

# **E-journals: Developing Country Access Survey, 2002**

In 2002 INASP undertook a survey of initiatives to make content available within the less developed countries. The results of this survey are presented here.

Published in 2003 by INASP, Oxford, UK

## Contents

Abstract .....	3
Introduction and background .....	3
Methodology .....	3
Results .....	3
Organisation type .....	3
Geographical spread.....	4
Subject areas .....	4
Free online access to all people.....	4
Reduced-rate or free access to Less Developed Countries (LDCs).....	4
Discussion .....	5
Summary.....	8
Acknowledgements .....	8
Appendices .....	9
Appendix 1: INASP survey questionnaire.....	9
Appendix 2 : Pan-publisher initiatives to enable access to information by LDCs .....	11
Appendix 3: Countries eligible to join pan-publisher initiatives, January 2003 .....	14

## **Abstract**

The survey initiated by INASP identified considerable interest in initiatives to promote and deliver information into the developing world. It highlighted a number of small publisher-specific programmes already in place, mostly associated with learned societies and society membership. It also highlighted the complexity of the publishing environment, where involvement in any initiatives to promote readership are dependent on other partnerships – with other publishers, with other societies, and with membership requirements.

## **Introduction and background**

Over the past two years concern over the information gap between developed and less developed countries has resulted in a number of initiatives from publishers and/or learned and professional societies designed to supply journals into the developing world. These initiatives have largely focussed on the provision of online information, as this can be provided at little cost to the information provider. Connectivity within the developing countries is, of course, a limiting factor, but online supply is currently perceived as the most efficient and sustainable methodology by the information providers.

Whilst all information initiatives are to be welcomed, there is no comprehensive and up-to-date knowledge of the different approaches, and so not only is there a possibility of duplication of effort, but developing and transitional countries are finding it hard to identify suitable opportunities.

In response to this, the National Academy of Sciences (US) and the Committee for the Dissemination of Scientific Information (CDSI) encouraged INASP to conduct a survey of scholarly and academic publishers to obtain a full picture of what programmes and initiatives are taking place.

## **Methodology**

A short questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was created, and sent to several ListServes, including ALPSP (Association of Learned Professional and Society Publishers) members, the AAAS member, and national societies from around the world. In addition, Highwire posted the questionnaire on their internal Publishers Forum bulletin board, and several other associations also used their personal contacts and email groups to distribute the survey widely. It is estimated that the survey was sent to approximately 800 people.

Subsequent to the survey returns, several follow-up contacts were made to discuss issues raised in the responses.

## **Results**

In total only 46 survey questionnaires were received, mostly from the non-commercial sector. Although the number of responses were low, they represented almost 2000 scholarly and learned journals, plus a range of database and book publishing activities.

## **Organisation type**

The type of organisation responding was as follows:

Not-for-profit 87%

Commercial 13%

The response from the commercial publishers was disappointing. This may have been due to a number of factors. Among those highlighted when publishers were subsequently contacted were:

- Difficulty of answering due to the complexities associated with publishing a range of products in association with different societies and organisations
- Pressure of time, and low priority given to the survey
- Not knowing who was the best person to supply the answers

### **Geographical spread**

The geographical spread of responses was as follows:

UK and Europe	66%
USA	32%
RoW	2%

Europe and the USA represent the majority of publishing activity worldwide, so it was not surprising that the majority of responses came from these regions, although it might have been hoped for better representation from the Australasian region.

### **Subject areas**

The responses covered all subject areas within scholarly publishing, and there were no noticeable differences between the different groups in their opinions or activities in relation to providing information at reduced- or no-cost to the LDCs.

### **Free online access to all people**

Free access to all people is here defined as freely available to all - not only to subscribers or to readers from specific geographical or economic regions (e.g. through one of the initiatives).

Free online access (as defined above) to the online journals was offered by 26% of the publishers. The majority make their content available after one or two years: only one publisher reported making the content immediately available on publication. There was no correlation between those offering free online access and those making their material available within the LDCs at reduced cost or free.

### **Reduced-rate or free access to Less Developed Countries (LDCs)**

The survey did not define “Less Developed Countries”. The publishers responding cited the World Bank categorisation of the “poorest countries”; however, the criteria may differ between publishers, with some countries being included or excluded (for example, Highwire uses the World Bank definition, but also includes Djubouti).

36% of the respondents did not offer their publications to LDCs at any preferential rate, or free.

Of the publishers who did offer their publications at a reduced rate or free, some ran their own initiative, and some participated in a pan-publisher initiative such as HINARI, TEEAL, eIFL and INASP (see Appendix 2 for details of these initiatives).

	No initiative	Pan-publisher initiative (e.g. HINARI, INASP) only	Own initiative only	Both own and pan-publisher initiative
Commercial*	0	67%	33%	0
Non-commercial*	40.5%	17%	19%	21%
Total all respondents	36%	23.5%	21%	19%

\*Percentage of total commercial or non-commercial respondents respectively.

Number of respondents associated with pan-publisher initiative

	HINARI	PERI	eIFL	TEEAL	Highwire	Association of Commonwealth libraries
Commercial	15%	5%	0	5%	0	10%
Non commercial	35%	35%	35%	15%	20%	0
Total	50%	40%	35%	20%	20%	7%

\*percentage of those involved with any pan-publisher initiative

In addition to these initiatives, there was 1 publisher participating in Sattelite, and 1 publisher participating in eJDS.

Many of the non-commercial, and two of the commercial publishers operated their own initiative to make their material available to LDCs for a reduced rate, or free.

The “Own initiatives” included a range of methods including:

- formally published special rates for LDCs
- reduced-cost membership rates (which included journal subscription)
- working with partner societies and organisations, offering reduced subscriptions
- Exchange programmes with libraries and societies.

There was little evidence of any promotion of individual-publisher initiatives, except where they were allied to society membership, and the majority of own initiatives were perceived as costly and of restricted effectiveness.

## Discussion

The majority of recipients were very positive about the supply of information at a reduced cost, or no cost, to Less Developed Countries. (However, it may be assumed that those not interested in such an issue would generally not have returned the questionnaire). Of all the recipients, only one was adamant that supplying information free was contrary to the best interests of their organisation. The learned society publishers described dissemination to LDCs as part of their mission, but commercial publishers appear to consider it just as important in their global strategy.

*“Our Publishing Board saw [pan-publisher initiative] as a piece of welcomed outreach that fitted well with our wider mission, but that we were not resourced to do alone.” Non-commercial society*

*“We support the principles involved in facilitating greater access to research information by the developing world.” Commercial publisher*

*“the benefits . . . increased readership, PR benefit, fit with desires of societies, as well as seeding the market for future revenues as developing countries develop.” Commercial publisher*

Most respondents thought that the sustainability of larger initiatives is good, with the acknowledgement that cost and time to the publisher is an important consideration. In general, pan-publisher initiatives were considered to be more appealing:

*“thinking through initiatives and their implementation can be time-consuming ... projects such as [pan-publisher initiative] which can offer a “one-stop-shop” ... are more likely to be the way forward.”*

All of the commercial publishers had some programme to enable cheaper or free access to LDCs, whereas only 59% of the non-commercial publishers were currently making their material available for any reduced rate. From the responses, it appears that this has not been due to a lack of will, but due to a lack of awareness about the initiatives, and a lack of resources to take an independent initiative forward. Several of the non-commercial publishers were unaware of the pan-publisher initiatives.

*“We would like to, but lack information.”*

*“This is essentially the first time I have heard about these various programs. It would be useful to learn where we can find out about developments.”*

Lack of involvement and awareness in the non-commercial (and usually smaller publisher) sector appears to be partly due to a lack of information – however in an economic climate where the financial security and content quality are vital to survival, it is perhaps not surprising that dissemination to LDCs is not at the top of their priorities.

Although on the questionnaire there was no indication of a confusion about the different pan-publisher initiatives, subsequent follow-up questions revealed that there is some confusion between the different initiatives, and a wish for clarification.

There was some indication that those publishers currently running their own initiatives were looking for the pan-publisher initiatives to supersede these, but many appeared to consider them complimentary. This may be because they frequently reach different types of subscriber in the LDCs, and serve to promote a more direct-action approach to reaching the developing world by the individual journals.

*“We hope to join another online initiative because they are much more cost effective and efficient for the Society.”*

*“This is a project initiated several years ago . . . and will be a [society] project for the next few years . . . I see no conflict.”*

Few society publishers reported linking reduced journal subscription with membership for individuals in developing countries (only 22% of all non-commercial publishers who ran their own initiative). The survey expected to find more programmes such as this already in place. This may be because fewer societies are incorporating a journal subscription with membership, or it may have been an omission in the responses to the survey.

A few non-commercial publishers published via a commercial publisher (20% of all non-commercial publishers), and the decision of whether they made their journal available to one of the pan-publisher initiatives was determined by their commercial partner.

*“This is a decision for [our publisher], but we have no objection ourselves”*

Equally, most of the commercial publishers worked in close collaboration with learned societies, and although they may have a company policy (which is what was reported on in the questionnaire and the results) they reported some exceptions due to the needs and wishes of their non-commercial partners:

*“There is no criteria for setting these reduced rates – they are selected and agreed by the society for whom we publish.”*

*“a small number of societies have raised a concern.”*

There was no report of any promotion of these initiatives being undertaken by the publishers and there appeared to be a reliance on the other partner (either the pan-publisher programme, or the recipient library) to promote the service to potential users. (However, one publisher has subsequently said that they offer staff time to one of the initiatives to assist promotion.) Presumably it is seen as too time-consuming and costly when there is little or no financial return. It is surprising that the journals are not promoting their involvement to existing authors and readers via the journals themselves.

*“Editors and editorial boards are, I think, told in a rather ad-hoc fashion. But there are moves afoot to increase visibility.”*

There were few publishers reporting sale of reproduction rights to developing countries (the only clear indication of such an initiative was from CAB International who sell reproduction rights to China, and also to India). Again, this was surprising, but may have also been due to the investment required for little financial return. Equally, it may have been omitted from the information provided (as these agreements may be handled by different individuals within the organisations).

Few societies listed formalised relationships with other bodies in LDCs (libraries, other societies, etc.), through which they worked to promote membership, share facilities or distribute material. However, the questionnaire only asked about “formal” arrangements, and there were indications of other, more informal, arrangements with libraries, societies and individuals throughout the Less Developed World.

It was generally thought that sustainability of online access programmes to reach the LDCs was good, so long as the costs of the publishers were not too high. Although online provision avoids direct postal and printing costs, there are still administrative, and other “hidden” (particularly staff time) costs that were of some concern, although it was thought that the pan-publisher initiatives would remove some of this burden from the publishers. There was no concern about lost revenue through compromising potential sales.

There was no concern about security in the responses and few of the publishers mentioned any reporting requirements to monitor abuse. There were comments about the difficulty of dealing with the changing economies of certain countries which would change their eligibility status, and two publishers mentioned that they were considering the initiatives as a trial, and would evaluate their continued involvement at the end of 2004. There was no mention of politics influencing country selection.

*"I do think that this service is sustainable but that we have to evaluate carefully which countries qualify."*

*"We need to watch out for deeply discounts extending to the next band of countries, or to poorer areas of otherwise reasonably well-off countries."*

There were mentions of earlier initiatives (mostly paper-based), which have now ceased, or been migrated to the online initiatives: for example the OSI sponsorship of some journals to reach the NIS which has now been replaced by the eIFL programme. There appeared to be no belief that paper-based distribution was feasible, and online delivery was thought to be the only sustainable methodology. The publishers asked did not know how successful these previous schemes had been.

## **Summary**

There is a willingness and a desire by publishers (both commercial and non-commercial) to make their content more visible and more available in the developing world. However there are also some concerns about the costs to societies and publishers. Pan-publisher initiatives are perceived as an opportunity to improve the reach into less developed countries, whilst reducing the burden on publishers.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank all those who returned the survey questionnaire and responded to subsequent enquiries. I would also like to thank the Committee for the Dissemination of Scientific Information (CDSI) for their financial support of this survey.

For further information about this survey please contact Ms Pippa Smart, Head of Publishing Initiatives, INASP: [psmart@inasp.info](mailto:psmart@inasp.info)



## Appendices

### Appendix 1: INASP survey questionnaire

<b>Contact details</b>	
Contact name(s)	
Company / Society / Institution name	
Are you a not-for-profit, charitable or for-profit organisation?	
Address	
Telephone	
Fax	
Email	
Web site	
Is your organisation a member of ALPSP?	
Is your organisation a member of SSP?	
<b>Journal publication details</b>	
How many journals do you publish?	
Is your publishing managed by an external Publisher (e.g. Blackwell, Elsevier)?	
Subject scope of your journals	
How many of your journals are available online?	
Via which online service (e.g. HighWire, Ingenta, third-party publisher or your own site)?	
How many of your journals are available electronically in other media (e.g. CD-ROM) (excluding subscription agencies' own methods of supply)?	
Do you provide your journals free online after a specified period (if so, then how long)?	
<b>Developing country initiatives</b>	
<b>1</b> Are your journals available to less developed countries (LDCs) via any of the following initiatives:	
WHO: HINARI	
EIFL with the Soros Foundation	
INASP: PERI	
African Virtual University	
eJDS - eJournals Delivery Service	
Association of Commonwealth Universities: Protecting the African Library	
SateLLife	
TEEAL	
(a) If you do take part in one (or more) of these initiatives, are all your journals included, and if not, what are the criteria for their inclusion?	
(b) Is there a time-limit to any of these initiatives?	
(c) Do you plan to join one or more of these initiatives in the near future?	
<b>2</b> Do you provide your journals free to LDCs via any other initiative(s) in print or online (please give details):	
(a) Is there a time limit to this initiative?	
(b) What are the criteria for countries to obtain the journals free?	
(c) Does this include all your journals, and if not, what are the criteria for their inclusion?	
(d) Are you planning to join any other initiative(s) in the near future?	
<b>3</b> Do you offer your journals to developing countries online or in print at preferential rates (please give details):	

(a) If so, what are the criteria for countries to obtain these rates? (b) What are the criteria for setting the rates (e.g. what percentage of full price)? (c) Is there a time limit to this initiative? (d) Do you set differential rates for individuals within developing countries? (e) Does this include all your journals, and if not, what are the criteria for their inclusion? (f) If you are not already doing so, are you planning to implement a reduced rate in the near future?	
<b>4</b> Do you sell reproduction rights to LDC-publishers (i.e. the rights to reprint copies for distribution within certain territories)? If so, please give details: (a) what are the criteria for the sale? (b) what approximate price do you charge (e.g. as a percentage of the subscription rate)?	
<b>Promotion</b>	
How do you promote your activities to developing countries?	
<b>Partnership</b>	
Do you have any formalised partnerships with organisations within the LDCs (e.g. institutions, societies, libraries)?	
Do you provide any additional support within developing countries (for example workshops, seminars, newsletters, etc.)?	
<b>The future</b>	
If you do not currently offer your journals free or at a discount, do you think your organisation will do so in future? If you do not think you would be likely to offer your journals free or at a discount, why not?	
If you do currently offer your journals free or at a discount, do you think that you would be prepared to continue to offer free access of your journals for the foreseeable future? Do you believe that your present approach is sustainable for the foreseeable future? If you do not see free or discounted access as sustainable, why not?	
<b>Comments:</b> Please add any additional comments	
<b>Results:</b> The results will be available on the INASP website by the end of the year, but if you would like us to email you the results of this survey, please tick here	
<b>THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME</b>	

**Appendix 2 : Pan-publisher initiatives to enable access to information by LDCs**

The following information was extracted from the websites of each initiative on December 12, 2002.

**Association of Commonwealth Universities: Protecting the African Library**

<http://www.acu.ac.uk/yearbook/feb2002/19-25.pdf>

Publishers offer their journals to ACU member universities in selected countries at either the individual subscription rate, or another rate equivalent to 10-20% of the normal institutional subscription, plus distribution charges at cost. ACU undertakes (at no charge) the publicity or the scheme to the universities concerned, to take orders, collect and pass on payments.

- Participating Publishers: Blackwell Publishing, Cambridge University Press, Haworth Press, ITDG Publishing, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Palgrave, Portland Press, Sage Publications, Taylor & Francis, Ltd., University of Calgary Press, University of Chicago Press
- Reach: 17 African countries. See Appendix 3
- All disciplines (including science, technical, medical, humanities).

**EJDS**

<http://www.ictp.trieste.it/ejournals/>

EJDS: The Programme is geared to facilitate the access to current scientific literature. It is meant for scientists in institutions in *The Third World Countries* which have low bandwidth internet facilities that do not allow them to download material in a timely manner and/or they cannot afford them.

- Currently includes 197 journals from Academic Press, the American Physical Society and World Scientific
- Reach: For “scientists in Developing Countries”, but each publisher stipulates which countries can access their material on the service – full information on the website. See Appendix 3 for countries that are entitled to receive some of their content
- All disciplines (including science, technical, medical, humanities).

**eIFL**

<http://www.eifl.net/>

eIFL-Electronic Information for Libraries. Aims to facilitate affordable access to electronic scholarly resources by libraries in countries in transition. Participating countries pay highly discounted subscription fees for country-wide access. The initial prices have been guaranteed for three years.

- Content currently includes the EBSCO databases, American Physical Society, ProQuest, Blackwell Publishing, Cambridge University Press, HighWire Press, and Institute of Physics Publishing
- Reach: Their website lists 27 Newly Independent countries, and 9 African countries: See Appendix 3
- All disciplines (including science, technical, medical, humanities).

## Highwire

<http://www.highwire.org/lists/devecon.dtl>

HighWire offers an option for journals to provide free access to the World Bank's list of "low income economies", plus Djibouti, starting in December 2002

Free Access to a number of journals that publish through Highwire to World Bank's list of "low income economies,"

- Currently 41 journals from: the BMA, Society for Academic Emergency Medicine, American Physiological Society, The Royal College of Psychiatrists, American Society of Hematology, the Journal of Joint and Bone Surgery, Rockefeller University Press, the American Society for Clinical Investigation, Massachusetts Medical Society (New England Journal of Medicine), and the National Academy of Sciences.
- Reach: the World Bank's list of "low income economies". See Appendix 3
- All medicine and biomedical sciences

## HINARI

<http://www.healthinternetwork.org/index.php>

The *Health InterNetwork* was created to bridge the "digital divide" in health, ensuring that relevant information - and the technologies to deliver it - is widely available and effectively used by health personnel: professionals, researchers and scientists, and policy makers.

- Currently 2082 journals from American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Annals of Internal Medicine, Arnold, Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Paris, BioMed Central, Blackwell Publishing, BMJ Publishing Group, CABI International, Canadian Medical Association Journal, The Cochrane Collaboration, The Company of Biologists, Elsevier Science, IRNEM - Institut Fédératif de Recherche, Necker Enfants Malades, JAMA & Archives Journals, The National Academy of Sciences, Nature Publishing Group, The New England Journal of Medicine, Oxford University Press, Portland Press Limited, the Biochemical Society, The Royal Society of Medicine Press, Sage, Springer Verlag, Taylor & Francis, Thieme Verlag, University of Chicago Press, John Wiley & Sons, Wolters Kluwer International Health & Science, Yale University Library
- Reach: Country lists are based on GNP per capita (World Bank figures, 1998). See Appendix 3.
- All medical and biomedical sciences.

## PERI

<http://www.inasp.info/peri/index.html>

Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information (PERI). A programme of support to information production, access and dissemination for research partners in developing and transitional countries utilising new Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs).

- Currently c.7500 journals from CAB International; EBSCO, SilverPlatter, Academic Press, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford University Press, Institute of Physics, Gale, The Cochrane Library, Mary Ann Liebert
- Reach: based on GDP and/or HDI ranking: See Appendix 3.

- All disciplines (including science, technical, medical, humanities).

**TEEAL**

<http://teeal.cornell.edu/>

TEEAL includes the scanned and digitised contents of over 140 of the world's most important scientific journals in the field of agriculture presented on CD-ROMs.

- Currently 140 journals from a 75 publishers (most providing a small number of journals or other publications to the service), plus a series of FAO papers and monographs
- Reach: 110 of the lowest-income food deficit countries, as listed in the World Bank's *1998-9 World Development Report*. See Appendix 3.
- All agricultural.

**SATELLIFE**

<http://www.healthnet.org/infoservices.php>

SATELLIFE has specially designed a suite of electronic information service tools to help connect health workers with each other and with relevant, useful, and reliable sources of knowledge.

- It publishes its own digests including material from over 40 peer-reviewed medical journals from a range of publishers
- Reach: developing countries – there is not a specific list
- All medical and biomedical sciences.

### Appendix 3: Countries eligible to join pan-publisher initiatives, January 2003

(NB eligibility to join is as quoted on website: access may be free or reduced-price, as determined by initiative organisation, and there may be other selection criteria within country)

Hinari	EiFL	EjDS	ACU	Highwire	PERI	TEEAL
Afghanistan				Afghanistan	Afghanistan	Afghanistan
Albania	Albania				Albania	Albania
Algeria					Algeria	Algeria
Angola		Angola		Angola	Angola	Angola
Armenia	Armenia	Armenia		Armenia	Armenia	Armenia
		Argentina				
Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan		Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan
		Bangladesh		Bangladesh	Bangladesh	Bangladesh
Belarus	Belarus				Belarus	Belarus
Belize					Belize	Belize
Benin		Benin		Benin	Benin	Benin
Bhutan		Bhutan		Bhutan	Bhutan	Bhutan
Bolivia					Bolivia	Bolivia
	Bosnia					Bosnia and Herzegovina
	Botswana		Botswana		Botswana	
		Brazil				
		Brunei Darussalam				
Bulgaria	Bulgaria					Bulgaria
Burkina Faso		Burkina Faso		Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso
Burundi		Burundi		Burundi	Burundi	Burundi
Cambodia		Cambodia		Cambodia	Cambodia	Cambodia
Cameroon		Cameroon	Cameroon	Cameroon	Cameroon	Cameroon
Cape Verde						Cape Verde
	Croatia	Croatia				
Central African Republic		Central African Republic		Central African Republic	Central African Republic	Central African Republic
Chad		Chad		Chad	Chad	Chad
		Chile				
		China			China	
Colombia		Colombia			Colombia	
Comoros				Comoros	Comoros	Comoros
Congo, Kinshasa		Congo, Kinshasa		Congo, Kinshasa	Congo, Kinshasa	Congo, Kinshasa
Congo, Brazzaville		Congo, Brazzaville		Congo, Brazzaville	Congo, Brazzaville	Congo, Brazzaville
Costa Rica						Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire		Côte d'Ivoire		Cote d'Ivoire	Côte d'Ivoire	Cote d'Ivoire
Cuba					Cuba	
	Czech Republic					
Djibouti				Djibuti	Djibouti	Djibouti

						Dominica
Dominican Republic					Dominican Republic	Dominican Republic
East Timor						East Timor
Ecuador					Ecuador	Ecuador
					Egypt	Egypt
El Salvador					El Salvador	El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea		Equatorial Guinea			Equatorial Guinea	Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea		Eritrea		Eritrea	Eritrea	Eritrea
	Estonia					
Ethiopia		Ethiopia		Ethiopia	Ethiopia	Ethiopia
Fiji					Fiji	Fiji
					Gabon	
Gambia		Gambia	Gambia	Gambia	Gambia	Gambia
Georgia	Georgia			Georgia	Georgia	Georgia
Ghana		Ghana	Ghana	Ghana	Ghana	Ghana
					Grenada	Grenada
Guatemala					Guatemala	Guatemala
Guinea		Guinea		Guinea	Guinea	Guinea
Guinea-Bissau		Guinea-Bissau		Guinea-Bissau	Guinea-Bissau	Guinea-Bissau
Guyana					Guyana	Guyana
Haiti		Haiti		Haiti	Haiti	Haiti
Honduras		Honduras			Honduras	Honduras
		Hong Kong				
		Hungary				
		Indonesia		Indonesia	Indonesia	Indonesia
		India		India	India	
		Iran			Iran	
					Iraq	
Jamaica					Jamaica	Jamaica
Jordan		Jordan			Jordan	Jordan
Kazakhstan	Kazakhstan				Kazakstan	Kazakstan
Kenya		Kenya	Kenya	Kenya	Kenya	Kenya
Kiribati					Kiribati	Kiribati
	Kosova					
Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyz Republic		Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstan
		Korea		Korea	Korea	
Lao PDR		Lao PDR		Lao PDR		Lao PDR
					Laos	
Latvia	Latvia				Latvia	Latvia
					Lebanon	
Lesotho	Lesotho	Lesotho	Lesotho	Lesotho	Lesotho	Lesotho
Liberia				Liberia	Liberia	Liberia
					Libya	
Lithuania	Lithuania					Lithuania
Macedonia	Macedonia				Macedonia	Macedonia

Madagascar		Madagascar		Madagascar	Madagascar	Madagascar
		Malaysia			Malaysia	
Malawi	Malawi	Malawi	Malawi	Malawi	Malawi	Malawi
Mali		Mali		Mali	Mali	Mali
Maldives						Maldives
Marshall Islands						Marshall Islands
Mauritania		Mauritania		Mauritania	Mauritania	Mauritania
			Mauritius		Mauritius	
		Mexico			Mexico	
Micronesia, Federated States of						Micronesia, Fed. States
Republic of Moldova	Moldova	Moldova		Moldova	Moldova	Moldova
Mongolia	Mongolia	Mongolia		Mongolia	Mongolia	Mongolia
	Montenegro					Montenegro
Morocco					Morocco	Morocco
Mozambique		Mozambique	Mozambique	Mozambique	Mozambique	Mozambique
Myanmar				Myanmar	Myanmar	Myanmar
Namibia	Namibia		Namibia		Namibia	Namibia
Nepal		Nepal		Nepal	Nepal	Nepal
Nicaragua		Nicaragua		Nicaragua	Nicaragua	Nicaragua
Niger		Niger		Niger	Niger	Niger
Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria
					Oman	
		Pakistan		Pakistan	Pakistan	
Panama					Panama	Panama
Papua New Guinea					Papua New Guinea	Papua New Guinea
Paraguay					Paraguay	Paraguay
Peru					Peru	Peru
		Philippines			Philippines	Philippines
	Poland	Poland				
Romania					Romania	Romania
Rwanda		Rwanda		Rwanda	Rwanda	Rwanda
	Russia	Russia			Russian Federation	
São Tomé and Príncipe		São Tomé and Príncipe		São Tomé and Príncipe	São Tomé and Príncipe	São Tomé and Príncipe
					Saint Lucia	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines					Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	St. Vincent, Grenadines
Senegal		Senegal		Senegal	Senegal	Senegal
Serbia						Serbia
					Seychelles	
Sierra Leone		Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone
		Singapore				
	Slovakia					



	Slovenia					
Solomon Islands				Solomon Islands	Solomon Islands	Solomon Islands
Somalia		Somalia		Somalia	Somalia	Somalia
	South Africa	South Africa			South Africa	
					Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka
Sudan		Sudan		Sudan	Sudan	
Suriname					Surinam	Surinam
Swaziland	Swaziland		Swaziland		Swaziland	Swaziland
Syrian Arab Republic					Syria	
Tajikistan	Tajikistan	Tajikistan		Tajikistan	Tajikistan	Tajikistan
Tanzania		Tanzania	Tanzania	Tanzania	Tanzania	Tanzania
		Thailand			Thailand	
Togo		Togo		Togo	Togo	Togo
Tokelau						
Tonga					Tonga	Tonga
					Trinidad	
Tunisia					Tunisia	Tunisia
		Turkey			Turkey	
Turkmenistan		Turkmenistan			Turkmenistan	Turkmenistan
Tuvalu						
Uganda		Uganda	Uganda	Uganda	Uganda	Uganda
Ukraine	Ukraine			Ukraine	Ukraine	Ukraine
Uzbekistan				Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan
Vanuatu	Uzbekistan				Vanuatu	Vanuatu
					Venezuela	
Vietnam		Vietnam		Vietnam	Vietnam	Vietnam
Wallis and Fortuna						
West Bank and Gaza					West Bank and Gaza	West Bank and Gaza
Western Samoa					Western Samoa	Western Samoa
Yemen		Yemen		Yemen, Rep.	Yemen	Yemen
	Yugoslavia				Yugoslavia	
Zambia	Zambia	Zambia	Zambia	Zambia	Zambia	Zambia
Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe