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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Web & Growing Inequality

Growing inequality is one of the defining challenges of our time. What role can the World Wide Web play in tackling it?

Seven out of 10 people live in countries where the gap between rich and poor is greater than it was 30 years ago, according to Oxfam research. In some countries these disparities are reaching levels last seen before the Great Depression. Inequality topped the World Economic Forum’s annual survey of global risks this year, while the head of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Christine Lagarde, recently warned that rising inequality is choking economic growth, and leaving “a wasteland of discarded potential” in its wake.

This skewed potential is the most damaging effect of inequality, eroding the chance for people to make a better life for themselves and making poverty a permanent trap passed on from parents to children.

The Web’s power to help restore equality of opportunity is clear. Twenty-five years ago Sir Tim Berners-Lee and his colleagues at CERN took a momentous decision not to patent the Web, which led to a remarkable democratisation of its capabilities. Today, armed with little more than a smartphone, anyone — regardless of where they were born or how much they earn — can start a business, record a music video, crowdfund an invention, take courses with Nobel Prize-winning professors, or even launch a successful campaign for office. As the examples of Brazil, Estonia and Iceland demonstrate, the Web has three critical contributions to make to fighting inequality:

- Expanding access to knowledge, information and skills
- Enabling wider political participation and voice
- Lowering barriers for small and micro enterprises to innovate, compete and succeed

But we can’t take the equalising power of the Internet for granted. Current trends suggest that we now stand at a crossroads between a Web “for everyone”, which strengthens democracy and creates equal opportunity for all, or a “winner takes it all” Web that further concentrates economic and political power in the hands of a few.

Already, overall scores for the Web’s contribution to development and human rights are strongly correlated with wealth. The higher a country’s per capita income, the higher its Web Index ranking.

In part, this is because access is still heavily skewed to those living in high income countries. An estimated 4.4 billion people — mostly poor, female, rural and living in developing countries — have no access to the Internet at all.

While Internet use has soared from around 45% to 78% in high-income countries since 2005, in low-income countries it has remained below 10% year after year. Internet penetration grew by only one percentage point per year from 2011-2013 in low-income countries.

In the poorest countries, the relative costs of basic Internet access remain over 80 times higher than in the rich world — while Internet use is 10 times lower.

But digital divides also exist within countries. First, the skills and education needed to fully benefit from technology are very unevenly distributed. According to the ITU, and OECD, the Internet revolution is increasing the wage gap between the very highly skilled and everyone else, making technological progress the single biggest factor driving income inequality in both advanced and developing countries.

Second, powerful state actors and economic elites are gaining more control over what ordinary people can do and say online.

- At least 1.8 billion Internet users have little or no right to privacy or freedom of expression online thanks to pervasive surveillance or censorship.
- Legal safeguards against government snooping on our communications were encoded or bypassed in many countries in the past year, with 84% of Web Index countries failing our test for basic privacy safeguards, up from 63% in the 2013 Index.
- Almost 40% of countries blocked politically or socially sensitive Web content to a moderate or extreme degree in the past year, up from 32% in 2013.
- In 74% of Web Index countries, lack of net neutrality means that ability to pay may limit the content and services users can access.
- One in five female Internet users live in countries where harassment and abuse of women online is extremely unlikely to be punished.
- Third, governments and donors have yet to invest enough in putting the power of the Web in the hands of the poor and marginalised, leaving some groups even further behind.

Policy makers must:

1. Accelerate progress towards getting everyone online. Poverty must not prevent anyone, anywhere from connecting. Universal access means everyone should be able to use all of the Web all of the time, safely, freely and privately.
2. Level the playing field by preventing price discrimination in Internet traffic, balancing the rights of copyright holders with those of Web users, and protecting online service providers from liability for content posted by third parties. We believe that governments must recognise the Internet’s essential place in economic and social infrastructure and treat it like other public utilities.
3. Invest in high-quality public education for all to ensure that technological progress doesn’t leave some groups behind.
4. Promote participation in democracy and protect freedom of opinion. Fight the growing “democratic deficit” by reversing the erosion of press freedom and civil liberties seen in almost all Web Index countries in recent years; use the Web to make government more transparent to citizens, and provide stronger protections for freedom of speech, freedom of association, and privacy, both offline and on.
5. Create opportunities for women and poor and marginalised groups by investing more in ICTs to overcome key barriers in health, education, agriculture and gender equity. Achieve scale and impact by involving stakeholders in identifying the specific problems that ICTs can help to solve and those it cannot, and designing properly resourced programmes to address both.
As the table below shows, the Web Index rankings — which measure the economic, social and political benefit that countries gain from the Web — are strongly correlated with per capita income. Rich countries, such as the Scandinavian countries, dominate the top of the Index for the third year running.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Overall score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>98.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>97.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK &amp; Northern Ireland</td>
<td>95.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>94.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>94.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>93.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Republic Of Korea</td>
<td>92.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>91.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>89.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See full table in Appendix 1)

The Web Index is best explored online. We’ve produced this PDF for convenience for offline reading, but it is a much less rich experience than you’ll find on our website. If you can, we urge you to head over to thewebindex.org/report to enjoy interactive visualisations, the chance to compare countries side-by-side and much more!

For the 86-country sample as a whole there is also a significant relationship between income inequality and the Web Index scores. When countries are broken down into income groups, inequality seems to be a more important factor in high income countries, whereas absolute poverty levels seem to be more significant in developing countries. The existence of the two dimensions together — high absolute poverty and high inequality — seems to produce a compounded negative effect on the ability to benefit from technology, which in turn could exacerbate inequality by leaving poorer countries and poorer people further behind. (In measuring inequality, we used the latest available World Bank “Gini Coefficient” data — a widely-used statistical measure of income inequality in countries).

This sets a very clear challenge for the international community. People living in poverty must be able to use the Web to improve their lives and their communities every bit as much as affluent groups. The steep slope on the graph needs to be flattened out, making the Web truly “for everyone”. Unless and until that happens, the Web can’t become an effective weapon to fight poverty and inequality globally. Indeed, it may even contribute to worsening inequality.

Building a Web “for everyone” requires policies that promote equal opportunities and equal participation in decision making, both on- and off-line. The top-performing Nordic countries are a case in point.

As the global economy becomes more digitally driven, countries’ ability to harness the Web for the common good may also start to influence how equal or unequal, as well as how rich or poor, they become. Nordic policy-makers have been quick to adopt and promote the free Internet — and open access to information — as a 21st century public good. Others, as this year’s findings show, need to move fast to catch up.

Although very different from the Scandinavian countries, in their own ways Korea, Iceland and Brazil have also seized on the possibilities of the open Web to expand opportunities for all. (Read more in our country examples woven through the text).
THE WEB AND ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

Equal opportunity to succeed is a principle vital to market economies; it makes sure that everyone’s talents and ideas can be fully utilised regardless of the circumstances of their birth, and promotes trust and compromise across different social groups since everyone has a stake in the economy’s success. Large gaps between rich and poor undermine and ultimately destroy this principle, as the chair of America’s central bank warned earlier this year. In today’s high-inequality US, a child born to poor parents has less than a one in 10 chance of making it into the top 20% income bracket, compared to a one in five chance in low-inequality Denmark.

The Web has long been held out as an equaliser of opportunity and broad-based growth. Among other things, it can:
- Reduce entry barriers and disrupt monopolies;
- Make knowledge freely accessible to all, lowering the costs of acquiring and disseminating information;
- Build social capital that helps people get better jobs and services, and
- Match workers to job opportunities and enable traders to overcome geographical isolation.

Our rankings of economic empowerment observed, the higher the education level, the greater the economic empowerment. Of course, poor education and high inequality are usually closely related, in and of themselves. However, initial analysis suggests that in many instances, each variable on its own plays a significant role in explaining the empowerment scores.

This analysis confirms that investment in universal education is a key prerequisite to enable everyone to benefit from the Internet revolution. It also suggests other factors that need to be tackled before the Web can make a real contribution to inclusive, broad-based growth. These fall into two main categories: barriers to access and use, and barriers to innovation.

3.1 Getting Online: Affordability & Access

Over four billion people are not connected to the Internet. Nine in 10 of them are in the developing world. As the graph below shows, there is a very strong correlation between per capita income and access to the Internet, with the steepest increases in Internet penetration taking place as average income rises from $5 to $10,000 per year. In high-income countries, lower levels of inequality — as measured by Gini coefficient — also seem to be related to higher levels of access. (See opposite).

However, as McKinsey points out, the rate of growth in Internet use is slowing. On current trends, McKinsey estimates, more than half the global population will still be offline in 2017.

Overall, the proportion of people using the Internet increased only 5% last year in the Web Index countries. It is upper-middle-income countries that have racked up the most growth in connectivity, from 39% in 2011 to 45% in 2013. As the analysis below shows, these are also the countries with the cheapest entry-level broadband in the world (when prices are averaged across both fixed-line and mobile options). But low-income countries, with 2013 penetration rates below 7%, managed to raise these rates by only 2 percentage points by 2013. This unimpressive performance was brightened by spectacular achievements in four low-income African countries that achieved a 20% jump in Internet adoption last year — Kenya, Malawi, Ethiopia and Sierra Leone.

3.2 Internet and Inequality

The primary reason for sluggish growth in user numbers is affordability. The average cost of a basic fixed-line broadband subscription dropped significantly in 2012, but barely budged in 2013. Fixed broadband packages cost as little as 1% of average earnings in high-income countries, and 3% in upper-middle-income countries — but over 100% in low-income countries.

African countries that achieved a 20% jump in connectivity, from 39% in 2011 to 45% in 2013. As the analysis below shows, these are also the countries with the cheapest entry-level broadband in the world (when prices are averaged across both fixed-line and mobile options). But low-income countries, with 2013 penetration rates below 7%, managed to raise these rates by only 2 percentage points by 2013. This unimpressive performance was brightened by spectacular achievements in four low-income African countries that achieved a 20% jump in Internet adoption last year — Kenya, Malawi, Ethiopia and Sierra Leone.

For decades, apartheid South Africa competed with junta-ruled Brazil for the title of most unequal country in the world. Unlike Brazil, however, South Africa has become more unequal since its transition to democracy. Heavy spending on social grants is not enough to bridge the divides created by a dysfunctional education system, high levels of unemployment, and extreme wage inequality. The returns from economic growth to the organized, the educated, the highly skilled and the well connected,“ says economist Lizette Smith.

But rather than using its excellent communications infrastructure as a tool to address these fundamental challenges, the South African government has been content to allow mobile cellular and broadband prices to remain among the highest in the world. Internet uptake has grown relatively fast in recent years with the spread of smartphones, but users are disproportionately affluent and well-educated. Less than 20% of those beneath the poverty line are Internet users, according to the South Africa survey research.

Three-quarters of Internet use is urban, and over 40% are fluent in English. Hence, under the current policy regime, it is hard not to conclude that technology is deepening economic and social inequalities in South Africa.

Politicians’ apparent apathy on access and affordability may be related to an increase in “climate of concern” in government that makes the free flow of information and views online a “national security threat” rather than a boon. In 2013, the government developed “a new law restricting the rights to information and freedom of expression,” the Protection of State Information Bill (not yet passed), which criminalises reporting on classified state information and intentionally accessing leaked information online. and the Freedom of Information Amendment Act, which authorises state security agencies to intercept “foreign signals intelligence” without a warrant.

Nevertheless, South Africans remain determined to exercise their hard-won democratic rights online as much as offline. In cases such as the death of a man dragged behind a police truck in early 2018, and the ongoing controversy over government spending on President Jacob Zuma’s private estate, Nkandla, citizens are using photos and videos taken on cell phones and circulated by social media to challenge the official version of the facts and force the authorities to account for their actions. Shortly after the government attempted to disable the Nkandla debate by declaring it illegal to publish photos of Zuma’s villa, a journalist’s tweet going the Google Earth coordinates of the compound went viral on Twitter. The hashtag #Nkandla instantly became a trending topic, “with some enraged South Africans using recent Nkandla pictures as their profile pictures on social media as a sign of defiance,” according to the SA Times.

SOUTH AFRICA
However, there were some surprises. Hungary made universal access to the Internet a pillar of their commitment to equal opportunities. This sub-index was, once again, the best performing sub-index in middle- and low-income countries, only a fifth of the rural population, on average, is covered by a 3G network.

As we will discuss later, this is a significant barrier to the use of technology to improve health and education outcomes in the developing world.

Mobile broadband is a cheaper option in most of the developing world, but it is no nearer being affordable—a 4GB monthly packet in low-income countries still costs over half of average monthly earnings, and as much as 202% for those living below the $2/day poverty line. What is more, in those countries that in middle- and low-income countries, only a fifth of the rural population, on average, is covered by a 3G network.

As the South Africa case study suggests, making Internet access more affordable is critical for fighting inequality and creating jobs. A 2013 Frelimo report estimated that if Internet penetration rates in developing countries could be raised to those of developed countries, ‘the resulting economic activity could generate $2.2 trillion in additional GDP, a 72% increase in the world’s job creation. A four-dollar increase in the price of a gigabyte of mobile broadband is a cheaper option in most developing world.Entrepreneurship, job creation and political participation with many positive impacts on education, health and social mobility are key to reducing poverty and inequality. Motoring the economic engine.’

3.2 Using the Web to Enhance Jobs & Livelihoods

Even in countries with relatively high rates of Internet use, broadband suggests that the benefits of lower access to more skilled workers, increasing the wage gap between them and everyone else. This trend lies behind the 3% faster that technological progress has been the single most important cause of increased income inequality in recent years.

An equitable education system is key to mitigating this, as discussed below. In addition, deliberate efforts are needed to ensure low-paid workers and small micro businesses can benefit from technology’s spread. Small farms are a prime example.

Agriculture & The Web

Farmers, fishermen and forest producers make up the economy percentage in most developing countries, and they are overwhelmingly poor. Boosting their productivity and earnings is key to reducing poverty and unlocking sustainable growth. There are many economic handicaps that must be overcome for small farmers to thrive. ICTs are no panacea, but could help farmers to tackle some of the biggest challenges they face—including information asymmetries and lack of market power vis-à-vis the intermediaries who buy their crops, as well as increased weather risk resulting from climate change.

Simply by tracking weather conditions and crop prices through mobile phones, farmers in India increased their profits by 8% (Shades of Data Hoyt) predicts larger impacts from more sophisticated Web-based tools. Market price information is being widely shared via ICTs, on a real-time or daily basis, in almost 100% of Web Index countries.

Agricultural extension advice is universally accessible via ICTs in only 23% of all Web Index countries and in only two of the developing and middle-income countries in our research.

Climate change is causing weather-related risks, such as droughts, floods, and tropical storms, to steadily increase in scale and frequency. Enabling farmers to anticipate and plan for such threats is key to protect their livelihoods, and the Web can help. Chile delivers targeted information from the Web directly to farmers via SMS messages, a system designed to work even on slow networks with intermittent connectivity. One farmer reported that his entire crop for 2009 was saved by an SMS message advising him to delay planting because of impending bad weather.

Unfortunately, less than a quarter of Web Index countries are making effective use of ICTs to share early warning information about both slow-onset and rapid-onset disasters, and all of them, except Costa Rica, are high-income countries. Sierra Leone and Bangladesh perform as well in India, and in this area, providing very good early warning information on rapid-onset emergencies via ICTs, but fall flat on the score for slow-burning crises.

3.2.3 The Web & SMEs

We also looked at the Web’s contribution to the growth of other small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Our results suggest that in rich countries which already have a thriving Internet ecosystem, the market is presently driving SMEs to adopt Web-based tools and strategies, as shown by generally high scores on this indicator in high-income countries.

In low- and middle-income countries, however, our research found limited impact of the Web on small business growth. No low-income countries, and only a handful of middle-income countries (Turkey, China, Brazil, Argentina, India, Mauritius), scored above a five on this topic. In addition to removing barriers such as high access costs, low penetration rates, and unclear rules for Internet intermediaries, governments may also need to consider incentives (such as tax breaks or seed funding) or support (such as training programmes) to promote the Web as an engine of small business.
3.3 Putting the Brakes on Innovation

Another way in which the Web can contribute to a more level playing field is by removing entry barriers and reducing information costs for new or small market players, encouraging new business formation and promoting competition.

3.3.1 Net Neutrality

Net neutrality — the principle that all internet traffic should be treated the same — is fundamental to ensure all Internet traffic should be treated equally. Only three countries (Chile, Israel and the Netherlands) scored an eight ("very good") in this indicator. Our analysis suggests that 74% of Web Index countries either lack clear and effective net neutrality rules, and/or show evidence of traffic discrimination. There were only three countries without effective regulations where we found no evidence of traffic discrimination. While the establishment of higher-priced “fast lanes” for certain paid video or entertainment services is the concern in the rich world, in the developing world zero-rating deals are perhaps the most rapidly spreading form of price discrimination. While zero-rating involves an operator agreeing to carry a limited selection of preferred services and content over its network for free. Examples include Amazon’s “Prime Touch internet” and a Facebook’s “Internet.org” in Zambia, Tanzania and Kenya, and the deal between China Unicom and messaging service Tencent.

Although zero-rating deals have the short-term benefit of enabling more people to access at least some Web services, critics warn they may undermine competition (both with operators and among content providers); disadvantage small, local players; and could even play into the hands of governments keen to block or spy on the Web. The telecommunications authorities of Chile and Norway have both determined that such practices violate net neutrality laws, but governments in most other countries have yet to give serious attention to zero-rating, or lack clear net neutrality regulation in the first place.

It is not always private companies that are the culprits. In Nepal (which scored a five) our researchers report that despite the presence of laws and regulations designed to protect net neutrality, there are multiple complaints from private sector ISPs that state-owned providers get preferential treatment from the state-owned telecom operator. ISPs can also be compelled to violate net neutrality by governments who require them to block or throttle access to politically or socially sensitive content. As discussed below, almost 40% of Web Index countries were deemed to have engaged in blocking sensitive content for political reasons over the last 12 months. In order for true net neutrality to be in place, traffic must be free from interference for either political or economic reasons.

Net neutrality is currently the subject of an intense battle in Europe. Last year, the European Parliament passed a package of rules designed to protect net neutrality, but these were overturned by the EU’s law court in February, which ruled that they failed to strike the right balance between users’ rights and copyright holders’ rights. The new rules are set to be re-voted on by the European parliament in June.

3.3.2 Copyright and Intermediary Liability

Copyright enforcement is another way in which economic and political power can become entangled on the Web to the detriment of ordinary users. Takedown demands from private parties on grounds of copyright infringement far exceed government censorship attempts. In the first half of 2013, services operated by Google received copyright takedown notices for about 4 million URLs every week, while government demands for content removal affected about 1,000 items per week. Together received 40 times as many copyright takedown notices as government removal requests during the first half of 2014.

Although many such complaints are directed towards piracy and other legitimate instances of infringement, there are also examples of intellectual property protections being abused to deny fair use, disadvantage competitors, or suppress criticism. In Italy, for example, observers have suggested that copyright law is being used as a basis for censorship, while in Ecuador there are reports that content critical of the president is being targeted under copyright pretext.

The notice-and-takedown system pioneered by the US Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) in 1998 was intended to help sensitive content or law that they need to monitor users’ online actions — which would have an even greater chilling effect. As long ago as 2011, US Senator Frank La Rue called on the US to clarify the legal obligations of intermediaries and ensure that copyright measures are not delegated to private entities.

Despite this, our Web Index 2014 findings demonstrate that 64% of countries surveyed have not established clear and adequate protection for intermediaries. This creates an environment that is both highly uncertain and very costly for online service providers, as our examples show. Smaller, local Web companies are likely to be particularly disadvantaged. If intermediaries respond to legal uncertainty with self-imposed censorship or arbitrary takedowns, competition, innovation, and scientific progress via the Web will ultimately be hindered.
THE WEB AND GENDER INEQUALITY

Ending discrimination against women and girls — in health, education, political representation, and labour markets — is a powerful way to boost economic growth and unlock human potential. To what extent is the Web contributing to realising women’s rights and reducing gender inequality?

![Image: 74% of countries are not doing enough to stop online violence against women.]

4.1 Women Online: Access & Rights

Gender inequality in Internet use remains significant, albeit poorly researched. According to International Telecommunication Union (ITU) estimates, 15% fewer women than men use the Internet in the developing world. Other studies confirm a significant gender gap in equal opportunities for online participation, including the Broadband Commission Working Group on Gender report and Research ICT’s Africa 2012 study.

Policy action to address and overcome the gender gap has been sluggish. Only 30% of the Web Index countries score higher than a five for implementing concrete targets for gender equity in ICT access and use. Almost all of them are high-income countries that have already achieved high levels of gender parity in other spheres of life (as assessed by the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap rankings).

Among countries with big women’s rights challenges, Estonia, Turkey and Tanzania stand out for prioritising gender equity in ICTs. We looked at implementation as well as policy commitment, by assessing the extent to which government and civil society groups are using the Web to expand access to sexual and reproductive health rights advice and services, and to support victims of gender-based violence. We chose these two issues because they are frequently surrounded by stigma and polemic, making the ability to obtain support privately and anonymously through the Web a potential game-changer. Countries’ scores on these two indicators tended to closely track their scores for policy commitment to gender equity in ICTs, varying by only half a point on average. However, in many cases, civil society is stepping in to provide ICT-based resources that the government does not. An example is Colombia’s Profamily, which aims to educate poor and marginalised communities on sexual and reproductive rights. By putting ICTs at the heart of its strategy, it has reached tens of thousands across the country. The net effect of civil society activism in these areas was to push 37% of countries to scores above a five on these two indicators (as compared to only 30% scoring above a five for policy commitment).

Likewise, women themselves are not simply sitting back and waiting for government to take action. In over 60% of countries, women are using the Web to claim and exercise their rights to a moderate or extensive degree. When the Web is used to good effect, the results can be dramatic. In 2014, a NGO called Shoft in Egypt released footage of a young female student being harassed on Cairo University campus. The resulting outcry led to the university implementing a sexual harassment policy — one of the first universities in the region to do so.

4.2 Gender-Based Violence Online

Inasmuch as they can enhance fights for women’s rights, social networks can also amplify misogyny and gender-based violence. The Pew Research Internet Project study in the US finds that 26% of young women aged 16-24 have been stalked online, and 35% were the target of online sexual harassment. Drones tracked more than 6 million instances of the word “slut” or “whore” in English on Twitter over a six-week period in early 2014; an estimated 20% of these misogynistic Tweets were judged to be threatening.

Online harassment of women has hit the headlines on multiple occasions this year, helping to prod law enforcement agencies and online service providers to respond to it more assertively. “Revenge porn” — which sees intimate pictures of former partners posted online — has become a major issue this year. The response has been swift — Israel became the first country in the world to pass a specific law outlawing revenge porn in January 2014. The practice is illegal in 12 US states, while Canada, the UK, and Japan are all mulling new laws. However, many of these laws have been criticised as carelessly drafted and overly broad, as we went to press, the courts suspended Arizona’s revenge porn law in response to free speech concerns.

In most countries, however, responses to ICT-mediated violence against women remain wholly inadequate. We assessed whether clear legal protection exists (either through the application of existing laws or the development of new ones), whether training and clear guidelines are provided to both the police and judiciary, and whether enforcement is taking place as evidenced by the arrest and prosecution of perpetrators. In 74% of Web Index countries, including many high-income nations, law enforcement agencies and the courts are failing to take appropriate actions in situations where Web-enabled ICTs are used to commit acts of gender-based violence.

“In the Web is democratising and also the voice of people who don’t think they have another outlet. And that voice can be punitive.”

Mary Beard

In March 2014, an NGO called Shoft Taharir (I Saw Harassment: Enhancing Twitter online of a young female student being harassed on Cairo University campus. The resulting outcry led to the university implementing a sexual harassment policy — one of the first universities in the region to do so.

Better training and clear, balanced legal guidance for police, courts and online service providers is a priority to ensure an effective law enforcement response without trampling on freedom of expression or privacy. Additionally, as highlighted in a recent report by the Association for Progressive Communications, online service providers must improve their own user policies, including through providing transparency on their reporting and redress procedures, engaging with the perspectives of women beyond North America and Europe, and broadening their human rights policies to include clear commitment and standards for respecting women’s rights.
THE WEB AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY

Not only is investment in human capital critical to build the infrastructure of skills and capabilities that will enable everyone to benefit from technology, but smart use of technology and data can also make it easier and more affordable to expand access to good quality health care and education, creating a virtuous circle of opportunity and growth.

Our research looks not only at the use of PCs and smartphones in schools and clinics, but any and all “Web-powered” platforms, including Web-based services that can be deployed via simple mobile phones or community radio. We also tested whether the information and services provided by such tools are locally relevant and available in local languages.

Some countries are making good use of this two-way street between the Web and enhanced human capital, but in most — including the majority of developing countries and poorer — the potential of digital technology to fight poverty is mostly untapped. Despite some striking successes — such as mobile payment systems in East Africa — the “ICT for Development” (ICT4D) effort remains small scale and fragmented, with small pilot projects often spurring to a halt due to a failure to tackle systemic constraints. In this section we explore what needs to happen to bring ICT4D to scale.

5.1 Education

Education is perhaps the most consistently successful way to lift people out of poverty and catalyse broad-based, inclusive growth. All of the countries cited in our case studies — Brazil, Kenya, Iceland, and Estonia — either inherited strong universal education systems or made investment in education a key pillar of their strategies for inclusive growth.

Globally, however, educational attainment remains highly unequal, both between and within countries. Mean years of schooling among the adult population is 13.8 years in the UK, and less than one year in Burkina Faso. Within countries, it is the poorest children who receive the worst and the least education. In some countries these educational inequalities are stark. In the US, the ‘imbalance between rich and poor children in college completion — the single most important predictor of success in the workforce has grown throughput 50% since the late 1960s’ in India, children belonging to “‘high” caste score 27 percentage points better than “low caste” children on basic reading ability. In South Africa, less than half of Grade 4 students in disadvantaged schools are able to read.

Not surprisingly, in low- and middle-income countries, Web Index scores for economic empowerment through the Web are highly correlated to levels of secondary school enrolment. Countries with better educated citizens do better on the economic empowerment sub-index, regardless of their income level.

Interestingly, in low-income countries, there also seems to be some relationship between male to female gaps in school life expectancy and the Web Index scores for economic empowerment, suggesting that a strong policy commitment to overcoming gender disparities in society at large is essential — not just women and girls — to derive more benefit from ICTs.

Hence, expanding access to quality education is essential to ensure that the benefits of the Internet are spread more equally, and must be a major investment priority for countries seeking to profit from the digital revolution.

At the same time, the Web itself could help to make better education accessible to poor and marginalised groups. The Web Index research suggests that it is beginning to happen. Over 80% of high-income countries and almost 50% of low- and middle-income countries have at least started pilot projects and allocated budgets for programmes that could help improve education outcomes for poor and marginalised communities. However, of the 21 low- and middle-income countries with e-learning programmes, 13 seem to be allocating the majority of their resources to delivering computers or tablets to schools — with little attention to designing appropriate e-learning curricula and materials, or supporting teachers to use technology effectively. On its own, this approach has been found to have little or no impact on learning achievement, particularly among more disadvantaged students.

5.2 Health

As with education, there is a two-way causality between health and economic inequality. On the one hand, poverty is a predictor of poor health, and countries with higher levels of inequality tend to have worse health outcomes. On the other hand, health is a predictor of income. Those in poor health lose out on earnings. And every year, 11 million people worldwide are pushed into poverty by the costs of treating ill health.

Not all of the factors leading to worse health among poorer people can be tackled through ICTs. But evidence shows that the ability to access and understand accurate information about staying well, and to effectively navigate the healthcare system to get better treatment, is a direct determinant of health, and here the Web can make an important contribution to more equitable health outcomes. For example, database estimates that improved health information to expectant mothers and health workers could lead to a reduction in child poverty, saving 210,000 children who may have otherwise died in their first year.

In addition, ICT tools can reduce the costs of providing quality health care, making it easier for governments to implement free or inexpensive health services for all, reducing the burden of health care costs on the poor. Finally, ICTs can speed the spread of new and better medical techniques and tools from rich countries to developing ones.

South Korea

South Korea, number eight on the Web Index and the top performing non-Western country, overcame poverty and achieved rapid economic growth while maintaining, until recently, a relatively equitable income distribution that powered the expansion of the middle class. By the early 1990s, 70% of the population identified themselves as belonging to the middle class. Two factors that enabled this approach achieved two things: first, it “created not only a huge demand and market for the ICT industry,” helping to make it the single most important engine of growth for Korea’s economy, but it also helped to create “the vital human infrastructure” to make that growth equitable and sustainable.

As our examples show, the pioneering Web Index countries who are starting to scale up ICTs for health are using them in several different ways:

- To facilitate remote consultation, diagnosis, and treatment, allowing physicians in remote locations to take advantage of the professional skills and experiences of colleagues and collaborating institutions.
- To provide ongoing training to health workers.
- To enable policy-makers and healthcare professionals to keep abreast of the rapidly evolving stock of medical knowledge.
- To improve disease prevention by enabling more effective monitoring and response mechanisms.
- To disseminate public health information.

Yet the health sector is lagging even further behind than the education sector in uptake of Web-enabled ICTs to improve the quality and affordability of public health care. Just one in five Web Index countries across the world have moved beyond pilot projects to broader implementation. Only 25% of

J Spall, P Achterberg. “Preliminary analysis of SACMEQ III South Africa.” Stellenbosch Economic Working (2011). 3. Although secondary school enrolment levels don’t make a statistically significant difference in economic empowerment scores in high-income countries, we believe this is only because secondary school education is nearly universal in high-income countries. Levels of post-graduate education would likely be the most relevant to economic empowerment outcomes in high-income countries. Similarly, a World Bank survey of 137 countries education systems notes “there appears to be little or no impact on learning achievement, particularly among more disadvantaged students."

Deloitte. “One million people worldwide are pushed into poverty each year by the costs of treating ill health.” Deloitte Insight 16:6 (2011).
the countries have training programmes in place to improve the ICT skills of health workers. As with education, the impact of ICTs on health care is further constrained by high broadband costs, lack of internet access in public clinics, and the slow progress of open access policies requiring publicly funded medical research to be made openly available at no cost. The next wave of ICT for Development (ICT4D) initiatives must go hand-in-hand with efforts to reduce the costs and increase the availability of broadband, as well as efforts to expand open licensing of educational and scientific materials; the Korean experience of ICTs in education is a good example. Across education, health, agriculture, and women’s rights issues, our research also suggests that many of the first wave of ICT4D projects were poorly designed, following an “old technology and old recipe” with little or no consultation with frontline users. The recent donor fascination with “innovation” (typified by “app contests”) has sometimes displaced attention to scale, sustainability, and structural change. Sending SMS reminders to pregnant women to attend ante-natal clinics, for example, obviously will not reduce infant and maternal mortality if the messages are in a language they cannot understand, or if most women in the area are functionally illiterate. But it also will fail to have the desired impact if the nearest clinic is 50 km away, or if the clinic is not stocked with basic drugs. Sharing market price information with farmers via mobile phone may not make a difference if farmers are dependent on a particular large buyer for access to credit and inputs. But it may have a large impact if combined with “offline” initiatives to improve the market power of small producers.

Learning from such experiences, in the next wave of ICT4D we must involve the intended users and beneficiaries in identifying the locally specific problems that technology can actually help to solve as well as those it can’t – and in designing participatory strategies to tackle both.

62% of countries report that the Web plays a major role in sparking social or political action.

THE WEB AND POLITICAL INEQUALITY

Political equality — the idea that each citizen’s preferences should count the same — is at the heart of democracy. There is often a two-way and cumulative relationship between high levels of economic inequality and concentration of political power among elites. More affluent and privileged groups are more likely to participate in political processes, and this may lead to policy outcomes becoming increasingly skewed in their favour, which can further increase social and economic inequalities.

Informed and unfettered debate through a free press is an important safeguard against undue concentration of power, but the overall environment for freedom of expression has deteriorated in the overwhelming majority of Web Index countries. In 2013, over 50% of Web Index countries scored worse on either or both of the leading indices of press freedom (Freedom House and Reporters without Borders) than they did in 2007. Perhaps most worrying, the setbacks have been concentrated in the “most free” countries. Three in four of the Web Index countries that did better than average on Freedom House’s Freedom of the Press Index in 2007 witnessed a decline in score in 2013, in 14 countries, including the US, UK, Finland, New Zealand, and Denmark, scores fell by 20% or more. Voter turnout, identification with political parties and confidence in political institutions have also been declining steadily in OECD countries. Yet ordinary citizens do not necessarily have other ways to organise around their interests. A large-scale study of US policy-making, released last year, found that rich individuals and business-controlled interest groups dominate political decision-making while ordinary citizens have a “near zero” influence on policy outcomes. The Democratic deficit takes different, but equally severe forms in other countries. In Africa, voter turnout is relatively high. But the Afrobarometer surveys reveal that less than half of Africans believe elections give people any power over politicians, while only 20% believe that MPs often or always “listen to what people like me have to say.” In India, a study showed that every single MP under the age of 30 had inherited his or her seat. Opinion polls commissioned by Oxfam in six countries (Spain, Brazil, India, South Africa, the UK and the USA) found that a majority of people believe laws are skewed in favour of the rich. Inspired by examples such as Iceland, many hope the Web can help to close this democratic deficit. The Web can disrupt the undue concentration of power, but the overall environment for freedom of expression has deteriorated in the overwhelming majority of Web Index countries.
Brazil has strongly committed to an open and universally accessible Internet as “a means for innovation, economic development and a tool to transform society,” in the words of President Dilma Rousseff. In her government’s wise, both universal human rights and privacy and freedom of expression online are necessary to build a more equal Brazil.

At the same time, however, efforts to hijack progress towards improved transparency and fundamental rights in a similar proportion of countries. And almost half of governments are making use of the Web to claim and exercise their rights in over 60% of countries we studied. Women are not able to use the Web at all, another 1.8 billion people who are connected nonetheless face severe limitations on their rights online. This is the total number of Internet users living in Web Index countries in which we found extensive government censorship of politically or socially sensitive content and/or very weak to non-existent due process protections against mass surveillance of electronic communications – scoring 5 out of 10 or worse, on one or both of the relevant Web Index indicators. Such extensive denial of rights poses a threat that is economic as well as political – a report by Dalberg Global Advisors found that in countries where governments tend to censor or control content, it appears that there is a significant relationship between the Gini coefficient and scores on the Web Index sub-index for freedom and openness online: more equal societies are also likely to allow more space for citizens to exercise their rights to information, participation, privacy, and freedom of expression.

**6.1 Privacy & Surveillance**

At the time we released our 2013 Index, whistleblowers Edward Snowden’s revelations had just begun to reverberate around the world. One year on, we now know even more about how governments around the world routinely use the Internet to secretly monitor their citizens, and in many instances, consolidate their power. Last year, we asked the question: “To what extent are there laws and regulations in your country that provide both substantive and procedural safeguards to protect the privacy of electronic communications?” There were laws in place, we asked researchers to assess how well they were being enforced, or if they were largely ignored in practice. This year, we repeated that question, with telling results.

This year, the proportion of countries whose legal safeguards for privacy were judged weak to non-existent rose from 63% to 83%—despite a 2013 UN resolution calling on all member states to review their laws and practices to ensure that surveillance did not interfere with fundamental rights. The UK, US, Australia, Canada and France all score below three out of a possible 10 on this indicator, placing them in the company of China, Russia, and Turkey, to name just a few. Part of this shift is clearly explained by the fact that we now know a lot more about what governments are getting up to. Much new information has come to light in the past year about the ability of state and intelligence actors to circumvent due process and the rule of law, even where such safeguards are nominally on the books. However, there is also evidence that due process safeguards for citizens are being progressively dismantled — even as the capability and appetite of governments to spy on us is expanding. The companies that report on government demands for user data have documented worldwide increases in such orders — between January–June 2013 and January–June 2014, Twitter reported a 78% increase; Google, a 14% increase; and Facebook, a 50% increase. Microsoft reported 30% growth in the number of accounts affected by secret US Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) requests between 2011 and 2013, while Yahoo said it was “troubled” by a 47% increase in accounts subject to FISA orders between the first and last half of 2013. Transparency about the extent and nature of law enforcement and security agency surveillance is a basic starting point for any informed debate on the right to privacy in the digital age. Although some countries have increased transparency with regard to their surveillance activities, Belgium said it was legally permitted to publish aggregate information about law enforcement demands in less than half of the 29 countries where it operates. Countries that did not allow disclosure of aggregate statistics on interception warrants and/or access to communications metadata included the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, and Ireland, as well as India, South Africa, and Turkey.
such abuses of power by governments create inequalities by stifling dissent and increasing the chances that a dominant elite will be able to maintain a monopoly of power, shaping policies and laws in its own interest rather than for the common good. During the March 2014 election campaign, for example, the Turkish government blocked several websites, as well as access to YouTube, Twitter and SoundCloud. The ban on Twitter was lifted after the election, thanks to a court decision.

6.2 Censorship

Like surveillance, censorship too is on the rise. In 2013, we reported that just over 30% of Web Index countries were blocking politically or socially sensitive Web content to a moderate or extreme degree. This year, that figure rises to 34%.

6.3 Mobilising via the Web

“The internet authorities can and do police physical space, but they cannot hope to control virtual space.”

— Professor Abhijit Gupta, commenting on the role of social media in sparking student protests against gender violence at Jadavpur University.

Despite the worrying trends discussed above, the Web remains a powerful tool for activists and civil society to mobilise the public. Civil society organisations (CSOs) around the world are increasingly using Web-powered ICTs to educate and inform citizens about government decision-making and public policy issues; in over half of the Web Index countries, most or all of the major CSOs are using the Web in this way. An Internetmeter survey in 34 African countries found that “those who use the Internet more often consider leaders less trustworthy [and are] more critical of the government.”

For the second year in a row, we found evidence that the Web is playing a significant role in enabling social and political action, amplifying previously marginalised voices and causes in over 60% of the countries surveyed. Notable examples included Kenya, Chile, Mexico, the US and Turkey.

Unsurprisingly, most countries that score highly on the World Bank’s offline measures of voice, participation and accountability also score highly on our political empowerment measures and, in particular, are seeing active use of online tools to organise citizens. However, there appears to be a poverty barrier to the Web’s political impact: nearly all of the democratic countries that scored very poorly (three or below) on the use of the Web to catalyse citizen mobilisation are low- or lower-middle-income countries, and no low-income country scored above a six. High poverty rates are associated with low political empowerment scores for all countries as a group. This may well be explained by low levels of Internet access, preventing Web-powered communications from reaching a wide audience.

Web-based protest and mobilisation has also become a force to be reckoned with in a number of countries where citizen voice is limited offline — such as Egypt, Colombia, China, Bahrain, Russia, Thailand and Venezuela. Many of these countries are also ones where we found that the Internet is less heavily censored than traditional media.

However, some research suggests that Web empowerment online is most prevalent among the efficient, urban, male and well-educated — reproducing, rather than reversing, disparities in political participation and civic engagement that have been growing wider. This 2014 Web Index does not examine this directly, but we look forward to the results of household survey research in the 2015 Web Index that may shed light on this issue.

ONLINE ACTIVISM

In Korea, the Web was used this year to mobilise protestors against a perceived political abuse of power. In the run-up to the 2013 presidential elections, it was alleged that Korea’s National Intelligence Service used Twitter to run a smear campaign against one of the candidates. Starting in 2013, furious citizens used social media to fuel online and offline protests. The sustained public pressure has resulted in the conviction of the former agency boss, Won Se-soo, who was sentenced to two and a half years in prison. In September this year. Even in China — a country typically associated with repression online — grievances over corruption and perceived elite impunity have fuelled online activism. For instance, a social media campaign was cited as a factor in ensuring justice was served in a gang rape case against a wealthy general’s son.

In the US, the #Not1MoreDeportation campaign for the rights of illegal immigrants was designed as an “open-source campaign” that used ICTs to enable many different actors — from families fighting an individual deportation case to large trade unions — to collaborate without a central decision-making structure.

The campaign — which also used traditional tactics such as civil disobedience and direct action — won a significant victory in a year for, when President Obama issued an executive order in November 2014 to expand protection from deportation to over four million immigrants.

Chile provides another example of how the Web has helped to remove a political inequality. Chilean law states that all citizens have the right to vote, but expats had to return to Chile on election day to do so. In the run up to an election in December 2013, disgruntled expats started an online campaign called “No tu Voto Valor” (Make Your Vote Fly). This campaign quickly caught the attention of traditional media, and became an election issue. Presidential candidates were weighed in on the issue and a virtual online election was held for those who could not vote. Although reforms were not made before the December 2013 elections, in April 2014, a new law was passed which will make it easier for expats abroad to vote.

Meanwhile, in Mexico, citizens supported by the Web We Want campaign, and other international groups, were able to mobilise around demands for net neutrality, privacy and freedom of speech. In opposition to the country’s proposed telecommunications bill, through the “DefiendeInternet” (Defend the Internet) campaign, Mexican Internet activists planned a site that lets Mexicans call lawmakers to demand that they put human rights at the core of any new bill.

Across national boundaries, the Web also helped build successful movements on a variety of issues. Over 77,000 people worldwide are actively involved in the Wikipedia project to create a free, open-source, collaborative repository of the world’s knowledge. “Alternative” Internet currencies such as Bitcoin have given rise to a 21st century version of the libertarian “free banking” movement, organised entirely around and through Internet technologies. Avaaz leverages petitions signed and funds donated by its millions of users around the world to put local issues in the international media spotlight, a strategy that in 2014 helped Maasai pastoralists in Tanzania fend off eviction from their traditional lands, and overturned a flagging sentence for a 15-year-old rape survivor in Afghanistan. Through crisis mapping — the real-time gathering, display and analysis of data during a conflict or disaster — the Web has become a force to be reckoned with in hundreds of thousands of virtual volunteers in the fight against Ebola in West Africa.
We stand at a crossroads between a Web “for everyone”— one that enables all people around the world to improve their life chances and reduces inequalities both between and within countries — and a “winner takes all” Web that further concentrates wealth and political power in the hands of a few. A “winner takes all” Web is not a predetermined outcome. As this report has sought to demonstrate, much depends on the policy choices we make now. Will we take bold action to ensure the open Web belongs to all of us? Or will we allow billions to be shut out from reaping the benefits of the most powerful technology of the century? It is time to recognise the Internet as a fundamental human right and take the following steps to make it a reality:

Policy makers must:

1. **Accelerate progress towards getting everyone online.** Poverty must not prevent anyone, anywhere from connecting. Universal access means everyone should be able to use all of the Web all of the time, safely, freely and privately.

2. **Level the playing field** by preventing price discrimination in Internet traffic, balancing the rights of copyright holders with those of Web users, and protecting online service providers from liability for content posted by third parties. We believe that governments must recognise the Internet’s essential place in economic and social infrastructure and treat it like other public utilities.

3. **Invest in high-quality public education for all** to ensure that technological progress doesn’t leave some groups behind.

4. **Promote participation in democracy and protect freedom of opinion.** Fight the growing “democratic deficit” by reversing the erosion of press freedom and civil liberties seen in almost all Web Index countries in recent years; use the Web to make government more transparent to citizens; and provide stronger protections for freedom of speech, freedom of association, and privacy, both offline and online.

5. **Create opportunities** for women and poor and marginalised groups by investing more in ICTs to overcome key barriers in health, education, agriculture and gender equity. Achieve scale and impact by involving stakeholders in identifying the specific problems that ICTs can help to solve and those it cannot, and designing properly resourced programmes to address both.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

We stand at a crossroads between a Web “for everyone” — one that enables all people around the world to improve their life chances and reduces inequalities both between and within countries — and a “winner takes all” Web that further concentrates wealth and political power in the hands of a few. A “winner takes all” Web is not a predetermined outcome. As this report has sought to demonstrate, much depends on the policy choices we make now. Will we take bold action to ensure the open Web belongs to all of us? Or will we allow billions to be shut out from reaping the benefits of the most powerful technology of the century? It is time to recognise the Internet as a fundamental human right and take the following steps to make it a reality:

**Policy makers must:**

1. **Accelerate progress towards getting everyone online.** Poverty must not prevent anyone, anywhere from connecting. Universal access means everyone should be able to use all of the Web all of the time, safely, freely and privately.

2. **Level the playing field** by preventing price discrimination in Internet traffic, balancing the rights of copyright holders with those of Web users, and protecting online service providers from liability for content posted by third parties. We believe that governments must recognise the Internet’s essential place in economic and social infrastructure and treat it like other public utilities.

3. **Invest in high-quality public education for all** to ensure that technological progress doesn’t leave some groups behind.

4. **Promote participation in democracy and protect freedom of opinion.** Fight the growing “democratic deficit” by reversing the erosion of press freedom and civil liberties seen in almost all Web Index countries in recent years; use the Web to make government more transparent to citizens; and provide stronger protections for freedom of speech, freedom of association, and privacy, both offline and online.

5. **Create opportunities** for women and poor and marginalised groups by investing more in ICTs to overcome key barriers in health, education, agriculture and gender equity. Achieve scale and impact by involving stakeholders in identifying the specific problems that ICTs can help to solve and those it cannot, and designing properly resourced programmes to address both.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Freedom &amp; Openness Score</th>
<th>Universal Access Sub Index</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Freedom &amp; Openness Score</th>
<th>Universal Access Sub Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Republic Of Korea</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Phillipines</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>United States Of America</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>