

Chapter IV

Worldwide E-Governance: A Longitudinal Assessment of Municipal Web Sites and the Digital Divide

Tony Carrizales, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, NY

Marc Holzer, Rutgers University—Newark, NJ

Aroon Manoharan, Rutgers University—Newark, NJ

Abstract

This following chapter highlights the research findings of a digital governance survey conducted in the fall of 2005. The study replicates a 2003 survey of large municipalities worldwide. This longitudinal assessment, based on the Rutgers-SKKU E-Governance Performance Index, focused on the evaluation of current practices in government, with emphasis on the evaluation of each Web site in terms of digital governance. Specifically, we analyzed security, usability, content of Web sites, the type of online services currently being offered, and citizen response and participation through Web sites established by city governments. Based on the 2005 evaluation of 81 cities, Seoul, New York, Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Sydney represent the highest performing cities in digital governance. There were only slight changes in the top five cities when compared to the 2003 study. Moreover, there continues to be a divide in terms of digital governance throughout the world among the 30 developed nations belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and non-OECD member nations. This divide is highlighted by the change

in average scores among the municipalities when comparing municipalities from OECD and non-OECD member nations.

Introduction

The following research highlights the results of an international survey conducted in the fall of 2005 evaluating the practice of digital governance in large municipalities. A similar study was conducted in 2003 (Holzer & Kim 2004; Melitski, Holzer, Kim, Kim, & Rho, 2005) which provided one of the most exhaustive studies of municipal e-governance ever conducted. The research was replicated two years later through a collaboration between the E-Governance Institute at Rutgers-Newark and the Global e-Policy e-Government Institute at Sungkyunkwan University in Seoul. The joint study again produced a wealth of information that contributes to the growing field of digital government. In particular, we focus on the changes over two years in this longitudinal assessment of municipal Web sites.

Literature Review

A review of digital governance literature includes numerous areas of research, all highlighting the potential of technology under terms such as e-government, e-democracy, e-participation, and digital democracy. In particular, the literature below indicates potential for improved government services and online democratic practices. Our survey research evaluates municipal Web sites in these areas and the data presented reflect the current practice of e-governance throughout the world.

Numerous researchers have highlighted the potential for e-governance. In order for good governance to be achieved, Cloete (2003) argues for an acceptance of technological innovations, suggesting that Internet-based services and other technological service delivery applications will be the only way governments can meet their own service delivery goals. A 2003 survey by the Pew Internet & American Life Project attempted to determine how Americans contact government. Their study found that e-government is an increasingly popular tool for Internet users, with a primary purpose of getting information and sending messages to the government (Horrihan, 2004). West (2004) highlights a study of chief information officers, where the respondents felt positive about the capacity for the Internet to transform government, however, argues that e-government “has fallen short of its potential to transform government” in the areas of service delivery and trust in government (p. 16).

E-government initiatives, specifically the Internet, must go beyond the static listing of information to more “intentions-based” design so that citizens can more effectively utilize Web portals (Howard, 2001). Recent advances in e-services include the personalization of government Web pages. Virginia’s “MyGov” allows an individual to format Web pages around their interests from options such as public meeting announcements, interactive government services, legislative sites, local government, local media, public schools, lottery numbers, press releases, state government, and traffic information (Eggers, 2005). These developments in e-services are well intentioned, but misdirected suggests Eggers (2005), because they are underutilized and rarely involve transactions, adding little to no value for individuals and businesses. Individuals still do not visit government Web sites enough to make services such as personalized Web pages a common locus for e-government initiatives.

Moreover, a relatively new aspect of digital governance, e-democracy, is in reality a concept with a history dating to the 1960s in which scholars, activists, and politicians were forecasting technological utopias (Bryan, Tsagarousianou, & Tambini, 1998). The current interest in e-democracy can in part be attributed to the lack of performance in old technologies used for democracy (Shane, 2002). Early discussions of the technology-democracy relationship highlighted the potential of telecommunications, with emphasis on cable television and telephone conferencing (Arterton, 1987, 1988; Becker, 1993; Christopher, 1987, McLean, 1989). However, the focus has now significantly shifted to the Internet (Bellamy & Taylor, 1998; Browning, 2002; Gattiker, 2001; Kamarck & Nye, 1999, 2003; Loader, 1997; Westen, 1998, 2000; Wilhelm, 1998; Witschge, 2002).

Unlike other mediums, citizens are now able to demand and obtain content when going online (Browning, 2002). Korac-Kakabadse and Korac-Kakabadse (1999) point out that ICTs provide the possibility for direct-democracy on a larger scale. They define e-democracy as the capacity for ICTs to enhance the degree and quality of public participation in government. Proponents argue that e-democracy will allow for greater government transparency and openness, which leads to a better-informed citizenry. The openness of government can lead to increased accountability and reduced government corruption. The case of Seoul’s Online Procedures Enhancement for Civil Application (OPEN) system has demonstrated a successful practice of transparency and decreased corruption in government via the use of the Internet (Holzer & Kim, 2004).

Online discussion boards are another example of an opportunistic use of technology for developing e-democracy. Online discussion boards allow for political discussions without requiring participants to share space and time, leading to increased access to political debate (Malina, 1999). The potential for citizen participation in decision and policy-making is growing, albeit slowly, through initiatives such as *regulations.gov* (Skrzycki, 2003a, 2003b). Some municipalities have already begun to practice aspects of e-democracy, which include information disclosure pertinent to government decision making as well as mediums for two-way communication.

The following data will also reflect the changes in online citizen participation among municipalities worldwide.

Scholars have outlined the potential of digital governance, but little can be said about the state of current e-government's practices in municipalities worldwide. International studies, as this research is, are critical contributions to the overall literature of digital governance. To better understand how various regions of the world differ in the area of e-governance, comprehensive studies of regions throughout the world are necessary for a basis of comparison. More importantly, regional studies provide regional benchmarks and best practices that allow for increased performance in digital governance overtime for those municipalities still in the earliest developments.

A review of the literature also suggests that our survey instrument is one of the most thorough in practice for e-governance research today. With 98 measures and five distinct categorical areas of e-governance research, the survey instrument is unlike any other. In studies of e-governance practices worldwide, our Performance Index differs quite significantly from other survey instruments. The following section reviews four of the most prominent and encompassing longitudinal worldwide e-governance surveys. The critiques of the Annual Global Survey at Brown University's Taubman Center for Public Policy (West 2001-2005), the United Nations Global E-government Report (UNPAN 2003, 2004, 2005), the Accenture E-government Leadership Survey (Accenture, 2002, 2004) and Capgemini's European Commission Report (Capgemini, 2005) are intended to highlight the distinct differences between the survey instruments and results. The findings and rankings of e-governance worldwide can best be understood by highlighting the distinct differences among the survey instruments.

The Taubman Center's Global E-government Survey is one of the only international e-government studies that have been conducted on an annual basis for the past five years (e.g., West 2001, 2004, 2005). Since 2001, the researchers at the Taubman Center have utilized an index instrument that measures the presence of Web site features. That instrument is geared toward specific Web functions, with limited attention to addressing privacy/security or usability. The e-governance area of citizen participation is only measured by one item. Moreover, their survey instrument has changed substantially from year to year. One of the problems with a rapidly evolving instrument is in the applicability of comparisons over the years. Our survey instrument has also changed with the inclusion of new questions, specifically in the citizen participation section. However, the Taubman Center's survey instrument has decreased its measurement criteria over the years. In 2001 and 2002, the number of measures were 24 and 25, respectively. In 2003, 2004, and 2005 the number of measures decreased to 20, 19, and 19, respectively. For 2005, its measures are broken down into two groups, with 18 primary measures and one bonus measure encompassing 28 possible points. The final overall scores are converted for a possible total score of 100. We also use a final possible score of 100, with each of our five categories allowing for a possible score of 20.

In all, the number of measures in the Taubman survey is limited, with only 19 metrics. A final score of e-governance performance is reflective of the specific questions focused on Web features that are captured by those 19 measures. One of the consequences of this methodology is the limited differentiation in performance of e-governance among countries. As a result, many of the countries received the same scores. In addition, there is an inconsistency in the annual rankings, specifically in the non-English Web sites. For example, the Republic of Korea has fluctuated in rankings as follows: 45th in 2001, 2nd in 2002, 87th in 2003, 32nd in 2004, and 86th in 2005. In other international findings, however, such as the United Nations Global E-government Survey, the Republic of Korea has consistently been recognized as one of the best in e-governance performance (4th in 2004 and 2005). One other example is Bolivia, which has also significantly fluctuated over the years in rankings. Bolivia was ranked 18th in 2001, 164th in 2002, 119th in 2003, 20th in 2004, and 225th in 2005. These significant variations in rankings can, in part, be attributed to the limited number of measures, allowing for shifting variations in overall scores. However, this can also be attributed to the method of not using native speakers when evaluating all the Web sites. In some cases, researchers at the Taubman Center have utilized language translation software available online, such as <http://babelfish.altavista.com>. Online translation software, however, can misinterpret specific languages and phrases.

The United Nations Global E-government Report is also one of the few longitudinal studies of Web presence throughout the world (e.g., UNPAN, 2004, 2005). The UN has two specific studies that it produces: an e-government readiness index and an e-participation index. The e-government readiness index incorporates Web measures, telecommunication infrastructure, and human capital. Their Web measure index is a quantitative measure, evaluating national Web sites. Their evaluation is based on binary values (presence/absence of a service). Their e-participation index is a qualitative study, with 21 measures used to assess the quality, relevance, usefulness, and willingness of government Web sites in providing online information and service/participation tools for citizens. The UN Global E-government Report takes methodological precautions to ensure accuracy and fairness. The surveying of Web sites is done within a 60-day “window” and Web sites are reevaluated by senior researchers for purposes of consistency. In addition, the survey incorporates native language speakers when necessary in an effort to review every Web site in the official language. However, this survey does differ from our research in that the UN studies central government Web sites, while we focus on large municipal Web sites throughout the world.

Accenture conducts a third global e-government study. Accenture’s annual E-government Leadership report highlights the performance of 22 selected countries (e.g., Accenture 2002, 2004). The most recent report (2004) measured 206 services when assessing national government Web sites. The 206 national government services were divided between 12 service sectors: eDemocracy, education, human services,

immigration, justice and security, postal, procurement, regulation, participation, revenue and customs, and transport. As an effort toward reliability, the research was conducted in a two-week period. The Accenture report, however, only focuses on 22 countries. The Accenture study omits numerous countries throughout the world, as well as many of the top performing governments in e-governance. Similarly, a study conducted by Capgemini, on behalf of the European Commission, is limited in international focus (Capgemini, 2005). This study is limited to nations in the European Union and only utilizes 20 basic public services as measures in the research study. The methodology is split between studying services to citizens (12) and services to businesses (8). An additional worldwide e-government survey is conducted by the Waseda University Institute of E-Government in Japan. Their methodology includes 26 indicators as well as a component for surveying the Chief Information Officer of each country (World E-Gov Forum, 2007). Similar to the UN and Taubman Center studies, the Accenture, Capgemini, and Waseda University studies focus on national government Web sites, a distinguishing aspect from our research.

Design and Methodology

As stated above, previous e-governance research varies in the use of scales to evaluate government Web sites. For example, one researcher uses an index consisting of 25 dichotomous (yes or no) measures (West, 2001); other assessments use a more sophisticated four-point scale (Kaylor, 2001) for assessing each measure. We have developed the Rutgers-SKKU E-Governance Performance Index for evaluating city and municipal Web sites, consisting of five components: 1.) Security and Privacy; 2.) Usability; 3.) Content; 4.) Services; and 5. Citizen Participation. Our 2005 survey instrument utilizes 98 measures, of which 43 are dichotomous. For each of the five e-governance components, our research applies 18 to 20 measures, and for questions which were not dichotomous, each measure was coded on a four-point scale (0, 1, 2, 3; see Table 1). Furthermore, in developing an overall score for

Table 1. E-governance scale

Scale	Description
0	Information about a given topic does not exist on the Web site
1	Information about a given topic exists on the Web site (including links to other information and e-mail addresses)
2	Downloadable items are available on the Web site (forms, audio, video, and other one-way transactions, popup boxes)
3	Services, transactions, or interactions can take place completely online (credit card transactions, applications for permits, searchable databases, use of cookies, digital signatures, restricted access)

each municipality, we have equally weighted each of the five categories so as not to skew the research in favor of a particular category (regardless of the number of questions in each category). The dichotomous measures in the “service” and “citizen participation” categories correspond with values on our four point scale of “0” or “3”; dichotomous measures in “security/ privacy” or “usability” correspond to ratings of “0” or “1” on the scale.

In this research, the main city homepage is defined as the official Web site where information about city administration and online services are provided by the city. The city Web site includes Web sites about the city council, mayor, and executive branch of the city. Based on the concept above, this research evaluated the official Web sites of each city selected. Nineteen of 100 cities, however, do not have official city Web sites or were not accessible during the survey period: ten in Africa (71%), seven in Asia (22%), and two in North America (20%). As a result, this research evaluated only 81 cities of the 100 cities initially selected. Our research examined local government services using an e-governance model of increasingly sophisticated e-government services. Moon (2002) developed a framework for categorizing e-government models based on the following components: information dissemination, two-way communication, services, integration, and political participation. Our methodology for evaluating e-government services includes such components; however, we have added an additional factor of security.

That additional e-governance factor was grounded in recent calls for increased security, particularly of our public information infrastructure. Concern over the security of the information systems underlying government applications has led some researchers to the conclusion that e-governance must be built on a secure infrastructure that respects the privacy of its users (Kaylor, 2001).

The 2005 E-Governance Performance Index differs slightly from the one used in 2003. The most significant change was in the citizen participation component, where six new research questions were added. These new questions are, in part, recognition of the growing literature focusing on the various methods for more digitally-based democracy. These new questions survey the presence and functions of municipal forums, online decision making (e.g., e-petitions and e-referenda), and online surveys and polls. The new questions for the citizen participation component bring the total number of questions to 20, with a total possible raw score of 55. In addition, one question was removed from the security and privacy component. That question focused on the scanning of viruses during downloadable files from the municipal Web site. This aspect was found to be more dependent on personal computers than as a function of a municipal Web site. The removal of the question for the security and privacy component brings the total number of questions to 18, with a total possible raw score of 25. The final change to the E-Governance Performance Index was a question added to the content component. The additional question focuses on the number of possible downloadable documents from a municipal Web site. The

Table 2. E-governance performance measures

E-governance Category	Key Concepts	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Keywords
Security/ Privacy	18	25	20	Privacy policies, authentication, encryption, data management, and use of cookies
Usability	20	32	20	User-friendly design, branding, length of homepage, targeted audience links or channels, and site search capabilities
Content	20	48	20	Access to current accurate information, public documents, reports, publications, and multimedia materials
Service	20	59	20	Transactional services involving purchase or register, interaction between citizens, businesses, and government
Citizen Participation	20	55	20	Online civic engagement, internet based policy deliberation, and citizen based performance measurement
Total	98	219	100	

new question for content brings the total number of questions to 20, with a total possible raw score of 48.

The changes to the E-Governance Performance Index have helped make this ongoing survey of municipal Web sites one of the most thorough in the field of e-governance research. The Index now has a total of 98 questions, with a total possible raw score of 219. Given the changes to the survey instrument between 2003 and 2005, the method of weighting each component for a possible score of 20 and a total score of 100 allows for a consistency in comparisons over time. Table 2, which features e-governance performance measures, summarizes the 2005 survey instrument, and in Appendix A we present an overview of the criteria used during the evaluation.

Similar to our 2003 study, to ensure reliability each municipal Web site was assessed in the official language by two evaluators. Many of our evaluators were either doctoral students or researchers in the area of digital governance. In addition, all of the evaluators were provided comprehensive written instructions for assessing Web sites. The instructions and survey instrument itself included detailed examples for associated scores for each question. The two adjusted scores for each Web site were then compared and evaluated for consistency in evaluation. The evaluations were done via a preset spreadsheet instrument that alerted researchers when errors were made. Also, the instrument allowed for specific comments associated with each question, so that researchers can review in cases of evaluator discrepancy. Each Web site evaluation was done independent of one another and in cases where significant variation (+ or – 10%) existed on the weighted score between evaluators,

Web sites were analyzed a third time. The only Web site requiring a third evaluator for the 2005 survey was Brussels, Belgium. The three evaluations for Brussels were then reviewed and scores averaged to represent a municipal score. A framework of the survey instrument utilized is included in Appendix A.

International Municipalities

Both the 2003 and 2005 studies focused on the evaluation of current practices in government, and the emphasis in the research was on the evaluation of each Web site in terms of digital governance. Simply stated, digital governance includes both digital government (delivery of public service) and digital democracy (citizen participation in governance). Specifically, we analyzed security, usability, content of Web sites, the type of online services offered, and citizen response and participation through Web sites established by city governments.

This research examines cities throughout the world based on their population size, and the total number of individuals using the Internet. In the 2003 survey, data from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), an organization affiliated with the United Nations (UN), were used to determine the 100 municipalities studied. Of 196 countries for which telecommunications data were reported, those with a total online population over 100,000 were identified. As a result, the most populated cities in 98 countries were selected to be surveyed (along with Hong Kong and Macao). For the 2005 worldwide survey, the most recent available ITU-UN data were used. These updated figures produced slightly different results from the previous survey in 2003. Countries with an online population over 100,000 increased to 119. Therefore, we set a new cut-off mark at countries with an online population over 160,000. This resulted in 98 countries which met the new mark. With the inclusion of Hong Kong and Macao, as in 2003, a total of 100 cities were identified for the 2005 survey. Hong Kong and Macao were added to the 98 cities selected, since they have been considered as independent countries for many years and have high percentages of Internet users.

The rationale for selecting the largest municipalities stems from the e-governance literature, which continues to suggest a positive relationship between population and e-governance capacity at the local level (Moon, 2002; Moon & deLeon, 2001; Musso, Weare, & Hale, 2000; Weare, Musso, & Hale 1999). In 2003, the most populated city in each country was identified using various data sources. In cases where the city population data that were obtained utilized a source dated before 2000, a new search was done for the most recent population figures. All city population data were updated to reference 2000-2005 figures.

Six countries that were identified in 2003 do not have online populations of over 160,000. These countries and their most populated cities are: Manama, Bahrain; Port Louis, Mauritius; Port-of-Spain, Trinidad & Tobago; Asuncion, Paraguay;

Sarajevo, Bosnia; and Havana, Cuba. Of these six cities, only five were surveyed, with Havana having an unidentified official government Web site. As none of the five surveyed cities listed above was ranked in the top 25th percentile of rankings, their exclusion from the 2005 worldwide survey was not found to be significant enough to retain. The six new cities are: Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire; Accra, Ghana; Chisinau, Moldova; Omdurman, Sudan; Halab, Syria; and Libya, Tripoli. In 2003, 80 of the 100 cities identified were surveyed (by two surveyors) and were included in the overall rankings. For the 2005 data, 81 of the 100 cities were included in the overall rankings, excluding municipalities where no official Web site was obtainable. Table 3 is a list of the 100 cities selected.

Table 3. 100 cities selected by continent (2005)

Africa (14)		
Abidjan (Cote d'Ivoire)*	Casablanca (Morocco)*	Lome (Togo)*
Accra (Ghana)*	Dakar (Senegal)*	Nairobi (Kenya)
Algiers (Algeria)*	Dar-es-Salaam (Tanzania)*	Omdurman (Sudan)*
Cairo (Egypt)	Harare (Zimbabwe)*	Tunis (Tunisia)*
Cape Town (South Africa)	Lagos (Nigeria)	
Asia (31)		
Almaty (Kazakhstan)*	Hong Kong SAR (Hong Kong)	Quezon City (Philippines)
Amman (Jordan)	Istanbul (Turkey)	Riyadh (Saudi Arabia)
Baku (Azerbaijan)*	Jakarta (Indonesia)	Seoul (Republic of Korea)
Bangkok (Thailand)	Jerusalem (Israel)	Shanghai (China)
Beirut (Lebanon)	Karachi (Pakistan)	Singapore (Singapore)
Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan)*	Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia)	Tashkent (Uzbekistan)
Colombo (Sri Lanka)	Kuwait City (Kuwait)*	Tehran (Iran)
Dhaka (Bangladesh)	Macao SAR (Macao)	Tripoli (Libya)*
Dubai (United Arab Emirates)	Mumbai (India)	Tokyo (Japan)
Halab (Syria)*	Muscat (Oman)*	
Ho Chi Minh (Vietnam)	Nicosia (Cyprus)	
Europe (34)		
Amsterdam (Netherlands)	Kiev (Ukraine)	Rome (Italy)
Athens (Greece)	Lisbon (Portugal)	Sofia (Bulgaria)
Belgrade (Serbia and Montenegro)	Ljubljana (Slovenia)	Stockholm (Sweden)
Berlin (Germany)	London (United Kingdom)	Tallinn (Estonia)
Bratislava (Slovak Republic)	Luxembourg City (Luxembourg)	Vienna (Austria)
Brussels (Belgium)	Madrid (Spain)	Vilnius (Lithuania)
Bucharest (Romania)	Minsk (Belarus)	Warsaw (Poland)
Budapest (Hungary)	Moscow (Russian Federation)	Zagreb (Croatia)
Chisinau (Moldova)	Oslo (Norway)	Zurich (Switzerland)
Copenhagen (Denmark)	Paris (France)	
Dublin (Ireland)	Prague (Czech Republic)	
Helsinki (Finland)	Reykjavik (Iceland)	
	Riga (Latvia)	

continued on following page

Table 3. continued

North America (10)		
Mexico City (Mexico) Guatemala City (Guatemala) Kingston (Jamaica)* New York (United States)	Panama City (Panama) San Jose (Costa Rica) San Salvador (El Salvador) Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)*	Tegucigalpa (Honduras) Toronto (Canada)
South America (9)		
Buenos Aires (Argentina) Caracas (Venezuela) Guayaquil (Ecuador)	La Paz (Bolivia) Lima (Peru) Montevideo (Uruguay)	Santa Fe De Bogota (Colombia) Santiago (Chile) Sao Paulo (Brazil)
Oceania (2)		
Auckland (New Zealand)	Sydney (Australia)	

* Official city Web sites unavailable

Findings and Longitudinal Assessment

The rankings in Table 4 reflect the top twenty municipalities in overall score based on the five e-governance component categories. The highest possible score for any one city Web site is 100. Seoul received a score of 81.70, the highest ranked city Web site for 2005. Seoul's Web site was also the highest ranked in 2003, with a score of 73.48. New York City had the second highest ranked municipal Web site, with a score of 72.71. New York City moved up two places from its fourth place ranking in 2003. Similarly, Shanghai, China moved up two places in ranking since 2003, with the third ranked score of 63.93 in 2005. Hong Kong and Sydney, Australia complete the top five ranked municipal Web sites with scores of 61.51 and 60.82, respectively. Hong Kong was also ranked in the top five in 2003; however, Sydney significantly increased its score and ranking from 2003 (ranked 19th with a score of 37.41).

Privacy and security results indicate that Seoul, Sydney, Zurich, New York, and Hong Kong are top ranked cities in the category of privacy and security. New to the top five are Sydney and Zurich. Sydney was ranked 11th in 2003 with a score of 6.79, but has improved to 2nd overall with a score of 16.80 in 2005. Zurich was ranked 20th in 2003 with a score of 3.57, but has improved to 3rd overall with a score of 16.40 in 2005. The average score in this category is 4.17, an increase from a score of 2.53 in 2003. Thirty-one cities evaluated earned 0 points in this category, a decrease in the total number of municipalities that earned 0 points in 2003 (36). Many cities still have not properly understood the importance of a privacy and security policy, a very important deficiency in the development of digital governance.

Usability results indicate that New York, Shanghai, Seoul, Sydney and Riga are top ranked cities in the category of usability. New to the top five are New York, Sydney and Riga. New York was ranked 11th in 2003 with a score of 15.63, but has improved to 1st overall with a score of 19.06 in 2005. Sydney was ranked 34th in 2003 with a score of 12.19, but has improved to 4th overall with a score of 17.81 in 2005. Riga was ranked 51st in 2003 with a score of 10.00, but has improved to 5th overall with a score of 17.50 in 2005. The average score in this category is 12.42, an increase from a score of 11.45 in 2003. One of the best practices in the category of usability is New York, scoring 19.06. The Web sites for New York are very “user-friendly.” For example, all pages use consistent color, formatting, “default colors,” and underlined text to indicate links. There are consistent uses of navigation bars and links to the homepage on every page. The Web sites contain very advanced forms, allowing citizens to submit pertinent information.

Results for content indicate that Seoul, New York, Tallinn, Zurich, Hong Kong, and Riga are top ranked cities in the category of content. New to the top five are Tallinn, Zurich, and Riga. Tallinn was ranked 6th in 2003 with a score of 12.55, but has improved to 3rd overall with a score of 14.79 in 2005. Zurich was ranked 28th in 2003 with a score of 7.66, but has improved to 4th overall with a score of 13.96 in 2005. Riga was ranked 51st in 2003 with a score of 4.26, but has improved to 5th overall with a score of 13.75 in 2005. The average score for the top five cities has only slightly increased from 2003. The average score for the top five ranked cities in 2005 is 14.66, while the average score for the top five ranked cities in 2003 was 14.08. However the overall average increase for this category is second largest of the five categories. The average score in this category is 7.63, an increase from a score of 6.43 in 2003.

The results for online services indicate that Seoul, New York, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Warsaw are the top ranked cities in the category of online services. New to the top five are New York and Warsaw. New York was ranked 6th in 2003 with a score of 12.28, but has improved to 2nd overall with a score of 15.76 in 2005. Warsaw was ranked 62nd in 2003 with a score of 1.93, but has improved to 5th overall with a score of 11.86 in 2005. The average score in this category is 5.32, an increase from a score of 4.82 in 2003. Only two cities evaluated earned 0 points in this category, a decrease from the three municipalities that earned 0 points in 2003. The average score for the top five ranked cities in 2005 is 14.51, while the average score for the top five ranked cities in 2003 was 13.69.

The results for citizen participation indicate that Seoul, Warsaw, Bratislava, London, and Prague are the top ranked cities in the category of privacy and security. New to the top five are all of those cities except Seoul, which repeats as the top ranked city in the category. Warsaw was ranked 74th in 2003 with a score of 0.00, but has improved to 2nd overall with a score of 12.55 in 2005. Bratislava was not ranked in 2003, but has received a 3rd overall ranking with a score of 10.91 in 2005. London was ranked 51st in 2003 with a score of 1.54, but has improved to 4th overall with

a score of 10.55 in 2005. Prague was not ranked in 2003 but has received a 5th overall ranking with a score of 10.18 in 2005. The average score in this category is 3.57, an increase from a score of 3.26 in 2003. The category of citizen participation resulted in the smallest overall increase in performance. This can be attributed in part to the additional questions added to the survey instrument to better survey citizen participation online. However, the results can also be attributed, in part, to the lack of support for such online practices.

Table 4. Top 20 cities in digital governance (2005)

Ranking	City	Score	Privacy	Usability	Content	Service	Participation
1	Seoul	81.70	17.60	17.81	16.04	16.61	13.64
2	New York	72.71	16.00	19.06	14.79	15.76	7.09
3	Shanghai	63.93	12.00	18.75	13.13	11.69	8.36
4	Hong Kong	61.51	15.60	16.25	13.75	13.73	2.18
5	Sydney	60.82	16.80	17.81	12.50	8.98	4.73
6	Singapore	60.22	10.40	15.94	11.67	14.58	7.64
7	Tokyo	59.24	12.00	16.25	12.29	10.34	8.36
8	Zurich	55.99	16.40	14.69	13.96	9.49	1.45
9	Toronto	55.10	11.20	14.06	11.46	9.83	8.55
10	Riga	53.95	6.80	17.50	13.75	6.44	9.45
11	Warsaw	53.26	0.00	15.31	13.54	11.86	12.55
12	Reykjavik	52.24	11.60	13.13	13.54	10.34	3.64
13	Sofia	49.11	8.00	13.44	11.67	7.46	8.55
14	Prague	47.27	0.00	16.88	10.21	10.00	10.18
15	Luxembourg	46.58	7.20	15.31	11.88	7.29	4.91
16	Amsterdam	46.44	10.40	12.50	9.79	5.93	7.82
17	Paris	45.49	8.80	15.94	11.46	4.75	4.55
18	Macao	45.48	10.40	13.44	13.13	5.42	3.09
19	Dublin	44.10	8.00	16.88	11.04	4.92	3.27
20	Bratislava	43.65	0.00	15.94	11.04	5.76	10.91

Table 5. Top 10 cities in privacy and security (2005)

Rank	City	Country	Score
1	Seoul	Republic of Korea	17.60
1	Sydney	Australia	16.80
3	Zurich	Switzerland	16.40
4	New York	United States	16.00
5	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	15.60
6	Rome	Italy	13.20
7	Berlin	Germany	12.80
8	Shanghai	China	12.00
8	Tokyo	Japan	12.00
10	Reykjavik	Iceland	11.60

Table 6. Top 10 cities in usability (2005)

Rank	City	Country	Score
1	New York	United States	19.06
2	Shanghai	China	18.75
3	Seoul	Republic of Korea	17.81
3	Sydney	Australia	17.81
5	Riga	Latvia	17.50
6	Oslo	Norway	17.19
7	Dublin	Ireland	16.88
7	Prague	Czech Rep.	16.88
7	Jerusalem	Israel	16.88
10	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	16.25

Table 7. Top 10 cities in content (2005)

Rank	City	Country	Score
1	Seoul	Republic of Korea	16.04
2	New York	United States	14.79
2	Tallinn	Estonia	14.79
4	Zurich	Switzerland	13.96
5	Riga	Latvia	13.75
5	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	13.75
7	Warsaw	Poland	13.54
7	Reykjavik	Iceland	13.54
9	Shanghai	China	13.13
9	Macao	Macao	13.13

Table 8. Top 10 cities in service delivery (2005)

Rank	City	Country	Score
1	Seoul	Republic of Korea	16.61
2	New York	United States	15.76
3	Singapore	Singapore	14.58
4	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	13.73
5	Warsaw	Poland	11.86
6	Shanghai	China	11.69
7	Tokyo	Japan	10.34
7	Reykjavik	Iceland	10.34
9	Prague	Czech Rep.	10.00
10	Toronto	Canada	9.83

Table 9. Top 10 cities in citizen participation (2005)

Rank	City	Country	Score
1	Seoul	Republic of Korea	13.64
2	Warsaw	Poland	12.55
3	Bratislava	Slovak Republic	10.91
4	London	United Kingdom	10.55
5	Prague	Czech Rep.	10.18
6	Riga	Latvia	9.45
7	Toronto	Canada	8.55
7	Sofia	Bulgaria	8.55
9	Shanghai	China	8.36
9	Tokyo	Japan	8.36

The comparisons between the findings from the 2003 evaluation and the findings of the 2005 evaluation indicate an overall average score increase from 28.49 in 2003 to 33.11 in 2005. This would be the expectation for municipalities increasingly seeking ways to utilize technology to increase effectiveness and efficiency. The Internet is an ideal medium for meeting such goals. Table 10 highlights these increases by continent. All six identified regions have collectively improved in their e-governance performance.


The results, when analyzed by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and non-OECD member countries, highlight a growing gap between the two groups. In all, 30 countries represent OECD member countries, and the

Table 10. Average score by continent for 2005 and 2003

	Oceania	Europe	Average	Asia	North America	Africa	South America
2005 Overall Averages	49.94	37.17	33.11	33.05	30.21	24.87	20.45
2003 Overall Averages	46.01	30.23	28.49	30.38	27.42	17.66	20.05

largest municipality for each of these countries was evaluated and included in the results. Fifty-one non-OECD member countries are also included in the evaluations. Seoul, Korea was the highest ranked municipality for OECD member countries and Shanghai, China was the highest ranked municipality for non-OECD member countries. OECD member countries have a combined average of 44.35, well above the overall average for all municipalities, 33.11. Non-OECD member countries have an overall average of 26.50. The increase for OECD member countries from 2003 was 8.01 points, and for non-OECD member countries there was an increase of only 2.24 from 2003. More importantly, the gap between OECD and non-OECD member countries increased since the 2003 evaluation. The difference in 2003 between the average scores of OECD and non-OECD member countries was 12.08. Based on the 2005 evaluations, the gap has increased to 17.85. The increase in the overall average of scores has been predominately a result of OECD member countries improving overall municipal Web site performance. The following Figure 1 reflects the average scores of OECD member and nonmember countries, as well as the average score

Figure 1. Average score by e-governance categories in OECD member and non-member countries (2005)



for each of the five e-governance categories. The figure highlights the gap between OECD member and nonmember countries across all categories.

On further research, it has been found that the digital divide between the OCED and non-OCED member countries varies across the five established criteria as shown in Table 11. The most significant gap has been recorded in the areas of service, privacy, and citizen participation. Overall, OCED member countries have shown a higher percentage of increase in all areas except usability. In the area of usability, non-OCED member countries increased 10.1% in average score, while OCED member countries had a minimal increase of 5%. However, the OCED member countries showed significant increase in scores in the areas of privacy and service with 82% and 26% change, respectively. The percent change for non-OECD member countries in the same e-government categories were only 36.4% and -4.5 %. This comparison sheds light on the significance of investment in e-government infrastructure involving privacy and security to sustain the e-government mechanisms in OCED countries, while the need for increased investment in non-OECD member countries. Moreover the negative average score changes for citizen participation (-2.95%) and services (-4.5 %) among non-OCED member countries signify that Web presence alone will not indicate an increase in performance, but rather non-OCED member countries may need to develop a comprehensive policy that addresses the unique e-government requirements of individual countries and help in bridging the digital divide.

Specific increases in the five e-governance categories have been discussed above, but it is important to note that the most significant improvement in average score is in the area of privacy and security. Municipalities have recognized Web site security and

Table 11. Variations in OCED and non-OCED member countries

	Usability	Content	Service	Privacy & Security	Citizen Participation	Year
OCED Member Countries	14.30	10.21	7.50	7.17	5.18	2005
OCED Member Countries	13.62	8.55	5.95	3.94	4.29	2003
% Increase in Score (OECD)	5 %	19.4 %	26.0 %	82 %	20.7 %	
Non-OCED Member Countries	11.32	6.12	4.03	2.41	2.63	2005
Non-OCED Member Countries	10.28	5.29	4.22	1.77	2.71	2003
% Increase in Score (Non-OECD)	10.1 %	15.6 %	- 4.5 %	36.4 %	- 2.95 %	

Table 12. Average score by e-governance categories in 2005 and 2003

	Usability	Content	Service	Privacy & Security	Citizen Participation
2005 Average Scores	12.42	7.63	5.32	4.17	3.57
2003 Average Scores	11.45	6.43	4.82	2.53	3.26

Table 13. Change in rank between 2003 and 2005 evaluations

Ranking	City	Country	2003	2005	Rank (2003)	Rank 2005	Change in Rank
1	Seoul	Korea	73.48	81.70	1	1	0
2	New York	United States	61.35	72.71	4	2	+2
3	Shanghai	China	58.00	63.93	5	3	+2
4	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	66.57	61.51	2	4	-2
5	Sydney	Australia	37.41	60.82	19	5	+14
6	Singapore	Singapore	62.97	60.22	3	6	-3
7	Tokyo	Japan	46.52	59.24	9	7	+2
8	Zurich	Switzerland	28.59	55.99	35	8	+27
9	Toronto	Canada	46.35	55.10	10	9	+1
10	Riga	Latvia	17.12	53.95	62	10	+52

citizen privacy as key components to effective and efficient Web sites. The category with the smallest increase in average score is citizen participation. Municipalities still have not found that citizen participation in government is a critical component for online functions. Table 12 highlights these findings.

In addition, some of the changes in the individual municipal rankings from 2003 to 2005 are of note. Table 13 shows the rankings of the top 10 municipalities based on the 2005 evaluations, as well as their change in ranking position. In general, Web sites would not be expected to decrease in score or ranking significantly, as a reduction or elimination in Web site services and functions is not common practice. For the most part, ranking changes were three places or less; however, there are significant changes in a few Web sites that have improved over the two years between evaluations. Those Web sites that have improved their Web sites significantly, as is apparent by their increase in overall ranking, are Sydney, Zurich, and Riga. Sydney

moved up 14 places in ranking to a 5th place ranking in 2005. Zurich moved up 27 places to 8th overall. Riga represented the most significant increase in rankings from those municipal Web sites evaluated in 2003. Riga moved up 52 places to 10th overall in the 2005 evaluation.

Conclusion

The study of municipal e-governance practices throughout the world is an area that clearly requires ongoing research. Our studies in 2003 and 2005 have produced findings that contribute to the e-governance literature, in particular in the areas of Web site privacy/security, usability, content, services, and citizen participation. The 2005 study highlights the increased attention spent on privacy and security and the need for further attention in the area of citizen participation via municipal Web sites.

In addition, the gap between OECD and non-OECD member countries in average scores has increased since 2003. Although overall average scores have improved for non-OECD member countries, they have not done so at the rate of OECD member countries. As we concluded in 2003, since there is a gap between developed and less-developed countries, it is very important for international organizations such as the UN and cities in advanced countries to attempt to bridge the digital divide. We recommend developing a comprehensive policy for bridging that divide. That comprehensive policy should include capacity building for municipalities, including information infrastructure, content, and applications and access for individuals.

With the growing research and development of e-governance emerging throughout the world, as well as the importance of information and communication technologies, we expect that the gap discussed above will begin to close. The continued study of municipalities worldwide, with a third evaluation planned in 2007, will further provide insight into the direction of e-governance and the performance of e-governance throughout regions of the world. This second study of worldwide digital governance has allowed for initial assessments in the direction of e-governance performance via a two-year comparison. With forthcoming studies, already in the planning, the data will become critical in evaluating whether the gaps highlighted here continue to increase. Moreover, every region has examples of best practices for overall performance and in each specific e-governance category. As municipalities seek to increase their municipal Web site performance, searching within their region offers opportunities to identify e-governance benchmarks. Those municipalities that serve as top performers in their respective regions can then look at the top-ranked cities in municipalities throughout the world. Although the 2005 study highlights increases in e-governance performance throughout the world, continuous improvement should be the norm for every municipality.

Acknowledgment

We are grateful for the work and assistance of research staffs in the E-Governance Institute/ National Center for Public Productivity at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Campus at Newark, and the Global e-Policy e-Government Institute at Sungkyunkwan University. We would also like to express our deepest thanks for their contributions to the evaluators who participated in this project. A complete listing of names can be found at <http://www.andromeda.rutgers.edu/~egovinst/Website/>

References

- Accenture. (2002). eGovernment leadership: Realizing the vision. *The Government Executive Series*. Retrieved September 9, 2006, from http://www.accenture.com/Global/Services/By_Industry/Government/R_and_I/EGovVision.htm
- Accenture (2004). eGovernment leadership: High performance, maximum value. *The Government Executive Series*. Retrieved September 9, 2006, from http://www.accenture.com/Global/Services/By_Industry/Government/R_and_I/
- Arterton, F. C. (1987). *Can technology protect democracy?* Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.
- Arterton, F. C. (1988). Political participation and teledemocracy. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 21(3), 620-626.
- Becker, T. (1993). Teledemocracy: Gathering momentum in state and local governance. *Spectrum: The Journal of State and Government*, 66(2), 14-19.
- Bellamy, C., & Taylor, J. A. (1998). *Governing in the information age*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Browning, G. (2002). *Electronic democracy: Using the internet to transform American politics*. Medford: CyberAge Books.
- Bryan, C., Tsagarousianou, R., & Tambini, D. (1998). Electronic democracy and the civic networking movement in context. In R. Tsagarousianou, D. Tambini, & C. Bryan, *Cyber democracy: Technology, cities, and civic networks* (pp. 1-17). New York: Routledge.
- Capgemini. (2005) Online availability of public services: How is Europe progressing? *European Commission Report*. Retrieved September 7, 2006, from http://www.capgemini.com/news/2005/Online_availability_of_public_services_5th_measurement.pdf
- Christopher, A. F. (1987). *Teledemocracy: Can technology protect democracy?* Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.

- Cloete, F. (2003). Assessing governance with electronic policy management tools. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 26(3), 276-290.
- Eggers, W. D. (2005). *Government 2.0: Using technology to improve education, cut red tape, reduce gridlock, and enhance democracy*. New York: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Gattiker, U. E. (2001). *The Internet as a diverse community: Cultural, organizational, and political issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Giga Consulting. (2000). *Scorecard analysis of the New Jersey department of treasury*. Unpublished report to the NJ Department of Treasury.
- Holzer, M., & Kim, S.-T. (2004). *Digital governance in municipalities worldwide*. Newark, NJ: National Center for Public Productivity. Retrieved July 5, 2006, from <http://www.andromeda.rutgers.edu/~egovinst/Website/Report%20-%20Egov.pdf>
- Horrigan, J. B. (2004). *How Americans get in touch with government: Internet users benefit from the efficiency of e-government, but multiple channels are still needed for citizens to reach agencies and solve problems*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- Howard, M. (2001, August). e-Government across the globe: How will “e” change Government? *Government Finance Review*, 6-9.
- Kamarck, E. C., & Nye, J. S., Jr. (Eds.). (1999). *Democracy.com? Governance in a networked world*. Hollis: Hollis Publishing.
- Kamarck, E. C., & Nye, J. S., Jr. (Eds.), (2003). *Governance.com: Democracy in the information age*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kaylor, C., Deshazo, R., & Van Eck, D. (2001). Gauging e-government: A report on implementing services among American cities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 18, 293-307.
- Korac-Kakabadse, A., & Korac-Kakabadse, N. (1999). Information technology's impact on the quality of democracy: Reinventing the 'democratic vessel.' In R. Heeks (Ed.), *Reinventing government in the information age: International practice in IT-enabled public sector reform*. London: Routledge.
- Loader, B. D. (Ed.). (1997). *The governance of cyberspace: Politics, technology and global restructuring*. London: Routledge.
- Malina, A. (1999). Perspectives on citizen democratisation and alienation in the virtual public sphere. In B. N. Hague & B. D. Loader (Eds.), *Digital democracy: Discourse and decision making in the information age*. London: Routledge.
- McLean, I. (1989). *Democracy and the new technology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Melitski, J., Holzer, M., Kim, S.-T., Kim, C.-G., & Rho, S. Y. (2005). Digital government worldwide: An e-government assessment of municipal Web-sites. *International Journal of E-Government Research*, 1(1), 1-19.

- Moon, M. J. (2002). The evolution of e-government among municipalities: Rhetoric or reality? *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), 424-433.
- Moon, M. J., & deLeon, P. (2001). Municipal reinvention: Municipal values and diffusion among municipalities. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(3), 327-352.
- Musso, J., Weare, C., & Hale, M. (2000). Designing Web technologies for local governance reform: Good management or good democracy. *Political Communication*, 17(1), 1-19.
- Skrzycki, C. (2003a, January 23). U.S. opens online portal to rulemaking; Web site invites wider participation in the regulatory process. *The Washington Post*, p. E01.
- Skrzycki, C. (2003b, October 28). Idea of electronic rulemaking boots up slowly. *The Washington Post*, p. E01.
- Shane, P. M. (2002, September 20-22). *The electronic federalist: The internet and the eclectic institutionalization of democratic legitimacy*. Paper Presented at the Prospects for Electronic Democracy Conference, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- United Nations Online Network in Public Administration (UNPAN). (2003). *United Nations global e-government survey*. Retrieved September 7, 2006, from <http://www.unpan.org/egovernment3.asp>
- United Nations Online Network in Public Administration (UNPAN). (2004). *United Nations global e-government readiness report*. Retrieved September 7, 2006, from <http://www.unpan.org/egovernment4.asp>
- United Nations Online Network in Public Administration (UNPAN). (2005). *United Nations global e-government readiness report*. Retrieved September 7, 2006, from <http://www.unpan.org/dpepa-egovernment%20readiness%20report.asp>
- Weare, C. J., Musso, & Hale, M. (1999). Electronic democracy and the diffusion of municipal Web pages in California. *Administration and Society*, 31(1), 3-27.
- West, D.M. (2001). *WMRC e-government survey*. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from <http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt01int.html>
- West, D. M. (2004). *Global e-government survey*. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from <http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt04int.html>
- West, D. M. (2005). *Global e-government survey*. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from <http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt05int.pdf>
- Westen, T. (1998). Can technology save democracy? *National Civic Review*, 87(1), 47-56.
- Westen, T. (2000). E-democracy: Ready or not, here it comes. *National Civic Review*, 89(3), 217-227.

- Wilhelm, A. G. (1998). Virtual sounding boards: How deliberative is on-line political discussion. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1(3), 313-338.
- Witschge, T. (2002, September 22-22). *Online deliberation: Possibilities of the internet for deliberation*. Paper Presented at the Prospects for Electronic Democracy Conference, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- World E-Gov Forum. (2007) *Top ten e-government countries 2007*. Retrieved February 28, 2007, from http://www.worldegovforum.com/article.php3?id_article=1367

Appendix A: Survey Framework

Privacy/ Security	
1-2. A privacy or security statement/policy 3-6. Data collection 7. Option to have personal information used 8. Third party disclosures 9. Ability to review personal data records 10. Managerial measures 11. Use of encryption	12. Secure server 13. Use of “cookies” or “Web Beacons” 14. Notification of privacy policy 15. Contact or e-mail address for inquiries 16. Public information through a restricted area 17. Access to nonpublic information for employees 18. Use of digital signatures
Usability	
19-20. Homepage, page length. 21. Targeted audience 22-23. Navigation bar 24. Site map	25-27. Font color 30-31. Forms 32-37. Search tool 38. Update of Web site
Content	
39. Information about the location of offices 40. Listing of external links 41. Contact information 42. Minutes of public 43. City code and regulations 44. City charter and policy priority 45. Mission statements 46. Budget information 47-48. Documents, reports, or books (publications)	49. GIS capabilities 50. Emergency management or alert mechanism 51-52. Disability access 53. Wireless technology 54. Access in more than one language 55-56. Human resources information 57. Calendar of events 58. Downloadable documents
Service	
59-61. Pay utilities, taxes, fines 62. Apply for permits 63. Online tracking system 64-65. Apply for licenses 66. E-procurement 67. Property assessments 68. Searchable databases 69. Complaints 70-71. Bulletin board about civil applications	72. FAQ 73. Request information 74. Customize the main city homepage 75. Access private information online 76. Purchase tickets 77. Webmaster response 78. Report violations of administrative laws and regulations
Citizen Participation	
79-80. Comments or feedback 81-83. Newsletter 84. Online bulletin board or chat capabilities 85-87. Online discussion forum on policy issues 88-89. Scheduled e-meetings for discussion	90-91. Online survey/ polls 92. Synchronous video 93-94. Citizen satisfaction survey 95. Online decision making 96-98. Performance measures, standards, or benchmarks