen	43	0	0	0	0
Zambia	13	38	0	50	0
Zimbabwe	0	0	0	50	0

Table A-5 Best Practices of Top Government Sites, 2006

1. South Korea

       South Korea's e-government system received the highest marks in our study. Korea's sites feature an impressive level of organization and offer a wealth of information and services. The eGov portal site alone provides users with over 500 services executable online. Other departmental pages offer a wide range of e-services, such as paying taxes, checking bar exam results, or searching for lost relatives in North Korea. All sites contain publications and databases, and nearly all offer audio or video clips. The Korean sites are also highly customizable, with a majority allowing the user to manage his or her own activities. In addition, most sites offer PDA or wireless access, and nearly all allow visitors to sign up for e-mail updates. Also notable are the interactive features available for users – virtually every site contains a prominent guestbook or forum as well as the option to petition the particular department. Furthermore, the Korean pages feature a clever design characterized by colorful drawings and icons which are appealing to the eye and allow for easy navigation. Overall, Korea's site offers an abundance of features while remaining user-friendly for its visitors.

2. Taiwan

       Taiwan boasts an easily navigable website. Its aesthetically pleasing design makes the site seem more personable as a government website. A comprehensive list of services and information for Taiwan e-government is centered on their My eGov website, which users can log in to and personalize. Taiwan is one of the few government websites out there that offers PDA access on some of their pages. A prominent feature which is very helpful for users is a site map and language options located on the top portion of the site. The English version of the sites may deviate from the original Chinese version, but most of the content is still available and accessible to the English user. Most sites featured links to a privacy policy, so users know they are secure as they browse. Taiwan's websites are updated frequently, so users can sign up to receive newsletters from each site. Taiwan's websites are clearly designed for the user, and they make it as easy as possible for anyone to use it.

3. Singapore

       Singapore's e-government system is certainly one of the most sophisticated in existence. The country's eCitizen site acts as a portal to all of the government services offered online, and these services are conveniently grouped by topics such as housing, defense, and health. This type of organization and clarity, which can be seen on all of Singapore's government websites, makes the sites very easy to navigate. Also, all of Singapore's sites feature both privacy and security policies; this demonstrates the government's concern for the protection of its citizens and other users of the extensive online resources offered. Almost all of the sites have some mechanism by which users can make comments and provide opinions about the site, such as online polls and discussion boards. Furthermore, many of the sites tailor the information and services offered to the needs of different users, such as businesses, citizens, teachers, or employers depending on the site. This type of personalization makes it simple for users to quickly access the information or services in which they are interested. Lastly, several of the sites employ innovative methods of providing news and updates to citizens, such as using the text messaging (SMS) feature on mobile phones. This way, citizens can receive desired information from government agencies regardless of their location or proximity to a computer.

4. United States

       The United States is once again among the top five sites, displaying its consistency in its service to its citizens. Although each site features different layout designs, they are all easily navigable. The United States' FirstGov website displays an incredible amount of services for citizens,

businesses, federal employees, and governments. All of the services are listed in alphabetical order by topic, minimizing stress in finding the service you need. Each U.S. website is updated regularly, which enhances its credibility and proves to be a reliable website with up-to-date information. Some websites have RSS feeds, and you can also sign up for newsletters. On top of that, videos, audio clips, and even Podcasts are featured on some of the government websites. Privacy and accessibility are two features that the U.S. websites prominently highlight.

5. Canada

Like the other top websites, Canada boasts a website that is comprehensive, interactive, and user-friendly. Each site starts with a splash page that offers the English and French versions of the site, so a user does not have to look around the main page for the tiny little language option buttons. Personalization seems to be a prominent factor in the designers' minds while making these websites; many sites have sections catering to a specific audience (i.e. citizens, businessmen, students). Canada even has a MyGovernment account for citizens to access online services. Most of Canada's websites offer a plethora of information ranging from publications and databases to webcasts of Parliament to interactive assistance to citizen services such as . The strength of Canada's website stems from its thorough website design that maximizes ease of use and navigation, and takes into account user needs without sacrificing style