



International Federation of
Library Associations and Institutions

IFLA/FAIFE World Report Series
Vol. VIII

IFLA World Report 2010

Editor: Theo JD Bothma

August 2010



Individual country reports are available at
<http://www.ifla-world-report.org>

Project manager

Theo JD Bothma

Authors of country reports

Theo JD Bothma

Retha Claasen-Veldsman

Erica Cosijn

Archie L Dick

Ina Fourie

Cecilia Penzhorn

Administration and liaison

Joukje Geertsema

Systems development

Catalyst Studios cc

Additional Research

Koos de Beer

Kosie Eloff

Copy editing

Aida Thorne

August 2010

Contact the team at: info@ifla-world-report.org

The IFLA World Report 2010 is published under the Creative Commons license Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Netherlands, available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/nl/deed.en>.

The text of a country report is based on the response provided by the respondent(s) of each country and additional research in third party resources. Care has been taken to represent these views as accurately as possible. IFLA, the FAIFE Committee of IFLA and/or the editors/authors of the individual country reports cannot be held responsible for any inaccuracies that may occur in the report. If the reader is aware of any such inaccuracies or would like to add information to the individual country reports, please send an e-mail to info@ifla-world-report.org.

Analysis and conclusions

Theo Bothma

1. Introduction

In this chapter the findings of this year's research are analysed and comparisons are made with the 2007 Report, where possible.

The previous Reports in this series were branded as the IFLA/FAIFE World Report since the emphasis was primarily on FAIFE-related issues (see <http://www.ifla.org/en/faife/world-report>). At the request of IFLA Headquarters (HQ) the questionnaire was expanded considerably, as explained below, to include non-FAIFE-related issues. IFLA HQ therefore decided that the Report should be rebranded as the IFLA World Report. The current Report nevertheless still has a strong focus on FAIFE-related issues.

Data collection for the World Report 2010 started in April 2009 and continued until the end of 2009, with a number of countries asking for extension into 2010. Data for the individual country reports therefore to a very large extent reflect the situation as in 2009. Therefore, in the comparative tables, the 2009 date was kept since this is the more accurate date for the data from most countries. Additional research for and authoring of the country reports took place in the latter half of 2009 and the first half of 2010. The World Report is launched at the IFLA World Library and Information Congress 2010, 76th IFLA General Conference and Assembly, in Gothenburg, Sweden, in August 2010. The 2007 Report for which the data was collected during 2007, was also only launched the following year, at the IFLA WLIC in August 2008.

This chapter commences with an analysis of the participants of the current Report; comparisons with previous reports; first-time participants and participation trends since 2001 are also given.

Thereafter the questions in the questionnaire are each analysed separately. Conclusions are provided at the end of each question, with a summary conclusion at the end of the chapter.

1.1 Participants in the IFLA World Report 2010

Countries that are represented in the IFLA World Report 2010 are listed in Table 1 below.

Afghanistan	Cyprus	Korea, South (Republic of)	Saint Lucia
Albania	Czech Republic	Kuwait	Serbia
Algeria	Denmark	Latvia	Sierra Leone
Andorra	Dominica	Lebanon	Slovenia
Angola	Egypt	Lesotho	Solomon Islands
Antigua and Barbuda	El Salvador	Lithuania	South Africa
Armenia	Estonia	Luxembourg	Spain
Aruba	Ethiopia	Macedonia	Sri Lanka
Australia	Fiji	Malaysia	Sudan

Austria	Finland	Maldives	Suriname
Bahamas, The	Gabon	Mali	Swaziland
Bangladesh	Gambia, The	Malta	Sweden
Barbados	Germany	Mexico	Switzerland
Belgium	Ghana	Moldova	Syria (Syrian Arab Republic)
Belize	Greece	Montenegro	Tanzania
Bhutan	Greenland	Morocco	Thailand
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Togo
Botswana	Guinea	Nepal	Trinidad and Tobago
Brunei	Guyana	Netherlands, The	Tunisia
Bulgaria	Hungary	Netherlands Antilles	Turkey
Burkina Faso	Iceland	New Zealand	Uganda
Cambodia	India	Norway	Ukraine
Canada	Indonesia	Oman	United Arab Emirates
Cape Verde	Iran	Pakistan	United Kingdom
Central African Republic	Ireland	Palestinian Territories	United States
Chile	Israel	Peru	Vanuatu
China	Italy	Philippines	Vietnam
Colombia	Jamaica	Puerto Rico	Virgin Islands, USA
Côte d'Ivoire	Japan	Qatar	Zimbabwe
Croatia	Jordan	Romania	
Cuba	Kazakhstan	Russia	

Table 1: Participants in the IFLA World Report 2010

1.2 Participants in the IFLA World Report 2010 who did not participate in 2007

34 Countries are represented in the IFLA World Report 2010 who did not participate in 2007. These countries are listed in Table 2 below.

Afghanistan	Colombia	Malaysia	Spain
Angola	Dominica	Morocco	Sudan
Antigua and Barbuda	Gabon	Netherlands	Syria
Armenia	Greece	Philippines	Togo
Bangladesh	Grenada	Puerto Rico	Tunisia
Brunei	India	Qatar	United Arab Emirates
Canada	Indonesia	Romania	Virgin Islands, USA
Central African Republic	Iran	Saint Lucia	
China	Macedonia	Sierra Leone	

Table 2: Participants in the IFLA World Report 2010 who did not participate in 2007

1.3 First-time participants in the IFLA World Report 2010

A total of 20 countries participated for the first time in 2010 in the IFLA World Report. These are listed in Table 3 below.

Afghanistan	Dominica	Malaysia	Sudan
Antigua and Barbuda	Gabon	Morocco	Togo
Bangladesh	Greece	Puerto Rico	Tunisia
Brunei Darussalam	Grenada	Qatar	United Arab Emirates
Central African Republic	Indonesia	Saint Lucia	Virgin Islands, USA

Table 3: First-time participants in the IFLA World Report 2010

1.4 Countries participating in the World Report series since 2001

Table 4, a comparative table, indicates all countries that have participated in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report series from 2001 to 2010.

	Country	2001	2003	2005	2007	2009
		46	88	84	116	122
1.	Afghanistan					1
2.	Albania	1			1	1
3.	Algeria				1	1
4.	Andorra		1	1	1	1
5.	Angola		1	1	Indicated non-participation	1
6.	Antigua and Barbuda					1
7.	Argentina				Indicated non-participation	Indicated non-participation
8.	Armenia	1	1			1
9.	Aruba		1	1	1	1
10.	Australia	1	1	1	1	1
11.	Austria		1		1	1
12.	Azerbaijan		1	1		Indicated non-participation
13.	Bahamas			1	1	1
14.	Bangladesh					1
15.	Barbados				1	1
16.	Belarus		1			
17.	Belgium (Flanders)	1	1	1	1	1
18.	Belize		1		1	1
19.	Benin		1	1	1	
20.	Bermuda				1	
21.	Bhutan				1	1
22.	Bolivia		1		1	1
23.	Bosnia and Herzegovina		1		1	
24.	Botswana		1	1	1	1
25.	Brazil				1	
26.	Brunei Darussalam					1
27.	Bulgaria	1	1		1	1
28.	Burkina Faso				1	1
29.	Cambodia	1			1	1
30.	Cameroon	1				
31.	Canada	1	1	1		1
32.	Cape Verde		1	1	1	1
33.	Central African Republic					1
34.	Chad		1			
35.	Chile	1	1	1	1	1



36.	China		1	1	Indicated non-participation	1
37.	Colombia		1	1		1
38.	Congo Brazzaville				1	
39.	Congo (DRC)			1	1	
40.	Costa Rica	1	1	1	1	
41.	Côte d'Ivoire				1	1
42.	Croatia	1	1	1	1	1
43.	Cuba	1		1	1	1
44.	Cyprus		1	1	1	1
45.	Czech Republic	1	1	1	1	1
46.	Denmark	1	1	1	1	1
47.	Dominica					1
48.	Ecuador			1		
49.	Egypt	1	1	1	1	1
50.	El Salvador				1	1
51.	Estonia		1	1	1	1
52.	Ethiopia	1	1	1	1	1
53.	Fiji		1	1	1	1
54.	Finland		1	1	1	1
55.	France		1			
56.	Gabon					1
57.	Gambia		1		1	1
58.	Georgia	1	1	1		
59.	Germany	1	1	1	1	1
60.	Ghana		1	1	1	1
61.	Greece					1
62.	Greenland				1	1
63.	Grenada					1
64.	Guam		1	1	1	Indicated non-participation
65.	Guatemala		1		Indicated non-participation	
66.	Guinea				1	1
67.	Guyana				1	1
68.	Haiti				1	
69.	Honduras				1	
70.	Hong Kong (SAR of China)		1	1	1	
71.	Hungary				1	1
72.	Iceland	1	1	1	1	1
73.	India	1	1	1		1
74.	Indonesia					1
75.	Iran, Islamic Republic of		1			1
76.	Ireland		1	1	1	1
77.	Israel	1		1	1	1
78.	Italy	1	1	1	1	1
79.	Jamaica	1		1	1	1
80.	Japan	1	1	1	1	1
81.	Jordan				1	1
82.	Kazakhstan			1	1	1
83.	Kenya	1	1	1	1	
84.	Korea (Republic of)				1	1
85.	Kuwait	1	1		1	1
86.	Latvia		1	1	1	1

87.	Lebanon	1	1		1	1
88.	Lesotho	1			1	1
89.	Liechtenstein		1			
90.	Lithuania	1	1	1	1	1
91.	Luxembourg				1	1
92.	Macao		1			
93.	Macedonia		1	1		1
94.	Malaysia					1
95.	Maldives, Republic of				1	1
96.	Mali				1	1
97.	Malta		1		1	1
98.	Mauritius			1	1	
99.	Mexico	1	1	1	1	1
100.	Moldova, Republic of		1	1	1	1
101.	Monaco				1	Indicated non-participation
102.	Mongolia		1	1		
103.	Montenegro				1	1
104.	Morocco					1
105.	Mozambique				1	
106.	Namibia		1		1	1
107.	Nepal		1	1	1	1
108.	Netherland, The	1	1	1	Indicated non-participation	1
109.	Netherlands Antilles (St Maarten)		1	1	1	1
110.	New Caledonia		1	1	1	
111.	New Zealand		1	1	1	1
112.	Nicaragua		1	1		
113.	Niger		1			
114.	Nigeria	1		1	1	
115.	Norway	1	1	1	1	1
116.	Oman				1	1
117.	Pakistan			1	1	1
118.	Palau				1	
119.	Palestinian Territories				1	1
120.	Panama		1		1	
121.	Papua New Guinea			1		
122.	Paraguay				1	
123.	Peru			1	1	1
124.	Philippines		1	1		1
125.	Poland		1	1	1	
126.	Portugal					Indicated non-participation
127.	Puerto Rico					1
128.	Qatar					1
129.	Romania			1		1
130.	Russia		1	1	1	1
131.	Rwanda	1			1	
132.	Saint Lucia					1
133.	San Marino				1	
134.	Senegal				Indicated non-participation	
135.	Serbia				1	1
136.	Serbia and Montenegro		1	1		

137.	Seychelles			1	1	
138.	Sierra Leone			1		1
139.	Singapore		1	1	1	
140.	Slovak Republic		1		1	
141.	Slovenia	1	1	1	1	1
142.	Solomon Islands				1	1
143.	South Africa	1	1		1	1
144.	Spain	1		1		1
145.	Sri Lanka	1		1	1	1
146.	St Kitts and Nevis (Nevis)			1		
147.	Sudan					1
148.	Suriname				1	1
149.	Swaziland		1	1	1	1
150.	Sweden	1	1	1	1	1
151.	Switzerland		1	1	1	1
152.	Syrian Arab Republic			1		1
153.	Tanzania			1	1	1
154.	Thailand	1	1		1	1
155.	Togo					1
156.	Trinidad and Tobago		1	1	1	1
157.	Tunisia					1
158.	Turkey	1			1	1
159.	Turkmenistan			1		
160.	Uganda		1	1	1	1
161.	Ukraine	1	1	1	1	1
162.	United Arab Emirates					1
163.	United Kingdom	1		1	1	1
164.	United States of America	1	1	1	1	1
165.	Uruguay		1		1	
166.	Uzbekistan		1	1		
167.	Vanuatu				1	1
168.	Vatican City		1			
169.	Venezuela		1			
170.	Vietnam				1	1
171.	Virgin Islands, USA					1
172.	Zambia	1		1	1	
173.	Zimbabwe	1	1		1	1

Table 4: Countries participating in the World Report series since 2001

Since the start of the IFLA/FAIFE World Report series in 2001 until 2009/2010, with reference to the fifth report, 171 countries have been represented in these reports.

The participation rate is summarised in Table 5.

Countries' participation since 2001	#
Once	44
Twice	40
Three times	31
Four times	36
Five times – thus represented in all five reports	19
Indicated non-participation and have not yet participated up to now	3

Table 5: Participation rate since 2001

In 2001, 46 countries were represented in the first IFLA/FAIFE World Report. This number almost doubled in 2003, when 88 countries responded. This was the first time a questionnaire was used to report on specific issues, as in 2001 participants wrote their own country reports. (This is also the reason why the format of the 2001 report differs totally from the others.) Altogether 29 such reports were received and “further information was added to these to eventually cover the status of libraries and intellectual freedom in 46 different countries” (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 45). In 2005, the number of participants decreased slightly to 84 and increased to 116 in 2007. The current Report for 2010 has a total of 122 countries represented. As indicated earlier, the World Report 2010 has 34 countries that did not participate in 2007, of which 20 countries are represented for the first time since the beginning of the series. Five countries indicated their non-participation in the World Report 2010, of which three have participated previously. Their reasons varied, including there being no changes in their situation since earlier World Reports; insufficient data being available; and also the fact that such research first needed to be conducted in the country concerned. Some of these countries have already indicated that they would like to participate in the next report.

27 Countries (of which one would have been a first-time participant) indicated that they wanted to participate in the current Report, but in the end failed to do so, even though they were repeatedly requested to complete the questionnaire; a further six countries (of which one would have been a first-time participant) could not find a suitable or willing person to complete the questionnaire; in addition, a further five countries indicated that they did not intend participating (in total therefore 38). Another 33 countries (of which 17 were previous participants) were asked to participate (through many e-mails to many different possible respondents), but did not respond in any way.

1.5 Regional breakdown of the 2010 participants

The same regional definitions as in the 2005 report are used in this Report, as found in the United Nations Populations Prospects Database at <http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=5>. This breakdown is used to allow comparisons with the 2007 Report. The said database lists 229 countries in the world. Of this number the research team tried to contact 193 countries. Most of the countries that were not contacted either have a population of less than 100,000 or fall in the category of least developed countries. Of the contacted countries, 122 participated, another 38 (27 + 6 + 5) responded and 33 did not respond at all. Even though the response reflects 69.8% of all the countries, only 53.2% of the countries participated in 2010. However, since 2001 75.5% of the countries have participated.

Even though 2010 had 20 new responses the report still represents only slightly more than half of the countries of the world listed in the UN database. The ideal would be that all previous countries should respond, as well as the outstanding 24.5% of non-participating countries.

The number of respondents from each region is given in Table 6.

Region	2005	2007	2009	Number of possible respondents
Africa	17	28	26	55
Asia	18	21	32	50
Europe	27	34	34	49
Latin American and the Caribbean	14	22	22	46
North America	2	3	3	5
Oceania	6	8	5	24

Table 6: Regional distribution of respondents

The only numerical increase between 2007 and 2010 is from Asia. Numbers from other regions have either remained the same or declined. It is, however, to be noted that responding countries vary even though numbers may remain stable or fairly stable. This makes comparisons very difficult.

2. Analysis of individual questions

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaire follows the same format as that of the 2007 Report.

The different sections that were covered include the following:

Section 1: Country details

- This section contains data sourced from the CIA World Factbook, 2009 Edition (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>) and Internet World Stats, as of 31 December 2009 (<http://www.internetworldstats.com/>).

Section 2: Estimated number of libraries

- Numbers and facts were asked about national libraries, public, university, school and government funded research libraries.

Section 3: Libraries and the Internet

- Internet access in libraries
- The availability of local content on the Internet
- The use of filtering and blocking software
- The costs of accessing the Internet
- Open access

Section 4: Legal issues

- Libraries and anti-terror legislation
- Copyright laws
- Laws guaranteeing FAIFE principles
- User privacy and anti-terror legislation
- Violations of intellectual freedom

Section 5: Social issues

- HIV/Aids awareness
- Women's literacy and freedom of access to information
- The disabled and freedom of access to information
- Senior citizens and freedom of access to information
- Libraries and the provision of universal primary education
- Libraries and environmental sustainability

Section 6: Ethics and IFLA initiatives

- The adoption of a code of ethics
- The IFLA Internet Manifesto
- The Glasgow Declaration
- The IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption

The analysis section is followed by a final conclusion.

Comparisons with the 2007 Report are offered where feasible. It is to be noted, however, that such comparisons are very often problematic due to the increased number of countries responding (many of which are developing countries) and not the same countries responding for each report. For example, there is an increase of 11 respondents between 2005 and 2007 in Africa and again a decline of two for 2010. However, only seven of the 11 responses in 2007 were first-time respondents, since four have participated in earlier reports. In addition, eight of the respondents for 2010

did not participate in 2007, but 10 respondents of 2007 did not again participate in 2010; of the eight new respondents six were first time respondents and two had participated in reports before 2007. All comparisons are therefore to be taken only as broad indications. Comparisons of a specific country since the inception of the World Report series over time becomes very difficult and is only indicated in a limited number of questions and/or cases.

2.1 Section 1: Country details

This section contains data sourced from the CIA World Factbook, 2009 Edition (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>) and Internet World Stats (<http://www.internetworldstats.com/>, as of 31 December 2009). It is to be noted that, in a small number of cases, respondents objected to or offered corrections for data contained in these sources. It was nevertheless decided to keep the data from these two sources for the sake of consistency. This applied to country maps, languages used in countries, literacy rates and internet statistics. Where necessary the respondents' comments were included in the introductory section to the specific country report.

2.2 Section 2: Library statistics

The questions in this Section asked data about the national libraries and data for the numbers of public and research libraries per country.

The current questionnaire differs from the previous one in that questions about the existence of a national library in a country and its functions were included, as well as whether the national library has an online presence. Of the 122 respondents, 112 indicated that they do have a national library and 10 that they didn't. 91 respondents provided web addresses for their national libraries. In cases where no national library exists, the typical functions of a national library are performed by, for example, a public library or a university/college library.

The category of research libraries was subdivided into university research libraries, school libraries and government-funded research libraries (statutory research council libraries), as in 2007. These numbers were not analysed in any detail in previous reports and comparisons with the 2007 Report is therefore problematical. In addition, before 2007 only one category of research libraries was defined, which included all the sub-categories defined since 2007; comparisons between the different reports are therefore problematical. A superficial comparison indicates that library numbers have remained fairly constant during the past two years, with, on average, limited growth or decline. In a few cases numbers differed fairly substantially, but this seems to be linked to different respondents or more updated statistics being available. These numbers are not further analysed.

2.3 Section 3: Libraries and the Internet

A lack of access to the Internet deprives library users of one of the core information resources of the 21st century (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 352). As with previous reports, different levels of Internet access have been a core focus, and the current Report again followed up on this.

2.3.1 Question 3.1: The digital divide

Question 3.1 had four sub-questions, viz. about internet access in libraries, the amount of local content available on the Internet, the amount of local content in local languages on the Internet and the literacy rate of the country.

2.3.1.1 Internet access in libraries

As in the previous questionnaires, the first part of the question asked respondents to estimate the levels of Internet access in the different categories of libraries. Data between 2009 and 2007 are compared for all categories of library. Comparisons of Internet access in public libraries for earlier reports can be found in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 409 and 410.

2.3.1.1.1 Public libraries

Table 7 provides a comparison of levels of Internet access in public libraries in 2009 and 2007.

Comparisons show that there has been a considerable increase in Internet access in public libraries between 2007 and 2009. At the higher level 37.3% now offer Internet access in 81-100% of libraries, compared to 29.6% in 2007. The percentage of public libraries that offer less than 20% access to the Internet has dropped from 39.1% to 28.2%. In the case of 12 countries the respondents either did not provide any data, or the percentages were unknown.

Access	2009		2007	
	#	%	#	%
81-100%	41	37.3	34	29.6
61-80%	10	9.1	9	7.8
41-60%	20	18.2	16	13.9
21-40%	8	7.3	11	9.6
≤20%	31	28.2	45	39.1
Total (N=)	110		115	
No data/unknown	12		1	

Table 7: Percentage of public libraries offering Internet access

As in 2007, the results are more interesting at a regional level. The levels of Internet access in public libraries in the different regions are summarised in Table 8.

In your estimate, what percentage of all public libraries in your country offers Internet access to users?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total %	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
81-100%	2009	1	4.5	6	22.2	20	58.8	10	47.6	2	66.7	2	66.7	41	37.3
	2007	2	7.1	4	20.0	16	47.1	6	27.3	2	66.7	4	50.0	34	29.6
61-80%	2009	1	4.5	1	3.7	5	14.7	3	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	9.1
	2007	1	3.6	1	5.0	3	8.8	4	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	7.8
41-60%	2009	2	9.1	10	37.0	4	11.8	4	19.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	18.2
	2007	2	7.1	4	20.0	8	23.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	16	13.9
21-40%	2009	4	18.2	1	3.7	1	2.9	1	4.8	1	33.3	0	0.0	8	7.3
	2007	3	10.7	3	15.0	1	2.9	3	13.6	1	33.3	0	0.0	11	9.6
≤20%	2009	14	63.6	9	33.3	4	11.8	3	14.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	31	28.2
	2007	20	71.4	8	40.0	6	17.6	8	36.4	0	0.0	3	37.5	45	39.1
Total (N=)	2009	22		27		34		21		3		3		110	
	2007	28		20		34		22		3		8		115	
No data / unknown	2009	4		5		0		1		0		2		12	
	2007	0		1		0		0		0		0		1	

Table 8: Number and percentage of public libraries offering Internet access according to regions

Africa

Only one country reported 81-100% Internet access in its public libraries, viz. Egypt (compared to the 41-60% of 2007 and 61-80% of 2005). Mauritius and Seychelles reported 81-100% Internet access in their public libraries in 2007; however, neither participated in 2009. As in 2007 and 2005, access to the Internet in public libraries is very low, with 14 of the 22 countries that participated being unable to offer access to the Internet in more than 20% of their public libraries. This seems to be a slight improvement from 2007, but since four countries provided no data (and two less countries participated) no reliable deductions can be made.

Levels of access to the Internet in public libraries in Africa remain extremely low, as in the past. This may improve in future as different projects providing broadband Internet access to the African continent become operational (see, for example, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Submarine_communications_cable and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_broadband_plans_from_around_the_world#Africa). However, currently the lack of Internet access definitely has a negative impact on the possibility of Africa meeting the Millennium Development Goals and on its general economic development.

Asia

Six countries (Israel, Kuwait, Malaysia, South Korea, Turkey and Vietnam) have reported 81-100% access to the Internet in their public libraries, compared to four countries (Hong Kong, the South Korea, Singapore and Vietnam) in 2007.

Europe

Of the 34 countries in Europe that participated in the 2007 Report, 20 have set their Internet access in public libraries at 81-100%, viz. Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom (compared to 16 of 34 countries in 2007 and 13 of 27 countries in 2005), adding Lithuania, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Slovenia and Spain to the group; Germany who in 2005 reported 81-100%, however, dropped to 61-80%.

Overall, the 2009 results show an improvement over 2007, which in turn was an improvement on 2005. However, improvement in Internet access in public libraries has not been evident everywhere, and four of the six countries that have reported less than 20% access in 2007 or earlier (Moldova, Romania, Russia, Ukraine) are still at this level.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Ten of the 22 countries have reported their level of Internet access in public libraries as 81-100%, viz. Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, Trinidad and Tobago, Virgin Islands (compared to six out of 22 in 2007), adding Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana and Virgin Islands to the group. (Belize dropped to 61-80% and Chile did not provide any data.)

North America

In 2009, the USA and Canada participated in the report, both countries reporting 81-100% access to the Internet in their public libraries, as in 2005. The USA reported 81-100% access in 2007 as well, but Canada unfortunately did not participate at that stage. Greenland has reported that Internet access levels in their public libraries remained constant at 21-40%.

Oceania

Of the five respondents in Oceania, two offer Internet access in 81-100% of their public libraries, viz. Australia and New Zealand. Fiji reported levels of access of less than 20% and has remained in this bracket since 2005. The other two respondents didn't provide any data.

Summary for public libraries

There has been a slight overall increase in levels of access to the Internet in public libraries among countries that participated previously in the World Report. It seems as if the trend observed in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 411, viz. that Internet access in public libraries is lower amongst first-time respondents, still holds (with some exceptions); unfortunately a number of first-time respondents did not provide any data.

2.3.1.1.2 School libraries

Comparing data of 2009 with that of 2007 seems to indicate that Internet access in schools has improved: all percentages are higher in 2009, except for the lowest category. However, seeing that 32 of the 122 countries provided no data, this conclusion is probably not warranted, as the numbers remained fairly similar, with a noticeable decline only in the lowest category of 2009, as is clear from Table 9. However, one could speculate that countries that didn't provide any data would typically be in the lower categories.

Access	2009		2007	
	#	%	#	%
81-100%	27	30.0	28	25.0
61-80%	13	14.4	11	9.8
41-60%	13	14.4	12	10.7
21-40%	11	12.2	13	11.6
≤20%	26	28.9	48	42.9
Total (N=)	90		112	100
No data/unknown	32		4	

Table 9: Percentage of school libraries offering Internet access

At the regional level significant differences can be observed, with Europe and North America (+ Australia and New Zealand) providing access to the Internet in many more school libraries than any of the other regions, as is evident from Table 10.

In your estimate, what percentage of all school libraries in your country offers Internet access to users?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total %	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
81-100%	2009	1	6.0	3	13.0	19	66.0	1	6.0	1	100.0	2	50.0	27	30.0
	2007	2	7.1	4	21.1	16	47.1	2	9.5	2	66.7	2	28.6	28	25.0
61-80%	2009	1	6.0	5	21.0	2	7.0	5	31.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	14.4
	2007	0	0.0	3	15.8	4	11.8	2	9.5	0	0.0	2	28.6	11	9.8
41-60%	2009	0	0.0	7	29.0	3	10.0	3	19.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	14.4
	2007	1	3.6	2	10.5	6	17.6	3	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	10.7
21-40%	2009	4	25.0	3	13.0	2	7.0	2	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	12.2
	2007	5	17.9	3	15.8	1	2.9	3	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	13	11.6
≤20%	2009	10	63.0	6	25.0	3	10.0	5	31.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	26	28.9
	2007	20	71.4	7	36.8	7	20.6	11	52.4	1	33.3	2	28.6	48	42.9

Total (N=)	2009	16	24	29	16	1	4	90
	2007	28	19	34	21	3	7	112
No data / unknown	2009	10	8	5	6	2	1	32
	2007	0	2	0	1	0	1	4

Table 10: Number and percentage of school libraries offering Internet access according to regions

Africa

Levels of Internet access in school libraries in Africa in 2009 are very similar to those of 2007. In percentages it seems as if there has been an improvement, but since ten countries did not provide any data, the actual numbers are very similar, with only two countries (Egypt and Ghana) being in the two higher categories. Ten countries are in the lowest category, but since ten countries provided no data, this number is probably not accurate.

Asia

Numbers for Asia are very similar in the different categories between 2009 and 2007, with a noticeable exception in the category 41-60%, from two to seven. This can be ascribed to the fact that more countries from Asia participated in 2009. However, eight countries did not provide any data (compared to two in 2007), which makes comparisons problematical. Malaysia, South Korea and Turkey provide Internet access in 81-100% of school libraries, whereas India, Kuwait, Lebanon, Qatar and Vietnam estimated it at 61-80%.

Europe

Internet access in schools in Europe at the 81-100% level improved from 16 to 19 (out of 29 countries that provided data). The numbers in three of the four remaining categories halved, but again any comparison is problematical since five countries provided no data.

Latin America and the Caribbean

The situation in Latin America and the Caribbean improved at the two highest levels, with six countries reporting Internet access in schools at these levels, compared to four in 2007. The number at the lowest level halved, but any comparison is problematical since six countries provided no data.

North America

Only Canada reported Internet access in schools at 81-100%; the USA and Greenland providing no data. (In 2007 the USA estimated the percentage at 81-100%.)

Oceania

Two countries in Oceania provide Internet access in schools at the level of 81-100%, viz. Australia and New Zealand. Two, Fiji and the Solomon Islands, estimated their percentages at the lowest level. One country provided no data.

Summary for school libraries

The levels of Internet access in school libraries remain on average lower than the levels of access in public libraries, as in 2007. The numbers at the four higher levels remained fairly constant. If the speculation that the 32 countries that provided no data would be in the lower categories is correct, it would imply that the situation regarding Internet access in school libraries showed no improvement; this, however, remains speculation.

2.3.1.1.3 University libraries

At the highest level it seems that the situation regarding Internet access in university libraries has improved: 81 countries now offer Internet access at this level, compared to 69 in 2007. It is nevertheless a matter of grave concern that there are 15 countries in which Internet access is still at the two lowest levels (with a further ten countries providing no data).

Access	2009		2007	
	#	%	#	%
81-100%	81	72.3	69	63.3
61-80%	11	9.8	14	12.8
41-60%	5	4.5	6	5.5
21-40%	5	4.5	8	7.3
≤20%	10	8.9	12	11.0
Total (N=)	112		109	
No data/unknown	10		7	

Table 11: Percentage of university libraries offering Internet access

Data at regional level are provided in Table 12.

In your estimate, what percentage of all university libraries in your country offers Internet access to users?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total %	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
81-100%	2009	9	39.1	18	64.3	31	91.2	17	85.0	3	100	3	75.0	81	72.3
	2007	8	32.0	14	66.7	26	81.3	13	61.9	2	66.7	6	85.7	69	63.3
61-80%	2009	5	21.7	4	14.3	1	2.9	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	9.8
	2007	5	20.0	4	19.0	1	3.1	4	19.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	12.8
41-60%	2009	1	4.3	2	7.1	0	0.0	2	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.5
	2007	1	4.0	1	4.8	2	6.3	1	4.8	0	0.0	1	14.3	6	5.5
21-40%	2009	0	0.0	3	10.7	2	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	4.5
	2007	3	12.0	0	0.0	2	6.3	2	9.5	1	33.3	0	0.0	8	7.3
≤20%	2009	8	34.8	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	10	8.9
	2007	8	32.0	2	9.5	1	3.1	1	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	11.0
Total (N=)	2009	23		28		34		20		3		4		112	
	2007	25		21		32		21		3		7		109	
No data / unknown	2009	3		4		0		2		0		1		10	
	2007	3		0		2		1		0		1		6	

Table 12: Number and percentage of university libraries offering Internet access according to regions
Africa

As observed in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 413), it is evident that universities in Africa are considerably better off in terms of Internet access than public and school libraries: approximately 60% of the countries offer Internet access at the two highest levels, which, in numbers, is approximately the same as in 2007, viz. 14 compared to 13. However, a third of countries still offer Internet access in university libraries at the lowest level (the same as in 2007).

Asia

Nearly two-thirds of the participating countries in Asia offer Internet access in university libraries at the highest level, in numbers an increase from 14 to 18, with only four countries at the lowest levels.

Europe

Of the 34 respondents in Europe, 31 (more than 90%) offer Internet access at the highest level in university libraries, with no country at the lowest level.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Internet access in university libraries in Latin America and the Caribbean improved considerably: 85% of the countries offer access at the highest level (17 compared to 13 in 2007), with no country at the lowest two levels.

North America

All three respondents from North America (Canada, Greenland and the USA) offer Internet access in their university libraries at the highest level.

Oceania

Three countries in Oceania (Australia, Fiji and New Zealand) offer Internet access in university libraries at the highest level, with one country reporting it at the lowest level and one country providing no data.

Summary for university libraries

Across the world, Internet access in university libraries is considerably better than in public and school libraries, which is to be expected. More than 80% of countries provide Internet access in the two higher categories. However, the fact that there are still 15 countries that reported Internet access in university libraries at the two lowest levels (with ten countries providing no data) does not bode well for scholarship in these countries. Eight of the 15 countries are in Africa (a disproportionately high number), which again has a very negative impact on the competitiveness of Africa. The situation in Africa will, however, hopefully improve in the near future due to a number of development projects to bring broadband to Africa (noted above) and also the development of national research networks (see, for example, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nren>).

2.3.1.1.4 Government-funded research libraries

The category “Government-funded research libraries” was defined in the questionnaire as the “libraries of a statutory research councils or research institutes (such as a medical research council or a council for scientific and industrial research)”. This expanded definition (compared to the questionnaire of 2007) still seems to have been unclear to quite a number of respondents, as 32 countries have provided no data on their levels of Internet access.

The number of countries in which Internet access is provided to government-funded research libraries at the highest level has increased from 47 to 57. The numbers in the category 61-80% has remained constant and those in the category 41-60% have decreased, which could indicate that a number of countries have moved up one category. However, since 32 countries have provided no data (compared to 13 in 2007) any comparison is very tentative. A summary of all countries is provided in Table 13.

Access	2009		2007	
	#	%	#	%
81-100%	57	63.3	47	45.6
61-80%	11	12.2	11	10.7
41-60%	4	4.4	11	10.7
21-40%	7	7.8	11	10.7
≤20%	11	12.2	23	22.3
Total (N=)	90		103	
No data/unknown	32		13	

Table 13: Percentage of government-funded research libraries offering Internet access

Regional breakdown of data is provided in Table 14.

In your estimate, what percentage of all government-funded research libraries in your country offers Internet access to users?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total %	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
81-100%	2009	5	27.8	14	58.3	26	83.9	8	66.7	2	100	2	66.7	57	63.3
	2007	5	19.2	9	47.4	22	68.8	6	35.3	2	66.7	3	50.0	47	45.6
61-80%	2009	5	27.8	2	8.3	2	6.5	2	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	12.2
	2007	2	7.7	2	10.5	4	12.5	3	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	10.7
41-60%	2009	2	11.1	1	4.2	1	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.4
	2007	5	19.2	2	10.5	3	9.4	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	10.7
21-40%	2009	0	0.0	5	20.8	1	3.2	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	7.8
	2007	4	15.4	1	5.3	2	6.3	3	17.6	0	0.0	1	16.7	11	10.7
≤20%	2009	6	33.3	2	8.3	1	3.2	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	11	12.2
	2007	10	38.5	5	26.3	1	3.1	4	23.5	1	33.3	2	33.3	23	22.3
Total (N=)	2009	18		24		31		12		2		3		90	
	2007	26		19		32		17		3		6		103	
No data / unknown	2009	8		8		3		10		1		2		32	
	2007	2		2		2		5		0		2		13	

Table 14: Number and percentage of government-funded research libraries offering Internet access according to regions

Africa

Internet access in government-funded research libraries has improved in the two higher categories (ten compared to seven in 2007), but remains lower than that in university libraries (compared to 14 in the same categories). A third of countries remains in the lowest category, which is lower than 2007; however, eight countries provided no data (compared to only two in 2007).

Asia

Government-funded research libraries are again worse off than university libraries in terms of Internet access, with 16 providing access at the two highest levels (compared to 22 in the case of university libraries). Numbers at the two lower levels remain fairly constant; however, eight countries provided no data (compared to two in 2007).

Europe

Of the 34 countries in Europe that participated, 28 provided Internet access at the two highest levels (compared to 32 university libraries) with the remaining three countries evenly distributed amongst the three lower categories. Government-funded research libraries remain in a slightly worse position than university libraries in terms of Internet access.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Ten of the 12 countries that provided data reported Internet access at the two highest levels in government-funded research libraries (compared to nine in 2007). However, ten countries have omitted data on their levels of access.

North America

Two countries in North America provide Internet access at the highest level in government-funded research libraries; one country provided no data.

Oceania

Two of the three countries provide Internet access at the highest level in government-funded research libraries, with one at the lowest level. Two countries have not supplied data.

Summary for government funded research libraries

It is remarkable that Internet access in government-funded research libraries remains less than in university libraries – 75.5% compared to more than 80% at the two highest levels and 23% compared to 13.4% at the two lowest levels. Access is nevertheless still considerably higher than in school libraries.

2.3.1.1.5 Conclusion: Internet access in libraries

Of the 122 countries participating in the 2007 Report, 24 could report an 81-100% level of Internet access in all four categories (compared to 18 in 2007); this breaks down as follows in terms of the regions:

- *Africa*: 1 – Egypt (1 in 2007)
- *Asia*: 3 – Malaysia, South Korea, Turkey (3 in 2007)
- *Europe*: 16 – Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland, and the UK (9 in 2007)
- *North America*: 1 – Canada (2 in 2007)
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: 1 – Trinidad and Tobago (1 in 2007)
- *Oceania*: 2 – Australia, New Zealand (2 in 2007)

Four countries have reported less than 20% Internet access in all four categories, all four from Africa:

- *Africa*: 4 – Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Tunisia

However, a further ten countries reported no higher than less than 20% access or no data for all four categories:

- *Africa*: 5 – Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Gabon, Guinea, Sierra Leone
- *Asia*: 3 – Afghanistan, Brunei, United Arab Emirates
- *Oceania*: 2 – Solomon Islands, Vanuatu

No countries in Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean or North America have reported less than 20% Internet access in all four categories.

From the overall statistics it is evident that (Western) Europe, North America (+ Australia and New Zealand) have the best Internet access in all categories, whereas Africa has the worst, as was the case in 2007.



Access to the Internet in all categories of libraries seems to have increased slightly in terms of numbers; however, as pointed out earlier, comparisons are extremely tenuous because of the fact that different countries have participated in 2009 compared to 2007. It does seem as if, in general, access is rather limited for most countries that have participated in the World Report for the first time in 2009/2010.

The remarkable difference in the levels of Internet access in the three categories of research libraries (school libraries, university libraries and government-funded research libraries) observed in 2007 is again apparent.

Internet access in school libraries remains on average lower than in public libraries (and considerably lower than in university libraries). The comments made in 2007, viz. that “this in itself is not a favourable situation, as the youth are not sufficiently exposed to information resources on the Internet in a controlled environment where they can be taught how to evaluate the quality of information. Some of the youth may have access to the Internet at public libraries. This would most probably be in less controlled circumstances, and may not necessarily improve the technological and information literacy of the young people” (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 414) remain valid.

University libraries are on average in a fairly good position in terms of Internet access. It is, however, remarkable that government-funded research libraries are on average in a worse position than university libraries.

The situation in the developing world has improved marginally (especially in university libraries), but Internet access remains at fairly low or very low levels, with Africa being by far in the worst position. The following comments made in 2007 are equally valid in 2010: “Paper-based information resources do not compensate for lack of access to Internet resources (especially in the form of electronic journals) since, in many cases, universities and research libraries in the developing world do not have access to sufficient and up-to-date print resources either. This simply emphasises the unequal information provision globally, and the serious disadvantages the developing world has in comparison with the developed world. The latter has a moral obligation to assist the developing world in obtaining appropriate information resources to enable them to become more competitive by acquiring better access to information resources via the Internet” (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 415).

2.3.1.2 Local content on the Internet

The digital divide not only manifests itself in (lack of) access to the Internet and information and communication technologies (ICTs). The 2009 questionnaire therefore included two questions on the nature of the content available – how much local content is available on the Internet and how much content is available in local languages. Local content was defined in the questionnaire as content that originates within the country and is managed by the government of the country/local businesses/local individuals/local organisations etc. The question on local content was expanded considerably to include different categories of information and publishers. The data is summarised per region in Table 15.

In your estimate how much local content is available on the Internet? And To what degree is local content on the Internet available in the official languages of your country?																
	Government & government agencies		Newspapers, magazines & broadcast		Local NGOs		Local educational institutions		Tourist information		Industry information		Other local information		Local content in official languages	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Africa																
Very much	3	12.0	4	16.0	1	4.2	2	8.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	4.8
Much	2	8.0	8	32.0	6	25.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	4	18.2	4	17.4	4	19.0
Average	9	36.0	8	32.0	8	33.3	11	44.0	9	36.0	9	40.9	6	26.1	5	23.8

Little	10	40.0	3	12.0	7	29.2	3	12.0	10	40.0	4	18.2	7	30.4	7	33.3
Very little	1	4.0	2	8.0	2	8.3	6	24.0	3	12.0	4	18.2	6	26.1	4	19.0
Total (N=)	25		25		24		25		25		22		23		21	
No data	1		1		2		1		1		4		3		5	
Asia																
Very much	3	10.0	8	26.7	3	10.0	2	6.9	3	10.0	2	6.9	1	3.7	7	24.1
Much	9	30.0	9	30.0	10	33.3	9	31.0	10	33.3	8	27.6	4	14.8	7	24.1
Average	12	40.0	8	26.7	10	33.3	8	27.6	11	36.7	9	31.0	14	51.9	7	24.1
Little	6	20.0	4	13.3	5	16.7	9	31.0	5	16.7	9	31.0	6	22.2	4	13.8
Very little	0	0.0	1	3.3	2	6.7	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	3.4	2	7.4	4	13.8
Total (N=)	30		30		30		29		30		29		27		29	
No data	2		2		2		3		2		3		5		3	
Europe																
Very much	16	47.1	15	45.5	13	38.2	11	33.3	14	43.8	8	25.0	8	26.7	20	60.6
Much	8	23.5	12	36.4	8	23.5	9	27.3	10	31.3	6	18.8	8	26.7	7	21.2
Average	8	23.5	5	15.2	9	26.5	10	30.3	6	18.8	13	40.6	12	40.0	6	18.2
Little	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.9	2	6.1	2	6.3	2	6.3	2	6.7	0	0.0
Very little	2	5.9	1	3.0	2	5.9	1	3.0	0	0.0	3	9.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total (N=)	34		33		34		33		32		32		30		33	
No data	0		1		0		1		2		2		4		1	
Latin America and the Caribbean																
Very much	3	14.3	3	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	27.3	0	0.0	1	5.0	10	50.0
Much	4	19.0	7	33.3	3	13.6	4	18.2	8	36.4	3	14.3	2	10.0	6	30.0
Average	12	57.1	10	47.6	13	59.1	11	50.0	5	22.7	12	57.1	13	65.0	2	10.0
Little	0	0.0	1	4.8	5	22.7	3	13.6	1	4.5	5	23.8	3	15.0	1	5.0
Very little	2	9.5	0	0.0	1	4.5	4	18.2	2	9.1	1	4.8	1	5.0	1	5.0
Total (N=)	21		21		22		22		22		21		20		20	
No data	1		1		0		0		0		1		2		2	
North America																
Very much	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100
Much	2	66.7	3	100.0	2	66.7	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0
Average	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	100.0	2	66.7	2	66.7	0	0.0
Little	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Very little	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total (N=)	3		3		3		3		3		3		3		3	
No data	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Oceania																
Very much	2	40.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	2	40.0
Much	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
Average	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	0	0.0
Little	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
Very little	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0
Total (N=)	5		5		5		5		5		5		5		5	
No data	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	

Table 15: Local content and content in local languages

No comparison can be made with 2007 since the categories of local content have been expanded and the scale has been increased from a 4-point scale to a 5-point scale.

2.3.1.3 Content in local languages on the Internet

Any conclusion based on the data is fairly tenuous since it is evident that respondents have interpreted the scale differently (as was the case in 2007; see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 416) and is also evident from a superficial comparison of the data from Europe and North America. However, it is possible to observe broad trends based on the respondents' perceptions. It seems as if the category "Newspapers, magazines and broadcast information" scored the highest across all regions, closely followed by the categories "Tourist information" and "Government and government agencies". Europe on average scored the highest across all categories and Africa the lowest.

In terms of the local content available in official languages, North America scored the highest, with Europe and Latin America nearly equal at around 80% of countries reporting at the two highest levels. Africa again provided the lowest estimates.

As indicated in 2007, "there seems to be a definite correlation between the availability of Internet access in different types of libraries and the availability of local content and content in local languages on the Internet" (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 416), also taking into account the expansion of the different types of local information.

In conclusion, Africa is again worst off in terms of local content and content available in local languages on the Internet, with (Western) Europe and North America (+ Australia and New Zealand) again being in the best positions, as was the case in 2007 (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 416).

2.3.1.4 Literacy rate

Respondents were requested to provide the literacy rate in their countries and to provide a reference for this. In Section 1 the literacy rate is also given, based on data from the CIA World Factbook. In some cases there are small differences between the respondents' data and those of the CIA World Factbook. In most cases the differences don't seem to be significant. This is not analysed further.

2.3.2 Filtering and blocking of information

Filtering and blocking software is defined as software implemented on local computers administered by the library itself and not "upstream" filtering by external or government agencies.

2.3.2.1 The use of filtering and blocking software

The regional breakdown and totals for the use of filtering software is provided in Table 16.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in your country's libraries?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	3	13.6	10	33.3	4	13.3	2	10.5	0	0.0	2	40.0	21	19.3
	2007	0	0	3	14.3	1	3.0	1	5.3	2	66.7	0	0	7	6
Yes, to a certain degree	2009	8	36.4	10	33.3	14	46.7	6	31.6	2	66.7	1	20.0	41	37.6
	2007	7	26.9	8	38.1	16	48.5	4	21.1	0	0	8	100	43	39
No	2009	11	50.0	10	33.3	12	40.0	11	57.9	1	33.3	2	40.0	47	43.1
	2007	19	73.1	10	47.6	16	48.5	14	73.7	1	33.3	0	0	60	55
Total (N=)	2009	22		30	100.	30		19		3		5		109	

			0					
	2007	26	21	33	19	3	8	110
No data	2009	4	2	4	3	0	0	13
	2007	2	0	1	3	0	0	6

Table 16: Extent to which filtering software is widespread in libraries

The use of filtering software has increased across the world. This is evident from the fact that 62 countries reported “yes” or “yes, to a certain degree”, compared to 50 in 2007, and 47 reported “No”, compared to 60 in 2007. In addition, many countries that reported “Yes, to a certain degree” in 2007 reported “Yes” in 2009. The increase in the use of filtering software has to be read in conjunction with the motivation for the use of such software; see 2.3.2.2 below.

A few respondents mentioned that the use of filtering software is not common because very few computers in (public) libraries are connected to the Internet. Lack of skills to implement such systems has also been mentioned as a reason why its use is not common.

2.3.2.2 Motivations for using filtering software

Altogether 69 countries gave reasons why filtering software is being used in the country; the comparative list for 2009 and 2007 is given in Table 17.

What is the motivation for the use of filtering software?		
Motivation	Countries responding	
	2009 N=69	2007 N=69
Protection of children	53	68
National Security (e.g. Terrorism)	13	19
Safeguard religious values	13	19
Safeguard national ethos/culture	16	7
Crime	20	23
Safeguard public morality	31	36
Total indications	146	174
Others	3	5

Table 17: Motivations for the use of filtering software

By far the most common motivation for the use of filtering and blocking software is the protection of children. A number of respondents further elaborated on the protection of children and the safeguarding of public morality and specifically mentioned the blocking of pornographic or obscene sites, sites relating to trafficking, drugs, racism, child molestation, child abuse, gambling, violence and hate speech. Some respondents also mentioned financial reasons for the use of filtering software. As in 2007 other reasons indicated for using filtering software are more technical, and include issues such as the conservation of bandwidth (preventing playing of Internet games, the downloading of large files and the use of specific programmes such as Skype) and network safety (protection against viruses, hackers and spam).

As in 2007, a few countries reported “upstream filtering” of the Internet, where content is filtered by the government and/or authorities over which libraries have no control. This is sometimes done by Internet service providers (as in the case of Croatia to block objectionable content in primary and secondary schools and Denmark to block child pornography) or by government (as in Malaysia where the government intends to introduce an Internet pornography filter).

“Upstream filtering” in the sense of political censorship also occurs, as was reported in 2007 (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 421). The following are examples of such filtering and blocking:

- Third-party research indicates that although Internet access in Brunei is unrestricted in general, the primary Internet service provider is state owned and the country’s Internet practice code stipulates certain conditions of use. Internet monitoring efforts were recently stepped up and Internet cafés were asked to install firewalls to prevent users from viewing immoral content, and to monitor private email and chat room exchanges that could be subversive (<http://www.freedomhouse.org>).
- Third-party research indicates that all Internet traffic in Kazakhstan has to pass through state-owned channels and that the government has implemented a complex system allowing for state surveillance on Internet traffic that can be used to filter or suppress Internet content (<http://opennet.net/research/profiles/kazakhstan>).
- Independent research indicates that, in Sudan, the state’s regulatory authority has established a special unit to monitor and implement filtering (<http://www.opennet.net/research/profiles/sudan>).
- Similar “upstream filtering” occurs in many other countries, including, for example, China, Cuba, Myanmar/Burma and Pakistan, to name only a few.

2.3.2.3 Library associations’ position on filtering

The rationale for this question was the same as in 2005 (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 355-356) and 2007. Comparative data for the different regions are provided in Table 18.

Is the library association in your country in favour of filtering information on library Internet terminals?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
Yes	2009	4	20.0	6	23.1	3	11.1	4	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	17.9
	2007	2	7.7	2	10	2	5.9	3	16.7	1	33.3	2	25	12	11
Yes, to a certain degree	2009	11	55.0	9	34.6	10	37.0	6	37.5	0	0.0	1	33.3	37	38.9
	2007	15	57.7	11	55	23	67.6	8	44.4	0	0.0	4	50	61	56
No	2009	5	25.0	11	42.3	14	51.9	6	37.5	3	100.0	2	66.7	41	43.2
	2007	9	34.6	7	35	9	26.5	7	38.9	2	66.7	2	25	36	33
Total (N=)	2009	20		26		27		16		3		3		95	
	2007	26		20		34		18		3		8		109	
No data	2009	6		6		7		6		0		2		27	
	2007	2		1		0		4		0		0		7	

Table 18: The position of library associations on filtering software in libraries

As in 2007 it is not clear to what extent respondents have differentiated between “yes” and “yes, to a certain degree” regarding library associations’ position on the use of filtering software; for analysis purposes these two answers are therefore grouped together. Percentages for “yes” and “yes, to a certain degree” have decreased from 67% in 2007 to 56.8% in 2009, which is a reverse of the tendency observed between 2005 and 2007 (in 2005 61% reported “yes” or “yes, to a certain degree”). This shift in the opinion of library associations against Internet filtering in libraries can be observed across all regions.

The fact that the use of filtering software is not widespread in some countries does not necessarily mean that there are many libraries in the country where no filtering software is used; it simply means that there are many libraries with very limited or no Internet access. This is again most evident in the case of Africa.

2.3.2.4 Policy about filtering

Very few countries have a policy regarding filtering and blocking of information, as is evident from Table 19, and even fewer of these policies are available online.

Does the library association have a policy regarding filtering and blocking?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	3	14.3	4	14.8	10	31.2	2	11.1	2	66.7	1	25.0	22	21.0
No	18	85.7	23	85.2	22	68.8	16	88.9	1	33.3	3	75.0	83	79.0
Total (N=)	21		27		32		18		3		4		105	
No data	5		5		2		4		0		1		17	

Table 19: Library association policy regarding filtering and blocking

In total 22 countries indicated that they have a policy regarding filtering and blocking, viz. three from Africa, four from Asia, ten from Europe, two from Latin America and the Caribbean, two from North America and one from Oceania. In some cases these are not separate policies, but such a policy or statement forms part of a code of ethics, as is the case in, for example, Finland, Puerto Rico and Russia.

Only 17 of the 22 countries indicated an online availability of such policies, viz. one in Africa, one in Asia, all respondents from Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, North America and Oceania.

2.3.3 Financial barriers

This question addressed the issue of Internet costs, the rationale being the same as in 2005 and 2007, namely to determine whether the situation has changed in the preceding two years as technology has advanced. The first part of the question intended to ascertain to what extent Internet access is free of charge in the different types of libraries. The second part intended to find out whether the state or other library authorities have made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries.

2.3.3.1 Costs of Internet access in libraries

Costly Internet access hampers equal access to information resources, and the costs of Internet access should be as low as possible, or access should even be offered free of charge. As with the previous reports, respondents were asked to indicate the costs of access in the different types of libraries; research libraries were again split into three categories, as was done in the earlier questions and as in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007. However, the questions were formulated differently for 2009, which makes comparisons with 2007 only approximate. In Table 20 below, the numbers for 2007 were taken from Tables 29 – 34 in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 422-424.

Is it free of charge for library users to access the Internet on the following computers?								
	Public library computers		University library computers		School library computers		Government-funded research library computers	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Africa								
Yes, unlimited	3	13.00	10	41.70	1	4.50	8	38.10
Yes, limited	7	30.40	12	37.50	11	59.10	3	28.60

Yes in 2007	4		4		11		3	
No	13	56.50	5	20.80	8	36.40	7	33.30
Total (N=)	23		24		22		21	
No data	3		2		4		5	
Asia								
Yes, unlimited	9	31.00	19	65.50	10	35.70	12	50.00
Yes, limited	16	55.20	6	20.70	14	50.00	9	37.50
Yes in 2007	13		14		15		12	
No	4	13.80	4	13.80	4	14.30	3	12.50
Total (N=)	29		29		28		24	
No data	3		3		4		8	
Europe								
Yes, unlimited	19	59.40	29	87.90	25	78.10	26	89.70
Yes, limited	10	31.30	4	12.10	7	21.90	3	10.30
Yes in 2007	18		29		20		22	
No	3	9.40	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total (N=)	32		33		32		29	
No data	2		1		2		5	
Latin America and the Caribbean								
Yes, unlimited	7	35.00	9	50.00	5	27.80	4	36.40
Yes, limited	11	55.00	5	27.80	8	44.40	3	27.30
Yes in 2007	10		11		13		8	
No	2	10.00	4	22.20	5	27.80	4	36.40
Total (N=)	20		18		18		11	
No data	2		4		4		11	
North America								
Yes, unlimited	2	66.70	2	66.70	2	66.70	2	100.00
Yes, limited	1	33.30	1	33.30	1	33.30	0	0.00
Yes in 2007	3		0		3		0	
No	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total (N=)	3		3		3		2	
No data	0		0		0		1	
Oceania								
Yes, unlimited	1	20.00	3	60.00	2	50.00	1	25.00
Yes, limited	2	40.00	1	20.00	1	25.00	2	50.00
Yes in 2007	1		5		3		3	
No	2	40.00	1	20.00	1	25.00	1	25.00
Total (N=)	5		5		4		4	
No data	0		0		1		1	
Total (N=)								
Yes, unlimited	41	36.6	72	64.3	45	42.1	53	58.2
Yes, limited	47	42.0	26	23.2	44	41.1	23	25.3
Yes in 2007	51	44.0	73	62.9	76	65.5	53	45.7
No	24	21.4	14	16.8	18	16.8	15	16.5
Total (N=)	112		112		107		91	
No data	10		10		15		31	

Table 20: Free Internet access in libraries

No detailed comparison can be made between the different reports because of the increase in the scale from a “yes/no” question to “yes, unlimited”, “yes, limited” and “no”. If “yes, unlimited” and “yes, limited” are added, it seems as if there is a considerable improvement in all regions from 2007 to 2009 in the numbers of countries that

offer free (unlimited or limited) access to the Internet in public, university and government-funded research libraries; this is, however, not the case in school libraries.

However, from the regional breakdown above it is evident that free Internet access in 2009 is not equal across the different regions and also not equal in the different types of libraries, as was the case in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 422-424). Africa remains the worst off in all categories in this regard, with citizens of Europe and North America (+ Australia and New Zealand) being in very good positions, especially in terms of access in their school and university libraries.

Limited access to computers and the lack of free access to the Internet impacts not only on the use of the Internet, but also on the use of information as a resource. As the data indicates, developing countries (especially in Africa) are the worst off in terms of having free access to the Internet as well as to having access to computers in general. Especially in developing countries the cost of Internet access is very high. Due to factors such as poverty and other expenses, money is usually spent on resources to meet basic needs, rather than on information services and/or sources. An increase in access to computers and free access to the Internet will play an important role in overcoming the digital divide, and in establishing societies in which there is a culture of valuing information as a critical resource for development.

2.3.3.2 Extra funding for Internet access in libraries

The second part of the question intended to establish whether the state or other library authorities have made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries. Comparative data for the different regions are provided in Table 21.

Has the state or other library authorities made any extra funding available for Internet access in the library															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	12	60.0	13	52.0	16	55.2	11	68.8	1	50.0	3	75.0	56	58.3
	2007	29	70.4	11	55.0	23	67.7	17	77.3	1	33.3	6	75.0	76	66.7
No	2009	8	40.0	12	48.0	13	44.8	5	31.3	1	50.0	1	25.0	40	41.7
	2007	8	29.6	9	45.0	11	32.3	5	22.7	2	67.7	2	25.0	38	33.3
Total (N=)	2009	20		25		29		16		2		4		96	
	2007	27		20		34		22		3		8		114	
No data	2009	6		7		5		6		1		1		26	
	2007	1		1		0		0		0		0		2	

Table 21: Extra funding for libraries

Both percentages and numbers went down between 2007 and 2009: in 2009 56 countries (58.3%) reported additional funding, compared to 76 (66.7%) in 2007; unfortunately 26 countries provided no data.

Additional funding provided by government is often in conjunction with private companies such as ISPs and telephone companies. A few countries reported that donor funding is the only extra resource of funding available. In a number of cases where no extra funding has been made available, such funding is probably not needed, as Internet access is already ubiquitous and free of charge in all libraries. Extra funding in developed countries is often earmarked for rural areas.

2.3.4 Open Access

This is the first time that respondents were asked about the attitude of library associations towards Open Access and the existence of such projects in their countries.

2.3.4.1 Support for Open Access by the library association

The vast majority of library associations support Open Access, as is evident from Table 22.

Does the library association in your country support Open Access?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	19	79.2	24	85.7	32	100	12	85.7	3	100.0	4	80.0	94	88.7
No	5	20.8	4	14.3	0	0.0	2	14.3	0	0.0	1	20.0	12	11.3
Total (N=)	24		28		32		14		3		5		106	
No data	2		4		2		8		0		0		16	

Table 22: Support by the library association for open access

Support for Open Access by library associations is very high across all regions, with Europe and North America reporting no library association that did not support Open Access (unfortunately 16 countries provided no data). This is a very positive sign. Open access to scholarly publications is especially important in the developing world and can help to improve the levels of scholarship in such countries.

2.3.4.2 Open Access initiatives

Many respondents have reported Open Access initiatives in their countries, as is evident from Table 23.

Are there specific Open Access initiatives in the country?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	18	81.8	19	70.4	26	86.7	7	53.8	2	66.7	3	75.0	75	75.8
No	4	18.2	8	29.6	4	13.3	6	46.2	1	33.3	1	25.0	24	24.2
Total (N=)	22		27		30		13		3		4		99	
No data	4		5		4		9		0		1		23	

Table 23: Specific Open Access initiatives in the country

Of the 99 countries that reported data for this question, 75 mentioned Open Access projects; unfortunately not very much detail was provided. Open Access projects range from a single, small repository to large-scale country-wide initiatives. Some of the most common projects are Open Access repositories of research articles implemented by university libraries. In many cases projects are at the experimental stage.

2.4 Legal issues

The section about legal issues was considerably expanded. Questions about copyright laws, exceptions for libraries and laws guaranteeing freedom of access to information and freedom of expression principles were included, in addition to those of the 2007 Report (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 426ff).

2.4.1 Copyright laws

Most countries have copyright laws (92.4% of responding countries) and this is split fairly evenly across the regions, with Asia being the exception (with only five respondents, the 60% reported from Oceania is probably not indicative of the whole region), as is evident from Table 24.

Does your country have a copyright law?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania	Total		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	24	96.0	26	83.9	34	100.0	20	95.2	3	100.0	3	60.0	110	92.4
No	1	4.0	5	16.1	0	0.0	1	4.8	0	0.0	2	40.0	9	7.6
Total (N=)	25		31		34		21		3		5		119	
No data	1		1		0		1						3	

Table 24: Copyright laws

However, the number of countries that have exceptions for libraries is considerably lower, viz. only 75.8%; the data are summarised in Table 25.

Does the copyright law include specific limitations or exceptions for libraries?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania	Total		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	10	50.0	17	77.3	29	87.9	12	80.0	2	66.7	2	100.0	72	75.8
No	10	50.0	5	22.7	4	12.1	3	20.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	23	24.2
Total (N=)	20		22		33		15		3		2		95	
No data	6		10		1		7		0		3		27	

Table 25: Limitations or exceptions for libraries in copyright laws

Differences across the regions are also noticeable. The numbers are high across most regions, except for Africa, where such exceptions occur in only 50% of the countries (percentages for North America and Oceania are not reliable because of the small number of respondents). Unfortunately nearly a quarter of respondents provided no data; one could deduce from this that they didn't know, and it is rather disconcerting that the situation about laws directly affecting the library community is not common knowledge amongst those that are affected by such laws.

2.4.2 Laws guaranteeing freedom of access to information and freedom of expression principles

Of the 97 respondents that provided data, 85 (87.6%) reported that their countries do have laws that guarantee freedom of access to information and freedom of expression, as summarised in Table 26.

Does your country have any legislation that guarantees freedom of access to information and freedom of expression principles?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania	Total		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Yes	19	100.0	19	79.2	32	94.1	11	73.3	3	100.0	1	50.0	85	87.6
No	0	0.0	5	20.8	2	5.9	4	26.7	0	0.0	1	50.0	12	12.4
Total (N=)	19		24		34		15		3		2		97	
No data	7		8		0		7		0		3		25	

Table 26: Legislation that guarantees freedom of access to information and freedom of expression principles

Responses are fairly equal across the regions, with Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean reporting the lowest occurrences of such laws (because of the low number of respondents, the data from Oceania is not statistically significant). As in the case of the previous question, nearly a quarter of respondents provided no data, which most probably means that they don't know what the situation in their country is. As remarked above, it is disconcerting that responding institutions are not aware of the situation about laws directly affecting them and their patrons.

Of the 97 respondents, 60 provided online addresses for these laws. In many cases such laws form part of the constitution. In some cases respondents only referred to the constitution without providing a URL and it is not clear whether the constitution is available online.

Respondents were asked to provide examples of how such laws either positively or negatively affected freedom of access to information and freedom of expression. Very few respondents provided any details. A number of respondents provided references to laws that adversely impact on freedom of access to information and freedom of expression, for example censorship laws in Brunei, Israel, Lebanon and Qatar, amongst others. The most common initiatives by libraries to promote FAIFE principles was the organisation of workshops and seminars and presentations at conferences; exhibitions, book fairs and the formation of pressure groups. A number of respondents also referred to issues covered by the next section of this Report, viz. initiatives for the promotion of access to information for specific groups (such as senior citizens and the disabled).

2.4.3 User privacy and anti-terror legislation

This question consists of three parts, viz. the existence of anti-terror legislation that could impact on users' intellectual freedom, the library community's perceptions of the impact of such legislation and their perceptions on the impact of keeping usage records on user s' intellectual freedom. The first two questions are dealt with together and the third one is discussed separately.

2.4.3.1 Anti-terror legislation

Very little new anti-terror legislation that adversely affects library users' intellectual freedom has been passed, as is evident from Table 27.

Has anti-terror legislation been passed in your country that adversely affects library users' intellectual freedom?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	3	13.6	5	17.9	4	13.8	3	17.6	1	33.3	1	25.0	17	16.5
No	19	86.4	23	82.1	25	86.2	14	82.4	2	66.7	3	75.0	86	83.5
Total (N=)	22		28		29		17		3		4		103	
No data	4				5		5		0		1		19	

Table 27: The passing of anti-terror legislation that adversely affects library users' intellectual freedom

In 2009, 17 countries reported the existence of such anti-terror laws, a similar number as in 2007 (but different countries). In Africa, three countries reported such laws, viz. Egypt, Ghana and Tunisia (compared to six in 2007) but the respondents did not provide any detail. Five countries in Asia reported such laws, viz. Japan, Jordan, Turkey, Pakistan and the Philippines (compared to only three in 2007). Of the 34 respondents in Europe, four reported such laws, viz. Italy, the Netherlands, Russia and the United Kingdom (compared to six in 2007) and three respondents from Latin America and the Caribbean reported such laws, viz. Peru, Puerto Rico, Trinidad and Tobago (compared to no

countries in 2007). In North America and Oceania only the USA and Australia reported such laws (compared to the USA and Fiji in 2007).

Table 28 provides a regional breakdown about the view of the respondent’s institution regarding the possible impact of anti-terror legislation on user privacy.

Is it the opinion of the library association/national library/institution that anti-terror legislation will impact on user privacy?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	50.0	6	22.2	10	66.7	1	11.1	1	100.0	2	50.0	24	37.5
No	4	50.0	21	77.8	5	33.3	8	88.9	0	0.0%	2	50.0	40	62.5
Total (N=)	8		27		15		9		1		4		64	
No data	18		5		19		13		2		1		58	

Table 28: The opinion of the library association/national library/institution whether anti-terror legislation will impact on user privacy

Close on half of all respondents did not offer any opinion on whether the library association, national library or the institution (on behalf of which they completed the questionnaire) was of the opinion that anti-terror legislation would impact on user privacy. Just more than a third of the rest were of the opinion that it would and nearly two-thirds that it would not. Because of the small numbers any deductions based on statistics is probably invalid.

Most respondents did not elaborate on their statements in these two questions and very little detail about the effect of anti-terror laws on intellectual freedom was provided. The respondent from Japan indicated that the library association has serious misgivings about this legislation and the respondents from Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the USA provided more detail, for which see the individual country reports.

2.4.3.2 Keeping usage records

“Usage records” were defined in the questionnaire as records that include “all ‘business records’ collected by the library, such as records of print or audio-visual materials borrowed or records of Internet use on library computers”; it specifically excludes biographical information of patrons libraries keep for management purposes. Regional comparison of data is provided in Table 29.

Is it the opinion of the library association/national library/ institution that keeping usage records affects the freedom of access to information of the individual Internet library user?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	5	33.3	11	40.7	14	66.7	6	40.0	1	100.0	2	50.0	39	47.0
No	10	66.7	16	59.3	7	33.3	9	60.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	44	53.0
Total (N=)	15		27		21		15		1		4		83	
No data	11		5		13		7		2		1		39	

Table 29: The opinion of the library association/national library/institution whether keeping usage records affects the freedom of access to information of the individual Internet library user

It is interesting to note that percentages in Europe are approximately the reverse from percentages in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean (again leaving out North America and Oceania because of the small numbers). Because so many respondents provided no data, it is not possible to make valid deductions for regional tendencies.

However, it is rather surprising that a third of respondents did not offer an opinion on this issue. It is unclear how to interpret this: did the responding institution not have an opinion about the matter, or was the individual respondent who responded on behalf of the institution unaware of the institution's viewpoint?

2.4.4 Violations of intellectual freedom

Reporting on violations of intellectual freedom has been one of the main aspects of the World Report series in the past. Even though the emphasis in the Report has shifted slightly this year, it remains an important issue.

As in 2007, the question contained a tick box where respondents could indicate whether they were aware of any incidents in the last two years that have adversely affected freedom of access to information or freedom of expression in their countries. Their responses were supplemented by consulting a number of independent third-party resources (listed below). The comparative number of respondents that reported incidents in their countries and numbers of countries about which data could be obtained from the third-party resources is summarised in Table 30 for 2009 and 2007.

Have any incidents occurred in your country in the last two years that adversely affect freedom of access to information or freedom of expression?								
	2009				2007			
	Respondents		Third-party resources		Respondents		Third-party resources	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Africa								
Yes	8	42.1	25	96.2	5	17.9	25	89.3
No	11	57.9	1	3.8	23	82.1	3	10.7
Total (N=)	19		26		28		28	
No data	7		0					
Asia								
Yes	4	17.4	32	100.0	6	28.6	20	95.2
No	19	82.6	0	0.0	15	53.6	1	3.6
Total (N=)	23		32		21		21	
No data	9		0					
Europe								
Yes	5	17.9	29	85.3	4	11.8	18	52.9
No	23	82.1	5	14.7	30	88.2	16	47.1
Total (N=)	28		34		34		34	
No data	6		0					
Latin America & Caribbean								
Yes	3	18.8	17	77.3	1	4.5	16	72.7
No*	13	81.3	5	22.7	21	95.5	6	27.3
Total (N=)	16		22		22		22	
No data	6		0					
North America								
Yes	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	1	33.3
No*	3	100.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	2	66.7
Total (N=)	3		3		3		3	
No data	0		0					
Oceania								
Yes	1	20.0	4	80.0	2	25.0	2	25.0
No*	4	80.0	1	20.0	6	75.0	6	75.0
Total (N=)	5		5		8		8	
No data	0		0					

Total								
Yes	21	22.3	109	89.3	19	16.4	82	70.7
No*	73	77.7	13	10.7	97	83.6	34	29.3
Total (N=)	94		122		116		116	
No data	28		0					

* For 2007 there is unfortunately no data to distinguish between “No” and “No data”; for the sake of percentages and comparisons, the two categories were combined for 2007 under the heading “No”.

Table 30: Incidents in the last two years that adversely affect freedom of access to information or freedom of expression – numbers of respondents and third-party resources that reported incidents

As noted already in the 2005 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 368), “responses regarding violations of intellectual freedom should give the international library community cause for concern” and, as noted in the 2007 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 428) “the phrase ‘grave concern’ would also be appropriate”.

As mentioned above, additional independent third-party sources were consulted by the research team to supplement data from the respondents. The research team monitored primarily the following 15 online sources:

- <http://www.amnesty.org/>
- <http://www.ifex.org/>
- http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=1657&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- <http://irrepressible.info/>
- <http://opennet.net/>
- http://www.rsf.org/index.php?page=rubrique&id_rubrique=2
- <http://www.indexoncensorship.org/>
- <http://www.edri.org/>
- <http://www.hrw.org/>
- <http://www.transparency.org/>
- <http://infoserv.inist.fr/wwsympa.fcgi/arc/faife-l>
- <http://news.google.com>
- <http://www.bbc.co.uk>
- <http://lists.ala.org/sympa/arc/ifaction>
- <http://lists.ala.org/sympa/arc/ifforum>

In all cases only incidents between the finalisation of the previous World Report and the end of 2009 were monitored; the discussion of incidents in the individual country reports are, however, not comprehensive and is only intended to provide an indication of the nature of incidents that occurred world-wide. The research team does not claim to have identified all possible sources, or all possible instances in any particular source. It does nevertheless provide a totally different picture from that supplied by the respondents. As in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007:432), “these sources describe violations of intellectual freedom that range from a single incident in a country (e.g. the harassment of one journalist) to numerous issues in a particular country, including repressive laws; serious restrictions of the media; multiple cases of harassment of journalists, civil society activists and critics of the government; attacks on such individuals and organisations; and the detention, imprisonment and even murder of individuals”.

The reported violations of intellectual freedom are summarised in the individual country reports and readers are referred to the country reports and the sources/references listed there for details. It was not the intention of the researchers to duplicate all details provided in the third-party resources listed above, but only to provide examples of such incidents. This discussion will therefore also not provide a list of occurrences per individual country, since this discussion cannot be comprehensive and a list may unintentionally discriminate against specific countries.

As noted in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 432) “it is remarkable how few respondents are aware of any situations that merit reporting. Most have simply ticked the “no” box without providing any further information, either positive or negative. (There are, obviously, exceptions.) One can only speculate on the reasons for respondents’

inaccurate answers. On the one hand, they may simply be unaware of the incidents; on the other hand, they may be unable or unwilling to provide any details they may know of for fear of reprisal (even though anonymity was guaranteed, if so requested).”

In many cases the individual country reports paint a very bleak picture of the state of intellectual freedom in the world. The situation should be of grave concern to IFLA, the FAIFE Committee and the library community across the world. All parties should continue to express their alarm concerning the lack of freedom of expression and freedom of access to information to the international community by all possible means.

The current online Report contains a feature by means of which readers can contribute to the Report via an online form. Readers are requested to anonymously report any incidents. All such contributions will be evaluated and either added to the main report or shown as comments. Thereby a more detailed and updated representation of the current situation in the world will emerge.

2.5 Social issues

This section of the Report was expanded considerably to include questions about the provision of information to the disabled, visually impaired, senior citizens and the role of libraries in supporting the ideals of universal primary education and providing information regarding environmental sustainability, in line with the Millennium Development Goals (<http://www.undp.org/mdg/>). Questions from previous reports on the provision of HIV/Aids information and women and freedom of access to information were retained.

2.5.1 HIV/Aids awareness

As indicated in the 2005 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 372), libraries are ideally placed to provide information to their communities about HIV/Aids.

This question consisted of three parts: the first part asked whether libraries are involved in programmes to raise awareness of HIV/Aids; and the second part whether libraries are involved in providing such information to people who are unable to read and the third part asked whether libraries in the respondent’s country are making use of the free material regarding HIV/Aids information access made available by the FAIFE committee on the IFLA website.

2.5.1.1 Library involvement in HIV/Aids awareness programmes

Only about half the respondents indicated that libraries in their countries have been involved in programmes to raise awareness of HIV/Aids, as is evident from Table 31, which is lower than in 2007.

Have libraries in your country been involved in any programmes to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	15	60.0	12	41.4	10	31.3	15	75.0	1	50.0	3	60.0	56	49.6
	2007	23	82.1	4	19.1	14	45.4	15	75	3	100.0	4	50.0	63	55.8
No	2009	10	40.0	17	58.6	22	68.8	5	25.0	1	50.0	2	40.0	57	50.4
	2007	5	17.9	17	80.9	19	57.6	5	25.0	0	0	4	50.0	50	44.2
Total (N=)	2009	25		29		32		20		2		5	25	113	
	2007	28		21		33		20		3		8		113	
No data	2009	1		3		2		2		1		0		9	
	2007	0		1		1		1		0		0		3	

Table 31: Libraries’ involvement in programmes to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS

Countries in which libraries are involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes are as follows:

- *Africa*: Algeria, Angola, Botswana, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Armenia, Bangladesh, India, Iran, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam
- *Europe*: Albania, Croatia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Ukraine
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Aruba, Bahamas, The, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, Peru, Puerto Rico, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago
- *North America*: Greenland
- *Oceania*: Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 433.

In Africa the number of countries where libraries have been involved in raising awareness about HIV/Aids has dropped from 23 to 15, which is remarkable taking into account the prevalence of HIV/Aids on the continent. A decrease is also observed in Europe. In Asia, however, the number has increased from four to 12 which, because of the increase in the number of participants, is a doubling of the percentage.

As in 2005 and 2007, a number of different methods are used to raise awareness. This includes printed materials (brochures, flyers, periodicals, books, posters, documentation in general), audio-visual materials, electronic media (such as CDs, DVDs and the Internet), exhibitions, an HIV/Aids corner or desk in the library, training (through workshops, seminars, talks and conferences, as well as peer educators), mobile libraries (especially in rural areas), special HIV/Aids awareness and outreach programmes (for example on World Aids Day and during national library weeks) and radio and television programmes.

In a number of cases partnerships with NGOs, international organisations and/or government are popular ways to incorporate HIV/Aids awareness activities or campaigns into library services.

In many cases, the HIV/Aids awareness programmes and activities are the initiative of individual libraries and are therefore not necessarily coordinated and managed by a national body such as government or a library association. Also, involvement in HIV/Aids awareness activities may be a one-off event and does not provide any indication of an ongoing involvement, as mentioned in the 2007 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 434).

Respondents indicating that libraries in their countries are not involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes have provided a number of reasons for this. Most have stated that such programmes are managed by other bodies, for example health authorities (such as Ministries of Health, Culture, Education or Youth), NGOs and other agencies. Some have specified that HIV/Aids is not a serious problem in their countries or that material regarding HIV/Aids is generally available (in libraries and elsewhere) and consequently special awareness programmes are unnecessary. In a few cases respondents indicated that strict religious and moral values are such that HIV/Aids has not become a national problem. Especially countries from the developing world have mentioned economic factors such as a lack of sufficient funding, inadequate infrastructure and insufficient staff as the reason why libraries are not involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes.

2.5.1.2 HIV/Aids information for people who are unable to read

Only about a quarter of respondents were aware of libraries being involved in providing information about HIV/Aids to members of the community who cannot read, as is evident from Table 32.

Have libraries in your country been involved in any programmes to provide HIV/AIDS information to members of the community unable to read?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	7	30.4	10	34.5	6	19.4	4	21.1	0	0.0	1	20.0	28	25.7
	2007	12	44.4	2	10.0	4	12.1	8	36.4	1	33.3	1	12.5	28	24.8
No	2009	16	69.6	19	65.5	25	80.6	15	78.9	2	100.0	4	80.0	81	74.3
	2007	15	55.6	18	90	29	87.9	14	63.6	2	66.7	7	87.5	85	75.2
Total (N=)	2009	23		29		31		19		2		5		109	
	2007	27		20		33		22		3		8		113	
No data	2009	3		3		3		3		1		0		13	
	2007	1		1		1		0		0		0		3	

Table 32: Libraries' involvement in programmes to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS to members of the community unable to read

The total numbers for 2009 are the same as that for 2007; however, the distribution per region differs quite considerably, with a large increase in Asia, which correlates with the increased participation in the World Report from Asia.

Countries where libraries are involved in providing HIV/Aids information to members of the community unable to read include:

- *Africa*: Ethiopia, Guinea, Lesotho, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Armenia, Bangladesh, India, Iran, Jordan, Malaysia, Nepal, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam
- *Europe*: Albania, Croatia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, Spain
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: The Bahamas, Colombia, El Salvador, Mexico
- *North America*: None
- *Oceania*: Vanuatu

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 434.

Methods that are used to reach members of the community who cannot read are the same as in 2007 (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 434) and include practically all the methods mentioned for the previous question that don't require the skill of reading.

Reasons for libraries not being involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes for members of the community unable to read are identical to those listed in the previous question. A further reason provided by some countries of the developed world is that no such programmes are necessary because of the high literacy rate in the country.

2.5.1.3 Libraries' use of the FAIFE committee's material regarding HIV/AIDS information access

Very few countries make use of the material provided by the FAIFE committee, as is evident from Table 33.

Are libraries in your country using the free material regarding HIV/AIDS information access, made available by the FAIFE committee on the IFLA website?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	18.2	4	16.7	5	17.2	3	18.8	0	0.0%	0	0.0	16	16.5
No	18	81.8	20	83.3	24	82.8	13	81.3	2	100.0	4	100.0	81	83.5
Total (N=)	22		24		29		16		2		4		97	
No data	4		8		5		6		1		1		25	

Table 33: Libraries' use of the free material regarding HIV/AIDS information access, made available by the FAIFE committee on the IFLA website

As this is a new question no comparison can be drawn with earlier reports.

The percentage use of the materials is fairly equal in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean. The 16 countries that do make use of the materials are:

- *Africa*: Ethiopia, Ghana, South Africa, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Japan, Jordan, Nepal, Philippines
- *Europe*: Albania, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Russia
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago
- *North America*: None
- *Oceania*: None

The main reason that countries listed why use is not made of these materials is that they are unaware of the existence of such materials. There is therefore considerable scope for IFLA and FAIFE to advertise the existence of the materials and to discuss the use of and successes attained through such materials in workshops and by individual libraries and others widely. The fact that libraries in specific countries are not involved in HIV/Aids awareness campaigns because such campaigns are not necessary is a further motivation why libraries are not using the material. A further reason provided by mostly respondents from the developing world is the lack of computers and Internet access.

2.5.2 Women's access to information

This year's report again addressed the issue of women's access to information and the same subcategories were used as in the past. Respondents were again requested to provide examples of such programmes.

2.5.2.1 Libraries and women's literacy programmes

The first part of the question asked whether libraries were involved in special programmes that focus on promoting women's literacy. Numbers remained fairly stable, except in Asia where a marked increase occurred (due to more countries participating) and Europe where numbers went down from nine to six. The regional breakdown is given in Table 34.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes focusing on the promotion of women's literacy?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	9	37.5	12	40.0	6	20.0	7	35.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	35	31.5
	2007	10	35.7	3	14.3	9	26.5	6	27.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	30	25.9
No	2009	15	62.5	18	60.0	24	80.0	13	65.0	2	66.7	4	100.0	76	68.5
	2007	18	64.3	18	85.7	25	73.5	16	72.7	1	33.3	8	100	86	74.1
Total (N=)	2009	24		30		30		20		3		4		111	
	2007	28		21		34		22		3		8		116	
No data	2009	2		2		4		2		0		1		11	
	2007	0		0		0		0		0		0		0	

Table 34: Special programmes in libraries to promote women's literacy

Countries that are involved in such programmes are as follows:

- *Africa*: Ethiopia, The Gambia, Lesotho, Morocco, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Bangladesh, Brunei, India, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Philippines, Qatar, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam
- *Europe*: Albania, Germany, Iceland, Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, El Salvador, Guyana, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago

- *North America:* The USA
- *Oceania:* None

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 435.

As in 2007, countries that do not offer such literacy programmes have offered mainly three reasons: lack of skills, knowledge, training, facilities and/or funding; the fact that such programmes are offered by other agencies (e.g. NGOs, volunteers and government ministries); or the fact that the literacy rate is very high.

Methods by means of which such programmes are offered by libraries include workshops, seminars, adult education programmes (for example programmes for the development of reading skills and information literacy programmes) and special programmes in libraries (such as book displays and exhibits). These programmes are often offered in conjunction with NGOs and are very often initiatives of individual libraries (rather than national campaigns).

A number of respondents have mentioned that such programmes are not aimed only at women, but at all members of society.

2.5.2.2 Women's access to specific categories of information

The second part of the question asked whether libraries have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting women's access to one or more of the following topics: social information, the economy, education, health and family planning. The regional breakdown is given in Table 35.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting women's access to one or more of the following topics: social information, economy, education, health, and family planning?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	10	45.5	11	42.3	10	33.3	6	31.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	37	35.9
	2007	9	34.6	5	23.8	14	41.2	8	36.4	2	66.7	3	37.5	41	36.0
No	2009	12	54.5	15	57.7	20	66.7	13	68.4	2	100.0	4	100.0	66	64.1
	2007	17	65.4	16	76.2	20	58.8	14	63.6	1	33.3	5	62.5	73	64.0
Total (N=)	2009	22		26		30		19		2		4		103	
	2007	26		21		34		22		3		8			
No data	2009	4		6		4		3		1		1		19	
	2007	2		0		0		0		0		0			

Table 35: Special programmes in libraries for providing specific categories of information to women

Countries in which libraries have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting women's access to one or more of the topics listed are as follows:

- *Africa:* Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Morocco, Namibia, Sudan, Swaziland, Zimbabwe
- *Asia:* Bangladesh, India, Japan, Jordan, Nepal, Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Qatar, Syria, Thailand, Vietnam
- *Europe:* Albania, Andorra, Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Ukraine
- *Latin America and the Caribbean:* Bolivia, Cuba, El Salvador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname
- *North America:* None
- *Oceania:* None

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 436.

Few respondents have described specific programmes that are offered or given any explanation why libraries are not involved in such programmes. The role of government departments, NGOs and other organisations has been mentioned by some respondents as the reason why libraries are not involved in such programmes. As in 2007, "social inclusion policies and non-discriminatory policies have again been mentioned, with countries making information on

such topics available to both men and women” (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 436). As was the case in the previous question, the lack of sufficient funding and knowledge has also been mentioned as reasons why libraries are not involved in such programmes.

2.5.3 The disabled and Freedom of Access to Information

Questions regarding the disabled and freedom of access to information have been included for the first time. Respondents were requested to provide information on special programmes offered by libraries and whether the country has legislation designed to improve access to information for the visually impaired or other disabled people.

2.5.3.1 Library programmes for the disabled on promoting access to information

Nearly 60% of respondents indicated that libraries in their countries have special programmes for the disabled on promoting access to information. However, distribution of such programmes in terms of percentages amongst the regions of the world is uneven, as is evident from Table 36.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting access to information for the disabled?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	10	40.0	17	58.6	26	78.8	12	63.2	2	66.7	1	20.0	68	59.6
No	15	60.0	12	41.4	7	21.2	7	36.8	1	33.3	4	80.0	46	40.4
Total (N=)	25		29		33		19		3		5		114	
No data	1		3		1		3		0		0		8	

Table 36: Special programmes in libraries focusing on promoting access to information for the disabled

Percentages and numbers are considerably higher than for the preceding questions, and it seems as if programmes for the disabled as a category of citizens that need access to information have received more attention than women (or people needing information about HIV/Aids).

Countries in which libraries have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting access to information for the disabled are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lesotho, Morocco, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zimbabwe

Asia: Armenia, Brunei, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam

Europe: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom

Latin America and the Caribbean: Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Guyana, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Puerto Rico, Suriname, Virgin Islands

Northern America: Canada, the USA

Oceania: Australia

Programmes listed by respondents can be classified in different broad categories. This includes special associations / libraries / sections in libraries for the disabled, the physical accessibility of libraries, special educational and recreational programmes for the disabled and, mostly, providing information in alternative media and the provision of equipment for alternative media.

A number of respondents mentioned specific associations that focus on the provision of information for the disabled (physically as well as mentally disabled), resource centres and special libraries for the visually impaired (at both the

national and local level), special sections in libraries that provide information resources for the disabled (including audio and listening libraries) and special disability units at universities. Under physical accessibility respondents mentioned special ramps that are built to provide access for wheelchairs and the general accessibility of buildings. A few respondents referred to educational and recreational programmes (for example games, dances and social events) for the disabled organised by libraries.

By far the most common programmes offered by libraries are the provision of information in alternative formats and media and the equipment to access these media. This includes offering information resources in Braille format and equipment to transfer ordinary print to Braille, computers with special software to enlarge print, large format print books, books on CD or audio cassette, MP3 players for the use of audio books, tactile children’s books and toys and other equipment.

Respondents probably interpreted the phrase “special programmes” differently. A number of developed countries stated that there are no special programmes in their countries to promote access to information for the disabled. It is, however, inconceivable that these countries don’t have all or most of the programmes mentioned in the preceding paragraphs in place.

A number of developing countries mentioned that, due to a lack of resources, materials for, for example, the visually disabled are not readily available.

2.5.3.2 Legislation regarding the disabled and Freedom of Access to Information

Of the 106 countries that provided data for this question, respondents from 44 countries reported that legislation designed to improve access to information for the visually impaired or other disabled people exists in their countries, as is indicated in Table 37.

Does your country have legislation designed to improve access to information for the visually impaired or other disabled people - e.g., laws that permit copying of copyrighted works into accessible formats for the visually impaired?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	21.1	10	34.5	22	68.8	4	22.2	2	66.7	2	40.0	44	41.5
No	15	78.9	19	65.5	10	31.3	14	77.8	1	33.3	3	60.0	62	58.5
Total (N=)	19		29		32		18		3		5		106	
No data	7		3		2		4		0		0		16	

Table 37: Legislation designed to improve access to information for the visually impaired or other disabled people

Countries in which libraries have legislation designed to improve access to information for the visually impaired or other disabled people are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Lesotho, Namibia, Sudan

Asia: Brunei, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Philippines, Syria, Thailand, Turkey

Europe: Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom

Latin America and the Caribbean: Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, Peru

Northern America: Canada, the USA

Oceania: Australia, New Zealand

It is evident that more countries in the developed world, specifically in Europe and North America (+ Australia and New Zealand) have legislation in place that make provision for providing information to the visually impaired and other disabled people and that, on average, such issues have not yet reached any prominence in the developing world.

2.5.4 Senior citizens and Freedom of Access to Information

Questions regarding senior citizens and freedom of access to information have been included for the first time. Respondents were requested to provide information on special programmes offered by libraries. Data are summarised in Table 38.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting access to information for senior citizens?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	9	39.1	13	48.1	21	67.7	10	52.6	2	66.7	2	40.0	57	52.8
No	14	60.9	14	51.9	10	32.3	9	47.4	1	33.3	3	60.0	51	47.2
Total (N=)	23		27		31		19		3		5		108	
No data	3		5		3		3		0		0		14	

Table 38: Special programmes in libraries focusing on promoting access to information for senior citizens

Countries in which libraries have programmes designed to improve access to information for senior citizens are as follows:

Africa: Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Gambia, The, Morocco, Namibia, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zimbabwe

Asia: Brunei, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, South, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam

Europe: Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom

Latin America and the Caribbean: Aruba, Belize, Colombia, Cuba, Guyana, Jamaica, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Virgin Islands

Northern America: Greenland, United States

Oceania: Australia, New Zealand

There is a definite correlation between numbers per region for this question and the one on programmes that focus on the disabled.

Programmes offered by libraries include the following: extension of lending services (e.g. through mobile libraries, lending services for the housebound and book delivery at retirement homes); providing information in specific formats (large print and audio books) and age-related information; cultural and social meetings (e.g. book fairs, book promotions, reading aloud sessions and intergenerational programmes); general educational programmes and programmes promoting lifelong learning. A number of respondents expanded on the last-mentioned category, providing examples of information literacy courses, Internet and web-surfing courses and general computer skills courses. Free library membership for senior citizens and even the provision of glasses and magnifying glasses were mentioned.

2.5.5 Libraries and support for the ideals of universal primary education

Questions regarding library programmes that support the ideals of universal primary education have been included for the first time. Respondents were requested to provide information on special programmes offered by libraries. This does not seem to be very high on library agendas, as is evident from the numbers in Table 39.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes that support the ideals of universal primary education?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	13	56.5	12	44.4	13	44.8	9	45.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	48	45.7
No	10	43.5	15	55.6	16	55.2	11	55.0	2	100.0	3	75.0	57	54.3
Total (N=)	23		27		29		20		2		4		105	
No data	3		5		5		2		1		1		17	

Table 39: Special programmes in libraries that support the ideals of universal primary education

Regional distribution seems to be fairly even, with Africa in a slightly higher position (again not taking North America and Oceania into account). Unfortunately 17 respondents provided no information.

Countries in which libraries have programmes that support the ideals of universal primary education are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Cape Verde, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Namibia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe

Asia: Brunei, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Nepal, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Thailand, Turkey

Europe: Albania, Estonia, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Russia, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland

Latin America and the Caribbean: The Bahamas, Belize, Colombia, Cuba, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago

Northern America: None

Oceania: Vanuatu

Programmes offered by libraries include the following: the establishing and upgrading of school libraries (especially in rural areas); book donations (such as textbooks) to school libraries; the extension of public library services to schools; the establishment of special children's sections and reading rooms in libraries, specifically aimed at providing learning materials; the establishment of homework centres; the training of school librarians; social and cultural programmes (for example summer programmes and reading competitions).

The most common reasons respondents offered why libraries are not involved in such programmes is that universal primary education is already compulsory in their country (and special programmes are therefore not necessary) and that the issue is handled by other entities (such as government departments of education). A number of respondents mentioned that libraries in their countries don't have the resources to become involved in such programmes.

2.5.6 Libraries and environmental sustainability

Questions regarding library programmes that provide information on promoting environmental sustainability have also been included for the first time. Respondents were requested to provide information on special programmes offered by libraries. This also does not seem to be very high on library agendas, as is evident from the numbers in Table 40.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes that provide information on promoting environmental sustainability?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	11	52.4	10	40.0	16	57.1	9	47.4	2	66.7	2	50.0	50	50.0
No	10	47.6	15	60.0	12	42.9	10	52.6	1	33.3	2	50.0	50	50.0
Total (N=)	21		25		28		19		3		4		100	
No data	5		7		6		3		0		1		22	

Table 40: Special programmes in libraries that provide information on promoting environmental sustainability

Regional distribution seems to be fairly even, all within 10% of the total percentages (again not taking North America into account). Unfortunately 22 respondents provided no information.

Countries in which libraries have programmes that provide information on promoting environmental sustainability are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Cape Verde, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Namibia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda

Asia: Armenia, Cyprus, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Palestinian Territories, Syria, Turkey, Vietnam

Europe: Albania, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Serbia, Spain, Ukraine

Latin America and the Caribbean: Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago

Northern America: Canada, the USA

Oceania: Fiji, New Zealand

Very few respondents provided any details about programmes offered by libraries. Such programmes include the following: displays and exhibitions in libraries; the provision of special materials on environmental sustainability in libraries; cooperation with environmental organisation in organising events; events for children relating to environmental sustainability, such as art competitions and theatre productions.

The main reasons for not becoming involved in such programmes are the lack of appropriate resources (funding, skills and knowledge) and the fact that, in many countries, other entities deal with environmental issues.

2.6 Section 6: Ethics and IFLA initiatives

Reporting on codes of ethics and the different IFLA initiatives have formed part of previous reports; one subsection was added, viz. about the IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption. In each case respondents were asked whether the library association has adopted the code / manifesto / declaration and to provide examples of how libraries have implemented it. If libraries had not yet adopted it, respondents were requested to indicate whether the library association intended adopting it within the next two years.

2.6.1 Codes of ethics

The total numbers of countries in which library associations have adopted a code of ethics has increased only marginally, from 57 to 59, even though 27 countries reported in 2007 that their library associations intended adopting a code of ethics within the next two years, as is evident from the Tables 41 and 43 below.

Has your library association adopted a code of ethics?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	7	29.2	15	53.6	27	84.4	6	33.3	2	66.7	2	40.0	59	53.6
	2007	7	26.9	9	47.4	27	79.4	10	47.6	1	33.3	3	37.5	57	51.4
No	2009	17	70.8	13	46.4	5	15.6	12	66.7	1	33.3	3	60.0	51	46.4
	2007	19	73.1	10	52.6	7	20.6	11	52.4	2	66.7	5	62.5	54	48.6
Total (N=)	2009	24		28		32		18		3		5		110	
	2007	26		19		34		21		3		8		111	
No data	2009	2		4		2		4		0		0		12	
	2007	2		2		0		1		0		0		5	

Table 41: The adoption of codes of ethics

The situation in the different regions has remained fairly constant, with an increase in Asia (because of the larger number of respondents from the region), but has gone down in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Countries in which library associations have adopted a code of ethics are as follows:

Africa: Botswana, Ethiopia, Ghana, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Zimbabwe

Asia: Armenia, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Malaysia, Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Turkey, Vietnam

Europe: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom

Latin America and the Caribbean: Cuba, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Puerto Rico

Northern America: Canada, USA

Oceania: Australia, New Zealand

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 437-438.

Very few countries have provided any detail about how the codes of ethics are implemented in their libraries. Some have mentioned that librarians are introduced to the code through workshops and seminars; others have referred to extensive information and guidelines being available online. A number of respondents indicated that ethical behaviour is expected from all working in libraries and that it is implemented by librarians in their daily work through serving their patrons equally and with no discrimination (regardless of racial, ethnic, religious, political, gender or social status), by maintaining standards, by improving the level of professionalism in the library and by developing their library.

The most common reasons offered why library associations have not yet implemented a code of ethics is that the country's library association is inactive or even non-existent. A few respondents indicated that such a code is not a priority for the library association. This is similar to reasons offered in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 438).

The data regarding the online availability of a code of ethics are summarised in Table 42.

Is the code of ethics available on the Internet?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania	Total		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	15.4	11	34.4	26	76.5	2	9.1	2	66.7	2	40.0	47	38.5
No / No data	22	84.6	21	65.6	8	23.5	20	90.9	1	33.3	3	60.0	75	61.5
Total (N=)	26		32		34		22		3		5		122	

Table 42: The online availability of the code of ethics

47 Respondents indicated that their code of ethics is available online, a small increase from 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 438).

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the library association intended adopting a code of ethics within the next two years, if they had not previously done so; the data are summarised in Table 43.

If there is no code, does your library association intend to adopt one in the next two years?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania	Total		
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	10	66.7	5	38.5	3	60.0	5	62.5	1	33.3	1	33.3	24	54.5
	2007	13	100.0	5	71.4	2	40.0	4	50.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	27	67.5
No	2009	5	33.3	8	61.5	2	40.0	3	37.5	2	66.7	2	66.7	20	45.5

	2007	0	0.0	2	28.6	3	60.0	4	50.0	2	100.0	2	40.0	13	32.5
Total (N=)	2009	15		13		5		8		0		3		44	
	2007	13		7		5		8		2		5		40	
No data*	2009	11		19		29		14		3		2		78	
	2007	15		14		29		14		1		3		76	

* No data = no data + not applicable because already adopted

Table 43: The intention to adopt a code of ethics

24 Respondents indicated that their library associations intended adopting a code of ethics within the next two years, compared to 27 in 2007. These countries are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Sierra Leone, Tanzania

Asia: Cyprus, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Oman

Europe: Belgium, Denmark, Finland

Latin America and the Caribbean: Aruba, Colombia, Grenada, Netherlands Antilles, Suriname

Northern America: None

Oceania: Fiji

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 438.

Some countries that indicated in 2007 that they intend adopting a code of ethics within two years have not yet done so; in some cases they have again indicated that they intend adopting a code and therefore they again appear in the above list, but in others they have provided no data (or indicated "no"). This phenomenon is also observed when earlier reports are compared. The comments in the 2007 Report therefore remain valid: "This implies that the process of adopting a code is more complex or protracted than originally envisaged – or that the enthusiasm to do so does not result in the necessary actions" (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 439). The conclusion drawn in the 2007 Report also remains valid: "The issue of the adoption of a code of ethics and the implementation of such a code should be a matter of grave concern to IFLA. It is evident that there are quite a number of countries where there is little interest in such a code – whether it exists in that country's libraries or not – and even if it were to exist it is not widely propagated or implemented, or there is very little information available on how it is implemented in practice. There obviously are exceptions, however" (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 439).

2.6.2 The IFLA Internet Manifesto

There has been an improvement in numbers of library associations that have adopted the IFLA Internet Manifesto; however, still less than 40% have done so, as is clear from Table 44.

Has your library association adopted the IFLA Internet Manifesto?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	5	20.8	5	18.5	23	74.2	7	38.9	1	33.3	1	20.0	42	38.9
	2007	3	12.0	3	15.0	22	66.7	5	26.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	34	31.5
No	2009	19	79.2	22	81.5	8	25.8	11	61.1	2	66.7	4	80.0	66	61.1
	2007	22	88.0	17	85.0	11	33.3	14	73.7	2	33.3	8	100.0	74	68.5
Total (N=)	2009	24		27		31		18		3		5		108	
	2007	25		20		33		19		3		8		108	
No data	2009	2		5		3		4		0		0		14	
	2007	3		1		1		3		0		0		8	

Table 44: The adoption of the IFLA Internet Manifesto

The small increase in numbers can be observed in all regions (except North America).

Countries in which library associations have adopted the IFLA Internet Manifesto are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Ghana, South Africa, Swaziland, Zimbabwe

Asia: Armenia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Turkey, Vietnam

Europe: Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, Ukraine

Latin America and the Caribbean: Chile, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, Peru

Northern America: USA

Oceania: New Zealand

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 439-440.

Very few respondents provided any detail on how the Manifesto was implemented in their countries. The most common way of propagating it was by translating it into the official language and distributing information about it to libraries either in print format or via the Internet, or publishing it in local journals. In some cases the Manifesto was discussed in workshops and seminars.

The motivations for not adopting the Manifesto are the same as those for not adopting a code of ethics (see 2.6.1 above). Some respondents also mentioned that their library association was not aware of the Manifesto or that adopting it is not a priority, *inter alia* because there are very few computers and only very limited Internet access in libraries in their countries, or that they have similar codes/regulations in their own countries that make the adoption of the Manifesto unnecessary.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the library association intended adopting the Manifesto within the next two years, if they had not previously done so; the data are summarised in Table 45.

If the Manifesto has not yet been adopted, does your library association intend to adopt it in the next two years?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	11	78.6	11	57.9	2	33.3	4	57.1	0	0.0	1	33.3	29	58.0
	2007	20	95.2	9	75	2	33.3	9	90.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	43	76.8
No	2009	3	21.4	8	42.1	4	66.7	3	42.9	1	100.0	2	66.7	21	42.0
	2007	1	4.8	3	25	4	66.7	1	10.0	2	100.0	2	40.0	13	23.2
Total (N=)	2009	14		19		6		7		1		3		50	
	2007	21		12		6		10		2		5		56	
No data*	2009	12		13		28		15		2		2		72	
	2007	7		9		28		12		1		3		60	

* No data = no data + not applicable because already adopted

Table 45: The intention to adopt the IFLA Internet Manifesto

Countries in which library associations intend adopting the Manifesto within the next two years are as follows:

Africa: Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, The Gambia, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Namibia, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo

Asia: Cambodia, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, South Korea, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Philippines

Europe: Malta, Montenegro

Latin America and the Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Grenada, Suriname

Northern America: None

Oceania: Fiji

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 440.

As was the case with the adoption of a code of ethics (see 2.6.1 above) some countries that indicated in 2007 that they intend adopting the Manifesto within two years have not yet done so; in some cases they have again indicated that they intend adopting a code and therefore they again appear in the above list, but in others they have provided no data (or indicated "no"). This phenomenon is also observed when earlier reports are compared. As was stated in 2007

(IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 441), “this means that the process of adopting the Manifesto is more complex or protracted than originally envisaged – or that the enthusiasm to do so does not result in the necessary actions”.

The FAIFE committee of IFLA has made free training material regarding the Manifesto available on the IFLA website; data regarding the use of the material are summarised in Table 46.

Does the library association in your country or members of the library community make use of the free training material made available by the FAIFE committee on the IFLA website?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	25.0	7	28.0	13	54.2	5	38.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	35.4
No	12	75.0	18	72.0	11	45.8	8	61.5	1	100.0	3	100.0	53	64.6
Total (N=)	16		25		24		13		1		3		82	
No data	10		7		10		9		2		2		40	

Table 46: Use of the free training material made available by the FAIFE committee on the IFLA website

Countries in which libraries free training material made available by the FAIFE committee on the IFLA website are as follows:

Africa: Ethiopia, The Gambia, Tanzania, Uganda

Asia: Armenia, Iran, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Nepal, Philippines

Europe: Albania, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Netherlands, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Ukraine

Latin America and the Caribbean: Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago

Northern America: None

Oceania: None

This question did not form part of the 2007 Report.

There is much scope for improvement and therefore many opportunities for IFLA to raise awareness of the free training materials.

2.6.3 The IFLA Glasgow Declaration

The adoption of the Glasgow Declaration has declined slightly from 2007 to 2009, as is evident from Table 47.

Has your library association adopted the IFLA Glasgow Declaration on libraries, information services and intellectual freedom?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	3	15.0	3	12.0	17	53.1	2	11.8	1	33.3	1	20.0	27	26.5
	2007	4	17.4	2	10.0	17	51.5	4	25	1	33.3	1	12.5	29	28.2
No	2009	17	85.0	22	88.0	15	46.9	15	88.2	2	66.7	4	80.0	75	73.5
	2007	19	82.6	18	90.0	16	48.5	12	75	2	66.7	7	87.5	74	71.8
Total (N=)	2009	20		25		32		17		3		5		102	
	2007	23		20		33		16		3		8		103	
No data	2009	6		7		2		5		0		0		20	
	2007	5		1		1		6		0		0		13	

Table 47: The adoption of the IFLA Glasgow Declaration

Countries in which library associations have adopted the Glasgow Declaration are as follows:

Africa: Ghana, South Africa, Tanzania

Asia: Armenia, Japan, Turkey

Europe: Albania, Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia

Latin America and the Caribbean: Mexico, Peru

Northern America: USA

Oceania: New Zealand

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 441.

Very few respondents provided any detail on how the Declaration was implemented in their libraries. The most common way of propagating it was by translating and distributing it either in print format or via the Internet. A few respondents mentioned that the Declaration represented core values of the profession and are discussed in seminars and at workshops.

The most common reasons offered why library associations have not yet implemented the Declaration is that the country's library association is inactive or even non-existent. A number of respondents also mentioned that their library association was not aware of the Declaration. This is similar to reasons offered in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 442).

There is evidently much scope for improvement and therefore many opportunities for IFLA to raise awareness of the relevance and importance of the Declaration.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the library association intended adopting the Declaration within the next two years, if they had not previously done so; the data are summarised in Table 48.

If no, does your library association intend to adopt the Declaration in the next two years?															
		Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	2009	12	75.0	13	65.0	6	60.0	7	58.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	39	62.9
	2007	17	94.4	8	80.0	7	63.6	8	88.9	0	0.0	3	60.0	43	78.2
No	2009	4	25.0	7	35.0	4	40.0	5	41.7	1	100.0	2	66.7	23	37.1
	2007	1	5.6	2	20.0	4	36.4	1	11.1	2	100.0	2	40.0	12	21.8
Total (N=)	2009	16		20		10		12		1		3		62	
	2007	18		10		11		9		2		5		55	
No data	2009	10		12		24		10		2		2		60	
	2007	10		11		23		13		1		3		61	

Table 48: The intention to adopt the IFLA Glasgow Declaration

Countries in which library associations intended adopting the Declaration within the next two years are as follows:

Africa: Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Sudan, Togo, Zimbabwe

Asia: Cambodia, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Israel, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Vietnam

Europe: Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Malta, Montenegro, Ukraine

Latin America and the Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Colombia, El Salvador, Grenada, Netherlands Antilles, Suriname

Northern America: None

Oceania: Fiji

For the list of countries in 2007, see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 442.

As was the case with the adoption of a code of ethics and the Internet Manifesto (see 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 above) some countries that indicated in 2007 that they intend adopting the Declaration within two years have not yet done so; in some cases they have again indicated that they intend adopting a code and therefore they again appear in the above list, but in others they have provided no data (or indicated "no"). This phenomenon is also observed when earlier

reports are compared. As was stated in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 443), “this means that the process of adopting the Declaration is more complex or protracted than originally envisaged – or that the enthusiasm to do so does not result in the necessary actions”.

2.6.4 The adoption of the IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption

The IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption was only endorsed by the IFLA Governing Board on 3 December 2008 (<http://www.ifla.org/en/publications/ifla-manifesto-on-transparency-good-governance-and-freedom-from-corruption>) and it is therefore not surprising that only four countries have adopted this Manifesto up to the end of 2009, as is evident from Table 49.

Has your library association adopted the IFLA Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	1	4.8	1	4.0	2	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.0
No	20	95.2	24	96.0	27	93.1	16	100.0	3	100.0	5	100.0	95	96.0
Total (N=)	21		25		29		16		3		5		99	
No data	5		7		5		6		0		0		23	

Table 49: The adoption of the Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption

Countries in which library associations have adopted the Manifesto are as follows:

Africa: Ghana

Asia: Kazakhstan

Europe: Greece, Latvia

Latin America and the Caribbean: None

Northern America: None

Oceania: None

Only one of the four respondents indicated how the Manifesto is implemented in libraries in his/her country, viz. the respondent from Latvia stated “that the main points of the Manifesto are used for protecting democracy in different situations, also for lobbying libraries as democratic institutions. The main topics of the Manifesto are analysed in seminars, working groups, professional meetings and educational courses for librarians (and it is planned to translate it into Latvian)”.

A number of respondents indicated that their library associations were not aware of the Manifesto.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether the library association intended adopting the Manifesto within the next two years, if they had not previously done so; the data are summarised in Table 50.

If no, does your library association intend to adopt a resolution to support the Manifesto within the next two years?														
	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	14	77.8	16	72.7	16	72.7	7	63.6	0	0.0	1	50.0	54	71.1
No	4	22.2	6	27.3	6	27.3	4	36.4	1	100.0	1	50.0	22	28.9
Total (N=)	18		22		22		11		1		2		76	
No data	8		10		12		11		2		3		46	

Table 50: The intention to adopt the IFLA a resolution to support the Manifesto within the next two years

Countries in which library associations intended adopting the Manifesto within the next two years are as follows:

Africa: Algeria, Côte d’Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zimbabwe

Asia: Armenia, Cambodia, Cyprus, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, South Korea, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Vietnam

Europe: Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Romania, Serbia, Ukraine

Latin America and the Caribbean: Aruba, Cuba, El Salvador, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, Peru, Suriname

Northern America: none

Oceania: Fiji

One can only trust that these intentions translate into the necessary actions, and that a similar situation as with the other four questions in this section regarding the intentions of library associations to adopt a code of ethics, the Internet Manifesto and the Glasgow Declaration is not observed when a follow-up survey on the adoption of this Manifesto is conducted.

2.6.5 Conclusion on the four ethics-related questions

This section provides a brief comparison between the adoption and intention to adopt the four items discussed in Section 2.6, viz. a code of ethics, the Internet Manifesto, the Glasgow Declaration and the Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption, comparing the 2009 data with that of 2007 in the case of the first three. In all three cases percentages have gone down, even though actual numbers have gone up or down slightly. The data are summarised in Table 51.

A comparison of the four ethics-related questions		2009		2007	
		#	%	#	%
Code of ethics					
	Yes	59	48.4	57	49.1
	Within two years	24	19.7	27	23.3
	Totals	83	68.0	84	72.4
Internet Manifesto					
	Yes	42	34.4	34	29.3
	Within two years	29	23.8	43	37.1
	Totals	71	58.2	77	66.4
Glasgow Declaration					
	Yes	27	22.1	29	25.0
	Within two years	39	32.0	43	37.1
	Totals	66	54.1	72	62.1
Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption					
	Yes	4	3.3		
	Within two years	54	44.3		
	Totals	58	47.5		
		N= 122 Percentages recalculated out of 122		N= 116 Percentages recalculated out of 116	

Table 51: A comparison of the four ethics-related questions; data taken from preceding tables in Section 6 of this Report and Table 54 from IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 443

Quite a number of library associations (both in numbers and as a percentage) have adopted a code of ethics, even though the numbers have increased only marginally between 2007 and 2009. A far smaller number have adopted the Internet Manifesto and the Glasgow Declaration; since the Manifesto on Transparency, Good Governance and Freedom from Corruption was only endorsed by the IFLA Governing Board on 3 December 2008 (see 2.6.4 above) it is to be expected that its adoption trails far behind the others. In terms of the intention to adopt these items, both

numbers and percentages have declined since 2007. Furthermore, comparing this Report with the 2007 data (and data from earlier reports), it is unfortunately clear that the intention to adopt any of these items is not necessarily realised, and it can be safely assumed that the “within two years” numbers and percentages for 2009 in Table 51 are rather optimistic.

As noted in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 443), “IFLA should consider a special effort to convince library associations to adopt all three [for 2009 obviously four] items discussed in this section. As the Manifesto[s] and the Declaration are specifically IFLA initiatives and they have been adopted to a lesser extent than codes of ethics, IFLA should propagate them even more strongly. The urgent need for this is borne out by the number of respondents who have been unaware of the existence of [both] Manifesto[s] and the Declaration”.

One of the main reasons respondents have offered in both the 2010 and 2007 Reports for library associations not having adopted these items is the fact that the associations are dormant, inactive or non-existent. The initiative for building strong libraries (see <http://www.ifla.org/en/news/ifla-announces-new-training-programme-for-library-association-development>) will hopefully address this issue.

Even when one or more of these items have been adopted by library associations, there is in many cases no or very little evidence that any of these are being propagated or applied in libraries. As mentioned in the 2007 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 443), “adopting any of these items is of no use if library associations do not actively monitor their implementation. IFLA should therefore consider providing guidelines on how to monitor the implementation of these items”. There are, obviously, exceptions, as is evidenced by a number of reports from respondents.

3. Conclusion

The original intention of the World Report Series was to provide a global picture of issues relating to the freedom of access to information and freedom of expression, specifically as it relates to libraries and library services. At the request of IFLA the set of questions was considerably extended for the 2010 Report to include non-FAIFE related issues as well. The IFLA/FAIFE World Report has therefore been rebranded as the IFLA World Report. In 2009/2010 the main focus is still on FAIFE issues with the inclusion of a number of other issues. However, this may not necessarily be the case for future volumes in this Series.

Each of the questions was dealt with in detail in the preceding part of this chapter – in each case the data of the country reports have been analysed and compared, where possible, with the 2007 Report. In this final conclusion, these conclusions will not be repeated or summarised. Only a few closing remarks will be made, highlighting some of the issues involved.

There are significant differences between developed and developing countries in terms of Internet access in different types of libraries and the availability of limited or unlimited free Internet access in these libraries. The necessary infrastructure to access the Internet, costs related to Internet access and the implied financial burdens are all factors that play an important role in the limited access to the Internet in libraries of the developing world. Even though there is an increase in countries participating in this year’s Report, there are still many countries that could conceivably participate in future reports. Most of these are developing countries. If all these countries were to participate, the fairly positive picture of this and previous reports may be drastically impacted. This tendency is very clear by comparing data from previous reports, as already noted in 2007 (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 444). It can therefore be concluded that the digital divide is still a serious reality and that it will take a huge effort to close the gap between information-rich and information-poor countries.

There has again been a shift in the views of library associations in terms of Internet filtering. A smaller number of library associations are now in favour of filtering (compared to a shift towards more library associations being in favour of filtering between 2005 and 2007). However, filtering specifically to safeguard children and morality is still

listed by most countries as a motivation for filtering. This is, in general, to be commended. Such filtering could, however, very easily develop into general Internet censorship and any developments should be carefully monitored by library communities and other interested parties, so as to ensure that legitimate information needs of the general public can be satisfied. The “upstream filtering” of the Internet, in particular, is a matter for serious concern. This has occurred in a number of countries that have participated in this year’s Report, but is also prevalent in a number of countries that have not participated. This tendency should be closely monitored by IFLA and the FAIFE Committee.

Open Access to information resources can contribute to reduce the impact of the digital divide. The fact that respondents that provided data for the specific questions indicated that nearly 90% of library associations are in favour of Open Access and that there are Open Access initiatives in about 76% of countries, is a very positive development. According to respondents copyright laws exist in 110 countries and in 72 countries the copyright laws include limitations or exceptions for libraries; 85 respondents reported that their countries have legislation that guarantees freedom of access to information and freedom of expression. These are all very positive aspects. Library associations and library communities across the world should endeavour to increase these numbers and to ensure that the principles underlying the questions are implemented and safeguarded in their countries.

Violations of freedom of expression and freedom of access to information are still very prevalent in many countries in all regions of the world. Interestingly enough very few respondents have reported on such incidents in their countries and most of the information comes from third-party sources – only 21 respondents have highlighted any issues, whereas the consulted third-party sources have listed issues in at least 109 countries (compared to 19 and 82 respectively in 2007). The fact that only a few respondents have reported incidents is worrisome, regardless of the reason for this. On the other hand, the fact that there are so many countries in which such incidents take place, should be a matter of grave concern to IFLA and the library community in general. The current online Report makes provision for reader comments, and it is hoped that readers across the world will contribute to the Report by adding descriptions of such violations, thereby keeping the Report current and up-to-date. The same applies to all occurrences of repressive legislation that may impact on freedom of access to information and freedom of expression.

Libraries have an important function to fulfil in terms of supplying information to all communities. This Report is more inclusive than previous reports in that it includes questions about providing information to women, people with disabilities (including the visually impaired) and senior citizens, as well as questions about libraries’ role in supporting the ideals of universal primary education and providing information on promoting environmental sustainability. In nearly all cases less than 50% of the possible 122 respondents provided a positive response about the involvement of libraries in their countries in such programmes. The only exception was programmes that focus on providing information for the disabled that were reported by 68 respondents. There is therefore an excellent opportunity for libraries worldwide to improve their contributions in this regard. There are many countries in which libraries are doing sterling work in this regard (as was also reported in 2007) and it is necessary that IFLA should take more note of this. The database of success stories can be a good way of highlighting and acknowledging the contributions of the library community in general, and of individual libraries and library patrons in particular; the current Success Stories Database already has many such contributions (see <http://www.ifla.org/en/success-stories>) and it is envisaged that a new version of this database (see <http://www.ifla.org/en/news/report-about-it-brainstorming-meeting-at-ifla-headquarters>; also see <http://www.ifla.org/en/news/ifla-presidential-newsletter-no-2-february-2010>) will inspire the library community to record their successes.

Ethical issues are always of concern to library communities. It is therefore disconcerting that the number of countries that have adopted ethical codes, the IFLA Internet Manifesto and the IFLA Glasgow Declaration has increased only marginally since 2007. It is also very disconcerting that many countries that have indicated their intention to adopt any of these items within two years have not done so – in some cases not in the two years from 2005 to 2007 and also not in the two years from 2007 to 2009. There also seems to be remarkable apathy about ethical issues in a number of cases, as already noted in the 2007 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 444): “This is evidenced by the fact that a number of respondents appear to have been unaware of the [two] Manifesto[s] and the Declaration, and also that some have reported finding very little evidence in their library communities that a code of ethics, the Manifesto[s] or the Declaration are actually implemented, or how they are implemented.” There are obviously exceptions. However,



IFLA should consider doing serious follow-up work on this to bring the importance of these codes to the attention of library communities yet again.

As mentioned in the 2007 Report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2007: 445), “the fact that this Report again includes country reports from a number of countries that had no IFLA members at the time of writing provides IFLA with an ideal opportunity to propagate its ideals and its work among non-members. Such a global, unified network that truly represents the library and information community worldwide could work even more effectively to address and overcome global issues and problems that face the profession”.

This Report highlights many positive issues about which librarians and library patrons can be very proud – issues that need to be documented in more detail and that should be easily visible and accessible to everyone interested in the role and successes of libraries in providing equal access to information to all in the world. There are nevertheless many issues that should be of very serious concern to IFLA, the FAIFE Committee, library communities and individual library patrons worldwide, and concerted efforts are needed to address these issues successfully. Visualising all the successes and concerns on an interactive map of the world as is used as primary interface for this Report can highlight such issues and facilitate access to details.