



**Institute  
for Information Freedom Development**

[www.svobodainfo.org](http://www.svobodainfo.org)

# **Methodology for the Monitoring of Government Bodies' Official Websites**

**St.-Petersburg  
2011**

*Authors:* Ivan Y. Pavlov, Elena G. Golubeva, Vladimir O. Golubev

*Edited by:* Ivan Y. Pavlov, JD, PhD

## **Summary**

The monitoring of the government bodies' official websites is a research evaluating the state of the official web portals in order to assess the openness/closeness of individual governmental agencies and the state in general, evaluate their inclination to corruption and also to assess the citizens' possibilities to get access to information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government.

The principle tool used in the monitoring of government bodies' official websites is a method for evaluating information accessibility of the official websites. The suggested method allows to calculate basic indicators that show the actual state of affairs with implementing information technologies in the government bodies operation and with obeying the requirements set by the Federal laws "On Providing Access to Information On Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government" and "On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Courts in the Russian Federation".

The method has been tested in the research work performed by the Institute for Information Freedom Development, including that within governmental contract of the Russian Federation.

The method is authored by the Institute for Information Freedom Development experts.

## Content

<a href="#">Introduction.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">Description of the Monitoring Methods.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">Principal Characteristics of the Monitoring.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">Monitoring Cycles, Stages, and Tasks.....</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">Requirements for the monitoring experts.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">Calculating Social Significance and Relevance Coefficients.....</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">Parameters and Criteria Applied in the Monitoring.....</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">Parameter evaluating procedure.....</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">Calculating the final information accessibility coefficient for an official website belonging to an administrative body.....</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">Forming Information Accessibility Rating for the Official Websites of Government Bodies.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">Conclusion.....</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">Appendix 1. Key terms used in this method.....</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">Appendix 2. Principal statutory acts regulating access to official information in the Russian Federation.....</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">Appendix 3. Coefficients used in the research.....</a>	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">Appendix 4. Sample calculation of the Information Accessibility Coefficient.....</a>	<a href="#">23</a>

## Introduction

Today government bodies' official websites have become an important source of information concerning the performance of government bodies and local self-government institutions.

Proper realization of the e-Government concept will result not just in improving the efficiency of the government itself but will also contribute to providing the citizens' access to the state information resources and will make the authorities more transparent to the society. In addition, it will increase to social responsibility of the officials which will definitely lead to an increase in quality of peoples' life.

It is the way the governmental official websites are maintained that indicates the rate of openness/closeness of particular agencies and the state on the whole; it also demonstrates the accessibility of information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government, decision-making and procedure transparency and also the inclination of a particular agency to corruption.

Implementation of information technologies in the governmental practices has become a priority in information policies of many countries. Obviously, information technologies can become a key link in cooperation between the authorities and the society, provide transparency of the government and enable public control over the government activities. In other words, exercising peoples' right to free searching and getting information can be regarded a necessary pre-condition for developing a law-based democracy.

The Decree of the Russian Government # 65 of January 28, 2002 "On the Federal Target Program 'E-Russia (2002-2010)" was a significant step towards implementing information technologies in the practices of the Russian government bodies. The program was aimed at increasing the government efficiency through broad implementation of information and communication technologies as well as providing the citizens' right to have free access to information on activities of government bodies.

One of the important tasks of the "E-Russia (2002-2010)" federal target program was to provide information openness in government bodies' practices and accessibility of governmental information resources, to create conditions for effective cooperation between the authorities and the society through using information and communication technologies. It was manifested in creating the "e-Government" concept as part of the "E-Russia (2002-2010)" program. The concept suggests a complete change in the principle of cooperation between the government and the citizens to make it more efficient. Such cooperation should be based on increasing the openness of the governmental information resources and expanding the range of data that have to be published in the information telecommunication networks, the Internet primarily.

At the moment the Internet is the most efficient way of establishing cooperation between the authorities and the society, the most efficient, fast and economical means of spreading the information concerning the performance of the government bodies in the society as well as releasing the official viewpoint to the public. Creating a unified information space within the "E-Russia (2002-2010)" federal target program implementation was an important step in providing all citizens and organizations regardless of their place of residence with equal access to the governmental information resources.

Until recently the information concerning the government bodies' activities was released irregularly and not in full. It was from the media only that the citizens could learn about the operation of the authorities and newly-adopted statutory acts. But few people were able to get the

relevant information from the original source. Nowadays, when information technologies are developing rapidly and computers have become an essential part of everyday life, 'going online' has obviously become a necessity for governmental agencies. They should launch the official websites as their Internet offices available for everyone 24/7.

Having a proper official website makes governing bodies more organized and socially-oriented. Knowing the official viewpoint, one can analyze it, to compare them with the alternative sources, to question and to criticize it. Government bodies which are obliged to tell about their activities on-line have no choice but to become more responsible to in performing their duties and more accountable to the citizens.

Consequently, providing access to governmental information resources through the Internet increases social security of the citizens and promotes better stability and effectiveness for the business while fighting corruption in the government bodies.

Government bodies' official websites should soon become a key source of full and reliable official information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government. This conclusion is based on the following:

- firstly, the governmental information resources are the most sought-after in the society;
- secondly, it is the governing bodies that hold most socially significant information;
- thirdly, the Internet is the most efficient and modern way of spreading the information in the society;
- and, finally, the fact that the state bodies have their own websites makes them socially as well as legally responsible for the data published on these websites, which makes the authorities more accountable to the society.

Other information sources, including the media, are, in theory, independent of the government and can offer nothing but their own interpretation of the official viewpoint that may be different from the original concept. Streams of information from various media resources make it difficult for an ordinary citizen to find out the official viewpoint of the government over particular topical issues. Accessible governmental electronic resources help to solve this problem.

Another move to achieve better openness of the government bodies was the Information Society Development Strategy approved by the President of Russia on February 7, 2008. This document is aimed at providing higher accessibility of information and technologies and improving the state system guaranteeing providing human and civil rights in the information. This document should be considered a true national concept that determines the state information policy for the near-term prospect and sets guidelines for developing information relations between the government, the society and the individual.

Enforcement of the Federal law "On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government" in 2010 was a landmark event in information accessibility legislation development. The act is aimed at providing transparency of government bodies and bodies of local self-government, implementing information technologies, informing residents and civil society grounds about the activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government.

The law stipulates the unified procedure for providing the information by government bodies and bodies of local self-government concerning their operation. Information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government is defined by the law as information received in any form from any external sources or produced by the government bodies themselves of their subordinate institutions/agencies. The main principles for exercising the right

of citizens and organizations to have access to information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government are openness and accessibility of such information, its reliability, respecting rights and interests of the third parties while providing the information and the responsibility of the government bodies for violating the information access right.

The law also defines the ways of getting information. Now the obligation of all the government bodies and bodies of local self-government to disclose the information on their practices at their official Internet websites according to the attached list has been formally set by a federal act. This list set by the law is of general nature and is to be further detailed by statutory by-law regulations according to the competence of each particular agency.

It should also be noted that another federal act meant to regulate the court information accessibility came into force in 2010. That is the Federal law “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Courts in the Russian Federation”. Information on activities of courts is defined by the law as any information prepared by courts, by Judicial Department and its agencies, or by communities of judges within their competence as well as information received by them and related to court performance. Russian legislation stipulating the judicial procedure, courts’ powers and operations, as well as those of Judicial department and its agencies, or communities of judges; and court rulings on particular cases and other acts regulating court operation are also regarded as information related to court performance. According to the law, the courts are obliged to provide the information on their activities according to the approved list at their Internet websites.

Thus, after the introduction of federal laws “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government” and “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Courts in the Russian Federation” in 2010, government bodies’ official websites turned into official and legally recognized information sources.

We should also mention another statutory act that determines the development of e-Government concept in Russia for the following decade. That is Statement of the Government of the Russian Federation #1815-r of October 20, 2010 “On the “Informational Society” (2011-2020) Governmental Program of the Russian Federation”.

The program is aimed at increasing transparency of government bodies and forming e-Government. To achieve this, the program sets a number of priority policies to 2015, intended to establish electronic cooperation both within the government bodies themselves and between the citizens and the authorities. While doing this government bodies’ official websites are regarded as the principal means of electronic cooperation.

We could wonder how fully the openness and accessibility principle is realized in providing the information related to government bodies, or how much information is provided by the authorities at their Internet websites.

The suggested method of monitoring of the government bodies’ official websites may be applied to get principal indicators demonstrating the present state of affairs in implementing information technologies in the government bodies’ everyday activities and obeying the Federal law “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government”.

## **Description of the Monitoring Methods**

The methodology for monitoring government bodies' official websites of (hereinafter referred to as the Monitoring) involves studying and assessing the information content and technical features of the government bodies' official websites, calculating the coefficient that characterizes the information accessibility of each official websites, forming information accessibility rating of the official websites, and making recommendations to the government bodies with regard to maintaining their official websites.

Web-content analysis method is applied when analyzing the content of government bodies' official websites. This method suggests that the experts study the Internet website content online to determine whether the websites have the quantitative and qualitative characteristics selected. The effectiveness of the method is determined by its maximum similarity to the ways of searching information used by common Internet users when getting information from government bodies' official websites.

The content of government bodies' official websites is studied by means of comparing it to the requirements set for the official websites (hereinafter referred to as the Requirements to the official websites) considering its comprehensiveness, relevance, navigability and user-friendly format, social significance of the content and the competence of the of the government bodies themselves. The Requirements to the official websites are formulated as a list of parameters characterizing the accessibility of the information on activities of the government bodies at the official websites of these government bodies.

The Requirements to the official websites used in the Monitoring are based on the provisions of the valid law regulating access to information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government. The Requirements to the official websites also take into consideration the Russian and foreign experience of maintaining Internet websites as well as the expert opinion concerning the public demand for certain characteristics of the authorities' websites.

Thus, the Monitoring involves assessing the official websites using the list of parameters, and each of them is evaluated by particular criteria.

The Monitoring results in making an integrated evaluation of the official websites where in percentage rating it can be seen to what extent all the of their aggregate information accessibility quantitative and qualitative characteristics conform to the Requirements to the official websites.

The Monitoring is based on the following basic principles:

*Openness:* the Monitoring method description and its results are published and are freely available.

*Independence:* the Monitoring results are based only on the assessments made by the experts who are independent of the government bodies and each other.

*Objectivity:* the Monitoring results reflect the current situation in the studied sphere and do not depend on the subjective opinion or wish of the expert performing the research. The experts doing the monitoring should possess proper qualification and knowledge.

*Legality:* the Monitoring is based on the requirements for the government bodies' official websites set by the existing law.

The principal tool used in the monitoring of the government bodies' official websites is the method for evaluating the degree of information accessibility of official websites.

The method used in the Monitoring of the government bodies' official websites allows to carry out the comprehensive comparative research and evaluation of the content of government bodies' official websites in terms of their information accessibility considering the requirements of the valid law that stipulate access to information on activities of government bodies and

bodies of local self-government. The method also helps to watch the dynamics of the official websites' information accessibility development for individual government bodies and for all bodies researched in one Monitoring cycle.

A key element in the Monitoring procedure is calculating the final rating of the official website content (information accessibility coefficient). Each official website shall receive its own information accessibility coefficient based on the aggregate evaluation of all the parameters. These assessments are used as a ground for forming information accessibility rating of government bodies' official websites by ranging them from top to bottom with descending information accessibility coefficient value.

The specific feature of this method as compared with other methods<sup>1</sup> used for evaluating government bodies' official websites, is that it is methodologically and legally structured, and lot of attention is paid to checking content of the official websites for conformity with the requirements set by the valid legislation in part of providing access to information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government and maintaining their official websites.

The Monitoring can be used as a tool of control over the government bodies for guaranteeing that they provide the information concerning their activities. Regular Monitoring will enable us to follow the dynamics of accessibility of the information concerning the performance of the government bodies.

The results achieved through the Monitoring enable us to assess the efficiency of measures taken by the authorities for providing information on their activities.

## **Principal Characteristics of the Monitoring**

**Monitoring subject:** Conformity of the government bodies' official websites content to the requirements to the official websites including those stipulated by the following legal acts:

- Federal law of February 9, 2009 # 8-FZ "On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government";
- Federal law of December 22, 2008 # 262-FZ "On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Courts in the Russian Federation";
- Decree of the Russian government of November 24, 2009 # 953 "On Providing Access to Information on Activities of the Government of the Russian Federation and of Federal Executive Government Bodies";

---

<sup>1</sup>See: "Developing a Monitoring Method for Evaluating the Information Openness of the Federal Executive Bodies. Expert Evaluation of the Information Resources Belonging to the Federal Executive Bodies" - a report on the research work concerning the governmental contract done by order of the Russian Economic Development Ministry and performed by "Expert RA Rating Agency" CJSC, Moscow, 2006;

Methods of rating evaluation of the official Internet websites designed for disclosing governmental contract information in the Russian Federation developed by "Expert RA Rating Agency" CJSC, Moscow, 2007, online resource [<http://www.raexpert.ru/ratings/internet/g2b/>];

"Research and analyses of the official websites belonging to the government bodies and bodies of local self-government in the Russian Federation subjects for conformity with the requirements set by the Federal Law #8-FZ of 09.02.2009 "On Providing Access to Information on Activities of the Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government" -a report of the research work concerning the governmental contract done by order of Russian Economic Development Ministry and performed by Institute of the Information Society, Moscow, 2009; Measuring Website Quality, Central Office of Information (COI), UK, 2010.

- Decree issued by the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation on November 16, 2009 # 470 “On Requirements to Technological, Program, and Linguistic Means Providing Usage of the Official Websites of Federal Executive Government Bodies”, and other statutory acts regulating the accessibility of the official information.

**Monitoring object:** Government bodies’ official websites.

The Monitoring involves analyzing government bodies’ official websites, that release information on activities of the government body given that the website domain name belongs to the particular government body (according to Article 1 of the Federal law “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government”). The monitoring should be performed within the website domain name (at all levels).

The monitoring covers government bodies’ official websites that are valid at the time of conducting the research and summing up the results.

**Monitoring objective** is to perform integral assessment of information accessibility of government bodies’ official websites by means of quantitative and qualitative characteristics.

## **Monitoring Cycles, Stages, and Tasks**

**Monitoring cycle** is a period of time when all the monitoring stages should be performed in regard to the websites of the government bodies selected.

The Monitoring consists of three *stages*:

1. Preparation stage, when the expert background and tools for the upcoming Monitoring cycle are prepared.
2. Implementation stage, when the analyzing and evaluation of the official websites takes place.
3. Final stage, when the Monitoring results are summed up.

**Monitoring tasks:**

*Preparation stage:*

- Forming an expert group (Group A) for developing or updating (basing on the experience of the previous Monitoring cycles) and approving the tools to be used in doing the upcoming Monitoring cycle (list of parameters).
- Developing or updating (basing on the experience of the previous Monitoring cycles) a list of parameters for evaluating the content of government bodies’ official websites.
- Experts of Group A should assign a parameter relevance coefficient to each of the parameters for each governmental body.
- Experts of Group A should assign a Criteria relevance coefficient to each criterion for each parameter.
- Experts of Group A should assign a social significance coefficient to each parameter.
- Forming an expert group (Group B) for assessing the parameters related to content of government bodies’ official websites.

*Implementation stage:*

- Preliminary assessment of the official websites content parameters according to the scale and the list of criteria made by experts of Group B.

- Secondary<sup>2</sup> assessment of the official websites content parameters according to the scale and the list of criteria made by experts of Group B.

*Final stage:*

- Calculating information accessibility coefficients for each parameter and for each official website.
- Calculating final information accessibility coefficients for each official website.
- Calculating average information accessibility coefficient for official websites.
- Forming information accessibility rating of government bodies' official websites.
- Forming official websites ratings by various parameters and criteria as well as discovering interconnection between different characteristics.
- Making recommendations for the government bodies on developing their websites.
- Making recommendations for conducting the following Monitoring cycle.

## **Requirements for the monitoring experts**

Two expert groups are involved in the Monitoring. The first one (Group A) is responsible for preparation and final stages of the Monitoring. The second one (Group B) should perform the application stage of the Monitoring. The qualifying requirements for the experts are determined by the nature of the tasks to be resolved by the Monitoring.

The Group A should consist of the experts who possess the knowledge and considerable practical experience in state and municipal governing and in the sphere of providing access to the official information.

The qualification of the Group A experts can be confirmed by the following:

- 1) a university degree in law, state or municipal governing, political studies or economics;
- 2) working experience for at least 5 years in state or municipal administration; or
- 3) working experience for at least 5 years in legal or economics sphere; or
- 4) working experience of for least 5 years in research work in state or municipal administration sphere, or
- 5) working experience for at least 5 years in research work related to providing access to official information. Experience of participation in legal proceedings related to realizing and protecting the right access to official information.

The Group A leader has to meet the following qualifying requirements:

- 1) an advanced degree in law;
- 2) knowledge of the state system and administrative structure both in the Russian Federation and abroad;
- 3) a minimum 10-year experience of working in legal sphere;
- 4) an experience of legal procedures related to realizing and protecting the right to have access to the official information;
- 5) an experience of participation in research work directly connected with studying government bodies' official websites;

---

<sup>2</sup>This task can be performed at the application stage of the Monitoring if there is interaction between the expert group members and governmental officials so that both mistakes made by the experts in the evaluation and faults in the official websites content can be corrected.

6) scientific publications related to the information openness of the government bodies.

The Group B consists of experts who are knowledgeable in the field of in state or municipal administration, and also in the issues of providing access to the official information.

The qualification of the Group B experts can be confirmed by the following:

- 1) a university degree in law, state or municipal governing, political studies or economics;
- 2) for undergraduates – experience in state or municipal administration sphere;
- 3) experts who have experience in research work related to providing access to official information should be undergraduate students at least.

The Group B leader has to meet the following qualifying requirements:

- 1) knowledge of the state system and administrative structure both in the Russian Federation and abroad;
- 2) a minimum 10-year experience of working in legal sphere;
- 3) an experience of legal procedures related to realizing and protecting the right to have access to the official information;
- 4) an experience of participation in research work directly connected with studying government bodies' official websites;
- 5) scientific publications related to the information openness of the government bodies.

Candidates for the Group A shall undergo a competitive selection procedure led by other experts and the leader of the Group A. The competitive selection consists of two stages. The first stage is an interview covering the following theoretical points:

- state and municipal structure in Russia,
- governmental system and self-government bodies in Russia,
- competence of the government bodies,
- legal framework regulating the access to the official information,
- IT and Internet basics,
- official information sources,
- ways for searching official information, and
- Internet navigation.

The second stage is practical. At this stage the candidate has to complete the task involving finding particular data categories and services at the official website selected.

To pass the competition successfully, a candidate to the Group B has to demonstrate satisfactory knowledge of state and municipal structure; of the procedure for government bodies and bodies of local self-government how to provide information concerning their activities, and also to show the necessary skills for information searching at government bodies' official websites.

Prior to each new Monitoring cycle, the Group A experts should carry out an educational training for successful candidates to study the details of structure and performance of the government bodies that are to be covered by the upcoming Monitoring cycle, to explain the provisions of the Monitoring a methods focusing on the parameters and criteria of the upcoming Monitoring cycle, and also to perform a pilot analysis of a few official websites to be covered by the upcoming Monitoring cycle. The results of such pilot analyses are later analyzed further. After the training all the participants should do a test to demonstrate the understanding of the essence of all the parameters and criteria to be applied in the particular Monitoring cycle. The experts who succeed in passing the test join the Group A.

## Calculating Social Significance and Relevance Coefficients

To make the research more objective and to take into account nonequivalence of the evaluated parameters in terms of the demand for the particular data or the particular service, **Social Significance Coefficient (SSc)** is applied. This coefficient should reflect the social significance of the particular data or the particular service and the level of public interest in them. This indicator is necessary because the parameters may differ in terms of their social significance. For instance, knowing the exact location of a particular administration body is more important than directions on how to get there by public transport.

The social significance coefficient may have one of the three values:

- low social significance –  $SSc = 1$ ;
- medium social significance –  $SSc = 2$ ;
- high social significance –  $SSc = 3$ .

Another tool for improving the objectiveness of the research is applying the **Parameter Relevance Coefficient (PRc)** and the **Criterion Relevance Coefficient (CRc)**. They have been introduced in the method for two reasons:

- possible differences in structure and competence of different government bodies whose official websites are to be evaluated within one Monitoring cycle (PRc should be applied for that);
- specific nature of the particular parameter that can be assessed by some of the criteria only (CRc should be applied for that).

The competence of each administrative body is determined by relevant statutory acts. Due to the specific nature of their competence, some agencies have to publish certain categories of data at their official websites, while others do not have to do so.

For instance, performing expertise is a function possessed by a few federal executive bodies only (like the Federal Service of Environmental, Technological and Nuclear Supervision, or the Federal Service for Supervision of Natural Resource Usage); only a few government bodies can provide licensing and accreditation services (like the Federal Supervision Agency for Information Technologies and Communications, the Federal Tax Service, or the Russian Federation Ministry of Civil Defense and Emergency Response). Differences may occur in the institution structures, too, for instance, not all the agencies have local territorial bodies (for instance, the Federal Tourism Agency, or Federal Youth Policy Agency do not have them) or foreign offices (the Federal Antimonopoly Service or the Federal Treasury have no foreign offices).

To consider these differences, experts of the Group A analyze the valid law provisions which set the powers, functions and tasks of each administrative body. Having completed the analysis, experts of the Group A select the parameters that should not be assessed by all of the criteria. In other words, using this indicator, the experts can say whether the particular parameter is related to the competence of the particular administrative body or not.

In addition, some parameters can be assessed by one or a few criteria only, not by all of them. This may happen due to the nature of information or service set by the parameter.

For instance, for parameters like “Full name of the administrative body head”, “Postal address of the administrative body”, “Link to the official website for disclosing governmental contract information”, the “Comprehensiveness” criterion can not be assessed. “Relevance” criterion can only be evaluated for the information for which the updating rate is stipulated by statutory legal acts (like “reviews of the citizens’ applications, “performance reports of the administrative

body”, “official statistics data”, “events outcome” etc.). For other parameters, this criterion cannot be evaluated.

Parameter relevance coefficient may have two values:

- if, while evaluating the official website, for particular administrative body the parameter is not considered, PRc = 0;
- if, while evaluating the official website, for particular administrative body the parameter is considered, PRc = 1.

Criterion relevance coefficient may have two values:

- if, while evaluating the official website, the criterion for the particular parameter is not considered, CRc = 0;
- if, while evaluating the official website, the criterion for the particular parameter is considered, CRc = 1.

## **Parameters and Criteria Applied in the Monitoring**

A parameter for the monitoring of the official websites (hereinafter referred to as a parameter) is a property of an official websites of an administrative body to be assessed in the course of the Monitoring.

Parameters are divided into two types – substantial and technical ones.

A substantial parameter is a property of the official website found by the experts that characterizes its information content.

A technical parameter is a property of the official website found by the experts that characterizes technological, program and linguistic means for providing official websites operation.

Before a full list of parameters can be completed, the following operations should be done:

- analyzing the existing legislation in terms of setting the government bodies competence and providing access to the official information;
- analyzing the technical, program and other requirements for maintaining and using government bodies’ official websites and other websites;
- analyzing international experience in the sphere of maintaining government bodies’ official websites;

Information accessibility of an official website of a particular administrative body can be characterized by the conformity of its content with the list of parameters. Each parameter shall have its own integrated information accessibility assessment.

Experts of the Group B shall evaluate the parameters by the following criteria:

- availability;
- comprehensiveness;
- relevance;
- navigability;
- HTML accessibility;
- file accessibility;
- graphic accessibility.

These criteria are determined by the goals of the Monitoring. A specific combination of the criteria enables us to offer a definite mathematical assessment for each of the parameters.

The criteria are divided into two types depending on their nature: quantitative ones (availability and comprehensiveness) and qualitative ones (relevance, navigability, HTML accessibility, file accessibility and graphic accessibility).

The criteria are evaluated by selecting a value from pre-defined variants. The number of possible values shall not exceed three which makes the expert work easier and promotes better objectiveness.

The objectiveness of the criteria evaluation is determined by choosing a well-grounded, stable and accurate measuring scale:

- choosing a rank scale is justified because applying it in the research ensures proper studying of the object to be monitored;
- the stability of the scale is characterized by the frequency of the measurement results;
- accuracy of the scale means that it is sensitive enough to provide precise measurement.

It has been empirically proved that using a three-point scale is the most sensitive in monitoring the official websites. Using a more sensitive scale would lead to consistent errors.

Only the criteria where the Criterion Relevance Coefficient (CRc) = 1 are to be assessed.

“**Availability**” is a quantitative criterion which describes the fact of publishing the information or service corresponding to the particular parameter at the official website. When analyzing the parameter for “Availability” the experts shall evaluate the **Parameter availability coefficient (K<sub>1</sub>)**, which may have two values:

- if the information or service of the particular parameter is available at the official website, **K<sub>1</sub> = 1**;
- if the information or service of the particular parameter is not available at the official website, **K<sub>1</sub> = 0**.

“**Comprehensiveness**” is a quantitative criterion which describes the sufficiency of the information published at the official websites for forming an integral idea by the particular parameter.

Information that is sufficient for forming an integral idea should have the following characteristics:

- 1) The quantitative representation of the information published at the official website of an administrative body should conform to the composition of the data produced by this body within its competence for the whole period of its performance. For instance, if an agency has prepared five reports, all of them must be available at the official website;
- 2) The content of the information published at the official website should reflect all the necessary information scope for the particular parameter. For instance, full texts of the reports should be available at the website, not just extracts or summaries.

Evaluating the completeness and the data composition of the data provided should be based on literal interpretation of the parameter, taking into account the following:

- requirements set by the statutory acts regulating the obligations of the particular administrative body in part of creating and/or receiving information and determining the content of such information;
- logical evaluation of the conceptual meaning of the given parameter.

When analyzing the parameter by the Comprehensiveness criteria the experts should assess the **Comprehensiveness coefficient (K<sub>2</sub>)** that may equal to one of the three values depending on the comprehensiveness of the information:

- high comprehensiveness (90-100%) – **K<sub>2</sub> = 1** (all the required data are provided in full and the scope is sufficient);

- medium comprehensiveness (30-90%) -  $K_2 = 0,5$  (all the required data are provided but the information is not full; or the information is full but its scope is insufficient);
- low comprehensiveness (5-30%) -  $K_2 = 0,2$  (only scrappy information is provided);

**“Relevance”** - is a qualitative criterion which describes the updating rate of the information available at the official website as well as its relevance at the moment of the expert analyzes. This criterion depends on the dynamics of changing the information characteristics.

When analyzing the parameter by the “Relevance” criteria, the experts should assess the **Relevance coefficient ( $K_3$ )** that may have one of the three values depending on the relevance of the information:

- high relevance –  $K_3 = 1$  (the latest version of the information is available at the official website; all the upgrades and amendments have been considered at the time of the analysis);
- medium relevance –  $K_3 = 0,85$  (the second latest version of the information is available at the official website, the latest upgrades and amendments made not earlier than 1 month prior to the analysis, are not shown);
- low relevance –  $K_3 = 0,7$  (the official website offers outdated information; upgrades and amendments made earlier than 1 month prior to the analysis, are not shown).

**“Navigability”** is a qualitative criterion which describes the convenience of searching the information by the given parameter at official website.

When analyzing the parameter by the “Navigability” criteria the experts should assess the **Navigability coefficient ( $K_4$ )** that may have one of the three values depending on the navigability of the information provided by the official website:

- high navigability –  $K_4 = 1$  (the information is available by using consecutive hyperlinks, starting from the home page of the official website. The number of links to be used should not exceed 5);
- medium navigability –  $K_4 = 0,95$  (the information is available by using consecutive hyperlinks, starting from the home page of the official website. The number of links to be used exceeds 5);
- low navigability –  $K_4 = 0,9$  (the information is not available by using consecutive hyperlinks, starting from the home page of the official website or is not located in the proper section).

**“HTML accessibility”** is a qualitative criterion which describes the fact of placing the parameter information at the official website in HTML format, facilitating the search.

When analyzing the parameter by the “HTML accessibility” criteria, the experts should assess the **HTML accessibility coefficient ( $K_5$ )**, that may have on of the two values depending on whether the information is available at the official website in HTML format, or not:

- the information is available at the official website in HTML format –  $K_5 = 1$ ;
- the information is not available at the official website in HTML format –  $K_5 = 0,2$ .

**“File accessibility”** is a qualitative criteria which describes the fact of placing the document required by the given parameter at the official website in a format that allows the user to store it at his/her hardware devices, to search for and to copy extracts of the text in the document (hereinafter referred to as downloadable format) so that the users can further use the information.

When analyzing the parameter by the “File accessibility” criteria the experts should assess its **File accessibility coefficient ( $K_6$ )** that may have on of the two values depending on whether the document is available at the official website in downloadable format, or not:

- the document is available at the official website in downloadable format –  $K_6 = 1$ ;
- the document is not available at the official website in downloadable format –  $K_6 = 0,85$ .

**“Graphic accessibility”** is a qualitative criteria which describes the fact of placing the document required by the given parameter at the official website in a in the graphic format the actual image of the document so that the users can read its original version (hereinafter referred to as graphic format).

When analyzing the parameter by the «Graphic accessibility» criteria the experts should assess the **Graphic accessibility coefficient (K<sub>7</sub>)** that may have on of the two values depending on whether the document is available at the official website in the graphic format, or not:

- the document is available at the official website in the graphic format –  $K_7 = 1$ ;
- the document is not available at the official website in the graphic format –  $K_7 = 0,95$ .

Full list of all coefficients including their content and possible values can be found in Appendix 3.

### **Parameter evaluating procedure**

Each parameter of each official website of an administrative body shall be analyzed by the Group B experts themselves according to the list of criteria and their scale. While doing this analyzes the experts should calculate the coefficient value of each relevant criteria by each relevant parameter for each official website.

The Group B leader can perform a random check of the results achieved in his discretion. If the experts disagree about the assessment results, the Group B leader should arrange a discussion with the whole expert group. The final decision is to be made on a consensus basis after each expert of the Group B gives his/her grounded opinion. If no consensus is reached, then the final decision is to be made by a majority vote of all experts and the leader of the Group B. If the votes split equally, the opinion supported by the Group B leader prevails.

On calculating the values of all the coefficients by all relevant criteria and parameters for all websites within one Monitoring cycle, the results of the Monitoring cycle are to be approved by the Group B leader.

Automation equipment can be applied in the Monitoring.

### **Calculating the final information accessibility coefficient for an official website belonging to an administrative body**

At the preparation and application stages, values of all unique coefficients that are necessary for formulating the research results were estimated. Thus, prior to the Monitoring final stage, the following values have to be estimated:

- Social significance coefficient (SSc) for each parameter.
- Criteria relevance coefficient (CRc) for each criteria of each parameter.
- Parameter relevance coefficient (PRc) for each parameter for each official website.
- Parameter availability coefficients (K<sub>1</sub>) for each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.
- Comprehensiveness coefficients (K<sub>2</sub>) for each comprehensiveness criterion (where CRc value = 1) of each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.
- Relevance coefficients (K<sub>3</sub>) for each relevance criterion (where CRc value = 1) of each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.

- Navigability coefficients ( $K_4$ ) for each navigability criterion (where CRc value = 1) of each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.
- HTML accessibility coefficients ( $K_5$ ) for each HTML accessibility criterion (where CRc value = 1) of each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.
- File accessibility coefficients ( $K_6$ ) for each file accessibility criterion (where CRc value = 1) of each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.
- Graphic accessibility coefficients ( $K_7$ ) for each graphic accessibility criterion (where CRc value = 1) of each parameter (where PRc value = 1) for each official website.

Assessing an official website is made basing on the aggregate value of separate parameters and criteria by applying the information accessibility coefficient (IACoef). This coefficient is calculated by the following formula:

$$IACoef = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \prod_{j=1}^7 (K_{ij} \times CRCoef_{ij} + 1 - CRCoef_{ij}) \times PRCoef_i \times SSCoef_i \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (PRCoef_i \times SSCoef_i)} \times 100\%$$

Where:

i – parameter ordinal number (from 1 to n);

j – criterion ordinal number (from 1 to 7);

$K_{ij}$  – Coefficient for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  criterion, the  $i^{\text{th}}$  parameter

$CRc_{ij}$  – Criterion Relevance Coefficient for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  criterion, the  $i^{\text{th}}$  parameter;

$PRc_i$  – Parameter Relevance Coefficient for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  parameter;

$SSc_i$  – Social Significance Coefficient for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  parameter

In the shown formula each criterion used in evaluating the parameter is used as a “fine” diminishing the value of the information accessibility coefficient for the particular parameter and for the whole website. The size of the “fine” will vary depending on the criterion importance.

The Availability criterion is the most important one since the negative evaluation of this parameter shall nullify its information accessibility.

The Comprehensiveness criterion is also among the principal ones reflecting quantitative characteristics of the information published at the official website. This accounts for the considerable value of the corresponding “fine”: 50% or 80% that can be charged for insufficient information volume.

The “fine” for insufficient HTML accessibility of the official website data is also considerable: it amounts to 80%. The reason for this is that in this case the information becomes virtually unavailable for searching with the traditional Internet search engines (Google, Yandex etc.), preventing users from finding and using this data.

Relevance of the information is less important than comprehensiveness and HTML accessibility. Thus, the “fine” for insufficient relevance is smaller: 15% or 30%, whereas the “fine” for insufficient file accessibility is just 15%.

Navigability and graphic accessibility criteria are the least important ones. Consequently, the “fines” for faults in these criteria are minimal: 5% and 10%, for navigability, and 5% for graphic accessibility.

The **IACoef** value may range from 0% (which normally means that the no website exists at all), to 100% meaning that the official website fully meets all the requirements. For obvious reasons, the latter does not happen in practice.

## **Forming Information Accessibility Rating for the Official Websites of Government Bodies**

Evaluating procedure through calculating information accessibility coefficient should be done for each of the selected official websites belonging to government bodies within one Monitoring cycle.

Information accessibility ratings of official websites belonging to government bodies are formed by sorting them from top to bottom with descending the information accessibility coefficient. If two or more websites have the same value of information accessibility coefficient, they will share the rating position and will be placed in alphabetical order.

Forming the information accessibility rating of the official websites belonging to government bodies is the principle outcome of the Monitoring.

The authors of the methods assume that, in theory, any official website can reach the 100% openness coefficient. Mathematical operations like scaling, fitting, data correction (for information accessibility coefficients) should not be used in the rating. The results are ranged according to “pure” values of information accessibility coefficient. Procedures for excluding “outliers” are not used, either. The ranging scale is measured basing on the theoretical 100% value of the information accessibility coefficient IACoef (“a perfect website”), rather than from the existing maximum IACoef value for the given site category.

The ranging procedure shall be applied to all the official websites from the selected group. No official website (and no information accessibility coefficient value) can be excluded from the analyses for content, political or methodological reasons. Excluding any government bodies’ official websites from this group may deform the results and lead to mistrust to the whole research.

If a governmental body whose website was to be evaluated within the particular Monitoring, has no official website whatsoever, the information accessibility coefficient IACoef of this body given the value “0” with the remark “no official website exists”. If there are a few bodies/regions with no official websites, they shall be placed at the bottom position of the rating and listed in alphabetical order.

### **Conclusion**

The suggested method can be used for the monitoring of the government bodies’ official websites for conformity with the requirements including those set by the valid law, and considering their comprehensiveness, relevance, navigability, user-friendly format and social significance of the provided, and specific competence of the government bodies themselves.

The strengths of the method are that it is based on the valid law provisions, suggests high quality research through full scope of the official websites data as well as its universalism understood as a possibility of covering the official websites of all of the government bodies of the same level.

During the many years when the monitoring has been performed by the Institute for Information Freedom Development, the method proved to be highly effective. As a result, it is in the focus of increasing attention from both the authorities and the expert community of the field.

Apart from being an important scientific challenge, the monitoring of the government bodies’ official websites also has an important civil value and therefore can be used for solving a more urgent task. Another significant effect of the valid legislation in part of providing access to the official information is that it is aimed at promoting accountability and responsibility of the authorities to the citizens and fighting corruption, legal nihilism and other social evils.

Transparency of the authorities should significantly decrease the possibilities of human rights violations by the officials or should eliminate it altogether, offering certain tools of public control over their actions and decisions.

Providing unrestricted free access to legal information shall help to eliminate the legal illiteracy of the population while laying the foundation for broader public participation in state government.

## Appendix 1. Key terms used in this method

**Access to information** – a possibility to receive and use the information.

**Interactivity** – a possibility of mutual information exchange.

**Information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government (official information)** – information (including documented data), produced by government bodies and their local agencies, or by bodies of local self-government within their powers, or produced by their subordinate institutions/agencies; or the information received by such bodies and institutions. Information on activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government also includes laws and other statutory acts, whereas the information concerning the activities of bodies of local self-government includes municipal statutory acts establishing the structure, powers, forming procedure and operation of such institutions as well as other information related to their operation.

**Official website of the administrative body** – a website in the Internet information and telecommunication network that includes information concerning the activities of the **administrative body (official information)** provided that its electronic address includes a domain name which belongs to this particular body .

**A parameter for the Monitoring of the official websites** – a property of the official website of an **administrative body to be evaluated in the course of the Monitoring**.

**Information accessibility rating of the government bodies' official websites** – a list of government bodies' official websites formed by ranging them from top to bottom with descending information accessibility coefficient.

**Monitoring cycle** – a period of time in which all the stages of the Monitoring of the official websites belonging to the selected government bodies are performed.

## Appendix 2. Principal statutory acts regulating access to official information in the Russian Federation<sup>3</sup>

The Constitution of the Russian Federation;  
Federal law # 59-FZ of May 2, 2006 “On the Procedure for Reviewing Applications from Citizens of the Russian Federation”;  
Federal law # 149-FZ of July 27, 2006 “On Information, Information Technologies, and Protection of Information”;  
Federal law # 262-FZ of December 22, 2008 “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Courts in the Russian Federation”;  
Federal law # 8-FZ of February 9, 2009 “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of Government Bodies and Bodies of Local Self-Government”;  
Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation #953 of November 24, 2009 “On Providing Access to Information on Activities of the Government of the Russian Federation and of Federal Executive Government Bodies”;  
Statement of the Government of the Russian Federation #1815-r of October 20, 2010 “On the “Information Society” (2011-2020) Governmental Program of the Russian Federation”;

---

<sup>3</sup> Detailed list of statutory acts that regulate access to information concerning the activities of government bodies and bodies of local self-government is available at <http://www.law.svobodainfo.org>

Order of the Ministry for Economic Development and Trade #470 of November 16, 2009 “On Requirements to Technological, Program, and Linguistic Means Providing Usage of the Official Websites of Federal Executive Government Bodies”.

### Appendix 3. Coefficients used in the research

Name	Description	Values
<b>Social significance coefficient (SSc)</b>	Shows the significance of the particular data in terms of what public interest they provoke.	«1» - parameter of little social significance. «2» - parameter of medium social significance. «3» - parameter of high social significance.
<b>Parameter relevance coefficient (PRc)</b>	Shows the specific competence of each administrative body as determined by the relevant statutory acts. This coefficient shows whether the parameter is within the competence of the particular body, or not.	«0» - the parameter is beyond the competence of the particular administrative body and cannot be evaluated. «1» - the parameter is within the competence of the particular administrative body and shall be evaluated.
<b>Criteria relevance coefficient (CRc)</b>	Shows the specific nature of each parameter and whether the criterion can be applied to the particular parameter.	«0» - the criterion can not be applied to this parameter. «1» - the criterion can be applied to this parameter.
<b>Parameter availability coefficient (K<sub>1</sub>)</b>	Shows whether the parameter property (information, service etc) is available at the official website.	«0» - the property is not available at the official website. «1» - the property is available at the official website.
<b>Comprehensiveness coefficient (K<sub>2</sub>)</b>	Shows whether the information provided by the official website is sufficient to give overall impression about the parameter involved.	«0.2» - low comprehensiveness (scrappy information is provided) «0.5» - medium comprehensiveness (information is not provided in full) «1» - high comprehensiveness (all scope of information is provided in full)
<b>Relevance coefficient (K<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Shows the information updating rate at the official website as well as its relevance at the moment of the expert analyzes. The criterion depends on the dynamics of changing the information characteristics.	«0.7» - low relevance (the official website offers outdated information; upgrades and amendments made earlier than 1 month prior to the analysis, are not shown). «0.85» - medium relevance (the official website offers the second latest version of the information is available at the official website, the latest upgrades and amendments made not earlier than 1 month prior to the analysis, are not shown). «1» - high relevance (the latest version of the information is available at the official website; all the upgrades and amendments have been considered at the time of the analyzes)

Name	Description	Values
<b>Navigability coefficient (K<sub>4</sub>)</b>	Shows the convenience of information search and its logical location in the proper section of the official website.	“1” – high navigability (the information is available by using consecutive hyperlinks, starting from the home page of the official website. The number of links to be used does not exceed 5); “0.95” – medium navigability (the information is available by using consecutive hyperlinks, starting from the home page of the official website. The number of links to be used exceeds 5); “0.9” – low navigability (the information is not available by using consecutive hyperlinks, starting from the home page of the official website or is not located in the proper section).
<b>HTML accessibility coefficient (K<sub>5</sub>)</b>	Shows whether the information is available at the official website in HTML format.	“1” – the information is available at the official website in HTML format. “0.2” - the information is not available at the official website in HTML format.
<b>File accessibility coefficient (K<sub>6</sub>)</b>	Shows whether the information is available at the official website in a format that allows the user to store it at his/her hardware devices so that parts of the text can be searched and copied in the document ( <b>downloadable format</b> ).	“1” - the document is available at the official website in downloadable format. “0.85” - the document is not available at the official website in downloadable format.
<b>Graphic accessibility coefficient (K<sub>7</sub>)</b>	Shows whether the official website provides the actual image of the document <b>in the graphic format</b> so that the users can read its original version ( <b>graphic format</b> ).	“1” – the document is available at the official website in the graphic format. “0.95” – the document is not available at the official website in the graphic format.

## Appendix 4. Sample calculation of the Information Accessibility Coefficient

Before doing the monitoring experts of Group A shall make a list of parameters, shall assign a value of social significance coefficient for each parameter, evaluate the value of the Parameter Relevance Coefficient for each parameter and for each official website, and find the Criteria Relevance Coefficients for each parameter.

The example below shows the calculation of the Information Accessibility Coefficient for one official website by three parameters.

1. Forming a list of parameters and assigning values for Social Significance Coefficient for each parameter by Group A experts:

Name of the parameter	SSc
1 Composition of advisory and deliberative bodies including public ones	SSc=2
2 Minutes of advisory and deliberative bodies, including public ones, meetings	SSc=3
3 Availability of official website map	SSc=1

2. Assigning values for Criteria Relevance Coefficients for each parameter by Group A experts:

Name of the parameter	K <sub>1</sub>	K <sub>2</sub>	K <sub>3</sub>	K <sub>4</sub>	K <sub>5</sub>	K <sub>6</sub>	K <sub>7</sub>
1 Composition of advisory and deliberative bodies including public ones	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=0	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=0	CRc=0
2 Minutes of advisory and deliberative bodies, including public ones, meetings	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=1	CRc=1
3 Availability of official website map	CRc=1	CRc=0	CRc=0	CRc=0	CRc=1	CRc=0	CRc=0

3. Assigning a value of Parameter Relevance Coefficient for each parameter by Group A experts:

Name of the parameter	PRc
1 Composition of advisory and deliberative bodies including public ones	PRc=1
2 Minutes of advisory and deliberative bodies, including public ones, meetings	PRc=1
3 Availability of official website map	PRc=1

4. After that, basing on the results achieved by experts of Group A, Group B experts evaluate all the criteria where the relevance coefficient **CRc** = 1, by all the parameters where the relevance coefficient **PRc** = 1.

The table below shows the coefficient values for each criterion calculated by experts of B Group:

Name of the parameter	K <sub>1</sub>	K <sub>2</sub>	K <sub>3</sub>	K <sub>4</sub>	K <sub>5</sub>	K <sub>6</sub>	K <sub>7</sub>
1 Composition of advisory and deliberative bodies including public ones	1	0.5	-	0.9	1	-	-
2 Minutes of advisory and deliberative bodies, including public ones, meetings	1	0.2	0.85	0.95	0.2	1	0.95
3 Availability of official website map	1	-	-	-	1	-	-

**Experts of Group B do not assess the criteria where CRc value = 0**, because such criteria cannot be evaluated due to the specific nature of the parameter. As in this method all the coefficient values other than “1” are used as a penalty, the criteria that cannot be evaluated should have the coefficient value “1”. Then such criterion shall not have the negative effect on the information accessibility coefficient of the parameter or on the information accessibility coefficient of the official website on the whole.

5. Final table of values for calculating the **IACoef**:

Name of the parameter	K <sub>1</sub>	K <sub>2</sub>	K <sub>3</sub>	K <sub>4</sub>	K <sub>5</sub>	K <sub>6</sub>	K <sub>7</sub>
1 Composition of advisory and deliberative bodies including public ones	1	0.5	1	0.9	1	1	1
2 Minutes of advisory and deliberative bodies, including public ones, meetings	1	0.2	0.85	0.95	0.2	1	0.95
3 Availability of official website map	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

6. Calculating the information accessibility coefficient **IACoef**:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{IACoef} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \prod_{j=1}^7 \left( K_{ij} \times \int \text{CRC}_{ij} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{ij} \right) \times \text{PRC}_i \times \text{SSc}_i \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\text{PRC}_i \times \text{SSc}_i)} \times 100\% = \\
 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \left( \prod_{j=1}^7 \left( K_{ij} \times \text{CRC}_{ij} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{ij} \right) \times \text{PRC}_i \times \text{SSc}_i \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^3 (\text{PRC}_i \times \text{Kcc}_i)} \times 100\% = \\
 &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \left( \frac{\left( K_{i1} \times \text{CRC}_{i1} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i1} \right) \left( K_{i2} \times \text{CRC}_{i2} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i2} \right) \left( K_{i3} \times \text{CRC}_{i3} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i3} \right)}{\left( K_{i4} \times \text{CRC}_{i4} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i4} \right) \left( K_{i5} \times \text{CRC}_{i5} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i5} \right) \left( K_{i6} \times \text{CRC}_{i6} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i6} \right)} \right.}{\left. \left( K_{i7} \times \text{CRC}_{i7} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{i7} \right) \times \text{PRC}_i \times \text{SSc}_i \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^3 (\text{PRC}_i \times \text{SSc}_i)} \times 100\% = \\
 &= \frac{\left( \begin{aligned} &\left( K_{11} \times \text{CRC}_{11} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{11} \right) \left( K_{12} \times \text{CRC}_{12} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{12} \right) \left( K_{13} \times \text{CRC}_{13} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{13} \right) \\ &\left( K_{14} \times \text{CRC}_{14} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{14} \right) \left( K_{15} \times \text{CRC}_{15} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{15} \right) \left( K_{16} \times \text{CRC}_{16} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{16} \right) \\ &\left( K_{17} \times \text{CRC}_{17} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{17} \right) \times \text{PRC}_1 \times \text{Kcc}_1 + \left( K_{21} \times \text{CRC}_{21} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{21} \right) \\ &\left( K_{22} \times \text{CRC}_{22} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{22} \right) \left( K_{23} \times \text{CRC}_{23} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{23} \right) \left( K_{24} \times \text{CRC}_{24} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{24} \right) \\ &\left( K_{25} \times \text{CRC}_{25} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{25} \right) \left( K_{26} \times \text{CRC}_{26} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{26} \right) \left( K_{27} \times \text{CRC}_{27} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{27} \right) \times \\ &\times \text{RPC}_2 \times \text{SSc}_2 + \left( K_{31} \times \text{CRC}_{31} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{31} \right) \left( K_{32} \times \text{CRC}_{32} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{32} \right) \\ &\left( K_{33} \times \text{CRC}_{33} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{33} \right) \left( K_{34} \times \text{CRC}_{34} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{34} \right) \left( K_{35} \times \text{CRC}_{35} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{35} \right) \\ &\left( K_{36} \times \text{CRC}_{36} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{36} \right) \left( K_{37} \times \text{CRC}_{37} + 1 - \text{CRC}_{37} \right) \times \text{PRC}_3 \times \text{SSc}_3 \end{aligned} \right)}{\left( \text{PRC}_1 \times \text{SSc}_1 \right) + \left( \text{PRC}_2 \times \text{SSc}_2 \right) + \left( \text{PRC}_3 \times \text{SSc}_3 \right)} \times 100\% = \\
 &= \frac{\left( \begin{aligned} &\left( 1 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 0.5 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \left( 0.9 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 1 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \\ &\left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \times 1 \times 2 + \left( 1 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 0.2 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 0.85 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \\ &\left( 0.95 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 0.2 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 1 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 0.95 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \times 1 \times 3 + \\ &\left( 1 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \left( 1 \times 1 + 1 - 1 \right) \left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \\ &\left( 1 \times 0 + 1 - 0 \right) \times 1 \times 1 \end{aligned} \right)}{\left( 1 \times 2 \right) + \left( 1 \times 3 \right) + \left( 1 \times 1 \right)} \times 100\% = \\
 &= \frac{0.9 + 0.092 + 1}{2 + 3 + 1} \times 100 = \frac{1.992}{6} \times 100\% = 33.20\%
 \end{aligned}$$

7. Final value of the Information Accessibility Coefficient: **IACoef = 33.20%**.



**Institute for Information Freedom Development**  
[www.svobodainfo.org](http://www.svobodainfo.org)

## **Methodology for the Monitoring of Government Bodies' Official Websites**

*Edited by:* Ivan Y. Pavlov

© Institute for Information Freedom Development