

# Analysis and conclusions

*Theo Bothma & Retha Claasen-Veldsman*

## 1. Introduction

In this section the findings of this year's research are analysed and comparisons are made with the 2005 report, where possible.

The section commences with an analysis of the participants of the current report; and comparisons with previous reports, first-time participants and participation trends since 2001 are also shown.

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

### 1.1 Participants in the 2007 IFLA/FAIFE World Report

Countries that are represented in the 2007 IFLA/FAIFE World Report are listed in Table 1 below.

Albania	Czech Republic	Kuwait	Poland
Algeria	Denmark	Latvia	Russia
Andorra	Egypt	Lebanon	Rwanda
Aruba	El Salvador	Lesotho	San Marino
Australia	Estonia	Lithuania	Serbia
Austria	Ethiopia	Luxembourg	Seychelles
Bahamas	Fiji	Maldives	Singapore
Barbados	Finland	Mali	Slovak Republic
Belgium (Flanders)	Gambia	Malta	Slovenia
Belize	Germany	Mauritius	Solomon Islands
Benin	Ghana	Mexico	South Africa
Bermuda	Greenland	Moldova	Sri Lanka
Bhutan	Guam	Monaco	Suriname
Bolivia	Guinea	Montenegro	Swaziland
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guyana	Mozambique	Sweden
Botswana	Haiti	Namibia	Switzerland
Brazil	Honduras	Nepal	Tanzania
Bulgaria	Hong Kong	Netherlands Antilles (St Maarten)	Thailand
Burkina Faso	Hungary	New Caledonia	Trinidad and Tobago
Cambodia	Iceland	New Zealand	Turkey
Cape Verde	Ireland	Nigeria	Uganda
Chile	Israel	Norway	Ukraine
Congo Brazzaville	Italy	Oman (Sultanate of)	United Kingdom
Congo (DRC)	Jamaica	Pakistan	United States of America
Costa Rica	Japan	Palau	Uruguay
Côte d'Ivoire	Jordan	Palestine	Vanuatu
Croatia	Kazakhstan	Panama	Vietnam
Cuba	Kenya	Paraguay	Zambia
Cyprus	Korea (Republic of)	Peru	Zimbabwe

**Table 1: Participants in the 2007 IFLA/FAIFE World Report**

### 1.2 First-time participants in the 2007 IFLA/FAIFE World Report

A total of 33 countries participated for the first time in 2007 in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report. These are listed in Table 2 below.

Algeria	Luxembourg
Barbados	Maldives
Bermuda	Mali
Bhutan	Montenegro
Brazil	Mozambique
Burkina Faso	Monaco
Congo Brazzaville	Oman (Sultanate of)
Côte d'Ivoire	Palau
El Salvador	Palestine
Greenland	Paraguay
Guinea	San Marino
Guyana	Serbia
Haiti	Solomon Islands
Honduras	Suriname
Hungary	Vanuatu
Jordan	Vietnam
Korea (Republic of)	

**Table 2: First-time participants in the 2007 IFLA/FAIFE World Report**

### 1.3 Countries participating in the World Report series since 2001

Table 3, a comparative table, indicates all countries that have participated in the IFLA/FAIFE World Report series from 2001 to 2007.

Country	2001	2003	2005	2007
Albania	X			X
Algeria				X
Andorra		X	X	X
Angola		X	X	Indicated non-participation
Argentina				Indicated non-participation
Armenia	X	X		
Aruba		X	X	X
Australia	X	X	X	X
Austria		X		X
Azerbaijan		X	X	
Bahamas			X	X
Barbados				X

Belarus		X		
Belgium (Flanders)	X	X	X	X
Belize		X		X
Benin		X	X	X
Bermuda				X
Bhutan				X
Bolivia		X		X
Bosnia and Herzegovina		X		X
Botswana		X	X	X
Brazil				X
Bulgaria	X	X		X
Burkina Faso				X
Cambodia	X			X
Cameroon	X			
Canada	X	X	X	
Cape Verde		X	X	X
Chad		X		
Chile	X	X	X	X
China		X	X	Indicated non-participation
Colombia		X	X	
Congo Brazzaville				X
Congo (DRC)			X	X
Costa Rica	X	X	X	X
Côte d'Ivoire				X
Croatia	X	X	X	X
Cuba	X		X	X
Cyprus		X	X	X
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X
Denmark	X	X	X	X
Ecuador			X	
Egypt	X	X	X	X
El Salvador				X
Estonia		X	X	X
Ethiopia	X	X	X	X
Fiji		X	X	X
Finland		X	X	X
France		X		
Gambia		X		X
Georgia	X	X	X	
Germany	X	X	X	X

Ghana		X	X	X
Greenland				X
Guam		X	X	X
Guatemala		X		Indicated non-participation
Guinea				X
Guyana				X
Haiti				X
Honduras				X
Hong Kong (SAR of China)		X	X	X
Hungary				X
Iceland	X	X	X	X
India	X	X	X	
Iran		X		
Ireland		X	X	X
Israel	X		X	X
Italy	X	X	X	X
Jamaica	X		X	X
Japan	X	X	X	X
Jordan				X
Kazakhstan			X	X
Kenya	X	X	X	X
Korea (Republic of)				X
Kuwait	X	X		X
Latvia		X	X	X
Lebanon	X	X		X
Lesotho	X			X
Liechtenstein		X		
Lithuania	X	X	X	X
Luxembourg				X
Macao		X		
Macedonia		X	X	
Maldives				X
Mali				X
Malta		X		X
Mauritius			X	X
Mexico	X	X	X	X
Moldova		X	X	X
Monaco				X
Mongolia		X	X	
Montenegro				X

Mozambique				X
Namibia		X		X
Nepal		X	X	X
Netherlands	X	X	X	Indicated non-participation
Netherlands Antilles (St Maarten)		X	X	X
New Caledonia		X	X	X
New Zealand		X	X	X
Nicaragua		X	X	
Niger		X		
Nigeria	X		X	X
Norway	X	X	X	X
Oman				X
Pakistan			X	X
Palau				X
Palestine				X
Panama		X		X
Papua New Guinea			X	
Paraguay				X
Peru			X	X
Philippines		X	X	
Poland		X	X	X
Romania			X	
Russia		X	X	X
Rwanda	X			X
San Marino				X
Senegal				Indicated non-participation
Serbia				X
Serbia and Montenegro		X	X	
Seychelles			X	X
Sierra Leone			X	
Singapore		X	X	X
Slovak Republic		X		X
Slovenia	X	X	X	X
Solomon Islands				X
South Africa	X	X		X
Spain	X		X	
Sri Lanka	X		X	X

St Kitts and Nevis (Nevis)			X	
Suriname				X
Swaziland		X	X	X
Sweden	X	X	X	X
Switzerland		X	X	X
Syria			X	
Tanzania			X	X
Thailand	X	X		X
Trinidad and Tobago		X	X	X
Turkey	X			X
Turkmenistan			X	
Uganda		X	X	X
Ukraine	X	X	X	X
United Kingdom	X		X	X
United States of America	X	X	X	X
Uruguay		X		X
Uzbekistan		X	X	
Vanuatu				X
Vatican City		X		
Venezuela		X		
Vietnam				X
Zambia	X		X	X
Zimbabwe	X	X		X

**Table 3: Countries participating in the World Report series since 2001**

Since the start of the IFLA/FAIFE World Report series in 2001 until 2007, with reference to the fourth report, 150 countries have been represented in these reports. The participation rate is summarised in Table 4.

Countries' participation since 2001	No.
Once	51
Twice	35
Three times	43
Four times – thus represented in all four reports	21

**Table 4: 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. The current report for 2007 has a total of 116 countries represented.

As indicated earlier, the 2007 World Report has 33 countries represented for the first time since the beginning of the series. Six countries indicated their non-participation in the 2007 World Report. Their reasons varied, including there being no changes in their situation since the 2005 World Report; 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.

#### 1.4 Regional breakdown of the 2007 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 2005 report. The said database lists 229 countries in the world. Of this number the research team was able to contact 174 countries, of which 116 responded, as explained in the Methodology section. Even though the response was up by 32 countries (38%) compared with the 2005 report, it still represents only slightly more than half of the countries of the world listed in the UN database.

The number of respondents from each region is given in Table 5.

Region	2007	2005	Number of possible respondents
Africa	28	17	55
Asia	21	18	50
Europe	34	27	49
Latin America and the Caribbean	22	14	46
North America	3	2	5
Oceania	8	6	24
Total	116	84	229

**Table 5: Regional distribution of respondents**

There has been an increased response from all regions, with the biggest numerical increase from Africa.

## 2. Analysis of individual questions

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaire follows the same format as that of the previous report. The different sections that were covered include the following:

- Internet access in libraries and the digital divide
- The use of filtering software
- The costs of accessing the Internet
- Libraries and anti-terror legislation
- Violations of intellectual freedom
- HIV/Aids awareness and libraries
- Women's literacy and access to information
- The adoption of a code of ethics, the IFLA Internet Manifesto and the Glasgow Declaration

The analysis section is followed by a final conclusion.

Comparisons with the 2005 report are offered where feasible. It is to be noted, however, that such comparisons are problematic due to the increased number of countries responding (many of which are developing countries).

Also, increased numbers do not necessarily indicate a similar increased number of responses. For example, there is an increase of 11 respondents between 2005 and 2007 in Africa. However, only seven of the 11 are first-time respondents, since four have participated in earlier reports. To further complicate matters, two respondents participated only in 2001 when the structure of the questionnaire was totally different and no statistics were requested. All comparisons are therefore to be taken only as broad indications.

### 2.1 Questions 1 and 2: Numbers of libraries

Questions 1 and 2 asked for the numbers of public and research libraries per country. The current questionnaire differs from the previous ones in that the category of research libraries was subdivided into university research libraries, school libraries and government-funded research libraries. Comparisons between the different reports are therefore problematical. These numbers are not further analysed.

### 2.2 Question 3: The digital divide

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).

Different levels of Internet access have been a core focus of all the previous reports, and the current report followed up on this.

#### 2.2.1 Question 3a: The extent of 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. A direct comparison can be made between the levels of access in public libraries. This is not, however, possible for the broader category of research libraries. In the previous report a single category of research libraries was used (comprising school and university libraries), and for this questionnaire the question was split into three separate ones asking respondents to estimate the levels of Internet access separately for school libraries, university libraries and government-funded research libraries.

##### 2.2.1.1 Public libraries

Table 6 provides a comparison of levels of Internet access in public libraries in 2007, 2005 and 2003.

Percentages between 2007 and 2005 are fairly stable. It is to be noted, however, that there are 12 more countries with less than 20% access, compared with only seven more offering 81-100% access. This can be ascribed to the fact that many of the first-time respondents are from the developing world, where Internet access is more limited.

Access	2007		2005		2003	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
81-100%	34	29.6	27	33	18	21
61-80%	9	7.8	6	7	5	6
41-60%	16	13.9	7	8	10	12
21-40%	11	9.6	10	12	14	16
≤ 20%	45	39.1	33	40	39	45
Total	115		83		86	
	No data from one country					

**Table 6: Percentage of public libraries offering Internet access (2007, 2005 and 2003)**

As in 2005, 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 7.

	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total %	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
81-100%	2	7.1	4	20.0	16	47.1	6	27.3	2	66.7	4	50.0	34	29.6
61-80%	1	3.6	1	5.0	3	8.8	4	18.2	0	0.0		0.0	9	7.8
41-60%	2	7.1	4	20.0	8	23.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	16	13.9
21-40%	3	10.7	3	15.0	1	2.9	3	13.6	1	33.3		0.0	11	9.6
≤ 20%	20	71.4	8	40.0	6	17.6	8	36.4	0	0.0	3	37.5	45	39.1
Total	28		20		34		22		3		8		115	100
No data			Bhutan											

**Table 7: Number and percentage of public libraries offering Internet access according to regions (2007)**

### Africa

Only two countries in Africa (Mauritius and Seychelles) have reported 81-100% Internet access in their public libraries; both reported the same access levels in 2005. Again, this can possibly be ascribed to the small public library systems on the two island states, reporting only 20 and five public libraries respectively. As in 2005, access to the Internet in public libraries is very low, with 20 of the 28 countries that participated being unable to offer access to the Internet in more than 20% of their public libraries. More disconcerting is the fact that 10 of the 11 countries that did not participate in the 2005 report only offer Internet access in less than 20% of their public libraries. This tendency could possibly indicate that the majority of new respondents from developing countries could, in future reports, report very low Internet access in public libraries, unless there is a concerted effort to upgrade facilities in the developing world.

In two countries Internet access in public libraries went down from 2005: Egypt has reported a drop from 61-80% in 2005 to 41-60% in 2007, and Namibia a drop to less than 20% in 2007 compared with 21-40% in 2005. In four cases there have been improvements: in Cape Verde from less than 20% to 41-60%, the Gambia from less than 20% in 2003 to 21-40%, Ghana from less than 20% in 2005 to 21-40%, and South Africa, with a substantial improvement from 21-40% in 2005 to 61-80% in 2007.

Levels of access to the Internet in public libraries in Africa remain extremely low and most countries that participated in the World Report for the first time in 2007 have reported less than 20% Internet access. (One can speculate that Internet access in public libraries in the 27 African countries that did not participate in the 2007 report would also be very low.)

This low level of Internet access in public libraries definitely has a negative impact on Africa's progress towards an information society and the continent's general economic development.

### Asia

Four countries (Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea, Singapore and Vietnam) have reported 81-100% access to the Internet in their public libraries in 2007, compared with only Hong Kong and Singapore in 2005. Of the nine countries that did not participate in the 2005 report, five offer Internet access in only less than 20% of their public libraries. In one case, Internet access is estimated at 41-60% (Maldives) and in the Republic of Korea and Vietnam it is estimated at between 81-100% (one country did not provide data).

In most cases Internet access in public libraries has remained fairly stable. In two countries it has dropped: Kazakhstan has reported a remarkable drop to less than 20% in 2007 (compared with 61-80% in 2005), and Thailand has dropped from 61-80% in 2005 to 41-60% in 2007. Two countries have reported an improvement since 2005: Japan (from less than 20% to 21-40%) and Kuwait (from 41-60% to 61-80%).

### Europe

Of the 34 countries in Europe that participated in the 2007 report, 16 have set their Internet access in public libraries at 81-100%, viz. Andorra, Austria, Belgium (Flanders), Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, San Marino, Sweden and the UK (compared with 13 out of 27 countries in 2005). Eight countries have reported an increase in Internet access in public libraries, viz. Austria (up from 61-80% in 2003 to 81-100%), Bosnia and Herzegovina (up from less than 20% in 2003 to

21-40%), Czech Republic (a remarkable increase to 81-100%, compared with 21-40% in 2005), Germany and Latvia (both up from 61-80% in 2005 to 81-100%), Lithuania and Poland (both up from 21-40% in 2005 to 41-60%) and Slovenia (up from 41-60% in 2005 to 61-80%).

Two countries have reported a drop in levels of Internet access in public libraries, viz. Croatia (down to 61-80% from 81-100% in 2005) and the Slovak Republic (down to less than 20% from 41-60% in 2005). Of the seven countries that did not participate in the 2005 report, five have reported Internet access levels of 41-60% (Hungary, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro and Serbia), one has reported less than 20% (Albania) and one 81-100% (San Marino).

Overall, the 2007 results show an improvement over 2005, which in turn was an improvement on 2003. However, improvement in Internet access in public libraries has not been evident everywhere, and five of the six countries that have reported less than 20% access in 2005 or earlier (Bulgaria, Moldova, Russia, Slovak Republic and Ukraine) are still at this level, with Albania being added to this group.

### **Latin America and the Caribbean**

Six of the 22 countries have reported their level of Internet access in public libraries as 81-100% (Aruba, Belize, Chile, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles [St Maarten] and Trinidad and Tobago), compared with six out of 14 in 2005. Four countries have reported an increase, viz. Belize (a remarkable 81-100%, compared with less than 20% in 2003), Bolivia and Panama (up from less than 20% in 2003 to 61-80% and 41-60% respectively) and Peru (up from less than 20% in 2005 to 21-40%). Only one country (Cuba) has reported a decline in the level of Internet access in public libraries, down from 41-60% in 2005 to less than 20% in 2007.

Eight countries have participated for the first time, viz. Barbados and Guyana (61-80% in both cases), Brazil and El Salvador (21-40% in both cases) and Haiti, Honduras, Paraguay and Suriname (all with less than 20%). Only two of the five countries that were at the lowest level in 2005 have been able to improve their access, while four have remained at the lowest level. Four of the eight countries that participated for the first time have reported their level of Internet access in public libraries at less than 20%.

### **North America**

In 2005, the USA and Canada participated in the report, both countries reporting 81-100% access to the

Internet in their public libraries. The USA has again reported 81-100% access in 2007, but Canada unfortunately did not participate. Two new respondents (Bermuda and Greenland) have reported Internet access levels in their public libraries of 81-100% and 21-40% respectively. No comparisons are possible.

### **Oceania**

Of the eight respondents in Oceania, four offer Internet access in 81-100% of their public libraries, viz. Australia, Guam (showing an increase from 41-60% in 2005), New Zealand, and Palau (which has participated for the first time in 2007). The two other first-time participants (Solomon Islands and Vanuatu) have both reported levels of access of less than 20%, the same as Fiji, which has remained in this bracket since 2005.

### **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 is, however, evident that such levels are on average lower among first participants – levels of access lower than 20% have been offered by all seven new participants from Africa (plus a further two that only participated in 2001), three out of seven in Asia (plus a further two that only participated in 2001), one out of seven in Europe, four out of eight in Latin America and the Caribbean, and two out of three in Oceania, in total 17 out of 33 (plus a further four that only participated in 2001). It is to be expected that this trend will continue as the number of new respondents increases, in particular for new respondents from developing countries.

#### **2.2.1.2 School libraries**

No direct comparisons can be made between data for school libraries in 2007 and the broader category of research libraries in the 2003 and 2005 reports, which included school libraries. The levels of Internet access in school libraries in the different regions are summarised in Table 8.

### **Africa**

Levels of Internet access in school libraries are very similar to those of public libraries, with only two countries (Mauritius and Seychelles) offering access at 81-100%, and 20 countries offering access at less than 20% – both identical to public libraries. The remaining six countries are at lower levels, with five countries offering access at 21-40% and one at 41-60%.

	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
81-100%	2	7.1	4	21.1	16	47.1	2	9.5	2	66.7	2	28.6	28	25.0
61-80%	0	0.0	3	15.8	4	11.8	2	9.5	0	0.0	2	28.6	11	9.8
41-60%	1	3.6	2	10.5	6	17.6	3	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	10.7
21-40%	5	17.9	3	15.8	1	2.9	3	14.3	0	0.0	1	14.3	13	11.6
≤ 20%	20	71.4	7	36.8	7	20.6	11	52.4	1	33.3	2	28.6	48	42.9
Total	28		19		34		21		3		7		112	100
No data			Bhutan, Japan				Guyana				Guam			

**Table 8: Number and percentage of school libraries offering Internet access according to regions (2007)**

### Asia

Two countries in Asia have not provided data on the levels of Internet access in school libraries. Of the remaining 19 countries, more than a third offer access at the lowest level, with four countries at the highest level and the others being fairly evenly distributed among the remaining three levels.

### Europe

Close to half the countries in Europe offer Internet access at the highest level in their school libraries, with a fairly even distribution among the other levels (except for one country being at 21-40%).

### Latin America and the Caribbean

The situation in Latin America and the Caribbean is the opposite from that of Europe, with more than half the countries offering access to the Internet in school libraries at the lowest level. Only two out of 21 (about 10%) offer access at the highest level.

### North America

The USA and Bermuda offer Internet access in school

libraries at the highest level, and Greenland at the lowest level.

### Oceania

The seven countries in Oceania are fairly evenly distributed; one country has not provided data on its levels of access.

### Summary for school libraries

The levels of Internet access in school libraries is on average lower than the levels of access in public libraries – approximately 4% lower at the highest level and approximately 4% higher at the lowest level.

### 2.2.1.3 University libraries

No direct comparisons can be made between data for university libraries in 2007 and the broader category of research libraries in the 2003 and 2005 reports, which included university libraries. The levels of Internet access in university libraries in the different regions are summarised in Table 9.

	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
81-100%	8	32.0	14	66.7	26	81.3	13	61.9	2	66.7	6	85.7	69	63.3
61-80%	5	20.0	4	19.0	1	3.1	4	19.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	12.8
41-60%	1	4.0	1	4.8	2	6.3	1	4.8	0	0.0	1	14.3	6	5.5
21-40%	3	12.0	0	0.0	2	6.3	2	9.5	1	33.3	0	0.0	8	7.3
≤ 20%	8	32.0	2	9.5	1	3.1	1	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	11.0
Total	25		21		32		21		3		7		109	100
No data	Mali, Nigeria, Seychelles				Finland, Monaco		(Panama 61-100%)				Guam			

**Table 9: Number and percentage of university libraries offering Internet access according to regions (2007)**



### Africa

Universities in Africa are considerably better off in terms of Internet access than are public and school libraries: about one third of the countries offer Internet access at the highest level (and another third at the lowest level). Three countries have not provided data on levels of Internet access in their university libraries.

### Asia

Two-thirds of the participating countries in Asia offer Internet access in university libraries at the highest level, with only about 10% at the lowest level.

### Europe

More than 80% of the participating countries in Europe offer Internet access at the highest level in university libraries, with only one country (3.1%) at the lowest level. Finland and Monaco have not presented any statistical data, but it is inconceivable that they would not also offer access at the highest level.

### Latin America and the Caribbean

Internet access in university libraries in Latin America and the Caribbean is fairly good: about 62% of the countries offer access at the highest level and a further 20% at 61-80%. (The two respondents from Panama have provided slightly different estimates.)

### North America

The USA and Bermuda offer Internet access in their

university libraries at the highest level, and Greenland at the mid-level.

### Oceania

Six countries in Oceania offer Internet access in university libraries at the highest level, with one country at the mid-level and one country not having provided any statistical 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. It is, however, disconcerting that approximately 11% of the countries that have participated in the 2007 report offer Internet access at the lowest level in their university libraries, with a further 7.4% at a level of 21-40% – altogether 20 out of 109 countries. This does not bode well for scholarship in these countries. Eleven of the 20 countries are in Africa (a disproportionately high percentage), which again has a very negative impact on the competitiveness of Africa.

#### 2.2.1.4 Government-funded research libraries

No direct comparisons can be made between data for government-funded research libraries in 2007 and the broader category of research libraries in the 2003 and 2005 reports, which included government-funded research libraries. The levels of Internet access in government-funded research libraries in the different regions are summarised in Table 10.

	Africa		Asia		Europe		Latin America & Caribbean		North America		Oceania		Total	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
81-100%	5	19.2	9	47.4	22	68.8	6	35.3	2	66.7	3	50.0	47	45.6
61-80%	2	7.7	2	10.5	4	12.5	3	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11	10.7
41-60%	5	19.2	2	10.5	3	9.4	1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11	10.7
21-40%	4	15.4	1	5.3	2	6.3	3	17.6	0.0	0.0	1	16.7	11	10.7
≤ 20%	10	38.5	5	26.3	1	3.1	4	23.5	1	33.3	2	33.3	23	22.3
Total	26		19		32		17		3		6		103	
No data	Mali, Nigeria		Bhutan, Japan		Moldova, Monaco		Bahamas, Chile, Netherlands Antilles, Suriname, Uruguay				Vanuatu, New Caledonia			

**Table 10: Number and percentage of government-funded research libraries offering Internet access according to regions (2007)**

The definition of “government-funded research library” seems to have been unclear to quite a number of respondents, as 14 countries have either provided no data on the number of such libraries and/or their levels of Internet access. The definition will have to be refined in future questionnaires.

### **Africa**

Internet access in government-funded research libraries is lower than that in university libraries, with only about 20% providing Internet access at the highest level and nearly 40% at the lowest level. Two countries have not furnished data on levels of Internet access in government-funded research libraries.

### **Asia**

Government-funded research libraries are again considerably worse off than university libraries in terms of Internet access, with less than 50% providing access at the highest level and about 25% providing access at the lowest level. Two countries have not supplied data on levels of Internet access in government-funded research libraries.

### **Europe**

Government funded research libraries are in a slightly worse position than university libraries in terms of Internet access, with about two-thirds providing access at the highest level. One country provides access only at the lowest level. Two countries have not supplied data on the levels of Internet access in their government-funded research libraries.

### **Latin America and the Caribbean**

Only a third of the countries provide Internet access at the highest level in government-funded research libraries, with the rest fairly evenly distributed. Five countries have omitted data on their levels of access.

### **North America**

Government-funded research libraries in North America are in identical position to university libraries.

### **Oceania**

Only 50% of the countries provide Internet access at the highest level in government funded research libraries, with the other 50% at the two lowest levels. Two countries have not supplied data on levels of access in government-funded research libraries.

### **Summary for government funded research libraries**

It is remarkable that quite a number of countries

provide fairly low Internet access in government-funded research libraries – less than 50% at the highest level and nearly a quarter at the lowest level, which is on average considerably lower than access in universities. Access is nevertheless still considerably higher than in school libraries.

### **2.2.1.5 Conclusion: Internet access in libraries**

Of the 116 countries participating in the 2007 report, only 18 could report a 81-100% level of Internet access in all four categories; this breaks down as follows in terms of the regions:

- *Africa*: 1 (Mauritius)
- *Asia*: 3 (Hong Kong, Republic of Korea, Vietnam)
- *Europe*: 9 (Andorra, Austria, Belgium [Flanders], Czech Republic, Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Norway and the UK)
- *North America*: 2 (Bermuda and the USA)
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: 1 (Trinidad and Tobago)
- *Oceania*: 2 (Australia, Guam)

Only 10 countries have reported less than 20% Internet access in all four categories:

- *Africa*: 6 (Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Congo Brazzaville, Guinea)
- *Asia*: 2 (Kazakhstan, Nepal)
- *Europe*: 1 (Russia)
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: 1 (Honduras)

No countries in North America or Oceania have reported less than 20% Internet access in all four categories.

From the overall statistics it is evident that (Western) Europe and North America have the best Internet access in all categories, whereas Africa has the worst.

Access to the Internet in public libraries has increased slightly in countries that participated in the World Report previously, but for most first-time countries access is rather limited, as indicated above.

The category “research libraries” in the 2005 report was subdivided into three categories, viz. school libraries, university libraries and government-funded research libraries. There is a remarkable difference in the levels of Internet access in these libraries. This indicates that the split into three separate categories was justified, as it provides a clearer indication of the situation regarding Internet access throughout the various types of libraries. It does, however,

unfortunately make any comparison with previous reports impossible.

Internet access in school libraries is on average lower than in public libraries. 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.

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 considerably worse position than university libraries. Students at university will hopefully become aware of the value of access to information via the Internet (i.e. resources on both the open Web and the invisible or deep Web) and will, once they move into industry and research, initiate a culture change in their organisations.

What is very disconcerting in the data of 2007 are the fairly low or very low levels of Internet access in developing countries across the world, with Africa being by far in the worst position. 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.

### 2.2.2 Questions 3b and 3c: Local content and content in local languages

The digital divide not only manifests itself in (lack of) access to the Internet and information and communication technologies (ICTs). The 2007 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. The data is summarised per region in Table 11.

Region	Local content	Content in local languages
<b>Africa</b>		
Very much	0	1
Average	7	3
Very little	17	9
Nothing or practically nothing	4	15
<b>Asia</b>		
Very much	4	4
Average	9	7
Very little	7	7
Nothing or practically nothing	0	2
No data (1 country reported "very much to average" local content)		1
<b>Europe</b>		
Very much	15	18
Average	13	10
Very little	6	5
Nothing or practically nothing	0	0
No data (1 country reported "average to very little" content in local languages, depending on the language)		1
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b>		
Very much	0	4
Average	12	5
Very little	9	6
Nothing or practically nothing	1	5
No data (1 country had "average to very little" content in local languages)		1
<b>North America</b>		
Very much	2	2
Average	0	0
Very little	1	1
Nothing or practically nothing	0	0
<b>Oceania</b>		
Very much	2	2
Average	2	0
Very little	2	1
Nothing or practically nothing	2	5

**Table 11: Local content and content in local languages**

Looking at the different country profiles and the regional breakdown, it is evident that the respondents have made very different estimates and that the data should be interpreted very carefully. A number of conclusions could be defended, as set out below.

The terms “very much”, “average”, “very little” and “nothing or practically nothing” have been interpreted differently by different respondents. For example, the UK respondent has indicated that very much local content is available on the Internet, but that only an average amount of this is available in local languages (although most of the local content is available in English, obviously a local language). The respondent is probably referring to the fact that very little local content is available in Welsh and Scottish (listed as official local languages).

The South African respondents have indicated that there is very little local content available on the Internet and that very little of this is available in local languages. Most of the local content on the Internet is, however, available in English, which is regarded as a local language, and “very little” in this case would refer to the other 10 official languages of the country. The reported amount of local South African content on the Internet is debatable, and from experience the researchers would probably rather have classified this as average (similar to Lesotho and Swaziland).

Usually, if English is the only official language, or one of the official languages of a country, the respondents would indicate that “very much” of the local content is available in local languages. This has been the case in, for example, Australia, Hong Kong and the USA. A number of countries that do not have English as an official language have stated that there is very much

local content available in local languages on the Internet (Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, the Republic of Korea, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland) – again countries predominantly in Europe.

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. This was not tested statistically, and it is not at this stage clear whether the correlations are statistically significant. 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 again being in the best positions.

The correlation between Internet access (general and in different types of libraries), local content and content in local languages is something that could be explored in much more detail, either in future IFLA/FAIFE reports or in independent research. More reliable data than the best estimates of respondents would, however, be required, as well as better definitions of the various categories. Nevertheless, even the fairly superficial quantification and analysis of this report have provided interesting results.

**2.3 Question 4: Filtering and blocking of information**

The rationale for this question was the same as in 2005 (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 355-356).

**2.3.1 Questions 4a and 4b: Library associations’ position on filtering**

Tables 12 and 13 provide comparative statistics for

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes						Yes, to a certain degree						No					
	2007		2005		2003		2007		2005		2003		2007		2005		2003	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	12	11	13	17	5	6	61	56	33	44	34	42	36	33	29	39	43	52
No data from 7 countries in 2007; N = 109 in 2007; N = 75 in 2005; N = 82 in 2003.																		

**Table 12: Library associations’ position on filtering library Internet terminals**

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes						Yes, to a certain degree						No					
	2007		2005		2003		2007		2005		2003		2007		2005		2003	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	7	6	9	11	8	10	43	39	27	34	23	27	60	55	43	55	52	63
No data from 6 countries in 2007; N = 110 in 2007; N = 79 in 2005; N = 83 in 2003.																		

**Table 13: Extent to which filtering software is widespread in respondents’ country’s libraries**

2007, 2005 and 2003 (for 2005 and 2003 statistics see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 356-357) on the position of library associations on filtering and the extent to which filtering is widespread in libraries. Regional breakdowns are discussed next.

### Africa

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	2	7.7	15	57.7	9	34.6
N = 26; no data from two countries.						

**Table 14: The position of library associations in Africa on filtering software in libraries**

Only two countries have indicated “yes” (Congo Brazzaville and Lesotho), while 15 countries have indicated “yes, to a certain degree” (Algeria, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, Nigeria, the Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe) and nine have indicated “no” (Benin, the DRC, Egypt, Ethiopia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda). Two countries have not supplied data (Botswana and Cape Verde).

Since the 2005 report, five countries have changed their viewpoints from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree” (the Gambia, South Africa [2003], Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe). The DRC has changed its position from “yes” to “no”, while Tanzania has changed from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no”. Ethiopia and Seychelles indicated “N/A” in 2005, but have now taken the position “no” and “yes, to a certain degree” respectively.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	0	0	7	26.9	19	73.1
N = 26; no data from two countries.						

**Table 15: The use of filtering software in libraries in Africa**

The use of filtering software is not widespread anywhere in Africa. In seven countries it is used to a certain degree (Algeria, Cape Verde, Egypt, Ghana, Lesotho, South Africa and Swaziland), while in the remaining 19 countries the answer has been “no”. Two countries have not provided data (Botswana and the

Seychelles). In Egypt and Swaziland there has been an increase in the use of filtering software (both from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree”). Ethiopia and Zimbabwe have gone from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no”, and Cape Verde from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree”. South Africa did not supply data in 2003, but has now indicated “yes, to a certain degree”.

It therefore seems that, contrary to the 2005 report, the use of filtering software in African libraries has declined, especially if first responses are taken into account, even though two-thirds of the library associations from Africa are in favour of the use of filtering software. As indicated previously, there is a definite correlation between low Internet access in especially public libraries and the indication that the use of filtering software is not widespread.

### Asia

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	2	10	11	55	7	35
N = 20; no data from one country.						

**Table 16: The position of library associations in Asia on filtering software in libraries**

The library associations in 13 countries are in favour of using filtering software, with Kuwait and Vietnam indicating “yes”, and Cambodia, Hong Kong, Jordan, Korea, Lebanon, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Turkey indicating “yes, to a certain degree”. Bhutan, Cyprus, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Palestine and Thailand have indicated that they are not in favour of using such software. Two countries have gone from “yes” to “no”, and one from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no”, while Pakistan and Singapore have changed from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree”. Two countries have strengthened their position on the use of filtering software – Kuwait from “no” in 2003 to “yes”, and Nepal from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree”.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	3	14.3	8	38.1	10	47.6
N = 21; all countries have provided data.						

**Table 17: The use of filtering software in libraries in Asia**

The use of filtering software is widespread in Kuwait, Lebanon and Vietnam, while it is widespread to a certain degree in Cambodia, Hong Kong, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Maldives, Oman, Singapore and Turkey. Bhutan, Cyprus, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Pakistan, Palestine, Sri Lanka and Thailand have indicated that the use of such software is not widespread.

Only four countries have changed their positions on how widespread the use of filtering software is – more in two cases (Lebanon, from “no” in 2003 to “yes”, and Kuwait from “yes, to a certain degree” to “yes”) and less in the other two cases (Singapore from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree” and Israel from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no”).

### Europe

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	2	5.9	23	67.6	9	26.5
N = 34; all countries have provided data.						

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

Altogether 25 library associations in Europe are in favour of using filtering software (“yes” in Russia and San Marino and “yes, to a certain degree” in Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium (Flanders), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, the Slovak Republic, Switzerland and the UK), while nine are not in favour of using such software (Finland, Latvia, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden and Ukraine).

Five countries that were previously not in favour are now “to a certain degree” in favour of using filtering software (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Lithuania and the Slovak Republic). In Ireland and the UK the position was previously still unclear or under discussion, but both have now indicated that they are “to a certain degree” in favour of the use of filtering software. Moldova has changed its approach slightly, replying “yes, to a certain degree” in 2007, compared with “yes” previously. In the case of Finland the situation was still under discussion in 2005, and the library association has decided that it is opposed to the use of filtering software. In most cases where library

associations are currently more in favour of using filtering software, the reason offered for this includes the protection of children and/or the safeguarding of public morality.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	1	3.0	16	48.5	16	48.5
N = 33; no data from one country.						

**Table 19: The use of filtering software in libraries in Europe**

The use of filtering software is widespread in only one country in Europe, viz. Malta. The other participating countries are evenly divided between “yes, to a certain degree” (Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, Poland, San Marino, the Slovak Republic, Switzerland and the UK), and “no” (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Monaco, Norway, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden and Ukraine). Montenegro has not provided any data.

The use of filtering software has increased in four countries from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree” (Lithuania, Moldova, Poland and the Slovak Republic), and from “no” to “yes” in Malta. In two cases its use has declined from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree” (the UK) and from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no” (Denmark).

### Latin America and the Caribbean

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	3	156.7	8	44.4	7	38.9
N = 18; no data from four countries.						

**Table 20: The position of library associations in Latin America and the Caribbean on the use of filtering software in libraries**

The library associations in 11 countries are in favour of using filtering software (“yes” in Aruba, Mexico, and Trinidad and Tobago) and “yes, to a certain degree” in Belize, Bolivia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guyana, Netherlands Antilles [St Maarten], Panama and Paraguay). In seven countries the library associations

are against the use of filtering software (Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Haiti, Honduras, Peru and Uruguay).

In three cases library associations have softened their view on the use of filtering software – from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree” in Belize, “yes, to a certain degree” to “no” in Peru, and “yes” to “no” in Chile. Bolivia (2003) and Netherlands Antilles (St Maarten) have changed from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree”, and in Mexico and in Trinidad and Tobago the position has changed from “yes, to a certain degree” to “yes”. Panama provided no data previously, but has now indicated “yes, to a certain degree”. The Bahamas, Cuba, Jamaica and Suriname have not provided data.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	1	5.3	4	21.1	14	73.7
N = 19; no data from three countries.						

**Table 21: The use of filtering software in libraries in Latin America and the Caribbean**

The use of filtering software is widespread only in Trinidad and Tobago, with a further four countries indicating that it is widespread “to a certain degree” (Aruba, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Paraguay). Fourteen countries have indicated that it is not widespread (Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles [St Maarten], Panama, Suriname and Uruguay).

The use of filtering software has increased in Costa Rica (from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree”), and decreased in Aruba (from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree”) and in Chile (from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no”). Panama has indicated that the use of such software is not widespread (having not provided any data in 2005), and the Bahamas, Jamaica and Peru have not provided any data for 2007.

#### North America

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7
N = 3; all countries have provided data.						

**Table 22: The position of library associations in North America on filtering software in libraries**

In Greenland, the library association is in favour of the use of filtering software, whereas in Bermuda and the USA the library associations are not in favour of its use. Of the three, the USA is the only country that participated in the 2005 report.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3
N = 3; all countries have provided data.						

**Table 23: The use of filtering software in libraries in North America**

The use of filtering software is widespread in Greenland and the USA, but not in Bermuda. Its use has increased in the USA (from “to a certain degree” to “yes”), even though the library association has indicated that it is not in favour of using such software.

#### Oceania

Is the association in favour of filtering on Internet terminals?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	2	25	4	50	2	25
N = 8; all countries have provided data.						

**Table 24: The position of library associations in Oceania on filtering software in libraries**

The library associations in six countries in Oceania are in favour of using filtering software, two having indicated “yes” (Australia and Vanuatu) and four indicating “yes, to a certain degree” (New Caledonia, New Zealand, Palau and Solomon Islands). Fiji and Guam are not in favour of such use: Fiji has changed its position from “yes, to a certain degree” to “no”, and New Caledonia from “yes” to “yes, to a certain degree”. Guam has indicated “no” (“N/A” in 2005). Australia has changed from “no” to “yes”.

Is the use of filtering software widespread in libraries?	Yes		Yes, to a certain degree		No	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Number of countries	0	0	8	100	0	0
N = 8; all countries have provided data.						

**Table 25: The use of filtering software in libraries in Oceania**

All eight countries in Oceania indicated that filtering software is used “to a certain degree” in their libraries. Fiji and New Caledonia have changed their positions from “no” to “yes, to a certain degree” and Guam has indicated “yes, to a certain degree”, having indicated “N/A” in 2005.

### Conclusion on filtering software

It is not clear to what extent respondents have differentiated between “yes” and “yes, to a certain degree” – some respondents have listed only one reason for a “yes”, while others have listed all possible options for “yes, to a certain degree”. It is also not clear whether “yes, to a certain degree” is to be taken as “yes, in the case of some types of libraries” or “yes, for a specific list of reasons”. These questions will have to be rephrased in future questionnaires. Whichever way the questions are to be interpreted, however, the results remain interesting:

- In both questions the percentages for “yes, to a certain degree” have increased – from 42% (2003) to 44% (2005) to 56% (2007) for the library associations’ position on filtering; and from 27% (2003) to 34% (2005) to 39% (2007) for the extent to which the use of filtering software is widespread in the different countries.
- In both cases the “no” answers have declined – from 52% (2003) to 39% (2005) to 33% (2007) and from 63% (2003) to 55% (2005 and 2007) respectively.

In both cases there has been a decline in “yes” answers from 2005 to 2007, but if the “yes” and “yes, to a certain degree” percentages are to be combined, there is consistent growth in the three reports in these answers, compared with the “no” answers. This implies that there has been a definite shift in the opinion of library associations towards favouring Internet filtering in libraries, and also that the use of filtering software is much more widespread in 2007 than previously.

This is further borne out if it is taken into account that, in many cases where respondents have indicated that the use of filtering software is not widespread, the Internet penetration in especially public libraries has been indicated as less than 20%. The fact that the use of filtering software is not widespread therefore does not mean that there are many libraries where no filtering software is used; it simply means that there are many libraries with no Internet access. This is again most evident in the case of Africa. In some countries, however, where Internet access in public libraries is high (or fairly high), the library association is not in

favour of filtering software and the use of such software is not widespread (e.g. Bermuda, Chile, Finland, Latvia, Slovenia and Sweden).

### 2.3.2 Questions 4c and 4d: Motivations for using filtering software

Altogether 69 countries gave reasons why the library association supports the use of filtering software (or why filtering software is being used in the country, even though its use is not supported by the library association, as, for example, in the case of Fiji and the USA). The comparative list for 2005 and 2003 is given in Table 26.

Motivation	Countries responding		
	2007 N = 69	2005 N = 47	2003 N = 41
Protection of children	68	47	34
Protection of national security (e.g. terrorism)	19	8	4
Safeguarding of religious values	19	8	3
Safeguarding of the national culture/ethos	7	11	5
Crime (e.g. gambling)	23	9	9
Safeguarding of public morality	36	19	19
Other	5	4	3
Total indications	179	106	77

**Table 26: Motivations for the use of filtering software**

Other reasons indicated for using filtering software are more technical, and include issues such as the conservation of bandwidth and network safety (protection against viruses, hackers and spam).

Except in one case, all countries have indicated the protection of children as a motivation for the use of filtering software (in that specific case the safeguarding of public morality has been indicated and the protection of children could possibly be assumed under this). Safeguarding public morality (which, in some cases, includes the specific mentioning of pornographic sites) has also been listed frequently.

Two specific issues that have been mentioned deserve comment: (i) lack of skills to implement filtering software; and (ii) “upstream filtering” of the Internet, where content is filtered by the government and/or authorities, over which libraries have no control.

A few countries have indicated that they are in favour of using filtering software (specifically for the



protection of children), but that there are no such systems in place and/or they do not have the technical expertise to implement such a system. This serves to show the importance of having sufficient information technology (IT) skills available to optimise the use of computers and the Internet for all users of libraries. Librarians, especially those in public libraries, should have these skills to ensure that they do not have to depend on IT professionals for fairly simple tasks.

“Upstream filtering” of the Internet has been reported by a few countries. Cases similar to that of Turkmenistan (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 361), have been reported by Bhutan, Fiji and Pakistan:

- From Bhutan it has been reported that an independent website ([www.bhutantimes.com](http://www.bhutantimes.com)) was blocked from local viewing for some time.
- The respondent from Fiji has indicated that the current “military regime has tried to block access to certain sites/blogs in the interests of national security”.
- The 2007 annual report of Reporters Without Borders ([http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id\\_article=20794](http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=20794)) mentions that Pakistan had its first cases of Internet censorship in February 2006, and that more websites have since been added to the Internet blacklist: “General Musharraf has been on the Reporters Without Borders’ list of press freedom predators since 2004” ([http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id\\_article=24310](http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=24310)).
- Even though the Cuban respondent did not report any upstream filtering of the Internet, this is widely reported by third-party sources (see the country report for Cuba).

Similar cases of governments censoring Internet access during the past two years were reported by countries that have not participated in the current report (e.g. China and Myanmar/Burma). Regarding China, the 2007 Amnesty International report (<http://thereport.amnesty.org/eng/Regions/Asia-Pacific/China>) states that “hundreds of international websites remained blocked and thousands of Chinese websites were shut down. The government strengthened systems for blocking, filtering and monitoring the flow of information”. The 2007 annual report of Reporters Without Borders ([http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id\\_article=20779](http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=20779)) states that “China unquestionably continues to be the world’s most advanced country in Internet filtering”.

Mass protest in Myanmar/Burma started in September 2007, led by Buddhist monks “protesting against the

government, calling for a reduction in commodity prices, release of political prisoners and national reconciliation” (<http://thereport.amnesty.org/eng/Regions/Asia-Pacific/Myanmar>). On 25 September the government began with a crackdown on protesters, which included a curfew and a public warning of legal action against protesters. Many people were arrested, including monks, Members of Parliament and other public figures; a number of people were killed. The 2007 Amnesty International report (<http://thereport.amnesty.org/eng/Regions/Asia-Pacific/Myanmar>) cites the blocking of websites, periodic blocks on free Internet email services and the cutting of Internet lines, especially with regard to the mass protests and subsequent crackdown on protestors by authorities.

The 2007 annual report of Reporters Without Borders ([http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id\\_article=20773](http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=20773)) notes the repressive Internet policies of the Burmese government: “[Its] Internet policies are even more repressive than those of its Chinese and Vietnamese neighbours. The military junta clearly filters opposition websites. It keeps a very close eye on Internet cafés, in which the computers automatically execute screen captures every five minutes to monitor user activity.”

In 2006 already, Reporters Without Borders ([http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id\\_article=18202](http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=18202)) stated that “the Burmese Internet increasingly resembles an Intranet”. A more detailed analysis of the situation in Myanmar/Burma can be found at <http://opennet.net/research/bulletins/013>.

The discussion and analysis in the 2005 report (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 361) are therefore as valid in 2007 as they were then. Internet filtering in many countries takes place “upstream” at a point beyond the influence of library authorities.

Question 4d asked respondents to comment on a “no” answer in questions 4a or 4b; there were unfortunately no comments.

#### **2.4 Question 5: Financial barriers**

This question addressed the issue of Internet costs, the rationale being the same as in 2005, namely to determine whether the situation has changed in the past 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.

### 2.4.1 Question 5a: 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 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 question 3.

Free Internet access in libraries	2007 N = 116		2005 N = 84		2003 N = 72	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Free in all libraries	41	35.34	35	42	23	32
Public libraries	10	8.62	5	6	8	11
School libraries	35	30.17	N/A		N/A	
University libraries	32	27.59	N/A		N/A	
Government-funded research libraries	12	10.34	N/A		N/A	
All research libraries	N/A		19	22	10	14
No	28	24.14	25	30	31	43
N = 116 for 2007; all countries have reported data. However, note that the total for 2007 does not add up to 116, as countries have reported separately for the different types of libraries. The percentages for 2007 are calculated out of 116.						

**Table 27: Free Internet access in libraries**

No true comparison can be made between the different reports because of the increase in categories. It is evident, however, that the percentage of countries that offer free Internet access in all libraries has remained fairly stable compared with 2003, but has declined rather sharply from 2005. The percentage of public libraries offering Internet access free of charge has shown a small decrease compared with 2003, with a small increase from 2005 to 2007. There has been a fairly dramatic decline in countries that offer no free access to the Internet, from 40% in 2003 to 30% in 2005 to 25% in 2007. Only in the case of libraries offering no free Internet access can the comparisons between numbers and percentages be taken as correct, as there seems to be a difference in how country responses were counted.

Table 28 gives a much better indication of the actual percentages of the different types of libraries that offer free access. If a country offers access to the Internet free of charge in all libraries, it per definition

implies that the country offers free Internet access in all public libraries, all school libraries, and so on. Thus, in Table 28, 41 has been added to the number of public libraries in Table 27 to indicate the total number of countries offering free Internet access in public libraries; the same applies to the other categories.

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	41	35.34%
Public libraries	51	43.97%
School libraries	76	65.52%
University libraries	73	62.93%
Government-funded research libraries	53	45.69%
No	28	24.14%
N = 116		

**Table 28: Free Internet access in libraries – consolidated**

In all cases this number must be lower than 88, because there are 28 countries that offer no free access ( $116 - 28 = 88$ ). This is a much more accurate reflection than in Table 27.

It is clear that just more than one third of all countries in the 2007 report offer Internet access free of charge in all their libraries, whereas close to two-thirds offer free Internet access in their school and university libraries, and close to 45% do so in public libraries and government-funded research libraries. Only about a quarter of the countries offer no free Internet access at all. (Unfortunately, the same type of calculations cannot be made for the 2005 and 2003 data, as the numbers appear to have been calculated differently.) In the regional breakdown below, the numbers and percentages have been calculated as in Table 28.

#### Africa

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	3	10.71
Public libraries	4	14.29
School libraries	11	39.29
University libraries	12	42.86
Government-funded research libraries	3	10.71
No	13	46.43
N = 28		

**Table 29: Free Internet access in libraries in Africa**

Countries in Africa show mixed results between 2005 and 2007. Some countries now provide free access to the Internet to a lesser extent. Botswana, the DRC and Seychelles indicated free access in research libraries in 2005, but have now indicated that there is no free access. Tanzania has indicated a decline from free access in all libraries to public and university libraries only. Some countries have, however, also reported an increase in free access: both Ethiopia and Uganda have gone from no free access to free access in university libraries, while Zambia has gone from no free access to free access in school libraries, and Zimbabwe from free access in research libraries to free access in all libraries. According to the 2005 report, Cape Verde offered free access in public libraries, but this has now changed to free access in university and school libraries only.

It is to be noted that close to half the African countries that participated in the 2007 report offer no free Internet access, which is nearly double the figure for the rest of the world, and free Internet access is considerably lower in all other categories than for all other regions.

## Asia

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	10	47.62
Public libraries	13	61.90
School libraries	15	71.43
University libraries	14	66.67
Government-funded research libraries	12	57.14
No	4	19.05
N = 21		

**Table 30: Free Internet access in libraries in Asia**

In two cases only do countries offer free Internet access to a lesser extent in 2007 than in 2005 – in Kuwait the response has changed from “yes” in 2003 to “no”, and in Japan it has changed from free Internet access in all libraries in 2005 to public libraries only in 2007.

Two countries have changed from research libraries only to all libraries (Cyprus and Pakistan), while Kazakhstan has indicated public, school and university libraries. Nepal has indicated government-funded research libraries, compared with no libraries previously having free Internet access.

## Europe

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	18	56.25
Public libraries	20	62.50
School libraries	31	96.88
University libraries	29	87.88
Government-funded research libraries	22	68.75
No	1	3.13
N = 33 for university libraries and 32 for the rest. (Austria has only listed university libraries and indicated that the others are unknown. Switzerland has indicated that many libraries offer free access, but not all, and is therefore not included in the count.)		

**Table 31: Free Internet access in libraries in Europe**

Only one country in Europe has indicated that Internet access in libraries is not free of charge (Hungary), but the respondent has added that it is only a “symbolic fee”.

In quite a number of countries free Internet access has increased in various categories of libraries: Bosnia and Herzegovina and Latvia from none to all libraries, Bulgaria from none to school libraries, the Slovak Republic from none to school and university libraries, and the Czech Republic and Lithuania from research libraries to all libraries.

In Poland, the position has changed from free access in public libraries to free access in school and university libraries. In the UK it has changed from no free access to free access in school, university and government-funded research libraries, as well as the majority of public libraries (public libraries have therefore not been included in the count above).

Compared with the other regions, citizens in the participating countries in Europe are therefore far better off in terms of Internet access being offered free of charge.

## Latin America and the Caribbean

In a number of cases, free Internet access appears to have decreased slightly in Latin America and the Caribbean. Costa Rica and Mexico currently list only public libraries, school libraries and university libraries, compared with all libraries previously. Bolivia and Peru both currently list university libraries only, compared with public libraries previously. In the Bahamas, the position has improved from no free access previously to free access currently in school libraries.

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	7	31.82%
Public libraries	10	45.45%
School libraries	13	59.09%
University libraries	11	33.33%
Government-funded research libraries	8	36.36%
No	7	31.82%
N = 22		

**Table 32: Free Internet access in libraries in Latin America and the Caribbean**

**North America**

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	2	66.7
Public libraries	3	100
School libraries	3	100
University libraries	0	0
Government-funded research libraries	0	0
No	0	0
N = 3		

**Table 33: Free Internet access in libraries in North America**

Greenland and the USA offer Internet access free of charge in all libraries, and Bermuda in public and school libraries. At the Bermuda College Library, although access is free for members, there is a membership fee of BM\$30.

**Oceania**

Free Internet access in libraries (consolidated)	2007	
	#	%
Free in all libraries	1	12.50
Public libraries	1	12.50
School libraries	3	37.50
University libraries	5	15.15
Government-funded research libraries	3	37.50
No	3	37.50
N = 8		

**Table 34: Free Internet access in libraries in Oceania**

Australia indicated free Internet access in research libraries in 2005, which included school libraries. In the

2007 report, however, the respondent has listed only university and government-funded research libraries, and has not mentioned school libraries. New Caledonia has indicated that Internet access is free in all libraries, but that only some public libraries charge a fee (public libraries have therefore not been included).

**Conclusions on free Internet access in libraries**

From the regional breakdown above it is evident that free Internet access is not equal across the different regions and also not equal in the different types of libraries. Africa is the worst off in all categories in this regard, with citizens of Europe and North America being in very good positions, especially in terms of access in their school and university libraries.

Free access to the Internet (or the lack thereof) 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. Paying for Internet access is expensive, especially in developing countries. 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 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 information seeking and use.

**2.4.2 Question 5b: Extra funding for Internet access in libraries**

The second part of question 5 intended to establish whether the state or other library authorities have made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries.

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007 N = 114		2005 N = 80		2003 N = 87	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	76	66.67	39	49	48	55
No	38	33.33	41	51	39	45
N = 114; two countries did not report data in 2007 (Mozambique and Vietnam).						

**Table 35: Extra funding for libraries**

Two-thirds of the respondents in 2007 have indicated that additional funding has been made available for

Internet access in libraries, compared with only about 50% in 2005 and 55% in 2003 (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 363). In a number of cases where no extra funding has been made available, such funding is probably not needed, as Internet access is already free of charge in all libraries, for example in Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway and Sweden.

### Africa

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	19	70.37
No	8	29.63
N = 27; Mozambique has not provided data.		

**Table 36: Extra funding for Internet access – Africa**

In many African countries additional funding has been made available, either by the state or NGOs, or by international donor organisations. For example, in Burkina Faso the national library and some research libraries have obtained extra funding for Internet access. For example, 40 computers have been procured for an Internet café in the national library of Lesotho; school libraries in Mauritius and university libraries in Uganda have obtained extra funding; there has been additional government funding for the national university in Kenya; and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has provided funding in Botswana. Even though no specific additional funding has been made available in South Africa, the government has made a substantial amount available for the development of public libraries, some of which may be used for Internet access.

### Asia

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	11	55.0
No	9	45.0
N = 20; Vietnam has not provided data.		

**Table 37: Extra funding for Internet access –Asia**

A number of initiatives have been reported in Asian countries. In Israel, for example, extra funding is part of government policy, and in Sri Lanka the Information and Communication Agency has provided free access to new e-centres for a limited period. In Palestine,

universities and municipalities usually pay for Internet services from the fees collected from the users; in addition, projects are sometimes funded by NGOs such as the British Council, AMEDEAST, AED and the World Bank. Singapore will provide free wireless access in public libraries for the next three years.

### Europe

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	23	67.65
No	11	32.35
N = 34		

**Table 38: Extra funding for Internet access – Europe**

Even though the level of Internet access in libraries in Europe is very good, there are a number of initiatives to provide additional funding, for example funding by the state (Hungary) and local authorities (Ukraine). In Croatia there is an initiative to ask the Minister of Culture to secure agreements with telecommunication companies for free Internet access. Government departments in Ireland have provided grants for Internet access for personal computers, as well as a grant for broadband/wi-fi in public libraries. A wi-fi hotspot has also been financed by the government in Malta. In Poland, the government has made funding available for Internet access for small towns and disabled people. In Serbia, the Ministry of Education is attempting to connect all schools to the Internet. Public money is also spent on various projects in the UK for Internet access (see the country report for details).

### Latin America and the Caribbean

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	17	77.27%
No	5	22.73%
N = 22		

**Table 39: Extra funding for Internet access – Latin America and the Caribbean**

Extra funding for Internet access is being made available in Latin America and the Caribbean to provide improved Internet access, for example in Costa Rica and Cuba, where there are a number of initiatives

(see the country reports for details). Government funding has been made available in the Bahamas and Jamaica; this is also the case in Haiti, although the respondent has mentioned that it is insufficient. In Panama, the University of Panama has received extra funding to improve Internet access and purchase more computers. In Guyana, corporate funding may be available.

### North America

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	1	33.3
No	2	66.7
N = 3		

**Table 40: Extra funding for Internet access – North America**

The respondent from the USA has indicated that funding for Internet access comes from the state and local governments instead of the federal government.

### Oceania

Has the state or other library authorities made extra funding available for Internet access in libraries?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	6	75.0
No	2	25.0
N = 8		

**Table 41: Extra funding for Internet access – Oceania**

Additional funding for Internet access has been made available by the government in Australia. The respondent from New Zealand also lists a number of initiatives (see the country report for details).

### Conclusions on extra funding for Internet access

The fact that two-thirds of the respondents have indicated that additional funding (albeit limited in some cases) has been made available for Internet access in libraries is a positive sign. Financial support from the government and/or other organisations plays an integral part in providing (increased) Internet access to the general public. Acquiring the necessary infrastructure and providing access to the Internet is a costly exercise – additional funding will ease some of the financial burdens of libraries, which often

experience financial pressures. Additional funding and subsequent increased access to the Internet will also play an important role in incorporating developing countries into the information society. Increased access to the Internet may also lead to an increase of local information available online, as well as the availability of information in local languages.

### 2.5 Question 6: User privacy and anti-terror legislation

This question consists of three parts. The first two are dealt with together below, while the third is discussed separately.

#### 2.5.1 Questions 6a and 6b: Anti-terror legislation

The first two parts of the question dealt with anti-terror legislation that may have been passed, and its effect on libraries.

Very few of the participating countries in Africa have indicated the existence of such laws. Of the 28 African respondents, only six (Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mauritius, Seychelles, Tanzania and Uganda) have indicated that there currently is such legislation. These countries are divided on the impact thereof. Tanzania has indicated that the legislation currently has no effect on libraries, but that it might in future; Uganda has echoed this by referring to the potential application of such laws. The respondent from the Seychelles feels that the legislation has a negative impact on libraries. The remaining African countries are generally of the opinion that anti-terror legislation would not have an impact on libraries; a few, however, have expressed the fear that it might. A number of countries have not expressed an opinion on this issue.

Only three of the 21 contributing countries in Asia (Japan, Jordan and Oman) have reported the existence of anti-terror laws that could impact on libraries. The respondent from Japan has referred to the Emergency Security Act, which could constitute a possible threat to libraries. In Jordan, the legislation has no effect on libraries, according to the respondent. The respondent from Oman has indicated that some patrons are declining to visit libraries because of such legislation.

In most of the remaining countries the respondents are of the opinion that such legislation would not affect libraries, with Kuwait and Lebanon being the exceptions.

Of the 34 countries in Europe that participated in the survey, only six have reported the existence of (new) anti-terror legislation that may affect libraries. According to the Albanian respondent, anti-terror

legislation is in the process of being passed by Parliament. Bulgaria has indicated that no new legislation has been passed, but that such legislation does exist.

In Denmark, anti-terror legislation was implemented in 2007. The intelligence service may, for example, demand information about library users without a court order if it is investigating terror suspects. This nevertheless has little effect on libraries, as libraries keep user records for only up to four weeks.

Germany passed anti-terror legislation in 2002 already; this was extended in 2005 and amended in 2007. According to the respondent it has had very little impact on library work. In Italy, anti-terror legislation was passed in 2005, which compels libraries to make photocopies of users' identity documents and access dates; this nevertheless has little effect on library users.

In the UK, the Terrorism Act of 2006 was passed. This Act makes it an offence to disseminate a publication encouraging terrorism, and thus could potentially put librarians at risk of breaking the law. The respondent is also of the opinion that extensive powers already exist.

No (new) anti-terror legislation exists in the remaining European countries, and most respondents have not expressed an opinion on whether such legislation, if it existed, would have an effect on library users.

In South America and the Caribbean, no country has reported the adoption of anti-terror legislation during the past two years. The respondent from Guyana, however, has mentioned that there have been efforts to draft such a Bill. Although the respondent from Haiti has indicated that no new anti-terror laws have been adopted, the citizens of the country are said to be traumatised by the dictatorship, which may affect their freedom of expression.

Many respondents have not offered any view on whether or not anti-terror legislation would have an effect on library users if it were to be adopted, but in the case of those that did there was again a fairly even split.

In North America, only the USA has reported the existence of anti-terror legislation, referring specifically to sections 215 and 505 of the USA PATRIOT Act that allow the Federal Bureau of Investigation to access users' records secretly. It is felt that this kind of legislation has a chilling effect on readers. The government's secrecy, however, makes it difficult to assess the real impact on users.

In Oceania, only one country (Fiji) reported the existence of anti-terror legislation: "The coup in Fiji in 2006 has seen increased censorship by the regime, with the government telecommunications provider being coerced to breach accepted standards by at times blocking access to selected blogs and perhaps even providing the regime details of Internet users' access. The Public Emergency Decree and regulations were brought into force in December 2006; these have only now been rescinded. They severely compromised freedom of expression and freedom of information and many other basic human rights. The Public Order Act is now the legal framework to continue such abuses [...] new legislation introduced the Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption (FICAC) and has the potential to compromise privacy. Fiji does not have a Freedom of Information Act and is now unlikely to get one, given the military regime's attempt to abuse basic human rights."

From the responses it is clear that very little new anti-terror legislation has been passed during the past two years; in a number of cases legislation has been revised and updated. Where such legislation does exist, the respondents feel it has serious consequences for library users. Unfortunately, many respondents did not complete all the sections of this question and very few elaborated on their statements.

### 2.5.2 Question 6c: Keeping user records

The third part of the question dealt with the issue of whether keeping user records in libraries would affect the freedom of expression of the individual Internet library user.

Countries in Africa are fairly evenly split on this matter. A number of them have remarked that keeping user records is good practice and should anyhow be done for management purposes – it all depended on how these records were used, whether they were accessible to non-library agencies, and so on.

Countries in Asia that responded to this part of the question are also fairly evenly divided on whether keeping user records would have any effect on the user. As in the case of Africa, a number of respondents have indicated that user records are needed for management purposes. The respondent from Singapore, however, has indicated that records are not archived in that country because of the potential impact this may have on the freedom of expression of the individual.

The respondents of the five countries in Europe that reported new legislation have all indicated that

keeping user records would affect the freedom of expression of the user. In total, 16 countries in Europe are of the opinion that keeping user records would have a negative impact on users, with 11 denying that it would have an impact and seven not providing any data.

Approximately two-thirds of the countries from South America and the Caribbean that have answered this part of the question are of the opinion that keeping user records would have a negative impact on users. In the North American region, only the USA has reported that keeping user records has a negative impact on users and that there have been incidents of violation of intellectual freedom.

In Oceania, the respondent from Fiji has indicated that keeping user records would affect the freedom of expression of the individual Internet user. The respondent from the Solomon Islands feels that although it would affect users’ freedom of expression, such records are useful for planning and development purposes. In three cases, the respondents have indicated that it would have no negative impact, while three countries have not expressed an opinion.

As in the case of the 2005 report (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 367), some respondents may have confused the phrase “user records” with user registration details. So, for example, a number of countries have indicated that user records are beneficial for planning and good management. It is therefore difficult to draw any definite conclusions from the responses. Some countries have not completed this part of the question. The percentages in Table 42 are, however, very similar to those of the 2005 report (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 367).

Do you think that keeping user records affects the freedom of expression of the individual Internet library user?	2007	
	#	%
Yes	50	52.63%
No	45	47.37%
N = 95; 21 countries have not provided data.		

**Table 42: Keeping user records**

Overall, countries that responded seem to be fairly evenly split in their opinion of whether the keeping of user records affects the freedom of expression of the individual library user. This might also be interpreted as being indicative of the contentious nature of the issue. The fact that 21 countries did not submit any

data may also add to this conclusion. The main cause for concern would be the reason for keeping such user records and, subsequently, who would have access to them. The potential invasion of individual privacy and the impact on freedom of access to information and freedom of expression are important issues, as evidenced by the concerns expressed by a number of countries, among others the USA.

The matter of possible misinterpretation of the concept “user records” (as mentioned above) should be dealt with in the next World Report. The question may need to be rephrased or additional clarification provided in the questionnaire to prevent potential misunderstanding.

**2.6 Question 7: Violations of intellectual freedom**

This section should be read in conjunction with the questions on Internet filtering (Question 4).

As 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” – the phrase “grave concern” would also be appropriate.

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. Respondents were then asked to provide details of any such incidents and to list any information sources that might further explain the situation in their countries. Additional third-party sources were consulted by the research team to supplement data from the respondents.

The reported violations of intellectual freedom are summarised per region below. It is difficult to classify the different violations. In the descriptions broad classifications are used, even though some of the incidents could fall into different categories. Readers are referred to the individual country reports and the sources/references listed there for further details.

**Africa**

Only five respondents from Africa reported negative issues: Guinea has mentioned that archives were destroyed; Kenya has reported one incident of the harassment of the media; Uganda has mentioned the banning of a potentially controversial play; Zimbabwe has mentioned that several pressure groups have been arrested; Zambia has mentioned that there have been incidents, but has given no detail.



In 25 of the 28 African countries, third-party sources have reported incidents of the violation of intellectual freedom. The most common of these have been the harassment of journalists, civil society activists and government critics and the violation of their rights. Such incidents have been reported in Algeria (where journalists have been imprisoned), Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Congo Brazzaville, Côte d'Ivoire (which, according to Reporters Without Borders, is "one of Africa's most dangerous countries for both local and foreign media"), the DRC (where journalists have been imprisoned, received death threats and some murdered), Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia (even though there is less harassment) and Zimbabwe.

Repressive laws have featured in a number of reports, such as those of Algeria, Botswana (where there are directives to refrain from negative reporting), Guinea, Kenya (where the law is self-regulatory and can be seen as an attempt to gag the media), Nigeria (where the President has failed to sign the Freedom of Information Bill into law), South Africa (where envisaged new laws could lead to censorship) and Zambia (where the government has rejected the Freedom of Information Bill). Criticism of the government is not tolerated well in Mali, Swaziland and Tanzania, according to third-party reports.

Media restrictions have occurred in Egypt (where a newspaper has been banned and websites shut down), Ethiopia (where opposition websites have been shut down), Nigeria (where the offices of an independent network have been destroyed), the Seychelles (where a newspaper has been heavily fined, which resulted in its suspension, and a radio station has been banned), Tanzania (where press freedom specifically in Zanzibar is an issue), Uganda (where Internet filtering has occurred) and Zambia (where a radio station's licence has been revoked).

On the positive side, the respondent of Burkina Faso has indicated that there is press freedom in the country (even though some concerns have been raised by third-party sources). Third-party sources have indicated that press freedom is a reality in Mali, even though there are also some concerns. The situation in Kenya is satisfactory, despite some concerns; the BBC has also indicated that the country is "media friendly". Tanzania has passed an omnibus media law that guarantees access to information.

## Asia

Six respondents from Asia have reported negative

issues. The respondent from Israel has mentioned that there are concerns about intellectual freedom and that there have been attempts to censor books. Incidents are, however, very few and not related to the security situation. In Sri Lanka, the government has tried to bring back the criminal defamation law, but this was put on hold because of opposition. In the Republic of Korea there are serious restrictions on reporting favourably about North Korea, according to the respondent. The respondent from Lebanon has indicated that the country is sectarian and that the government sometimes bans religious and political books that offend different communities.

The respondent from Singapore has reported on three issues: the banning of a newspaper, reclassification of three publications as offshore publications, and the compulsory termination of a library subscription. In the Sultanate of Oman it is difficult to start a new library because of regulations, and libraries are prevented from marketing their materials and services widely.

In 20 of the 21 Asian countries, third-party sources have reported incidents of the violation of intellectual freedom. Very common are the harassment of journalists, civil society activists and government critics and the violation of their rights.

Such incidents have occurred in Cambodia (where death threats have been made against journalists and some have been forced to flee; others have been imprisoned, inter alia for criticising the government), Israel (where Palestinian journalists have been detained), Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives (where human rights activists have been arrested), Nepal (where journalists have been attacked by armed groups and in one case a bomb was thrown at journalists), Pakistan, Palestine (the most famous incident being the BBC journalist that was abducted; other incidents include the endangerment of journalists, storming of a news agency and murder of a journalist and media worker), Thailand and Vietnam (where human rights lawyers, a priest and other dissidents have been imprisoned).

Repressive laws have also been reported by third-party sources. In Israel, there is an outdated press law, whereas in Kazakhstan, a new law gives the government the power to close independent and opposition media outlets for technical and administrative violations. A law that allows the government to censor publications and websites favourable to North Korea exists in the Republic of Korea. A new law was passed in Kuwait to license and suspend publications.

In the Maldives, there are calls for reforms to media legislation. Press freedom is a serious issue in the Sultanate of Oman. In Sri Lanka, independent third-party sources have corroborated the country respondent's remarks about attempts to bring back the criminal defamation law. In Thailand, there are censorship laws that threaten to curb press freedom. There are concerns about freedom of expression and the new penal code in Turkey. In Vietnam, there is a decree tightly restricting public gatherings and additional regulations to further control access to the Internet.

Media restrictions also occur commonly in Asia. In Bhutan, an independent newspaper has been temporarily blocked. Reporters Without Borders has stated that it has been a bad year for press freedom in Cambodia. In Israel, there are restraints on journalists to enter restricted zones. In Japan, the International Federation of Journalists has called on the government to refrain from editorial interference. A newspaper website and news agency have been temporarily shut down in Kazakhstan. In Nepal, newspapers have been blocked or banned because of their content.

Internet censorship exists in Pakistan, as reported earlier in this chapter (Question 4). Freedom of expression and assembly are increasingly being controlled in Singapore. Blocking of websites occurs in Thailand. In Vietnam, newspapers have been suspended or banned and there is increased government censorship of the Internet.

On the positive side, it is reported that measures have been taken in Hong Kong to ensure that Radio Television Hong Kong remains free from government interference. Israel recently announced the establishment of a National Committee for the Information for All Programme, which provides a platform for wide-ranging discussion on issues of intellectual freedom. In Kuwait, women have gained the right to vote and stand for political office. The Director of the International Press Institute (IPI), commenting on a report by the IPI on press freedom in Lebanon, commented that Lebanon enjoyed "a greater degree of press freedom than many of its regional neighbours".

### **Europe**

Four respondents from Europe have reported on issues of concern. In Russia, the New Part of the Civil Code restricts access to information in electronic format. The respondent from Latvia has noted that a Member of Parliament demanded that a book on sex education

be withdrawn from public libraries. In Luxembourg, there was a lawsuit between Greenpeace and the Minister of Economy about public access to environmental information. The respondent from the Ukraine regards the lack of funding for libraries for collection development and problems with access to libraries for handicapped people as impediments to the freedom of access to information.

Third-party sources have reported violations of intellectual freedom in 18 of the 34 countries from Europe that have participated in the current survey. Harassment of journalists has occurred in Albania (where journalists and media houses have been attacked), Bosnia Herzegovina and Bulgaria (where, in both cases, there have been attacks on journalists and death threats against them), Germany (where the external intelligence service, the BND, has spied on journalists), Hungary (where one journalist has been attacked – the report does, however, point out that such incidents are very rare), Latvia (where a TV journalist whose programmes exposed abuse of authority and corruption by politicians has been dismissed), Malta (with reports of attacks on journalists, human rights activists and others), Moldova (with reports on the arrest and detention of journalists and a defamation case brought against a journalist who criticised politicians), Poland (with lawsuits against journalists for "defaming Polish people" and the suspension of an editor), Serbia (where there have been threats against journalists and suspension, as well as an attempted assassination) and the UK (where there has been violation of the rights of journalists).

A number of third-party sources have mentioned repressive laws. These include Albania (where there have been pleas for the reformation of defamation laws), Austria (where new defamation and other laws have raised concerns about free speech), Bulgaria (where proposed amendments to the Freedom of Information Act are worrying), Ireland (where new Bills that pose a threat to freedom of expression have been passed), Italy (where a Bill on phone call intercepts has raised concerns about freedom of expression), Moldova and Poland (where existing censorship legislation is a cause for concern in both countries), and the UK (where there is cause for concern about censorship in Northern Ireland).

Restriction of the media also occurs in a number of countries, according to third-party sources. Human Rights Watch has reported that the media is "far from free" in Albania. In Lithuania, all the copies of a weekly

have been confiscated for “revealing state secrets”. Political powers and the government have been putting pressure on media freedom in Slovenia. Two media outlets in Switzerland have been prosecuted for the publication of “secret official debates”. Third-party sources have reported that in both the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, Romani pupils suffer lack of access to education.

On the positive side, the respondent from Montenegro has indicated that the Constitution guarantees freedom of thought and expression, and prohibits censorship of the press and other public information and media. IFEX nevertheless doubts the effectiveness of these guarantees. The respondents from a number of countries have remarked on their high standard of intellectual freedom, including Denmark, Finland and Iceland. Reporters Without Borders has indicated that Malta has made impressive advances in press freedom, and regards the Czech Republic as a “haven of freedom of expression”.

### **Latin America and the Caribbean**

Only one of the 22 respondents in Latin America and the Caribbean has reported a violation of access to information – in Belize, the government was called upon to release a document that should not have been privileged. One country (Guyana) did not complete this section of the questionnaire. The remaining 20 respondents have indicated that there have been no violations of intellectual freedom.

In the case of 16 of the 22 participating countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, third-party sources have reported cases of the violation of intellectual freedom. Harassment and victimisation of journalists have occurred quite often, for example in Cuba (where there has been a rise in the harassment of librarians and journalists, and independent journalists publishing outside Cuba have faced intimidation and arrests), and Paraguay (where journalists have been threatened after doing investigative work on politics, drugs and the environment). Threats and attacks against journalists and the media are common in the Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay. In a number of cases journalists have been murdered or disappeared.

Repressive laws regarding intellectual freedom are to be found in a number of countries, according to third-party sources. This includes Chile (where efforts of the Supreme Court to restrict press reporting have been found to be unconstitutional), Cuba (where there are such laws that do not comply with international

standards), El Salvador (where there has been a call for reform of existing laws because of problems relating to access to information), Jamaica (where existing libel and defamation laws are said to restrict freedom of expression), Mexico (where the government has been urged to proceed with a major reform of the Radio, Television and Telecommunications Law), Panama (where the criminal code restricts freedom of expression and information) and Uruguay (where the government still has to decriminalise media offences).

Restriction of the media is especially prevalent in Cuba, according to third-party sources. This includes the banning of independent media and the fact that legal media outlets are under government control. Access to the Internet is also severely limited and extensively monitored. In Guyana, the licence of a TV station was withdrawn after it had criticised the government. In Paraguay, the Inter America Press Association has reported that freedom of the press will remain uncertain until a number of issues have been resolved (see the country report for details). One case of the censorship of a TV discussion programme has been reported on by the respondent from Suriname.

In Guyana, the government withdrew advertising from a large newspaper after the paper had criticised it. IFEX has reported multiple violations of freedom of expression and the right to information in Honduras, and has stated that freedom of expression is limited.

There have also been some positive remarks by third-party sources. Reporters Without Borders has mentioned that Chile has a good name for press freedom compared with other Latin American countries (even though there is cause for concern). In Barbados, intellectual freedom is respected and freedom of the press is constitutionally guaranteed. In Jamaica, the press is largely free to express critical views. The Netherlands Antilles is one of eight Caribbean countries that have pledged to uphold press freedom principles. According to Reporters Without Borders, the media in Uruguay is fairly free and the country has a high reputation for press freedom (even though a few matters for concern have been raised in different reports).

### **North America**

No violations of intellectual freedom have been reported by Bermuda and Greenland. The respondent from the USA has listed numerous issues that are cause for concern and the reader is referred to the country report of the USA and <http://www.ala.org/template.cfm?Section=oif&CFID=88451965&CFTOKEN>

=53988293. Third-party sources have also reported on the harassment of journalists and bloggers and on Internet censorship in the USA.

### Oceania

Two of the eight respondents from Oceania have mentioned violations of intellectual freedom. One case occurred in New Caledonia, where some libraries do not subscribe to newspapers whose editorial policy is not in agreement with the local majority. Several issues concerning censorship have been listed by the respondent from Fiji, who cites a number of sources as examples of these incidents.

Third-party sources have listed concerns in two countries. In Australia, acceptance of a law on the interception of communications increases the risk of abuse against the press – journalists are already feeling the impact of this law (a number of sources are listed in the country report). In New Zealand, a number of concerns have been raised about regulation of the Internet.

The following positive issues have been reported. The respondent from New Zealand has indicated that the country has a full range of legislation covering all aspects of access to information, and that intellectual freedom is highly valued. Reporters Without Borders adds that New Zealand is “a successful example of virtually total respect for press freedom”. In New Caledonia, conflict between a union and the only public broadcaster has been resolved and resulted in “their joint commitment to media pluralism and freedom of expression”.

### Conclusion on violations of intellectual freedom

As is evident from the descriptions above, most data about the violations of intellectual freedom comes from independent third-party sources consulted by the research team. 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.

Only 19 respondents have reported incidents of the violation of intellectual freedom, compared with 31 in the 2005 report (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 368). However, consulted third-party sources have reported incidents in 82 of the countries that have

participated in this year’s survey, in many cases there are multiple reports from multiple sources. 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.

Reports about violations of intellectual freedom	2007	
	Respondents	Third-party sources
Africa	5	25
Asia	6	20
Europe	4	18
Latin America and the Caribbean	1	16
North America	1	1
Oceania	2	2
Total	19	82
N = 116		

**Table 43: Number of respondents and consulted third-party sources that reported violations of intellectual freedom**

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).

It is evident that violations of intellectual freedom occur in many countries that have participated in the current survey. Such violations also occur in many countries that did not participate in 2007 and these are obviously not detailed in this report.

Even though there are notable exceptions, the report paints a very bleak picture of the state of intellectual freedom in the world. The situation should be of grave concern to IFLA. IFLA and the FAIFE Committee are urged to 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.

IFLA should also consider methods whereby library communities, library associations and even individual library patrons in countries that are affected by violations of intellectual freedom can anonymously report such incidents to IFLA (e.g. through a web report form on its website) to create a comprehensive database of violations of intellectual freedom, especially with reference to the impact such violations may have on library communities.

## 2.7 Question 8: 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 is a very serious issue for IFLA, which was specifically addressed in many papers at the IFLA conference in Durban (for details see the conference programme of the 73rd IFLA General Conference and Council at <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla73/Programme2007.htm> and search under the term "Aids").

This question consisted of two 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.

### 2.7.1 Question 8a: Library involvement in HIV/Aids awareness programmes

Are libraries involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes?		2007	
		#	%
Africa	Yes	23	82.14
	No	5	17.86
Asia	Yes	4	19.05
	No	17	80.95
Europe	Yes	14	42.42
	No	19	57.58
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	15	75.0
	No	5	25.00
North America	Yes	3	100.0
	No	0	0.0
Oceania	Yes	4	50.0
	No	4	50.0
Total	Yes	63	55.75
	No	50	44.25
N = 113; 3 countries have not provided data.			

**Table 44: Library involvement in HIV/Aids awareness programmes**

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

- *Africa*: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Congo Brazzaville, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, the Gambia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Nepal, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey
- *Europe*: Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Monaco, Norway, Poland, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Ukraine, the UK
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles (St Maarten), Panama, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago
- *North America*: Bermuda, Greenland, the USA
- *Oceania*: Fiji, Guam, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu

Slightly more than half the participating countries have indicated that their libraries are involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes.

As in 2005, a number of different methods are used to raise awareness. From the responses, displays, exhibitions and/or dedicated areas within the library for the purpose of HIV/Aids awareness information appear to be popular ways of making such information accessible to the public.

The media used for these purposes include standard print media such as books, brochures and leaflets; visual media such as posters, as well as electronic media – CDs, DVDs, the Internet, etc. In many cases talks, workshops, seminars and conferences are organised. Broadcasting media – both radio and television – have been mentioned, although to what extent libraries are directly involved in this is not clear.

Respondents have also indicated that partnerships with other organisations (e.g. NGOs and international organisations) and other government departments (e.g. Departments of Health and Education) are very popular ways to incorporate HIV/Aids awareness activities or campaigns into the library services.

In other cases, HIV/Aids-related initiatives were coupled with awareness days (Algeria) and international events, such as World Aids Day (the Gambia) and national library weeks (Vanuatu and Zambia). Singapore has combined an HIV/Aids awareness programme with an art exhibition; for details see the country report.

It is important to note that, in many cases, the HIV/Aids awareness programmes and activities are the initiative of individual libraries. These programmes are not necessarily coordinated and managed by a national body such as government or library association. Another aspect to bear in mind is the fact that, in some cases, involvement in HIV/Aids awareness activities may be a one-off event and does not provide any indication of an ongoing involvement.

A suggestion for the next World Report would be to specify the duration of such involvement, i.e. in the past two years, in order to keep the information current. This will prevent the gathering of dated information.

Countries indicating that their libraries are not involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes have listed 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), NGOs and other agencies. Some have specified that HIV/Aids is not a problem in their countries and consequently special awareness programmes are unnecessary. In this regard, religious and moral values have been indicated as the reason why HIV/Aids is not a national problem. Other countries have indicated that information on HIV/Aids is generally available as part of the library material, for example health sources, and no special programmes are provided. Other reasons include a lack of sufficient funding, infrastructure, staff, and so on.

Compared with 2005, there is a slight increase from 52% in 2005 to 55.75% in 2007 in the number of countries whose libraries are involved in HIV/Aids awareness programmes.

### 2.7.2 Question 8b: HIV/Aids information for people who are unable to read

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

- *Africa*: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Swaziland, Uganda, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Singapore, Thailand
- *Europe*: Czech Republic, Italy, Latvia, Serbia
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Belize, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guyana, Honduras, Panama, Peru
- *North America*: the USA
- *Oceania*: Vanuatu

Have libraries in your country been involved in any programmes to provide HIV/Aids information to members of the community who are unable to read?	2007	
	#	%
Africa	Yes	12 44.44
	No	15 55.56
Asia	Yes	2 10.0
	No	18 90.0
Europe	Yes	4 12.12
	No	29 87.88
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	8 36.36
	No	14 63.64
North America	Yes	1 33.33
	No	2 66.67
Oceania	Yes	1 12.5
	No	7 87.5
Total	Yes	28 24.78
	No	85 75.22
N = 113; 3 countries have not provided data.		

**Table 45: Library involvement in providing HIV/Aids information to people unable to read**

There is a noticeable difference between the number of countries offering HIV/Aids awareness programmes to the general public and those who specifically offer such programmes to members of the public who cannot read. The main reasons given include the fact that such programmes are offered by other institutions (such as Ministries of Health and NGOs); there is a lack of skills, knowledge, training, facilities and/or funding; or the literacy rate is very high. Other reasons include the fact that the information-providing function of libraries is not sufficiently acknowledged and the main focus is on providing access to library material; HIV/Aids information is provided in the general media; and there is a lack of initiative from libraries.

Specific methods of conveying information to those unable to read include talks, meetings, discussion groups and debates in the vernacular (Burkina Faso and Swaziland); the use of visual media (posters, photos and art) and audio and/or audiovisual media (audio cassettes, video and TV). Libraries in Lesotho, for example, engage illiterate youth through drama.

Interestingly, this question was mainly interpreted as a matter of literacy vs illiteracy. Two respondents have noted that it also includes visual disability. The respondent from Thailand has indicated that information is offered to their visually disabled through Braille publications in addition to audio cassettes.

It is suggested that a separate category for the provision of access to information for people with disabilities should be incorporated into the next World Report. It need not be focused on HIV/Aids-related issues as such, but on access to information and information services in general. Such an addition would focus attention on matters of social inclusion.

When comparing the responses of 2007 with those of 2005, there is a noticeable decrease of approximately 10% (from 35% to 24.78%) in the involvement of libraries offering HIV/Aids information to members of the community unable to read.

As in 2005, the responses to questions 8a and 8b for 2007 indicate that libraries are more involved in general HIV/Aids awareness programmes than specific programmes for those members of the community who are unable to read.

### 2.8 Question 9: Women's access to information

Following the 2005 report (see IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 375), this year's report again addressed the issue of women's access to information. The same subcategories were used in the 2007 questionnaire and respondents were again asked to provide examples of such programmes.

#### 2.8.1 Question 9a: 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. The regional breakdown is given in Table 46. Countries that are involved in such programmes are as follows:

- *Africa*: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Congo Brazzaville, the Gambia, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Africa, Swaziland, Uganda
- *Asia*: Singapore, Thailand, Turkey
- *Europe*: Albania, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, the UK, Ukraine, Serbia
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Guyana, Honduras, Peru
- *North America*: Greenland, the USA
- *Oceania*: None

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.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes focusing on the promotion of women's literacy?		2007	
		#	%
Africa	Yes	10	35.71
	No	18	64.29
Asia	Yes	3	14.29
	No	18	85.71
Europe	Yes	9	26.47
	No	25	73.53
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	6	27.27
	No	16	72.73
North America	Yes	2	66.67
	No	1	33.33
Oceania	Yes	0	0.0
	No	8	100.0
Total	Yes	30	25.86
	No	86	74.14
N = 116			

**Table 46: Special programmes in libraries for the promotion of women's literacy**

Especially respondents in Europe offered the last mentioned item as a reason why literacy programmes are not being offered. A number of countries have reported that they do not have specific literacy programmes for women and that such programmes are offered to all members of society because of a policy of non-discrimination (e.g. Australia, Barbados, Guam, Montenegro, Palau, Slovak Republic, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, and Vanuatu). The USA has many initiatives, including special programmes for women, but follows a non-discriminatory approach.

Nepal has indicated that it has a Ministry for Women to coordinate such programmes. Jamaica, New Zealand and Uruguay have indicated that no such programmes are necessary, as the literacy rate among women is higher than among men. Bermuda has noted that young men are most in need of such programmes. In the Czech Republic, such programmes are offered mainly by libraries engaging in community work among ethnic minorities.

Unfortunately, respondents have generally not elaborated on how such programmes are offered. Some have noted that there are special corners in the library where functional literacy is taught, and others that easy reading material is used for this purpose. A

few respondents have also mentioned that theatre, poetry and song are used in the education process. Teaching women IT skills was also mentioned as an example of a specific programme.

Compared with 2005, it is worrisome that library initiatives for promoting women’s literacy declined (from 34% in 2005 to 25.86% in 2007) in countries offering such programmes. The number of countries indicating that such programmes are not offered has increased from 66% in 2005 to 74.14% in 2007.

**2.8.2 Question 9b: Women’s access to specific categories of information**

The second part of question 9 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 47.

Do libraries in your country have special programmes focusing specifically on promoting women’s access to one or more of these topics: social information, the economy, education, health and family planning?		2007	
		#	%
Africa	Yes	9	34.62
	No	17	65.38
Asia	Yes	5	23.81
	No	16	76.19
Europe	Yes	14	41.18
	No	20	58.82
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	8	36.36
	No	14	63.64
North America	Yes	2	66.67
	No	1	33.33
Oceania	Yes	3	37.50
	No	5	62.50
Total	Yes	41	35.96
	No	73	64.04
N = 114; 2 countries have not provided data.			

**Table 47: 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*: Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo Brazzaville, the Gambia, Guinea, Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda
- *Asia*: Kuwait, Palestine, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey
- *Europe*: Albania, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Serbia, Switzerland, the UK, Ukraine
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guyana, Honduras, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago
- *North America*: Greenland, the USA
- *Oceania*: Fiji, Palau, Vanuatu

Few respondents have offered a detailed explanation why libraries are not involved in such programmes, or have described specific programmes that are offered. A number of respondents have again emphasised the role of government departments, NGOs and other organisations as being the reason why libraries are not involved in such programmes.

Social inclusion policies and non-discriminatory policies have again been mentioned, with countries making information on such topics available to both men and women. It has also been mentioned that women have access to these categories of information through the normal library services, even though there are special programmes for these topics. Lack of sufficient funding, initiative and/or skills has also been mentioned by some respondents.

Examples of programmes provided by respondents mostly refer to collaboration with government departments, NGOs and/or other institutions to offer special programmes on specific topics, which include displays, conferences, lectures, writing competitions (Singapore) and specialised resource centres for women (Switzerland).

Responses have remained fairly consistent with the 2005 World Report, with a very slight decrease (down from 37% in 2005 to 35.96% in 2007) in countries offering special programmes focusing on promoting women’s access to information on specific topics.

With reference to both questions 9a and 9b, libraries appear to have limited involvement in offering special services to women (literacy programmes, as well as special programmes for access to specific information or topics), as the majority of respondents have indicated that no such programmes are offered. Although various reasons have been given in this regard, it should be noted that there is a vast potential



for libraries to offer special programmes for women. However, the fact that a number of respondents have indicated that libraries follow an inclusive approach towards all members of society may be an indication that this question should be rephrased for future reports. It might also be of value to investigate the informational role that library services can play in broader society to make information on different social issues more accessible to all members of the community.

Analysing the responses for questions 8 and 9 proved a bit problematic in that respondents' interpretation of the question may have differed. Many respondents have indicated that HIV/Aids awareness programmes and programmes on women's issues exist, and have made specific reference to the involvement of other organisations, NGOs and/or government departments. The direct involvement and role of libraries in these projects have not always been clearly indicated.

From these responses it is nonetheless evident that in many cases there is collaboration between library services, government departments, NGOs and/or other organisations with regard to special campaigns, etc. to increase awareness and offer greater access to information. Such collaboration assists in keeping library services relevant in the everyday life of people and is indicative of their dynamic nature.

The data in the current report indicates the same trend referred to in the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 376), viz. that "the number of libraries worldwide choosing to focus specifically on women's issues is significantly smaller" than the number that focuses on HIV/Aids awareness programmes.

Furthermore, as stated in the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 378), it can again be noted that there are significant opportunities for "increased library activity in HIV/Aids programmes and women's issues".

### 2.9 Question 10: Codes of ethics

Question 10 dealt with codes of ethics. The first part of the question asked whether the library association has adopted a code of ethics and whether it is available on the Internet. Respondents were also asked requested to provide details about its implementation or give reasons for not having adopted a code. The last part of the question asked whether the library association intended to adopt a code of ethics within the next two years if it currently did not have one. The responses are summarised in Tables 48 and 49.

Has your library association adopted a code of ethics?		2007	
		#	%
Africa	Yes	7	25.0
	No	19	67.86
	No answer	2	7.14
Asia	Yes	9	42.86
	No	10	47.62
	No answer	2	9.52
Europe	Yes	27	79.41
	No	7	20.59
	No answer	0	0.0
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	10	45.45
	No	11	50.0
	No answer	1	4.55
North America	Yes	1	33.33
	No	2	66.67
	No answer	0	0.0
Oceania	Yes	3	37.5
	No	5	62.50
	No answer	0	0.0
Total	Yes	57	49.14
	No	54	46.55
	No answer	5	4.31
N = 116; 5 countries have not provided data.			

**Table 48: The adoption of codes of ethics**

In 2005, 46 (58%) respondents indicated that their library associations adopted a code of ethics; this was considerably higher than the figure in 2003 (38, 45%) (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 380). Even though the number of library associations that currently have a code of ethics has risen to 57, the percentage has declined to 49.14%, compared with 2005. It is evident that in many countries contributing to the World Report for the first time, the library associations have not yet adopted a code of ethics.

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

- *Africa*: Egypt, Kenya, Mauritius, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda
- *Asia*: Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey
- *Europe*: Albania, Belgium (Flanders), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic,

Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the UK, Ukraine

- *Latin America and the Caribbean:* Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay
- *North America:* The USA
- *Oceania:* Australia, Guam, New Zealand

If there is no code of ethics, does your library association intend to adopt one in the next two years?		2007	
		#	% *
Africa	Intend to adopt	13	61.9
	Do not intend to adopt	0	0.0
	No answer	8	38.1
	Not applicable **	7	
Asia	Intend to adopt	5	41.67
	Do not intend to adopt	2	16.67
	No answer	5	41.67
	Not applicable **	9 ***	
Europe	Intend to adopt	2	28.57
	Do not intend to adopt	3	42.86
	No answer	2	28.57
	Not applicable **	27	
Latin America and the Caribbean	Intend to adopt	4	33.33
	Do not intend to adopt	4	33.33
	No answer	4	33.33
	Not applicable **	10	
North America	Intend to adopt	0	0.00
	Do not intend to adopt	2	100.0
	No answer	0	0.0
	Not applicable **	1	
Oceania	Intend to adopt	3	60.0
	Do not intend to adopt	2	40.0
	No answer	0	0.0
	Not applicable **	3	
Total	Intend to adopt	27	45.76
	Do not intend to adopt	13	22.03
	No answer	19	32.20
	Not applicable **	57	

N = 116. \* % = the percentage calculated from the number of respondents indicating that their library association has not yet adopted a code of ethics, or who have provided no answer to this question. ("Not applicable" is not expressed as a percentage.)

\*\* Not applicable = the library association has already adopted a code of ethics.

\*\*\* Kuwait has indicated both that its library association has already adopted a code of ethics and also that it intends to adopt one within two years; in the numbers above it has been included in the "not applicable" group.

In total, 43 respondents have indicated that the code of ethics is available on the Internet; not all respondents, however, have provided a URL. Most respondents have not supplied any detail on how the code of ethics is implemented. Countries that have provided some detail include Brazil, Croatia, New Zealand, Singapore and the UK. Some have given the date when the code was adopted, but this sometimes differs from the date provided in previous reports. There are even some contradictions with regard to the information in previous reports; this could probably be ascribed to the fact that different respondents completed the questionnaires for different reports.

The most prevalent reason for not yet having adopted a code of ethics has been that the country's library association is inactive or dormant, or that no library association exists. A few respondents have indicated that adopting a code of ethics was not currently a priority for the library association, or that the library association paid very little attention to such issues.

From the responses there appears to be a considerable degree of uncertainty about codes of ethics – when or even whether they have been adopted, how they are implemented, and so on. In countries where no code of ethics has been adopted by the library association, the association sometimes appears to be apathetic in this regard.

In the second part of the question, respondents had to indicate whether the library association intends to adopt a code of ethics within the next two years if there currently is none. Positive responses are as follows:

- *Africa:* Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Congo Brazzaville, Côte d'Ivoire, DRC, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Nigeria, Rwanda
- *Asia:* Cambodia, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Palestine
- *Europe:* San Marino, Slovak Republic
- *Latin America and the Caribbean:* Aruba, Barbados, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago
- *North America:* (None)
- *Oceania:* Guam, Fiji, Vanuatu

Table 49: The intention to adopt a code of ethics

Altogether 27 respondents have indicated that they intend to adopt a code of ethics within the next two years, compared with 21 in the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 380). However, 13 countries have indicated that they do not intend to adopt a code, which is also considerably higher than the nine of the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 380). A further 19 respondents have not answered this question, which could conceivably also be interpreted as a “no”. This means that 32 library associations (i.e. 55.23% of those associations that do not have a code of ethics) most probably do not intend to adopt one within the next two years.

A few countries that have indicated that they intend to adopt a code of ethics within the next two years already indicated the same intention in the 2005 report (and the same phenomenon can be observed when the 2005 and 2003 reports are compared). 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.

Currently, about half of the library associations of the countries that participated in the 2007 survey have codes of ethics and nearly half of the remainder have expressed the intention to adopt one within the next two years. This implies that approximately three-quarters of the library associations of the current respondents should have a code of ethics within the next two years. In terms of numbers this is a considerable improvement on the situation in 2005, but in terms of percentages there is a decline.

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.

### 2.10 Question 11: The IFLA Internet Manifesto

The first part of the question asked whether the library association has adopted the IFLA Internet Manifesto and requested respondents to provide details about its implementation. The last part of the question asked whether the library association intended to adopt the Manifesto within the next two years, if it had not done so yet. The responses are summarised in Tables 50 and 51.

Has your library association adopted the IFLA Internet Manifesto?		2007	
		#	%
Africa	Yes	3	10.7
	No	22	78.57
	No answer	3	10.71
Asia	Yes	3	14.29
	No	17	80.95
	No answer	1	4.76
Europe	Yes	22	64.71
	No	11	32.35
	No answer	1	2.9
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	5	22.73
	No	14	63.6
	No answer	3	13.64
North America	Yes	1	33.33
	No	2	66.67
	No answer	0	0.0
Oceania	Yes	0	0
	No	8	100.0
	No answer	0	0.0
Total	Yes	34	29.31
	No	74	63.79
	No answer	8	6.9
N = 116; however, 8 countries have not provided data.			

**Table 50: The adoption of the IFLA Internet Manifesto**

In 2005, 27 (35%) respondents indicated that their library associations had adopted the IFLA Internet Manifesto; this was slightly higher than the numbers in 2003 (24, 30%) (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 381). Even though the number of associations that have adopted it has risen to 34, the percentage has declined to 29.31%. It is evident that, in many countries contributing for the first time, library associations have not yet adopted the Manifesto, with some indicating that they have not even been aware of the Manifesto.

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

- *Africa*: Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania
- *Asia*: Japan, Kazakhstan, Turkey
- *Europe*: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Norway, Poland, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Ukraine

If the Manifesto has not yet been adopted, does your library association intend to adopt it in the next two years?		2007	
		#	% *
Africa	Intend to adopt	20	80.0
	Do not intend to adopt	1	4.0
	No answer	4	16.0
	Not applicable **	3 ***	
Asia	Intend to adopt	9	50.0
	Do not intend to adopt	3	16.67
	No answer	6	33.33
	Not applicable **	3	
Europe	Intend to adopt	2	16.67
	Do not intend to adopt	4	33.33
	No answer	6	50.0
	Not applicable **	22	
Latin America and the Caribbean	Intend to adopt	9	52.94
	Do not intend to adopt	1	5.88
	No answer	7	41.18
	Not applicable **	5	
North America	Intend to adopt	0	0.0
	Do not intend to adopt	2	100.0
	No answer	0	0.0
	Not applicable **	1	
Oceania	Intend to adopt	3	37.5
	Do not intend to adopt	2	25.0
	No answer	3	37.5
	Not applicable **	0	
Total	Intend to adopt	43	52.44
	Do not intend to adopt	13	15.85
	No answer	26	31.71
	Not applicable **	34	
<p>N = 116; however, 26 countries have not provided data.</p> <p>* % = the percentage calculated from the number of respondents indicating that their library association has not yet adopted the Manifesto, or who have provided no answer to this question. ("Not applicable" is not expressed as a percentage.)</p> <p>** Not applicable = the library association has already adopted the Manifesto.</p> <p>*** Lesotho has indicated that its library association has already adopted the Manifesto and also that it intends to adopt it within two years; in the numbers above it has been included in the "not applicable" group.</p>			

**Table 51: The intention to adopt the IFLA Internet Manifesto**

- *Latin America and the Caribbean:* Brazil, Cuba, Netherlands Antilles (St Maarten), Peru, Uruguay
- *North America:* The USA
- *Oceania:* (None)

Most respondents have not provided any detail on how the Manifesto is implemented. Countries that have provided some detail are Albania, Brazil, Czech Republic, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Italy, New Zealand, Russia, Singapore and Turkey. The most common way of propagating the Manifesto is by translating it into the official language and publishing it on the Internet and/or in a local library journal; it is also often discussed at conferences or seminars.

In the UK, CILIP has not adopted either the Internet Manifesto or the Glasgow Declaration because of its own statements that are similar to these policies. These are currently under review, however, and CILIP will consider the IFLA initiatives as part of the reviews. Australia also has its own policy on Online Content Regulation and Free Access to Information.

The most prevalent reason respondents have offered for not yet having adopted the Manifesto is that the country's library association is inactive or dormant, or that no such association exists. A few respondents have indicated that they have not been aware of the Manifesto, or that they have other priorities. There are a few discrepancies between the 2005 report and data provided for the 2007 report. This is also evident in the answers to the second part of the question.

Respondents that have indicated that the country's library association intends to adopt the Manifesto within the next two years (if it has not yet been adopted) are as follows:

- *Africa:* Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Congo Brazzaville, Côte d'Ivoire, DRC, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe
- *Asia:* Israel, the Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Palestine, Sri Lanka, Thailand
- *Europe:* Finland, Malta
- *Latin America and the Caribbean:* Aruba, Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago
- *North America:* (None)
- *Oceania:* Guam, Fiji, Palau

Altogether 43 respondents have indicated that they intend to adopt the Manifesto within the next two years. This figure is slightly higher than the 38 of the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 381). However, 13 countries have indicated that they do not intend adopting the Manifesto, which is also considerably higher than the six of the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 381). A further 26 respondents have not answered this question, which could conceivably also be interpreted as a “no”. This means that 39 library associations (47.56% of those library associations that have not yet adopted the Manifesto), most probably do not intend adopting it within the next two years.

A few countries that have currently indicated that they intend adopting the Manifesto within the next two years, already indicated the same intention in the 2005 report (and the same phenomenon can be observed when the 2005 and 2003 reports are compared). 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.

Currently slightly less than one third of the library associations of countries participating in the 2007 survey have adopted the Manifesto, and slightly more than half of the remainder have expressed the intention to do so within the next two years. This implies that slightly more than three-quarters of the library associations of the current respondents should have adopted the Manifesto within the next two years. In terms of numbers this is a considerable improvement on the situation in 2005, but in terms of percentages there is a decline.

### 2.11 Question 12: The IFLA Glasgow Declaration

Question 12 dealt with the IFLA Glasgow Declaration. The first part of the question again asked whether the library association has adopted the Declaration and requested respondents to provide details about its implementation or reasons for not having adopted it.

The last part of the question asked whether the library association intends to adopt the Declaration within the next two years if it has not yet done so. The responses are summarised in Tables 52 and 53.

In 2005, 24 (32%) respondents indicated that their library associations have adopted the IFLA Glasgow Declaration; this was higher than the numbers in 2003 (20, 24%) (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 383). Even though the current number of library associations that have adopted the Declaration has risen to 29, the

Has your library association adopted the IFLA Glasgow Declaration?		2007	
		#	%
Africa	Yes	4	14.3
	No	19	67.86
	No answer	5	17.86
Asia	Yes	2	9.52
	No	18	85.71
	No answer	1	4.76
Europe	Yes	17	50.0
	No	16	47.06
	No answer	1	2.9
Latin America and the Caribbean	Yes	4	18.18
	No	12	54.5
	No answer	6	27.27
North America	Yes	1	33.33
	No	2	66.67
	No answer	0	0.0
Oceania	Yes	1	12.5
	No	7	87.5
	No answer	0	0.0
Total	Yes	29	25.0
	No	74	63.79
	No answer	13	11.2
N = 116; however, 13 countries have not provided data.			

**Table 52: The adoption of the IFLA Glasgow Declaration**

percentage has declined to 25% (compared with 2005). It is evident that, in many countries contributing to the World Report for the first time, library associations have not yet adopted the Declaration. According to some respondents, they have not even been aware of the Declaration.

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

- *Africa*: DRC, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda
- *Asia*: Japan, Turkey
- *Europe*: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Moldova, Norway, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Brazil, Costa Rica, Peru, Uruguay
- *North America*: The USA
- *Oceania*: New Zealand

If the Declaration has not yet been adopted, does your library association intend to adopt it in the next two years?		2007	
		#	% *
Africa	Intend to adopt	17	70.83
	Do not intend to adopt	1	4.17
	No answer	6	25.0
	Not applicable **	4 ***	
Asia	Intend to adopt	8	42.11
	Do not intend to adopt	2	10.53
	No answer	9	47.37
	Not applicable **	2	
Europe	Intend to adopt	7	41.18
	Do not intend to adopt	4	23.53
	No answer	6	35.29
	Not applicable **	17	
Latin America and the Caribbean	Intend to adopt	8	44.44
	Do not intend to adopt	1	5.56
	No answer	9	50.00
	Not applicable **	4	
North America	Intend to adopt	0	0.0
	Do not intend to adopt	2	100.0
	No answer	0	0.0
	Not applicable **	1	
Oceania	Intend to adopt	3	42.86
	Do not intend to adopt	2	28.57
	No answer	2	28.57
	Not applicable **	1	
Total	Intend to adopt	43	49.43
	Do not intend to adopt	12	13.79
	No answer	32	36.78
	Not applicable **	29	
<p>N = 116; however, 32 countries have not provided data.</p> <p>* % = the percentage calculated from the number of respondents that have indicated that their library association has not yet adopted the Declaration, or who have provided no answer to this question. ("Not applicable" is not expressed as a percentage.)</p> <p>** Not applicable = the library association has already adopted the Declaration.</p> <p>*** DRC has indicated that its library association has already adopted the Manifesto and also that it intends to adopt it within two years. In the numbers above it has been included in the "not applicable" group.</p>			

**Table 53: The intention to adopt the IFLA Glasgow Declaration**

Most respondents have not provided any detail on how the Declaration is implemented. Countries that have include Brazil, Croatia, Germany, Kenya, Peru and Turkey. A number of respondents have again mentioned that the Declaration is translated into the local official language and published on the Internet or in a local library journal; it is often discussed at conferences or seminars as well.

The remarks of Australia and the UK regarding the Internet Manifesto are also applicable to the Glasgow Declaration.

The most prevalent reason that respondents have offered for not yet having adopted the Declaration is that the country's library association is inactive or dormant, or that no library association exists. A few respondents have indicated that they have not been aware of the Declaration, or that they have other priorities. There are again a few discrepancies between the 2005 report and data provided for the 2007 report. This is also evident in the answers to the second part of the question.

Respondents that have indicated that the country's library association intends to adopt the Declaration within the next two years (if it has not been adopted already) are as follows:

- *Africa*: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Congo Brazzaville, Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe
- *Asia*: Israel, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Maldives, Nepal, Palestine, Thailand
- *Europe*: Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Malta, San Marino, Slovenia
- *Latin America and the Caribbean*: Aruba, Barbados, Bolivia, Cuba, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, Panama
- *North America*: (None)
- *Oceania*: Guam, Palau, Vanuatu

Altogether 43 respondents have indicated that they intend to adopt the Declaration within the next two years. This figure is slightly higher than the 37 of the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 383). However, 12 countries have indicated that they do not intend to adopt the Declaration, which is considerably higher than the eight of the 2005 report (IFLA/FAIFE World Report, 2005: 383). A further 32 respondents have not provided an answer to this question; this could conceivably also be interpreted as a "no", which

means that 44 library associations (50.57% of those library associations that have not yet adopted the Declaration) most probably do not intend doing so within the next two years.

A few countries that have currently indicated that they intend adopting the Declaration within the next two years, already indicated the same intention in the 2005 report (and the same phenomenon can be observed when the 2005 and 2003 reports are compared). 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. The situation is similar to that of the codes of ethics and the Internet Manifesto.

Currently, 29 library associations of the 116 countries that participated in the 2007 survey have adopted the Declaration and 43 of the remainder have expressed their intention to do so within the next two years. This implies that 72 out of 116 (62.07%) of the library associations of the current respondents should have adopted the Declaration within the next two years. In terms of numbers this is an improvement on the situation in 2005, but in terms of percentages there is a decline.

### 2.12 Conclusion on the three ethics-related questions

In terms of the codes of ethics and the IFLA initiatives (the Internet Manifesto and the Glasgow Declaration) there has been an improvement in numbers in all cases, but a decline in percentages due to the larger number of countries that have participated. If the three questions on ethics are compared, it is evident that the two IFLA initiatives are not supported as they should be. The numbers are given in Table 54.

Quite a number of library associations (both in numbers and as a percentage) have adopted a code of ethics. A far smaller number have adopted the Internet Manifesto and the Glasgow Declaration. In terms of the intention to adopt these, practically the reverse is true – more library associations have expressed the intention to adopt the Manifesto and the Declaration than they have to adopt a code of ethics. Comparing this report with the 2005 and 2003 reports, it is nevertheless 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 above are rather optimistic.

IFLA should consider a special effort to convince library associations to adopt all three items discussed in this section. As the Manifesto and the Declaration are

A comparison of the ethics questions	2007	
	#	%
Code of ethics		
Yes	57	49.14
Within two years	27	23.28
Totals	84	72.42
Internet Manifesto		
Yes	34	29.31
Within two years	43	37.07
Totals	77	66.38
Glasgow Declaration		
Yes	29	25.0
Within two years	43	37.07
Totals	72	62.07
N = 116. Percentages of “within two years” calculated out of the full number of 116.		

**Table 54: A comparison of the ethics questions; data taken from Tables 49, 51 and 53**

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 the Manifesto and the Declaration.

One of the main reasons respondents have offered for library associations not having adopted these items is the fact that the associations are dormant, inactive or non-existent. IFLA should continue its drive to emphasise to the library community worldwide the importance of having active and vibrant library associations in all countries.

It is furthermore disturbing that a number of correspondents have indicated that, even though one or more of these items have been adopted by their library associations, there is in many cases no or very little evidence that any of these are being propagated or applied in the libraries. 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

This report intends 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. Each of the questions was dealt with in detail in the preceding part of this section – in each case the data of the country reports has been analysed, followed by a conclusion on the section. 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 libraries and Internet access. Access to the Internet, the necessary infrastructure, 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 a substantial 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 already evidenced in the 2007 report. 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 been a shift in the views of library associations in terms of Internet filtering. More countries are now in favour of filtering, specifically to safeguard children and morality. This is, in general, to be commended. A very careful watch, however, should be kept that this does not result in Internet censorship, 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, and deserves further in-depth research.

This matter links in closely with violations of freedom of expression and freedom of access to information, one of this year's special issues. Interestingly enough very few respondents have reported on such incidents in their countries and most of the information comes from third-party sources – only 19 respondents have highlighted any issues, whereas the consulted third-party sources have listed issues in at least 82 countries. 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 FAIFE Committee.

IFLA should strive to set up a database that records such incidents and its impact on library services worldwide, and should use all means at its disposal to bring pressure to bear on countries and governments where freedom of access to information and freedom of expression are curtailed. IFLA and the FAIFE Committee should also very carefully monitor all 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 social information to all communities – those who can read and those that cannot, including members of the community with disabilities. Even though there are notable exceptions, it is evident from the data that there is much scope for libraries worldwide to improve their contributions in this regard. This need not include only information about HIV/Aids or access to specific categories of information for certain communities – as is probably already the case in many libraries and in many countries.

It should be considered to expand future reports so as to be more inclusive, and to reflect the role libraries play outside of these fairly small domains. There are many countries in which libraries are doing sterling work in this regard and it is necessary that IFLA should take more note of this. A 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.

Ethical issues are always of concern to library communities. It is to be commended that a number of countries have adopted ethical codes, the IFLA Internet Manifesto and the IFLA Glasgow Declaration since 2005, or have the intention to do so. There does, however, seem to be remarkable apathy about ethical issues in a number of cases. This is evidenced by the fact that a number of respondents appear to have been unaware of the Manifesto and the Declaration, and also that some have reported finding very little evidence in their library communities that a code of ethics, the Manifesto or the Declaration are actually implemented, or how they are implemented. Obviously there are again exceptions.

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. A database of success stories on how these codes have been implemented and the effect this has had on library communities could again be considered.

The fact that this report 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 again highlights 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.