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Doing Business 2018 is the 15th in a series of annual reports investigating the regulations that enhance business activity and those that constrain it. Doing Business presents quantitative indicators on business regulation and the protection of property rights that can be compared across 190 economies—from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe—and over time.

Doing Business measures aspects of regulation affecting 11 areas of the life of a business. Ten of these areas are included in this year’s ranking on the ease of doing business: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, getting credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency. Doing Business also measures features of labor market regulation, which is not included in this year’s ranking.

Data in Doing Business 2018 are current as of June 1, 2017. The indicators are used to analyze economic outcomes and identify what reforms of business regulation have worked, where and why.
Foreword

In its 14 years of publication, Doing Business has come a long way. At a recent international forum, I heard the leaders of India and the Russian Federation talking about how important it is for their countries to improve their Doing Business rankings and create more jobs for young workers.

When the first edition was published in September 2003, little data was available on regulation affecting business activity. Doing Business created a new approach to policy reform—one informed by hard data and focused on domestic companies. The objectives of Doing Business are as clear as they are ambitious: to inform the design of reforms and motivate these reforms through country benchmarking. Behind each set of indicators lies rigorous academic analysis, done in cooperation with leading scholars. For example, the indicators on efficient insolvency systems were created with the help of Professor Oliver Hart from Harvard University, the 2016 Nobel Prize winner in economics.\(^1\) In the years since the start of the project, over 3,000 peer-reviewed academic papers and another 7,000 working papers have been written using the Doing Business data. Their findings improve our knowledge of how economic policy works.

Since its inception—when Doing Business covered 145 economies—the scope of the report has expanded to 190 economies worldwide. The regulatory areas measured by the report have also been expanded to include more aspects that are relevant to the daily operations of domestic small and medium-size firms. For eight of the 11 Doing Business indicator sets, the report’s traditional focus on efficiency—defined as the time, cost and number of interactions necessary to incorporate a new business or connect a warehouse to the electrical grid—has been complemented with a new focus on regulatory quality. Doing Business data shows that efficiency and quality go hand in hand, reinforcing each other.

Despite these additions and improvements, one aspect of Doing Business has remained unchanged: its focus on promoting regulatory reform that strengthens the ability of the private sector to create jobs, lift people out of poverty and create more opportunities for the economy to prosper. The notion that the private sector has substantial economic, social and development impact is now universally recognized. Responsible for an estimated 90% of employment in developing economies, the private sector

---

is ideally placed to alleviate poverty by providing the opportunities to secure a good and sustainable standard of living.

Policy reforms catalyze private investment. Promoting a well-functioning private sector is a major undertaking for any government. It requires long-term policies of removing administrative barriers and strengthening laws that promote entrepreneurship.

Hard data helps do that. It gives a voice to the people to demand improved public services. It also increases government accountability. Over the past decade, more than 60 economies have established regulatory reform committees that use the Doing Business indicators. As a result, governments have reported more than 3,180 regulatory reforms, including about 920 reforms that have been inspired by Doing Business. This is true impact.

Kristalina Georgieva
Chief Executive Officer
The World Bank
Washington, DC
Overview

This year marks the 15th Doing Business report. Since the inception of the project in 2003, the global business regulatory environment has changed dramatically. Governments around the world have embraced and nurtured advances in information technology to reduce bureaucratic hurdles and increase transparency. Today, in 65 of the 190 economies covered by Doing Business, entrepreneurs can complete at least one business incorporation procedure online, compared with only nine of the 145 economies measured in Doing Business 2004. Furthermore, in 31 economies it is now possible to initiate a commercial dispute online. This kind of progress can also be observed in the other areas measured by Doing Business.

Doing Business measures aspects of business regulation and their implications for firm establishment and operations. It does not include all the issues that are relevant for businesses’ decisions, but it does cover important areas that are under the control of policy makers. Governments worldwide recognize the economic and political benefits of improved business regulation. In fact, 119 of the 190 economies measured by Doing Business 2018 enacted at least one business regulation reform in 2016/17. Of these, 79.8% implemented at least one reform for a second consecutive year and 64.7% for a third.

Business regulation can enable new ideas to come to life. When a software engineer realizes that she can develop a better and less-expensive product than is currently available, she may choose to start her own company to develop the idea. She will be more likely to become an entrepreneur in an economy where the rules governing start-ups are accessible, transparent and predictable. Conversely, in an economy where business regulation is cumbersome or ambiguous, she may be less willing to start her own company. In this case, the economy forfeits a new entrepreneur—as well as the associated capital investment and job creation. In turn, consumers have fewer, lower quality and more expensive product choices. Such a scenario highlights the way in which cumbersome regulation can distort resource allocation by stifling entrepreneurial endeavors in favor of maintaining a less optimal status quo.

Consider the case of the potential software entrepreneur. If she were a national of Canada, it would take just two procedures, one and a half days and less than 1% of income per capita to start her business in Toronto. First, she would need to file for federal incorporation and provincial registration online via Industry Canada’s Electronic Filing Centre; this costs 200 Canadian dollars ($159) and is completed within a day. Second, she would need to...

- Doing Business uses 11 indicator sets to measure aspects of business regulation that matter for entrepreneurship.
- Although good regulatory practices can be found around the world, they are most common in OECD high-income economies and the economies of Europe and Central Asia.
- Sub-Saharan Africa has the widest variation in performance among the areas measured by Doing Business, with Mauritius standing at 25 in the ranking and Somalia at 190.
- South Asia is the only region not represented in the top 50 ranking for ease of doing business. However, India stands out this year as one of the 10 economies that improved the most in the areas measured by Doing Business.
- The regions with the highest share of reforming economies in Doing Business 2018 are Europe and Central Asia, South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Crises are opportunities for reform; economies are more likely to implement regulatory reforms in the areas measured by Doing Business when there is fiscal distress. Evidence shows that an economic crisis creates a stronger motivation for reform than a change of government.
- Better performance in Doing Business is associated with lower levels of unemployment and poverty.
register online for value added tax; this costs nothing and is completed within half a day. She can perform these steps online from the comfort of her home. As her business expands and becomes profitable, she would be expected to pay 20.9% of her commercial profits in taxes and contributions annually. However, if the same entrepreneur were a national of the Philippines, living in Quezon City, the business incorporation process would require 16 procedures, take 28 days and cost around 16% of income per capita. She would need to make 20 different tax and contribution payments and visit multiple agencies in person. Furthermore, her business would be expected to pay 42.9% of its commercial profits in taxes and contributions annually. Cumbersome business regulatory structures such as these constrain the ability of entrepreneurs to transform their ideas into viable businesses.

Doing Business measures the processes for starting a business, obtaining a building permit, getting an electricity connection, transferring property, paying taxes, taking a commercial dispute to court, and resolving an insolvency case, as well as credit and equity market regulations and logistics of importing and exporting goods (figure 1.1). There are many other factors that influence firm decisions—such as the availability of skilled labor or market size—that are not captured in Doing Business. But Doing Business focuses on key areas of interaction between the government and entrepreneurs, where policy makers and regulators can directly influence procedures to facilitate these interactions. For more information on what is measured and what is not, see the chapter About Doing Business.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF IMPROVED BUSINESS REGULATION?

The 11 Doing Business indicator sets capture the effectiveness and quality of business regulation. Research findings substantiate the economic relevance of the aspects of business regulation measured by Doing Business. Recent research, for example, examines the impact of improving business regulation. One study finds that high start-up costs can result in lower overall productivity. Specifically, incumbent firms are more likely to continue operating despite poor productivity because there is little competition from new, more productive firms. In the absence of effective regulation, firms are also less inclined to leave the informal sector.¹

In addition, Doing Business measures the coverage, scope and quality of credit information available from credit registries and bureaus. When functioning well, these institutions form an essential element of an economy’s financial infrastructure by strengthening access to financial services, particularly credit. By collecting and sharing credit information, such agencies reduce information asymmetries, increase access to credit for small firms, lower interest rates, improve borrower discipline and strengthen bank supervision and credit risk monitoring. Indeed, a study of a credit bureau serving the equipment finance industry in the United States found that better exchange of information between lenders results in improved repayment behavior by firms, including lower incidences of delinquencies and defaults. This impact was stronger for firms that typically lack

---

¹ The word “improved” in the context of the business regulation index does not necessarily mean “good” in a moral sense. It means that the regulatory settings are more predictable, efficient, and transparent. The index captures the cost and time associated with regulatory procedures and compares them across countries and over time.
informational transparency, such as small and young firms.2

Doing Business places emphasis on the quality of legal infrastructure and the strength of legal institutions. The protecting minority investors indicator set, for example, measures the protection of minority shareholders. For businesses to secure equity finance, legal mechanisms are needed to prevent the use of corporate assets by company insiders for personal gain—especially during financial crises or times of market distress. Research has shown that during the 2008 global financial crisis, for example, companies in economies with better investor protections and stronger corporate governance experienced a smaller decrease in their market value. Conversely, firms in economies with weak legal structures saw a more significant decline in value.3

The Doing Business indicators on resolving insolvency provide evidence of a strong relationship between regulatory quality and efficient outcomes. The indicator set measures the quality of regulation as the recovery rate for secured creditors and the extent to which domestic law has incorporated certain internationally-accepted principles on liquidation and reorganization proceedings. Efficient outcomes occur when viable businesses are given a chance to survive, while loss-prone, inefficient firms exit the market, putting resources to better use elsewhere in the economy. In the absence of strong legal bankruptcy legislation, however, the balance between firm survival and efficient exit is distorted. This distortion was highlighted by research using data from Hungary, where the majority of firms in bankruptcy were preserved and allowed to continue operating as going concerns—despite generating substantial operating losses and resulting in low recovery rates for creditors. The main cause of this distortion was the inadequate allocation of control rights between secured and unsecured creditors, which decreased the recovery value by not allowing creditors to take important decisions related to the company assets during insolvency procedures. Another cause was the establishment of a compensation scheme for agents managing bankruptcy proceedings based on assets sold and operating revenues of a firm, which created a significant increase in the cost of bankruptcy procedures and reduced creditors’ recovery rate.4

In the area of cross-border trade, Doing Business measures the effectiveness of trade logistics. Several studies have underscored the importance of port automation and efficiency for both trade facilitation and regional economic development. These studies have found that ports that are more automated require less maintenance, are more cost-effective and ensure better worker safety. Furthermore, a study of the determinants of shipping costs from Latin America to the United States found that—for most exporting economies—high transportation costs pose even greater barriers to trade than import tariffs, and that port inefficiencies significantly add to these costs. One of the most striking findings is that by improving port efficiency from the 25th to the 75th percentile, shipping costs are lowered by 12%, substantially increasing the volume of bilateral trade.5 One of the principal causes of port inefficiency is excessive regulation—precisely what Doing Business advocates to curb.

WHERE IS BUSINESS REGULATION BETTER?

The overall measure of the ease of doing business gives an indication of where it is easier for domestic small and medium-size firms to do business. Although the economies with the most business-friendly regulation in this year’s ease of doing business ranking are relatively diverse, the economies within the top 20 share some common features. Fourteen of the top 20 are OECD high-income economies; three are from Europe and Central Asia and three from East Asia and the Pacific. Eighteen of the top 20 are classified as high-income economies. The top 5 performers are New Zealand, Singapore, Denmark, the Republic of Korea and Hong Kong SAR, China. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is the only upper-middle-income economy on the list, while Georgia is the only lower-middle-income one (table 1.1). To date, no low-income economy has reached the top 20 group. However, being wealthy does not guarantee a front-runner position in the ease of doing business ranking; many high-income economies still have room for progress. Having few bureaucratic hurdles, robust legal institutions and laws and regulations that are based on international good practices is what matters most for a good performance in the ease of doing business ranking.

Among the top 20 economies, Georgia, with a ranking of 9, has implemented the highest number of business regulation reforms since the launch of Doing Business in 2003—a total of 47. With 41, FYR Macedonia has carried out the second highest number of reforms among the top 20. During the same period, Latvia and Lithuania have also actively reformed their business regulatory environments, with 28 and 31 reforms respectively. Among other reforms, Lithuania has made six reforms to its business incorporation processes, five reforms to bankruptcy proceedings and four reforms to its taxation system. Many other top-ranked economies have followed this pattern of continuous reform, demonstrating that comprehensive reform efforts can lead to considerable improvements in an economy’s regulatory and business environment. Another feature that the top 20 economies have in common—albeit not measured by Doing Business—is that on average they have higher labor force participation rates and lower levels of income inequality. Indeed, the average Gini coefficient of the top 20 economies is 0.3 (with 0 representing perfect equality and 1 representing perfect inequality), compared to 0.4 for the lowest 20.7
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TABLE 1.1

Ease of doing business ranking

DB
2018
Rank Economy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64

New Zealand
Singapore
Denmark
Korea, Rep.
Hong Kong SAR, China
United States
United Kingdom
Norway
Georgia
Sweden
Macedonia, FYR
Estonia
Finland
Australia
Taiwan, China
Lithuania
Ireland
Canada
Latvia
Germany
United Arab Emirates
Austria
Iceland
Malaysia
Mauritius
Thailand
Poland
Spain
Portugal
Czech Republic
France
Netherlands
Switzerland
Japan
Russian Federation
Kazakhstan
Slovenia
Belarus
Slovak Republic
Kosovo
Rwanda
Montenegro
Serbia
Moldova
Romania
Italy
Armenia
Hungary
Mexico
Bulgaria
Croatia
Belgium
Cyprus
Israel
Chile
Brunei Darussalam
Azerbaijan
Peru
Colombia
Turkey
Costa Rica
Mongolia
Luxembourg
Puerto Rico (U.S.)

DTF
score

DTF
change

DB
2018
Rank

86.55
84.57
84.06
83.92
83.44
82.54
82.22
82.16
82.04
81.27
81.18
80.80
80.37
80.14
80.07
79.87
79.51
79.29
79.26
79.00
78.73
78.54
78.50
78.43
77.54
77.44฀
77.30
77.02
76.84
76.27
76.13
76.03
75.92
75.68
75.50
75.44
75.42
75.06
74.90
73.49
73.40
73.18
73.13
73.00
72.87
72.70
72.51
72.39
72.27
71.91
71.70
71.69
71.63
71.42
71.22
70.60
70.19
69.45
69.41
69.14
69.13
69.03
69.01
68.85

-0.18
+0.04
-0.01
0.00
+0.29
-0.01
-0.12
-0.25
+2.12
+0.03
-0.21
+0.05
-0.11
0.00
+0.41
+1.05
-0.19
-0.09
-0.79
-0.19
+1.87
-0.15
+0.01
+0.96
+2.09
+5.68
+0.18
0.00
-0.14
+0.03
-0.06
+0.51
+0.19
+0.07
+0.81
+1.06
+0.99
+0.55
-0.25
+4.98
+3.21
+1.64
+0.26
+0.20
+0.17
+1.15
+0.59
+0.26
+0.18
+0.10
+0.05
-0.23
-0.49
+0.05
+0.37
+5.83
+3.12
+0.01
-0.11
+1.16
+1.23
+1.27
+0.35
+0.05

65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128

Economy

DTF
score

DTF
change

Albania
Bahrain
Greece
Vietnam
Morocco
Jamaica
Oman
Indonesia
El Salvador
Uzbekistan
Bhutan
Ukraine
Kyrgyz Republic
China
Panama
Kenya
Botswana
South Africa
Qatar
Malta
Zambia
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Samoa
Tunisia
Tonga
Vanuatu
St. Lucia
Saudi Arabia
San Marino
Uruguay
Seychelles
Kuwait
Guatemala
Dominica
Dominican Republic
India
Fiji
Trinidad and Tobago
Jordan
Lesotho
Nepal
Namibia
Antigua and Barbuda
Paraguay
Papua New Guinea
Malawi
Sri Lanka
Swaziland
Philippines
West Bank and Gaza
Honduras
Solomon Islands
Argentina
Ecuador
Bahamas, The
Ghana
Belize
Uganda
Tajikistan
Iran, Islamic Rep.
Brazil
Guyana
Cabo Verde
Egypt, Arab Rep.

68.70
68.13
68.02
67.93
67.91
67.27
67.20
66.47
66.42
66.33
66.27
65.75
65.70
65.29
65.27
65.15
64.94
64.89
64.86
64.72
64.50
64.20
63.89
63.58
63.43
63.08
62.88
62.50
62.47
61.99
61.41
61.23
61.18
60.96
60.93
60.76
60.74
60.68
60.58
60.42
59.95
59.94
59.63
59.18
59.04
58.94
58.86
58.82
58.74
58.68
58.46
58.13
58.11
57.83
57.47
57.24
57.11
56.94
56.86
56.48
56.45
56.28
56.24
56.22

+ 0.96
+0.01
+0.01
+2.85
-0.03
+0.57
+0.08
+2.25
+3.54
+4.46
+1.06
+1.90
+0.54
+0.40
+1.25
+2.59
+0.07
-0.08
+0.61
+0.43
+3.92
+0.42
+2.06
-0.20
+0.50
+0.02
+0.01
+2.92
-0.03
+0.35
+1.01
+1.52
-0.43
+0.34
+2.52
+4.71
+0.04
-0.19
+2.38
+0.54
+2.35
+0.54
+0.98
+0.06
+0.17
+6.33
+0.13
+0.25
+0.42
+3.80
-0.07
-0.01
+0.07
-0.01
+0.82
+0.34
+0.03
+0.42
+0.93
+0.26
+0.38
+0.39
+0.42
+0.10

DB
2018
Rank

Economy

DTF
score

DTF
change

129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190

St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Palau
Nicaragua
Barbados
Lebanon
St. Kitts and Nevis
Cambodia
Maldives
Tanzania
Mozambique
Côte d'Ivoire
Senegal
Lao PDR
Grenada
Mali
Niger
Nigeria
Gambia, The
Pakistan
Burkina Faso
Marshall Islands
Mauritania
Benin
Bolivia
Guinea
Djibouti
Togo
Kiribati
Comoros
Zimbabwe
Sierra Leone
Ethiopia
Madagascar
Cameroon
Burundi
Suriname
Algeria
Gabon
Iraq
São Tomé and Príncipe
Sudan
Myanmar
Liberia
Equatorial Guinea
Syrian Arab Republic
Angola
Guinea-Bissau
Bangladesh
Timor-Leste
Congo, Rep.
Chad
Haiti
Afghanistan
Central African Republic
Libya
Yemen, Rep.
South Sudan
Venezuela, RB
Eritrea
Somalia

55.72
55.58
55.39
55.20
54.67
54.52
54.47
54.42
54.04
54.00
53.71
53.06
53.01
52.94
52.92
52.34
52.03
51.92
51.65
51.54
51.45
50.88
50.47
50.18
49.80
49.58
48.99
48.88
48.74
48.52
48.47
48.18
47.77
47.67
47.23
46.92
46.87
46.71
46.19
44.87
44.84
44.46
44.21
43.55
41.66
41.55
41.49
41.45
40.99
40.62
39.57
38.30
38.24
37.65
36.19
34.86
33.21
33.00
32.86
30.87
22.87
19.98

+0.01
+0.46
+0.09
-0.09
-0.10
+0.18
+0.23
+0.64
+0.11
+0.97
+2.04
+3.75
+0.43
-0.11
+0.30
+2.26
+3.85
-0.01
+0.71
+0.20
+0.03
+1.56
+1.85
+0.32
+0.32
+3.99
+0.01
+0.64
-0.31
+0.47
+0.80
-0.06
+2.08
+3.05
+2.18
+0.06
+0.11
-0.01
+1.33
+0.48
+0.39
+0.17
+0.30
+3.10
+1.77
+0.08
+1.38
+0.23
+0.15
-0.07
-0.52
-0.28
+0.01
+0.22
-1.80
+0.78
+0.03
+0.06
-0.33
-0.79
+0.42
-0.31

Source: Doing Business database.
Note: The DB 2018 rankings are benchmarked to June 2017 and based on the average of each economy’s distance to frontier (DTF) scores for the 10 topics included in
the aggregate ranking. For the economies for which the data cover two cities, scores are a population-weighted average for the two cities. A positive change indicates an
improvement in the score between 2016 and 2017 (and therefore an improvement in the overall business environment as measured by Doing Business), while a negative
change indicates a deterioration and 0.00 indicates no change in the score.


What can the Doing Business 2018 data tell us about global patterns? Good regulatory practices are present in almost all of the world’s regions. Aside from 28 OECD high-income economies, the 50 highest-ranked economies include 13 from Europe and Central Asia, five from East Asia and the Pacific, two from Sub-Saharan Africa and one each from the regions of Latin America and the Caribbean and the Middle East and North Africa. Each region also has a relatively wide spectrum of strong and weak performers. Economies are ranked based on the distance to frontier score. This measure shows the distance of each economy to the “frontier,” which represents the best performance observed on each of the indicators across all economies in the Doing Business sample (box 1.1). In OECD high-income economies, for example, New Zealand, Denmark and Korea have the highest overall distance to frontier scores at 86.55, 84.06 and 83.92, respectively. Conversely, Greece, Luxembourg and Chile have the lowest scores in this group, at 68.02, 69.01 and 71.22. However, the OECD high-income group has the smallest gap between the highest and the lowest scores, of only 18.53 percentage points (figure 1.2). Sub-Saharan Africa has the widest gap (57.56 percentage points), with a regional average score of only 50.43—the lowest across all regions. Among the economies of Sub-Saharan Africa, Mauritius has the highest distance to frontier score (77.54), while Somalia the lowest (19.98).

Regional rankings across different Doing Business indicator sets also show large variations. South Asia, for example—the only region not represented in the top 50 list—scores comparatively well for starting a business, with an average distance to frontier score of 83.27. In contrast, South Asia’s regional average score for resolving insolvency is only 33.04. Indeed, Doing Business data show considerable variation in performance between economies within the same region and within the same regulatory area. Within South Asia, India has the highest score (80) for protecting minority investors compared to Afghanistan’s score of 10. Similarly, there is a substantial difference in scores between economies in the Middle East and North Africa region. Malta, for example, has a distance to frontier score for trading across borders of 91.01, while Algeria only scores 24.15. Interestingly, all regions have at least one economy in the top 20 ranking on the protecting minority investors indicators and all regions—except the OECD high-income group—have at least one economy in the bottom 20 ranking on the protecting minority investors indicators. These patterns indicate that there is further room for improvement across all regions and at all income levels.

BOX 1.1 What is the distance to frontier score?

Doing Business measures many different dimensions of business regulation. To combine measures with different units such as the number of days to obtain a construction permit and the number of procedures to start a business into a single score, Doing Business computes the distance to frontier score. The distance to frontier score captures the gap between an economy’s current performance and the best practice across the entire sample of 41 indicators across 10 Doing Business indicator sets. For example, according to the Doing Business database across all economies and over time, the least time to start a business is 0.5 days while in the worst 5% of cases it takes more than 100 days to incorporate a company. Half a day is, therefore, considered the frontier of best performance, while 100 days is the worst. Higher distance to frontier scores show absolute better ease of doing business (as the frontier is set at 100 percentage points), while lower scores show absolute poorer ease of doing business (the worst performance is set at 0 percentage points). The percentage point distance to frontier scores of an economy on different indicators are averaged to obtain an overall distance to frontier score. For more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking.

FIGURE 1.2 Where it is easier to do business and where it is more difficult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance to frontier score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

WHICH ECONOMIES IMPROVED THE MOST IN DOING BUSINESS 2018?

Doing Business 2018 captures 264 business regulation reforms across the 10 measured indicator sets. As in previous years, Sub-Saharan Africa is the region
with the highest number of reforms (83 in total), followed by East Asia and the Pacific (45) and Europe and Central Asia (44). The regions with the highest share of reforming economies are Europe and Central Asia (79%), South Asia (75%) and Sub-Saharan Africa (79%), while the OECD high-income group has the lowest share (46%). The indicator sets for starting a business and getting credit record the highest number of reforms (38 each) in 2016/17. They are closely followed by the trading across borders indicator set with 33 reforms. The least-reformed areas as captured by Doing Business continue to be the indicators with a legal focus—for example, resolving insolvency (13 reforms) and enforcing contracts (20). Legal reforms are typically slow to advance, mainly because they require long-term political commitments, substantial resources and close collaboration between multiple regulatory agencies and rulemaking institutions.

It is important to look at both the number of reforms and their impact on the distance to frontier score because they provide different information. The number of reforms indicates how many areas an economy chose to target for improvement, while the change in the distance to frontier score indicates the size of the impact those changes had on the Doing Business data. Across all economies, the average distance to frontier score increase is 0.76 percentage points, with the highest regional increase in Sub-Saharan Africa (1.18), although this region does not have the highest percentage of economies implementing at least one business regulatory reform. Nevertheless, there is a strong correlation between the number of reforms and the actual improvement in the distance to frontier score. Doing Business data show that it has become easier for small and medium-size enterprises to do business in 62.6% of economies worldwide (or 119 of the 190 economies measured by Doing Business).

While economies in the Sub-Saharan Africa region show the highest average increase in the distance to frontier score, economies in the OECD high-income group have the lowest average increase (0.11 percentage points). This is not surprising as most OECD high-income economies are already near to global good practices. The Doing Business indicator sets capturing the most business regulation reforms across regions in 2016/17 are paying taxes and trading across borders. Indeed, the reform agendas of OECD high-income and East Asia and the Pacific economies appear to be dominated by regulatory changes captured by the paying taxes indicator set (figure 1.3). Lower-middle-income economies have the highest average reform count at 1.9 reforms each; low-income economies are second highest at 1.3 reforms. Unsurprisingly, high-income economies recorded the lowest average reform count (1).

Of the 10 economies showing the most improvement in performance on the Doing Business indicators, three are from Sub-Saharan Africa, two from East Asia and the Pacific, two from Europe and Central Asia, one from Latin America and the Caribbean, one from the Middle East and North Africa and one from South Asia. Brunei Darussalam, the only high-income economy on the list of top 10 improvers, showed the largest advance toward the global good practice frontier after implementing eight reforms in 2016/17; it joins this list for the second year in a row.

FIGURE 1.3  The average number of reforms per economy is highest in South Asia but the average impact is biggest in Sub-Saharan Africa

![Graph showing the average number of reforms and change in distance to frontier score by region](image)

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The average change in the distance to frontier score shows the change between Doing Business 2018 and Doing Business 2017.
row. El Salvador, India, Malawi, Nigeria and Thailand also made impressive strides and joined the 10 top improvers for the first time. Among top improvers, Brunei Darussalam, India and Thailand implemented the highest number of business regulation reforms in 2016/17, with eight reforms each. The remaining four economies in the list of top improvers are: Kosovo, Uzbekistan, Zambia and Djibouti. For details on the reforms these countries undertook, see the chapter on reforming the business environment in 2016/17.

The database of Doing Business reforms indicates differences in reform momentum, both within topics and across regions. Why are reforms more common in some years than others? When do economies tend to reform in the areas covered in Doing Business? Two main theories explain the timing of regulatory reform. The first suggests that economies reform when they must—that is, when there is no choice but to implement a regulatory change. In this case, an increase in reforms would be more likely during crises.7 A second theory argues that economies reform when they can—that is, when governments are recently elected and are in the “honeymoon period.”10

Doing Business data can be used to explore which theory is more likely to hold true in practice. Recent research shows that governments are more likely to reform business regulation when their economy is experiencing a fiscal crisis.11 This is particularly true for regulation concerning resolving insolvency, which showed a spike in reform activity in 2010/11,12 a couple of years after the 2008/09 financial crisis. The reason is that these kinds of reforms take time to be implemented and captured by Doing Business (figure 1.4). However, the effect of fiscal crises on reform intensity is less robust when public debt is lower. When a fiscal crisis can be solved—albeit temporarily—by increasing borrowing, the need for reform becomes less urgent. In contrast, the “honeymoon” theory of reforms has less evidence to support it. In general, political change is not associated with more reform unless the political change takes place after the fiscal crisis. Indeed, economies tend to reform when they must, rather than when they can.

WHAT IMPACT DOES BUSINESS REGULATION HAVE ON EMPLOYMENT AND POVERTY?

Many factors explain poverty. These can include vulnerability to natural disasters, remoteness, quality of governance, property rights, availability of infrastructure and services, proximity to markets, social relationships, the gender of the head of household, employment status, hours worked, property owned and educational attainment.13 Several of these factors have a direct link to the areas measured in Doing Business since the Doing Business indicators measure factors such as the quality of governance and property rights. Furthermore, Doing Business can have an indirect link to these factors as improvements to business regulation can drive additional job creation. And ultimately, as a reliable source of income, employment can lift people out of poverty.

Reforming in the areas measured by Doing Business can be particularly beneficial to employment creation when those reforms take place in the areas of starting a business and labor market regulation.14 Such an assertion, however, is made with some caveats from other research exploring causal relationships between business entry regulation and job creation.15 Nonetheless, one of the mechanisms through which business regulation can impact employment directly is the simplification of business start-up regulations. Across economies there is a significant positive association between employment growth and the distance to frontier score (figure 1.5). While this result shows an association, and cannot be interpreted in a causal fashion, it is reassuring to see that economies with better business regulation, as measured by Doing Business, also tend to be the economies that are creating more job opportunities.16 When it comes to unemployment, the expected opposite result is evident. Economies with less streamlined business regulation are those with higher levels of unemployment on average. In fact, a one-point improvement in the distance to frontier score is associated with a 0.02 percentage point decline in unemployment growth rate.17
Doing Business 2017 reported that there is a negative association between the Gini index, which measures income inequality within an economy, and the distance to frontier score. Economies with poor quality business regulation have higher levels of income inequality on average. This relationship can be partially explained by the strong association between measures of poverty and the distance to frontier score. When business regulation is overly cumbersome, entrepreneurs and workers are pushed out of the formal sector and must resort to operating in the informal sector. The informal sector is characterized by a lack of regulation, minimal social protection and increased levels of poverty. Individuals living in poverty are likely to gain the most from smarter and more streamlined business regulation. When bureaucratic hurdles are high, only the most privileged members of society can get things done, either through hiring third parties or paying bribes. In economies with complex company incorporation processes, for example, entrepreneurs tend to hire lawyers to assist with the process of registering their businesses.

The data support this interpretation as there is a strong association between inequality, poverty and business regulation. In fact, economies with better business regulation have lower levels of poverty on average. Indeed, a 10 percentage point improvement in the distance to frontier is associated with a 2 percentage point reduction in the poverty rate, measured as the percentage of people earning less than $1.90 a day. Frailty is also a factor linked to poverty. However, even fragile economies can improve in areas that ultimately reduce poverty levels. Despite their fragile status, several economies implemented reforms as captured by Doing Business 2018 (box 1.2). The case study on dealing with construction permits analyzes private sector participation in construction regulation. It demonstrates that economies which employ some form of private sector involvement in construction regulation tend to have more efficient processes and better quality controls. However, they also exhibit higher costs and a propensity for conflicts of interest. Finally, the case study on resolving insolvency discusses three successful insolvency reforms—in France, Slovenia and Thailand—and the lessons learned that are transferable to other economies.

**FIGURE 1.5** Better business regulation is associated with employment growth and poorer regulation with higher unemployment

![Figure 1.5](image)


Note: The relationships are significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita. The left-hand side relationship also holds when using employment growth rate and distance to frontier average score between 2010 and 2015.
Fragile states, often characterized by weak governance, residual violence, concentrated poverty and inequality, face myriad development and humanitarian challenges. Depleted human capital, minimal rule of law and violence all contribute to significant—and often extreme—rates of poverty in fragile states. While fragile states are not home to the majority of the world’s poor, the poor are disproportionately located in fragile states, underscoring the need to address poverty in these economies. In poor and fragile states, the private sector is often constrained by a lack of infrastructure, political instability, high rates of informality and poor business skills. Private sector job creation is one of the factors that can diminish the incentives to engage in violence, thereby reducing both fragility and poverty.

*Doing Business* data show that fragile economies are reforming and approaching crises as opportunities for better business regulations. As a result, the gap with non-fragile economies in some areas of business regulation has been narrowing over time (see figure). In 2016/17, of the 34 economies classified as most vulnerable by the World Bank Group’s 2017 Harmonized List of Fragile Situations, 14 implemented at least one business regulation reform and six economies implemented two reforms or more. Getting credit was the most reformed area of business regulation, accounting for eight of the 24 reforms implemented by this group. Djibouti recorded five reforms, the highest number among all fragile states. Djibouti reduced the fees associated with starting a business and construction inspections, implemented decennial liability for all professionals involved in construction projects, increased the transparency of its land administration system and established a new credit information system. As a result of these reforms, Djibouti’s distance to frontier score improved by 3.79 percentage points.

Kosovo, the second most-reformed country in the fragile states group, implemented three business regulation reforms. Iraq, Madagascar, Myanmar, and Sierra Leone made two reforms each in 2016/17. Iraq simplified the process of starting a business by combining multiple registration procedures and reducing the time to register a company. It also launched a new credit registry, improving access to credit information. Similarly, Myanmar adopted a regulation that allows the creation of credit bureaus, while Madagascar increased the coverage of its credit registry. Kosovo and Liberia undertook reforms in the area of resolving insolvency in 2016/17. Both of these economies introduced a legal framework for corporate insolvency, making liquidation and reorganization procedures available to debtors and creditors.

---

**Source:** *Doing Business* database.

**Note:** Fragile states are classified based on the World Bank Group’s Harmonized List of Fragile Situations for fiscal year 2017. The sample includes 174 economies where data is available back to *Doing Business* 2006.

---

d. The harmonized list also includes Tuvalu, the only economy from the list that is not measured by *Doing Business.*
NOTES

1. Moscoso Boedo and Mukoyama 2012.
6. The Gini coefficient, the most commonly-used measure of inequality, is a measure of statistical dispersion intended to represent the income or wealth distribution of an economy’s residents.
7. The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.
8. The correlation between the number of reforms and the actual improvement in the distance to frontier score is 0.57.
12. The second peak is explained by substantial business regulation reforms undertaken by the 17 member states of the Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa, known by its French acronym OHADA. The organization adopted a revised Uniform Act Organizing Collective Proceedings for Wiping Off Debts in 2015, which introduced a simplified preventive settlement procedure for small companies and a new reconciliation procedure for companies facing financial difficulties, encouraging an agreement between a debtor and its main creditors. The OHADA Uniform Act also introduced provisions on cross-border insolvency that were implemented in all 17 OHADA member states.
16. The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.
17. The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita and population size; it is shown in figure 1.5.
20. Loayza and Serven 2010.

This association is significant when using the following indicator sets individually: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting credit and enforcing contracts. The relationship holds after controlling for income per capita and government expenditure.
About Doing Business

The foundation of Doing Business is the notion that economic activity benefits from clear and coherent rules: rules that set out and clarify property rights and facilitate the resolution of disputes. And rules that enhance the predictability of economic interactions and provide contractual partners with essential protections against arbitrariness and abuse. Such rules are much more effective in shaping the incentives of economic agents in ways that promote growth and development where they are reasonably efficient in design, are transparent and accessible to those for whom they are intended and can be implemented at a reasonable cost. The quality of the rules also has a crucial bearing on how societies distribute the benefits and finance the costs of development strategies and policies.

Good rules create an environment where new entrants with drive and good ideas can get started in business and where good firms can invest, expand and create new jobs. The role of government policy in the daily operations of domestic small and medium-size firms is a central focus of the Doing Business data. The objective is to encourage regulation that is designed to be efficient, accessible to all and simple to implement. Onerous regulation diverts the energies of entrepreneurs away from developing their businesses. But regulation that is efficient, transparent and implemented in a simple way facilitates business expansion and innovation, and makes it easier for aspiring entrepreneurs to compete on an equal footing.

Doing Business measures aspects of business regulation for domestic firms through an objective lens. The focus of the project is on small and medium-size companies in the largest business city of an economy. Based on standardized case studies, Doing Business presents quantitative indicators on the regulations that apply to firms at different stages of their life cycle. The results for each economy can be compared with those for 189 other economies and over time.

**FACTORS DOING BUSINESS MEASURES**

Doing Business captures several important dimensions of the regulatory environment as it applies to local firms. It provides quantitative indicators on regulation for starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, getting credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency (table 2.1). Doing Business also measures features of labor market regulation. Although Doing Business does not present rankings of economies on the labor market regulation indicators or include the topic in the aggregate distance to frontier score or ranking on the ease of doing business, it does present the data for these indicators.

- **Doing Business** measures aspects of business regulation affecting domestic small and medium-size firms defined based on standardized case scenarios and located in the largest business city of each economy. In addition, for 11 economies a second city is covered.

- **Doing Business** covers 11 areas of business regulation across 190 economies. Ten of these areas—starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, getting credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency—are included in the distance to frontier score and ease of doing business ranking. Doing Business also measures features of labor market regulation, which is not included in these two measures.

- **Doing Business** relies on four main sources of information: the relevant laws and regulations, Doing Business respondents, the governments of the economies covered and the World Bank Group regional staff.

- More than 43,000 professionals in 190 economies have assisted in providing the data that inform the Doing Business indicators over the past 15 years.

- **Doing Business** data are widely used by governments, researchers, international organizations and think tanks to guide policies, conduct research and develop new indexes.
How the indicators are selected

The design of the Doing Business indicators has been informed by theoretical insights gleaned from extensive research and the literature on the role of institutions in enabling economic development.\(^1\) In addition, the background papers developing the methodology for each of the Doing Business indicator sets have established the importance of the rules and regulations that Doing Business focuses on for such economic outcomes as trade volumes, foreign direct investment, market capitalization in stock exchanges and private credit as a percentage of GDP.\(^2\)

The choice of the 11 sets of Doing Business indicators has also been guided by economic research and firm-level data, specifically data from the World Bank Enterprise Surveys.\(^3\) These surveys provide data highlighting the main obstacles to business activity as reported by entrepreneurs in more than 131,000 companies in 139 economies. Access to finance and access to electricity, for example, are among the factors identified by the surveys as important to businesses—inspiring the design of the Doing Business indicators on getting credit and getting electricity.

Some Doing Business indicators give a higher score for more regulation and better-functioning institutions (such as courts or credit bureaus). Higher scores are given for stricter disclosure requirements for related-party transactions, for example, in the area of protecting minority investors. Higher scores are also given for a simplified way of applying regulation that keeps compliance costs for firms low—such as by easing the burden of business start-up formalities with a one-stop shop or through a single online portal. Finally, Doing Business scores reward economies that apply a risk-based approach to regulation as a way to address social and environmental concerns—such as by imposing a greater regulatory burden on activities that pose a high risk to the population and a lesser one on lower-risk activities. Thus, the economies that rank highest on the ease of doing business are not those where there is no regulation—but those where governments have managed to create rules that facilitate interactions in the marketplace without needlessly hindering the development of the private sector.

The distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking

To provide different perspectives on the data, Doing Business presents data both for individual indicators and for two aggregate measures: the distance to frontier score and the ease of doing business ranking. The distance to frontier score aids in assessing the absolute level of regulatory performance and how it improves over time. This measure shows the distance of each economy to the “frontier,” which represents the best performance observed on each of the indicators across all economies in the Doing Business sample since 2005 or the third year in which data were collected for the indicator. The frontier is set at the highest possible value for indicators calculated as scores, such as the strength of legal rights index or the quality of land administration index. This underscores the gap between a particular economy’s performance and the best performance at any point in time and is used to assess the absolute change in the economy’s regulatory environment over time as measured by Doing Business. The distance to frontier is first computed for each topic and then averaged across all topics to compute the aggregate distance to frontier score. The ranking on the ease of doing business complements the distance to frontier score by providing information about an economy’s performance in business regulation relative to the performance of other economies as measured by Doing Business.

Doing Business uses a simple averaging approach for weighting component indicators, calculating rankings and determining the distance to frontier score.\(^4\) Each topic covered by Doing Business relates to a different aspect of the business regulatory environment. The distance to frontier scores and rankings of each economy vary, often considerably, across topics, indicating that a strong performance by an economy in one area of regulation can coexist with weak performance in another (figure 2.1). One way to assess the variability of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator set</th>
<th>What is measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>Procedures, time, cost and paid-in minimum capital to start a limited liability company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Procedures, time and cost to complete all formalities to build a warehouse and the quality control and safety mechanisms in the construction permitting system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>Procedures, time and cost to get connected to the electrical grid, the reliability of the electricity supply and the transparency of tariffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>Procedures, time and cost to transfer a property and the quality of the land administration system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>Movable collateral laws and credit information systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>Minority shareholders’ rights in related-party transactions and in corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>Payments, time and total tax and contribution rate for a firm to comply with all tax regulations as well as post-filing processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>Time and cost to export the product of comparative advantage and import auto parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Time and cost to resolve a commercial dispute and the quality of judicial processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>Time, cost, outcome and recovery rate for a commercial insolvency and the strength of the legal framework for insolvency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market regulation</td>
<td>Flexibility in employment regulation and aspects of job quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An economy’s regulatory performance is to look at its distance to frontier scores across topics (see the country tables). Morocco, for example, has an overall distance to frontier score of 67.91, meaning that it is about two-thirds of the way from the worst to the best performance. Its distance to frontier score is 92.46 for starting a business, 85.72 for paying taxes and 81.12 for trading across borders. At the same time, it has a distance to frontier score of 34.03 for resolving insolvency, 45 for getting credit and 58.33 for protecting minority investors.

**FACTORS DOING BUSINESS DOES NOT MEASURE**

Many important policy areas are not covered by Doing Business; even within the areas it covers its scope is narrow (table 2.2). Doing Business does not measure the full range of factors, policies and institutions that affect the quality of an economy’s business environment or its national competitiveness. It does not, for example, capture aspects of macroeconomic stability, development of the financial system, market size, the incidence of bribery and corruption or the quality of the labor force. The focus is deliberately narrow even within the relatively small set of indicators included in Doing Business. The time and cost required for the logistical process of exporting and importing goods is captured in the trading across borders indicators, for example, but they do not measure the cost of tariffs or of international transport. Doing Business provides a narrow perspective on the infrastructure challenges that firms face, particularly in the developing world, through these indicators. It does not address the extent to which inadequate roads, rail, ports and communications may add to firms’ costs and undermine competitiveness (except to the extent that the trading across borders indicators indirectly measure the quality of ports and border connections). Similar to the indicators on trading across borders, all aspects of commercial legislation are not covered by those on starting a business or protecting minority investors. And while Doing Business measures only a few aspects within each area that it covers, business regulation reforms should not focus only on these aspects, because those that it does not measure are also important.

Doing Business does not attempt to quantify all costs and benefits of a particular law or regulation to society as a whole. The paying taxes indicators measure the tax and contribution rate, which, in isolation, is a cost to businesses. However, the indicators do not measure—nor are they intended to measure—the benefits of the social and economic programs funded with tax revenues. Measuring the quality and efficiency of business regulation provides only one input into the debate on the regulatory burden associated with achieving regulatory objectives, which can differ across economies. Doing Business provides

**TABLE 2.2 Examples of areas not covered by Doing Business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macroeconomic stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the financial system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of bribery and corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a starting point for this discussion and should be used in conjunction with other data sources.

**ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY**

The Doing Business methodology is designed to be an easily replicable way to benchmark specific aspects of business regulation. Its advantages and limitations should be understood when using the data (table 2.3).

Ensuring comparability of the data across a global set of economies is a central consideration for the Doing Business indicators, which are developed using standardized case scenarios with specific assumptions. One such assumption is the location of a standardized business—the subject of the Doing Business case study—in the largest business city of the economy. The reality is that business regulations and their enforcement may differ within a country, particularly in federal states and large economies. But gathering data for every relevant jurisdiction in each of the 190 economies covered by Doing Business is infeasible. Nevertheless, where policy makers are interested in generating data at the local level, beyond the largest business city, and learning from local good practices, Doing Business has complemented its global indicators with subnational studies (box 2.1). Also, coverage was extended to the second largest business city in economies with a population of more than 100 million (as of 2013) in Doing Business 2015.

Doing Business recognizes the limitations of the standardized case scenarios and assumptions. But while such assumptions come at the expense of generality, they also help to ensure the comparability of data. Some Doing Business topics are complex, and so it is important that the standardized cases are defined carefully. For example, the standardized case scenario usually involves a limited liability company or its legal equivalent. There are two reasons for this assumption. First, private limited liability companies are the most prevalent business form (for firms with more than one owner) in many economies around the world. Second, this choice reflects the focus of Doing Business on expanding opportunities for entrepreneurship: investors are encouraged to venture into business when potential losses are limited to their capital participation.

Another assumption underlying the Doing Business indicators is that entrepreneurs have knowledge of and comply with applicable regulations. In practice, entrepreneurs may not be aware of what needs to be done or how to comply with regulations and may lose considerable time trying to find out. Alternatively, they may intentionally avoid compliance—by not registering for social security, for example. Firms may opt for bribery and other informal arrangements intended to bypass the rules where regulation is particularly onerous—an aspect that helps explain differences between the de jure data provided by Doing Business and the de facto insights offered by the World Bank Enterprise Surveys. Levels of informality tend to be higher in economies with particularly burdensome regulation. Compared with their formal sector counterparts, firms in the informal sector typically grow more slowly, have poorer access to credit and employ fewer workers—and these workers remain outside the protections of labor law and, more generally, other legal protections embedded in the law. Firms in the informal sector are also less likely to pay taxes. Doing Business measures one set of factors that help explain the occurrence of informality and provides policy makers with insights into potential areas of regulatory reform.

| TABLE 2.3 Advantages and limitations of the Doing Business methodology |
|---|---|---|
| **Feature** | **Advantages** | **Limitations** |
| Use of standardized case scenarios | Makes data comparable across economies and methodology transparent | Reduces scope of data; only regulatory reforms in areas measured can be systematically tracked |
| Focus on largest business city* | Makes data collection manageable (cost-effective) and data comparable | Reduces representativeness of data for an economy if there are significant differences across locations |
| Focus on domestic and formal sector | Keeps attention on formal sector—where regulations are relevant and firms are most productive | Unable to reflect reality for informal sector—important where that is large—or for foreign firms facing a different set of constraints |
| Reliance on expert respondents | Ensures that data reflect knowledge of those with most experience in conducting types of transactions measured | Indicators less able to capture variation in experiences among entrepreneurs |
| Focus on the law | Makes indicators “actionable”—because the law is what policy makers can change | Where systematic compliance with the law is lacking, regulatory changes will not achieve full results desired |

* In economies with a population of more than 100 million as of 2013, Doing Business covers business regulation in both the largest and second largest business city.

**DATA COLLECTION IN PRACTICE**

The Doing Business data are based on a detailed reading of domestic laws and regulations as well as administrative requirements. The report covers 190 economies—including some of the smallest and poorest economies, for which little or no data are available from other sources. The data are collected through several rounds of communication with expert respondents (both private sector practitioners and government officials), through responses to questionnaires, conference calls, written correspondence and visits by the team. Doing Business relies on four main sources of information: the relevant laws and regulations, Doing Business respondents, the governments of the economies covered and the World Bank Group regional staff (figure 2.2). For a
BOX 2.1 Subnational Doing Business indicators: regional-level benchmarking in the European Union

Subnational Doing Business studies point to differences in business regulation and its implementation—as well as in the pace of regulatory reform—across locations in a single economy or region. For several economies, subnational studies are now periodically updated to measure change over time or to expand geographic coverage to additional cities. Six economies completed subnational studies this year: Afghanistan, Colombia, three EU member states (Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania) and Kazakhstan. In addition, an ongoing study updated data for Nigeria.

With funding from the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO), the first of a series of new subnational reports was launched focusing on the European Union member states. Doing Business in the European Union 2017: Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania builds on subnational studies completed in Italy, Spain and Poland. The next study in the subnational series will cover Croatia, the Czech Republic, Portugal and the Slovak Republic.

These studies will provide valuable input to individual country reports produced for the European Semester, the European Union’s economic and fiscal policy coordination framework, and will be closely linked with the Lagging Regions initiative launched by the European Commission in June 2015, which studies constraints to growth and investment in the European Union’s low-income and low-growth regions.

Doing Business in the European Union 2017: Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania goes beyond the largest business cities of Sofia, Budapest and Bucharest to benchmark an additional 19 locations. In total, the study measures business regulation in 22 locations—six in Bulgaria, seven in Hungary and nine in Romania. The study benchmarks the locations using five Doing Business indicator sets: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property and enforcing contracts.

The study finds that there are locations in each economy that outperform the EU average in at least one area. In Bulgaria, for example, Varna and Pleven outperform the EU average on the starting a business indicators. This is also the case in Pecs and Szeged (Hungary), which outperform the EU average on the dealing with construction permits indicators. All Hungarian cities and Oradea (Romania) perform above the EU average for registering property; most locations also do so for enforcing contracts. However, none of the subnational locations surveyed came close to the EU average on the indicators for getting electricity.

While no single location excels in all five areas covered by the study, most demonstrate a noteworthy performance in at least one area, providing reform-minded officials with examples of existing good practices that can be replicated. For example, Bulgarian cities could make starting a business easier by adopting the good practices observed in Varna. Cities in Hungary could make it easier to get electricity by emulating the good practices of Szeged and Szekesfehervar. And Romanian cities could strengthen their own contract enforcement regimes by studying the example of Timisoara. The study, which also includes comparisons with 187 other economies worldwide, provides practical recommendations and showcases good practices for improving the business environment.

FIGURE 2.2 How Doing Business collects and verifies the data

|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-------|------|

**Data collection and analysis**
- The Doing Business team distributes the questionnaires and analyzes the relevant laws and regulations along with the information in the questionnaires.
- The Doing Business team travels to approximately 30 economies.
- The Doing Business team engages in conference calls, video conferences and in-person meetings with government officials and private sector practitioners.
- Governments and World Bank Group regional teams submit information on regulatory changes that could potentially be included in the global count of regulatory reforms.

**Data verification**
- The Doing Business team shares preliminary information on reforms with World Bank Group regional teams for their feedback.
- The Doing Business team analyzes the data and writes the report. Comments on the report and data are received from across the World Bank Group through an internal review process.

**Report launch**
- The report is published, followed by media outreach and findings dissemination.

* The Doing Business team updates the questionnaires and consults with internal and external experts.
detailed explanation of the Doing Business methodology, see the data notes.

**Relevant laws and regulations**

The Doing Business indicators are based mostly on laws and regulations: approximately two-thirds of the data embedded in the Doing Business indicators are based on a reading of the law. In addition to filling out questionnaires, Doing Business respondents submit references to the relevant laws, regulations and fee schedules. The Doing Business team collects the texts of the relevant laws and regulations and checks the questionnaire responses for accuracy. The team will examine the civil procedure code, for example, to check the maximum number of adjournments in a commercial court dispute, and read the insolvency code to identify if the debtor can initiate liquidation or reorganization proceedings. These and other types of laws are available on the Doing Business law library website. Since the data collection process involves an annual update of an established database, having a very large sample of respondents is not strictly necessary. In principle, the role of the contributors is largely advisory—helping the Doing Business team to locate and understand the laws and regulations. There are quickly diminishing returns to an expanded pool of contributors. This notwithstanding, the number of contributors rose by 60% between 2010 and 2017. Extensive consultations with multiple contributors are conducted by the team to minimize measurement error for the rest of the data. For some indicators—for example, those on dealing with construction permits, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency—the time component and part of the cost component (where fee schedules are lacking) are based on actual practice rather than the law on the books. This introduces a degree of judgment by respondents on what actual practice looks like. When respondents disagree, the time indicators reported by Doing Business represent the median values of several responses given under the assumptions of the standardized case (box 2.2).

---

**BOX 2.2 Where is the implementation of regulation more predictable and does it matter?**

Doing Business measures the median duration of each procedure or process individually across the different indicator sets with time components. However, in practice, the time it takes to complete the same transaction can differ significantly from one entrepreneur to another. Because entrepreneurs place a premium on reliability and low risk, this variability in time can have important implications.

This year, Doing Business sets out to better understand these differences for the eight indicators with a time component, namely starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency. To do so, Doing Business collected data estimating the time to complete a procedure in both the best and worst case scenarios in an economy. The data show that in Spain, for example, a commercial dispute trial takes 280 days on average in a normal case, but can range from 180 days to 550 days depending on the individual circumstances.

The data show that—across the eight Doing Business indicators mentioned above—high-income economies have lower time variability and, therefore, more predictable regulatory environments than low- or middle-income economies (see figure below for an example). In addition, the data confirm that the median is very much at the center of the time distribution. In the United Kingdom, for example, the median time for dealing with construction permits is 90 days. The worst case scenario is 120 days and the best case scenario is 60 days, meaning that the distribution is centered around the median plus or minus 30 days.

---

**High-income economies have the smallest difference between the best and worst case scenario time estimates**

---

*Source: Doing Business database.*

(continued)
More than 43,000 professionals in 190 economies have assisted in providing the data that inform the Doing Business indicators over the past 15 years. This year’s report draws on the inputs of more than 13,000 professionals. The Doing Business website shows the number of respondents for each economy and each indicator set.

Selected on the basis of their expertise in these areas, respondents are professionals who routinely administer or advise on the legal and regulatory requirements in the specific areas covered by Doing Business. Because of the focus on legal and regulatory arrangements, most of the respondents are legal professionals such as lawyers, judges or notaries. In addition, officials of the credit bureau or registry complete the credit information questionnaire. Accountants, architects, engineers, freight forwarders and other professionals answer the questionnaires related to paying taxes, dealing with construction permits, trading across borders and getting electricity. Information that is incorporated into the indicators is also provided by certain public officials (such as registrars from the company or property registry).

The Doing Business approach is to work with legal practitioners or other professionals who regularly undertake the transactions involved. Following the standard methodological approach for time-and-motion studies, Doing Business breaks down each process or transaction, such as starting a business or registering a building, into separate steps to ensure a better estimate of time. The time estimate for each step is given by practitioners with significant and routine experience in the transaction.

There are two main reasons that Doing Business does not survey firms. The first relates to the frequency with which firms engage in the transactions captured by the indicators, which is generally low. For example, a firm goes through the startup process once in its existence, while an incorporation lawyer may carry out 10 such transactions each month. The incorporation lawyers and other experts providing information to Doing Business are therefore better able to assess the process of starting a business than are individual firms. They also have access to current regulations and practices, while a firm may have faced a different set of rules when incorporating years before. The second reason is that the Doing Business questionnaires mostly gather legal information, which firms are unlikely to be fully familiar with. For example, few firms will know about all the main legal procedures involved in resolving a commercial dispute through the courts, even if they have gone through the process themselves. But a litigation lawyer should have little difficulty in providing the requested information on all the procedures.

Governments and World Bank Group regional staff

After receiving the completed questionnaires from the Doing Business
respondents, verifying the information against the law and conducting follow-up inquiries to ensure that all relevant information is captured, the Doing Business team shares the preliminary descriptions of regulatory reforms with governments (through the World Bank Group’s Board of Executive Directors) and regional staff of the World Bank Group. Through this process, government authorities and World Bank Group staff working on the economies covered by Doing Business can alert the team about, for example, regulatory reforms not reported by the respondents or additional achievements of regulatory reforms. The Doing Business team can then turn to the local private sector experts for further consultation and, as needed, corroboration. In addition, the team responds formally to the comments of governments or regional staff and provides explanations of the scoring decisions.

Data adjustments
Information on data corrections is provided in the data notes and on the Doing Business website. A transparent complaint procedure allows anyone to challenge the data. From November 2016 to October 2017 the team received and responded to over 180 queries on the data.

USES OF THE DOING BUSINESS DATA

Doing Business was designed with two main types of users in mind: policy makers and researchers. It is a tool that governments can use to design sound business regulatory policies. Nevertheless, the Doing Business data are limited in scope and should be complemented with other sources of information. Doing Business focuses on a few specific rules relevant to the specific case studies analyzed. These rules and case studies are chosen to be illustrative of the business regulatory environment, but they are not a comprehensive description of that environment. By providing a unique data set that enables analysis aimed at better understanding the role of business regulation in economic development, Doing Business is also an important source of information for researchers.

Governments and policy makers
Doing Business offers policy makers a benchmarking tool useful in stimulating policy debate, both by exposing potential challenges and by identifying good practices and lessons learned. Despite the narrow focus of the indicators, the initial debate in an economy on the results they highlight typically turns into a deeper discussion on areas where business regulatory reform is needed, including areas well beyond those measured by Doing Business. In economies where subnational studies are conducted, the Doing Business indicators go one step further in offering policy makers a tool to identify good practices that can be adopted within their economies (box 2.1).

Many Doing Business indicators can be considered “actionable.” For example, governments can set the minimum capital requirement for new firms, invest in company and property registries to increase their efficiency, or improve the efficiency of tax administration by adopting the latest technology to facilitate the preparation, filing and payment of taxes by the business community. And they can undertake court reforms to shorten delays in the enforcement of contracts. But some Doing Business indicators capture procedures, time and costs that involve private sector participants, such as lawyers, notaries, architects, electricians or freight forwarders. Governments may have little influence in the short run over the fees these professions charge, though much can be achieved by strengthening professional licensing regimes and preventing anticompetitive behavior. And governments have no control over the geographic location of their economy, a factor that can adversely affect businesses.

While many Doing Business indicators are actionable, this does not necessarily mean that they are all “action-worthy” in a particular context. Business regulatory reforms are only one element of a strategy aimed at improving competitiveness and establishing a solid foundation for sustainable economic growth. There are many other important goals to pursue—such as effective management of public finances, adequate attention to education and training, adoption of the latest technologies to boost economic productivity and the quality of public services, and appropriate regard for air and water quality to safeguard public health. Governments must decide what set of priorities best suits their needs. To say that governments should work toward a sensible set of rules for private sector activity (as embodied, for example, in the Doing Business indicators) does not suggest that doing so should come at the expense of other worthy policy goals.

Over the past decade governments have increasingly turned to Doing Business as a repository of actionable, objective data providing unique insights into good practices worldwide as they have come to understand the importance of business regulation as a driving force of competitiveness. To ensure the coordination of efforts across agencies, economies such as Colombia, Malaysia and the Russian Federation have formed regulatory reform committees. These committees use the Doing Business indicators as one input to inform their programs for improving the business environment. More than 60 other economies have also formed such committees. In East Asia and the Pacific, they include Brunei Darussalam; Indonesia; the Republic of Korea; the Philippines; Taiwan, China; and Thailand. In the Middle East and North Africa: the Arab Republic of Egypt, Kuwait, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. In South Asia: Bangladesh, India and Pakistan. In Europe and Central Asia: Albania, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, the Kyrgyz Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. In Sub-Saharan Africa: Benin,
burundi, the comoros, the democratic republic of congo, the republic of congo, côte d’ivoire, guinea, guinea-bissau, kenya, liberia, malawi, mali, mauritius, niger, nigeria, rwanda, senegal, sierra leone, sudan, tanzania, togo, zambia and zimbabwe. and in latin america and the caribbean: argentina, brazil, chile, costa rica, the dominican republic, guatemala, jamaica, mexico, nicaragua, panama, peru and st. lucia. since 2003, governments have reported more than 3,180 regulatory reforms, about 920 of which have been informed by doing business.

many economies share knowledge on the regulatory reform process related to the areas measured by doing business. among the most common venues for this knowledge sharing are peer-to-peer learning events—workshops where officials from different governments across a region or even across the globe meet to discuss the challenges of regulatory reform and to share their experiences.

think tanks and other research organizations

doing business data are widely used by think tanks and other research organizations, both for the development of new indexes and to produce research papers. many research papers have shown the importance of business regulation and how it relates to different economic outcomes. one of the most cited theoretical mechanisms on how excessive business regulation affects economic performance and development is that it makes it too costly for firms to engage in the formal economy, causing them not to invest or to move to the informal sector. recent studies have conducted extensive empirical testing of this proposition using doing business and other related indicators. according to one study, for example, a reform that simplified business registration in mexican municipalities increased registration by 5% and wage employment by 2.2%—and, as a result of increased competition, reduced the income of incumbent businesses by 3%. business registration reforms in mexico also resulted in 14.9% of informal business owners shifting to the formal economy.

efficient and non-distortionary business regulations are important drivers of productivity. a study on india, for example, shows that inefficient licensing and size restrictions cause a misallocation of resources, reducing total factor productivity by preventing efficient firms from achieving their optimal scale and allowing inefficient firms to remain in the market. the study shows that removing these restrictions would boost total factor productivity by an estimated 40–60%. in the european union and japan, implicit taxes on capital use were shown to reduce the average size of firms by 20%, output by 8.1% and output per firm by 25.6%. a recent study on côte d’ivoire, ethiopia, ghana and kenya demonstrates large productivity gains following the removal of firm-level distortions caused by uneven regulations and a poor business environment. research also shows that raising the efficiency level of bankruptcy laws in select oecd high-income economies to that of the united states would increase the total factor productivity of the former by about 30% through a rise in bank loans to large firms.

considerable effort has been devoted to studying the link between government regulation of firm entry and employment growth. in portugal, business reforms resulted in a reduction of the time and cost needed for company formalization, increasing the number of business start-ups by 17% and creating 7 new jobs per 100,000 inhabitants per month. new start-ups were more likely to be female-owned, were smaller and headed by less experienced, less-educated entrepreneurs than before the reform, suggesting that the reform created a more inclusive environment for aspiring entrepreneurs.

in many economies, companies engaged in international trade struggle with high trade costs arising from transport, logistics and regulations that impede their competitiveness and prevent them from taking full advantage of their productive capacity. with the availability of doing business indicators on trading across borders—which measure the time, procedural and monetary costs of exporting and importing—several empirical studies have assessed how trade costs affect the export and import performance of economies. a rich body of empirical research shows that efficient infrastructure and a healthy business environment are positively linked to export performance.

improving infrastructure efficiency and trade logistics bring documented benefits to an economy’s balance of trade and individual traders. however, delays in transit time can reduce exports: a study analyzing the importance of trade logistics found that a 1-day increase in transit time reduces exports by an average of 7% in sub-saharan africa. another study found that a 1-day delay in transport time for landlocked economies and for time-sensitive agricultural and manufacturing products has a particularly large negative impact, reducing trade by more than 1% for each day of delay. delays while clearing customs procedures also negatively impact a firm’s ability to export, particularly when goods are destined for new clients. and in economies with flexible entry regulations, a 1% increase in trade is associated with an increase of more than 0.5% in income per capita, but has no positive income effects in economies with more rigid regulation. research has also found that—although domestic buyers benefit from having goods of varying quality and price to choose from—import competition only results in minimal quality upgrading in oecd high-income economies with cumbersome regulation while it has no effect on quality upgrading in non-oecd economies with cumbersome regulation. therefore, the potential gains for consumers from import competition are reduced where regulation is cumbersome.

doing business measures aspects of business regulation affecting domestic firms.
However, research shows that better business regulation—as measured by Doing Business—is associated with higher levels of foreign direct investment. Furthermore, foreign direct investment can either impede or promote domestic investment depending on how business friendly entry regulations are in the host economy. In fact, foreign direct investment has been shown to crowd out domestic investment in economies with costly processes for starting a business. Another study showed that economies with higher international market integration have, on average, easier and simpler processes for starting a business.

Recent empirical work shows the importance of well-designed credit market regulations and well-functioning court systems for debt recovery. For example, a reform making bankruptcy laws more efficient significantly improved the recovery rate of viable firms in Colombia. In a multi-economy study, the introduction of collateral registries for movable assets was shown to increase firms’ access to finance by approximately 8%. In India, the establishment of debt recovery tribunals reduced non-performing loans by 28% and lowered interest rates on larger loans, suggesting that faster processing of debt recovery cases cut the cost of credit. An in-depth review of global bank flows revealed that firms in economies with better credit information sharing systems and higher branch penetration evade taxes to a lesser degree. Strong shareholder rights have been found to lower financial frictions, especially for firms with large external finance relative to their capital stock (such as small firms or firms in distress).

There is also a large body of theoretical and empirical work investigating the distortionary effects of high tax rates and cumbersome tax codes and procedures. According to one study, business licensing among retail firms rose 13% after a tax reform in Brazil. Another showed that a 10% reduction in tax complexity is comparable to a 1% reduction in effective corporate tax rates.

Labor market regulation—as measured by Doing Business—has been shown to have important implications for the labor market. According to one study, graduating from school during a time of adverse economic conditions has a persistent, harmful effect on workers’ subsequent employment opportunities. The persistence of this negative effect is stronger in economies with stricter employment protection legislation. Rigid employment protection legislation can also have negative distributional consequences. A study on Chile, for example, found that the tightening of job security rules was associated with lower employment rates for youth, unskilled workers and women.

By expanding the time series dimension and the scope of the data, Doing Business hopes to continue being a key reference for the debate on the importance of business regulation for economic development both within and outside the World Bank Group.

**Indexes**

Doing Business identified 17 different data projects or indexes that use Doing Business as one of its sources of data. Most of these projects or institutions use indicator level data and are not the aggregate ease of doing business ranking. The indicator set most widely used is starting a business, followed by labor market regulation and paying taxes. These indexes typically combine Doing Business data with data from other sources to assess an economy along a particular aggregate dimension such as competitiveness or innovation.

---

**BOX 2.3 Recent Doing Business research drawing on new data from Doing Business and World Bank Enterprise Surveys**

The Doing Business team conducted several studies in 2016/17 analyzing how the current data on business regulations from Doing Business and the World Bank Enterprise Surveys are associated with various economic and institutional outcomes. These studies found that:

- Small and medium-size firms are more likely to be credit constrained. In addition, a more advanced credit information system is associated with lower levels of credit constraints, particularly for smaller firms, firms that are not externally audited or firms that lack a quality certification.
- Fiscal pressures encourage regulatory reform. However, the effect of fiscal imbalances on reform weakens when governments can rely on low borrowing costs.
- Service unreliability is a significant factor in low-income economies, where power outages fluctuate significantly from year to year. Furthermore, burdensome electricity connections are associated with utility corruption and higher electricity sector constraints reduce firm demand for energy inputs.
- There is a significant negative relationship between corruption and firm productivity when business regulation is high, but there is no significant relationship when business regulation is low.

b. Djankov, Georgieva and Ramalho 2017a.
The Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom, for example, has used 22 Doing Business indicators to measure the degree of economic freedom in the world in four areas, including rule of law, government size, regulatory efficiency and market openness. Economies that score better in these four areas also tend to have a high degree of economic freedom.

Similarly, the World Economic Forum uses Doing Business data in its Global Competitiveness Index to demonstrate how competitiveness is a globaldriver of economic growth. The organization also uses 13 Doing Business indicators in five indexes that measure institutions, product market efficiency, labor market efficiency, financial market development and business dynamism. These publicly accessible sources expand the general business environment data generated by Doing Business by incorporating it into the study of other important social and economic issues across economies and regions. They prove that, taken individually, Doing Business indicators remain a useful starting point for a rich body of analysis across different areas and dimensions in the research world.

NOTES

2. These papers are available on the Doing Business website at http://www.doingbusiness.org/methodology.
3. For more on the World Bank Enterprise Surveys, see the website at http://www.enterprisesurveys.org.
4. For getting credit, indicators are weighted proportionally, according to their contribution to the total score, with a weight of 60% assigned to the strength of legal rights index and 40% to the depth of credit information index. In this way, each point included in these indexes has the same value independent of the component it belongs to. Indicators for all other topics are assigned equal weights. For more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking.
7. For the law library, see the website at http://www.doingbusiness.org/law-library.
8. The annual data collection exercise is an update of the database. The Doing Business team and the contributors examine the extent to which the regulatory framework has changed in ways relevant for the features captured by the indicators. The data collection process should therefore be seen as adding each year to an existing stock of knowledge reflected in the previous year’s report, not as creating an entirely new data set.
9. While about 13,000 contributors provided data for this year’s report, many of them completed a questionnaire for more than one Doing Business indicator set. Indeed, the total number of contributions received for this year’s report is more than 16,000, which represents a true measure of the inputs received. The average number of contributions per indicator set and economy is more than seven. For more details, see http://www.doingbusiness.org/contributors/doing-business.
10. These are reforms for which Doing Business is aware that information provided by Doing Business was used in shaping the reform agenda.
11. The papers cited here are just a few examples of research done in the areas measured by Doing Business. Since 2003, when the Doing Business report was first published, more than 10,000 working papers and research articles published in peer-reviewed academic journals have discussed how regulation in the areas measured by Doing Business influences economic outcomes.
33. Lawless 2013.
35. Claessens, Ueda and Yafeh 2014.
37. The annual data collection exercise is an update of the database. The Doing Business team and the contributors examine the extent to which the regulatory framework has changed in ways relevant for the features captured by the indicators. The data collection process should therefore be seen as adding each year to an existing stock of knowledge reflected in the previous year’s report, not as creating an entirely new data set.
38. For more on the Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom, see the website at http://heritage.org/index.
Starting a business in Thailand used to take 27.5 days. Today, thanks to a series of business regulation reforms, the process takes only 4.5 days. First, Thailand eliminated the requirement that companies obtain a company seal. Previously, every certificate of shares had to be signed by at least one director and bear the company seal. And second, Thailand repealed the requirement to obtain approval of the company’s work regulations from the Labor Department. Before the reform, companies with more than 10 employees were required to submit their work regulations to the Labor Department for approval. The company’s work regulations are now checked during regular labor inspections. Thailand’s case is not unique. In all, 38 economies reduced the complexity and cost of business incorporation processes in 2016/17, making it easier and faster for entrepreneurs to start a business.

Reform pays off. Reducing administrative burdens, simplifying regulation, strengthening competition and cutting red tape are reforms that are positively associated with higher manufacturing productivity growth in low-income economies and aggregate productivity growth in middle-income economies. There is ample evidence of the positive impact of reforming in the Doing Business areas with a historically higher number of reforms—namely starting a business, paying taxes and trading across borders. Regulatory reforms that make it easier to start a formal business, for example, are associated with an increase in the number of registered firms and with a higher level of employment and productivity. Tax policies can negatively impact productivity by creating disincentives for firms to engage in innovative activities or distorting the capital-labor allocation when considering labor taxes, including mandatory social contributions. Research shows that eliminating such fiscal barriers would lift real GDP growth rates by about 1 percentage point per year on average over the next two decades. Improving infrastructure efficiency and trade logistics bring documented benefits to an economy’s external trade balance and individual traders but transit delays can reduce exports. A study analyzing the importance of trade logistics found that a 1-day increase in transit time reduces exports by an average of 7% in Sub-Saharan Africa.

**WHO REFORMED THE MOST IN 2016/17?**

From June 2, 2016, to June 1, 2017, Doing Business recorded 264 regulatory reforms making it easier to do business—with 119 economies implementing at least one reform across the different areas measured by Doing Business. The economies that showed the most notable improvement in Doing Business 2018 are Brunei Darussalam, Thailand, Malawi, Kosovo, India, Uzbekistan, Zambia, Nigeria, Djibouti and El Salvador.

Europe and Central Asia continued to be the region with the highest share of economies (79%) implementing at least one business regulation reform, a trend that began over a decade ago. Sub-Saharan Africa, however, was the region with the highest total number of reforms in 2016/17, with 83 reforms recorded across all areas measured by Doing Business.

East Asia and the Pacific had the highest number of economies recording the greatest overall number of reforms making it easier to do business in 2016/17. Brunei Darussalam and Thailand each implemented eight reforms while Indonesia implemented seven reforms.
The region with the highest share of economies reforming across all topics is Europe and Central Asia, continuing a trend that began over a decade ago. Indeed, 79% of economies in the region implemented at least one business regulation reform recorded by Doing Business 2018. With five reforms, Uzbekistan is the regional leader on the total count of reforms, followed by Lithuania and Azerbaijan with four reforms each. However, Sub-Saharan Africa is the region with the highest total number of reforms in 2016/17 with 83 reforms recorded across all areas measured by Doing Business. Three-quarters of economies in the region implemented at least one business regulation reform in 2016/17. Similarly, 75% of economies in South Asia have implemented at least one business regulation reform captured in Doing Business 2018.

East Asia and the Pacific has the greatest number of economies recording the greatest overall number of reforms making it easier to do business in 2016/17; Brunei Darussalam and Thailand each implemented eight reforms while Indonesia implemented seven reforms. Latin America and the Caribbean and the OECD high-income group had the smallest shares of economies implementing business regulation reforms. The Middle East and North Africa was also among the regions with a relatively small share of economies reforming (65%). Nonetheless, Saudi Arabia implemented six reforms.

The 10 economies showing the most notable improvement in performance on the Doing Business indicators in 2016/17 were Brunei Darussalam, Thailand, Malawi, Kosovo, India, Uzbekistan, Zambia, Nigeria, Djibouti and El Salvador (table 3.2). These economies together implemented 53 business regulation reforms across 10 of the areas measured by Doing Business. Overall, the 10 top improvers implemented the most regulatory reforms in the area of getting credit (eight reforms), starting a business, dealing with construction permits and paying taxes (seven reforms in each area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of reform</th>
<th>Number of reforms in 2016/17</th>
<th>Region with the highest share of reformers in 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Note: The labor market regulation indicators also recorded 17 regulatory changes in the Doing Business 2018 report. These changes are not included in the total reform count.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank</th>
<th>Change in DTF score</th>
<th>Reforms making it easier to do business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Note: Economies are selected on the basis of the number of reforms and ranked on how much their distance to frontier (DTF) score improved. First, Doing Business selects the economies that implemented reforms making it easier to do business in three or more of the 10 areas included in this year’s aggregate distance to frontier score. Regulatory changes making it more difficult to do business are subtracted from the number of those making it easier. Second, Doing Business ranks these economies on the increase in their distance to frontier score due to reforms from the previous year (the impact due to changes in income per capita and the lending rate is excluded). The improvement in their score is calculated not by using the data published in 2016 but by using comparable data that capture data revisions and methodology changes. The choice of the most improved economies is determined by the largest improvements in the distance to frontier score among those with at least three reforms.
Among the 10 top improvers, Brunei Darussalam made the biggest advance toward the regulatory frontier for the second consecutive year by implementing eight reforms making it easier to do business. Brunei Darussalam removed post-incorporation procedures and implemented new building guidelines for construction, eliminating the requirement to obtain a hoarding permit and to submit both the commencement and completion notice to the one-stop shop. Additionally, Brunei Darussalam adopted a new secured transactions law that strengthened the rights of borrowers and creditors and strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency. The economy also introduced an electronic case management system for use by judges and lawyers and introduced an online system for filing and payment of the contributions to the employee provident fund. Finally, in 2016/17 Brunei Darussalam enhanced its National Single Window for goods clearance.

Thailand, the other economy in East Asia and the Pacific that made it to the list of the 10 top improvers, implemented changes in eight areas measured by Doing Business. Thailand streamlined the post-registration process to start a new business. Thailand also adopted a new secured transactions law that strengthened the rights of borrowers and creditors, introduced an automated risk-based system for selecting companies for tax audit and increased the automation and efficiency of enforcement processes in Bangkok. In addition, Thailand strengthened its land administration system by implementing a geographic information system and scanning the majority of maps in Bangkok.

Three Sub-Saharan African economies—Nigeria, Malawi and Zambia—made it to the list of 10 top improvers in 2016/17. Nigeria made starting a business faster by introducing the electronic approval of registration documents. Nigeria also increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing all relevant regulations, fee schedules and pre-application requirements online. In addition, Nigeria improved access to credit information by legally guaranteeing borrowers the right to inspect their own data and by starting to provide credit scores to banks, financial institutions and borrowers. Nigeria also introduced new centralized electronic payment channels for the payment of all federal taxes. Malawi halved the fees charged by the city council and reduced the time to process building plan approvals. It also improved access to credit information by establishing a new credit bureau. Zambia made exporting and importing easier by implementing the ASYCUDA World data management system and made tax compliance easier by introducing an online platform for filing and paying taxes. All three economies introduced or made amendments to their secured transactions laws.

Kosovo and Uzbekistan are the two economies in Europe and Central Asia that made the biggest advances toward the frontier in 2016/17. Kosovo recorded three reforms making it easier to do business, including adopting a new law that establishes clear priority rules inside bankruptcy for secured creditors and clear grounds for relief from a stay for secured creditors during reorganization procedures. Uzbekistan, which recorded five reforms, streamlined the process of obtaining an electricity connection by introducing a “turnkey” service at the utility that fulfills all connection-related services, including the design and construction completion of the external connection.

With eight reforms making it easier to do business in 2016/17, India was the only economy in South Asia to join the list of the 10 top improvers. India made obtaining a building permit faster by implementing an online Single Window System for the approval of building plans; the new system allows for the submission and approval of building plans prior to requesting the building permit. India also streamlined the business incorporation process by introducing the SPICE form (INC-32), which combined the application for the Permanent Account Number (PAN) and the Tax Account Number (TAN) into a single submission. Furthermore, following improvements to the online system in 2016, the time needed to complete the applications for Employee’s Provident Fund Organization (EPFO) and the Employee’s State Insurance Corporation (ESIC) decreased. The joint application for the Mumbai Value Added Tax (VAT) and the Profession Tax (PT) also was fully implemented in January 2017. India also strengthened access to credit by amending the rules on priority of secured creditors outside reorganization proceedings and adopting a new insolvency and bankruptcy code that introduced a reorganization procedure for corporate debtors. In trading across borders, India reduced border compliance time by improving infrastructure at the Nhava Sheva Port in Mumbai. Export and import border compliance costs were also reduced in both Delhi and Mumbai after merchant overtime fees were abolished. Thanks to the increased use of electronic and mobile platforms, since July 2016 importers under the Authorized Economic Operator (AEO) program have been able to clear cargo faster through simplified customs procedures.

With four reforms—captured in the indicators for dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, paying taxes and trading across borders—El Salvador is the only economy in Latin America and the Caribbean on this year’s list of 10 top improvers. Similarly, Djibouti (with five reforms) is the only economy in the Middle East and North Africa region on the list.

**REMOVING OBSTACLES TO STARTING A BUSINESS**

Entrepreneurs in many economies continue to face significant barriers to entry when starting a business. Burdensome
and costly regulation can prevent entrepreneurs from entering the formal economy, negatively impacting both the public and private sectors. Formalization allows entrepreneurs and employees to access the legal and financial services available to registered companies (such as obtaining loans and social security benefits). There is clear evidence that streamlining regulatory procedures can encourage business entry, business growth, job creation and rising national incomes.

Thirty-eight economies made starting a business easier in 2016/17 by reducing the procedures, time or cost associated with the process. Two-thirds of these economies simplified registration formalities by, for example, abolishing requirements to obtain various approvals or consolidating several registration processes into one. Others streamlined postregistration procedures by eliminating the need to obtain a general business license or company seal. And still others set up or improved one-stop shops, reduced or eliminated minimum capital requirements and set up online platforms for entrepreneurs. Of the 38 economies that reformed in this area, 12 implemented complex improvements associated with two or more types of reforms.

Equatorial Guinea advanced the most toward the frontier in starting a business in 2016/17. It did this by abolishing the requirement to obtain an authorization of establishment from the Office of the Prime Minister to start a business. Previously, it took four months on average for each new business to obtain this authorization.

Niger, another economy that notably improved the ease of starting a business, reduced its minimum capital requirement, allocated more personnel to its one-stop shop—resulting in a reduction in the time required to register a company—and allowed for the publication of the notice of company incorporation online free of charge.

Since its inception, Doing Business has captured at least one reform making it easier to start a business in almost 95% of economies. These reforms have made it faster and easier for firms to launch and formally operate. Fifteen years ago, it took entrepreneurs worldwide 52 days on average to start and formally operate a firm. Today, it takes 20 days.

Simplifying registration requirements can range from merging registration procedures to eliminating redundant processes. Several economies in Sub-Saharan Africa took steps to streamline these formalities in 2016/17 (figure 3.1). By eliminating the requirement that a woman must obtain her husband’s permission to operate a business, the Democratic Republic of Congo made it easier for women to register firms. And by combining multiple business registration procedures, the Democratic Republic of Congo also reduced the time required to start a business by nearly a business week.

Côte d’Ivoire, which showed the most significant improvement in this area in

---

**STREAMLINING THE PROCESS OF OBTAINING A BUILDING PERMIT**

The construction sector is a critical indicator of the health of an economy. An abundance of stalled construction projects is a visible sign of economic hardship, while a booming construction industry is indicative of economic growth. Although various obstacles remain—including the fragmented nature of the construction industry and its hesitancy to adapt to technological change—governments around the world are focused on implementing reforms that reduce the time and cost to obtain permission to build.

In 2016/17, five of the 22 economies that reformed their construction permitting processes focused their reforms on reducing the time to obtain the building permit itself (figure 3.2).

---

**FIGURE 3.1** Economies in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa have the highest share of reforms making it easier to start a business in 2016/17

| Share of economies that made it easier to start a business in 2016/17 (%) |
| South Asia | Sub-Saharan Africa | Middle East & North Africa | Europe & Central Asia | East Asia & Pacific | Latin America & Caribbean | OECD high income |
| 40 | 35 | 30 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 0 |

Source: Doing Business database.
2016/17, established a one-stop shop for building permits and published deadlines, costs and procedures related to obtaining the urban planning certificate. As a result, Côte d’Ivoire reduced the number of required procedures by four and the time to process applications by 210 days.

Notable progress was also made elsewhere in Sub-Saharan Africa, where 15 economies reformed multiple aspects of their construction permitting processes. Gabon streamlined procedures and reduced the time to obtain a building permit by setting up an internal pre-approval meeting of relevant technical experts who examine the application prior to a formal committee meeting. Gabon also made its building regulations, fee schedules and requirements to obtain a building permit available online. Similarly, Benin and Ghana improved transparency by making regulations concerning construction openly accessible online while Rwanda increased quality control during construction by introducing risk-based inspections. Kenya reduced construction fees by eliminating clearance fees from the National Environment Management Authority and the National Construction Authority. Malawi halved building permit fees. Tanzania streamlined its permitting process by improving the efficiency of its one-stop shop and increasing the frequency of building permit council meetings to once a month.

In Europe and Central Asia, Ukraine reduced the cost of construction by significantly lowering mandatory investor contributions to Kyiv’s social and engineering-transport infrastructure. Lithuania reduced the time needed to obtain technical conditions and the building permit. Uzbekistan streamlined the process for obtaining approvals of land plot allocations from various agencies.

Both an efficient connection process and safeguards to mitigate outage risks are crucial to business owners. Effective customer protections and regulations also provide predictability for firms, enabling them to better forecast risks.

Given the importance of the electricity sector, many economies aim to improve access to electricity and the quality of supply to strengthen the operating environment for small and medium-size enterprises. Doing Business recorded reforms in 20 economies making it easier to get electricity in 2016/17. Of these, 12 economies focused on improving the connection process and eight on the reliability of electricity supply.

The most common feature of electricity reforms in the past year was improvement to the connection process. Regulatory changes that reduce the number of interactions required between the utility or other third parties and customers when they apply for an electricity connection are an effective way to improve the connection process. Armenia successfully reduced the number of interactions required in 2016/17 by installing a geographic information system, eliminating the need for a site inspection to issue the technical conditions. As a result, the total time to obtain a connection was reduced from 138 days in 2016 to 127 days in 2017.

In the Dominican Republic and Kenya changes were made to improve the reliability of power supply. Major upgrades were made to the network infrastructure in Santo Domingo and Nairobi, resulting in a notable reduction in the duration of outages (figure 3.3). In Kenya, the utility in Nairobi invested in its distribution lines and transformers and set up a squad specializing in restoring power when outages occur. In the Dominican Republic, the utility in Santo Domingo built new substations, redesigned the network zoning plan and established a response squad to quickly restore service after an outage. The initiatives implemented by

**FIGURE 3.2  Many economies made getting construction permits faster in 2016/17**

![Graph showing time to get building permit (days) for Côte d’Ivoire, Gabon, Tanzania, Angola, and Lithuania.](image)

Source: Doing Business database.
REFORMING THE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT IN 2016/17

the utilities in both economies resulted in significant improvements in the reliability of electric supply. As a result, Kenya and the Dominican Republic became eligible to score on Doing Business’ reliability of supply and transparency of tariff index as their System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI) and System Average Interruption Frequency Index (SAIFI) scores are now below 100.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LAND ADMINISTRATION

Valid property rights are necessary to support investment, productivity and economic growth. Evidence from economies around the world suggests that property owners with registered titles are more likely to invest. They also have a better chance of getting credit when using their property as collateral. Likewise, having reliable, up-to-date information in cadasters and land registries is essential for governments to correctly assess and collect property taxes.

Twenty-nine economies made registering a property easier by increasing the efficiency of property transfers and improving the quality of land administration in 2016/17. The most common improvements included increasing transparency of information and increasing administrative efficiency by reducing the time to transfer property.

Mauritius made the biggest improvement in the ease of registering property in 2016/17. It did this by eliminating the 10% transfer tax and registration duty, implementing a complaint mechanism and publishing service standards. Rwanda also made improvements to its property registration process in 2016/17. Rwanda reduced the time for a property transfer by introducing new online services such as user searches of property information and online property transfer filing and registration (figure 3.4).

FIGURE 3.3 The duration of power outages has decreased in the Dominican Republic and Kenya

Source: Doing Business database.
Note: The figures show the average number of hours without electricity supply (as measured by SAIDI) and the average number of power outages (as measured by SAIFI) per customer served over the course of a year in the largest business city in each economy.

FIGURE 3.4 Rwanda has consistently reduced the time it takes to transfer property

Source: Doing Business database.
now possible to search online for owners of specific properties, locations and the encumbrances affecting the property. In addition, the parties, or their notary, can file the property transfer deed for registration online. Niger significantly reduced registration costs by reducing notary fees from 4% of the property value to a regressive fee scheme based on the property value. The government also made changes to the General Tax Code to lower property transfer registration fees.

Among regions, Europe and Central Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa tie as the regions with the most reforms relating to the transfer of property in 2016/17. In Europe and Central Asia, Croatia passed the Real Estate Transfer Act, which decreased the real estate transfer tax from 5% to 4%, while Kazakhstan made cadastral plans in Almaty available to the public via the government’s website and began publishing statistics on land disputes. The Russian Federation made property registration services available at its one-stop shop and passed legislation requiring that property registrations be completed within nine working days. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the land registry in Mauritania launched a website that provides relevant information to the public on land registry services, including property transfer regulations, procedures and fees. Senegal decreased property registration times by streamlining the interactions between different departments at the property registry, introducing internal mechanisms to identify bottlenecks and enacting internal time limits to speed up the registration process.

**STRENGTHENING ACCESS TO CREDIT**

Twenty-four economies implemented reforms improving their credit information systems in 2016/17. The most common feature of reform was the introduction of new credit bureaus and registries to improve the sharing of credit information. Malawi made the most improvement in credit reporting by operationalizing a new credit bureau, Credit Data CRB, in July 2016. The credit bureau distributes positive and negative credit information on both firms and individuals and borrowers have a legally-guaranteed right to inspect their own data. Cameroon, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan and Slovenia all established a new credit bureau or registry in 2016/17. Azerbaijan, Djibouti and Myanmar improved their regulatory framework for credit reporting, enabling the creation of new credit bureaus in the near future.

Economies in West Africa also implemented reforms in 2016/17 to improve their credit reporting systems. All West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) member states have now formally adopted the Uniform Law on the Regulation of Credit Information Bureaus. WAEMU’s regional credit bureau, Creditinfo VoLo, began operations in Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau and Togo in early 2017. These economies joined Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, Niger and Senegal, where Creditinfo VoLo was launched in 2016 (figure 3.5).

Elsewhere, economies adopted global good practices in credit reporting. The credit bureaus in Nigeria, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates began offering credit scores to their data users as a value-added service. Improvements were also made in the distribution of data from sources other than financial institutions. In Bhutan, two utility companies began submitting positive and negative information on consumer accounts to the credit bureau. In Kenya, public utility companies and savings and credit cooperative organizations are now required to share credit information. In the Islamic Republic of Iran, a vehicle dealership began sharing information on credit-based transactions with the credit bureau.

In 2016/17, 18 economies made it easier for businesses to obtain credit by modifying legislation to encourage the use of moveable property as collateral. The most common feature of reform included improvements in the legislative framework for secured transactions encompassing functional equivalents to security interests and creating modern, searchable collateral registries which are accessible on-line for the registration, modification and cancelation of security interests. West Bank and Gaza

---

**FIGURE 3.5** Timeline of West African Economic and Monetary Union regional credit bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAEMU Council of Ministers adopts Uniform Law</td>
<td>Uniform Law adopted by National Assembly of Mali</td>
<td>Creditinfo VoLo starts operations in Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Togo; Uniform Law adopted by National Assembly of Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
made the most noteworthy improvement in 2016/17 by adopting a secured transactions law in 2016 that establishes a modern collateral registry and allows a general description of present and future assets used as security interests. The new rules also establish priority for secured creditors outside insolvency and permit out-of-court enforcement.

Belarus created the Registry of Encumbrances on Movable Property in 2016 to record, store and provide information on security interests in movable assets. Mongolia’s Law on Movable and Intangible Property Pledges, which entered into force in March 2017, regulates the assignment of receivables, financial leases and retention-of-title sales, requiring their registration with the collateral registry. Similarly, Brunei Darussalam, the Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Russia, Samoa, Turkey and Zambia introduced new laws establishing modern collateral registries.

**PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF MINORITY SHAREHOLDERS**

Djibouti made the most noteworthy improvements to minority investor protections in 2016/17. A new law, Law No. 191/AN/17/7, which modified the Code of Commerce, takes significant steps to mitigate the risk of prejudicial conflicts of interest in companies. The law requires directors to inform their board in detail of any conflict of interest they may have on a proposed transaction. If they decide to proceed, they must also include the terms of the transaction and the extent of the conflict of interest in the annual report. Even after these precautions, shareholders can file in court to cancel the transaction and recover any profits made by the interested parties if the transaction was prejudicial to the company. Shareholders can also inspect transaction documents before filing a suit and seek reimbursement of their legal expenses. In addition, the law stipulates that transactions representing 51% of a company’s assets must be authorized by its shareholders and that the notice of meeting should be sent 21 days in advance. As a result of these and other amendments, Djibouti improved its score on all six indices of the indicator set, resulting in a 21.67-percentage point increase in its distance to frontier score for minority investor protections (figure 3.6).

Twenty other economies also strengthened minority shareholder protections in 2016/17. Costa Rica enacted Law No. 9392 in October 2016 which provides specific protections for minority investors and strengthens safeguards against conflicts of interest. The board of directors now must vote on transactions with interested parties and board members who have a personal interest must clearly disclose their interest and abstain from voting in this case. Should shareholders choose to file a claim against the transaction, the law also increases their access to evidence both before and during court proceedings. As a result, Costa Rica’s score improved significantly on both the extent of disclosure index and the ease of shareholder suits index, resulting in a 10 percentage point increase in its distance to frontier score for minority investor protections.

Thirteen economies—Azerbaijan, Brunei Darussalam, Djibouti, Arab Republic of Egypt, France, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Nepal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia and Uzbekistan—passed legislation in 2016/17 that increased corporate transparency requirements. These laws give more agenda-setting power to shareholders and disclose board member activities in other companies, executive compensation and audit reports. As a result, all of these economies improved their scores on the extent of corporate transparency index.

Azerbaijan, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Djibouti, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia and Thailand took steps to clarify corporate governance, ownership and control structures by, for example, enacting legislation that requires companies to nominate independent board members and set up an audit committee. These changes resulted in improvements in the scores of these nine economies on the extent of ownership and control index.

Finally, 11 economies enacted regulation in 2016/17 enhancing approval and disclosure requirements for related-party transactions. Among them, Luxembourg...
made it easier for shareholders representing 10% of the share capital of their company to get access to corporate information and to sue directors in cases of prejudicial third-party transactions. These 11 economies—Costa Rica, Djibouti, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Thailand and Ukraine—improved on the extent of approval, extent of director liability and ease of shareholder suits indices.

**ENHANCING TAX COMPLIANCE SYSTEMS**

Properly developed, effective taxation systems are crucial for a well-functioning society. In most economies, taxes are the main source of revenue to fund public spending on education, health care, public transport, infrastructure and social programs, among others. Tax policy is one of the most contentious areas of public policy. A large body of theoretical and empirical work examines the effects of high tax rates and complex fiscal systems. Although determining the optimal tax system can be challenging because context matters when economies want to maximize their welfare, there is less uncertainty—from both theoretical and empirical perspectives—about the distortionary effects of high taxes and cumbersome tax systems. A good tax system should ensure that taxes are proportionate and certain (not arbitrary) and that the method of paying taxes is convenient to taxpayers. Lastly, taxes should be easy to administer and collect.

El Salvador made the greatest advances in tax payment systems in 2016/17. Following regulatory changes, all companies are now required to submit their tax returns electronically. Electronic payments are now used by a majority of companies in El Salvador for profit taxes, value added taxes and labor taxes, including mandatory contributions. The tax administration also moved to a different assessment criteria for selecting companies for a tax audit, with its focus now primarily on larger companies. Low-risk companies and small businesses would not be selected for a tax audit in the case of an underpayment or self-reporting an error in the corporate income tax return.

The most common feature of reforms in the area of paying taxes over the past year was the implementation or enhancement of electronic filing and payment systems. Besides El Salvador, 16 other economies—Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Lithuania, Maldives, Morocco, New Zealand, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vietnam and Zambia—introduced or enhanced systems for filing and paying taxes online. India eased tax compliance on businesses by implementing an online platform for the electronic payment of the Employee Provident Fund and introducing administrative measures to ease corporate income tax compliance (figure 3.7).

The use of electronic tax filing and payment systems has increased substantially since 2006, with the most notable progress in the economies of Europe and Central Asia. Sub-Saharan Africa remains the region with the smallest share of economies using electronic filing or payments. However, in 2016 the use of online systems for filing and payment of taxes resulted in efficiency gains in several economies in the region, including Botswana, Kenya, Rwanda and Zambia. Angola, Mauritania, Senegal and Togo are improving their systems to enable taxpayers to shift from manual to online filing of tax returns in the near future.

Other economies directed efforts at reducing the financial burden of taxes on businesses and keeping tax rates at a reasonable level to encourage private sector development. With the objective of promoting more stable employment conditions, Italy exempted employers from social security contributions for a maximum of 36 months for hires with open-ended contracts from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015. Japan reduced the corporate income tax rate at the national level from 25.5% to 23.9% for tax years beginning on or after April 1, 2015. The Bahamas reduced the rate of stamp duty on land sales from 10% in 2015 to 2.5% in 2016.

**FIGURE 3.7** India made paying taxes faster by requiring the electronic payment of some taxes

![Graph showing India's progress in paying taxes](image-url)

Source: Doing Business database.
**FACILITATING INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

International trade is a cornerstone of economic development, as access to international markets is strongly correlated with economic growth. Although tariffs on exports and imports have fallen on average in recent decades, non-tariff measures have gained increasing prominence. Optimizing time and costs in the trade sector is strongly associated with trade growth, diversification and economic expansion. Accordingly, global trade policies have shifted their focus from tariffs to trade facilitation, including the elimination of trade-related transactions costs. Doing Business tracks global trade policies and reforms that facilitate trade by implementing cost-effective, time-efficient and transparent regulatory practices (figure 3.8).

Of the 33 economies that undertook reforms making it easier to trade across borders in 2016/17, 22 improved their existing electronic systems for exports or imports, reducing the time of documentary and border compliance by more than 760 hours overall. More than half of this time savings is associated with the enhancement of existing electronic systems. Zambia reduced the time to complete documentary and border compliance by about 30%, underscoring the impact of roll out of the ASYCUDA World system, an automated customs data management system, to multiple customs offices nationwide. In 2017 Zambia increased the functionality of the platform, enabling the electronic submission of declarations, supporting documents and the online payment of customs fees. Following its upgrade from ASYCUDA to the Sistema Único de Modernización Aduanera (Single Customs Modernization System: SUMA), Bolivia has enabled traders to clear their goods electronically, submitting customs declarations and supporting documents online and eliminating the need for visits to multiple government agencies to obtain clearance. As a result, Bolivia reduced the time required to prepare and submit all required documentation by 72 hours overall.

Eleven economies significantly upgraded their trade logistics infrastructure in 2016/17. Inadequate infrastructure is one of the main burdens in international trade. As part of its National Development Plan 2013-2017, Angola has significantly rehabilitated and upgraded the port of Luanda, expanding the terminals, adding new berths and acquiring equipment. This has resulted in improvements in handling processes and reduced border compliance time for both exports and imports.

The regions implementing the most reforms making it easier to trade across borders in 2016/17 were Sub-Saharan Africa (46% of reforms in this area) and East Asia and the Pacific (18%). Together, the economies in these two regions account for nearly 64% of reforms in this area as captured by Doing Business 2018. The remainder of reforms were made by economies in Latin America and the Caribbean (15%), the Middle East and North Africa (9%), South Asia (9%) and Europe and Central Asia (3%).

**FIGURE 3.8** Reforms affecting customs, especially those regarding the implementation of electronic systems, produce the highest time savings across regions
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Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The time reduction captures reforms that were implemented and had a positive impact on time for the trading across borders indicator set from 2016 to 2017. The reforms recorded during this period are aggregated in four wide-ranging categories: electronic systems, customs administration, risk-based inspections and infrastructure. Regions with no reforms on time are excluded from the figure.

**ENHANCING JUDICIAL EFFICIENCY**

A judicial system that provides effective commercial dispute resolution is crucial to a healthy economy. Case management systems supporting manual case flow through forms and files contribute to the overall timeliness and efficiency of the justice system, especially when combined with increased court automation and information communication technology solutions. The introduction of new case management features, or the expansion of existing case management or court automation systems, was the most common reform feature recorded in 2016/17. Some economies—Guyana and Kazakhstan, for example—focused on strengthening regulatory case management principles by introducing tighter time standards for key court events. Others—such as Switzerland and Taiwan, China—focused on the
implementation of a platform for the electronic submission of the initial complaint. Hungary strengthened its existing electronic-filing system by integrating it with a platform that allows litigants to pay court fees electronically.

Namibia, the economy that improved most notably in the area of enforcing contracts in 2016/17, is witnessing the results of a seven-year reform process in case management and information communication technology systems that began with a peer learning exercise with some of the top-performing economies on the enforcing contracts indicators. The reform process led to the approval of new court rules in 2014 that incorporated many case management principles such as time limits for key court events, early case management through pretrial conferences, earlier intervention by the judge, tools to dispose of cases that have been “abandoned” by the parties and court-connected mediation. The court also upgraded its information communication technology systems and court users are now able to submit their initial complaint online, while judges and lawyers have access to a dedicated online case management system. Today the Windhoek High Court has a case clearance rate of above 110% (figure 3.9), higher than some of the most sophisticated economies in the world, including Finland and Sweden.17

Other economies have strengthened judicial efficiency through the introduction of a specialized commercial court. Bhutan introduced dedicated benches that only hear commercial cases. Guyana, Nicaragua, the Slovak Republic and Vietnam strengthened their regulatory environment by introducing a new Code of Civil Procedure.

PROMOTING EFFICIENT BANKRUPTCY REGIMES

Efficient regulation of corporate insolvency is associated with increased access to credit for firms and on better terms.18 Creditors are more willing to lend because they are more likely to recover their loans. Additionally, economies that reform their insolvency law to provide a mechanism for business rescue may reduce the failure rate among firms, help maintain a higher overall level of entrepreneurship in the economy and preserve jobs.19 By facilitating the efficient business exit and liquidation of nonviable companies, an insolvency framework supports the efficient reallocation of resources across the economy.20

In 2016/17 Doing Business recorded 13 reforms making it easier to resolve insolvency. The most common feature of reform was the introduction of a reorganization procedure as an alternative to liquidation. Cabo Verde, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, India, Kosovo, Liberia, Malawi, Panama, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates adopted legal regulations enabling parties to make use of reorganization procedures for the purpose of saving viable businesses where there is a prospect of financial recovery.

The reform in Kosovo is particularly noteworthy. A comprehensive insolvency law, which was adopted in July 2016, introduced a number of modern features that are aligned with international good practices. In addition to establishing reorganization and liquidation procedures, the law provided the debtor with
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**FIGURE 3.9** Namibia has reduced its case backlog by implementing a case management system

![Chart showing reduction in cases](http://www.ejustice.moj.na)
the option to submit a pre-packaged rehabilitation plan before the commencement of reorganization proceedings and established expedited insolvency proceedings for small and medium-size enterprises. These new elements not only streamline liquidation and reorganization proceedings in Kosovo in general, but are also likely to shorten the timeframe for resolving insolvency. The law also allows the debtor to obtain new financing after the commencement of insolvency proceedings to facilitate continued operations, regulates the treatment of contracts and establishes a cross-border insolvency regime (table 3.3).

Upper-middle-income and high-income economies mainly focused their efforts on strengthening the rights of creditors in insolvency proceedings in 2016/17. Azerbaijan, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, and Panama made important amendments to their legal frameworks to provide creditors with additional safeguards and enable their participation in important decisions that affect their interests. The Dominican Republic and Grenada granted creditors the right to approve the sale of substantial assets of the debtor. Azerbaijan and Grenada provided creditors with the right to request information on the financial affairs of the debtor at any time. Additionally, Azerbaijan and Georgia granted creditors the right to object to the decision accepting or rejecting creditors’ claims.

### CHANGING LABOR MARKET REGULATION

Regulation of labor markets is essential for the achievement of primary economic goals, such as the efficient allocation of resources—that is, the distribution of resources to their most productive uses. Labor regulation is also indispensable in protecting vulnerable groups from market failures, such as forced labor and discrimination. In addition to these fundamental functions, smart labor regulation can help advance a myriad of economic and social goals, ranging from better responses to economic shocks to the promotion of equal opportunities and social cohesion. The challenge in developing labor policies is to prevent both over- and under-regulation by balancing labor flexibility with worker protection.

In 2016/17, Doing Business recorded 17 reforms in the areas covered by the indicators for labor market regulation, including the hiring of workers, working hours, redundancy rules and job quality. Some economies made their labor regulation more rigid while others made it more flexible; in some economies, the changes were in both directions. Puerto Rico (U.S.), for example, undertook a substantial regulatory reform effort by adopting the Transformation and Labor Flexibility Act (TLFA), which introduced comprehensive changes to regulation in all areas measured by the indicator for labor market regulation (table 3.4). The TLFA increased the length of the maximum probationary period for permanent employees, decreased the premium for daily overtime work and the wage premium for weekly holiday, decreased the mandate paid annual leave and established severance payments for all employees wrongfully made redundant.

Kiribati also implemented significant changes to labor regulation by approving the Employment and Industrial Relations Code (EIRC) which regulates the number of work hours per day, establishes paid annual leave and paid sick-leave and clarifies rules governing redundancies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.3 Kosovo’s previous and new insolvency frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can a debtor initiate liquidation or reorganization procedures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No liquidation or reorganization available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do creditors vote on the reorganization plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reorganization available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can a court invalidate preferential and undervalued transactions concluded before insolvency proceedings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can a debtor obtain credit after commencement of insolvency proceedings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can creditors participate in important decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No provisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

| TABLE 3.4 Puerto Rico (U.S.)’s Transformation and Labor Flexibility Act (TLFA) |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| **Old framework** | **Labor reform** |
| Length of the maximum probationary period for permanent employees | 3 months | 9 months |
| Wage premium for daily overtime work and weekly holiday work | 100% premium rate | 50% premium rate |
| Mandatory paid annual leave, workers with 1 year tenure | 15 days | 9 days |
| Mandatory paid annual leave, workers with 5-10 years tenure | 15 days | 12 days |

Source: Doing Business database.
established a standard workday of eight hours per day and designated Sunday as a weekly rest day. Taiwan, China, increased the number of weekly rest days from one to two and also extended the length of mandatory paid annual leave. Bosnia and Herzegovina decreased wage premiums for overtime work, night work and weekly holiday work. Tajikistan abolished restrictions on night work by non-pregnant women and non-nursing mothers.

In addition, some economies made changes to legislation regulating redundancy rules and costs. Tajikistan increased the amount of severance pay that an employer must provide when making an employee redundant. The Bahamas amended its legislation to introduce priority rules that apply to reemployment and Singapore adopted legislation requiring employers to notify the Ministry of Manpower when terminating a group of nine redundant workers.

Economies also implemented legislation in the area of job quality in 2016/17. The United States (Los Angeles) established a maximum of six working days of paid sick leave a year. Colombia, the Dominican Republic, India and Paraguay increased the duration of paid maternity leave.

NOTES

3. IMF 2015.
10. The economies that strengthened minority shareholder rights in 2016/17 are Azerbaijan, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.
15. Ramello and Voigt 2012.
### Making it easier to start a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplified preregistration and registration formalities (publication, notarization, inspection, and other requirements)</td>
<td>Bhutan; China; Democratic Republic of Congo; Republic of Congo; Czech Republic; Djibouti; Dominican Republic; Equatorial Guinea; Ethiopia; Gabon; Indonesia; Iraq; Jamaica; Kenya; Madagascar; Mauritius; Morocco; Nigeria; Pakistan; Senegal; Senegal; Serbia; Thailand; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Djibouti made starting a business more affordable by reducing the fees to register and publish the notice of commencement of activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut or simplified postregistration procedures (tax registration, social security registration, licensing)</td>
<td>The Bahamas; Brunei Darussalam; Greece; India; Iraq; Kenya; Kosovo; Madagascar; Malta; Niger; Tajikistan; Thailand; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>The Bahamas made starting a business easier by merging the process of registering for the business license and value added tax. Greece made starting a business easier by creating a unified social security institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved online procedures</td>
<td>India; Kuwait; Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia made starting a business easier through the use of an online system, which merges the name reservation and submission of the articles of association into one procedure. Saudi Arabia also improved the online payment system, removing the need to pay fees in person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created or improved one-stop shop</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo; Kuwait; Mauritania; Moldova; Niger; Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Mauritania made starting a business easier by combining multiple registration procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolished or reduced minimum capital requirement</td>
<td>Cameroon; Republic of Congo; Ethiopia; Gabon; Niger</td>
<td>Gabon made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement and by making the notarization of incorporation documents optional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Making it easier to deal with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced time for processing permit applications</td>
<td>Angola; Brunei Darussalam; Côte d’Ivoire; El Salvador; Gabon; India; Kenya; Lithuania; Mauritius; Niger; Nigeria; Tanzania; United Arab Emirates; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Lithuania reduced the time it takes to obtain technical conditions and the building permit. Norfolk introduced new rules to obtain a water connection as well as service delivery objectives, resulting in a reduction in the time to obtain a water connection. The Waste Water Management Authority (WMA) in Mauritius outsourced the design and construction of sewage connection works to five private companies, thereby reducing the time to provide sewage connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transparency</td>
<td>Benin; Cabo Verde; Gabon; Ghana; Niger; Nigeria; Seychelles</td>
<td>Gabon improved the transparency of information by publishing legislation related to the construction industry online. Nigeria (Kano and Lagos) increased transparency by publishing all relevant regulations, fee schedules and pre-application requirements online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined procedures</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam; Gabon; Niger; Nigeria; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam eliminated the requirement to obtain a hoarding permit and to submit both the commencement and completion notice to the one-stop shop. Nepal introduced its internal processes and set up a building permit commission which meets every Thursday to rule on permit applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted new building regulations</td>
<td>Djibouti; El Salvador; Niger; Rwanda; United Arab Emirates; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Djibouti implemented a decree clearly establishing decennial liability for all professionals engaged in construction projects. Uzbekistan introduced a new system of allocating land through a competitive selection process for land plots of up to a hectare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fees</td>
<td>Djibouti; Kenya; Malawi; Niger; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Kenya eliminated fees to obtain clearance from the National Environment Management Authority and the National Construction Authority. Malawi halved the fees to obtain a building permit. The National Laboratory of Djibouti published new official fees for its services, reducing the cost of concrete inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved or introduced electronic platforms or online services</td>
<td>Angola; El Salvador; India</td>
<td>El Salvador introduced a single window system, making preliminary construction fees payable online. The Municipality of Greater Mumbai introduced an online single window system that allows for the submission and approval of building plans prior to requesting the building permit along with various other services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved one-stop shop</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire; Tanzania</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire created a one-stop shop for processing building permits. Tanzania increased the efficiency of its one-stop shop by improving coordination among agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Making it easier to get electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated more reliable power supply and transparency of tariff information</td>
<td>Dominican Republic; El Salvador; Jamaica; Kenya; Mexico; Montenegro; Senegal; Vietnam</td>
<td>Jamaica improved the reliability of supply in Kingston by investing in the distribution network through several initiatives, including the installation of smart meters and distribution automation switches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved process efficiency</td>
<td>Armenia; Indonesia; Italy; Niger; Philippines</td>
<td>Armenia made getting electricity easier by imposing new deadlines for connection procedures and introducing a new geographic information system at the utility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined approval process</td>
<td>Indonesia; Lithuania; Mozambique; Thailand; United Arab Emirates; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Mozambique reduced the time to get an electricity connection by streamlining procedures through the utility instead of various agencies. Mozambique also reduced costs by eliminating the security deposit for large commercial clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved regulation of connection processes and costs</td>
<td>Georgia; Indonesia; Mozambique; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Georgia made getting electricity more affordable by reducing connection costs for new customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Making it easier to register property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased transparency of information</td>
<td>Benin; Brunei Darussalam; Djibouti; Hong Kong SAR, China; Kazakhstan; Kuwait; Mauritania; Mauritius; Nigeria; Pakistan; Seychelles; Suriname</td>
<td>Mauritania created a new section on the government website containing information on the services provided by the land registry. Kazakhstan made cadastral plans in Almaty available to the public and began publishing statistics on the number of land disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased administrative efficiency</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda; Costa Rica; Guyana; Kuwait; Nigeria; Russian Federation; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Tajikistan</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia implemented an online system to check for property ownership and encumbrances. Rwanda reduced the time to complete a property transfer from 12 to seven days, by reducing the time needed to conduct a title search and registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced taxes or fees</td>
<td>Benin; Croatia; Indonesia; Mauritius; Myanmar; Niger; Senegal; Turkey</td>
<td>Niger decreased registration fees, effectively lowering the cost to register a property by 15%. Turkey made registering property easier by reducing mortgage duties (mortgage registration fees) from 4% to 3%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased reliability of infrastructure</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China; Romania; Serbia; Seychelles; Thailand</td>
<td>Serbia and Thailand improved the reliability of their land administration systems by implementing a geographic information system. Hong Kong SAR, China, linked information recorded by the Lands Department with that of the Land Registry. Romania digitized its land book system in Bucharest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved the accessibility of the land dispute resolution mechanism</td>
<td>Armenia; Brunei Darussalam; Kazakhstan; Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Armenia, Brunei Darussalam, Kazakhstan and Saudi Arabia made their land dispute mechanism more accessible by publishing statistics on land-related cases filed at the court of first instance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengthening legal rights of borrowers and lenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created a unified and/or modern collateral registry for movable property</td>
<td>Belarus; Brunei Darussalam; Kyrgyz Republic; Malaysia; Mongolia; Nepal; Nigeria; Russian Federation; Samoa; Turkey; West Bank and Gaza; Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law on secured transactions that establishes a modern and centralized collateral registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced a functional and secured transactions system</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam; Mongolia; Nepal; Nigeria; Samoa; West Bank and Gaza; Zambia</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza strengthened access to credit by adopting the Security Interests in Moveable Property Act. The new law on secured transactions implements a functional secured transactions system. The law regulates functional equivalents to loans secured with movable property, such as financial leases and retention-of-title sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed for general description of assets that can be used as collateral</td>
<td>Albania; Thailand; West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>Albania implemented new laws allowing for the general description of assets that can be used as collateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded range of movable assets that can be used as collateral</td>
<td>Thailand; Vietnam</td>
<td>Thailand introduced a law that broadens the scope of assets which can be used as collateral to secure a loan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted absolute priority to secured creditors or allowed out-of-court enforcement</td>
<td>Albania; Brunei Darussalam; India; Kosovo; Malawi; Thailand; Turkey; West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>Turkey introduced a law that allows out-of-court enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted exemptions to secured creditors from automatic stay in insolvency proceedings</td>
<td>India; Kosovo; Thailand</td>
<td>Kosovo adopted a new bankruptcy law that includes protections for secured creditors during an automatic stay in reorganization proceedings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improving the sharing of credit information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established a new credit bureau or registry</td>
<td>Burkina Faso; Cameroon; Guinea-Bissau; Indonesia; Iraq; Jordan; Malawi; Slovenia; Togo</td>
<td>Indonesia improved access to credit information by launching a new credit bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved regulatory framework for credit reporting</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Benin; Djibouti; Guinea-Bissau; Kyrgyz Republic; Russia; Myanmar; Turkey</td>
<td>Djibouti improved access to credit information by adopting a law that creates a new credit information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded scope of information collected and reported by credit bureau or registry</td>
<td>Bhutan; Islamic Republic of Iran; Kenya; Netherlands</td>
<td>In Bhutan, two utility companies began submitting positive and negative information on consumer accounts to the credit bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced bureau or registry credit scores as a value-added service</td>
<td>Nigeria; Qatar; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>In the United Arab Emirates, the credit bureau began offering consumer credit scores to banks and financial institutions as a value-added service to help them assess the creditworthiness of borrowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed by law borrowers’ right to inspect data</td>
<td>Nigeria; Swaziland</td>
<td>Swaziland adopted the Consumer Credit Act 2016 guaranteeing borrowers’ right to inspect their own data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded borrower coverage by credit bureau or registry</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>In Madagascar, the credit registry for microfinance institutions was consolidated with the registry for banks, expanding the number of borrowers listed in the registry’s database with information on their borrowing history from the past five years to more than 5% of the adult population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3A.1** Who reduced regulatory complexity and cost and/or strengthened legal institutions in 2016/17—and what did they do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening minority investor protections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded shareholders’ role in company management</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Bhutan; Brunei Darussalam; Djibouti; Arab Republic of Egypt; France; Georgia; Indonesia; Kazakhstan; Lithuania; Malaysia; Nepal; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Thailand; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Lithuania enacted a law requiring the disclosure of information about board members’ other directorships as well as basic information on their primary employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced access to information in shareholder actions</td>
<td>Costa Rica; Djibouti; Georgia; Kazakhstan; Luxembourg; Rwanda; Thailand</td>
<td>Luxembourg adopted legislation allowing shareholders that represent at least 10% of the share capital to inspect transactions documents before filing a suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased disclosure requirements for related-party transactions</td>
<td>Costa Rica; Djibouti; India; Saudi Arabia; Ukraine</td>
<td>Costa Rica adopted a law requiring board members who have a personal interest in a proposed transaction to clearly disclose it and not participate in the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased director liability</td>
<td>Djibouti; India; Luxembourg; Pakistan</td>
<td>Djibouti adopted a law allowing shareholders to hold interested directors (as well as other board members) liable when a transaction with interested parties is unfair or prejudicial to the company and to have them repay profits made from the transaction upon a successful claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making it easier to pay taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or enhanced electronic systems</td>
<td>Botswana; Brunei Darussalam; El Salvador; India; Indonesia; Kenya; Lithuania; Maldives; Morocco; New Zealand; Philippines; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Uruguay; Vietnam; Zambia</td>
<td>El Salvador mandated all business taxpayers to file their annual income tax return through one of the available electronic methods (DET software or online processing). The general online tax processing and payment system was also consolidated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced profit tax rate</td>
<td>Japan; Norway</td>
<td>Japan adopted the 2016 Tax Reform Bill on February 5, 2016, which reduced the corporate income tax rate at the national level from 25.5% to 23.9% for tax years beginning on or after April 1, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced labor taxes and mandatory contributions</td>
<td>Belgium; France; Italy; Japan; Ukraine</td>
<td>Ukraine introduced in 2016 a flat rate of 22% for the Unified Social Contribution tax paid by employers, which replaced the previous differentiated rates ranging from 36.76% to 49.7%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce taxes other than profit and labor</td>
<td>The Bahamas; Indonesia; Thailand; Zambia</td>
<td>Indonesia reduced the statutory rate for capital gains tax from 5% to 2.5% in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified tax compliance processes or decreased number of tax filings or payments</td>
<td>China; India; Italy; Nigeria; Mauritania; Palau; Ukraine</td>
<td>India introduced the Income Computation and Disclosure Standards (ICDS) in 2016 to standardize the methods of computing taxable income and other tax accounting standards. Data gathering became more automated in India due to the use of modern enterprise resource planning (ERP) software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced a risk-based tax audit selection system</td>
<td>El Salvador; Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand implemented a new automatic risk-based system for selecting companies for a tax audit in 2016. The system does not flag for a tax audit in cases of self-reporting an error or an underpayment of tax liability due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced time limits for processing VAT cash refunds</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Senegal mandated by law that value added tax refunds be paid within 90 days from the moment the tax authority receives the documents from the taxpayer and the request for value added tax credit refund must be taken into account by the administration within 30 days from the time the request has been submitted. These changes were applied in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making it easier to trade across borders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved electronic submission and processing of documents for exports</td>
<td>Bolivia; Botswana; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Cabo Verde; Comoros; Malawi; Mauritius; Oman; Pakistan; Sierra Leone; Sri Lanka; St. Kitts and Nevis; Swaziland; Taiwan, China; Uganda; Vietnam; Zambia</td>
<td>Bolivia upgraded its automated customs system (SUMA) and reduced documentary compliance time to export. Zambia expanded its customs management system nationwide, allowing electronic payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved electronic submission and processing of documents for imports</td>
<td>Bolivia; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Cabo Verde; Comoros; Indonesia; Jamaica; Kenya; Malawi; Mauritius; Oman; Pakistan; Sri Lanka; Swaziland; Vietnam; Zambia</td>
<td>Due to improvements made to their respective electronic customs platforms, Cabo Verde and Kenya both reduced import document compliance time by 24 hours. Brazil made trading across borders faster by enhancing its electronic system—integrating customs, tax and administrative agencies—reducing import documentary compliance time by 72 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened transport or port infrastructure for exports</td>
<td>Angola; India; Malaysia; Mauritania; Mauritius; Mozambique; Pakistan; Qatar; Russian Federation; Singapore; Uganda</td>
<td>Angola rehabilitated the Port of Luanda, improving handling processes and reducing border compliance time. The Russian Federation opened a deep water port on the coast of the Gulf of Finland, increasing competition and reducing the cost of border compliance at the Port of St. Petersburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened transport or port infrastructure for imports</td>
<td>Angola; India; Malaysia; Mauritania; Mauritius; Pakistan; Qatar; Russian Federation; Singapore</td>
<td>Qatar made trading across borders easier by inaugurating the Hamad Port. Expansion of existing ports in Singapore and Malaysia improved the terminal handling process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated customs administration for exports and imports</td>
<td>Botswana; Brunei Darussalam; El Salvador; Ethiopia; India; Mauritania; Mauritius; São Tomé e Príncipe; Saudi Arabia; Sierra Leone; Vietnam</td>
<td>El Salvador increased the number of customs officers for clearance and inspections, reducing border compliance time. Mauritius decreased the number of intrusive inspections, which reduced border compliance time for both exports and imports by 10 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3A.1 Who reduced regulatory complexity and cost and/or strengthened legal institutions in 2016/17—and what did they do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to enforce contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced significant changes to the applicable civil procedure or enforcement rules</td>
<td>Guyana; Kazakhstan; Nicaragua; Senegal; Serbia; Slovak Republic; Spain; Vietnam</td>
<td>Nicaragua and the Slovak Republic each introduced a new Code of Civil Procedure. Serbia adopted a new enforcement law that broadens and clarifies the responsibilities of enforcement agents. Spain reduced the fees to file new cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded court automation by introducing electronic payment or by publishing judgments</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Hungary; Mauritania; Rwanda; Thailand</td>
<td>Azerbaijan, Hungary and Thailand implemented platforms to pay fees electronically. Mauritania and Rwanda made decisions rendered at all levels in commercial cases publicly available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or expanded the electronic case management system</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam; India; Namibia; Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam, Namibia and Saudi Arabia introduced electronic case management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced electronic filing</td>
<td>Namibia; Switzerland; Taiwan, China</td>
<td>Namibia, Switzerland and Taiwan, China, introduced electronic filing systems for commercial cases, allowing attorneys to submit the initial summons online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or expanded specialized commercial court</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Bhutan introduced a dedicated bench to resolve commercial disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded the alternative dispute resolution framework</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Vietnam introduced a new law regulating voluntary mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to resolve insolvency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved the likelihood of successful reorganization</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Cabo Verde; Dominican Republic; Georgia; Grenada; India; Kosovo; Liberia; Malawi; Panama; Thailand; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Cabo Verde established the possibility for the debtor to receive new financing after the commencement of insolvency proceedings and introduced corresponding priority rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced a new restructuring procedure</td>
<td>Cabo Verde; Dominican Republic; Grenada; India; Kosovo; Liberia; Malawi; Panama; Singapore; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>The United Arab Emirates introduced the option of reorganization for commercial entities as an alternative to liquidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened creditors’ rights</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Cabo Verde; Dominican Republic; Georgia; Grenada; Kosovo; Liberia; Panama</td>
<td>The Dominican Republic granted creditors the right to object to decisions of special importance made by the insolvency representative, such as the sale of substantial assets of the debtor in the course of insolvency proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Cabo Verde; Dominican Republic; Georgia; Kosovo; Liberia; Malawi; Panama; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Liberia allowed avoidance of preferential and undervalued transactions concluded prior to commencement of insolvency proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated the profession of insolvency administrators</td>
<td>India; Liberia; Malawi; Panama</td>
<td>Malawi regulated the profession of insolvency administrator, including its duties, powers and liabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changing labor legislation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered hiring rules and probationary period</td>
<td>Finland; Mongolia; Puerto Rico (U.S.)</td>
<td>Puerto Rico (U.S.) increased the length of the maximum probationary period for permanent employees, hired after the effective date of the Transformation and Labor Flexibility Act (TLFA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended regulation of working hours</td>
<td>Albania; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Democratic Republic of Congo; Kiribati; Taiwan, China; Tajikistan</td>
<td>Kiribati established rules for the number of work hours per day and the maximum number of working days per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed redundancy rules and cost</td>
<td>The Bahamas; Kiribati; Puerto Rico (U.S.); Singapore; Tajikistan</td>
<td>Singapore adopted legislation requiring employers to notify the Ministry of Manpower when terminating a group of nine redundant workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed legislation regulating worker protection and social benefits</td>
<td>Albania; Colombia; Dominican Republic; India; Kiribati; Latvia; Paraguay; Puerto Rico (U.S.); United States</td>
<td>The United States (Los Angeles) adopted the Paid Sick Leave Ordinance, allowing for a maximum of six working days of paid sick leave a year upon the oral or written request of an employee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: Reforms affecting the labor market regulation indicators are included here but do not affect the ranking on the ease of doing business.
Governments and civil society have come together in recent years to increase the transparency of business information. New regulations have been adopted to improve transparency, particularly regarding the dissemination of company data. These changes have been made in the wake of a series of revelations—such as the Panama papers and the Bahamas leaks—that showed the extent to which individuals take advantage of obscure company ownership structures to illicitly move money around the globe. There is now strong momentum behind expanding access to corporate information, including company ownership.

One way to increase transparency in the business environment is to disclose beneficial ownership information publicly—that is, to reveal the identity of individuals who ultimately enjoy the benefits of property rights in equity, even if they are not legal owners. Disclosure of beneficial ownership is useful in identifying suspected money laundering and potential terrorist financing.

To make ownership more transparent, Singapore amended its Companies Act to require locally-incorporated companies and foreign companies registered in Singapore to maintain beneficial ownership information and to make the data public upon request. Ghana amended its Companies Act in 2016 to regulate disclosure of information on beneficial ownership. In May 2017 Germany’s parliament passed a law requiring that the owners of all German enterprises (including offshore entities) be identified in an electronic beneficial ownership registry. Access to corporate information is vital for individuals and institutions looking to make sound investment decisions. It is crucial for investors to know who they are doing business with in the global economy.

Providing public access to company information through business registries strengthens confidence in businesses and institutions, but it also helps to manage financial exposure and increase market stability, thereby reducing the risks associated with doing business. Improving transparency necessitates the drafting of laws that expand public access to additional corporate data, such as the identities of the company directors, shareholders and beneficial owners.

This year, Doing Business has collected preliminary data on the information gathered and shared by business registries in 190 economies. Doing Business collects data on the public availability of both detailed corporate information (such as company name, directors, shareholders, beneficial owners and so on) and the information needed to start a business (for example, a documents list, fee schedule, services standards and official statistics on firm creation). Each type of information obtained without the need for any personal interaction is assigned points to reflect greater transparency. The features of transparency of information range from 0 (least transparent) to 18.

- Transparent information provided to the public by business registries can reduce transactions costs and facilitate investment decisions.
- The most common types of information shared by business registries include the company’s name, its legal address and the names of its directors.
- Information on beneficial ownership, corporate structure and annual financial returns is less commonly collected and made available to the public.
- Technological advances have greatly enhanced access to information.
- There is a strong association between a transparent business registry and higher efficiency, as well as a lower incidence of bribery.

Doing Business has collected preliminary data on the information gathered and shared by business registries in 190 economies. Doing Business collects data on the public availability of both detailed corporate information (such as company name, directors, shareholders, beneficial owners and so on) and the information needed to start a business (for example, a documents list, fee schedule, services standards and official statistics on firm creation). Each type of information obtained without the need for any personal interaction is assigned points to reflect greater transparency. The features of transparency of information range from 0 (least transparent) to 18.

Starting a Business

Transparency of information at business registries
(most transparent). The aim is to capture new and actionable aspects related to the business incorporation framework and to understand how transparency of information in business registration varies across regions and how it is associated with other institutional and economic outcomes.

HOW IMPORTANT IS TRANSPARENCY IN BUSINESS REGISTRIES?

As the principal agency responsible for registering firms, business registries allow companies to acquire a legal identity. This legal status enables a firm to enter into contracts with other firms, access formal financial systems and bid on public-sector contracts.¹ Business registries play a vital role by ensuring that the information they collect from these companies is not only captured within their systems but is also available to the public. Sharing information publicly makes it easier to ensure that the information is accurate.

Business registry transparency can increase the accountability of firms and public officials. By improving the predictability of transactions, transparency can also benefit financial institutions and company services providers as it becomes easier for them to obtain the information they need to comply effectively with due diligence requirements.² Registries with clearly-stipulated requirements facilitate the process of registering and verifying information. There tends to be a culture of greater competition and economic growth in economies where it is easier for companies to enter the market.³

Transparency of information can broaden the pool of potential investors by reducing the need for personal connections. It can level the playing field for a budding entrepreneur who may lack the necessary connections to formally launch his or her company. By reducing the risk associated with an investment, transparency can help investors determine the viability of a transaction.⁴ Revealing public information to curb information asymmetry can also reduce a firm’s cost of capital by attracting increased demand from large investors (due to increased liquidity of its securities).⁵ The financial cost of a lack of data transparency can be significant: in 2011 alone it is estimated that developing economies suffered nearly $1 trillion in illicit financial outflows.⁶ Transparent data on company ownership are vital in combating money laundering, tax evasion, corruption and other illegal activities.

WHAT KIND OF BUSINESS INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC?

Most business registries share some data with the public about the companies registered with them. The types of information that are most commonly made public by the business registry are the company’s name, legal address, year of incorporation, type of business activity and the names of its directors.⁷

Information regarding a firm’s corporate structure, annual returns and beneficial ownership is less commonly made available to the public. It is possible to access information on a company’s corporate structure—that is, whether it has subsidiaries or belongs to a holding company—and its beneficial ownership in only a few economies (figure 4.1).

![Figure 4.1](image.png)

**FIGURE 4.1** Data on shareholders and directors are more accessible than data on beneficial owners

Source: Doing Business database.

---

¹ Business registries play a vital role by ensuring that the information they collect from these companies is not only captured within their systems but is also available to the public. Sharing information publicly makes it easier to ensure that the information is accurate.

² Registries with clearly-stipulated requirements facilitate the process of registering and verifying information. There tends to be a culture of greater competition and economic growth in economies where it is easier for companies to enter the market.

³ Transparency of information can broaden the pool of potential investors by reducing the need for personal connections. It can level the playing field for a budding entrepreneur who may lack the necessary connections to formally launch his or her company. By reducing the risk associated with an investment, transparency can help investors determine the viability of a transaction.

⁴ Revealing public information to curb information asymmetry can also reduce a firm’s cost of capital by attracting increased demand from large investors (due to increased liquidity of its securities).

⁵ The financial cost of a lack of data transparency can be significant: in 2011 alone it is estimated that developing economies suffered nearly $1 trillion in illicit financial outflows.

⁶ Transparent data on company ownership are vital in combating money laundering, tax evasion, corruption and other illegal activities.

⁷ Most business registries share some data with the public about the companies registered with them. The types of information that are most commonly made public by the business registry are the company’s name, legal address, year of incorporation, type of business activity and the names of its directors.
Data on a firm’s corporate structure, for example, is readily available in less than one-third of economies worldwide. Furthermore, the identity of a company’s beneficial owners is made public in fewer than one-quarter of economies globally; only 8% of economies in East Asia and the Pacific and 15% of OECD high-income economies collect data on beneficial ownership and make it publicly available.

In general, the types of business registry information made available to the public vary little across economies. The names of a company’s directors, for example, are publicly available in 92% of high-income economies covered by Doing Business; this figure is only slightly lower in low-income economies (84%). For other categories of information, however, public access is not equally provided across economies. In 75% of high-income economies, for example, one can verify the number and type of company shares. This information can be publicly accessed at business registries in fewer than half of low-income economies. Similarly, while businesses’ annual accounts are available for public consultation in most high-income economies, these are available in only 10% of low-income economies. Registries in many developing economies either do not require companies to file annual accounts with the business registry or provide limited access to businesses’ annual accounts. As a result, the economy may be negatively impacted as poor quality corporate governance regimes can restrict access to information and reduce investment returns.8

Some kinds of business data are more accessible than others. In general, public access is greater when the information available is considered less sensitive. Basic data such as a company’s type of activity or year of incorporation can be found easily in most economies, but for business reasons some companies may prefer not to disclose their annual returns or annual accounts.

### HOW IS INFORMATION MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC?

During the past decade government agencies around the world have explored ways to increase business registry transparency. The need for access to corporate information in the name of greater transparency pushed many economies to digitize their business registries and publish data online. By allowing around-the-clock, online access to registry information, the need for personal visits has been reduced, significantly enhancing the utility of these registries.

Where company details can be searched remotely, information and transaction costs are reduced. Basic information underlying potential trade or business dealings—for example, whether an entity has the legal authority to commit to an export contract or whether a particular company is in good financial standing—can be obtained quickly. The majority of the business registries in the economies covered by Doing Business share some company information online. Business registries in OECD high-income economies publish most of the information collected on their websites.

The business registry information most widely available online includes the name of the company, its identification number, its legal address and the year the company was incorporated. The most basic information—the company name—is the information most commonly made available online. The names of existing companies are available online in 62% of economies covered by Doing Business, primarily because a company name must be verified before it can be registered as a new business. The business registries in all OECD high-income economies offer online company name search. In contrast, business registries in fewer than 10 economies in Sub-Saharan Africa—including Nigeria and Rwanda—offer this service (figure 4.2). More detailed information—such as information on a firm’s shareholders, directors or beneficial ownership—is less commonly made available online.

Information on a company’s directors, shareholders and beneficial owners is particularly important because it allows both business representatives and private individuals to identify the ownership of companies with which they may choose to do business or invest. In some

#### FIGURE 4.2 Company name search is mostly done in person in Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>In person</th>
<th>Not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
regions, however, this information is either not available or can only be obtained in person. In South Asia, for example, business registries in 75% of economies only allow information about shareholders to be made available in person. In contrast, less than 20% of economies in Europe and Central Asia require that those seeking this information appear in person at the business registry; in the vast majority of economies in this region, shareholder information can be obtained online. In Sub-Saharan Africa, business registries in 77% of economies do not make the names of registered companies available online. In East Asia and the Pacific, one-third of economies do not publish the legal address or the names of company directors online. This type of information would allow a company, before doing business with an individual, to verify, for example, whether that person is a legitimate company representative.

Even when business registry information is published online, it is not always provided free of charge or made easily searchable. In many economies, online access to company information is only available after preregistration or the payment of a subscription fee, limiting the information to those people who can pay for it. In contrast, Denmark and the United Kingdom publish their entire business registry database free of charge.\(^5\)

The presentation of the information can also be a barrier. If data are available only through record-by-record searches, for example, a person must begin their search with the company name or identification number to access information about it.

---

**FIGURE 4.3** Higher levels of transparency at the business registry are associated with higher overall levels of transparency in an economy

![Graph showing the relationship between transparency of information and control of corruption](image)

**Sources:** Doing Business database; Worldwide Governance Indicators (https://www.govindicators.org), World Bank.

**Note:** The Worldwide Governance Indicators control of corruption indicator captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as “capture” of the state by elites and private interests. Estimate gives the economy’s score on the aggregate indicator in units of a standard normal distribution, ranging from approximately -2.5 to 2.5, with higher values representing lower corruption perceptions. The features of transparency of information range from 0 (not transparent) to 18 (transparent). The sample includes 189 economies covered by both Doing Business and the control of corruption estimate (data on control of corruption estimate not available for San Marino). The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.

**HOW IS TRANSPARENCY OF INFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH EFFICIENCY AND CORRUPTION?**

Business registries facilitate the operation of firms in the formal economy and they are often the first public institution
with which entrepreneurs interact. This first interaction can have a formative impact on the entrepreneur’s perception of the efficacy of the public administration. Indeed, the level of transparency and trust in an economy has been shown to be highly correlated with the level of transparency of information at the business registry (figure 4.3). When business registry information is easily accessible and can be searched remotely, it can facilitate business transactions by removing unnecessary steps and reducing transactions costs.

The level of transparency of information at business registries is also associated with the time and cost to start a business. Data show that, on average, economies with greater transparency of information tend to have faster and less costly processes for starting a business (figure 4.4). In economies where official information on how to incorporate a business is not made readily available, entrepreneurs may have to seek legal advice from third parties or visit various government offices to find reliable information. In contrast, when the information is consolidated and easily obtained, entrepreneurs can spend less time and money finding it; they can dedicate more time to running their business.

Transparency can be approached from multiple aspects. Beyond providing readily available and reliable information about existing companies, it is important that entrepreneurs can openly access information about the requirements to establish a business (such as a list of required documents, fee schedules and services standards). When public access to information on company incorporation requirements is limited, it can represent a substantial obstacle to entrepreneurs who want to start a business. However, when transparency is a priority for business registries and all requirements are made public, more firms are able to enter the formal sector. If anyone can easily obtain transparent information before a business transaction, it can increase the ability of companies to conduct proper Know-Your-Client procedures, raising the level of trust in transactions and counterparts. Easy access to relevant information is also correlated with increased transparency of interactions with public officials. Doing Business data show that economies with transparent business registries tend to have lower incidences of bribery, both asked and given (figure 4.5). Transparent information provides citizens with the data they need to hold their counterparts accountable and improves trust in public agencies (including business registries), particularly when transparency is conveyed on multiple levels (such as clearly stating business registration fees and the expected time to receive incorporation documents).

**CONCLUSION**

The transparency of the information provided by the business registry plays a vital role in an economy. Transparent business registries reduce information asymmetry among entrepreneurs and broaden the pool of potential investors by reducing the need for personal connections. Transparency can also raise the accountability of public officials and strengthen trust in public agencies. In the past decade, government agencies around the world have used technology to increase the transparency of public services. Technology can be utilized by governments to improve transparency of company ownership and the procedures to start a business. This case study has shown that the public availability of information on company ownership and starting a business is associated with an increase in an economy’s overall level of transparency, an increase in the efficiency of business registration and a decrease in bribery.

**FIGURE 4.5** Levels of bribery tend to be lower in economies with higher transparency of information at the business registry


Note: The features of the transparency of information range from 0 (not transparent) to 18 (transparent). The samples include 100 and 89 economies covered by both the Doing Business database and the Transparency International database. The relationships are significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.
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Dealing with Construction Permits

Private sector participation in construction regulation

The world has witnessed an unparalleled expansion of cities in recent decades. The urban population of developing economies is projected to double by 2030, while the area covered by cities could triple. In tandem with this trend, the construction industry is forecast to grow by more than 70%, reaching $15 trillion by 2025. With the population of cities rising around the world, municipal authorities are struggling to keep up with increased demand for their services. In developing economies, in particular, building departments operating under tight budgets and resource constraints are finding it increasingly difficult to enforce building codes, ensure that quality standards are met and adhere to efficient service delivery processing times.

In some economies, local municipalities have partnered with the private sector to supplement their strained capacity to oversee construction. However, faster and more efficient services provided by third-party inspectors inevitably cost more. Doing Business data show that the need to hire qualified third-party professionals on construction projects raises the cost of regulatory compliance by 1% on average in lower-middle-income economies and by 1.3% on average in upper-middle-income economies. The average cost of regulatory compliance in low-income economies without third-party involvement is 7.8% lower; the tradeoff is that it takes longer than in those with third-party involvement.

The use of independent, private-sector entities in construction regulation has provided a conduit for the increased participation of the private sector in the regulatory process and—when appropriate safeguards are in place—has offered an innovative way of addressing regulatory gaps. Low compensation for public sector regulators has resulted in a scarcity of qualified building professionals in local governments. Hiring private sector experts has addressed this critical gap while improving the efficiency of the regulatory process. When it solicits the experts of private third-party engineering and architectural firms, the public sector taps into specialized skills that enable more robust compliance checks. These firms play a key role in monitoring the enforcement of building regulations and ensuring adherence to adequate standards of quality control at various stages of construction.

Initially pioneered in high-income economies—such as Australia, Japan and the United Kingdom—the trend toward involving private third-party engineers or specialized construction firms in public service delivery has been gradually gaining traction in lower-middle-income and upper-middle-income economies. Modern construction systems increasingly involve licensed or approved private engineers or firms, often enabled by the municipality and local enforcement agencies, to fulfill a building control function. Indeed, data show that 93 out of the 190 economies covered by Doing Business use

- Involving private sector engineers or firms in construction regulation is a trend that has been gaining traction in economies around the world.
- Some form of private sector participation in construction regulation is employed in 93 of the 190 economies covered by Doing Business.
- Private sector participation in building regulatory processes has shown positive results in achieving regulatory goals. However, the delegation of authority from the public to the private sector has generated significant challenges.
- Economies that employ some form of private sector involvement in construction regulation tend to have more efficient processes and better quality controls. Yet, they also exhibit higher costs and a propensity for conflicts of interest.
- The policy choice to integrate private sector entities in construction regulation should be accompanied by appropriate safeguards that favor the public interest over private profits.
some form of private third-party service in construction regulation. Of high-income and upper-middle-income economies, 66.1% and 56.9%, respectively, use third-party services in construction regulation, while 37.7% of lower-middle-income economies use third-party services. In contrast, only 25% of low-income economies make use of private third-party services in construction regulation (figure 5.1).

THE PRIVATE SECTOR’S ROLE IN CONSTRUCTION REGULATION

Over the past two decades, several models of private sector participation in building regulatory processes have emerged in economies around the world. Private participation in construction regimes can range from a very limited role for the private sector—such as in the Arab Republic of Egypt, where the Syndicate of Licensed Engineers merely certifies the qualifications of the supervising engineer—to a more comprehensive role where a private firm has complete authority over the entire process—such as in Australia, where private building surveyors directly oversee building design, control and inspection. In the United Kingdom, builders are given the option of either working with an approved private inspector or completing the required procedures with the public authorities. In other economies, such as France and the Republic of Congo, building controls are associated with an insurance-driven regulatory regime in which insurance and warranty firms engage private inspection firms in third-party reviews. While these two economies share the same insurance regime, there is a large disparity in terms of their performance on the quality control index, where France scores significantly higher than the Republic of Congo. At least two parties are held liable for any construction failure for a period of 10 years in 32% of high-income economies allowing third-party involvement, but this figure falls to just 9% for low-income economies. Under this legal framework, only buildings deemed safe by independent third-party entities can be insured by an insurance company.

The degree to which the private sector is engaged in regulatory activities varies significantly across economies (figure 5.2). However, the primary function of private third-party entities involved in construction regulation tends to focus on building inspections during project execution, as is the case in 92% of economies with private participation mechanisms. Of these economies, 61% engage private entities in reviewing building plans, 54% in conducting final inspections upon the completion of construction and 33% in conducting risk assessments of projects. Nonetheless, the issuance of building and occupancy permits remains largely under the purview of local authorities with only
9% of economies delegating these regulatory roles to the private sector.

**BENEFITS OF THIRD-PARTY INVOLVEMENT IN CONSTRUCTION REGULATION**

Economies can reap numerous benefits when private sector involvement is carefully implemented within a coherent regulatory framework. In most EU economies, there has been a complete shift from public to private governance mechanisms in building regulation, reflecting a desire to improve the quality of regulation, reduce the administrative burden for applicants and support a greater focus on risk mitigation.4

Public-private collaboration on construction regulation has shown positive results including improved compliance with building regulations, more rigorous quality control throughout the project lifecycle and better processing efficiency. *Doing Business* data show that private third-party involvement is associated with better building quality in construction as measured by the building quality control index.5 Private sector involvement in construction regulation can support the enforcement of building codes and other applicable regulations. It effectively promotes compliance with the existing legal framework, particularly in economies where clear, transparent rules and specific technical instructions are prescribed.

Economies that integrated the private sector into regulatory functions decades ago have seen notable improvements in building quality control. Japan, for example, suffers from an extremely high exposure to natural hazards such as typhoons and earthquakes. The authorities reformed building regulations in 1998 by introducing private third-party services to significantly expand its capacity to carry out building inspections. By doing so, it managed to increase the rate of final inspections to more than 90% in 2016 compared with just 40% before June 2000. By establishing a successful regulatory system that relies on third-party checks, Japan increased its capacity to detect deficiencies in building design and construction, offering timely and appropriate remedies. Private third-party firms now play an instrumental and dominant role in inspection works (figure 5.3).

Similarly, to improve the energy efficiency of its large stock of new buildings, in 2005 the Chinese government introduced an innovative private third-party mechanism to carry out compliance checks of green building code provisions, effectively tapping a vast and readily-available pool of private sector expertise. Five years after the reform, compliance rates with regulatory requirements had effectively doubled.6

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia initiated sweeping construction reforms in 2007/08 mandating the use of private engineers licensed by the Chamber of Engineers to undertake independent building plan reviews. Since then, FYR Macedonia has seen significant improvements in the efficiency of construction regulation as measured by *Doing Business*. The tradeoff has been an increase in regulatory cost (figure 5.4). Even the Netherlands—one of the few EU economies that has maintained exclusive public enforcement of building regulation—is now preparing to shift toward a more hybrid system of enforcement involving private third-party mechanisms.

Introducing private third-party involvement in construction regimes can also expand regulatory capacity through efficiency gains. The use of private sector third-party services allows for the flexibility to hire specialized expertise that is usually scarce in local municipal governments, particularly in low- and middle-income economies. Local governments are often subject to hiring restrictions and operate with less competitive pay scales that limit their capacity to hire well-qualified staff or contain the high level of staff turnover. These limitations are usually compounded by a wide range of factors, including inadequate local tax bases to fund service delivery, limited transfers from national governments and institutional capacity constraints.

*Doing Business* data show that the process of dealing with construction permits tends to be faster in economies with private participation in construction.

**FIGURE 5.3** Private third-party inspection firms have become instrumental players in Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public inspections</th>
<th>Private inspections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regulation. High-income economies employing private sector regulatory support experience time savings of up to 60 days on average compared to economies that do not rely on third-party participation. Private sector involvement in building control activities has the potential to promote administrative efficiency, which in turn results in favorable economic outcomes. A study of the economic impact of expediting permit processing reveals that improving administrative efficiency results in a 16.5% increase in property tax collection, a 5.7% increase in construction spending and a 0.6% increase in the rate of financial return for the investor. In contrast, regulatory delays could undermine the profitability of building projects, adding a financial burden that amounts to 5% of total construction costs incurred by developers and reducing the likelihood of further investment.

Economies with the least efficient construction permitting procedures have enforcement systems that rely exclusively on public authorities. Conversely, some economies that have transitioned from a public approach to a more open system involving partnerships with the private sector have experienced significant gains in efficiency. The planning office in Bogotá, Colombia, for example, reduced the average time needed to process a construction permit from three years in 1995 to 73 days in 2012 after it began using private professionals to carry out plan reviews and issue building permits. Given the successful integration of third-party professionals in building control activities, the authorities are now considering extending the use of specialized engineers to building inspections, which remain under the jurisdiction of local public officials.

**CHALLENGES OF THIRD-PARTY INVOLVEMENT IN CONSTRUCTION REGULATION**

Models of private sector participation in construction regimes vary. While third-party involvement in construction regulation can facilitate doing business in the construction industry by reducing the burden on local authorities, it comes with tradeoffs—including higher construction costs. Privatization of public services should be implemented carefully, with due regard to standards of transparency and accountability. The delegation of such a key regulatory mandate to the private sector should always be coupled with strict oversight safeguards designed to hold public interest above private profits.

For the private sector to successfully assume such an important regulatory role, a robust vetting system should be in place. Private third-party entities carrying out controls on construction are entrusted to promote compliance with building codes and regulations and enforce rigorous safeguards in favor of the public interest. For such an arrangement to work as intended, the public sector should regulate private third-party professionals and firms. Public sector agencies do so by enforcing professional certification criteria that render individuals and firms eligible to take on a regulatory mandate. Insufficient qualifications of private individuals or firms would undermine the objective of such a regulatory mechanism as the quality of service provided by these professionals would fail to meet the required standards of safety.

Economies with third-party involvement in regulatory functions often adopt specific standards of eligibility for private sector entities to be able to fulfill such a critical regulatory role. These standards typically include a minimum number of years of professional experience, certification by a recognized professional body and proof of performance on previous contracts. When private certification requirements were not properly implemented in New Zealand in the 1990s, the authorities quickly abandoned the shift to private sector building controls and reverted to the traditional public sector regulatory role. New Zealand’s attempt to adopt third-party inspections failed due to the lack of strong regulatory safeguards. This resulted in the “leaky building syndrome.” In 2008, the cost to repair 42,000 leaky buildings was estimated around 11.3 billion New Zealand dollars (approximately $8.3 billion). Third-party involvement in construction regulation holds the
promise of improving the regulatory framework, but it could also result in unintended adverse consequences if inadequately implemented. Although 22.2% of high-income economies with third-party involvement covered by Doing Business have standard eligibility requirements—including number of years of experience, a university degree and proof of performance on similar projects—only 3.3% of low-income economies require these standard qualifications.

Certifying agencies are mandated with monitoring the enforcement of professional standards. Government agencies represent the largest share of certifying bodies (68.5%) in those economies covered by Doing Business, followed by the national order of engineers (19.6%) and other independent bodies (13%) (table 5.1). In the United States, professional certification for third-party services is provided by the International Code Council (ICC), a non-governmental organization. Japan and China, by contrast, host this important function under central ministerial authorities. The United Kingdom has mandated an independent organization—the Construction Industry Council—to administer the registration system for Approved Inspectors (AIs).

Having strict qualification standards in place is an essential and necessary element of a third-party regulatory regime, but this alone is insufficient to ensure that qualified professionals are delivering a satisfactory service. Special attention should be given to the effective enforcement of these professional certification requirements. This may entail the introduction of oversight mechanisms, a liability and insurance regime and a disciplinary framework that accompanies the transfer of regulatory authority from public officials to third-party entities as part of an essential quality assurance mechanism of third-party providers. China, for example, directed the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development to certify private third-party companies to carry out compliance checks of green building code provisions. The ministry maintains a comprehensive online public database that contains information on certified third-party firms. It requires the management of construction inspection companies to maintain accountability and quality of service, enforcing penalties when violations are discovered by regular inspections of third-party firms.

When the regulatory framework clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of private service providers, third-party entities are aware of their rights and obligations under the law and can exercise their authority within a legally transparent environment. Furthermore, accountability provisions governing conflicts of interest should be put in place to minimize their incidence and promote unbiased and independent regulatory control. Regulations in 76% of economies that make use of third-party inspectors explicitly require the independence of third-party inspectors; they should have no financial interests in the project and should not be related to the investor or builder.

Without strong liability and insurance regimes and rigorous professional certification mechanisms, third-party involvement in construction regulation can become inefficient or fail to ensure high quality building standards. Moreover, builders could incur the high costs that often accompany private-sector regulatory control without fully benefiting from the advantages that this control is intended to offer. Some economies regulate the cost of such services to acceptable levels by enforcing fee schedules (within suggested industry guidelines) or by requiring fewer external professionals to be engaged by investors or local construction companies. In the Republic of Korea, for example, an independent third-party may not charge more than 1.29% of the estimated construction cost, in accordance with the Regulation for Scope of Architect Services and Fee Standard. In other economies, the local building authority either conducts all construction oversight or absorbs the cost of engaging external third-party professionals in the process through outsourcing. In South Africa, local authorities can temporarily appoint external building inspectors to conduct inspections on behalf of the local authority.

### TABLE 5.1 Distribution of certifying bodies for third-party entities involved in construction regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification agency for third-party entities in construction</th>
<th>Number of economies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of architects or engineers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other independent body</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

**CONCLUSION**

Sound construction regulation can save human lives, improve health and safety and support a prosperous and sustainable building sector and economy. It can help facilitate doing business by safeguarding lucrative investments, strengthening property rights and protecting the public from faulty building practices. Private sector involvement in the enforcement of building regulations has shown positive results in achieving regulatory goals. However, several challenges should be addressed before a policy of private sector involvement in construction regulation is pursued. The transfer of authority from the public to the private sphere could undermine the public interest. Public-private collaboration in building regulation has delivered successful results when authorities have enforced strict qualification requirements, effective oversight mechanisms and provisions on conflicts of interest, among other fundamental safeguards. A wealth of peer experience accumulated over the past 20 years is now available to economies considering integrating third-party entities in construction regulation.
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Transparency is a key element of the quality of land administration systems. Transparency eliminates asymmetrical information between users and officials with respect to services provided by the land administration, thereby increasing the efficiency of the real estate market. Transparent systems also strengthen public confidence in governments and facilitate substantial reductions in the cost of doing business.

In 2013 Transparency International reported that one in five users of land services globally claimed to have paid a bribe for services such as registering a land title or obtaining updated property ownership information. The prevalence of bribery in the land sector creates a substantial informal cost for those trying to register or transfer land. For those unable to afford illegal payments, it can also reduce access to land administration services, hindering property registration and increasing land tenure informality. In addition to bribes, corruption can take the form of land record fraud or alteration, land document forgery and multiple allocations of the same plot of land. Officials may also leverage their position to benefit from parties with an interest in acquiring, disposing of and developing land.¹

As a component of its registering property indicator set, Doing Business has measured the transparency of land administration systems for the past four years.² This research has focused on whether information concerning the ownership and physical location of a property is public, whether essential information on the property transfer process is made accessible, if there is an independent and specific complaint mechanism to respond to issues raised by land registry users and whether statistics on property transfers in the largest business city of an economy are published.³

Since 2013, 25 economies have improved transparency by launching websites, publishing fee schedules, setting time limits and implementing specific complaint mechanisms. Senegal introduced a comprehensive website for its land administration system, which includes a list of procedures, required documents, service standards and official fees to complete any property transaction.⁴ Similarly, Qatar and Guyana have increased transparency in their land administration systems by expanding web-based land administration portals to include dedicated and comprehensive sections on the services provided.⁵, ⁶

- Transparency of information provided by land administration systems can reduce transaction costs and facilitate investment in immovable property.
- In economies where information on fee schedules and documentary requirements is easily available, the process of completing property transfers tends to be more efficient.
- Since 2013, 25 economies have become more transparent by launching websites, publishing fee schedules, setting time limits and implementing specific complaint mechanisms.
- In 51 economies, the only way to obtain information about documentary requirements for property registration is by having an in-person interaction with a public official.
- Property-specific and independent complaint mechanisms are not common around the globe, indicating an area for improvement to increase transparency.
- A transparent land administration system reduces opportunities for corruption.
ACCESS TO INFORMATION DURING DUE DILIGENCE

Information on the property, the parties and the transfer process is fundamental for a property transaction to occur. Buyers and sellers will only be able to make informed decisions when this information is widely available, either at a low cost or free of charge. The parties should know the costs, required documents and the expected duration of the transfer process before the transaction takes place. Although these conditions are necessary for a sound land administration, whether an agency can deliver its services with efficiency and accountability depends on other variables such as the capacity and reliability of its infrastructure.

Around the world, 158 economies publish fee schedules for services offered at the land registry. If a fee schedule is public, it is also likely to be available online. In 131 economies, this information can be accessed through a dedicated website. Although the use of online platforms is common in high-income economies—where 80% publish fees on websites—only a third of low-income economies have such portals. One example is Zimbabwe. In 2016, the economy launched an official website that includes a list of documents and fees required to complete a land transaction, as well as a specific time frame for delivering legally-binding documents proving property ownership.

The documentary requirements for land registration should also be made available to the public. Parties involved in a property transaction can streamline their interactions with the agency in charge of property registration if they know beforehand what documents they will be required to submit. This greatly reduces the risk of unforeseen delays or obstacles to submitting a property transfer—including the incidence of informal payments. When the list of required documents is public and complete, for example, the likelihood that the parties would be requested to come back with additional documents is reduced, expediting the registration process.

Transparency of documentary requirements may also simplify a transaction by potentially reducing the need to resort to third-party professionals to prepare a property transfer application (figure 6.1). In 51 economies, the only way to obtain information about documentary requirements for property registration is by having an in-person interaction with a public official. In Zambia, for example, where the list of required documents is not publicly available, a lawyer is hired to complete most of the property transfer steps for a commercial warehouse, costing an entrepreneur an additional 2.5% of the property value.

To promote full transparency, in addition to document and fee schedules, all services provided by land registries—such as title search, ownership certificate or transfer of ownership—should be clearly specified, including the timeframes for their completion. This allows the public to know beforehand what level of service they can expect to receive, how much it will cost and how long it will take. Moreover, by providing clear public guidelines, governments set the standard for accountability of services offered by their land administration systems. Land registry services that lack established timeframes for completion can foster corruption in the form of bribes. An official might purposely delay registration, for example, to encourage clients to make facilitation payments to accelerate the process. Furthermore, in the absence of enforced time limits, land registry users are unable to monitor the status of their transactions.

Service standards at land registries are rare. Land registry users are not aware of any specific time limits promulgated by law in 122 economies covered by Doing Business. In addition, economies that do not establish service standards, such as specific time limits, tend to complete property transfers less efficiently (figure 6.2).

The Land Revenues Office charter, published in June 2013 by Nepal’s Department of Land Reform and Management, provides a good example of how to set effective time limits. The charter contains a comprehensive list of services provided by the Land Revenue Office, the list of documents needed to

---

**FIGURE 6.1** Transparency in land systems can bring efficiency gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average cost to transfer property (% of property value)</th>
<th>Average time to transfer property (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
complete each service, the applicable fees and the effective deadline within which the agency commits to deliver specific services. Similarly, the government of Thailand established a one-day service standard to register property transactions. To comply with this commitment, the number of staff is determined based on the average number of transactions, preventing delays.

**ACCESS TO INFORMATION DURING A PROPERTY TRANSACTION**

Land administration is defined by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) as “the processes of determining, recording and disseminating information about the ownership, value and use of land when implementing land management policies.” One of the major roles of a land registry is to make land transactions public. By doing so, it safeguards the interests of all parties involved in sales or leases.

When parties engage in a property transaction, it is essential that they obtain legally reliable information regarding the actual property involved in the transaction. The availability of information on the property—as well as its owners or creditors—helps to eliminate uncertainty over property rights or obligations that may encumber the property. In the absence of any public records or any related rights to a property, the transaction costs can become overwhelming, risking that ownership becomes untraceable.

In 127 of the 190 economies covered by *Doing Business*, the information recorded by the land registry is openly available to the public. In the remaining economies, mainly because of privacy concerns, only owners or third parties who prove legitimate interest can access the information kept in the land registry. In those economies, parties must hire an authorized professional to obtain ownership information, making the process more burdensome. In both cases, the agency in charge of registering immovable property can reject applications to access and retrieve ownership information on a discretionary basis. Public access should be embedded in land administration systems.

Among the economies covered by *Doing Business*, more than 70% of upper-middle-income and high-income economies make information on property ownership available to the public, whether for a nominal fee or free of charge. By contrast, only 50% of low-income economies open their records on land ownership to the public. Globally, information about land ownership is restricted to intermediaries and interested parties in 31% of economies. In 27 out of 190 economies—including Chile, Poland and the United States—this information is freely available (figure 6.3).

Because cadastral maps do not usually contain any personal information about the property owner, privacy concerns do not typically impact mapping agencies. However, the number of economies offering open access to maps is similar to the ones with open ownership information.

Overall, among the economies covered by *Doing Business*, 33% do not...
make information on land boundaries publicly available. Sweden, on the other hand, has an online system allowing anyone to freely access property ownership information and maps dating back 400 years.\textsuperscript{11}

\section*{ACCESS TO INFORMATION AFTER COMPLETION OF A PROPERTY TRANSACTION}

After property transactions are completed, it is important to provide citizens with a safe environment where they can register complaints. Unlike courts, an informal structure allows users to be more forthcoming about possible abuses, relieving the courts of additional cases. In addition to allowing citizens to contribute to a better business environment, an independent and specific mechanism for filing complaints would also help governments to track issues and respond accordingly.\textsuperscript{12}

Such complaint mechanisms promote three desired outcomes. First, the rights of citizens are safeguarded against any sub-standard service—whether by mistake or fault—provided by the land registry. Consequently, citizens can expect the land registry to provide services in accordance with the applicable rules and service guidelines. Second, citizens can have more confidence in a land tenure governance system where information is transparent and the officials providing land transfer services are held accountable for their actions. Third, candid feedback can help improve the administrative tasks performed by the land registry, resulting in a higher quality of service.

Only 24 economies measured by \textit{Doing Business} have established complaint mechanisms that improve the overall quality of land registries; half of these (12) are OECD high-income economies or East Asia and the Pacific economies. Such complaint mechanisms are not in place in any of the economies of South Asia or the Middle East and North Africa (figure 6.4). Globally, 22 economies offer complaint mechanisms in their cadastre or mapping agency. \textit{Doing Business} data suggest that this is one of the areas with the most room for improvement worldwide.

An independent and specific complaint mechanism is important in the fight against corruption. A study by Transparency International conducted in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda found that about 90\% of respondents that encountered a bribery incident did not report it or make a complaint to any authority or official; the reasons differed from economy to economy. In Kenya, most of the respondents indicated that they did not know where to report the incident, while in Tanzania most felt that no action would be taken to resolve their complaint.\textsuperscript{13} As of June 2017 it was possible to file a complaint online in only 19 economies covered by \textit{Doing Business}. The Singapore Land Authority recently introduced a web portal to file complaints about any issues related to their services. The Swedish Land and Cadastral Authority introduced a new mechanism for filing complaints regarding errors identified on maps of land plots.\textsuperscript{14} Similarly, Guatemala and Vanuatu have successfully implemented alternative offline solutions. In Guatemala, an agency within the public ministry investigates claims related to the land registry. In 2014 Vanuatu appointed the first Land’s Ombudsman, an official responsible for following up on all complaints, whose duty is to report to the lands ministry as well as the client within 30 days.

Governments can keep their stakeholders engaged by collecting and publishing statistics on land transactions. Transaction statistics benefit regulators as well as the real estate sector, serving as a data analysis tool for policy makers to monitor the real estate market. Currently, 122 economies covered by \textit{Doing Business} publish statistics on land transactions. In Japan, for example, data on land transactions are published monthly at the municipal level. In the United Arab Emirates, numbers on land transactions in Dubai are compiled daily and published on the land registry’s web portal.

\section*{REDUCING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CORRUPTION THROUGH TRANSPARENCY}

Transparency in a land administration system provides a defense against bribes intended to expedite the process of registering property, changing a title, acquiring information on land or processing cadastral surveys. Corruption in land administration can result in fraudulent land transfers, undermine public confidence in existing land rights while reducing investment and formal land
Such corrupt behaviors spur inefficient land ownership, with land being owned by those most able to participate in corrupt activities.16

Furthermore, corruption and abuse of power can hinder the development of the real estate market. It can have adverse consequences on the business climate and economic activities by increasing the costs of doing business, thus undermining private sector confidence. High costs, together with inefficient procedures discourage people from registering land transactions, steering them instead into the informal land market. Corruption in land management can have a direct negative impact on business operations.

To be successfully deployed, full-fledged land reforms are time-consuming, costly, demanding an immense effort from governments and stakeholders. But a transparent land administration system—one in which all land-related information is publicly available, all procedures regarding property transactions are clearly documented and information on fees for public services is easy to access—minimizes the opportunities for informal payments and abuses of the system. Indeed, cross-country data show that the greater the quality and transparency of a land administration system, the lower the incidence of bribery at the land registry (figure 6.5).

**CONCLUSION**

Transparency is one of the most important tools for combating corruption—it is the basic pillar of enhancing the quality of land administration.17 Moreover, rather than serving as a complementary tool, transparency should be considered as a key component when designing land policies. It is crucial that citizens have complete access to official land information, regulations and applicable fees. By establishing mechanisms that shield citizens from informal payments or other abuses, governments not only strengthen institutions but also increase the public’s confidence in them. Having well-defined rules and standards—in addition to a safe environment to censure wrongdoing—is essential to ensure quality and efficiency in the administration of land tenure rights.

**NOTES**

This case study was written by Yuriy Valentinovich Avramov, Albert Nogués i Comas, Laura Diniz, Brendan Meighan, Esperanza Pastor Nunes and Geyi Zheng.
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Since 2013/14, 19 economies have introduced reorganization procedures and another nine economies have improved their existing procedures. However, making them workable in practice can be challenging.

France introduced a restructuring procedure—the procédure de sauvegarde (safeguard procedure)—in 2005 to enable debtors to prevent economic and financial difficulties. Today, the procedure facilitates business survival in three out of four initiated cases.

Slovenia brought its legal framework closer to international good practices in 2013. Greater access to the reorganization procedures for creditors has been accompanied by an impressive survival rate of viable companies.

Although it took some time for stakeholders in Thailand to get accustomed to reorganization procedures, filings at the Central Bankruptcy Court increased steadily from 1% of total insolvency cases in 2011 to almost 9% in 2016.

Access to finance is key to the development of the private sector. Lenders need tools to assess not only the risk of non-repayment but also what happens if a debtor cannot repay debts as they mature. A good insolvency framework—one with clear rules, that efficiently rehabilitates viable companies and liquidates non-viable ones—provides entrepreneurs and lenders with tools to evaluate the consequences of a worst-case scenario.

Existing literature shows that legal protection of creditors and efficient enforcement are conducive to larger and more developed capital markets and that there is a link between insolvency reforms and access to credit. The specific features of an economy’s insolvency regime and its enforcement are important aspects for the legal protection of creditors. Several studies show that reforms strengthening the insolvency framework may reduce the cost of credit, increase the level of credit and lower interest rates on large loans.

A study on the 2005 Brazilian bankruptcy reform found a reduction in the cost of debt together with a significant increase in the amount of total and long-term debt. A more recent study found that the same reform led to an increase in secured loans, as well as an increase in investment and value of output in the years after the reform in Brazilian municipalities with less-congested courts. Another study shows that, across a sample of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, efficient bankruptcy procedures are associated with a higher proportion of new bank loans to large firms.

Other studies show that insolvency reforms that introduce or promote reorganization procedures through the adoption of several international good practices may decrease the failure rate of insolvent firms. Research on the 1999 Colombian bankruptcy reform shows that by reducing reorganization costs through, for example, streamlining the reorganization process and establishing mandatory deadlines on the length of proceedings, the new law enabled viable companies to reorganize and inefficient ones to liquidate (this was not possible before the reform).

Doing Business tracks insolvency reforms across 190 economies. Since Doing Business 2005, 110 economies have introduced 205 changes aimed at facilitating the efficient resolution of corporate insolvency. This case study uses the specific examples of France, Slovenia and Thailand to illustrate successful insolvency reforms that can inspire similar efforts elsewhere.

HOW HAVE ECONOMIES REFORMED THEIR INSOLVENCY SYSTEMS?

Insolvency laws have traditionally focused on enabling the swift liquidation of insolvent companies while organizing the repayment of creditors. The focus of modern insolvency regimes has been to offer restructuring tools to companies that are economically viable but face temporary
financial distress in order to maintain the business activity. Recent reform efforts around the world have introduced this modern feature to insolvency frameworks while also allowing the speedy liquidation of nonviable businesses.

In 2013/14, the resolving insolvency indicators started measuring whether insolvency laws complied with certain international standards, including access to reorganization proceedings for debtors and creditors. Since then, the most common type of reform recorded by the indicators has been the introduction of or improvements to reorganization procedures. During this period, 19 economies introduced reorganization procedures and another nine economies improved their existing procedures.7

Providing creditors with greater access to and participation in insolvency proceedings has been another common area of reform. Economies including Cyprus, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Mozambique, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Switzerland and Uganda have implemented reforms in this direction. Enabling creditors’ meaningful participation in the process can make them more cooperative and less litigious, and it can result in shorter proceedings.

Many factors, however, can make it challenging to implement insolvency reforms. Doing so requires not only the adoption of an insolvency law or amendments to existing legislation but also changes to regulation to make the law workable in practice. An insolvency law often requires setting up new structures under the regulatory framework such as, for example, a professional body of insolvency administrators. Successful implementation also requires the buy-in and active participation of the judiciary.

**WHAT DID SUCCESSFUL REFORMERS DO DIFFERENTLY?**

Doing Business has recorded several notable insolvency reforms. However, France, Slovenia and Thailand were selected for this case study because they implemented insolvency reforms that brought them closer to internationally recognized good practices—particularly through the introduction and improvement of restructuring procedures (table 7.1). There is also a significant amount of information available on the evolution of court procedures following these reforms. Business reorganization has become an increasingly utilized option for viable firms in financial distress in all three countries.

**The case of France**

Since the 1980s France has regularly assessed and updated its insolvency legal framework to encourage business rescue. In the mid-1980s—when the number of firms declaring bankruptcy doubled compared to the previous decade—liquidation was the only option available to companies in financial distress. The number of business liquidations rose from 11,000 in 1970 to 25,000 in 1984. Members of the legislature realized that some of these companies could have been saved had they been given the tools to restructure. The legislature subsequently adopted three laws in 1985 with the objective of saving viable businesses. A reorganization procedure, open to debtors in cessation of payments that had a prospect of survival, was introduced.

Contrary to initial expectations, the safeguard procedure was not widely used. When the procedure became available for the first time in 2006, only 509 safeguard applications were filed (compared to 16,046 judicial reorganizations and 31,045 judicial liquidations).8 One reason was that the criteria required to initiate the safeguard procedure were too strict. Debtors had to demonstrate that they were facing difficulties that would result in insolvent, which was challenging. Another reason was that the law did not clearly stipulate which party—the company managers or the court-appointed administrator—was responsible for the preparation of the safeguard plan, an issue which could deter managers from starting the proceedings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Reform content</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>High number of bankruptcy cases; no possibility for companies to reorganize prior to the reform</td>
<td>Starting in 1985, introduced restructuring procedures with focus on preventing firms economic and financial difficulties</td>
<td>Increased number of initiated and successful reorganization cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>High number of insolvent companies as a result of the 2008 global financial crisis; features of restructuring procedures not suited; no preventive procedures available</td>
<td>Starting in 2008, introduced preventive restructuring procedure for medium and large-size companies and simplified reorganization procedure for micro and small-size companies; improved access to reorganization proceedings for creditors</td>
<td>Increased number of initiated and successful reorganization cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>High number of non-performing loans in the context of the 1997 Asian financial crisis; no possibility for companies to reorganize prior to the reform</td>
<td>Starting in 1998, introduced reorganization procedure for corporate debtors; created specialized bankruptcy court</td>
<td>Increased number of initiated and successful reorganization cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
The insolvency law was amended again in 2008 to make the safeguard procedure more accessible and attractive to debtors by simplifying the eligibility criteria. Debtors had only to demonstrate difficulties—economic, financial, or legal—that they could not overcome, without having to define or qualify the gravity or extent of those difficulties. The 2008 amendment also made the procedure more attractive by clarifying that the managers of the company were responsible for preparing the safeguard plan with the assistance of the court-appointed administrator. Furthermore, in 2011 France introduced a procedure—the sauvegarde financière accélérée (accelerated financial safeguard)—under which a debtor can reach an out-of-court arrangement with a majority of its financial creditors and then initiate summary court proceedings to validate the agreement without negatively impacting non-financial creditors.

These changes led to a significant increase in the number of new safeguard procedures filed, to 1,386 cases in 2009. Since then the number of filings has risen steadily, to 1,620 new cases in 2014. Not only did the use of safeguard procedures increase, but three out of four cases terminated with an agreement to enable the company to continue operating (figure 7.1). However, the increased use of the safeguard procedure was accompanied by a significant number of filings for liquidation, which in 2014 amounted to 69% of all insolvency cases filed.

By allowing viable companies to restructure and continue operating as going concerns, the amendments to the insolvency law aimed to support entrepreneurial risk-taking and encourage enterprise creation. Insolvency reforms may have contributed in part to the surge in new businesses in France—525,000 companies were created in 2015, twice as many as in 2000. This growth underscores the connection made in the literature between sound insolvency systems and the level of entrepreneurship development as measured by the rate of new firm entry and entrepreneurship support.3

**The case of Slovenia**

The early 2000s were a period of significant reform in Slovenia as the country prepared to join the European Union in 2004. A new insolvency law was adopted in 2007, but it was insufficient to cope with the challenging economic and financial conditions brought on by the global financial crisis of 2008; many companies became insolvent. Firms suffered from over-indebtedness and had difficulties repaying their loans, leading to an increase in corporate non-performing loans to around 20% of total loans.11 Firms in Slovenia needed effective corporate restructuring procedures to guide the restructuring of their debt.

To address these needs and to bring the legal framework closer to international good practices, the government modified the corporate restructuring framework in 2013. The changes included the creation of a new pre-insolvency restructuring procedure for distressed medium and large-size companies to restructure their financial claims, as well as a new simplified compulsory settlement procedure to offer a reorganization option for micro and small companies. A change was also made to the existing compulsory settlement procedure to enable creditors to initiate the reorganization of companies for the first time.

The procedures quickly became a popular option for debtors and creditors. In the first two years following the reform, the proportion of companies using one of the three procedures more than doubled, rising from 6% of total insolvency proceedings in 2013 to 14% in 2015.11 Microenterprises, however, underwent corporate liquidation proceedings in the vast majority of cases (96%) in 2016. Microenterprises have less capacity to face a reorganization and to secure resources to enable them to operate in a situation of financial distress. Despite these challenges, microenterprises have also benefited from the restructuring options. Indeed, the number of simplified compulsory settlement proceedings for the benefit of microenterprises increased from 59 cases in 2014 to 85 in 2016.

---

**FIGURE 7.1** A significant number of companies undergoing restructuring proceedings in France continue operating at the end of proceedings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Safeguard procedure</th>
<th>Judicial reorganization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deloitte and Altares 2016.
Note: Companies that continue operating include companies that adopted a reorganization or safeguard plan, or that were sold as a whole.
Creditors have progressively taken advantage of the enabled access to compulsory settlement proceedings granted to them in 2013; by 2016 they initiated almost one-third of all cases. During the same period, the number of successfully terminated reorganization proceedings increased significantly. In 2016, most ended with an approved settlement (figure 7.2).

One of the companies that benefited from the restructuring procedures was Pivovarna Laško, Slovenia’s largest brewer. By the end of 2014, the company’s total financial liabilities stood at 226.8 million euros (about $268 million). It negotiated a restructuring plan with its creditors, which included a two-year debt rescheduling, the sale of shares in other companies and an intensive search for additional capital. Following the agreement, the company was bought by Heineken International BV, which committed to provide financial stability to the company. Following the sale of its assets in various corporations and entering into long-term loan agreements with Heineken, the company was able to repay its creditors in full in October 2015. Its value increased, the brewery was able to continue operating, saving hundreds of jobs.

Apart from increasing the likelihood of business survival—as shown by the rising number of successfully-terminated compulsory settlement and simplified settlement procedures—the insolvency reform may have contributed to broader positive economic effects. First, the level of entrepreneurship and company formation in Slovenia increased. One year after the reform was introduced, 6,243 new businesses were registered in Slovenia, the highest number in a decade (and similar to pre-crisis levels). Second, progress has been made in addressing Slovenia’s high level of non-performing loans, which decreased from 15% of total loans in 2012 to 7.9% in 2016. While these results do not establish a causal relationship with the insolvency reform, they suggest that sound insolvency regimes may encourage entrepreneurship and accelerate the speed of adjustment of non-performing loans.12

**The case of Thailand**

The 1997 Asian financial crisis prompted a major insolvency reform in Thailand. Non-performing loans had been increasing before the crisis, reaching a peak of 42.9% of total loans in 1998. Thailand’s antiquated insolvency law needed to be revised and given the features necessary to perform. The 1940 Thai Bankruptcy Act established the procedure of judicial liquidation for debtors unable to meet their financial commitments. It relied on an agency within the Ministry of Justice—the Legal Execution Department—to direct the proceedings. The only aim of the law was to organize the repayment of creditors through liquidation procedures; it did not offer a channel for viable companies to survive.

Amendments brought by the Bankruptcy Act of 1998 built on the existing legal and institutional framework. They introduced a reorganization procedure for corporate entities, giving insolvent debtors the chance to negotiate a reorganization plan with creditors. A specialized bankruptcy court was established in 1999 to adjudicate cases. Also, the Business Reorganization Office (within the Legal Execution Department) was set up to administer new reorganization cases.

Considerable time was needed in Thailand for stakeholders to become accustomed to reorganization procedures. Finding expertise within Thailand to prepare reorganization plans proved challenging; it required the capacity to negotiate a plan with multiple creditors in a short period of time to return the company to profitability. Managers of companies in financial difficulties found it challenging to formulate a reorganization plan effectively. Debtors turned to large companies with foreign human capital that had expertise in drafting such plans. However, this approach was expensive, making reorganization procedures accessible to only a small number of large debtors.

As a result, in the years following the reform, the number of annual applications for reorganization was modest, averaging 30 to 70 (compared to approximately 700 annual applications for
Realizing that the benefits of the procedure had to be explained to stakeholders, the government undertook outreach efforts. As local firms gained the necessary expertise to advise debtors during the reorganization process, reorganization practices progressively became more widespread in Bangkok. Consequently, all parties were able to experience the advantages of the new mechanism, enabling them to make use of it to save viable businesses. Together with a greater understanding of the law, reorganization filings rose to 3.5% of total insolvency cases in 2014 (from 1.1% in 2011). The share almost doubled in 2015 and continued to rise in 2016, when 8.5% of insolvency petitions received by the judiciary were reorganization cases (figure 7.3).

The rising use of reorganization proceedings in Thailand has driven an increase in the rate of successful reorganizations (that is, cases that end up with the approval of the reorganization plan, regardless of whether they continue operating in the longer term). The Central Bankruptcy Court’s reorganization plan approval rate reached 25% in 2016, up from 20% in 2015.

The connection between the insolvency reform and the likelihood of business survival is reflected in Doing Business data. Resolving simple reorganization cases in Bangkok has become easier over time. Companies are now more likely to continue operating at the end of reorganization procedures. Also, today it takes 18 months on average, half the time it took in 2010, for a small company to go through reorganization, counted up to the moment the reorganization plan is approved by creditors.

Studies on the effect of insolvency reforms that accelerate the procedures find that they increase the aggregate level of credit. Other studies suggest that where insolvency regimes are most effective, creditors are more willing to lend because they are more likely to recoup a larger share of a troubled loan. Following the reform in Thailand, domestic credit to the private sector rose from 93% of GDP in 2001 to 147% of GDP in 2016. Banks are more willing to lend in Thailand than in other parts of East Asia and the Pacific. Data from the World Bank Enterprise Surveys show that only 2.4% of firms in Thailand identify access to finance as a major constraint to doing business, compared to 12.2% of firms in the region and 26.5% in all economies. While no causal relationship can be established between these results and the bankruptcy reform in Thailand, they do show that access to credit improved in the years following the reform.

CONCLUSION

The successful implementation of insolvency reforms is not easy. Many factors must come into play for an insolvency reform to yield positive effects in both insolvency practice and the economy. Even in economies with strong legal frameworks and institutions, insolvency reforms take time. It is a complex area of law, which is why different agencies—including the judiciary as well as insolvency administrators—need to be trained and given the means to carry out the tasks envisioned in the law.

Lessons can be drawn from reforms implemented worldwide. The French and Slovenian examples show the importance of constantly assessing the insolvency system. Insolvency law is not a static field. Rather, it serves the economic system and needs to adapt as the structure of the economy evolves. Implementing and refining insolvency reform takes time; a quick fix will not bring positive long-term results. The example of Thailand illustrates the importance of utilizing the existing infrastructure to drive change—the focus should be on building on existing laws and institutions and creating new ones only when the existing system cannot be adapted. A new framework requires training along with patience. Amending the law should not be seen as a goal in itself, but rather as a first step to be followed by the thorough implementation of the amended law.

All in all, the three examples suggest that sound insolvency reforms can have a positive impact on an economy. Providing corporate debtors with the option to

FIGURE 7.3  Distressed businesses in Bangkok are more likely to pursue reorganization today than seven years ago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases as a share of total insolvency cases (%)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reorganize increases the chances of debt recovery by creditors, positively influencing their willingness to lend. The availability of reorganization procedures also increases the likelihood that viable firms will continue operating despite financial difficulties, thus decreasing the failure rate of firms, preserving jobs and encouraging entrepreneurship.
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7. The 19 economies that have introduced reorganization procedures are Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Kosovo, Liberia, Malawi, Mozambique, Panama, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, the Seychelles, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, and the United Arab Emirates. The nine economies that improved their existing reorganization procedures are Chile, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, Thailand, and Switzerland.
10. IMF 2015.
16. These data are from the World Development Indicators database (http://data.worldbank.org/indicator), World Bank.
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The indicators presented and analyzed in Doing Business measure business regulation and the protection of property rights—and their effect on businesses, especially small and medium-size domestic firms. First, the indicators document the complexity of regulation, such as the number of procedures to start a business or to register a transfer of commercial property. Second, they gauge the time and cost to achieve a regulatory goal or comply with regulation, such as the time and cost to enforce a contract, go through bankruptcy or trade across borders. Third, they measure the extent of legal protections of property, for example, the protections of minority investors against looting by company directors or the range of assets that can be used as collateral according to secured transactions laws. Fourth, a set of indicators documents the tax burden on businesses. Finally, a set of data covers different aspects of employment regulation. The 11 sets of indicators measured in Doing Business were added over time, and the sample of economies and cities expanded (table 8.1).

**METHODOLOGY**

The Doing Business data are collected in a standardized way. To start, the Doing Business team, with expert advisers, designs a questionnaire. The questionnaire uses a simple business case to ensure comparability across economies and over time—with assumptions about the legal form of the business, its size, its location and the nature of its operations.

Questionnaires are administered to more than 13,000 local experts, including lawyers, business consultants, accountants, freight forwarders, government officials and other professionals routinely administering or advising on legal and regulatory requirements (table 8.2). These experts have several rounds of interaction with the Doing Business team, involving conference calls, written correspondence and visits by the team. For Doing Business 2018 team members visited 26 economies to verify data and recruit respondents. The data from questionnaires are subjected to numerous rounds of verification, leading to revisions or expansions of the information collected.

The Doing Business methodology offers several advantages. It is transparent, using factual information about what laws and regulations say and allowing multiple interactions with local respondents to clarify potential misinterpretations of questions. Having representative samples of respondents is not an issue; Doing Business is not a statistical survey, and the texts of the relevant laws and regulations are collected and answers checked for accuracy. The methodology is easily replicable, so data can be collected in a large sample of economies. Because standard assumptions are used in the data collection, comparisons and benchmarks are valid across economies. Finally, the data not only highlight the extent of specific regulatory obstacles to business but also identify their source and point to what might be reformed. Doing Business 2018 has no major methodological change at the indicators level.
The Doing Business methodology has five limitations that should be considered when interpreting the data. First, for most economies the collected data refer to businesses in the largest business city (which in some economies differs from the capital) and may not be representative of regulation in other parts of the economy. (The exceptions are 11 economies which had a population of more than 100 million in 2013, where Doing Business now also collects data for the second largest business city.) To address this limitation, subnational Doing Business indicators were created (box 8.1). Second, the data often focus on a specific business form—generally a limited liability company (or its legal equivalent) of a specified size—and may not be representative of the regulation on other businesses (for example, sole proprietorships). Third, transactions described in a standardized case scenario refer to a specific set of issues and may not represent the full set of issues that a business encounters. Fourth, the measures of time involve an element of judgment by the expert respondents. When sources indicate different estimates, the time indicators reported in Doing Business represent the median values of several responses given under the assumptions of the standardized case.

### TABLE 8.1 Topics and economies covered by each Doing Business report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of economies          | 133     | 145     | 155     | 175     | 178     | 181     | 183     | 183     | 185     | 189     | 189     | 189     | 190     | 190     |         |

Note: Data for the economies added to the sample each year are back-calculated to the previous year. The exceptions are Kosovo and Montenegro, which were added to the sample after they became members of the World Bank Group. Eleven cities (though no additional economies) were added to the sample starting in Doing Business 2015. The data for all sets of indicators in Doing Business 2018 are for June 2017.

### TABLE 8.2 How many experts does Doing Business consult?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator set</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Economies with given number of respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market regulation</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,079</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOX 8.1 Benchmarking regulation and learning from good practices at the local level: the relevance of subnational Doing Business studies

Policy makers are increasingly interested in how the business environment differs between locations within the same economy. Substantial differences between locations that share the same legal and regulatory framework can be revealing: local officials find it hard to explain why doing business is more difficult in their jurisdiction than in a neighboring one. By expanding the Doing Business analysis beyond an economy’s largest business city, subnational Doing Business studies (which are undertaken at the request of governments) capture these differences at the local level, allowing policy makers to effectively target bottlenecks and improve the business environment across their economy.

Subnational studies show that there can be substantial variation in regulations or in the implementation of national laws across locations within an economy (as in Kazakhstan, for example). Similarly, there can be variations within locations across economies (as in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania). Some economies experience more variation than others. A study completed in 2017 benchmarking five different provinces in Afghanistan, for example, showed that dealing with construction permits takes as few as 96 days in Kandahar but almost four times as long in Kabul. Similarly, registering a property transfer takes 75 days in Kandahar, but more than three times as long in Kabul.

What is the main lesson? Afghan policy makers do not have to look very far to improve business processes in Kabul. Reforming legislation is not always necessary. In some cases, the answer may be a staffing increase or a reduction in the paperwork required. Looking at how processes work in other locations—in this case, Kandahar—can assist policy makers in replicating these good practices.

Furthermore, because the data produced by subnational Doing Business studies are comparable across locations within an economy and internationally, policy makers can benchmark their results both locally and globally. This allows them to see how their overall performance in Doing Business would improve if the largest business city were to adopt all of the good practices documented within their borders. Six economies completed subnational studies in 2017: Afghanistan (five locations), Colombia (32 locations), three EU member states (22 cities in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania) and Kazakhstan (eight locations). These studies show that if the latter four economies were to adopt local good practices across the getting electricity indicators, for example, their overall performance on the indicators would improve.

Subnational studies cover all regions of the world and economies of varying income levels, including fragile and conflict-affected states such as Afghanistan, which completed a subnational Doing Business study in 2017 (see map). Ongoing studies include those in Nigeria (36 states and the Federal Capital Territory of Abuja) and four EU member states (Croatia, the Czech Republic, Portugal and the Slovak Republic). Since 2005 subnational reports have covered 485 locations in 71 economies. Seventeen economies—including the Arab Republic of Egypt, Mexico, Nigeria, the Philippines and the Russian Federation—have undertaken two or more rounds of subnational data collection to measure progress over time.

Subnational studies cover a large number of cities across all regions of the world

Source: Subnational Doing Business database.

Note: Subnational reports are available on the Doing Business website at http://www.doingbusiness.org/subnational.
Economy characteristics

Gross national income per capita

Doing Business 2018 reports 2016 income per capita as published in the World Bank’s World Development Indicators 2017. Income is calculated using the Atlas method (in current U.S. dollars). For cost indicators expressed as a percentage of income per capita, 2016 gross national income (GNI) per capita in current U.S. dollars is used as the denominator. GNI data based on the Atlas method were not available for Bahrain; Brunei Darussalam; Djibouti; Eritrea; the Islamic Republic of Iran; Kuwait; Libya; Myanmar; Oman; Papua New Guinea; Puerto Rico (territory of the United States); Qatar; San Marino; Somalia; South Sudan; the Syrian Arab Republic; Taiwan, China; Timor-Leste; Vanuatu; and República Bolivariana de Venezuela. In these cases, GDP or GNP per capita data and growth rates from other sources, such as the International Monetary Fund’s World Economic Outlook database and the Economist Intelligence Unit, were used.

Region and income group

Doing Business uses the World Bank regional and income group classifications, available at https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519. Regional averages presented in figures and tables in the Doing Business report include economies from all income groups (low, lower middle, upper middle and high income), though high-income OECD economies are assigned the “regional” classification OECD high income.

Population


Finally, the methodology assumes that a business has full information on what is required and does not waste time when completing procedures. In practice, completing a procedure may take longer if the business lacks information or is unable to follow up promptly. Alternatively, the business may choose to disregard some burdensome procedures. For both reasons the time delays reported in Doing Business 2018 would differ from the recollection of entrepreneurs reported in the World Bank Enterprise Surveys or other firm-level surveys.

DATA CHALLENGES AND REVISIONS

Most laws and regulations underlying the Doing Business data are available on the Doing Business website at http://www.doingbusiness.org. All the sample questionnaires and the details underlying the indicators are also published on the website. Questions on the methodology and challenges to data can be submitted through email at rru@worldbank.org.

Doing Business publishes 24,120 indicators (120 indicators per economy) each year. To create these indicators, the team measures more than 118,000 data points, each of which is made available on the Doing Business website. Historical data for each indicator and economy are available on the website, beginning with the first year the indicator or economy was included in the report. To provide a comparable time series for research, the data set is back-calculated to adjust for changes in methodology and any revisions in data due to corrections. The website also makes available all original data sets used for background papers. The correction rate between Doing Business 2017 and Doing Business 2018 is 8.8%.

Governments submit queries on the data and provide new information to Doing Business. During the Doing Business 2018 production cycle the team received 181 such queries from governments. In addition, the team held multiple video conferences with government representatives in 65 economies and in-person meetings with government representatives from 44 economies.

STARTING A BUSINESS

Doing Business records all procedures officially required, or commonly done in practice, for an entrepreneur to start up and formally operate an industrial or commercial business, as well as the time and cost to complete these procedures and the paid-in minimum capital requirement (figure 8.1). These procedures include the processes entrepreneurs undergo when obtaining all necessary approvals, licenses, permits and completing any required notifications, verifications or inscriptions for the company and employees with relevant authorities. The ranking of economies on the ease of starting a business is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for starting a business. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.2). The distance to frontier score shows the distance of an economy to the “frontier,” which is derived from the most efficient practice or highest score achieved on each indicator.

Two types of local limited liability companies are considered under the starting a business methodology. They are identical in all aspects, except that one company is owned by five married women and other by five married men. The distance to frontier score for each indicator is the average of the scores obtained for each of the component indicators for both of these standardized companies.
After a study of laws, regulations and publicly available information on business entry, a detailed list of procedures is developed, along with the time and cost to comply with each procedure under normal circumstances and the paid-in minimum capital requirement. Subsequently, local incorporation lawyers, notaries and government officials review and verify the data. Information is also collected on the sequence in which procedures are to be completed and whether procedures may be carried out simultaneously. It is assumed that any required information is readily available and that the entrepreneur will pay no bribes. If answers by local experts differ, inquiries continue until the data are reconciled.

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the businesses and the procedures are used.

Assumptions about the business
The business:
- Is a limited liability company (or its legal equivalent). If there is more than one type of limited liability company in the economy, the limited liability form most common among domestic firms is chosen. Information on the most common form is obtained from incorporation lawyers or the statistical office.
- Operates in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1 at the end of the data notes).
- Is 100% domestically owned and has five owners, none of whom is a legal entity.
- Has start-up capital of 10 times income per capita.
- Performs general industrial or commercial activities, such as the production or sale to the public of goods or services. The business does not perform foreign trade activities and does not handle products subject to a special tax regime, for example, liquor or tobacco. It is not using heavily polluting production processes.
- Leases the commercial plant or offices and is not a proprietor of real estate.
- The amount of the annual lease for the office space is equivalent to one income per capita.
- The size of the entire office space is approximately 929 square meters (10,000 square feet).
- Does not qualify for investment incentives or any special benefits.
- Has at least 10 and up to 50 employees one month after the commencement of operations, all of them domestic nationals.
- Has a turnover of at least 100 times income per capita.
- Has a company deed that is 10 pages long.

The owners:
- Have reached the legal age of majority and are capable of making decisions as an adult. If there is no legal age of majority, they are assumed to be 30 years old.
- Are sane, competent, in good health and have no criminal record.
- Are married, the marriage is monogamous and registered with the authorities.
- Where the answer differs according to the legal system applicable to the woman or man in question (as may be the case in economies where there is legal plurality), the answer used will be the one that applies to the majority of the population.

Procedures
A procedure is defined as any interaction of the company founders with external parties (for example, government agencies, lawyers, auditors or notaries) or spouses (if legally required). Interactions between company founders or company officers and employees are not counted.
as procedures. Procedures that must be completed in the same building but in different offices or at different counters are counted as separate procedures. If founders have to visit the same office several times for different sequential procedures, each is counted separately. The founders are assumed to complete all procedures themselves, without middlemen, facilitators, accountants or lawyers, unless the use of such a third party is mandated by law or solicited by the majority of entrepreneurs. If the services of professionals are required, procedures conducted by such professionals on behalf of the company are counted as separate procedures. Each electronic procedure is counted as a separate procedure. Approvals from spouses to own a business or leave the home are considered procedures if required by law or if by failing to obtain such approval the spouse will suffer consequences under the law, such as the loss of right to financial maintenance. Obtaining permissions only required by one gender for company registration and operation, or getting additional documents only required by one gender for a national identification card are considered additional procedures. In that case, only procedures required for one spouse but not the other are counted. Both pre- and postincorporation procedures that are officially required or commonly done in practice for an entrepreneur to formally operate a business are recorded (table 8.3).

Procedures required for official correspondence or transactions with public agencies are also included. For example, if a company seal or stamp is required on official documents, such as tax declarations, obtaining the seal or stamp is counted. Similarly, if a company must open a bank account in order to complete any subsequent procedure—such as registering for value added tax or showing proof of minimum capital deposit—this transaction is included as a procedure. Shortcuts are counted only if they fulfill four criteria: they are legal, they are available to the general public, they are used by the majority of companies, and avoiding them causes delays.

Only procedures required for all businesses are included. Industry-specific procedures are excluded. For example, procedures to comply with environmental regulations are included only when they apply to all businesses conducting general commercial or industrial activities. Procedures that the company undergoes to connect to electricity, water, gas and waste disposal services are not included in the starting a business indicators.

**Time**

Time is recorded in calendar days. The measure captures the median duration that incorporation lawyers or notaries indicate is necessary in practice to complete a procedure with minimum follow-up with government agencies and no unofficial payments. It is assumed that the minimum time required for each procedure is one day, except for procedures that can be fully completed online, for which the minimum time required is recorded as half a day. Although procedures may take place simultaneously, they cannot start on the same day (that is, simultaneous procedures start on consecutive days). A registration process is considered completed once the company has received the final incorporation document or can officially commence business operations. If a procedure can be accelerated legally for an additional cost, the fastest procedure is chosen if that option is more beneficial to the economy’s distance to frontier score. When obtaining a spouse’s approval, it is assumed that permission is granted at no additional cost unless the permission needs to be notarized. It is assumed that the entrepreneur does not waste time and commits to completing each remaining procedure without delay. The time that the entrepreneur spends on gathering information is not measured. It is assumed that the entrepreneur is aware of all entry requirements and their sequence from the beginning but has had no prior contact with any of the officials involved.

**Cost**

Cost is recorded as a percentage of the economy’s income per capita. It includes all official fees and fees for legal or professional services if such services are required by law or commonly used in practice. Fees for purchasing and legalizing company books are included if these transactions are required by law. Although value added tax registration can be counted as a separate procedure, value added tax is not part of the incorporation cost. The company law, the commercial code and specific regulations and fee schedules are used as sources for calculating costs. In the absence of fee schedules, a government officer’s estimate is taken as an official source.
estimate, estimates by incorporation experts are used. If several incorporation experts provide different estimates, the median reported value is applied. In all cases the cost excludes bribes.

**Paid-in minimum capital**
The paid-in minimum capital requirement reflects the amount that the entrepreneur needs to deposit in a bank or with a third-party (for example, a notary) before registration or up to three months after incorporation. It is recorded as a percentage of the economy’s income per capita. The amount is typically specified in the commercial code or the company law. The legal provision needs to be adopted, enforced and fully implemented. Any legal limitation of the company’s operations or decisions related to the payment of the minimum capital requirement is recorded. In case the legal minimum capital is provided per share, it is multiplied by the number of shareholders owning the company. Many economies require minimum capital but allow businesses to pay only a part of it before registration, with the rest to be paid after the first year of operation. In Turkey in June 2017, for example, the minimum capital requirement was 10,000 Turkish liras, of which one-fourth needed to be paid before registration. The paid-in minimum capital recorded for Turkey is therefore 2,500 Turkish liras, or 7.8% of income per capita.

**REFORMS**
The starting a business indicator set tracks changes related to the ease of incorporating and operating a limited liability company every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The starting a business indicator set uses one criterion to recognize a reform.

The aggregate gap on the overall distance to frontier of the indicator set is used to assess the impact of data changes. Any data update that leads to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap is classified as a reform (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking). For example, if the implementation of a new one-stop shop for company registration reduces time and procedures in a way that the overall gap decreases by 2% or more, the change is classified as a reform. On the contrary, minor fee updates or other small changes in the indicators that have an aggregate impact of less than 2% on the gap are not classified as a reform, but the data is updated accordingly.

**The data details on starting a business can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. This methodology was developed by Djankov and others (2002) and is adopted here with minor changes.**

**DEALING WITH CONSTRUCTION PERMITS**
Doing Business records all procedures required for a business in the construction industry to build a warehouse, along with the time and cost to complete each procedure. In addition, Doing Business measures the building quality control index, evaluating the quality of building regulations, the strength of quality control and safety mechanisms, liability and insurance regimes, and professional certification requirements. Information is collected through a questionnaire administered to experts in construction licensing, including architects, civil engineers, construction lawyers, construction firms, utility service providers, and public officials who deal with building regulations, including approvals, permit issuance, and inspections.

The ranking of economies on the ease of dealing with construction permits is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for dealing with construction permits. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.3).

**EFFICIENCY OF CONSTRUCTION PERMITTING**
Doing Business divides the process of building a warehouse into distinct procedures in the questionnaire and solicits data for calculating the time and cost to complete each procedure (figure 8.4). These procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Obtaining all plans and surveys required by the architect and the engineer to start the design of the building plans (for example, topographical surveys, location maps or soil tests).
- Obtaining and submitting all relevant project-specific documents (for example, building plans, site maps and certificates of urbanism) to the authorities.
- Hiring external third-party supervisors, consultants, engineers or inspectors (if necessary).
- Obtaining all necessary clearances, licenses, permits and certificates.

**FIGURE 8.3** Dealing with construction permits: efficiency and quality of building regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps to comply with formalities, completed when final document is received</th>
<th>Quality of building regulation and its implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days to comply with formalities to build a warehouse</td>
<td>Cost to comply with formalities, as % of warehouse value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
● Submitting all required notifications for the start and end of construction and for inspections.
● Requesting and receiving all necessary inspections (unless completed by a hired private, third-party inspector).

Doing Business also records procedures for obtaining connections for water and sewerage. Procedures necessary to register the warehouse so that it can be used as collateral or transferred to another entity are also counted.

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the construction company, the warehouse project and the utility connections are used.

**Assumptions about the construction company**
The construction company (BuildCo):

- Is a limited liability company (or its legal equivalent).
- Operates in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table B8A.1).
- Is 100% domestically and privately owned.
- Has five owners, none of whom is legal entity.
- Is fully licensed and insured to carry out construction projects, such as building warehouses.

- Has 60 builders and other employees, all of them nationals with the technical expertise and professional experience necessary to obtain construction permits and approvals.
- Has a licensed architect and a licensed engineer, both registered with the local association of architects or engineers, where applicable. BuildCo is not assumed to have any other employees who are technical or licensed specialists, such as geological or topographical experts.
- Has paid all taxes and taken out all necessary insurance applicable to its general business activity (for example, accidental insurance for construction workers and third-person liability).
- Owns the land on which the warehouse will be built and will sell the warehouse upon its completion.

**Assumptions about the warehouse**
The warehouse:

- Will have road access and be located in the periurban area of the economy’s largest business city (that is, on the fringes of the city but still within its official limits). For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- Will not be located in a special economic or industrial zone.
- Will be located on a land plot of approximately 929 square meters (10,000 square feet) that is 100% owned by BuildCo and is accurately registered in the cadastre and land registry where freehold titles exist. However, when the land is owned by the government and leased by BuildCo, it is assumed that BuildCo will register the land in the cadastre or land registry or both, whichever is applicable, at the completion of the warehouse.
- Is valued at 50 times income per capita.
- Will be a new construction (with no previous construction on the land), with no trees, natural water sources, natural reserves, or historical monuments of any kind on the plot.
- Will have complete architectural and technical plans prepared by a licensed architect and a licensed engineer. If preparation of the plans requires such steps as obtaining further documentation or getting prior approvals from external agencies, these are counted as procedures.
- Will include all technical equipment required to be fully operational.
- Will take 30 weeks to construct (excluding all delays due to administrative and regulatory requirements).

**Assumptions about the utility connections**
The water and sewerage connections:

- Will have road access and be located in the periurban area of the economy’s largest business city (that is, on the fringes of the city but still within its official limits). For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- Will not be located in a special economic or industrial zone.
- Will be located on a land plot of approximately 929 square meters (10,000 square feet) that is 100% owned by BuildCo and is accurately registered in the cadastre and land registry where freehold titles exist. However, when the land is owned by the government and leased by BuildCo, it is assumed that BuildCo will register the land in the cadastre or land registry or both, whichever is applicable, at the completion of the warehouse.
- Is valued at 50 times income per capita.
- Will be a new construction (with no previous construction on the land), with no trees, natural water sources, natural reserves, or historical monuments of any kind on the plot.
- Will have complete architectural and technical plans prepared by a licensed architect and a licensed engineer. If preparation of the plans requires such steps as obtaining further documentation or getting prior approvals from external agencies, these are counted as procedures.
- Will include all technical equipment required to be fully operational.
- Will take 30 weeks to construct (excluding all delays due to administrative and regulatory requirements).
- Will not require water for fire protection reasons; a fire extinguishing system (dry system) will be used instead. If a wet fire protection system is required by law, it is assumed that the water demand specified below also covers the water needed for fire protection.

- Will have an average water use of 662 liters (175 gallons) a day and an average wastewater flow of 568 liters (150 gallons) a day. Will have a peak water use of 1,325 liters (350 gallons) a day and a peak wastewater flow of 1,136 liters (300 gallons) a day.

- Will have a constant level of water demand and wastewater flow throughout the year.

- Connection pipes will be 1 inch in diameter for water and 4 inches in diameter for sewerage.

**Procedures**

A procedure is any interaction of the building company’s employees, managers, or any party acting on behalf of the company with external parties, including government agencies, notaries, the land registry, the cadastral, utility companies, and public inspectors—and the hiring of external private inspectors and technical experts where needed. Interactions between company employees, such as development of the warehouse plans and inspections by the in-house engineer, are not counted as procedures. However, interactions with external parties that are required for the architect to prepare the plans and drawings (such as obtaining topographic or geological surveys), or to have such documents approved or stamped by external parties, are counted as procedures. Procedures that the company undergoes to connect the warehouse to water and sewerage are included. All procedures that are legally required and that are done in practice by the majority of companies to build a warehouse are counted, even if they may be avoided in exceptional cases. This includes obtaining technical conditions for electricity or clearance of the electrical plans only if they are required to obtain a building permit (table 8.4).

**Time**

Time is recorded in calendar days. The measure captures the median duration that local experts indicate is necessary to complete a procedure in practice. It is assumed that the minimum time required for each procedure is one day, except for procedures that can be fully completed online, for which the time required is recorded as half a day. Although procedures may take place simultaneously, they cannot start on the same day (that is, simultaneous procedures start on consecutive days), again with the exception of procedures that can be fully completed online. If a procedure can be accelerated legally for an additional cost, the fastest procedure is chosen if that option is more beneficial to the economy’s distance to frontier score. It is assumed that BuildCo does not waste time and commits to completing each remaining procedure without delay. The time that BuildCo spends on gathering information is not taken into account. It is assumed that BuildCo follows all building requirements and their sequence as required.

**Cost**

Cost is recorded as a percentage of the warehouse value (assumed to be 50 times income per capita). Only official costs are recorded. All fees associated with completing the procedures to legally build a warehouse are recorded, including those associated with obtaining land use approvals and preconstruction design clearances; receiving inspections before, during, and after construction; obtaining utility connections; and registering the warehouse at the property registry. Nonrecurring taxes required for the completion of the warehouse project are also recorded. Sales taxes (such as value added tax) or capital gains taxes are not recorded. Nor are deposits that must be paid up front and are later refunded. The building code, information from local experts, and specific regulations and fee schedules are used as sources for costs. If several local partners provide different estimates, the median reported value is used.

### TABLE 8.4 What do the indicators on the efficiency of construction permitting measure?

| Procedures to legally build a warehouse (number) | Submitting all relevant documents and obtaining all necessary clearances, licenses, permits and certificates |
| Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days) | Does not include time spent gathering information |
| Cost required to complete each procedure (% of warehouse value) | Each procedure starts on a separate day—though procedures that can be fully completed online are an exception to this rule |

**BUILDING QUALITY CONTROL**

The building quality control index is based on six indices—the quality of building regulations, quality control before, during and after construction, liability and insurance regimes, and professional certifications indices (table 8.5). The indicator is based on the same case study assumptions as the measures of efficiency.

**Quality of building regulations index**

The quality of building regulations index has two components:

- Whether building regulations are easily accessible. A score of 1 is assigned if building regulations (including the building code) or regulations dealing with construction permits are available on a website that is updated as new regulations are passed; 0.5 if the building regulations are available free of charge (or for a nominal fee) at the relevant permit-issuing authority; 0 if
TABLE 8.5 What do the indicators on building quality control measure?

### Quality of building regulations index (0–2)
- Accessibility of building regulations (0–1)
- Clarity of requirements for obtaining a building permit (0–1)
- Quality control before construction index (0–1)
- Whether licensed or technical experts approve building plans (0–1)
- Quality control during construction index (0–3)
- Types of inspections legally mandated during construction (0–1)
- Implementation of legally mandated inspections in practice (0–1)
- Quality control after construction index (0–3)
- Final inspection legally mandated after construction (0–2)
- Implementation of legally mandated final inspection in practice (0–1)
- Liability and insurance regimes index (0–2)
- Parties held legally liable for structural flaws after building occupancy (0–1)
- Parties legally mandated to obtain insurance to cover structural flaws after building occupancy or insurance is commonly obtained in practice (0–1)
- Professional certifications index (0–4)
- Qualification requirements for individual who approves building plans (0–2)
- Qualification requirements for individual who supervises construction or conducts inspections (0–2)
- Building quality control index (0–15)
- Sum of the quality of building regulations, quality control before construction, quality control during construction, quality control after construction, liability and insurance regimes, and professional certifications indices

The building regulations must be purchased or if they are not made easily accessible anywhere.

- Whether the requirements for obtaining a building permit are clearly specified. A score of 1 is assigned if the building regulations (including the building code) or any accessible website, brochure, or pamphlet clearly specifies the list of required documents to submit, the fees to be paid, and all required preapprovals of the drawings (example: electrical, water and sewerage, environmental) or plans by the relevant agencies; 0 if none of these sources specify any of these requirements or if these sources specify fewer than the three requirements mentioned above.

The index ranges from 0 to 2, with higher values indicating clearer and more transparent building regulations.

In New Zealand, for example, all relevant legislation can be found on an official government website (a score of 1). The legislation specifies the list of required documents to submit, the fees to be paid, and all required preapprovals of the drawings or plans by the relevant agencies (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives New Zealand a score of 2 on the quality of building regulations index.

### Quality control before construction index

The quality control before construction index has one component:

- Whether by law, a licensed architect or licensed engineer is part of the committee or team that reviews and approves building permit applications and whether that person has the authority to refuse an application if the plans are not in conformity with regulations. A score of 1 is assigned if the national association of architects or engineers (or its equivalent) must review the building plans, if an independent firm or expert who is a licensed architect or engineer must review the plans, if the architect or engineer who prepared the plans must submit an attestation to the permit-issuing authority stating that the plans are in compliance with the building regulations or if a licensed architect or engineer is part of the committee or team that approves the plans at the relevant permit-issuing authority; 0 if no licensed architect or engineer is involved in the review of the plans to ensure their compliance with building regulations.

The index ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating better quality control in the review of the building plans. In Rwanda, for example, the city hall in Kigali must review the building permit application, including the plans and drawings, and both a licensed architect and a licensed engineer are part of the team that reviews the plans and drawings. Rwanda therefore receives a score of 1 on the quality control before construction index.

### Quality control during construction index

The quality control during construction index has two components:

- Whether inspections during construction are mandated by law during the construction process. A score of 2 is assigned if (i) a government agency is legally mandated to conduct technical inspections at different stages during the construction or an in-house engineer (that is, an employee of the building company), an external supervising engineer or firm is legally mandated to conduct technical inspections at different stages during the construction and is required to submit a detailed inspections report at the completion of the construction; and (ii) it is legally mandated to conduct risk-based inspections. A score of 1 is assigned if a government agency is legally mandated to conduct only technical inspections at different stages during the construction or if an in-house engineer (that is, an employee of the building company), an external supervising engineer or an external inspections firm is legally mandated to conduct technical inspections at different stages during the construction of the building and is required to submit a detailed inspections report at the completion of the construction. A score of 0 is assigned if a government agency is legally mandated to conduct unscheduled inspections, or if no technical inspections are mandated by law.

- Whether inspections during construction are implemented in practice. A score of 1 is assigned if the legally mandated inspections during construction always occur in practice; 0
The index has two components: construction index and liability and insurance regimes index. The construction index ranges from 0 to 3, with higher values indicating better quality control during the construction process. The liability and insurance regimes index ranges from 0 to 2, with higher values indicating more stringent latent defect liability and insurance regimes.

### Quality control after construction index

The quality control after construction index has two components:

- Whether a final inspection is mandated by law in order to verify that the building was built in compliance with the approved plans and existing building regulations. A score of 2 is assigned if an in-house supervising engineer (that is, an employee of the building company), an external supervising engineer or an external inspections firm is legally mandated to verify that the building has been built in accordance with the approved plans and existing building regulations, or if a government agency is legally mandated to conduct a final inspection upon completion of the building; 0 if no final inspection is mandated by law after construction and no third party is required to verify that the building has been built in accordance with the approved plans and existing building regulations.

- Whether the final inspection is implemented in practice. A score of 1 is assigned if the legally mandated final inspection after construction always occurs in practice or if a supervising engineer or firm attests that the building has been built in accordance with the approved plans and existing building regulations; 0 if the legally mandated final inspection does not occur in practice, if the legally mandated final inspection occurs most of the time but not always, or if a final inspection is not mandated by law regardless of whether or not it commonly occurs in practice.

### Liability and insurance regimes index

The liability and insurance regimes index has two components:

- Whether any parties involved in the construction process are held legally liable for latent defects such as structural flaws or problems in the building once it is in use. A score of 1 is assigned if at least two of the following parties are held legally liable for structural flaws or problems in the building once it is in use: the architect or engineer who designed the plans for the building, the professional or agency that conducted technical inspections, or the construction company; 0.5 if only one of the parties is held legally liable for structural flaws or problems in the building once it is in use; 0 if no party is held legally liable for structural flaws or problems in the building once it is in use, if the project owner or investor is the only party held liable, if liability is determined in court, or if liability is stipulated in a contract.

- Whether any parties involved in the construction process are required to obtain a latent defect liability or decennial (10 years) liability—insurance policy to cover possible structural flaws or problems in the building once it is in use. A score of 1 is assigned if the architect or engineer who designed the plans for the building, the professional or agency that conducted the technical inspections, the construction company, or the project owner or investor is required by law to obtain either a decennial liability insurance policy or a latent defect liability insurance to cover possible structural flaws or problems in the building once it is in use or if a decennial liability insurance policy or a latent defect liability insurance is commonly obtained in practice by the majority of any of these parties even if not required by law. A score of 0 is assigned if no party is required by law to obtain either a decennial liability insurance or a latent defect liability insurance and such insurance is not commonly obtained in practice by any party, if the requirement to obtain an insurance policy is stipulated in a contract, if any party must obtain a professional insurance or an all risk insurance to cover the safety of workers or any other defects during construction but not a decennial liability insurance or a latent defect liability insurance that would cover defects after the building is in use, or if any party is required to pay for any damages caused on their own without having to obtain an insurance policy.

The index ranges from 0 to 3, with higher values indicating better quality control after the construction process. In Haiti, for example, the Municipality of Port-au-Prince is legally mandated to conduct a final inspection under the National Building Code of 2012. However, the final inspection does not occur in practice. Adding these numbers gives Haiti a score of 2 on the quality control after construction index.
Madagascar a score of 1 on the liability and insurance regimes index.

Professional certifications index
The professional certifications index has two components:

- The qualification requirements of the professional responsible for verifying that the architectural plans or drawings are in compliance with the building regulations. A score of 2 is assigned if national or state regulations mandate that the professional must have a minimum number of years of practical experience, must have a university degree (a minimum of a bachelor’s) in architecture or engineering, and must also either be a registered member of the national order (association) of architects or engineers or pass a qualification exam. A score of 1 is assigned if national or state regulations mandate that the professional must have a university degree (a minimum of a bachelor’s) in architecture or engineering, and must also either have a minimum number of years of practical experience or be a registered member of the national order (association) of architects or engineers or pass a qualification exam. If no national or state regulation determines the professional’s qualifications requirements.

- The qualification requirements of the professional who conducts the technical inspections during construction. A score of 2 is assigned if national or state regulations mandate that the professional must have a minimum number of years of practical experience, must have a university degree (a minimum of a bachelor’s) in engineering, and must also either be a registered member of the national order of engineers or pass a qualification exam. A score of 1 is assigned if national or state regulations mandate that the professional must have a university degree (a minimum of a bachelor’s) in engineering and must also either have a minimum number of years of practical experience or be a registered member of the national order (association) of engineers or pass a qualification exam. A score of 0 is assigned if national or state regulations mandate that the professional must meet only one of the requirements, if they mandate that the professional must meet two of the requirements but neither of the two is to have a university degree, or if no national or state regulation determines the professional’s qualification requirements.

The index ranges from 0 to 4, with higher values indicating greater professional certification requirements. In Albania, for example, the professional conducting technical inspections during construction must have a minimum number of years of experience, a relevant university degree and must be a registered architect or engineer (a score of 2). However, the professional responsible for verifying that the architectural plans or drawings are in compliance with building regulations must only have a minimum number of years of experience and a university degree in architecture or engineering (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Albania a score of 3 on the professional certifications index.

Building quality control index
The building quality control index is the sum of the scores on the quality of building regulations, quality control before construction, quality control during construction, quality control after construction, liability and insurance regimes, and professional certifications indices. The index ranges from 0 to 15, with higher values indicating better quality control and safety mechanisms in the construction regulatory system.

If an economy issued no building permits between June 2016 and June 2017 or if the applicable building legislation in the economy is not being implemented, the economy receives a “no practice” mark on the procedures, time and cost indicators. In addition, a “no practice” economy receives a score of 0 on the building quality control index even if its legal framework includes provisions related to building quality control and safety mechanisms.

REFORMS
The dealing with construction permits indicator set tracks changes related to the efficiency and quality of construction permitting systems every year. Depending on the impact on the data certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The dealing with construction permits indicator set uses only one criterion to recognize a reform.

The aggregate gap on the overall distance to frontier of the indicator set is used to assess the impact of data changes. Any data update that leads to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap is classified as a reform (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking). For example, if the implementation of a new electronic permitting system reduces time in a way that the overall gap decreases by 2% or more, such a change is classified as a reform. On the contrary, minor fee updates or other smaller changes in the indicators that have an aggregate impact of less than 2% on the gap are not classified as a reform, but their impact is still reflected on the most updated indicators for this indicator set.

The data details on dealing with construction permits can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org.
GETTING ELECTRICITY

Doing Business records all procedures required for a business to obtain a permanent electricity connection and supply for a standardized warehouse (figure 8.5). These procedures include applications and contracts with electricity utilities, all necessary inspections and clearances from the distribution utility and other agencies, and the external and final connection works. The questionnaire divides the process of getting an electricity connection into distinct procedures and solicits data for calculating the time and cost to complete each procedure.

In addition, Doing Business measures the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (included in the aggregate distance to frontier score and ranking on the ease of doing business) and the price of electricity (omitted from these aggregate measures). The reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index encompasses quantitative data on the duration and frequency of power outages as well as qualitative information on the mechanisms put in place by the utility for monitoring power outages and restoring power supply, the reporting relationship between the utility and the regulator for power outages, the transparency and accessibility of tariffs and whether the utility faces a financial deterrent aimed at limiting outages (such as a requirement to compensate customers or pay fines when outages exceed a certain cap).

The ranking of economies on the ease of getting electricity is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for getting electricity. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for all the component indicators except the price of electricity (figure 8.6).

Data on the reliability of supply are collected from the electricity distribution utilities or regulators, depending upon the specific technical nature of the data. The rest of the information, including data on transparency of tariffs and procedures for obtaining electricity connection, are collected from all market players—the electricity distribution utility, electricity regulatory agencies and independent professionals such as electrical engineers, electrical contractors and construction companies. The distribution utility consulted is the one serving the area (or areas) where warehouses are most commonly located. If there is a choice of distribution utilities, the one serving the largest number of customers is selected.

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the warehouse, the electricity connection and the monthly consumption are used.

Assumptions about the warehouse
- Is owned by a local entrepreneur.
- Is located in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1).
- Is located in an area where similar warehouses are typically located. In this area a new electricity connection is not eligible for a special investment promotion regime (offering special subsidization or faster service, for example).
- Is located in an area with no physical constraints. For example, the property is not near a railway.
- Is a new construction and is being connected to electricity for the first time.
- Has two stories, both above ground, with a total surface area of approximately 1,300.6 square meters (14,000 square feet). The plot of land on which it is built is 929 square meters (10,000 square feet).
- Is used for storage of goods.
Assumptions about the electricity connection

The electricity connection:
- Is a permanent one.
- Is a three-phase, four-wire Y connection with a subscribed capacity of 140-kilo-volt-ampere (kVA) with a power factor of 1, where 1 kVA = 1 kilowatt (kW).
- Has a length of 150 meters. The connection is to either the low- or medium-voltage distribution network and is either overhead or underground, whichever is more common in the area where the warehouse is located.
- Requires works that involve the crossing of a 10-meter wide road (by excavation, overhead lines) but are all carried out on public land. There is no crossing of other owners’ private property because the warehouse has access to a road.
- Includes only negligible length in the customer’s private domain.
- Does not require work to install the internal wiring of the warehouse. This has already been completed up to and including the customer’s service panel or switchboard and the meter base.

Assumptions about the monthly consumption for March
- It is assumed that the warehouse operates 30 days a month from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (8 hours a day), with equipment utilized at 80% of capacity on average and that there are no electricity cuts (assumed for simplicity reasons).
- The monthly energy consumption is 26,880 kilowatt-hours (kWh); hourly consumption is 112 kWh.
- If multiple electricity suppliers exist, the warehouse is served by the cheapest supplier.
- Tariffs effective in March of the current year are used for calculation of the price of electricity for the warehouse. Although March has 31 days, for calculation purposes only 30 days are used.

Procedures

A procedure is defined as any interaction of the company’s employees or its main electrician or electrical engineer (that is, the one who may have done the internal wiring) with external parties, such as the electricity distribution utility, electricity supply utilities, government agencies, electrical contractors and electrical firms. Interactions between company employees and steps related to the internal electrical wiring, such as the design and execution of the internal electrical installation plans, are not counted as procedures. Procedures that must be completed with the same utility but with different departments are counted as separate procedures (table 8.6).

The company’s employees are assumed to complete all procedures themselves unless the use of a third party is mandated (for example, if an electrician registered with the utility is the only party allowed to submit an application). If the company can, but is not required to request the services of professionals (such as a private firm), procedures will be counted for each interaction commonly done in practice.

Time

Time is recorded in calendar days. The measure captures the median duration that the electricity utility and experts indicate is necessary in practice, rather than required by law, to complete a procedure with minimum follow-up and no extra payments. It is assumed that the minimum time required for each procedure is one day. Although procedures may take place simultaneously, they cannot start on the same day (that is, simultaneous procedures start on consecutive days). It is assumed that the company does not waste time and commits to completing each remaining procedure without delay. The time that the company spends on gathering information is not taken into account. It is assumed that the company is aware of all electricity connection requirements and their sequence from the beginning.

Cost

Cost is recorded as a percentage of the economy’s income per capita and is exclusive of value added tax. All the fees and costs associated with completing the procedures to connect a warehouse to electricity are recorded, including those related to obtaining clearances from government agencies, applying for the connection, receiving inspections of both the site and the internal wiring, purchasing material, getting the actual connection works and paying a security deposit. Information from local experts

## Table 8.6 What do the getting electricity indicators measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures to obtain an electricity connection (number)</th>
<th>Submitting all relevant documents and obtaining all necessary clearances and permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days)</td>
<td>Is at least one calendar day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official costs only, no bribes</td>
<td>Reflects the time spent in practice, with little follow-up and no prior contact with officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost required to complete each procedure (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>Does not include time spent gathering information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transmits the ranking on the ease of getting electricity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Tools to restore power supply (0–1)**
- **Duration and frequency of power outages (0–3)**
- **Transparency and accessibility of tariffs (0–1)**
- **Price of electricity (cents per kilowatt-hour)**

Note: While Doing Business measures the price of electricity, it does not include these data when calculating the distance to frontier score for getting electricity or the ranking on the ease of getting electricity.
and specific regulations and fee schedules are used as sources. If several local partners provide different estimates, the median reported value is used. In all cases the cost excludes bribes.

**Security deposit**
Utilities may require security deposits as a guarantee against the possible failure of customers to pay their consumption bills. For this reason, the security deposit for a new customer is most often calculated as a function of the customer’s estimated consumption.

*Doing Business* does not record the full amount of the security deposit. If the deposit is based on the customer’s actual consumption, this basis is the one assumed in the case study. Rather than the full amount of the security deposit, *Doing Business* records the present value of the losses in interest earnings experienced by the customer because the utility holds the security deposit over a prolonged period, in most cases until the end of the contract (assumed to be after five years). In cases where the security deposit is used to cover the first monthly consumption bills, it is not recorded. To calculate the present value of the lost interest earnings, the end-2016 lending rates from the International Monetary Fund’s International Financial Statistics are used. In cases where the security deposit is returned with interest, the difference between the lending rate and the interest paid by the utility is used to calculate the present value.

In some economies, the security deposit can be put up in the form of a bond: the company can obtain from a bank or an insurance company a guarantee issued on the assets it holds with that financial institution. In contrast to the scenario in which the customer pays the deposit in cash to the utility, in this case the company does not lose ownership control over the full amount and can continue using it. In return, the company will pay the bank a commission for obtaining the bond. The commission charged may vary depending on the credit standing of the company. The best possible credit standing and thus the lowest possible commission are assumed. Where a bond can be put up, the value recorded for the deposit is the annual commission times the five years assumed to be the length of the contract. If both options exist, the cheaper alternative is recorded.

In Hong Kong SAR, China, a customer requesting a 140-kVA electricity connection in March 2017 would have had to put up a security deposit of 63,600 Hong Kong dollars (~$7,850) in cash or check, and the deposit would have been returned only at the end of the contract. The customer could instead have invested this money at the prevailing lending rate of 5.0%. Over the five years of the contract, this would imply a present value of lost interest earnings of 13,760 Hong Kong dollars (~$1,700). In contrast, if the customer chose to settle the deposit with a bank guarantee at an annual rate of 1.5%, the amount lost over the five years would be just 4,770 Hong Kong dollars (~$590).

**Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index**
*Doing Business* uses the system average interruption duration index (SAIDI) and the system average interruption frequency index (SAIFI) to measure the duration and frequency of power outages in the largest business city of each economy (for 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city; table 8A.1). SAIDI is the average total duration of outages over the course of a year for each customer served, while SAIFI is the average number of service interruptions experienced by a customer in a year. Annual data (covering the calendar year) are collected from distribution utility companies and national regulators on SAIDI and SAIFI. Both SAIDI and SAIFI estimates should include planned and unplanned outages, as well as load shedding.

An economy is eligible to obtain a score on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index if it satisfies two conditions. First, the utility must collect data on all types of outages (measuring the average total duration of outages per customer and the average number of outages per customer). Second, the SAIDI value must be below a threshold of 100 hours and the SAIFI value must be under 100 outages.

An economy is not eligible to obtain a score if outages are too frequent or long-lasting for the electricity supply to be considered reliable—that is, if the SAIDI or the SAIFI values exceed the determined thresholds. An economy is also not eligible to obtain a score on the index if data on power outages are not collected or collected partially (for example, planned outages or load shedding are not included in the calculation of the SAIDI and SAIFI indices), and if the minimum outage time considered for calculation of the SAIDI and SAIFI indices is over 5 minutes.

For all economies that meet the criteria as determined by *Doing Business*, a score on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index is calculated on the basis of the following six components:

- What the SAIDI and SAIFI values are. If SAIDI and SAIFI are 12 (equivalent to an outage of one hour each month) or below, a score of 1 is assigned. If SAIDI and SAIFI are 4 (equivalent to an outage of one hour each quarter) or below, 1 additional point is assigned. Finally, if SAIDI and SAIFI are 1 (equivalent to an outage of one hour per year) or below, 1 more point is assigned.
- What tools are used by the distribution utility to monitor power outages. A score of 1 is assigned if the utility uses automated tools, such as an Outage/Incident Management System (OMS/IMS) or Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system; 0 if it relies solely on calls from customers, and records and monitors outages manually.
What tools are used by the distribution utility to restore power supply. A score of 1 is assigned if the utility uses automated tools, such as an OMS/IMS or SCADA system; 0 if it relies solely on manual resources for service restoration, such as field crews or maintenance personnel.

Whether a regulator—that is, an entity separate from the utility—monitors the utility’s performance on reliability of supply. A score of 1 is assigned if the regulator performs periodic or real-time reviews; 0 if it does not monitor power outages and does not require the utility to report on reliability of supply.

Whether financial deterrents exist to limit outages. A score of 1 is assigned if the utility compensates customers when outages exceed a certain cap, if the utility is fined by the regulator when outages exceed a certain cap or if both these conditions are met; 0 if no deterrent mechanism of any kind is available.

Whether electricity tariffs are transparent and easily available. A score of 1 is assigned if effective tariffs are available online and customers are notified of a change in tariff a full billing cycle (that is, one month) ahead of time; 0 if not.

The index ranges from 0 to 8, with higher values indicating greater reliability of electricity supply and greater transparency of tariffs. In the United Kingdom, for example, the distribution utility company UK Power Networks uses SAIDI and SAIFI metrics to monitor and collect data on power outages. In 2016, the average total duration of power outages in London was 0.326 hours per customer and the average number of outages experienced by a customer was 0.166. Both SAIDI and SAIFI are below the threshold and indicate that there was less than one outage a year per customer, for a total duration of less than one hour. So the economy not only meets the eligibility criteria for obtaining a score on the index, it also receives a score of 3 on the first component of the index. The utility uses the automatic GE PowerOn Control System to identify faults in the network (a score of 1) and restore electricity service (a score of 1). The Office of Gas and Electricity Markets, an independent national regulatory authority, actively reviews the utility’s performance in providing reliable electricity service (a score of 1) and requires the utility to compensate customers if outages last longer than a maximum period defined by the regulator (a score of 1). Customers are notified of a change in tariffs ahead of the next billing cycle and can easily check effective tariffs online (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives the United Kingdom a total score of 8 on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index.

On the other hand, several economies receive a score of 0 on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index. The reason may be that outages occur more than once a month and none of the mechanisms and tools measured by the index are in place. An economy may also receive a score of 0 if either the SAIDI or SAIFI value (or both) exceeds the threshold of 100, or not all outages were considered when calculating the indices. In Suriname, for example, the utility does not include load shedding in the calculation of SAIDI and SAIFI indices. Thus, based on the criteria established, Suriname cannot receive a score on the index even though the utility uses automated systems for monitoring outages and restoration of power supply and there is a transparency of electricity tariffs.

If an economy issued no new electricity connections to an electrical grid between June 2016 and June 2017, or if electricity is not provided during that period, the economy receives a “no practice” mark on the procedures, time and cost indicators. In addition, a “no practice” economy receives a score of 0 on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariff index even if, for example, there is regulatory oversight of utilities on power interruptions, among others.

Price of electricity

Doing Business measures the price of electricity but does not include these data when calculating the distance to frontier score for getting electricity or the ranking on the ease of getting electricity. The data are available on the Doing Business website (http://www.doingbusiness.org) and are based on standardized assumptions to ensure comparability across economies.

The price of electricity is measured in U.S. cents per kilowatt-hour. A monthly electricity consumption is assumed, for which a monthly bill is then computed for a warehouse based in the largest business city of the economy for the month of March (for 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city; table 8A.1). As noted, the warehouse uses electricity 30 days a month, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., so different tariff schedules may apply if a time-of-use tariff is available.

REFORMS

The getting electricity indicator set tracks changes related to the efficiency of the connection process, as well as the reliability of power supply and transparency of tariffs. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The getting electricity indicator set uses two criteria to recognize a reform.

First, the aggregate gap on the overall distance to frontier of the indicator set is used to assess the impact of data changes. Any data update that leads to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap is classified as a reform (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking). For example, if the implementation of a new single window at the utility reduces the time to process new connection requests in a way that the overall gap decreases by 2% or more, such a change is classified as a reform. On the other hand, minor
fee updates from the utility or other small changes that have an aggregate impact of less than 2% on the gap are not classified as a reform, but their impact is still reflected in the most updated indicators for this topic.

Second, to be considered a reform, changes in the data must be tied to an initiative led by the utility or by the government—and not an exogenous event. For example, if outages increase considerably from one year to the next due to inclement weather, this cannot be considered a reform that makes doing business harder. Similarly, if the cost of electricity-related materials (such as cabling or transformers) decreases due to a currency appreciation, this cannot be considered a reform that makes doing business easier. However, if a utility establishes a one-stop shop to streamline the connection process or if it installs an automated system to improve monitoring of power outages and restoration of electricity services, these actions would be considered reforms that made doing business easier.

The data details on getting electricity can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. The initial methodology was developed by Geginat and Ramalho (2015) and is adopted here with minor changes.

**REGISTERING PROPERTY**

Doing Business records the full sequence of procedures necessary for a business (the buyer) to purchase a property from another business (the seller) and to transfer the property title to the buyer’s name so that the buyer can use the property for expanding its business, use the property as collateral in taking new loans or, if necessary, sell the property to another business. It also measures the time and cost to complete each of these procedures. Doing Business also measures the quality of the land administration system in each economy. The quality of land administration index has five dimensions:

- Efficiency of transferring property
- Quality of land administration system (including the quality of land registry)
- Cost to transfer property
- Reliability of infrastructure
- Transparency and coverage of land administration system

The ranking of economies on the ease of registering property is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for registering property. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.7).

**EFFICIENCY OF TRANSFERRING PROPERTY**

As recorded by Doing Business, the process of transferring property starts with obtaining the necessary documents, such as a copy of the seller’s title if necessary, and conducting due diligence if required. The transaction is considered complete when it is opposable to third parties and when the buyer can use the property, use it as collateral for a bank loan or resell it (figure 8.8). Every procedure required by law or necessary in practice is included, whether it is the responsibility of the seller or the buyer or must be completed by a third party on their behalf. Local property lawyers, notaries and property registries provide information on procedures as well as the time and cost to complete each of them.

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the parties to the transaction, the property and the procedures are used.

**Assumptions about the property**

- The property:
  - Has a value of 50 times income per capita, which equals the sale price.
  - Is fully owned by the seller.
  - Has no mortgages attached and has been under the same ownership for the past 10 years.
  - Is registered in the land registry or cadastre, or both, and is free of title disputes.
  - Is located in a periurban commercial zone, and no rezoning is required.
  - Consists of land and a building. The land area is 557.4 square meters (6,000 square feet). A two-story warehouse of 929 square meters (10,000 square feet) is located on the land. The warehouse is 10 years old, is in good condition, has no heating system and complies with all safety standards, building codes and other legal requirements. The property, consisting of land and building, will be transferred in its entirety.
  - Will not be subject to renovations or additional construction following the purchase.
  - Has no trees, natural water sources, natural reserves or historical monuments of any kind.

- The parties (buyer and seller):
  - Are limited liability companies (or the legal equivalent).
  - Are located in the periurban area of the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1).
  - Are 100% domestically and privately owned.
  - Have 50 employees each, all of whom are nationals.
  - Perform general commercial activities.

- The data details on getting electricity can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. The initial methodology was developed by Geginat and Ramalho (2015) and is adopted here with minor changes.
Will not be used for special purposes, and no special permits, such as for residential use, industrial plants, waste storage or certain types of agricultural activities, are required.

Has no occupants, and no other party holds a legal interest in it.

Procedures
A procedure is defined as any interaction of the buyer or the seller, their agents (if an agent is legally or in practice required) with external parties, including government agencies, inspectors, notaries and lawyers. Interactions between company officers and employees are not considered. All procedures that are legally or in practice required for registering property are recorded, even if they may be avoided in exceptional cases (table 8.7). If a procedure can be accelerated legally for an additional cost, the fastest legal procedure available and used by the majority of property owners is chosen. If procedures can be undertaken simultaneously, it is assumed that they are. It is assumed that the parties involved are aware of all requirements and their sequence from the beginning. Time spent on gathering information is not considered. If time estimates differ among sources, the median reported value is used.

Cost
Cost is recorded as a percentage of the property value, assumed to be equivalent to 50 times income per capita. Only official costs required by law are recorded, including fees, transfer taxes, stamp duties and any other payment to the property registry, notaries, public agencies or lawyers. Other taxes, such as capital gains tax or value added tax, are excluded from the cost measure. Both costs borne by the buyer and the seller are included. If cost estimates differ among sources, the median reported value is used.

Quality of land administration
The quality of land administration index is composed of five other indices: the reliability of infrastructure, transparency of information, geographic coverage, land dispute resolution and equal access to property rights (table 8.8). Data are collected for each economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.

Reliability of infrastructure index
The reliability of infrastructure index has six components:

- How land titles are kept at the registry of the largest business city of the economy. A score of 2 is assigned if the majority of land titles are fully digital;
### TABLE 8.8 What do the indicators on the quality of land administration measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of infrastructure index (0–8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of system for archiving information on land ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of electronic database to check for encumbrances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of system for archiving maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of geographic information system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link between property ownership registry and mapping system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of information index (0–6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of information on land ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of maps of land plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of fee schedules, lists of registration documents, service standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of a specific and separate mechanism for complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of statistics about the number of property transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic coverage index (0–8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of land registry at the level of the largest business city and the economy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of mapping agency at the level of the largest business city and the economy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land dispute resolution index (0–8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework for immovable property registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms to prevent and resolve land disputes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal access to property rights (-2–0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal ownership rights to property between unmarried men and women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal ownership rights to property between married men and women</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of the reliability of infrastructure, transparency of information, geographic coverage, land dispute resolution indices and equal access to property rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.

1 if the majority are scanned; 0 if the majority are kept in paper format.
- Whether there is an electronic database for checking for encumbrances. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.
- How maps of land plots are kept at the mapping agency of the largest business city of the economy. A score of 2 is assigned if the majority of maps are fully digital; 1 if the majority are scanned; 0 if the majority are kept in paper format.
- Whether there is a geographic information system—an electronic database for recording boundaries, checking plans and providing cadastral information. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.
- How the land ownership registry and mapping agency are linked. A score of 1 is assigned if information about land ownership and maps are kept in a single database or in linked databases; 0 if there is no connection between the different databases.
- How immovable property is identified. A score of 1 is assigned if there is a unique number to identify properties for the majority of land plots; 0 if there are multiple identifiers.

The index ranges from 0 to 8, with higher values indicating a higher quality of infrastructure for ensuring the reliability of information on property titles and boundaries. In Turkey, for example, the land registry offices in Istanbul maintain titles in a fully digital format (a score of 2) and have a fully electronic database to check for encumbrances (a score of 1). The Cadastral Directorate offices in Istanbul have digital maps (a score of 2), and the Geographical Information Directorate has a public portal allowing users to check the plans and cadastral information on parcels along with satellite images (a score of 1). Databases about land ownership and maps are linked to each other through the TAKBIS system, an integrated information system for the land registry offices and cadastral offices (a score of 1). Finally, there is a unique identifying number for properties (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Turkey a score of 8 on the reliability of infrastructure index.

### Transparency of information index

The transparency of information index has 10 components:
- Whether information on land ownership is made publicly available. A score of 1 is assigned if information on land ownership is accessible by anyone; 0 if access is restricted.
- Whether the list of documents required for completing the registration of property transactions is made publicly available. A score of 0.5 is assigned if the list of documents is accessible online or on a public board; 0 if it is not made available to the public or if it can be obtained only in person.
- Whether the fee schedule for completing the registration of property transactions is made publicly available. A score of 0.5 is assigned if the fee schedule is accessible online or on a public board or is free of charge; 0 if it is not made available to the public or if it can be obtained only in person.
- Whether the agency in charge of immovable property registration commits to delivering a legally binding document that proves property ownership within a specific time frame. A score of 0.5 is assigned if the service standard is accessible online or on a public board; 0 if it is not made available to the public or if it can be obtained only in person.
- Whether there is a specific and separate mechanism for filing complaints about a problem that occurred at the agency in charge of immovable property registration. A score of 1
is assigned if there is a specific and separate mechanism for filing a complaint; 0 if there is only a general mechanism or no mechanism.

- Whether there are publicly available official statistics tracking the number of transactions at the immovable property registration agency. A score of 0.5 is assigned if statistics are published about property transfers in the largest business city in the past calendar year at the latest on June 1st of the following year; 0 if no such statistics are made publicly available.

- Whether maps of land plots are made publicly available. A score of 0.5 is assigned if maps are accessible by anyone; 0 if access is restricted.

- Whether the fee schedule for accessing maps is made publicly available. A score of 0.5 is assigned if the fee schedule is accessible online or on a public board; 0 if it is not made available to the public or if it can be obtained only in person.

- Whether the mapping agency commits to delivering an updated map within a specific time frame. A score of 0.5 is assigned if the service standard is accessible online or on a public board; 0 if it is not made available to the public or if it can be obtained only in person.

- Whether there is a specific and separate mechanism for filing complaints about a problem that occurred at the mapping agency. A score of 0.5 is assigned if there is a specific and separate mechanism for filing a complaint; 0 if there is only a general mechanism or no mechanism.

### Geographic coverage index

The geographic coverage index has four components:

- How complete the coverage of the land registry is at the level of the largest business city. A score of 2 is assigned if all privately held land plots in the city are formally registered at the land registry; 0 if not.

- How complete the coverage of the land registry is at the level of the economy. A score of 2 is assigned if all privately held land plots in the economy are formally registered at the land registry; 0 if not.

- How complete the coverage of the mapping agency is at the level of the largest business city. A score of 2 is assigned if all privately held land plots in the city are mapped; 0 if not.

- How complete the coverage of the mapping agency is at the level of the economy. A score of 2 is assigned if all privately held land plots in the economy are mapped; 0 if not.

The index ranges from 0 to 6, with higher values indicating greater transparency in the land administration system. In the Netherlands, for example, anyone who pays a fee can consult the land ownership database (a score of 1). Information can be obtained at the office, by mail or online using the Kadaster website (http://www.kadaster.nl). Anyone can also get information online about the list of documents to submit for property registration (a score of 0.5), the fee schedule for registration (a score of 0.5) and the service standards (a score of 0.5). And anyone facing a problem at the land registry can file a complaint or report an error by filling out a specific form online (a score of 1). In addition, the Kadaster makes statistics about land transactions available to the public, reporting a total of 214,793 property transfers in Amsterdam in 2016 (a score of 0.5). Moreover, anyone who pays a fee can consult online cadastral maps (a score of 0.5). It is also possible to get public access to the fee schedule for map consultation (a score of 0.5), the service standards for delivery of an updated plan (a score of 0.5) and a specific mechanism for filing a complaint about a map (a score of 0.5). Adding these numbers gives the Netherlands a score of 6 on the transparency of information index.

### Land dispute resolution index

The land dispute resolution index assesses the legal framework for immovable property registration and the accessibility of dispute resolution mechanisms. The index has eight components:

- Whether the law requires that all property sale transactions be registered at the immovable property registry to make them opposable to third parties. A score of 1.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- Whether the formal system of immovable property registration is subject to a guarantee. A score of 0.5 is assigned if either a state or private guarantee over immovable property registration is required by law; 0 if no such guarantee is required.

- Whether there is a specific compensation mechanism to cover for losses incurred by parties who engaged in good faith in a property transaction based on erroneous information certified by the immovable property registry. A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- Whether the legal system requires verification of the legal validity of the documents necessary for a property transaction. A score of 0.5 is assigned if there is a review of legal validity, either by the registrar or by a professional (such as a notary or a lawyer); 0 if there is no review.

- Whether the legal system requires verification of the identity of the parties to a property transaction. A score of 0.5 is assigned if there is verification of identity, either by the registrar or by a professional (such as a notary or a lawyer); 0 if there is no verification.

- Whether there is a national database to verify the accuracy of identity
documents. A score of 1 is assigned if such a national database is available; 0 if not.
- How much time it takes to obtain a decision from a court of first instance (without an appeal) in a standard land dispute between two local businesses over tenure rights worth 50 times income per capita and located in the largest business city. A score of 3 is assigned if it takes less than one year; 2 if it takes between one and two years; 1 if it takes between two and three years; 0 if it takes more than three years.
- Whether there are publicly available statistics on the number of land disputes in the first instance. A score of 0.5 is assigned if statistics are published about land disputes in the economy in the past calendar year; 0 if no such statistics are made publicly available.

The index ranges from 0 to 8, with higher values indicating greater protection against land disputes. In Lithuania, for example, according to the Civil Code and the Law on the Real Property Register, property transactions must be registered at the land registry to make them opposable to third parties (a score of 1.5). The property transfer system is guaranteed by the state (a score of 0.5) and has a compensation mechanism to cover losses incurred by parties who engaged in good faith in a property transaction based on an error by the registry (a score of 0.5). A notary verifies the legal validity of the documents in a property transaction (a score of 0.5) and the identity of the parties (a score of 0.5), in accordance with the Law on the Notary Office (Law I-2882). Lithuania has a national database to verify the accuracy of identity documents (a score of 1). In a land dispute between two Lithuanian companies over the tenure rights of a property worth $770,000, the Vilnius District Court gives a decision in less than one year (a score of 3). Finally, statistics about land disputes are collected and published; there were a total of 549 land disputes in the country in 2016 (a score of 0.5). Adding these numbers gives Lithuania a score of 8 on the land dispute resolution index.

### Equal access to property rights index

The equal access to property rights index has two components:
- Whether unmarried men and unmarried women have equal ownership rights to property. A score of -1 is assigned if there are unequal ownership rights to property; 0 if there is equality.
- Whether married men and married women have equal ownership rights to property. A score of -1 is assigned if there are unequal ownership rights to property; 0 if there is equality.

Ownership rights cover the ability to manage, control, administer, access, encumber, receive, dispose of and transfer property. Each restriction is considered if there is a differential treatment for men and women in the law considering the default marital property regime. For customary land systems, equality is assumed unless there is a general legal provision stating a differential treatment.

The index ranges from -2 to 0, with higher values indicating greater inclusiveness of property rights. In Mali, for example, unmarried men and unmarried women have equal ownership rights to property (a score of 0). The same applies to married men and women who can use their property in the same way (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Mali a score of 0 on the equal access to property rights index—which indicates equal property rights between men and women.

### Quality of land administration index

The quality of land administration index is the sum of the scores on the reliability of infrastructure, transparency of information, geographic coverage, land dispute resolution and equal access to property indices. The index ranges from 0 to 30 with higher values indicating better quality of the land administration system.

If private sector entities were unable to register property transfers in an economy between June 2016 and June 2017, the economy receives a “no practice” mark on the procedures, time and cost indicators. A “no practice” economy receives a score of 0 on the quality of land administration index even if its legal framework includes provisions related to land administration.

### REFORMS

The registering property indicator set tracks changes related to the efficiency and quality of land administration systems every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The registering property indicator set uses two criteria to recognize a reform.

First, the aggregate gap on the overall distance to frontier of the indicator set is used to assess the impact of data changes. Any data update that leads to a change of 2% or more in the distance to frontier gap is classified as a reform (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking). For example, if the implementation of a new electronic property registration
system reduces time in a way that the overall gap decreases by 2% or more, such change is classified as a reform. On the contrary, minor fee updates or other smaller changes in the indicators that have an aggregate impact of less than 2% on the gap are not classified as a reform, but their impact is still reflected in the most updated indicators for this indicator set.

Second, the overall score on the quality of land administration is also considered as a criterion. Any change of 1 point or more on the overall quality score is acknowledged as a reform. For instance, the completion of the geographic coverage of the land registry of the business city (2 points) is considered as a reform.

The data details on registering property can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org.

**GETTING CREDIT**

*Doing Business* measures the legal rights of borrowers and lenders with respect to secured transactions through one set of indicators and the reporting of credit information through another. The first set of indicators measures whether certain features that facilitate lending exist within the applicable collateral and bankruptcy laws. The second set measures the coverage, scope and accessibility of credit information available through credit reporting service providers such as credit bureaus or credit registries (figure 8.9). The ranking of economies on the ease of getting credit is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for getting credit. These scores are the distance to frontier score for the sum of the strength of legal rights index and the depth of credit information index (figure 8.10).

**LEGAL RIGHTS OF BORROWERS AND LENDERS**

The data on the legal rights of borrowers and lenders are gathered through a questionnaire administered to financial lawyers and verified through analysis of laws and regulations as well as public sources of information on collateral and bankruptcy laws. Questionnaire responses are verified through several rounds of follow-up communication with respondents as well as by contacting third parties and consulting public sources. The questionnaire data are confirmed through teleconference calls or on-site visits in all economies.

**Strength of legal rights index**

The strength of legal rights index measures the degree to which collateral and bankruptcy laws protect the rights of borrowers and lenders and thus facilitate lending (table 8.9). For each economy it is first determined whether a unitary secured transactions system exists. Then two case scenarios, case A and case B, are used to determine how a nonpossessory security interest is created, publicized and enforced according to the law. Special emphasis is given to how the collateral registry operates (if registration of security interests is possible). The case scenarios involve a secured borrower, company ABC, and a secured lender, BizBank.

In some economies the legal framework for secured transactions will allow only case A or case B (not both) to apply. Both cases examine the same set of legal provisions relating to the use of movable collateral.

Several assumptions about the secured borrower (ABC) and lender (BizBank) are used:

- ABC is a domestic limited liability company (or its legal equivalent).
- ABC has up to 50 employees.
- ABC has its headquarters and only base of operations in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the

**FIGURE 8.9** Do lenders have credit information on entrepreneurs seeking credit? Is the law favorable to borrowers and lenders using movable assets as collateral?

**FIGURE 8.10** Getting credit: collateral rules and credit information

Rankings are based on distance to frontier scores for the sum of two indicators

Note: Credit bureau coverage and credit registry coverage are measured but do not count for the rankings.
second largest business city (table 8A.1).

- Both ABC and BizBank are 100% domestically owned.

The case scenarios also involve assumptions. In case A, as collateral for the loan, ABC grants BizBank a nonpossessory security interest in one category of movable assets, for example, its machinery or its inventory. ABC wants to keep both possession and ownership of the collateral. In economies where the law does not allow nonpossessory security interests in movable property, ABC and BizBank use a fiduciary transfer-of-title arrangement (or a similar substitute for nonpossessory security interests).

In case B, ABC grants BizBank a business charge, enterprise charge, floating charge or any charge that gives BizBank a security interest over ABC’s combined movable assets (or as much of ABC’s movable assets as possible). ABC keeps ownership and possession of the assets.

The strength of legal rights index covers functional equivalents to security interests in movable assets (such as financial leases and sales with retention of title) only in its first component, to assess how integrated or unified the economy’s legal framework for secured transactions is.

The strength of legal rights index includes 10 aspects related to legal rights in collateral law and 2 aspects in bankruptcy law. A score of 1 is assigned for each of the following features of the laws:

- The economy has an integrated or unified legal framework for secured transactions that extends to the creation, publicity and enforcement of four functional equivalents to security interests in movable assets: fiduciary transfers of title; financial leases; assignments or transfers of receivables; and sales with retention of title.
- The law allows a business to grant a nonpossessory security right in a single category of movable assets (such as machinery or inventory), without requiring a specific description of the collateral.
- The law allows a business to grant a nonpossessory security right in substantially all its movable assets, without requiring a specific description of the collateral.
- A security right can be given over future or after-acquired assets and extends automatically to the products, proceeds or replacements of the original assets.
- A general description of debts and obligations is permitted in the collateral agreement and in registration documents, all types of debts and obligations can be secured between the parties, and the collateral agreement can include a maximum amount for which the assets are encumbered.
- A collateral registry or registration institution for security interests granted over movable property by incorporated and nonincorporated entities is in operation, unified geographically and with an electronic database indexed by debtors’ names.
- The collateral registry is a notice-based registry—a registry that files only a notice of the existence of a security interest (not the underlying documents) and does not perform a legal review of the transaction. The registry also publicizes functional equivalents to security interests.
- The collateral registry has modern features such as those that allow secured creditors (or their representatives) to register, search, amend or cancel security interests online.
- Secured creditors are paid first (for example, before tax claims and employee claims) when a debtor defaults outside an insolvency procedure.
- Secured creditors are paid first (for example, before tax claims and employee claims) when a business is liquidated.
- Secured creditors are subject to an automatic stay on enforcement procedures when a debtor enters a court-supervised reorganization procedure, but the law protects secured creditors’ rights by providing clear grounds for relief from the automatic stay (for example, if the movable property is in danger) and setting a time limit for it.
- The law allows parties to agree in the collateral agreement that the lender may enforce its security right out of court; the law allows public and private auctions and also permits the secured creditor to take the asset in satisfaction of the debt.

The index ranges from 0 to 12, with higher scores indicating that collateral and bankruptcy laws are better designed to expand access to credit.

REFORMS

The strength of legal rights index tracks changes related to secured transactions and insolvency every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided in two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The strength of legal rights index uses the following criteria to recognize a reform.

All changes in laws and regulations that have any impact on the economy’s score
Reforms impacting the strength of legal rights index include amendments to or the introduction of a secured transactions act, insolvency code, or civil code as well as the establishment or modernization of any of the features of a collateral registry as measured by the indicators. For example, introducing a law which provides for a collateral registry and actually establishing that collateral registry—which is geographically centralized, unified for all types of movable assets and for both incorporated and non-incorporated entities searchable by debtor’s name—would represent a reform with a 1 point increase and would therefore be acknowledged in the report.

CREDIT INFORMATION

The data on the reporting of credit information are built in two stages. First, banking supervision authorities and public information sources are surveyed to confirm the presence of a credit reporting service provider, such as a credit bureau or credit registry. Second, when applicable, a detailed questionnaire on the credit bureau’s or credit registry’s structure, laws and associated rules is administered to the entity itself. Questionnaire responses are verified through several rounds of follow-up communication with respondents as well as by contacting third parties and consulting public sources. The questionnaire data are confirmed through teleconference calls or on-site visits in all economies.

Depth of credit information index

The depth of credit information index measures rules and practices affecting the coverage, scope and accessibility of credit information available through either a credit bureau or a credit registry.

A score of 1 is assigned for each of the following eight features of the credit bureau or credit registry (or both):

- Data on firms and individuals are distributed.
- Both positive credit information (for example, original loan amounts, outstanding loan amounts and a pattern of on-time repayments) and negative information (for example, late payments and the number and amount of defaults) are distributed.
- Data from retailers or utility companies are distributed in addition to data from financial institutions.
- At least two years of historical data are distributed. Credit bureaus and registries that erase data on defaults as soon as they are repaid or distribute negative information more than 10 years after defaults are repaid receive a score of 0 for this component.
- Data on loan amounts below 1% of income per capita are distributed.
- By law, borrowers have the right to access their data in the largest credit bureau or registry in the economy. Credit bureaus and registries that charge more than 1% of income per capita for borrowers to inspect their data receive a score of 0 for this component.
- Banks and other financial institutions have online access to the credit information (for example, through a web interface, a system-to-system connection or both).
- Bureau or registry credit scores are offered as a value-added service to help banks and other financial institutions assess the creditworthiness of borrowers.

The index ranges from 0 to 8, with higher values indicating the availability of more credit information, from either a credit bureau or a credit registry, to facilitate lending decisions. If the credit bureau or registry is not operational or covers less than 5% of the adult population, the score on the depth of credit information index is 0.

In Lithuania, for example, both a credit bureau and a credit registry operate. Both distribute data on firms and individuals (a score of 1). Although the credit registry does not distribute data on on-time repayments, the credit bureau distributes full positive and negative credit information (a score of 1). While the credit registry does not distribute data from retailers or utilities, the credit bureau does (a score of 1). Both distribute at least two years of historical data (a score of 1). Although the credit registry has a threshold of €290, the credit bureau distributes data on loans of any value (a score of 1). Borrowers have the right to access their data in both the credit bureau and the credit registry free of charge once a year (a score of 1). Both entities provide data users access to databases through a web interface (a score of 1). Although the credit registry does not provide credit scores, the credit bureau does (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Lithuania a score of 8 on the depth of credit information index.

Credit bureau coverage

Credit bureau coverage reports the number of individuals and firms listed in a credit bureau’s database as of January 1, 2017, with information on their borrowing history within the past five years, plus the number of individuals and firms that have had no borrowing history in the past five years but for which a lender requested a credit report from the bureau in the period between January 2, 2016, and January 1, 2017. The number is expressed as a percentage of the adult population (the population age 15 and above in 2016 according to the World Bank's World Development Indicators). A credit bureau is defined as a private firm or nonprofit organization that maintains a database
on the creditworthiness of borrowers (individuals or firms) in the financial system and facilitates the exchange of credit information among creditors. (Many credit bureaus support banking and overall financial supervision activities in practice, though this is not their primary objective.) Credit investigative bureaus that do not directly facilitate information exchange among banks and other financial institutions are not considered. If no credit bureau operates, the coverage value is 0.0%.

**Credit registry coverage**

Credit registry coverage reports the number of individuals and firms listed in a credit registry’s database as of January 1, 2017, with information on their borrowing history within the past five years, plus the number of individuals and firms that have had no borrowing history in the past five years but for which a lender requested a credit report from the registry in the period between January 2, 2016, and January 1, 2017. The number is expressed as a percentage of the adult population (the population age 15 and above in 2016 according to the World Bank’s World Development Indicators). A credit registry is defined as a database managed by the public sector, usually by the central bank or the superintendent of banks, that collects information on the creditworthiness of borrowers (individuals or firms) in the financial system and facilitates the exchange of credit information among banks and other regulated financial institutions (while their primary objective is to assist banking supervision). If no credit registry operates, the coverage value is 0.0%.

**REFORMS**

The depth of credit information index tracks changes related to the coverage, scope and accessibility of credit information available through either a credit bureau or a credit registry every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The credit information index uses three criteria to recognize a reform.

First, all changes in laws, regulations and practices that have any impact on the economy’s score on the credit information index are classified as reforms. Examples of reforms impacting the index include measures to distribute positive credit data in addition to negative data, the distribution of credit data from utilities or retailers or the introduction of credit scores as a value-added service. Any change that improves the score of a given economy in any of the eight features of the index is considered a reform. Some reforms can have an impact in more than one feature. For example, the introduction of a new credit bureau covering more than 5% of the adult population that distributes information on firms and individuals, as well as positive and negative data and provides online access to data users, represents a 3 point increase in the index. In contrast, the introduction of legislation that guarantees borrowers’ rights to access their data in the largest credit bureau or registry in the economy represents a reform with a 1 point increase in the index.

Second, changes that increase the coverage of the largest credit bureau or registry in an economy above 5% of the adult population may also be classified as reforms. According to the getting credit methodology, if the credit bureau or registry is not operational or covers less than 5% of the adult population, the score on the depth of credit information index is 0. The impact of the reform will depend on the characteristics of the economy’s credit reporting system as it relates to the eight features of the index. Expanded coverage that does not reach 5% of the adult population is not classified as a reform but the impact is still reflected on the most updated statistics.

Third, occasionally the credit information index will acknowledge legislative changes with no current impact on the data as reforms. This option is typically reserved to legislative changes of exceptional magnitude, such as the introduction of laws allowing the operation of credit bureaus or laws on personal data protection.

The data details on getting credit can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. The initial methodology was developed by Djankov, McLiesh and Shleifer (2007) and is adopted here with minor changes.

**PROTECTING MINORITY INVESTORS**

Doing Business measures the protection of minority investors from conflicts of interest through one set of indicators and shareholders’ rights in corporate governance through another (table 8.10). The data come from a questionnaire administered to corporate and securities lawyers and are based on securities regulations, company laws, civil procedure codes and court rules of evidence. The ranking of economies on the strength of minority investor protections is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for protecting minority investors. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for the extent of conflict of interest regulation index and the extent of shareholder governance index (figure 8.11).

**PROTECTION OF SHAREHOLDERS FROM CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

The extent of conflict of interest regulation index measures the protection of shareholders against directors’ misuse of corporate assets for personal gain by distinguishing three dimensions of regulation that address conflicts of interest: transparency of related-party transactions (extent of disclosure index), shareholders’ ability to sue and hold directors liable for self-dealing (extent of director liability index) and access to
evidence and allocation of legal expenses in shareholder litigation (ease of shareholder suits index). To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the business and the transaction are used (figure 8.12).

**Assumptions about the business**

The business (Buyer):
- Is a publicly traded corporation listed on the economy’s most important stock exchange. If the number of publicly traded companies listed on that exchange is less than 10, or if there is no stock exchange in the economy, it is assumed that Buyer is a large private company with multiple shareholders.
- Has a board of directors and a chief executive officer (CEO) who may legally act on behalf of Buyer where permitted, even if this is not specifically required by law.
- Has a supervisory board (applicable to economies with a two-tier board system) on which 60% of the shareholder-elected members have been appointed by Mr. James, who is Buyer’s controlling shareholder and a member of Buyer’s board of directors.
- Has not adopted any bylaws or articles of association that go beyond the minimum requirements. Does not follow codes, principles, recommendations or guidelines that are not mandatory.
- Is a manufacturing company with its own distribution network.

**Assumptions about the transaction**

- Mr. James owns 60% of Buyer and elected two directors to Buyer’s five-member board.
- Mr. James also owns 90% of Seller, a company that operates a chain of retail hardware stores. Seller recently closed a large number of its stores.
- Mr. James proposes that Buyer purchase Seller’s unused fleet of trucks to expand Buyer’s distribution of its food products, a proposal to which Buyer agrees. The price is equal to 10% of Buyer’s assets and is higher than the market value.
- The proposed transaction is part of the company’s ordinary course of business and is not outside the authority of the company.
- Buyer enters into the transaction. All required approvals are obtained, and all required disclosures made (that is, the transaction is not fraudulent).

---

**TABLE 8.10** What do the protecting minority investors indicators measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and approval requirements for related-party transactions</td>
<td>Shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal, immediate and periodic disclosure requirements for related-party transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority shareholders’ ability to sue and hold interested directors liable for prejudicial related-party transactions</td>
<td>Governance safeguards protecting shareholders from undue board control and entrenchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available legal remedies (damages, disgorgement of profits, disqualification, rescission of transactions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to internal corporate documents</td>
<td>Corporate transparency on significant owners, executive compensation, annual meetings and audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence obtainable during trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of legal expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of conflict of interest regulation index (0–10)</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder governance index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple average of the extent of disclosure, extent of director liability and ease of shareholder suits indices</td>
<td>Simple average of the extent of shareholder rights, extent of ownership and control and extent of corporate transparency indices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of minority investor protection index (0–10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple average of the extent of conflict of interest regulation and extent of shareholder governance indices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIGURE 8.11** Protecting minority investors: shareholders’ rights in conflicts of interest and corporate governance

Rankings are based on distance to frontier scores for two indicators

---

**FIGURE 8.12** How well are minority shareholders protected from conflicts of interest?
The transaction causes damages to Buyer. Shareholders sue Mr. James and the other parties that approved the transaction.

**Extent of disclosure index**
The extent of disclosure index has five components:
- Which corporate body can provide legally sufficient approval for the transaction. A score of 0 is assigned if it is the CEO or the managing director alone; 1 if the board of directors, the supervisory board or shareholders must vote and Mr. James is permitted to vote; 2 if the board of directors or the supervisory board must vote and Mr. James is not permitted to vote; 3 if shareholders must vote and Mr. James is not permitted to vote.
- Whether it is required that an external body, for example, an external auditor, review the transaction before it takes place. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- Whether disclosure by Mr. James to the board of directors or the supervisory board is required. A score of 0 is assigned if no disclosure is required; 1 if a general disclosure of the existence of a conflict of interest is required without any specifics; 2 if full disclosure of all material facts relating to Mr. James’s interest in the Buyer-Seller transaction is required.
- Whether immediate disclosure of the transaction to the public, the regulator or the shareholders is required.\(^4\) A score of 0 is assigned if no disclosure is required; 1 if disclosure on the terms of the transaction is required but not on Mr. James’s conflict of interest; 2 if disclosure on both the terms and Mr. James’s conflict of interest is required.
- Whether disclosure in the annual report is required. A score of 0 is assigned if no disclosure on the transaction is required; 1 if disclosure on the terms of the transaction is required but not on Mr. James’s conflict of interest; 2 if disclosure on both the terms and Mr. James’s conflict of interest is required.

The index ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating greater disclosure. In Poland, for example, the board of directors must approve the transaction and Mr. James is not allowed to vote (a score of 2). Poland does not require an external body to review the transaction (a score of 0). Before the transaction Mr. James must disclose his conflict of interest to the other directors, but he is not required to provide specific information about it (a score of 1). Buyer is required to disclose immediately all information affecting the stock price, including the conflict of interest (a score of 2). In its annual report Buyer must also disclose the terms of the transaction and Mr. James’s ownership in Buyer and Seller (a score of 2). Adding these numbers gives Poland a score of 7 on the extent of disclosure index.

**Extent of director liability index**
The extent of director liability index has seven components:\(^5\)
- Whether shareholder plaintiffs are able to sue directly or derivatively for the damage the transaction causes to the company. A score of 0 is assigned if suits are unavailable or are available only for shareholders holding more than 10% of the company’s share capital; 1 if direct or derivative suits are available for shareholders holding 10% of share capital.
- Whether a shareholder plaintiff is able to hold Mr. James liable for the damage the Buyer-Seller transaction causes to the company. A score of 0 is assigned if Mr. James cannot be held liable or can be held liable only for fraud, bad faith or gross negligence; 1 if Mr. James can be held liable only if he influenced the approval of the transaction or was negligent; 2 if Mr. James can be held liable when the transaction is unfair or prejudicial to the other shareholders.
- Whether a shareholder plaintiff is able to hold the approving body (the CEO, members of the board of directors or members of the supervisory board) liable for the damage the transaction causes to the company. A score of 0 is assigned if the approving body cannot be held liable or can be held liable only for fraud, bad faith or gross negligence; 1 if the approving body can be held liable for negligence; 2 if the approving body can be held liable when the transaction is unfair or prejudicial to the other shareholders.
- Whether Mr. James pays damages for the harm caused to the company upon a successful claim by the shareholder plaintiff. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- Whether Mr. James repays profits made from the transaction upon a successful claim by the shareholder plaintiff. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- Whether Mr. James is disqualified upon a successful claim by the shareholder plaintiff, A score of 0 is assigned if yes; 1 if no.
- Whether a court can void the transaction upon a successful claim by a shareholder plaintiff. A score of 0 is assigned if rescission is available only in case of fraud, bad faith or gross negligence; 1 if rescission is available when the transaction is oppressive or prejudicial to the other shareholders; 2 if rescission is available when the transaction is unfair or entails a conflict of interest.

The index ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating greater liability of directors. In Austria, for example, derivative suits are available for shareholders holding 10% of share capital (a score of 1). Assuming that the prejudicial transaction was duly approved and disclosed, in order to hold Mr. James liable a plaintiff must prove that Mr. James influenced the approving body or acted negligently (a score of 1). To hold the other directors liable, a plaintiff must prove that they acted negligently (a score of 1). If Mr. James is found liable, he must pay damages (a score of 1) and is required to disgorge his profits (a score of 1). Mr. James
can be neither fined and imprisoned nor disqualified (a score of 0). The prejudicial transaction cannot be voided (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Austria a score of 5 on the extent of director liability index.

**Ease of shareholder suits index**
The ease of shareholder suits index has six components:
- Whether shareholders owning 10% of the company’s share capital have the right to inspect the transaction documents before filing suit or request that a government inspector investigate the Buyer-Seller transaction without filing suit. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- What range of documents is available to the shareholder plaintiff from the defendant and witnesses during trial. A score of 1 is assigned for each of the following types of documents available: information that the defendant has indicated he intends to rely on for his defense; information that directly proves specific facts in the plaintiff’s claim; and any information relevant to the subject matter of the claim.
- Whether the plaintiff can obtain categories of relevant documents from the defendant without identifying each document specifically. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- Whether the plaintiff can directly examine the defendant and witnesses during trial. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes, with prior approval of the questions by the judge;
- Whether the plaintiff can obtain categories of relevant documents from the defendant without identifying each document specifically. A score of 1 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- Whether the plaintiff can recover their legal expenses from the company regardless of the outcome of their legal action.

The index ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating greater powers of shareholders to challenge the transaction. In Croatia, for example, a shareholder holding 10% of Buyer’s shares can request that a government inspector review suspected mismanagement by Mr. James and the CEO without filing suit in court (a score of 1). The plaintiff can access documents that the defendant intends to rely on for his defense (a score of 1). The plaintiff must specifically identify the documents being sought (for example, the Buyer-Seller purchase agreement of July 15, 2015) and cannot simply request categories (for example, all documents related to the transaction) (a score of 0). The plaintiff can examine the defendant and witnesses during trial, without prior approval of the questions by the court (a score of 2). The standard of proof for civil suits is preponderance of the evidence, while the standard for a criminal case is beyond a reasonable doubt (a score of 1). The plaintiff can recover legal expenses from the company only upon a successful outcome of the legal action (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Croatia a score of 6 on the ease of shareholder suits index.

**Extent of conflict of interest regulation index**
The extent of conflict of interest regulation index is the average of the extent of disclosure index, the extent of director liability index and the ease of shareholder suits index. The index ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating stronger regulation of conflicts of interest.

**SHAREHOLDERS’ RIGHTS IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**
The extent of shareholder governance index measures shareholders’ rights in corporate governance by distinguishing three dimensions of good governance: shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions (extent of shareholder rights index), governance safeguards protecting shareholders from undue board control and entrenchment (extent of ownership and control index) and corporate transparency on ownership stakes, compensation, audits and financial prospects (extent of corporate transparency index). The index also measures whether a subset of relevant rights and safeguards are available in limited companies.

**Assumptions about the business**
- The business (Buyer) is a publicly traded corporation listed on the economy’s most important stock exchange.
- If there is no stock exchange in the economy, it is assumed that Buyer is a large private company with multiple shareholders. Examples of company forms that can be listed and have a large number of shareholders include: the Joint Stock Company (JSC), the Public Limited Company (PLC), the C Corporation, the Societas Europaea (SE), the Aktiengesellschaft (AG) and the Société Anonyme/Sociedad Anónima (SA).
- In 10 of the questions, the assessment is made “assuming that Buyer is a limited company.” Buyer is instead a limited liability company or its functional equivalent: a distinct and simpler company form that cannot offer shares to the public. Examples include the Private Limited Company (Ltd), the Limited Liability Company (LLC), the Sociedad de Responsabilidad Limitada (SRL), the Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung (GmbH) and the Société à Responsabilité Limitée (SARL).

**Extent of shareholder rights index**
For each component of the extent of shareholder rights index, a score of 0 is assigned if the answer is no; 1 if yes. The index has 10 components:
- Whether the sale of 51% of Buyer’s assets requires shareholder approval.
The index has 10 components:
- Whether shareholders representing 10% of Buyer’s share capital have the right to call for an extraordinary meeting of shareholders.
- Whether Buyer must obtain its shareholders’ approval every time it issues new shares.
- Whether shareholders automatically receive preemption or subscription rights every time Buyer issues new shares.
- Whether the election and dismissal of the external auditor must be approved by the shareholders.
- Whether changes to rights associated with a class of shares are only possible if the holders of the affected shares approve those changes.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether the sale of 51% of Buyer’s assets requires member approval.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether members representing 10% have the right to call for a meeting of members.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether all members must consent to add a new member.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether members must first offer their interest to the existing members before they can sell to non-members.
- Whether a potential acquirer must make a tender offer to all shareholders upon acquiring 50% of Buyer.
- Whether Buyer must pay declared dividends within a maximum period set by law.
- Whether a subsidiary cannot acquire shares issued by its parent company.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether it must have a mechanism to resolve disagreements among members.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether a potential acquirer must make a tender offer to all members upon acquiring 50% of Buyer.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether Buyer must distribute profits within a maximum period set by law.

**Extent of ownership and control index**

For each component of the extent of ownership and control index, a score of 0 is assigned if the answer is no; 1 if yes. The index has 10 components:
- Whether the same individual cannot be appointed CEO and chair of the board of directors.
- Whether the board of directors must include independent and nonexecutive board members.
- Whether shareholder can remove members of the board of directors without cause before the end of their term.
- Whether the board of directors must include a separate audit committee.
- Whether a potential acquirer must make a tender offer to all shareholders upon acquiring 50% of Buyer.
- Whether Buyer must pay declared dividends within a maximum period set by law.
- Whether a subsidiary cannot acquire shares issued by its parent company.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether it must have a mechanism to resolve disagreements among members.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether a potential acquirer must make a tender offer to all members upon acquiring 50% of Buyer.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether Buyer must distribute profits within a maximum period set by law.

**Extent of corporate transparency index**

For each component of the extent of corporate transparency index, a score of 0 is assigned if the answer is no; 1 if yes. The index has 10 components:
- Whether Buyer must disclose direct and indirect beneficial ownership stakes representing 5%.
- Whether Buyer must disclose information about board members’ primary employment and directorships in other companies.
- Whether Buyer must disclose the compensation of individual managers.
- Whether a detailed notice of general meeting must be sent 21 calendar days before the meeting.
- Whether shareholders representing 5% of Buyer’s share capital can put items on the general meeting agenda.
- Whether Buyer’s annual financial statements must be audited by an external auditor.
- Whether Buyer must disclose its audit reports to the public.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether members must meet at least once a year.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company, whether members representing 5% can put items on the meeting agenda.
- Assuming that Buyer is a limited company larger than a threshold set by law, whether its annual financial statements must be audited by an external auditor.

**Extent of shareholder governance index**

The extent of shareholder governance index is the average of the extent of shareholder rights index, the extent of ownership and control index and the extent of corporate transparency index. The index ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating stronger rights of shareholders in corporate governance.

**REFORMS**

The protecting minority investors indicator set captures changes related to the regulation of related-party transactions as well as corporate governance every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. They are divided into two types: reforms that make it easier to do business and changes that make it more difficult to do business. The protecting minority investors indicator set uses the following criteria to recognize a reform.

All legislative and regulatory changes that impact the score assigned to a given economy on any of the 48 questions comprising the six indicators on minority investor protection are classified as a reform. The change must be mandatory, meaning that failure to comply allows shareholders to sue in court or for sanctions to be leveled by a regulatory body such as the company registrar, the capital market authority or the securities and exchange commission. Guidelines, model rules, principles, recommendations and duties to explain in case of non-compliance are excluded. When a change exclusively affects companies that are listed on the stock exchange, it will be captured...
only if the stock exchange has 10 or more equity listings. If the economy has no stock exchange or a stock exchange with less than 10 equity listings, the change is taken into account only if it affects companies irrespective of whether their shares are listed or not.

Reforms impacting the protecting minority investors indicator set include amendments to or the introduction of a new companies act, commercial code, securities regulation, code of civil procedure, court rules, law, decree, order, supreme court decision, or stock exchange listing rule. The changes must affect the rights and duties of issuers, company managers, directors and shareholders in connection with related-party transactions or, more generally, the aspects of corporate governance measured by the indicators. For example, in a given economy, related-party transactions have to be approved by the board of directors including board members who have a personal financial interest in seeing the transaction succeed. This economy introduces a law requiring that related-party transactions be approved instead by a general meeting of shareholders and that excludes shareholders with conflicting interests from participating in the vote. This law would result in a 2-point increase on the corresponding question in the extent of disclosure index and would therefore be acknowledged in the report.

The data details on protecting minority investors can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. The initial methodology was developed by Djankov, La Porta and others (2008).

**PAYING TAXES**

*Doing Business* records the taxes and mandatory contributions that a medium-size company must pay in a given year as well as measures of the administrative burden of paying taxes and contributions and complying with postfiling procedures (figure 8.13). The project was developed and implemented in cooperation with PwC. Taxes and contributions measured include the profit or corporate income tax, social contributions and labor taxes paid by the employer, property taxes, property transfer taxes, dividend tax, capital gains tax, financial transactions tax, waste collection taxes, vehicle and road taxes, and any other small taxes or fees.

The ranking of economies on the ease of paying taxes is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for paying taxes. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.14), with a threshold and a nonlinear transformation applied to one of the component indicators, the total tax and contribution rate. The threshold is defined as the total tax and contribution rate at the 15th percentile of the overall distribution for all years included in the analysis up to and including *Doing Business* 2015, which is 26.1%. All economies with a total tax and contribution rate below this threshold receive the same score as the economy at the threshold.

The threshold is not based on any economic theory of an “optimal tax rate” that minimizes distortions or maximizes efficiency in an economy’s overall tax system. Instead, it is mainly empirical in nature, set at the lower end of the distribution of tax rates levied on medium-size enterprises in the manufacturing sector as observed through the paying taxes indicators. This reduces the bias in the total tax and contribution rate indicator toward economies that do not need to levy significant taxes on companies like the *Doing Business* standardized case study company because they raise public revenue in other ways—for example, through taxes on foreign companies, through taxes on sectors other than manufacturing or from natural resources (all of which are outside the scope of the methodology).

*Doing Business* measures all taxes and contributions that are government mandated (at any level—federal, state or local) and that apply to the standardized business and have an impact in its financial
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statements. In doing so, Doing Business goes beyond the traditional definition of a tax. As defined for the purposes of government national accounts, taxes include only compulsory, unrequested payments to general government. Doing Business departs from this definition because it measures imposed charges that affect business accounts, not government accounts. One main difference relates to labor contributions. The Doing Business measure includes government-mandated contributions paid by the employer to a required private pension fund or workers’ insurance fund. It includes, for example, Australia’s compulsory superannuation guarantee and workers’ compensation insurance. For the purpose of calculating the total tax and contribution rate (defined below), only taxes borne are included. For example, value added taxes (VAT) are generally excluded (provided that they are not irrecoverable) because they do not affect the accounting profits of the business—that is, they are not reflected in the income statement. They are, however, included for the purpose of the compliance measures (time and payments), as they add to the burden of complying with the tax system.

Doing Business uses a case scenario to measure the taxes and contributions paid by a standardized business and the complexity of an economy’s tax compliance system. This case scenario uses a set of financial statements and assumptions about transactions made over the course of the year. In each economy tax experts from a number of different firms (in many economies these include PwC) compute the taxes and mandatory contributions due in their jurisdiction based on the standardized case study facts. Information is also compiled on the frequency of filing and payments, the time taken to comply with tax laws in an economy, the time taken to request and process a VAT refund claim and the time taken to comply with and complete a corporate income tax audit. To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the business and the taxes and contributions are used.

Assumptions about the business

The business:

- Is a limited liability, taxable company. If there is more than one type of limited liability company in the economy, the limited liability form most common among domestic firms is chosen. The most common form is reported by incorporation lawyers or the statistical office.  
- Started operations on January 1, 2015. At that time the company purchased all the assets shown in its balance sheet and hired all its workers.  
- Operates in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1).  
- Is 100% domestically owned and has five owners, all of whom are natural persons.  
- At the end of 2015, has a start-up capital of 102 times income per capita.  
- Performs general industrial or commercial activities. Specifically, it produces ceramic flowerpots and sells them at retail. It does not participate in foreign trade (no import or export) and does not handle products subject to a special tax regime, for example, liquor or tobacco.  
- At the beginning of 2016, owns two plots of land, one building, machinery, office equipment, computers and one truck and leases one truck.  
- Does not qualify for investment incentives or any benefits apart from those related to the age or size of the company.  
- Has 60 employees—4 managers, 8 assistants and 48 workers. All are nationals, and one manager is also an owner. The company pays for additional medical insurance for employees (not mandated by any law) as an additional benefit. In addition, in some economies reimbursable business travel and client entertainment expenses are considered fringe benefits. When applicable, it is assumed that the company pays the fringe benefit tax on this expense or that the benefit becomes taxable income for the employee. The case study assumes no additional salary additions for meals, transportation, education or others. Therefore, even when such benefits are frequent, they are not added to or removed from the taxable gross salaries to arrive at the labor tax or contribution calculation.  
- Has a turnover of 1,050 times income per capita.  
- Makes a loss in the first year of operation.  
- Has a gross margin (pretax) of 20% (that is, sales are 120% of the cost of goods sold).  
- Distributes 50% of its net profits as dividends to the owners at the end of the second year.
Sells one of its plots of land at a profit at the beginning of the second year.

Is subject to a series of detailed assumptions on expenses and transactions to further standardize the case. For example, the owner who is also a manager spends 10% of income per capita on traveling for the company (20% of this owner’s expenses are purely private, 20% are for entertaining customers, and 60% are for business travel). All financial statement variables are proportional to 2012 income per capita (this is an update from Doing Business 2013 and previous years’ reports, where the variables were proportional to 2005 income per capita). For some economies a multiple of two or three times income per capita has been used to estimate the financial statement variables. The 2012 income per capita was not sufficient to bring the salaries of all the case study employees up to the minimum wage thresholds that exist in these economies.

**Assumptions about the taxes and contributions**

- All the taxes and contributions recorded are those paid in the second year of operation (calendar year 2016). A tax or contribution is considered distinct if it has a different name or is collected by a different agency. Taxes and contributions with the same name and agency, but charged at different rates depending on the business, are counted as the same tax or contribution.

- The number of times the company pays taxes and contributions in a year is the number of different taxes or contributions multiplied by the frequency of payment (or withholding) for each tax. The frequency of payment includes advance payments (or withholding) as well as regular payments (or withholding).

**Tax payments**

The tax payments indicator reflects the total number of taxes and contributions paid, the method of payment, the frequency of payment, the frequency of filing and the number of agencies involved for the standardized case study company during the second year of operation (table 8.11). It includes taxes withheld by the company, such as sales tax, VAT and employee-borne labor taxes. These taxes are traditionally collected by the company from the consumer or employee on behalf of the tax agencies. Although they do not affect the income statements of the company, they add to the administrative burden of complying with the tax system and so are included in the tax payments measure.

The number of payments takes into account electronic filing. Where full electronic filing and payment is allowed and it is used by the majority of medium-size businesses, the tax is counted as paid once a year even if filings and payments are more frequent. For payments made through third parties, such as tax on interest paid by a financial institution or fuel tax paid by a fuel distributor, only one payment is included even if payments are more frequent.

Where two or more taxes or contributions are filed for and paid jointly using the same form, each of these joint payments is counted once. For example, if mandatory health insurance contributions and mandatory pension contributions are filed for and paid together, only one of these contributions would be included in the number of payments.

**Time**

Time is recorded in hours per year. The indicator measures the time taken to prepare, file and pay three major types of taxes and contributions: the corporate income tax, value added or sales tax, and labor taxes, including payroll taxes and social contributions. Preparation time includes the time to collect all information necessary to compute the tax payable and to calculate the amount payable. If separate accounting books must be kept for tax purposes—or separate calculations made—the time associated with these processes is included. This extra time is included only if the regular accounting work is not enough to fulfill the tax accounting requirements. Filing time includes the time to complete all necessary tax return forms and file the relevant returns at the tax authority. Payment time considers the hours needed to make the payment online or in person. Where taxes and contributions are paid in person, the time includes delays while waiting.

**Total tax and contribution rate**

The total tax and contribution rate measures the amount of taxes and mandatory contributions borne by the business in the second year of operation, expressed as a share of commercial profit. Doing Business 2018 reports
the total tax and contribution rate for calendar year 2016. The total amount of taxes and contributions borne is the sum of all the different taxes and contributions payable after accounting for allowable deductions and exemptions. The taxes withheld (such as personal income tax) or collected by the company and remitted to the tax authorities (such as VAT, sales tax or goods and service tax) but not borne by the company are excluded. The taxes included can be divided into five categories: profit or corporate income tax, social contributions and labor taxes paid by the employer (for which all mandatory contributions are included, even if paid to a private entity such as a required pension fund), property taxes, turnover taxes and other taxes (such as municipal fees and vehicle taxes). Fuel taxes are no longer included in the total tax and contribution rate because of the difficulty of computing these taxes in a consistent way for all economies covered. The fuel tax amounts are in most cases very small, and measuring these amounts is often complicated because they depend on fuel consumption. Fuel taxes continue to be counted in the number of payments.

The total tax and contribution rate is designed to provide a comprehensive measure of the cost of all the taxes a business bears. It differs from the statutory tax rate, which merely provides the factor to be applied to the tax base. In computing the total tax and contribution rate, the actual tax or contribution payable is divided by commercial profit.

Data for Iraq are provided as an example (table 8.12).

Commercial profit is essentially net profit before all taxes and contributions borne. It differs from the conventional profit before tax, reported in financial statements. In computing profit before tax, many of the taxes borne by a firm are deductible. In computing commercial profit, these taxes are not deductible. Commercial profit therefore presents a clear picture of the actual profit of a business before any of the taxes it bears in the course of the fiscal year.

Commercial profit is computed as sales minus cost of goods sold, minus gross salaries, minus administrative expenses, minus other expenses, minus provisions, plus capital gains (from the property sale) minus interest expense, plus interest income and minus commercial depreciation. To compute the commercial depreciation, a straight-line depreciation method is applied, with the following rates: 0% for the land, 5% for the building, 10% for the machinery, 33% for the computers, 20% for the office equipment, 20% for the truck and 10% for business development expenses. Commercial profit amounts to 59.4 times income per capita.

The methodology for calculating the total tax and contribution rate is broadly consistent with the Total Tax Contribution framework developed by PwC and the calculation within this framework for taxes borne. But while the work undertaken by PwC is usually based on data received from the largest companies in the economy, Doing Business focuses on a case study for a standardized medium-size company.

**Postfiling index**

The postfiling index is based on four components—time to comply with VAT refund, time to obtain VAT refund, time to comply with corporate income tax audit and time to complete a corporate income tax audit. If both VAT and corporate income tax apply, the postfiling index is the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for each of the four components. If only VAT or corporate income tax applies, the postfiling index is the simple average of the scores for only the two components pertaining to the applicable tax. If neither VAT nor corporate income tax applies, the postfiling index is not included in the ranking of the ease of paying taxes.

The definition of a tax audit includes any interaction between the taxpayer and the tax authority post filing of the tax return and payment of the tax liability due. Tax audit will include a correspondence between the taxpayer and the

### TABLE 8.12 Computing the total tax and contribution rate for Iraq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Category</th>
<th>Statutory rate</th>
<th>Taxable base b (ID)</th>
<th>Actual tax payable a = r x b (ID)</th>
<th>Commercial profit (ID)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate income tax (taxable income)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>452,461,855</td>
<td>67,869,278</td>
<td>453,188,210</td>
<td>14.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer paid—Social security contributions (taxable wages)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>511,191,307</td>
<td>61,342,957</td>
<td>453,188,210</td>
<td>13.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee paid—Social security contributions (taxable wages)</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>511,191,307</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duty on contracts</td>
<td>Fixed fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Small amount</td>
<td>Small amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Ownership Transfer tax</td>
<td>0%–6%</td>
<td>Value of property</td>
<td>10,480,197</td>
<td>453,188,210</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>139,692,432</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30.82%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: Commercial profit is assumed to be 59.4 times income per capita. ID is Iraqi dinar.

* Profit before all taxes borne.
The indicators are based on expanded case study assumptions.

**Assumptions about the VAT refund process**
- In June 2016, TaxpayerCo. makes a large capital purchase: one additional machine for manufacturing pots.
- The value of the machine is 65 times income per capita of the economy.
- Sales are equally spread per month (that is, 1,050 times income per capita divided by 12).
- Cost of goods sold are equally expensed per month (that is, 875 times income per capita divided by 12).
- The seller of the machinery is registered for VAT.
- Excess input VAT incurred in June will be fully recovered after four consecutive months if the VAT rate is the same for inputs, sales and the machine and the tax reporting period is every month.
- Input VAT will exceed output VAT in June 2016 (table 8.13).

**Assumptions about the corporate income tax audit process**
- An error in the calculation of the income tax liability (for example, use of incorrect tax depreciation rates, or incorrectly treating an expense as tax deductible) leads to an incorrect income tax return and consequently an underpayment of corporate income tax.
- TaxpayerCo. discovered the error and voluntarily notified the tax authority of the error in the corporate income tax return.
- The value of the underpaid income tax liability is 5% of the corporate income tax liability due.
- TaxpayerCo. submits the corrected information after the deadline for submitting the annual tax return, but within the tax assessment period.

**Time to comply with VAT refund**
Time is recorded in hours. The indicator has two parts:
- The process of claiming a VAT refund. Time includes: time spent by TaxpayerCo. on gathering VAT information from internal sources, including time spent on any additional analysis of accounting information and calculating the VAT refund amount; time spent by TaxpayerCo. on preparing the VAT refund claim; time spent by TaxpayerCo. preparing any additional documents that are needed to substantiate the claim for the VAT refund; time spent submitting the VAT refund claim and additional documents if that submission is done separately from the submission of the standard VAT return; time spent making representation at the tax office if required; and time spent by TaxpayerCo. on submitting the VAT refund. Time includes: time spent by TaxpayerCo. on gathering information and preparing any documentation (information such as receipts, financial statements, pay stubs) as required by the tax auditor; time spent by TaxpayerCo. on submitting the documents requested by the auditor.

A total estimate of zero hours is recorded if the process of claiming a VAT refund is done automatically within the standard VAT return without the need to complete any additional section or part of the return, no additional documents or tasks are required as a result of the input tax credit and in 50% or more of similar cases the company will not be subjected to an audit.

An estimate of half an hour is recorded for submission of documents if the submission is done electronically and is a matter of minutes. An estimate of zero hours is recorded in the case of a field audit if documents are submitted in person and at the taxpayer’s premises.

In Kosovo, for example, taxpayers spend 35.5 hours complying with the process of claiming a VAT refund. Taxpayers must submit a special form for a VAT refund request in addition to the standard VAT return. Taxpayers spend two hours gathering information from internal sources and accounting records and 1 hour to prepare the form. Taxpayers must also prepare and

---

**TABLE 8.13 Computing the value of the VAT input tax credit for Albania**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAT rate</th>
<th>Input VAT</th>
<th>Output VAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>( R \times A + R \times B )</td>
<td>( R \times Sales )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>ALL 5,556,402.78</td>
<td>ALL 7,479,772.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: ALL is Albanian lek.

---

The process of a VAT audit. This is captured if a request for a VAT cash refund due to a capital purchase triggers an audit in 50% or more of cases. Time includes: time spent by TaxpayerCo. on gathering information and preparing any documentation (information such as receipts, financial statements, pay stubs) as required by the tax auditor; time spent by TaxpayerCo. on submitting the documents requested by the auditor.

---

The process of a VAT audit. This is captured if a request for a VAT cash refund due to a capital purchase triggers an audit in 50% or more of cases. Time includes: time spent by TaxpayerCo. on gathering information and preparing any documentation (information such as receipts, financial statements, pay stubs) as required by the tax auditor; time spent by TaxpayerCo. on submitting the documents requested by the auditor.

---

In Kosovo, for example, taxpayers spend 35.5 hours complying with the process of claiming a VAT refund. Taxpayers must submit a special form for a VAT refund request in addition to the standard VAT return. Taxpayers spend two hours gathering information from internal sources and accounting records and 1 hour to prepare the form. Taxpayers must also prepare and
have available for review all purchase and sales invoices for the past three months, a business explanation of VAT overpayment for large purchases or investments, bank statements, any missing tax declaration and a copy of fiscal and VAT certificates. Taxpayers spend four hours preparing these additional documents and five hours and thirty minutes submitting these documents in person at the tax authority office. Taxpayers must also appear in person at the tax office to explain the VAT refund claim and the reasons for the excess input VAT in the month of June. This takes three hours. Additionally, the claim for a VAT refund would trigger a full audit at the taxpayer’s premises. Taxpayers spend 20 hours preparing the documents requested by the auditor including purchase and sales invoices, bills, bank transactions, records on accounting software, tax returns and contracts. Taxpayers submit the documents to the auditor in person at their premises (zero hours for submission).

### Time to obtain VAT refund

Time is recorded in weeks. Time measures the total waiting time to receive a VAT refund from the moment the request has been submitted. If a request for a VAT cash refund due to a capital purchase will trigger an audit in 50% or more of cases time includes time to start the audit from the moment of claiming the VAT refund, time spent by TaxpayerCo. interacting with the auditor from the moment an audit begins until there are no further interactions between TaxpayerCo. and the auditor (including the various rounds of interactions between TaxpayerCo. and the auditor), the time spent waiting for the tax auditor to issue the final audit decision from the moment TaxpayerCo. has submitted all relevant information and documents and there are no further interactions between TaxpayerCo. and the auditor and the time spent waiting for the release of the VAT refund payment from the moment the final audit decision has been issued by the auditor. As a continuation of the methodology change in Doing Business 2017, two new time components are added starting from Doing Business 2018. These include: time to start the tax audit and time waiting for the release of the VAT refund payment.

Time also includes an average waiting time to submit the refund claim. The average waiting time to submit the refund claim is half a month if the VAT refund claim is filed monthly. The average waiting time to submit the refund claim is one month if the VAT refund claim is filed bimonthly. The average waiting time to submit the refund claim is one and a half months if the VAT refund claim is filed quarterly. The average waiting time to submit the refund claim is three months if the VAT refund claim is filed semi-annually. The average waiting time to submit the refund claim is six months if the VAT refund claim is filed annually.

In Albania, for example, it takes 37.0 weeks to receive a VAT refund. The request for a VAT refund triggers an audit by the tax authorities. It takes four weeks for the tax authority to start the audit. Taxpayers spend 8.6 weeks interacting with the auditor and wait four weeks until the final assessment is issued. Taxpayers only receive the VAT refund after the audit is completed. Taxpayers wait five weeks for the release of the VAT refund payment. In Albania the taxpayers must carry forward the VAT refund for three consecutive VAT accounting periods (three months in the case of Albania) before a refund in cash is requested. The three months (13 weeks) carry forward period is included in the total time to receive a VAT refund. The VAT return is filed monthly and thus 0.5 month (2.1 weeks) is included in the total time to receive a VAT refund.

Time includes the mandatory carry forward time before a VAT refund in cash can be paid. The carry forward time is zero if there is no mandatory carry forward period.

In Albania, for example, it takes 37.0 weeks to receive a VAT refund. The request for a VAT refund triggers an audit by the tax authorities. It takes four weeks for the tax authority to start the audit. Taxpayers spend 8.6 weeks interacting with the auditor and wait four weeks until the final assessment is issued. Taxpayers only receive the VAT refund after the audit is completed. Taxpayers wait five weeks for the release of the VAT refund payment. In Albania the taxpayers must carry forward the VAT refund for three consecutive VAT accounting periods (three months in the case of Albania) before a refund in cash is requested. The three months (13 weeks) carry forward period is included in the total time to receive a VAT refund. The VAT return is filed monthly and thus 0.5 month (2.1 weeks) is included in the total time to receive a VAT refund.

If an economy does not have a VAT, the economy will not be scored on the two indicators for a VAT refund process—time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. This is the case in Bahrain. If an economy has a VAT and the purchase of a machine is not subject to VAT, the economy will not be scored on time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. This is the case in Sierra Leone. If an economy has a VAT that was introduced in calendar year 2016 and there is not sufficient data to assess the refund process, the economy will not be scored on time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund.

If an economy has a VAT but the ability to claim a refund is restricted to specific categories of taxpayers that do not include the case study company, the economy is assigned a score of 0 on the distance to frontier score for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. In Bolivia, for example, only exporters are eligible to request a VAT refund. As a result, Bolivia receives a score of 0 on the distance to frontier score for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. If an economy has a VAT and the case study company is eligible to claim a refund but cash refunds do not occur in practice, the economy is assigned a score of 0 on the distance to frontier score for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. This is the case in Central African Republic. If an economy has a VAT but there is no refund mechanism in place, the economy is assigned a score of 0 on the distance to frontier score for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. This is the case in Sudan. If an economy has a VAT but input tax on a capital purchase is a cost on the business, the economy is scored 0 on the distance to frontier score for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. This is the case in Myanmar. As a continuation of the methodology change in Doing Business 2017, the methodology for the cases of mandatory carry forward of four months or more has been refined. All economies who mandate taxpayers to carry forward the excess input VAT for four months or more before a cash refund can be requested are coded, starting from Doing Business 2018, on the time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund.
refund assuming that there is still some VAT credit remaining after the mandatory carry forward has passed.

**Time to comply with corporate income tax audit**

Time is recorded in hours. The indicator has two parts:

- The process of notifying the tax authorities of the error, amending the return and making additional payment. Time includes: time spent by TaxpayerCo. gathering information and preparing the documents required to notify the tax authorities; time spent by TaxpayerCo. in submitting the documents; and time spent by TaxpayerCo. in making the additional tax payment if the payment is done separately from the submission of the amended corporate income tax return. As a continuation of the methodology change in Doing Business 2017, the time spent in making the additional tax payment was added starting from Doing Business 2018 only if the payment is not done separately from the submission of the amended return.

- The process of complying with a corporate income tax audit. This is captured if self-reporting an error in the corporate income tax return resulting in an underpayment of the corporate income tax due liability triggers an audit in 25% or more of cases. The threshold used for assessing the corporate income tax audit is lower than the threshold used in the case of the VAT cash refund. This is because the case study scenario of self-reporting an error in the corporate income tax return and resulting in an underpayment of the tax liability should only be an issue among a small sample of companies selected for a tax audit. On the contrary to the VAT cash refund, it is common that a one-time request for a VAT cash refund be exposed to a tax audit. Time includes: time spent by TaxpayerCo. on gathering information and preparing any documentation (information such as receipts, financial statements, pay stubs) as required by the tax auditor; and time spent by TaxpayerCo. in submitting the documents requested by the auditor.

An estimate of half an hour is recorded for submission of documents or payment of the income tax liability due if the submission or payment is done electronically in several minutes. An estimate of zero hours is recorded in the case of a field audit if documents are submitted in person and at the taxpayer’s premises.

In the Slovak Republic, for example, taxpayers would submit an amended corporate income tax return electronically. It takes taxpayers one hour to correct the error in the return, half an hour to submit the amended return online and half an hour to make the additional payment online. Amending a corporate income tax return per the case study scenario in the Slovak Republic would not trigger an audit. This brings the total compliance time to two hours.

**Time to complete a corporate income tax audit**

Time is recorded in weeks. Time includes the time to start an audit from the moment the tax authority has been notified of the error in the corporate income tax return, time spent by TaxpayerCo. interacting with the auditor from the moment an audit begins until there are no further interactions between TaxpayerCo. and the auditor (including the various rounds of interactions between TaxpayerCo. and the auditor), and time spent waiting for the tax auditor to issue the final tax assessment from the moment TaxpayerCo. has submitted all relevant information and documents and there are no further interactions between TaxpayerCo. and the auditor. As a continuation of the methodology change in Doing Business 2017, the time to start the tax audit is now taken into account.

Time to complete a corporate income tax audit is recorded as zero if in less than 25% of similar cases the case study company will not go through an audit.

In Switzerland, for example, taxpayers are subject to a single-issue audit conducted at the taxpayer’s premises as a result of amending a corporate income tax return per the case study scenario. Taxpayers wait 30 days (4.28 weeks) until the tax authority starts the audit and interact for a total of four days (0.57 weeks) with the auditor and wait for four weeks until the final assessment is issued by the auditor, resulting in a total of 8.86 weeks to complete a corporate income tax audit.

If an economy does not levy corporate income tax, the economy will not be scored on the two indicators: time to comply with corporate income tax audit and time to complete a corporate income tax audit. This is the case in Vanuatu.

An economy receives a “no practice” mark on the payments, time, total tax and contribution rate and postfiling index indicators if the economy does not levy any taxes or mandatory contributions.

**REFORMS**

The paying taxes indicator set tracks changes related to the different taxes and mandatory contributions that a medium-size company must pay in a given year, the administrative burden of paying taxes and contributions and the administrative burden of complying with two postfiling processes (VAT refund, and tax audit) per calendar year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The paying taxes indicator set uses one criterion to recognize a reform.

The aggregate gap on the overall distance to frontier of the indicator set is used to assess the impact of data changes. Any data update that leads to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap is
classified as a reform (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking). For example, if the implementation of a new electronic system for filing or paying one of the three major taxes (corporate income tax, VAT, labor taxes and mandatory contributions) reduces the time or the number of payments in a way that the overall gap decreases by 2% or more, such change is classified as a reform. Alternatively, minor updates to tax rates or fixed charges or other smaller changes in the indicators that have an aggregate impact less than 2% on the gap are not classified as a reform, but their impact is still reflected on the most updated indicators for this indicator set.

The data details on paying taxes can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. This methodology was developed by Djankov and others (2010).

### TRADING ACROSS BORDERS

Doing Business records the time and cost associated with the logistical process of exporting and importing goods. Doing Business measures the time and cost (excluding tariffs) associated with three sets of procedures—documentary compliance, border compliance and domestic transport—within the overall process of exporting or importing a shipment of goods. Figure 8.15, using the example of Brazil (as exporter) and China (as importer), shows the process of exporting a shipment from a warehouse in the origin economy to a warehouse in an overseas trading partner through a port. Figure 8.16, using the example of Kenya (as exporter) and Uganda (as importer), shows the process of exporting a shipment from a warehouse in the origin economy to a warehouse in a regional trading partner through a land border. The ranking of economies on the ease of trading across borders is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for trading across borders. The main reason for this is that the time and cost for domestic transport are affected by many external factors—such as the geography and topography of the transit territory, road capacity and general infrastructure, proximity to the nearest port or border, and the location of warehouses where the traded goods are stored—and so are not directly influenced by an economy’s trade policies and reforms.

The data on trading across borders are gathered through a questionnaire administered to local freight forwarders, customs brokers, port authorities and traders.

If an economy has no formal, large-scale, private sector cross-border trade taking place as a result of government restrictions, armed conflict or a natural disaster,
it is considered a “no practice” economy. A “no practice” economy receives a distance to frontier score of 0 for all the trading across borders indicators.

Assumptions of the case study

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions are made about the traded goods and the transactions:

- For each of the 190 economies covered by Doing Business, it is assumed that a shipment is located in a warehouse in the largest business city of the exporting economy and travels to a warehouse in the largest business city of the importing economy. For 11 economies the data are also collected, under the same case study assumptions, for the second largest business city (table B.A.1).
- The import and export case studies assume different traded products. It is assumed that each economy imports a standardized shipment of 15 metric tons of containerized auto parts (HS 8708) from its natural import partner—the economy from which it imports the largest value (price times quantity) of auto parts. It is assumed that each economy exports the product of its comparative advantage (defined by the largest export value) to its natural export partner—the economy that is the largest purchaser of this product. Precious metal and gems, mineral fuels, oil products, live animals, residues and waste of foods and products as well as pharmaceuticals are excluded from the list of possible export products, however, and in these cases the second largest product category is considered as needed.
- A shipment is a unit of trade. Export shipments do not necessarily need to be containerized, while import shipments of auto parts are assumed to be containerized.
- If government fees are determined by the value of the shipment, the value is assumed to be $50,000.
- The product is new, not secondhand or used merchandise.
- The exporting/importing firm hires and pays for a freight forwarder or customs broker (or both) and pays for all costs related to domestic transport, clearance and mandatory inspections by customs and other agencies, port or border handling, documentary compliance fees and the like.
- The mode of transport is the one most widely used for the chosen export or import product and the trading partner, as is the seaport or land border crossing.
- All electronic submissions of information requested by any government agency in connection with the shipment are considered to be documents obtained, prepared and submitted during the export or import process.
- A port or border is defined as a place (seaport or land border crossing) where merchandise can enter or leave an economy.
- Government agencies considered relevant are agencies such as customs, port authorities, road police, border guards, standardization agencies, ministries or departments of agriculture or industry, national security agencies, central banks and any other government authorities.

Time

Time is measured in hours, and 1 day is 24 hours (for example, 22 days are recorded as 22 × 24 = 528 hours). If customs clearance takes 7.5 hours, the data are recorded as is. Alternatively, suppose that documents are submitted to a customs agency at 8:00 a.m., are processed overnight and can be picked up at 8:00 a.m. the next day. In this case the time for customs clearance would be recorded as 24 hours because the actual procedure took 24 hours.

Cost

Insurance cost and informal payments for which no receipt is issued are excluded from the costs recorded. Costs are reported in U.S. dollars. Contributors are asked to convert local currency into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rate prevailing on the day they answer the questionnaire.

Contributors are private sector experts in international trade logistics and are informed about exchange rates and their movements.

Documentary compliance

Documentary compliance captures the time and cost associated with compliance with the documentary requirements of all government agencies of the origin economy, the destination economy and any transit economies (table B.14). The aim is to measure the total burden of preparing the bundle of documents that will enable completion of the international trade for the product and partner pair assumed in the case study. As a shipment moves from Mumbai to New York City, for example, the freight forwarder must prepare and submit documents to the customs agency in India, to the port authorities in Mumbai and to the customs agency in New York City.

The time and cost for documentary compliance include the time and cost for obtaining documents (such as time spent to get the document issued and stamped); preparing documents (such as time spent gathering information to complete the customs declaration or certificate of origin); processing documents (such as time spent waiting for the relevant authority to issue a phytosanitary certificate); presenting documents (such as time spent showing a port terminal receipt to port authorities); and submitting documents (such as time spent submitting a customs declaration to the customs agency in person or electronically).

All electronic or paper submissions of information requested by any government agency in connection with the shipment are considered to be documents obtained, prepared and submitted during the export or import process. All documents prepared by the freight forwarder or customs broker for the product and partner pair assumed in the case study are included regardless of whether they are required by law or in practice. Any documents prepared and submitted so as to get access
to preferential treatment—for example, a certificate of origin—are included in the calculation of the time and cost for documentary compliance. Any documents prepared and submitted because of a perception that they ease the passage of the shipment are also included (for example, freight forwarders may prepare a packing list because in their experience this reduces the probability of physical or other intrusive inspections).

In addition, any documents that are mandatory for exporting or importing are included in the calculation of time and cost. Documents that need to be obtained only once are not counted, however. And Doing Business does not include documents needed to produce and sell in the domestic market—such as certificates of third-party safety standards testing that may be required to sell toys domestically—unless a government agency needs to see these documents during the export process.

**Border compliance**

Border compliance captures the time and cost associated with compliance with the economy’s customs regulations and with regulations relating to other inspections that are mandatory in order for the shipment to cross the economy’s border, as well as the time and cost for handling that takes place at its port or border. The time and cost for this segment include time and cost for customs clearance and inspection procedures conducted by other agencies. For example, the time and cost for conducting a phytosanitary inspection would be included here.

The computation of border compliance time and cost depends on where the border compliance procedures take place, who requires and conducts the procedures and what is the probability that inspections will be conducted. If all customs clearance and other inspections take place at the port or border at the same time, the time estimate for border compliance takes this simultaneity into account. It is entirely possible that the border compliance time and cost could be negligible or zero, as in the case of trade between members of the European Union or other customs unions.

If some or all customs or other inspections take place at other locations, the time and cost for these procedures are added to the time and cost for those that take place at the port or border. In Kazakhstan, for example, all customs clearance and inspections take place at a customs post in Almaty that is not at the land border between Kazakhstan and China. In this case border compliance time is the sum of the time spent at the terminal in Almaty and the handling time at the border.

Doing Business asks contributors to estimate the time and cost for clearance and inspections by customs agencies—defined as documentary and physical inspections for the purpose of calculating duties by verifying product classification, confirming quantity, determining origin and checking the veracity of other information on the customs declaration. (This category includes all inspections aimed at preventing smuggling.) These are clearance and inspection procedures that take place in the majority of cases and thus are considered the “standard” case. The time and cost estimates capture the efficiency of the customs agency of the economy.

Doing Business also asks contributors to estimate the total time and cost for clearance and inspections by customs and all other agencies for the specified product. These estimates account for inspections related to health, safety, phytosanitary standards, conformity and the like, and thus capture the efficiency of agencies that require and conduct these additional inspections.

If inspections by agencies other than customs are conducted in 20% or fewer cases, the border compliance time and cost measures take into account only clearance and inspections by customs (the standard case). If inspections by other agencies take place in more than 20% of cases, the time and cost measures account for clearance and inspections by all agencies. Different types of inspections may take place with different probabilities—for example, scanning may take place in 100% of cases while physical inspection occurs in 5% of cases. In situations like this, Doing Business would count the time only for scanning because it happens in more than 20% of cases while physical inspection does not. The border compliance time and cost for an economy do not include the time and

---

### TABLE 8.14 What do the indicators on the time and cost to export and import cover?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentary compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining, preparing and submitting documents during transport, clearance, inspections and port or border handling in origin economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers all documents required by law and in practice, including electronic submissions of information as well as non-shipment-specific documents necessary to complete the trade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Border compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customs clearance and inspections by customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections by other agencies (if applied to more than 20% of shipments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port or border handling at most widely used port or border of economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loading and unloading of shipment at warehouse, dry port or border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport by most widely used mode between warehouse and terminal or dry port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport by most widely used mode between terminal or dry port and most widely used border or port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic delays and road police checks while shipment is en route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cost for compliance with the regulations of any other economy.

**Domestic transport**

Domestic transport captures the time and cost associated with transporting the shipment from a warehouse in the largest business city of the economy to the most widely used seaport or land border of the economy. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1). This set of procedures captures the time for (and cost of) the actual transport; any traffic delays and road police checks; as well as time spent on loading or unloading at the warehouse or border. For a coastal economy with an overseas trading partner, domestic transport captures the time and cost from the loading of the shipment at the warehouse until the shipment reaches the economy’s port (figure 8.16). For an economy trading through a land border, domestic transport captures the time and cost from the loading of the shipment at the warehouse until the shipment reaches the economy’s land border (figure 8.16).

The time and cost estimates are based on the most widely used mode of transport (truck, train, riverboat) and the most widely used route (road, border posts) as reported by contributors. The time and cost estimates are based on the mode and route chosen by the majority of contributors. For the 11 economies for which data are collected for both the largest and the second largest business city, Doing Business allows the most widely used route and the most widely used mode of transport to be different for the two cities. For example, shipments from Delhi are transported by train to Mundra port for export, while shipments from Mumbai travel by truck to Nhava Sheva port to be exported.

In the export case study, as noted, Doing Business does not assume a containerized shipment, and time and cost estimates may be based on the transport of 15 tons of noncontainerized products. In the import case study auto parts are assumed to be containerized. In the cases where cargo is containerized, the time and cost for transport and other procedures are based on a shipment consisting of homogeneous cargo belonging to a single Harmonized System (HS) classification code. This assumption is particularly important for inspections, because shipments of homogeneous products are often subject to fewer and shorter inspections than shipments of products belonging to various HS codes.

In some cases the shipment travels from the warehouse to a customs post or terminal for clearance or inspections and then travels onward to the port or border. In these cases the domestic transport time is the sum of the time for both transport segments. The time and cost for clearance or inspections are included in the measures for border compliance, however, not in those for domestic transport.

**REFORMS**

The trading across borders indicator set records the time and cost associated with the logistical process of exporting and importing goods every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/17 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The trading across borders indicator set uses a standard criterion to recognize a reform.

The aggregate gap on the overall distance to frontier of the indicator set is used to assess the impact of data changes. Any data update that leads to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap is classified as a reform (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking). For example, if the implementation of a single window system reduces time or cost in a way that the overall gap decreases by 2% or more, such change is classified as a reform. Minor shipping fee updates or other small changes on the indicators that have an aggregate impact of less than 2% on the gap are not classified as a reform, yet, but their impact is still reflected on the most updated indicators for this indicator set.

The data details on trading across borders can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. This methodology was initially developed by Djankov and others (2008) and was revised in 2015.

**ENFORCING CONTRACTS**

Doing Business measures the time and cost for resolving a commercial dispute through a local first-instance court (table 8.15) and the quality of judicial processes index, evaluating whether each economy has adopted a series of good practices that promote quality and efficiency in the court system. The data are collected through study of the codes of civil procedure and other court regulations as well as questionnaires completed by local litigation lawyers and judges. The ranking of economies on the ease of enforcing contracts is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for enforcing contracts. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8.15</th>
<th>What do the indicators on the efficiency of resolving a commercial dispute measure?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time required to enforce a contract through the courts (calendar days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to file and serve the case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for trial and to obtain the judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to enforce the judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost required to enforce a contract through the courts (% of claim value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average attorney fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFICIENCY OF RESOLVING A COMMERCIAL DISPUTE

The data on time and cost are built by following the step-by-step evolution of a commercial sale dispute (figure 8.19). The data are collected for a specific court for each city covered, under the assumptions about the case described below. The “competent court” is the one with jurisdiction over disputes worth 200% of income per capita or $5,000, whichever is greater. Whenever more than one court has original jurisdiction over a case comparable to the standardized case study, the data are collected based on the court that would be used by litigants in the majority of cases. The name of the relevant court in each economy is published on the Doing Business website at http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploretopics/enforcing-contracts. For the 11 economies for which the data are also collected for the second largest business city, the name of the relevant court in that city is given as well.

Assumptions about the case

- The value of the claim is equal to 200% of the economy’s income per capita or $5,000, whichever is greater.
- The dispute concerns a lawful transaction between two businesses (Seller and Buyer), both located in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1). Pursuant to a contract between the businesses, Seller sells some custom-made furniture to Buyer worth 200% of the economy’s income per capita or $5,000, whichever is greater. After Seller delivers the goods to Buyer, Buyer refuses to pay the contract price, alleging that the goods are not of adequate quality. Because they were custom-made, Seller is unable to sell them to anyone else.
- Seller (the plaintiff) sues Buyer (the defendant) to recover the amount under the sales agreement. The dispute is brought before the court located in the economy’s largest business city with jurisdiction over commercial cases worth 200% of income per capita or $5,000, whichever is greater. As noted, for 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- At the outset of the dispute, Seller decides to attach Buyer’s movable assets (for example, office equipment and vehicles) because Seller fears that Buyer may hide its assets or otherwise become insolvent.
- The claim is disputed on the merits because of Buyer’s allegation that the quality of the goods was not adequate. Because the court cannot decide the case on the basis of documentary evidence or legal title alone, an expert opinion is given on the quality of the goods. If it is standard practice in the economy for each party to call its own expert witness, the parties each call one expert witness. If it is standard practice for the judge to appoint an independent expert, the judge does so. In this case the judge does not allow opposing expert testimony.
- Following the expert opinion, the judge decides that the goods delivered by Seller were of adequate quality and that Buyer must pay the contract price. The judge thus renders a final judgment that is 100% in favor of Seller.

Buyer does not appeal the judgment. Seller decides to start enforcing the judgment as soon as the time allocated by law for appeal lapses.
- Seller takes all required steps for prompt enforcement of the judgment. The money is successfully collected through a public sale of Buyer’s movable assets (for example, office equipment and vehicles). It is assumed that Buyer does not have any money in his bank account, making it impossible for the judgment to be enforced through a seizure of the Buyer’s accounts.

Time

Time is recorded in calendar days, counted from the moment Seller decides to file the lawsuit in court until payment. This includes both the days when actions take place and the waiting periods in between. The average duration of the following three different stages of dispute resolution is recorded: (i) filing and service; (ii) trial and judgment; and (iii) enforcement. Time is recorded considering the case study assumptions detailed above and only as applicable to the competent court.

Figure 8.19 What are the time and cost to resolve a commercial dispute through a local first-instance court?
The filing and service phase includes:
- The time for Seller to try and obtain payment out of court through a non-litigious demand letter, including the time to prepare the letter and the deadline that would be provided to Buyer to comply.
- The time necessary for a local lawyer to write the initial complaint and gather all supporting documents needed for filing, including authenticating or notarizing them, if required.
- The time necessary to file the complaint at the court.
- The time necessary for Buyer to be served, including the processing time at the court and the waiting periods between unsuccessful attempts, if more than one attempt is usually required.

The trial and judgment phase includes:
- The time between the moment the case is served on Buyer and the moment a pre-trial conference is held, if such pre-trial conference is part of the case management techniques used by the competent court.
- The time between the pre-trial conference and the first hearing, if a pre-trial conference is part of the case management techniques used by the competent court. If not, the time between the moment the case is served on Buyer and the moment the first hearing is held.
- The time to conduct all trial activities, including exchanges of briefs and evidence, multiple hearings, waiting times in between hearings and obtaining an expert opinion.
- The time necessary for the judge to issue a written final judgment once the evidence period has closed.
- The time limit for appeal.

The enforcement phase includes:
- The time it takes to obtain an enforceable copy of the judgment and contact the relevant enforcement office.
- The time it takes to locate, identify, seize and transport the losing party’s movable assets (including the time necessary to obtain an order from the court to attach and seize the assets, if applicable).
- The time it takes to advertise, organize and hold the auction. If more than one auction would usually be required to fully recover the value of claim in a case comparable to the standardized case study, then the time between multiple auction attempts is recorded.
- The time it takes for the winning party to fully recover the value of the claim once the auction is successfully completed.

**Cost**
Cost is recorded as a percentage of the claim value, assumed to be equivalent to 200% of income per capita or $5,000, whichever is greater. Three types of costs are recorded: average attorney fees, court costs and enforcement costs.

Average attorney fees are the fees that Seller (plaintiff) must advance to a local attorney to represent Seller in the standardized case, regardless of final reimbursement. Court costs include all costs that Seller (plaintiff) must advance to the court, regardless of the final cost borne by Seller. Court costs include the fees that the parties must pay to obtain an expert opinion, regardless of whether they are paid to the court or to the expert directly. Enforcement costs are all costs that Seller (plaintiff) must advance to enforce the judgment through a public sale of Buyer’s movable assets, regardless of the final cost borne by Seller. Bribes are not taken into account.

**QUALITY OF JUDICIAL PROCESSES**
The quality of judicial processes index measures whether each economy has adopted a series of good practices in its court system in four areas: court structure and proceedings, case management, court automation and alternative dispute resolution (table 8.16).

**Table 8.16 What does the quality of judicial processes index measure?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court structure and proceedings index (0–5)</td>
<td>Availability of specialized commercial court, division or section (0–1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of small claims court and/or simplified procedure for small claims (0–1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of pretrial attachment (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria used to assign cases to judges (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidentiary weight of woman’s testimony (-1–0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management index (0–6)</td>
<td>Regulations setting time standards for key court events (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations on adjournments and continuances (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of performance measurement reports (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of pretrial conference (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of electronic case management system for judges (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of electronic case management system for lawyers (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court automation index (0–4)</td>
<td>Ability to file initial complaint electronically (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to serve initial complaint electronically (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to pay court fees electronically (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication of judgments (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative dispute resolution index (0–3)</td>
<td>Arbitration (0–1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary mediation and/or conciliation (0–1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>Sum of the court structure and proceedings, case management, court automation and alternative dispute resolution indices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Court structure and proceedings index**
The court structure and proceedings index has five components:
- Whether a specialized commercial court, section or division dedicated solely to hearing commercial cases is in place. A score of 1.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.
- Whether a small claims court and/or a fast-track procedure for small claims is in place. A score of 1 is assigned if such a court or procedure is in place, it is applicable to all civil cases and the law sets a cap on the value of cases that can be handled.
through this court or procedure. If small claims are handled by a stand-alone court, the point is assigned only if this court applies a simplified procedure. An additional score of 0.5 is assigned if parties can represent themselves before this court or during this procedure. If no small claims court or simplified procedure is in place, a score of 0 is assigned.

- Whether plaintiffs can obtain pretrial attachment of the defendant’s movable assets if they fear the assets may be moved out of the jurisdiction or otherwise dissipated. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- Whether cases are assigned randomly and automatically to judges throughout the competent court. A score of 1 is assigned if the assignment of cases is random and automated; 0.5 if it is random but not automated; 0 if it is neither random nor automated.

- Whether a woman’s testimony carries the same evidentiary weight in court as a man’s. A score of -1 is assigned if the law differentiates between the evidentiary value of a woman's testimony and that of a man in any type of civil case, including family cases; 0 if it does not.

The index ranges from 0 to 5, with higher values indicating a more sophisticated and streamlined court structure. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, a specialized commercial court is in place (a score of 1.5), and small claims can be resolved through a dedicated division in which self-representation is allowed (a score of 1.5). Plaintiffs can obtain pretrial attachment of the defendant’s movable assets if they fear dissipation during trial (a score of 1). Cases are assigned randomly through an electronic case management system (a score of 1). A woman’s testimony carries the same evidentiary weight in court as a man’s (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Bosnia and Herzegovina a score of 5 on the court structure and proceedings index.

### Case management index

The case management index has six components:

- Whether any of the applicable laws or regulations on civil procedure contain time standards for at least three of the following key court events: (i) service of process; (ii) first hearing; (iii) filing of the statement of defense; (iv) completion of the evidence period; (v) filing of testimony by expert; and (vi) submission of the final judgment. A score of 1 is assigned if such time standards are available and respected in more than 50% of cases; 0.5 if they are available but not respected in more than 50% of cases; 0 if there are time standards for less than three of these key court events or for none.

- Whether there are any laws regulating the maximum number of adjournments or continuances that can be granted, whether adjournments are limited by law to unforeseen and exceptional circumstances and whether these rules are respected in more than 50% of cases. A score of 1 is assigned if all three conditions are met; 0.5 if only two of the three conditions are met; 0 if only one of the conditions is met or if none are.

- Whether there are any performance measurement reports that can be generated about the competent court to monitor the court’s performance, to track the progress of cases through the court and to ensure compliance with established time standards. A score of 1 is assigned if at least two of the following four reports are made publicly available: (i) time to disposition report (measuring the time the court takes to dispose/adjudicate its cases); (ii) clearance rate report (measuring the number of cases resolved versus the number of incoming cases); (iii) age of pending cases report (providing a snapshot of all pending cases according to case type, case age, last action held and next action scheduled); and (iv) single case progress report (providing a snapshot of the status of one single case). A score of 0 is assigned if only one of these reports is available or if none are.

- Whether a pretrial conference is among the case management techniques used in practice before the competent court and at least three of the following issues are discussed during the pretrial conference: (i) scheduling (including the time frame for filing motions and other documents with the court); (ii) case complexity and projected length of trial; (iii) possibility of settlement or alternative dispute resolution; (iv) exchange of witness lists; (v) evidence; (vi) jurisdiction and other procedural issues; and (vii) narrowing down of contentious issues. A score of 1 is assigned if a pretrial conference in which at least three of these events are discussed is held within the competent court; 0 if not.

- Whether judges within the competent court can use an electronic case management system for at least four of the following purposes: (i) to access laws, regulations and case law; (ii) to automatically generate a hearing schedule for all cases on their docket; (iii) to send notifications (for example, e-mails) to lawyers; (iv) to track the status of a case on their docket; (v) to view and manage case documents (briefs, motions); (vi) to assist in writing judgments; (vii) to semi-automatically generate court orders; and (viii) to view court orders and judgments in a particular case. A score of 1 is assigned if an electronic case management system that judges can use for at least four of these purposes is available; 0 if not.

- Whether lawyers can use an electronic case management system for at least four of the following purposes: (i) to access laws, regulations and case law; (ii) to access forms to be submitted to the court; (iii) to receive notifications (for example, e-mails); (iv) to track the status of a case; (v) to view and manage case documents (briefs, motions); (vi) to file briefs and documents with the court; and (vii) to view court orders...
and decisions in a particular case. A score of 1 is assigned if an electronic case management system that lawyers can use for at least four of these purposes is available; 0 if not.

The index ranges from 0 to 6, with higher values indicating a more qualitative and efficient case management system. In Australia, for example, time standards for at least three key court events are established in applicable civil procedure instruments and are respected in more than 50% of cases (a score of 1). The law stipulates that adjournments can be granted only for unforeseen and exceptional circumstances and this rule is respected in more than 50% of cases (a score of 0.5). A time to disposition report, a clearance rate report and an age of pending cases report can be generated about the competent court (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Australia a score of 5.5 on the case management index, the highest score attained by any economy on this index.

**Court automation index**

The court automation index has four components:

- Whether the initial complaint can be filed electronically through a dedicated platform (not e-mail or fax) within the competent court. A score of 1 is assigned if such a platform is available and litigants are not required to follow up with a hard copy of the complaint; 0 if not. Electronic filing is acknowledged regardless of the percentage of users, as long as no additional in-person interactions are required, and local experts have used it enough to be able to confirm that it is fully functional.

- Whether the initial complaint can be served on the defendant electronically, through a dedicated system or by e-mail, fax or SMS (short message service), for cases filed before the competent court. A score of 1 is assigned if electronic service is available and no further service of process is required; 0 if not. Electronic service is acknowledged regardless of the percentage of users, as long as no additional in-person interactions are required, and local experts have used it enough to be able to confirm that it is fully functional.

- Whether judgments rendered by local courts are made available to the general public through publication in official gazettes, in newspapers or on the internet. A score of 1 is assigned if judgments rendered in commercial cases at all levels are made available to the general public; 0 if only judgments rendered at the appeal and supreme court level are made available to the general public; 0 in all other instances. No points are awarded if judgments need to be individually requested from the court, or if the case number or parties’ details are required in order to obtain a copy of a judgment.

- Whether voluntary mediation, conciliation or both are a recognized way of resolving commercial disputes. A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

The index ranges from 0 to 4, with higher values indicating a more automated, efficient and transparent court system. In Estonia, for example, the initial summons can be filed online (a score of 1), it can be served on the defendant electronically (a score of 1), and court fees can be paid electronically as well (a score of 1). In addition, judgments in commercial cases at all levels are made publicly available through the internet (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Estonia a score of 4 on the court automation index.

**Alternative dispute resolution index**

The alternative dispute resolution index has six components:

- Whether domestic commercial arbitration is governed by a consolidated law or consolidated chapter or section of the applicable code of civil procedure encompassing substantially all its aspects. A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- Whether commercial disputes of all kinds—aside from those dealing with public order, public policy, bankruptcy, consumer rights, employment issues or intellectual property—can be submitted to arbitration. A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- Whether voluntary mediation, conciliation or both are governed by a consolidated law or consolidated chapter or section of the applicable code of civil procedure encompassing substantially all their aspects. A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- Whether financial incentives for parties to attempt mediation or conciliation (for example, if mediation or conciliation is successful, a refund of court filing fees, an income tax credit or the like). A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

The index ranges from 0 to 3, with higher values associated with greater availability of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. In Israel, for example, arbitration is regulated through a dedicated statute (a score of 0.5), all relevant commercial disputes can be submitted to arbitration (a score of 0.5), and valid arbitration
clauses are usually enforced by the courts (a score of 0.5). Voluntary mediation is a recognized way of resolving commercial disputes (a score of 0.5), it is regulated through a dedicated statute (a score of 0.5), and part of the filing fees is reimbursed if the process is successful (a score of 0.5). Adding these numbers gives Israel a score of 3 on the alternative dispute resolution index.

Quality of judicial processes index
The quality of judicial processes index is the sum of the scores on the court structure and proceedings, case management, court automation and alternative dispute resolution indices. The index ranges from 0 to 18, with higher values indicating better and more efficient judicial processes.

REFORMS
The enforcing contracts indicator set tracks changes related to the efficiency and quality of commercial dispute resolution systems every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The enforcing contracts indicator set uses three criteria to recognize a reform.

First, changes in laws and regulations that have any impact on the economy’s score on the quality of judicial processes index are classified as reforms. Examples of reforms impacting the quality of judicial processes index include measures to introduce electronic filing of the initial complaint, the creation of a commercial court or division, or the introduction of dedicated systems to resolve small claims. Changes affecting the quality of judicial processes index can be different in magnitude and scope and still be considered a reform. For example, implementing a new electronic case management system for the use of judges and lawyers represents a reform with a 2-point increase in the index, while introducing incentives for the parties to use mediation represents a reform with a 0.5-point increase in the index.

Second, changes that have an impact on the time and cost to resolve a dispute may also be classified as reforms depending on the magnitude of the changes. According to the enforcing contracts methodology, any updates in legislation leading to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking) of the time and cost indicators is classified as a reform. Changes with lower impact are not classified as reforms but they are still reflected on the most updated indicators data.

Third, legislative changes of exceptional magnitude such as sizeable revisions of the applicable civil procedure, or enforcement laws, that are anticipated to have a significant impact on time and cost in the future.

The data details on enforcing contracts can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. This methodology was initially developed by Djankov and others (2003) and is adopted here with several changes. The quality of judicial processes index was introduced in Doing Business 2016. The good practices tested in this index were developed on the basis of internationally recognized good practices promoting judicial efficiency.

RESOLVING INSOLVENCY
Doing Business studies the time, cost and outcome of insolvency proceedings involving domestic entities as well as the strength of the legal framework applicable to judicial liquidation and reorganization proceedings. The data for the resolving insolvency indicators are derived from questionnaire responses by local insolvency practitioners and verified through a study of laws and regulations as well as public information on insolvency systems. The ranking of economies on the ease of resolving insolvency is determined by sorting their distance to frontier scores for resolving insolvency. These scores are the simple average of the distance to frontier scores for the recovery rate and the strength of insolvency framework index (figure 8.20).

RECOVERY OF DEBT IN INSOLVENCY
The recovery rate is calculated based on the time, cost and outcome of insolvency proceedings in each economy. To make the data on the time, cost and outcome of insolvency proceedings comparable across economies, several assumptions about the business and the case are used.

Assumptions about the business
The business:

- Is a limited liability company.
- Operates in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1).
- Is 100% domestically owned, with the founder, who is also chairman of the supervisory board, owning 51% (no other shareholder holds more than 5% of shares).
- Has downtown real estate, where it runs a hotel, as its major asset.
- Has a professional general manager.
- Has 201 employees and 50 suppliers, each of which is owed money for the last delivery.

FIGURE 8.20 Resolving insolvency: recovery rate and strength of insolvency framework

Rankings are based on distance to frontier scores for two indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recovery rate</th>
<th>Strength of insolvency framework index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Has a 10-year loan agreement with a domestic bank secured by a mortgage over the hotel’s real estate property. A universal business charge (an enterprise charge) is also assumed in economies where such collateral is recognized. If the laws of the economy do not specifically provide for an enterprise charge but contracts commonly use some other provision to that effect, this provision is specified in the loan agreement.
- Has observed the payment schedule and all other conditions of the loan up to now.
- Has a market value, operating as a going concern, of 100 times income per capita or $200,000, whichever is greater. The market value of the company’s assets, if sold piecemeal, is 70% of the market value of the business.

**Assumptions about the case**

The business is experiencing liquidity problems. The company’s loss in 2016 reduced its net worth to a negative figure. It is January 1, 2017. There is no cash to pay the bank interest or principal in full, due the next day, January 2. The business will therefore default on its loan. Management believes that losses will be incurred in 2017 and 2018 as well. But it expects 2017 cash flow to cover all operating expenses, including supplier payments, salaries, maintenance costs and taxes, though not principal or interest payments to the bank.

The amount outstanding under the loan agreement is exactly equal to the market value of the hotel business and represents 74% of the company’s total debt. The other 26% of its debt is held by unsecured creditors (suppliers, employees, tax authorities).

The company has too many creditors to negotiate an informal out-of-court workout. The following options are available: a judicial procedure aimed at the rehabilitation or reorganization of the company to permit its continued operation; a judicial procedure aimed at the liquidation or winding-up of the company; or a judicial debt enforcement procedure (foreclosure or receivership) against the company.

**Assumptions about the parties**

The bank wants to recover as much as possible of its loan, as quickly and cheaply as possible. The unsecured creditors will do everything permitted under the applicable laws to avoid a piecemeal sale of the assets. The majority shareholder wants to keep the company operating and under his control. Management wants to keep the company operating and preserve its employees’ jobs. All the parties are local entities or citizens; no foreign parties are involved.

**Time**

Time for creditors to recover their credit is recorded in calendar years (table 8.17). The period of time measured by Doing Business is from the company’s default until the payment of some or all of the money owed to the bank. Potential delay tactics by the parties, such as the filing of dilatory appeals or requests for extension, are taken into consideration.

**Cost**

The cost of the proceedings is recorded as a percentage of the value of the debtor’s estate. The cost is calculated on the basis of questionnaire responses and includes court fees and government levies; fees of insolvency administrators, auctioneers, assessors and lawyers; and all other fees and costs.

**Outcome**

Recovery by creditors depends on whether the hotel business emerges from the proceedings as a going concern or the company’s assets are sold piecemeal. If the business continues operating, 100% of the hotel value is preserved. If the assets are sold piecemeal, the maximum amount that can be recovered is 70% of the value of the hotel.

**Recovery rate**

The recovery rate is recorded as cents on the dollar recovered by secured creditors through judicial reorganization, liquidation or debt enforcement (foreclosure or receivership) proceedings (figure 8.21). The calculation takes into account the outcome: whether the business emerges from the proceedings as a going concern or the assets are sold piecemeal. Then the costs of the proceedings are deducted (1 cent for each percentage point of the value of the debtor’s estate). Finally, the value lost as a result of the time the money remains tied up in insolvency proceedings is taken into account, including the loss of value due to depreciation of the hotel furniture. Consistent with international accounting practice, the annual depreciation rate for furniture is taken to be 20%. The furniture is assumed to account for a quarter of the total value of assets. The recovery rate is the present value of the remaining proceeds, based on end-2016 lending rates from the International Monetary Fund’s *International Financial Statistics*, supplemented with data from central banks and the Economist Intelligence Unit.
If an economy had zero completed cases a year over the past five years involving a judicial reorganization, judicial liquidation or debt enforcement procedure (foreclosure or receivership), the economy receives a “no practice” mark on the time, cost and outcome indicators. This means that creditors are unlikely to recover their money through a formal legal process. The recovery rate for “no practice” economies is zero. In addition, a “no practice” economy receives a score of 0 on the strength of insolvency framework index even if its legal framework includes provisions related to insolvency proceedings (liquidation or reorganization).

**STRENGTH OF INSOLVENCY FRAMEWORK**

The strength of insolvency framework index is based on four other indices: commencement of proceedings index, management of debtor’s assets index, reorganization proceedings index and creditor participation index (figure 8.22; table 8.18).

**Commencement of proceedings index**

The commencement of proceedings index has three components:

- Whether debtors can initiate both liquidation and reorganization proceedings. A score of 1 is assigned if debtors can initiate both types of proceedings; 0.5 if they can initiate only one of these types (either liquidation or reorganization); 0 if they cannot initiate insolvency proceedings.
- What standard is used for commencement of insolvency proceedings. A score of 1 is assigned if a liquidity test (the debtor is generally unable to pay its debts as they mature) is used; 0.5 if the balance sheet test (the liabilities of the debtor exceed its assets) is used; 1 if both the liquidity and balance sheet tests are available but only one is required to initiate insolvency proceedings; 0.5 if both tests are required; 0 if a different test is used.

The index ranges from 0 to 3, with higher values indicating greater access to insolvency proceedings. In Bulgaria, for example, debtors can initiate both liquidation and reorganization proceedings (a score of 1), but creditors can initiate only liquidation proceedings (a score of 0.5). Either the liquidity test or the balance sheet test can be used to commence insolvency proceedings (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Bulgaria a score of 2.5 on the commencement of proceedings index.

**Management of debtor’s assets index**

The management of debtor’s assets index has six components:

- Whether the debtor (or an insolvency representative on its behalf) can continue performing contracts essential to the debtor’s survival. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if continuation of contracts is not possible or if the law contains no provisions on this subject.

**Data Notes**

**TABLE 8.18** What do the indicators on the strength of the insolvency framework measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement of proceedings index (0–3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of liquidation and reorganization to debtors and creditors</td>
<td>(0–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards for commencement of insolvency proceedings (0–1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of debtor’s assets index (0–6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation and rejection of contracts during insolvency (0–2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of preferential and undervalued transactions (0–2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-commencement finance (0–2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization proceedings index (0–3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval and content of reorganization plan (0–3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditor participation index (0–4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors’ participation in and rights during liquidation and reorganization proceedings (0–4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8.21** Recovery rate is a function of the time, cost and outcome of insolvency proceedings against a local company

**FIGURE 8.22** Strength of insolvency framework index measures the quality of insolvency laws that govern relations between debtors, creditors and the court
0 if avoidance of such transactions is not possible or if the law contains no provisions on this subject.

■ Whether undervalued transactions entered into before commencement of insolvency proceedings can be avoided after proceedings are initiated. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if avoidance of such transactions is not possible or if the law contains no provisions on this subject.

■ Whether the insolvency framework includes specific provisions that allow the debtor (or an insolvency representative on its behalf), after commencement of insolvency proceedings, to obtain financing necessary to function during the proceedings. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if obtaining post-commencement finance is not possible or if the law contains no provisions on this subject.

■ Whether post-commencement finance receives priority over ordinary unsecured creditors during distribution of assets. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0.5 if post-commencement finance is granted superpriority over all creditors, secured and unsecured; 0 if no priority is granted to post-commencement finance or if the law contains no provisions on this subject.

The index ranges from 0 to 6, with higher values indicating more advantageous treatment of the debtor’s assets from the perspective of the company’s stakeholders. In Mozambique, for example, debtors can continue essential contracts (a score of 1) and reject burdensome ones (a score of 1) during insolvency proceedings. The insolvency framework allows avoidance of preferential transactions (a score of 1) and undervalued ones (a score of 1). But the insolvency framework contains no provisions allowing post-commencement finance (a score of 0) or granting priority to such finance (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Mozambique a score of 4 on the management of debtor’s assets index.

Reorganization proceedings index

The reorganization proceedings index has three components:

■ Whether the reorganization plan is voted on only by the creditors whose rights are modified or affected by the plan. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0.5 if all creditors vote on the plan, regardless of its impact on their interests; 0 if creditors do not vote on the plan or if reorganization is not available.

■ Whether creditors entitled to vote on the plan are divided into classes, each class votes separately and the creditors within each class are treated equally. A score of 1 is assigned if the voting procedure has these three features; 0 if the voting procedure does not have these three features or if reorganization is not available.

■ Whether the insolvency framework requires that dissenting creditors receive as much under the reorganization plan as they would have received in liquidation. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no such provisions exist or if reorganization is not available.

The index ranges from 0 to 3, with higher values indicating greater compliance with internationally accepted practices. Nicaragua, for example, has no judicial reorganization proceedings and therefore receives a score of 0 on the reorganization proceedings index. In Estonia, another example, only creditors whose rights are affected by the reorganization plan are allowed to vote (a score of 1). The reorganization plan divides creditors into classes, each class votes separately and creditors within the same class are treated equally (a score of 1). But there are no provisions requiring that the return to dissenting creditors be equal to what they would have received in liquidation (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Estonia a score of 2 on the reorganization proceedings index.

Creditor participation index

The creditor participation index has four components:

■ Whether creditors appoint the insolvency representative or approve, ratify or reject the appointment of the insolvency representative. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

■ Whether creditors are required to approve the sale of substantial assets of the debtor in the course of insolvency proceedings. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

■ Whether an individual creditor has the right to access financial information about the debtor during insolvency proceedings. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

■ Whether an individual creditor can object to a decision of the court or of the insolvency representative to approve or reject claims against the debtor brought by the creditor itself and by other creditors. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

The index ranges from 0 to 4, with higher values indicating greater participation of creditors. In Iceland, for example, the court appoints the insolvency representative, without creditors’ approval (a score of 0). The insolvency representative decides unilaterally on the sale of the debtor’s assets (a score of 0). Any creditor can inspect the records kept by the insolvency representative (a score of 1). And any creditor is allowed to challenge a decision of the insolvency representative to approve all claims if this decision affects the creditor’s rights (a score of 1). Adding these numbers gives Iceland a score of 2 on the creditor participation index.

Strength of insolvency framework index

The strength of insolvency framework index is the sum of the scores on the commencement of proceedings index, management of debtor’s assets index, reorganization proceedings index and creditor participation index. The index
ranges from 0 to 16, with higher values indicating insolvency legislation that is better designed for rehabilitating viable firms and liquidating nonviable ones.

**REFORMS**

The resolving insolvency indicator set tracks changes related to the efficiency and quality of insolvency framework every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Reforms are divided into two types: those that make it easier to do business and those changes that make it more difficult to do business. The resolving insolvency indicator set uses three criteria to recognize a reform.

First, all changes to laws and regulations that have any impact on the economy’s score on the strength of insolvency framework index are classified as reforms. Examples of reforms impacting the strength of insolvency framework index include changes in the commencement standard for insolvency proceedings, the introduction of reorganization procedures for the first time and measures to regulate post-commencement credit and its priority. Changes affecting the strength of insolvency framework index can be different in magnitude and scope and still be considered a reform. For example, implementing a post-commencement credit provision and designating it with certain priorities represents a reform with a potential 2-point increase in the index, while changing the commencement standard from the balance sheet test to the liquidity test represents a reform with a 0.5-point increase in the index.

Second, changes that have an impact on the time, cost or outcome of insolvency proceedings may also be classified as reforms depending on the magnitude of the changes. According to the resolving insolvency methodology any update in legislation leading to a change of 2% or more on the distance to frontier gap (for more details, see the chapter on the distance to frontier and ease of doing business ranking) of the recovery rate indicator is classified as a reform. Changes with lower impact are not classified as reforms but their impact is still reflected on the most updated indicators.

Third, occasionally the resolving insolvency indicator set will acknowledge legislative changes with no current impact on the data as reforms. This option is typically reserved to legislative changes of exceptional magnitude such as sizeable revisions of corporate insolvency laws.

This methodology was developed by Djankov, Hart and others (2008) and is adopted here with several changes. The strength of insolvency framework index was introduced in Doing Business 2015. The good practices tested in this index were developed on the basis of the World Bank’s Principles for Effective Insolvency and Creditor/Debtor Regimes (World Bank 2011b) and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law’s Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law (UNCITRAL 2004a).

---

**LABOR MARKET REGULATION**

Doing Business studies the flexibility of regulation of employment, specifically as it relates to the areas of hiring, working hours and redundancy. Doing Business also measures several aspects of job quality such as the availability of maternity leave, paid sick leave and the equal treatment of men and women at the workplace (figure 8.23).

Doing Business 2018 presents the data for the labor market regulation indicators in an annex. The report does not present rankings of economies on these indicators or include this indicator set in the aggregate distance to frontier score or ranking on the ease of doing business. Detailed data collected on labor market regulation are available on the Doing Business website (http://www.doingbusiness.org). The data on labor market regulation are based on a detailed questionnaire on employment regulations that is completed by local lawyers and public officials. Employment laws and regulations as well as secondary sources are reviewed to ensure accuracy.

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the worker and the business are used.

**Assumptions about the worker**

The worker:
- Is a cashier in a supermarket or grocery store, age 19, with one year of work experience.\(^{10}\)
- Is a full-time employee.
- Is not a member of the labor union, unless membership is mandatory.

**Assumptions about the business**

The business:
- Is a limited liability company (or the equivalent in the economy).
- Operates a supermarket or grocery store in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city (table 8A.1).
- Has 60 employees.
- Is subject to collective bargaining agreements if such agreements cover more than 50% of the food retail sector and apply even to firms that are not party to them.
- Abides by every law and regulation but does not grant workers more benefits than those mandated by law, regulation or (if applicable) collective bargaining agreements.
Employment

Data on employment cover three areas: hiring, working hours and redundancy (table 8.19).

Data on hiring cover five questions: (i) whether fixed-term contracts are prohibited for permanent tasks; (ii) the maximum cumulative duration of fixed-term contracts; (iii) the length of the maximum probationary period (in months) for permanent employees; (iv) the minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience; and (v) the ratio of the minimum wage to the average value added per worker.

Data on working hours cover eight questions: (i) the maximum number of working days allowed per week; (ii) the premium for night work (as a percentage of hourly pay); (iii) the premium for overtime work (as a percentage of hourly pay); (iv) whether there are restrictions on night work; (v) whether nonpregnant and non-nursing women can work the same night hours as men; (vi) whether there are restrictions on weekly holiday work; (vii) whether there are restrictions on overtime work; and (ix) the average paid annual leave for workers with 1 year of tenure, 5 years of tenure and 10 years of tenure.

Data on redundancy cover eight questions: (i) whether redundancy is allowed as a basis for terminating workers; (ii) whether the employer needs to notify a third party (such as a government agency) to terminate one redundant worker; (iii) whether the employer needs to notify a third party to terminate a group of nine redundant workers; (iv) whether the employer needs approval from a third party to terminate one redundant worker; (v) whether the employer needs approval from a third party to terminate a group of nine redundant workers; (vi) whether the law requires the employer to reassign or retrain a worker before making the worker redundant; (vii) whether priority rules apply for redundancies; and (viii) whether priority rules apply for reemployment.

Redundancy cost

Redundancy cost measures the cost of advance notice requirements and severance payments due when terminating a redundant worker, expressed in weeks of salary. The average value of notice requirements and severance payments applicable to a worker with 1 year of tenure, a worker with 5 years and a worker with 10 years is considered. One month is recorded as 4 and 1/3 weeks.

Job quality

Doing Business introduced new data on job quality in 2015. Doing Business 2018 covers the following eight questions on job quality: (i) whether the law mandates equal remuneration for work of equal value; (ii) whether the law mandates nondiscrimination based on gender in hiring; (iii) whether the law mandates paid or unpaid maternity leave; (iv) the minimum length of paid maternity leave (in calendar days); (v) whether employees on maternity leave receive 100% of wages; (vi) the availability of five fully paid days of sick leave a year; (vii) whether a worker is eligible for an unemployment protection scheme after one year of service; and (viii) the minimum duration of the contribution period (in months) required for unemployment protection.

Reforms

The labor market regulation indicator set tracks changes in labor rules every year. Depending on the impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of Doing Business reforms in 2016/2017 section of the report in order to acknowledge the implementation of significant changes. Examples include a change in the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts, regulation of weekly holiday work, redundancy rules, notice requirements and severance payments for redundant workers, introduction of unemployment insurance and laws that mandate gender nondiscrimination in hiring and equal remuneration for work of equal value in line with ILO standards. The introduction of a minimum wage in the private sector is recognized as a major reform and acknowledged in the reform summary. Changes in minimum wages are reflected in the Doing Business data but not acknowledged in the reform summary. The introduction of maternity leave or an increase in the duration of maternity leave would be acknowledged in the reform summary. Occasionally the labor market regulation indicator set will acknowledge legislative changes in areas not directly
measured by the indicators. This option is reserved for legislative changes of exceptional magnitude, such as the introduction of a new labor code.

The data details on labor market regulation can be found for each economy at http://www.doingbusiness.org. The Doing Business website also provides historical data sets. The methodology was developed by Botero and others (2004). Doing Business 2018 does not present rankings of economies on the labor market regulation indicators.

### TABLE 8.19 What do the labor market regulation indicators measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether fixed-term contracts are prohibited for permanent tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum duration of fixed-term contracts (in months), including renewals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum probationary period (in months) for permanent employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of working days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium for night work, work on weekly rest day and overtime work (% of hourly pay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether there are restrictions on night work, weekly holiday work and overtime work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether nonpregnant and nonnursing women can work the same night hours as men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid annual vacation days for workers with 1 year of tenure, 5 years of tenure and 10 years of tenure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redundancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of maximum probationary period (in months) for permanent employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether redundancy is allowed as grounds for termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether third-party notification is required for termination of a redundant worker or group of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether third-party approval is required for termination of a redundant worker or group of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether employer is obligated to reassign or retrain workers prior to making them redundant and to follow priority rules for redundancy and reemployment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redundancy cost (weeks of salary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice requirements and severance payments due when terminating a redundant worker, expressed in weeks of salary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether the law mandates equal remuneration for work of equal value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the law mandates nondiscrimination based on gender in hiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the law mandates paid or unpaid maternity leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum length of paid maternity leave (calendar days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether employees on maternity leave receive 100% of wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of five fully paid days of sick leave a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether unemployment protection is available after one year of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum duration of contribution period (in months) required for unemployment protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES

1. The data for paying taxes refer to January-December 2016.
2. These are Bangladesh, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United States.
3. This correction rate reflects changes that exceed 5% up or down.
4. This matter is usually regulated by stock exchange or securities laws. Points are awarded only to economies with more than 10 listed firms in their most important stock exchange.
5. When evaluating the regime of liability for company directors for a prejudicial related-party transaction, Doing Business assumes that the transaction was duly disclosed and approved. Doing Business does not measure director liability in the event of fraud.
6. PwC refers to the network of member firms of PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited (PwCIL) or, as the context requires, individual member firms of the PwC network. Each member firm is a separate legal entity and does not act as agent of PwCIL or any other member firm. PwCIL does not provide any services to clients. PwCIL is not responsible or liable for the acts or omissions of any of its member firms nor can it control the exercise of their professional judgment or bind them in any way. No member firm is responsible or liable for the acts or omissions of any other member firm nor can it control the exercise of another member firm’s professional judgment or bind another member firm or PwCIL in any way.
7. The nonlinear distance to frontier score for the total tax and contribution rate is equal to the distance to frontier score for the total tax and contribution rate to the power of 0.8. 
8. The economies for which a multiple of three times income per capita has been used are Honduras, Mozambique, West Bank and Gaza, and Zimbabwe. Those for which a multiple of two times income per capita has been used are Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Chad, Fiji, Guatemala, Haiti, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, the Federated States of Micronesia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Vanuatu and Zambia.
9. To identify the trading partners and export product for each economy, Doing Business collected data on trade flows for the most recent four-year period from international databases such as the United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database (UN Comtrade). For economies for which trade flow data were not available, data from ancillary government sources (various ministries and departments) and World Bank Group country offices were used to identify the export product and natural trading partners.
10. The case study assumption that the worker is 19 years old with one year of work experience is considered only for the calculation of the minimum wage. For all other questions where the tenure of the worker is relevant, Doing Business collects data for workers with 1, 5 and 10 years of tenure.
11. The average value added per worker is the ratio of an economy’s GNI per capita to the working-age population as a percentage of the total population.
12. If no maternity leave is mandated by law, parental leave is measured if applicable.
13. The minimum number of days that legally have to be paid by the government, the employer or both. If no maternity leave is mandated by law, parental leave is measured if applicable.
14. If no maternity leave is mandated by law, parental leave is measured if applicable.
TABLE 8A.1 Cities covered in each economy by the Doing Business report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities Economic City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities Economic City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities Economic City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities Economic City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities Economic City or cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
<td>Costa Rica San José</td>
<td>Iraq Baghdad</td>
<td>Mozambique Maputo</td>
<td>South Africa Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire Abidjan</td>
<td>Ireland Dublin</td>
<td>Myanmar Yangon</td>
<td>South Sudan Juba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Luanda</td>
<td>Croatia Zagreb</td>
<td>Israel Tel Aviv</td>
<td>Namibia Windhoek</td>
<td>Spain Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>St. John’s</td>
<td>Cyprus Nicosia</td>
<td>Italy Rome</td>
<td>Nepal Kathmandu</td>
<td>Sri Lanka Colombo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>Czech Republic Prague</td>
<td>Jamaica Kingston</td>
<td>Netherlands Amsterdam</td>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis Basseterre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Denmark Copenhagen</td>
<td>Japan Tokyo</td>
<td>Osaka New Zealand Auckland</td>
<td>St. Lucia Castries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Djibouti Djibouti Ville</td>
<td>Jordan Amman</td>
<td>Nicaragua Managua</td>
<td>St. Vincent the Grenadines Kingston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Dominica Roseau</td>
<td>Kazakhstan Almaty</td>
<td>Niger Niamey</td>
<td>Sudan Khartoum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Baku</td>
<td>Dominican Republic Santo Domingo</td>
<td>Kenya Nairobi</td>
<td>Nigeria Lagos, Kano</td>
<td>Suriname Paramaribo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Ecuador Quito</td>
<td>Kiribati Tarawa</td>
<td>Norway Oslo</td>
<td>Swaziland Mbabane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dhaka, Chittagong</td>
<td>El Salvador San Salvador</td>
<td>Kosovo Pristina</td>
<td>Pakistan Karachi</td>
<td>Switzerland Zurich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Bridgetown</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea Malabo</td>
<td>Kuwait Kuwait City</td>
<td>Palau Koror</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic Damascus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Minsk</td>
<td>Eritrea Asmara</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic Bishkek</td>
<td>Panama Panama City</td>
<td>Taiwan, China Taipei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Estonia Tallinn</td>
<td>Lao PDR Vientiane</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Port Moresby Tajikistan Dushanbe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Belize City</td>
<td>Ethiopia Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Latvia Riga</td>
<td>Paraguay Asunción</td>
<td>Tanzania Dar es Salaam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>Fiji Suva</td>
<td>Lebanon Beirut</td>
<td>Peru Lima</td>
<td>Thailand Bangkok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Thimphu</td>
<td>Finland Helsinki</td>
<td>Lesotho Lesotho Maseru</td>
<td>Philippines Quezon City</td>
<td>Timor-Leste Dili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>France Paris</td>
<td>France Libia</td>
<td>Morocco Poland</td>
<td>Sweden Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and</td>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td>Gabon Libreville</td>
<td>Libya Tripoli</td>
<td>Portugal Lisbon</td>
<td>Tonga Nuku’alafo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Gaborone</td>
<td>Gambia, The Banjul</td>
<td>Lithuania Vilnius</td>
<td>Puerto Rico (U.S.)</td>
<td>San Juan Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>Georgia Tbilisi</td>
<td>Luxembourg Luxembourg</td>
<td>Qatar Doha</td>
<td>Tunisia Tunis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>Bandar Seri Begawan</td>
<td>Germany Berlin</td>
<td>Macedonia FYR Skopje</td>
<td>Romania Bucharest</td>
<td>Turkey Istanbul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darussalam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Ghana Accra</td>
<td>Madagascar Antananarivo</td>
<td>Russian Federation Moscow, St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Uganda Kampala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Ouagadougou</td>
<td>Greece Athens</td>
<td>Malawi Blantyre</td>
<td>Rwanda Kigali</td>
<td>Ukraine Kiev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Bujumbura</td>
<td>Grenada St. George’s</td>
<td>Malaysia Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>Samoa Apia</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates Dubai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>Praia</td>
<td>Guatemala Guatemala City</td>
<td>Maldives Malé</td>
<td>San Marino San Marino</td>
<td>United Kingdom London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Guinea Conakry</td>
<td>Mali Bamako</td>
<td>Sào Tomé and Prin-cipe Sào Tomé</td>
<td>United States New York City, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Douala</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau Bissau</td>
<td>Malta Valletta</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia Riyadh</td>
<td>Uruguay Montevideo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Guyana Georgetown</td>
<td>Marshall Islands Majuro</td>
<td>Senegal Dakar</td>
<td>Uzbekistan Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African</td>
<td>Bangui</td>
<td>Haiti Port-au-Prince</td>
<td>Mauritania Nouakchott</td>
<td>Serbia Belgrade</td>
<td>Vanuatu Port-Vila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>N’Djamena</td>
<td>Honduras Tegucigalpa</td>
<td>Mauritius Port Louis</td>
<td>Seychelles Victoria</td>
<td>Venezuela, Caracas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China Hong Kong SAR</td>
<td>Mexico Mexico City, Monterrey</td>
<td>Sierra Leone Freetown</td>
<td>Vietnam Ho Chi Minh City Ramallah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Shanghai, Beijing</td>
<td>Hungary Budapest</td>
<td>Micronesia, Fed. Sts. Island of Pohnpei</td>
<td>Singapore Singapore</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza Ramallah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Bogotá</td>
<td>Iceland Reykjavik</td>
<td>Moldova Chişină</td>
<td>Slovak Republic Bratislava</td>
<td>Yemen, Rep. Sana’a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>India Mumbai, Delhi</td>
<td>Mongolia Ulaanbaatar</td>
<td>Slovenia Ljubljana</td>
<td>Zambia Lusaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Distance to Frontier and Ease of Doing Business Ranking

Doing Business presents results for two aggregate measures: the distance to frontier score and the ease of doing business ranking, which is based on the distance to frontier score. The ease of doing business ranking compares economies with one another; the distance to frontier score benchmarks economies with respect to regulatory best practice, showing the absolute distance to the best performance on each Doing Business indicator. When compared across years, the distance to frontier score shows how much the regulatory environment for local entrepreneurs in an economy has changed over time in absolute terms, while the ease of doing business ranking can show only how much the regulatory environment has changed relative to that in other economies.

DISTANCE TO FRONTIER

The distance to frontier score captures the gap between an economy’s performance and a measure of best practice across the entire sample of 41 indicators for 10 Doing Business topics (the labor market regulation indicators are excluded). For starting a business, for example, New Zealand has the smallest number of procedures required (1) and the shortest time to fulfill them (0.5 days). Slovenia has the lowest cost (0.0), and Australia, Colombia and 112 other economies have no paid-in minimum capital requirement (table 9.1).

Calculation of the distance to frontier score

Calculating the distance to frontier score for each economy involves two main steps. In the first step individual component indicators are normalized to a common unit where each of the 41 component indicators $y$ (except for the total tax and contribution rate) is rescaled using the linear transformation \((\text{worst} - y)/(\text{worst} - \text{frontier})\). In this formulation the frontier represents the best performance on the indicator across all economies since 2005 or the third year in which data for the indicator were collected. Both the best performance and the worst performance are established every five years based on the Doing Business data for the year in which they are established, and remain at that level for the five years regardless of any changes in data in interim years. Thus an economy may set the frontier for an indicator even though it is no longer at the frontier in a subsequent year.

For scores such as those on the strength of legal rights index or the quality of land administration index, the frontier is set at the highest possible value. For the total tax and contribution rate, consistent with the use of a threshold in calculating the rankings on this indicator, the frontier is defined as the total tax and contribution rate at the 15th percentile of the overall distribution for all years included in the analysis up to and including Doing Business 2015. For the time to pay taxes, the frontier is defined as the lowest time recorded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and indicator</th>
<th>Who set the frontier</th>
<th>Frontier</th>
<th>Worst performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>Australia; Colombia&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>400.0&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>No economy was at the frontier as of June 1, 2017.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>No economy was at the frontier as of June 1, 2017.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>373&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>No economy was at the frontier as of June 1, 2017.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>Luxembourg; New Zealand; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>Germany; Republic of Korea&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>Republic of Korea; St. Kitts and Nevis; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>248&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8,100.0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>Belgium; Ireland; Malaysia&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>Georgia; Norway; Portugal; Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>Georgia; New Zealand; Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>No economy has attained the frontier yet.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam; Colombia; Montenegro; New Zealand</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>Ecuador; United Kingdom&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>China; Malaysia&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>No economy has attained the frontier yet.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>India; Kazakhstan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>No economy has attained the frontier yet.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>France; Norway; Taiwan, China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paying taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China; Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>696&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>Canada; Singapore&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.1&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84.0&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>No economy with both CIT and VAT has attained the frontier yet.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to comply with VAT refund (hours)</td>
<td>Croatia; Netherlands&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to obtain VAT refund (weeks)</td>
<td>Austria; The Bahamas; Estonia</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>55&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to comply with corporate income tax audit (hours)</td>
<td>Lithuania; Portugal&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>56&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to complete a corporate income tax audit (weeks)</td>
<td>Sweden; United States&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;_a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
TABLE 9.1 What is the frontier in regulatory practice? (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and indicator</th>
<th>Who set the frontier</th>
<th>Frontier</th>
<th>Worst performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to export</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>Canada; Poland; Spain(^p)</td>
<td>1(^p)</td>
<td>170(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>Austria; Belgium; Denmark(^l)</td>
<td>1(^p)</td>
<td>160(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to export</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>Hungary; Luxembourg; Norway(^q)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>France; Netherlands; Portugal(^t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,060(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to import</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>Republic of Korea; Latvia; New Zealand(^s)</td>
<td>1(^p)</td>
<td>240(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>Estonia; France; Germany(^s)</td>
<td>1(^p)</td>
<td>280(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to import</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>Iceland; Latvia; United Kingdom(^t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>Belgium; Denmark; Estonia(^t)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,340(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>89.0(^p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>No economy has attained the frontier yet.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>0(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>No economy has attained the frontier yet.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0(^d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

* Worst performance is defined as the 99th percentile among all economies in the Doing Business sample.
* Worst performance is defined as the 95th percentile among all economies in the Doing Business sample.
* Another 112 economies also have a paid-in minimum capital requirement of 0.
* Worst performance is the worst value recorded.
* In 17 other economies it also takes no more than 3 procedures to get an electricity connection.
* Another 25 economies also have a score of 8 on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index.
* Another 32 economies also have a score of 8 on the depth of credit information index.
* Another 10 economies also have a score of 10 on the extent of disclosure index.
* Defined as the lowest time recorded among all economies in the Doing Business sample that levy the three major taxes: profit tax, labor taxes and mandatory contributions, and VAT or sales tax.
* Another 30 economies also have a total tax contribution rate equal to or lower than 26.1% of profit.
* Defined as the highest total tax and contribution rate among the 15% of economies with the lowest total tax and contribution rate in the Doing Business sample for all years included in the analysis up to and including Doing Business 2015.
* Another 8 economies also have a compliance time for VAT refund of 0 hours.
* Another 10 economies also have a compliance time for corporate income tax audit of no more than 1.5 hours.
* Another 92 economies also have a completion time for corporate income tax audit of 0 weeks.
* Another 22 economies also have a documentary compliance time to export of no more than 1 hour.
* Defined as 1 hour even though in many economies the time is less than that.
* Another 15 economies also have a border compliance time to export of no more than 1 hour.
* Another 16 economies also have a documentary compliance cost to export of 0.0.
* Another 16 economies also have a border compliance cost to export of 0.0.
* Another 26 economies also have a documentary compliance time to import of no more than 1 hour.
* Another 22 economies also have a border compliance time to import of no more than 1 hour.
* Another 27 economies also have a documentary compliance cost to import of 0.0.
* Another 24 economies also have a border compliance cost to import of 0.0.

among all economies that levy the three major taxes: profit tax, labor taxes and mandatory contributions, and value added tax (VAT) or sales tax. For the different times to trade across borders, the frontier is defined as 1 hour even though in many economies the time is less than that.

In the same formulation, to mitigate the effects of extreme outliers in the distributions of the rescaled data for most component indicators (very few economies need 700 days to complete the procedures to start a business, but many need 9 days), the worst performance
is calculated after the removal of outliers. The definition of outliers is based on the distribution for each component indicator. To simplify the process two rules were defined: the 95th percentile is used for the indicators with the most dispersed distributions (including minimum capital, number of payments to pay taxes, and the time and cost indicators), and the 99th percentile is used for number of procedures. No outlier is removed for component indicators bound by definition or construction, including legal index scores (such as the depth of credit information index, extent of disclosure index and strength of insolvency framework index) and the recovery rate (figure 9.1).

In the second step for calculating the distance to frontier score, the scores obtained for individual indicators for each economy are aggregated through simple averaging into one distance to frontier score, first for each topic and then across all 10 topics: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, getting credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency. More complex aggregation methods—such as principal components and unobserved components—yield a ranking nearly identical to the simple average used by Doing Business. Thus Doing Business uses the simplest method: weighting all topics equally and, within each topic, giving equal weight to each of the topic components.

An economy’s distance to frontier score is indicated on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the worst performance and 100 the frontier. All distance to frontier calculations are based on a maximum of five decimals. However, topic ranking calculations and the ease of doing business ranking calculations are based on two decimals.

The difference between an economy’s distance to frontier score in any previous year and its score in 2017 illustrates the extent to which the economy has closed the gap to the regulatory frontier over time. And in any given year the score measures how far an economy is from the best performance at that time.

**Treatment of the total tax and contribution rate**

The total tax and contribution rate component of the paying taxes topic enters the distance to frontier calculation in a different way than any other indicator. The distance to frontier score obtained for the total tax and contribution rate is transformed in a nonlinear fashion before it enters the distance to frontier score for paying taxes. As a result of the nonlinear transformation, an increase in

---

**FIGURE 9.1 How are distance to frontier scores calculated for indicators? Two examples**

- **A time-and-motion topic: getting electricity**
  - Regulatory frontier
  - Best performance (frontier): 3 procedures
  - Worst performance (99th percentile): 9 procedures

- **A legal topic: protecting minority investors**
  - Regulatory frontier
  - Best performance (frontier): 10 points
  - Worst performance: 0 points

Source: Doing Business database.
the total tax and contribution rate has a smaller impact on the distance to frontier score for the total tax and contribution rate—and therefore on the distance to frontier score for paying taxes—for economies with a below-average total tax and contribution rate than it would have had before this approach was adopted in Doing Business 2015 (line B is smaller than line A in figure 9.2). And for economies with an extreme total tax and contribution rate (a rate that is very high relative to the average), an increase has a greater impact on both these distance to frontier scores than it would have had before (line D is bigger than line C in figure 9.2).

The nonlinear transformation is not based on any economic theory of an “optimal tax rate” that minimizes distortions or maximizes efficiency in an economy’s overall tax system. Instead, it is mainly empirical in nature. The nonlinear transformation along with the threshold reduces the bias in the indicator toward economies that do not need to levy significant taxes on companies like the Doing Business standardized case study company because they raise public revenue in other ways—for example, through taxes on foreign companies, through taxes on sectors other than manufacturing or from natural resources (all of which are outside the scope of the methodology). In addition, it acknowledges the need of economies to collect taxes from firms.

**Calculation of scores for economies with two cities covered**

For each of the 11 economies in which Doing Business collects data for the second largest business city as well as the largest one, the distance to frontier score is calculated as the population-weighted average of the distance to frontier scores for these two cities (table 9.2). This is done for the aggregate score, the scores for each topic and the scores for all the component indicators for each topic.

---

**FIGURE 9.2** How the nonlinear transformation affects the distance to frontier score for the total tax and contribution rate

---

**TABLE 9.2** Weights used in calculating the distance to frontier scores for economies with two cities covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Weight (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chittagong</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monterrey</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Variability of economies’ scores across topics**

Each Doing Business topic measures a different aspect of the business regulatory environment. The distance to frontier scores and associated rankings of an economy can vary, sometimes significantly, across topics. The average correlation coefficient between the 10 topics included in the aggregate distance to frontier score is 0.49, and the coefficients between 2 topics range from 0.34 (between getting credit and paying taxes) to 0.63 (between getting electricity and trading across borders). These correlations suggest that economies rarely score universally well or universally badly on Doing Business topics (table 9.3).
Consider the example of Portugal. Its aggregate distance to frontier score is 76.84. Its score is 91.26 for starting a business and 100.00 for trading across borders. But its score is only 60.00 for protecting minority investors and 45.00 for getting credit.

Figure 2.1 in the chapter “About Doing Business” illustrates the degree of variability for each economy’s performance across the different areas of business regulation covered by Doing Business. The figure draws attention to economies with a particularly uneven performance by showing, for each economy, the distance between the average of its highest three distance to frontier scores and the average of its lowest three across the 10 topics included in this year’s aggregate distance to frontier score. While a relatively small distance between these two averages suggests a broadly consistent approach across the areas of business regulation measured by Doing Business, a relatively large distance suggests a more uneven approach, with greater room for improvement in some areas than in others.

Variation in performance across topics is not at all unusual. It reflects differences in the degree of priority that government authorities give to particular areas of business regulation reform and in the ability of different government agencies to deliver tangible results in their area of responsibility.

**Change in the distance to frontier gap**

Many topics use the magnitude of the change in their distance to frontier gap to classify changes as reforms. The change in the distance to frontier gap is defined as $(\text{dtf}_{\text{current year}} - \text{dtf}_{\text{prior year}})/(100 - \text{dtf}_{\text{prior year}})$, where $\text{dtf}$ is the aggregate distance to frontier score for the specific topic. For example, in 2016/17 Cameroon reduced the paid-in minimum capital requirement, resulting in an improvement in Cameroon’s aggregate distance to frontier score for starting a business from 75.27 to 82.39. This reduced the distance to frontier gap for Cameroon by $(75.27 - 82.39)/(100 - 75.27)$ or 28.79% on starting a business in Doing Business 2018. For a complete discussion of the methodology for classifying changes as reforms, see the data notes.

Selecting the economies that implemented regulatory reforms in at least three topics and had the biggest improvements in their distance to frontier scores is intended to highlight economies with ongoing, broad-based reform programs. The improvement in the distance to frontier score is used to identify the top improvers because this allows a focus on the absolute improvement—in contrast with the

---

### TABLE 9.3 Correlations between economy distance to frontier scores for Doing Business topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dealing with construction permits</th>
<th>Getting electricity</th>
<th>Registering property</th>
<th>Getting credit</th>
<th>Protecting minority investors</th>
<th>Paying taxes</th>
<th>Trading across borders</th>
<th>Enforcing contracts</th>
<th>Resolving insolvency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Doing Business database.*
relative improvement shown by a change in rankings—that economies have made in their regulatory environment for business.

EASE OF DOING BUSINESS RANKING

The ease of doing business ranking ranges from 1 to 190. The ranking of economies is determined by sorting the aggregate distance to frontier scores, rounded to two decimals.

NOTES

1. See Djankov and others 2005. Principal components and unobserved components methods yield a ranking nearly identical to that from the simple average method because both these methods assign roughly equal weights to the topics, since the pairwise correlations among topics do not differ much. An alternative to the simple average method is to give different weights to the topics, depending on which are considered of more or less importance in the context of a specific economy.

2. For getting credit, indicators are weighted proportionally, according to their contribution to the total score, with a weight of 60% assigned to the strength of legal rights index and 40% to the depth of credit information index. Indicators for all other topics are assigned equal weights.

3. Changes making it more difficult to do business are subtracted from the total number of those making it easier to do business.
Summaries of Doing Business Reforms in 2016/17

Doing Business reforms affecting all sets of indicators included in this year’s report, implemented from June 2016 to June 2017.

✔ Reform making it easier to do business
✘ Change making it more difficult to do business

**Afghanistan**

✘ Starting a business
Afghanistan made starting a business more costly by requiring that entrepreneurs pay the business license fee for three years at the time of incorporation.

**Albania**

✔ Getting credit
Albania strengthened access to credit by introducing amendments to the Civil Code and the Law on Securing Charges and by adopting a new insolvency law. A security interest can now be granted over any type of movable property—including tangible and intangible assets—and secured creditors are given absolute priority within insolvency proceedings.

**Labor market regulation**
Albania amended legislation to reduce the maximum number of hours (including overtime) allowed in a workweek and to mandate that women and men be given equal remuneration for work of equal value.

**Angola**

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Angola made dealing with construction permits easier and less time-consuming by improving its system for building permit applications.

✔ Getting electricity
Angola made getting electricity easier by upgrading Luanda’s electrical grid, thereby reducing the time it takes for the utility to complete feasibility studies for new connections.

✔ Trading across borders
Angola made trading across borders easier by improving infrastructure at the Port of Luanda.

**Antigua and Barbuda**

✔ Registering property
Antigua and Barbuda made property registration faster by eliminating an application backlog caused by a fire at the land registry.

**Argentina**

✘ Dealing with construction permits
Argentina made obtaining a building permit more costly by adopting a new tax law for the city of Buenos Aires.

Reforms affecting the labor market regulation indicators are included here but do not affect the ranking on the ease of doing business.
Armenia
✔ Getting electricity
Armenia made getting electricity easier by imposing new deadlines for connection procedures and introducing a new geographic information system at the utility.
✔ Registering property
Armenia made registering property easier by improving the land administration system’s dispute resolution mechanisms.

Azerbaijan
✔ Getting credit
Azerbaijan improved access to credit information by adopting a law allowing the establishment of credit bureaus.
✔ Protecting minority investors
Azerbaijan strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.
✔ Enforcing contracts
Azerbaijan made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a system that allows users to pay court fees electronically.
✔ Resolving insolvency
Azerbaijan made resolving insolvency easier by making insolvency proceedings more accessible for creditors and granting them greater participation in the proceedings, improving provisions on the treatment of contracts during insolvency and introducing the possibility to obtain post-commencement financing.

Bahamas, The
✔ Starting a business
The Bahamas made starting a business easier by merging the processes of registering for a business license and registering for value added tax.
✔ Paying taxes
The Bahamas made paying taxes less costly by decreasing the stamp duty on the sale of land.

Bahrain
✘ Paying taxes
Bahrain made paying taxes more complicated by introducing a new health care contribution borne by the employer.

Bangladesh
✘ Starting a business
Bangladesh made starting a business more expensive by increasing the cost of business registration at the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies and Firms. This reform applies to both Chittagong and Dhaka.

Barbados
✘ Paying taxes
Barbados made paying taxes more difficult by introducing a new national social responsibility levy of 2% on the value of products before VAT.

Belarus
✔ Getting credit
Belarus strengthened access to credit by adopting two new decrees that establish a unified collateral registry.

Belgium
✔ Paying taxes
Belgium made paying taxes less costly by reducing the social security contribution rate paid by employers.

Benin
✔ Dealing with construction permits
Benin increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.
✔ Registering property
Benin made registering a property less costly by eliminating the registration tax and making the schedule of fees and list of documents required for property registration available publicly.

Bhutan
✔ Starting a business
Bhutan made starting a business easier by reducing the time for obtaining a Security Clearance Certificate, registering at the Office of the Registrar and registering for taxes.
✔ Getting credit
Bhutan improved access to credit information by beginning to distribute payment data from two utility companies.
✔ Protecting minority investors
Bhutan strengthened minority investor protections by clarifying ownership and control structures but weakened minority investor protections by reducing shareholder rights.
✔ Enforcing contracts
Bhutan made enforcing contracts easier by creating a dedicated bench to resolve commercial cases.

Bolivia
✔ Trading across borders
Bolivia made exporting and importing easier by implementing the Sistema Único de Modernización Aduanera (SUMA), an automated customs data management system.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Labor market regulation
Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted legislation that decreased wage premiums for overtime, weekly holiday and night work.
Botswana

✘ Registering property
Botswana made registering property more difficult by reducing the efficiency of its Registrar of Deeds as it implements the computerization of manual records.

✔ Paying taxes
Botswana made paying taxes easier by establishing an online system for filing and paying taxes.

✔ Trading across borders
Botswana made trading across borders easier by implementing a new automated customs data management system.

Brazil

✔ Trading across borders
Brazil reduced the time for documentary compliance for both exporting and importing by enhancing its electronic data interchange system. This reform applies to both Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo.

Brunei Darussalam

✔ Starting a business
Brunei Darussalam made starting a business faster by removing post-incorporation procedures.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Brunei Darussalam made dealing with construction permits less cumbersome by streamlining the process of obtaining a building permit.

✘ Getting electricity
Brunei Darussalam made getting electricity more difficult by increasing the number of procedures needed to obtain a new connection. At the same time, a new compensation scheme was introduced to incentivize the utility to improve reliability.

✔ Registering property
Brunei Darussalam made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of its land administration system and by improving the land administration system's dispute resolution mechanisms.

✔ Getting credit
Brunei Darussalam strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law on secured transactions that establishes a unified legal framework for movable assets and creates a modern, notice-based collateral registry. The law also establishes priority rules for secured creditors inside and outside of insolvency proceedings and allows for out-of-court enforcement.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Brunei Darussalam strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

✔ Paying taxes
Brunei Darussalam made paying taxes easier by introducing an online system for filing and paying labor contributions.

✔ Trading across borders
Brunei Darussalam made exporting and importing easier by enhancing the Brunei Darussalam National Single Window and the customs clearance process.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Brunei Darussalam made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic case management system for the use of judges and lawyers.

Burkina Faso

✔ Getting credit
Burkina Faso improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.

Burundi

✘ Starting a business
Burundi made starting a business more expensive by increasing the cost of registering a business.

Cabo Verde

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Cabo Verde made dealing with construction permits easier by publishing all regulations related to construction online free of charge.

✔ Trading across borders
Cabo Verde made exporting and importing easier by implementing an automated customs data management system, ASYCUDA World.

✔ Resolving insolvency
Cabo Verde made resolving insolvency easier by adopting a law that introduces a reorganization procedure and facilitates continuation of the debtor's business during insolvency proceedings. The law also allows creditors greater participation in important decisions during insolvency proceedings.

Cameroon

✔ Starting a business
Cameroon made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement.

✔ Getting credit
Cameroon improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.

Canada

✘ Dealing with construction permits
Canada made dealing with construction permits more expensive by increasing fees for site plan approval and building permits.

China

✔ Starting a business
China made starting a business easier by streamlining registration procedures. This reform applies to both Beijing and Shanghai.

✔ Paying taxes
China made paying taxes easier by introducing several measures to ease compliance. This reform applies to both Beijing and Shanghai.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Reform Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Labor market regulation</td>
<td>Colombia increased the mandatory length of paid maternity leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>The Comoros made trading across borders easier by implementing an automated customs data management system, SYDONIA++, which reduced the time for the preparation and submission of documents for both exports and imports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>The Democratic Republic of Congo made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement that a woman obtain her husband’s permission to start a business and by combining multiple business registration procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>The Democratic Republic of Congo made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining processes at its one-stop shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor market regulation</td>
<td>The Democratic Republic of Congo introduced regulation pertaining to working hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>The Republic of Congo made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement for business incorporation and by replacing the requirement for the managers’ criminal records with a sworn declaration at the time of the company’s registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>Costa Rica decreased the time needed to transfer a property through several measures, including the introduction of effective time limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>Costa Rica strengthened minority investor protections by allowing greater access to corporate information before and during trial and enhancing disclosure requirements, but weakened shareholder rights in certain major transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Croatia made dealing with construction permits more costly by increasing the administrative fees for building and occupancy permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>Croatia made it less costly to transfer property by lowering the real estate transfer tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>Cyprus made paying taxes more difficult by increasing the frequency and number of VAT audits, including in cases of VAT cash refund requests. At the same time, paying taxes was made less costly following the introduction of notional interest tax-deductible expenses and an increase in the discount rate on immovable property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made starting a business less expensive by introducing lower fees for simple limited liability companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made paying taxes more complicated by introducing new requirements for filing VAT control statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Denmark made dealing with construction permits more expensive by raising the cost of building permits and the cost of obtaining a water and sewage connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>Djibouti made starting a business less costly by exempting new companies from professional license fees and reducing fees to register a business and publish the notice of commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Djibouti made obtaining a construction permit easier by reducing the cost of concrete inspections and by implementing decennial liability for all professionals involved in construction projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>Djibouti made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land administration system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>Djibouti improved access to credit information by adopting a law that creates a new credit information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>Djibouti strengthened minority investor protections by requiring greater disclosure of transactions with interested parties, strengthening remedies against interested directors, extending access to corporate information before trial, increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dominican Republic

✔ Starting a business
The Dominican Republic reduced the time needed to register a company by streamlining processes at the chamber of commerce.

✔ Getting electricity
The Dominican Republic improved the reliability of electricity by investing in grid expansion, redesigning network zoning and setting up a power restoration squad to respond to outages.

✘ Paying taxes
The Dominican Republic made paying taxes costlier by decreasing the inflation rate.

✔ Resolving insolvency
The Dominican Republic made resolving insolvency easier by adopting a law that introduces a reorganization procedure and facilitates continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings. The new law allows creditors greater participation in important decisions during insolvency proceedings.

Labor market regulation
The Dominican Republic increased the mandatory length of paid maternity leave.

Ecuador

✘ Registering property
Ecuador made registering property more burdensome by requiring a valuation certificate to register a property transfer.

✘ Paying taxes
Ecuador made paying taxes more costly by introducing a “solidarity tax” paid by employers and employees through withheld salary contributions.

Egypt, Arab Rep.

✘ Registering property
The Arab Republic of Egypt made it more difficult to register property by raising the cost to verify and ratify a sales contract.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Egypt strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions.

El Salvador

✔ Dealing with construction permits
The municipal authorities in San Salvador introduced legislation requiring phased inspections during construction as well as experience requirements for professionals in charge of inspections. Furthermore, an online system was implemented for the payment of preliminary construction fees.

✔ Getting electricity
El Salvador improved the reliability of electricity by introducing new software programs allowing better outage management and maintenance planning.

✔ Paying taxes
El Salvador made paying taxes easier by implementing an online platform for filing and paying taxes and by moving to a risk-based audit assessment selection system focusing on larger companies.

Trading across borders
El Salvador made exporting and importing easier by increasing the number of customs officers at the Anguiatú land border.

Equatorial Guinea

✔ Starting a business
Equatorial Guinea made starting a business easier by eliminating the need to obtain an authorization of establishment from the Office of the Prime Minister to start a business.

Ethiopia

✔ Starting a business
Ethiopia made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement to open a bank account prior to company registration.

✔ Trading across borders
Ethiopia made trading across borders easier through a series of initiatives including the implementation of a risk-based inspection system, the streamlining of documents for importers and the strengthening of the customs authority.

Finland

Labor market regulation
Finland increased the length of the maximum probationary period for permanent employees.

France

✔ Protecting minority investors
France strengthened minority investor protections by increasing corporate transparency.

✔ Paying taxes
France made paying taxes less costly by lowering rates for social security and training contributions.

Gabon

✔ Starting a business
Gabon made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement and by making the notarization of incorporation documents optional.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Gabon made dealing with construction permits faster by streamlining the process and increased transparency by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.

Georgia

✔ Getting electricity
Georgia made getting electricity more affordable by reducing connection costs for new customers.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Georgia strengthened minority investor protections by making it easier to sue directors in cases of prejudicial transactions between interested parties, by increasing shareholder rights and role in
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major corporate decisions and clarifying ownership and control structures.

✔ Resolving insolvency
Georgia made resolving insolvency easier by making insolvency proceedings more accessible for debtors and creditors, improving provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency and granting creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Georgia made dealing with construction permits more accessible for debtors and creditors, improving provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency and granting creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.

Guinea

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Guinea made dealing with construction permits more accessible for debtors and creditors, improving provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency and granting creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.

✔ Getting credit
Guinea made dealing with construction permits more accessible for debtors and creditors, improving provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency and granting creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.

✔ Resolving insolvency
Guinea made resolving insolvency easier by making insolvency proceedings more accessible for debtors and creditors, improving provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency and granting creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.

Ghana

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Ghana increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.

✔ Starting a business
Ghana increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.

Greece

✔ Starting a business
Greece made starting a business easier by creating a unified social security institution.

✔ Registering property
Greece made starting a business easier by creating a unified social security institution.

Grenada

✘ Paying taxes
Grenada made paying taxes more costly by increasing stamp tax rates.

✔ Resolving insolvency
Grenada made resolving insolvency easier by introducing a reorganization procedure for corporate entities. Grenada also introduced provisions facilitating the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings and allowing creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings. Grenada also established a public office responsible for the general administration of insolvency cases.

Guatemala

✘ Dealing with construction permits
Guatemala made dealing with construction permits more complicated and expensive by expanding the classification of projects requiring an environmental impact assessment.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Guatemala made dealing with construction permits more accessible for debtors and creditors, improving provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency and granting creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.

Guinea-Bissau

✔ Getting credit
Guinea-Bissau improved its credit reporting system by introducing regulations that govern the licensing and functioning of credit bureaus in the member states of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) and by launching a new credit bureau.

✔ Registering property
Guinea-Bissau improved its credit reporting system by introducing regulations that govern the licensing and functioning of credit bureaus in the member states of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) and by launching a new credit bureau.

Guyana

✔ Registering property
Guyana decreased the time to transfer property by allocating higher resources to infrastructure and personnel.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Guyana made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of civil procedure regulating time standards for key court events.

Haiti

✘ Paying taxes
Haiti made paying taxes more costly by increasing the rate for the business license tax.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Haiti made paying taxes more costly by increasing the rate for the business license tax.

Honduras

✘ Registering property
Honduras made registering property more difficult by reducing the number of employees at the land registry.

✔ Registering property
Honduras made registering property more difficult by reducing the number of employees at the land registry.

Hong Kong SAR, China

✔ Registering property
Hong Kong SAR, China, improved the quality of its land administration system by enhancing its reliability and establishing a complaints mechanism.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Hong Kong SAR, China, improved the quality of its land administration system by enhancing its reliability and establishing a complaints mechanism.

Hungary

✔ Enforcing contracts
Hungary made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a system that allows users to pay court fees electronically.

India

✔ Starting a business
India made starting a business faster by merging the applications for the Permanent Account Number (PAN) and the Tax Account Number (TAN) and by improving the online application system. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai. Mumbai also made starting a business faster by merging the applications for value added tax and the Profession Tax (PT).

✔ Dealing with construction permits
India reduced the number of procedures and time required to obtain a building permit by implementing an online system that has streamlined the process at the Municipality of New Delhi and Municipality of Greater Mumbai.

✔ Getting credit
India strengthened access to credit by amending the rules on priority of secured creditors outside reorganization proceedings and by adopting a new law on insolvency that provides a time limit and clear grounds for relief to the automatic stay for secured creditors during reorganization proceedings. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

India strengthened access to credit by amending the rules on priority of secured creditors outside reorganization proceedings and by adopting a new law on insolvency that provides a time limit and clear grounds for relief to the automatic stay for secured creditors during reorganization proceedings. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

India strengthened access to credit by amending the rules on priority of secured creditors outside reorganization proceedings and by adopting a new law on insolvency that provides a time limit and clear grounds for relief to the automatic stay for secured creditors during reorganization proceedings. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.
parties. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✔ Paying taxes
India made paying taxes easier by requiring that payments be made electronically to the Employees Provident Fund and introducing a set of administrative measures easing compliance with corporate income tax. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✔ Trading across borders
India reduced import border compliance time in Mumbai by improving infrastructure at the Nhava Sheva Port. Export and import border compliance costs were also reduced in both Delhi and Mumbai by eliminating merchant overtime fees and through the increased use of electronic and mobile platforms.

✔ Enforcing contracts
India made enforcing contracts easier by introducing the National Judicial Data Grid, which makes it possible to generate case management reports on local courts. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✔ Resolving insolvency
India made resolving insolvency easier by adopting a new insolvency and bankruptcy code that introduced a reorganization procedure for corporate debtors and facilitated continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✔ Labor market regulation
India increased the mandatory length of paid maternity leave. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

Indonesia

✔ Starting a business
Indonesia made starting a business less costly by reducing start-up fees for limited liability companies. This reform applies to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

✔ Getting electricity
Indonesia made getting electricity less costly by reducing connection and internal wiring certification fees.

In Jakarta, getting electricity was also made easier after the utility streamlined the processing of new connection applications.

✔ Registering property
Indonesia made registering property easier by reducing the transfer tax. This reform applies to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

✔ Getting credit
Indonesia improved access to credit information by launching a new credit bureau. This reform applies to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Indonesia strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions and requiring greater corporate transparency. This reform applies to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

✔ Paying taxes
Indonesia made paying taxes easier by promoting the online filing of taxes and by lowering the rate for capital gains tax. These reforms apply to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

Italy

✔ Getting electricity
Italy made getting electricity easier by streamlining the application process and reducing the time for the external works and meter installation.

✔ Paying taxes
Italy made paying taxes less costly by temporarily exempting employers from social security contributions. Italy also made paying taxes easier by abolishing the Comunicazione dati IVA (value added tax communication form).

Jamaica

✔ Starting a business
Jamaica made starting a business faster by reinstating next-day service for company incorporation.

✔ Getting electricity
Jamaica improved the reliability of the electricity supply in Kingston by investing in the distribution network through several initiatives, including the installation of smart meters and distribution automation switches.

✔ Trading across borders
Jamaica reduced the time for documentary compliance for importing by implementing a web-based customs data management platform, ASYCUDA World.

Iran, Islamic Rep.

✔ Getting credit
The Islamic Republic of Iran improved access to credit information by reporting data on credit payments from an automobile retailer.

Iraq

✔ Starting a business
Iraq made starting a business easier by combining multiple registration procedures and reducing the time to register a company.

✔ Getting credit
Iraq improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.

Jordan

✔ Getting credit
Jordan improved access to credit information by establishing a new credit bureau.
Kazakhstan
✔ Registering property
Kazakhstan made it easier to transfer a property by improving transparency and the land administration system’s dispute resolution mechanisms.
✔ Protecting minority investors
Kazakhstan strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures, requiring greater corporate transparency and allowing greater access to corporate information during trial.
✔ Enforcing contracts
Kazakhstan made enforcing contracts easier by introducing additional time standards for key court events that are respected in the majority of cases.
Kenya
✔ Starting a business
Kenya made starting a business easier by merging the procedures required to operate formally.
✔ Dealing with construction permits
Kenya made dealing with construction permits less expensive by eliminating fees for clearances from the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and the National Construction Authority.
✔ Getting electricity
Kenya improved the reliability of electricity by investing in its distribution lines and transformers and by setting up a specialized squad to restore power when outages occur.
✔ Getting credit
Kenya improved access to credit information by starting to distribute data from two utility companies.
✔ Paying taxes
Kenya made paying taxes easier by implementing an online platform, iTax, for filing and paying corporate income tax and the standards levy.
✔ Trading across borders
Kenya reduced the time for import documentary compliance by implementing its single window system, which allows for electronic submission of customs entries.
Kiribati
Labor market regulation
Kiribati introduced a mandatory minimum wage, provided specific rules on working hours, introduced annual paid leave and streamlined redundancy rules.
Kosovo
✔ Starting a business
Kosovo made starting a business easier by simplifying the process of registering employees.
✔ Getting credit
Kosovo strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law that establishes clear priority rules inside bankruptcy for secured creditors and clear grounds for relief from a stay for secured creditors in reorganization procedures.
✔ Resolving insolvency
Kosovo made resolving insolvency easier by introducing a legal framework for corporate insolvency, making liquidation and reorganization procedures available to debtors and creditors.
Kuwait
✔ Starting a business
Kuwait made starting a business easier by establishing a one-stop shop and improving online registration.
✔ Registering property
Kuwait made registering property easier by reducing the number of days needed to register property and by improving the transparency of the land administration system.
Kyrgyz Republic
✔ Registering property
The Kyrgyz Republic made property registration less transparent by no longer making official statistics on property transfers available to the public.
✔ Getting credit
The Kyrgyz Republic strengthened access to credit by adopting two new decrees that establish a unified and modern collateral registry. The Kyrgyz Republic also improved its credit reporting system by adopting a new law on exchanging credit information.
Latvia
Labor market regulation
Latvia amended its legislation to extend the duration of the contribution period that is required before an employee can become eligible for unemployment protection.
Liberia
✔ Resolving insolvency
Liberia made resolving insolvency easier by introducing a legal framework for corporate insolvency, making liquidation and reorganization procedures available to debtors and creditors.
Lithuania
✔ Dealing with construction permits
Lithuania made dealing with construction permits easier by reducing the time needed to obtain technical conditions and the building permit.
✔ Getting electricity
Lithuania made getting electricity easier by streamlining procedures and imposing deadlines for issuing internal wiring inspection certificates.
✔ Protecting minority investors
Lithuania strengthened minority investor protections by increasing corporate transparency.
✔ Paying taxes
Lithuania made paying taxes easier by introducing an electronic system for filing and paying value added tax, corporate income tax and social security contributions. On the other hand, the environmental tax was increased.
Luxembourg

✔ Protecting minority investors
Luxembourg strengthened minority investor protections by making it easier to sue directors in case of prejudicial related-party transactions and increasing access to corporate information.

Madagascar

✔ Starting a business
Madagascar made starting a business easier by publishing the notice of company incorporation online free of charge and by allowing the payment of registration fees directly at the one-stop shop.

✔ Getting credit
Madagascar improved access to credit information by increasing the coverage of the credit registry.

Malawi

✗ Starting a business
Malawi made starting a business more expensive by increasing the cost of registering a business with the Registrar General.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Malawi made dealing with construction permits cheaper by halving the fees charged by the city council to process building plan approvals.

✔ Getting credit
Malawi improved access to credit information by establishing a new credit bureau. Malawi also strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law that establishes clear priority rules inside and outside bankruptcy procedures.

✔ Trading across borders
Malawi made trading across borders easier by improving the infrastructure, equipment and facilities at Port Klang.

Malaysia

✔ Getting credit
Malaysia strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law that establishes a modern collateral registry.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Malaysia strengthened minority investor protections by requiring greater corporate transparency.

✔ Trading across borders
Malaysia made importing and exporting easier by improving the infrastructure, equipment and facilities at Port Klang.

Maldives

✔ Paying taxes
Maldives made paying taxes easier by introducing an online system for filing and paying taxes.

Malta

✔ Starting a business
Malta made starting a business easier by removing the requirement for a trading license for general commercial activities.

✔ Registering property
Malta made it easier to transfer property by eliminating the transfer tax and registration duty, implementing a complaint mechanism and publishing service standards.

✔ Trading across borders
Malta made trading across borders easier through a series of initiatives at the Port of Nouakchott, such as eliminating the requirement to weigh all import containers, investing in infrastructure, streamlining the movement of cargo and consolidating the payment of fees.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Mauritania made enforcing contracts easier by making judgments rendered at all levels in commercial cases available to the general public on the courts’ websites.

Mauritius

✔ Starting a business
Mauritius made starting a business easier by exempting trade fees for licenses below MUR 5,000 and introducing the electronic certificate of incorporation.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Mauritius made dealing with construction permits faster by outsourcing the design and construction of sewerage connection works.

✔ Registering property
Mauritius made it easier to transfer property by eliminating the transfer tax and registration duty, implementing a complaint mechanism and publishing service standards.

✔ Trading across borders
Mauritius made trading across borders easier by improving the Cargo Community System, introducing advanced electronic document submission and updating the risk-based inspection system.

Mexico

✗ Dealing with construction permits
Mexico made dealing with construction permits more costly by raising several fees. This reform applies to both Mexico City and Monterrey.

✔ Getting electricity
Mexico (Mexico City) improved the reliability of electricity supply by installing smart meters, extending the medium-voltage network and implementing a new system to remotely restore power service.
✘ Registering property
Mexico (Monterrey) made registering property more expensive by raising the municipal property transfer tax.

✔ Starting a business
Moldova made starting a business easier by removing the requirement to register with the Social Security Fund.

✔ Getting credit
Mongolia strengthened access to credit by introducing a new Law on Movable and Intangible Property Pledges and by setting up a new collateral registry. The new law implemented a functional secured transactions system. The collateral registry is operational, unified geographically, searchable by a debtor’s unique identifier, modern and notice-based.

✘ Paying taxes
Mongolia made paying taxes more burdensome by not allowing input VAT incurred on a business capital expenditure to be deducted as input credit.

✔ Labor market regulation
Mongolia amended its legislation to reduce the maximum length of the employee probationary period.

✘ Registering property
Morocco made registering property more expensive by increasing registration fees.

✔ Paying taxes
Morocco made paying taxes easier by improving the online system for filing and paying taxes.

✔ Getting credit
Morocco improved access to credit information by adopting a regulation allowing the establishment of credit bureaus.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Nepal strengthened minority investor protections by requiring greater corporate transparency.

✔ Getting credit
The Netherlands improved access to credit information by lowering the minimum loan amount to be included in the credit bureau’s database.

✔ Paying taxes
New Zealand made paying taxes easier by improving the online portal for filing and paying general sales tax.

✘ Enforcing contracts
New Zealand temporarily made enforcing contracts more difficult by suspending the filing of new commercial cases before the Commercial List of the High Court of New Zealand during the establishment of a new Commercial Panel.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Nicaragua made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of civil procedure that introduces stricter case management rules.

✔ Starting a business
Niger made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement for business incorporation, by reducing the time needed to register a company and by publishing the notice of company incorporation online free of charge.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Niger increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.
also reduced the time and cost to obtain a building permit and the time to obtain a water connection.

✔ Getting electricity
Niger reduced the time to get an electricity connection by implementing a single window.

✔ Registering property
Niger made registering property easier by lowering the cost of transferring property.

Nigeria

✔ Starting a business
Nigeria made starting a business faster by allowing electronic stamping of registration documents. This reform applies to both Kano and Lagos.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Nigeria (Kano) increased transparency by publishing all relevant regulations, fee schedules and pre-application requirements online. Nigeria (Lagos) made it easier to obtain construction permits by streamlining the permitting process and increased transparency by publishing all relevant regulations, fee schedules and pre-application requirements online.

✔ Registering property
Nigeria (Kano) made transferring property more transparent by publishing the list of documents, fee schedules and service standards for property transactions. Nigeria (Lagos) made transferring property easier and more transparent by removing the sworn affidavit for certified copies of land ownership records, introducing a specific and independent complaint mechanism and by publishing statistics on land transfers.

✔ Getting credit
Nigeria improved access to credit information by guaranteeing borrowers the legal right to inspect their credit data from the credit bureau and by starting to provide credit scores to banks, financial institutions and borrowers. Nigeria also strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law on secured transactions and establishing a modern collateral registry. These changes apply to both Kano and Lagos.

✔ Paying taxes
Nigeria made paying taxes easier by introducing new channels for payment of taxes and mandating taxpayers to file tax returns at the nearest Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) office. This reform applies to both Kano and Lagos.

Norway

✔ Paying taxes
Norway made paying taxes less costly by reducing the statutory corporate income tax rate.

Oman

✔ Trading across borders
Oman made exporting and importing easier by enhancing its online single window system for exports and imports, reducing the time required for documentary compliance.

Pakistan

✔ Starting a business
Pakistan made starting a business easier by replacing the need to obtain a digital signature for company incorporation with a less costly personal identification number. This change applies to both Karachi and Lahore.

✔ Registering property
Pakistan (Karachi) improved the transparency of the land registration process by making the fee schedule and list of documents to submit for property registration available online.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Pakistan increased minority investor protections by making it easier to sue directors in case of prejudicial transactions with interested parties. This reform applies to both Karachi and Lahore.

✔ Trading across borders
Pakistan made importing and exporting easier by developing a new container terminal and enhancing its customs platform for electronic document submission. These changes apply to both Karachi and Lahore.

Palau

✔ Paying taxes
Palau made paying taxes easier by introducing editable and populated gross revenue tax forms and a system of barcoded payments.

Panama

✔ Resolving insolvency
Panama made resolving insolvency easier by adopting a new insolvency law that introduces a reorganization procedure and facilitates continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings. The new law also allows creditors greater participation in important decisions during insolvency proceedings and regulates insolvency practitioners.

Paraguay

Labor market regulation
Paraguay increased the mandatory length of paid maternity leave.

Philippines

✔ Getting electricity
The Philippines reduced the time to get an electricity connection by implementing a new asset management system and by creating a new scheduling and planning office.

✔ Paying taxes
The Philippines made paying taxes easier by introducing a new electronic system for payment and collection of housing development fund contributions.

Puerto Rico (U.S.)

Labor market regulation
Puerto Rico (U.S.) increased the length of the maximum probationary period for permanent employees, decreased the wage premium for overtime and weekly holiday work, decreased the
mandatory paid annual leave and established severance payments for all employees wrongfully made redundant.

**Qatar**

- **Getting credit**
  Qatar improved access to credit information by starting to provide consumer credit scores to banks, financial institutions and borrowers.

- **Trading across borders**
  Qatar made exporting and importing easier by inaugurating the new Hamad Port.

**Romania**

- **Registering property**
  Romania improved the quality of land administration by digitizing ownership and land records.

**Russian Federation**

- **Registering property**
  The Russian Federation made it easier to transfer property by reducing the time needed to apply for state registration of title transfer. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

- **Getting credit**
  Russia improved access to credit by adopting a new law that establishes a modern collateral registry. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

- **Trading across borders**
  Russia made exporting and importing easier by opening a new deep water port on the coast of the Gulf of Finland, increasing competition and reducing the cost of border compliance at the Port of St. Petersburg. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

**Rwanda**

- **Dealing with construction permits**
  Rwanda increased quality control during construction by introducing risk-based inspections.

- **Registering property**
  Rwanda made registering property easier by implementing online services to facilitate the registration of property transfers.

- **Protecting minority investors**
  Rwanda strengthened minority investor protections by making it easier to sue directors, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

- **Paying taxes**
  Rwanda made paying taxes easier by establishing an online system for filing and paying taxes.

- **Enforcing contracts**
  Rwanda made enforcing contracts easier by making judgments rendered at all levels in commercial cases available to the general public on the judiciary’s website.

**Samoa**

- **Getting credit**
  Samoa strengthened access to credit with the implementation of the Personal Property Securities Act and by establishing a modern, notice-based collateral registry to register all types of charges and functional equivalents.

**São Tomé and Príncipe**

- **Trading across borders**
  São Tomé and Príncipe made exporting and importing easier by implementing a one-stop shop.

**Saudi Arabia**

- **Registering property**
  Saudi Arabia improved the efficiency of its land administration system by implementing an online platform to check for ownership and encumbrances and by streamlining the property registration process. Additionally, Saudi Arabia made registering property easier by improving the land administration system’s dispute resolution mechanisms.

- **Protecting minority investors**
  Saudi Arabia strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholder rights and role in major decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures, requiring greater corporate transparency and regulating the disclosure of transactions with interested parties.

- **Paying taxes**
  Saudi Arabia made paying taxes easier by improving its online platform for filing and paying taxes.

- **Trading across borders**
  Saudi Arabia reduced the time for documentary compliance for exports and imports by reducing the number of documents required for customs clearance.

- **Enforcing contracts**
  Saudi Arabia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic case management system for the use of judges and lawyers.

**Senegal**

- **Starting a business**
  Senegal made starting a business more affordable by reducing the notary fees for company incorporation.

- **Getting electricity**
  Senegal improved the monitoring and regulation of power outages by beginning to record data for the annual system average interruption duration index (SAIDI) and system average interruption frequency index (SAIFI).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Change in Doing Business</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>Made registering property easier by lowering the costs of transferring property and by reducing the time to transfer and register property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Paying taxes</td>
<td>Made paying taxes easier by introducing time limits to the General Tax Code for processing value added tax cash refunds and applying these time limits in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Made enforcing contracts easier by introducing stricter pre-trial hearing rules that led to a reduction of the time necessary to resolve a commercial dispute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>✔ Starting a business</td>
<td>Made starting a business easier by reducing the signature certification fee and increasing the efficiency of the registry, reducing the time for business registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>Improved the reliability of its land administration system by implementing a geographic information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new enforcement law that broadens and clarifies the responsibilities of enforcement agents as well as the powers of the courts during the enforcement process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>✔ Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing construction industry regulations online free of charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>Improved the quality of its land administration system by digitizing its maps and introducing a complaint mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>✔ Starting a business</td>
<td>Made starting a business easier by combining multiple registration procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Trading across borders</td>
<td>Made trading across borders easier through a series of initiatives, including the elimination of export permits and the implementation of pre-arrival processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>✔ Trading across borders</td>
<td>Made exporting and importing easier by improving infrastructure and electronic equipment at the port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>Made resolving insolvency easier by establishing a new scheme of arrangement procedure with features of the debtor-in-possession reorganization regime and introducing provisions applicable to prepackaged restructurings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Labor market regulation</td>
<td>Adopted legislation that requires employers with more than 10 employees to notify the Ministry of Manpower if five or more employees are retrenched within any six-month period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of civil procedure that introduces pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques used in court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>✔ Getting credit</td>
<td>Improved access to credit information by reporting both positive and negative data on consumers and commercial borrowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>✘ Starting a business</td>
<td>Made starting a business more expensive by increasing business registration fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Made enforcing contracts easier by reducing court fees for filing a claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>✔ Trading across borders</td>
<td>Made exporting and importing easier by developing a customs single window.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>✔ Trading across borders</td>
<td>Made trading across borders easier by updating its website and implementing ASYCUDA, an automated customs data management system, reducing documentary compliance time for exports and imports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>Made transferring property more transparent by publishing the fee schedule and list of documents for property registration online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>✘ Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Made dealing with construction permits more difficult by introducing a requirement that all new construction projects be registered with the Construction Industry Council and that a levy payment be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Getting credit</td>
<td>Improved access to credit information by adopting a law that guarantees borrowers’ right to access their own data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
✔ Trading across borders
Swaziland made exporting and importing easier by implementing a web-based customs data management platform, ASYCUDA World.

Switzerland
✔ Enforcing contracts
Switzerland made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic filing system.

✔ Trading across borders
Switzerland made exporting easier by implementing a web-based customs data management platform, ASYCUDA World.

Taiwan, China
✔ Trading across borders
Taiwan, China, made exporting easier by allowing different organizations to electronically issue certificates of origin.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Taiwan, China, made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic filing system.

Labor market regulation
Taiwan, China, adopted legislation that increased the number of mandatory paid annual leave days and the number of weekly rest days.

✔ Trading across borders
Taiwan, China, made exporting easier by allowing different organizations to electronically issue certificates of origin.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Taiwan, China, made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic filing system.

Labor market regulation
Taiwan, China, adopted legislation that increased the number of mandatory paid annual leave days and the number of weekly rest days.

Tajikistan
✔ Starting a business
Tajikistan made starting a business easier by raising the revenue threshold for mandatory value added tax registration.

✔ Registering property
Tajikistan made it easier and less costly to register property by eliminating the need to register the sale-purchase agreement at the municipal office. Tajikistan also made transferring property more costly by increasing fees.

Labor market regulation
Tajikistan adopted legislation that changes the rules of severance payments. It also abolished restrictions on night work by non-pregnant women and non-nursing mothers.

✔ Trading across borders
Tanzania made trading easier by implementing a one-stop shop and streamlining the building permit process.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Tanzania made dealing with construction permits easier by implementing a one-stop shop and streamlining the building permit process.

✔ Registering property
Tanzania made registering property more expensive by increasing the land and property registration fee.

Thailand
✔ Starting a business
Thailand made starting a business easier by abolishing the requirement to obtain a company's seal and eliminating the need for approval from the Labor Department of company work regulations.

✔ Getting electricity
Thailand made getting electricity easier by streamlining procedures through the implementation of a geographic information system, eliminating the external site inspection.

✔ Registering property
Thailand improved the reliability of its land administration system by implementing a geographic information system and by scanning maps for most of Bangkok.

✔ Getting electricity
Thailand made getting electricity easier by streamlining procedures through the implementation of a geographic information system, eliminating the external site inspection.

✔ Registering property
Thailand improved the reliability of its land administration system by implementing a geographic information system and by scanning maps for most of Bangkok.

✔ Getting credit
Thailand strengthened access to credit by adopting new legislation that broadens the scope of assets that can be used as collateral. Thailand now allows a general description of assets granted as collateral and allowing the security interest to automatically attach to the proceeds of the original asset. It also establishes clear grounds for relief from a stay for secured creditors during reorganization procedures and allows out-of-court enforcement of collateral.

✔ Protecting minority investors
Thailand strengthened minority investor protections by making it easier to sue directors in case of prejudicial related-party transactions, increasing shareholder rights and role in major corporate decisions and clarifying ownership and control structures.

✔ Paying taxes
Thailand made paying taxes easier by introducing an automatic risk-based system for selecting companies for a tax audit. It also made paying taxes less costly by reducing the property transfer tax rate.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Thailand made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a system that allows users to pay court fees electronically. Thailand also reduced enforcement times by increasing the automation and efficiency of enforcement processes.

✔ Resolving insolvency
Thailand made resolving insolvency easier by changing the voting procedures for reorganization plans.

✔ Getting credit
Togo improved access to credit information by launching a new credit bureau.

Trinidad and Tobago
✘ Paying taxes
Trinidad and Tobago made paying taxes more costly by increasing the rates for the environmental tax and social security contributions paid by employers.

Tunisia
✘ Paying taxes
Tunisia made paying taxes more costly by introducing a new exceptional corporate income tax contribution.

Turkey
✔ Registering property
Turkey made registering property easier by lowering the costs of transferring property.
Getting credit

Turkey strengthened access to credit by adopting a new law on secured transactions that establishes a unified collateral registry and allows out-of-court enforcement of collateral. Turkey also improved its credit reporting system by adopting a new law on personal data protection.

Resolving insolvency

Turkey made resolving insolvency more difficult by suspending applications for postponement of bankruptcy procedures introduced both before and during the state of emergency.

Uganda

Trading across borders

Uganda reduced the time for export documentary compliance and border compliance by allowing for electronic document submission and processing of certificates of origin and by further developing the Malaba One-Stop Border Post.

Ukraine

Dealing with construction permits

Ukraine made dealing with construction permits easier by reducing fees.

Protecting minority investors

Ukraine strengthened minority investor protections by requiring detailed immediate public disclosure of related-party transactions.

Paying taxes

Ukraine made paying taxes easier by reducing the rate for the unified social contribution tax.

United Arab Emirates

Dealing with construction permits

The United Arab Emirates strengthened construction quality control by imposing stricter qualification requirements for professionals reviewing drawings. It also reduced the time and cost to obtain a building permit by eliminating a procedure.

Getting electricity

The United Arab Emirates made getting electricity easier by streamlining the connection process and eliminating interactions between the customer and the utility to obtain external works. Getting electricity was also made less costly by the elimination of the security deposit for connections under 150 kVA.

Resolving insolvency

The United Arab Emirates made resolving insolvency easier by adopting an insolvency law that introduces a reorganization procedure and facilitates continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings.

Getting electricity

The United Arab Emirates improved access to credit information by starting to provide consumer credit scores to banks and financial institutions.

United States

Labor market regulation

The United States (Los Angeles) increased the maximum days of paid sick leave per year.

Uruguay

Starting a business

Uruguay made starting a business more costly by increasing the value of the official fiscal unit used for the payment of government fees and by increasing business incorporation fees.

Paying taxes

Uruguay made paying taxes easier by enhancing the online portal used for filing and paying taxes and making electronic payments compulsory.

Venezuela, RB

Starting a business

República Bolivariana de Venezuela made starting a business more expensive by raising several fees charged during the business registration process. Lawyer fees and publication costs were also increased.

Vietnam

Getting electricity

Vietnam increased the reliability of power supply by rolling out a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) automatic energy management system for the monitoring of outages and the restoration of service.

Getting credit

Vietnam strengthened access to credit by adopting a new civil code that
broadens the scope of assets that can be used as collateral.

✔ Paying taxes
Vietnam made paying taxes easier by abolishing the 12-month mandatory carry forward period for VAT credit and by introducing an online platform for filing social security contributions.

✔ Trading across borders
Vietnam made exporting and importing easier by upgrading the automated cargo clearance system and extending the operating hours of the customs department.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Vietnam made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of civil procedure and by introducing a consolidated law on voluntary mediation.

West Bank and Gaza

✔ Getting credit
West Bank and Gaza strengthened access to credit by introducing a new secured transactions law and by setting up a new collateral registry. The new law implemented a functional secured transactions system. It allowed general description of single categories of assets and allowed a general description of debts and obligations. The collateral registry is operational, unified geographically, searchable by a debtor’s unique identifier, modern and notice-based. The new law gave priority to secured creditors outside insolvency procedures and allowed out-of-court enforcement.

Zambia

✔ Getting credit
Zambia strengthened access to credit by adopting a new Movable Property Act and by setting up a new collateral registry. The new law implemented a functional secured transactions system. The collateral registry is operational, unified geographically, searchable by a debtor’s unique identifier, modern and notice-based.

✔ Paying taxes
Zambia made paying taxes easier by introducing an online platform for filing and paying taxes. Paying taxes was also made less costly through a reduction of the property transfer tax rate.

✔ Trading across borders
Zambia made exporting and importing easier by implementing a web-based customs data management platform, ASYCUDA World.

Zimbabwe

✔ Starting a business
Zimbabwe made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement to advertise applications for a business license.

✘ Getting credit
Zimbabwe improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry. However, credit scoring was discontinued, reducing access to credit information.
## Country Tables

### Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>South Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>48.45</td>
<td>34,656,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>84.24</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,426.7</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Albania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>2,876,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,426.7</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>66.27</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>48.31</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>48.31</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>513.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58.28</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>58.28</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY TABLES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALGERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>77.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>58.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>60.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>56.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY TABLES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGOLA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>80.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>68.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>44.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>990.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>56.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Argentina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>58.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>11,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>43,847,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protecting minority investors (rank)</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paying taxes (rank)</th>
<th>169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>49.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>311.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlifting index (0–100)</td>
<td>47.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcing contracts (rank)</th>
<th>102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>55.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolving insolvency (rank)</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>41.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argentina Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,443,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Armenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>72.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>3,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,094,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protecting minority investors (rank)</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paying taxes (rank)</th>
<th>87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>72.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlifting index (0–100)</td>
<td>49.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcing contracts (rank)</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolving insolvency (rank)</th>
<th>97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>43.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>80.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>54,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>24,127,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protecting minority investors (rank)</th>
<th>57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paying taxes (rank)</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>85.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlifting index (0–100)</td>
<td>95.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcing contracts (rank)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolving insolvency (rank)</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>78.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postlifting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSTRIA</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 78.54</td>
<td>45,230</td>
<td>8,747,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank) 118</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 83.13</td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 55.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 8</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 21</td>
<td>Time (days) 21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 5.1</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 5.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 12.5</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 12.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 42</td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 42</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.00</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 11</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 11</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 222</td>
<td>Time (days) 222</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 22</td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 22</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 87.71</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 87.71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 7.95</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 7.95</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.0</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AZERBAIJAN</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 70.19</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>9,762,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank) 18</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 122</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 94.36</td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 40.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 4</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 4</td>
<td>Time (days) 4</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 6.8</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 6.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 161</td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 161</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 54.90</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 54.90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 21</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 21</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 242</td>
<td>Time (days) 242</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 6.8</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 6.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 102</td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 102</td>
<td>67.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 67.98</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 67.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 7</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 69</td>
<td>Time (days) 69</td>
<td>141.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 21.4</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 21.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 14.5</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAHAMAS, THE</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 57.47</td>
<td>21,020</td>
<td>391,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank) 108</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 142</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 84.18</td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 16</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 21</td>
<td>Time (days) 21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 13.8</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 13.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 86</td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 86</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 68.30</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 68.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 16</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 16</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 180</td>
<td>Time (days) 180</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.0</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 10.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 117</td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 117</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 60.96</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 60.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 67</td>
<td>Time (days) 67</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 4.7</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 3.0</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score 0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELARUS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75.06</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>9,507,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank) 30</td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 92.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td>Time (days) 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 0.6</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 22</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 78.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 16</td>
<td>Time (days) 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.7</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 25</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 86.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 4</td>
<td>Time (days) 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 0.0</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank) 5</td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100) 92.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 2</td>
<td>Time (days) 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 0.0</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71.69</td>
<td>41,860</td>
<td>11,348,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank) 16</td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 94.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 3</td>
<td>Time (days) 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 5.6</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 16.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 39</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 10</td>
<td>Time (days) 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 103</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 67.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 6</td>
<td>Time (days) 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 101.1</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank) 138</td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100) 51.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 8</td>
<td>Time (days) 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 12.7</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIZE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>366,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank) 161</td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 73.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 9</td>
<td>Time (days) 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 34.6</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 114</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 65.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 16</td>
<td>Time (days) 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.5</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 88</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 72.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td>Time (days) 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 31.7</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank) 132</td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100) 52.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 9</td>
<td>Time (days) 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 41.8</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilng index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>10,872,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Indicators

- **Getting credit (rank)**: 142
  - DTF score for getting credit (0–100): 30.00
- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 46
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 73.85
- **Registering property (rank)**: 127
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 54.14
- **Protesting minority investors (rank)**: 146
  - DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 40.00
- **Registering property (rank)**: 56
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 80.36
- **Trading across borders (rank)**: 136
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100): 60.78

### South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>10,872,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Indicators

- **Getting credit (rank)**: 77
  - DTF score for getting credit (0–100): 55.00
- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 82
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 68.69
- **Registering property (rank)**: 56
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 73.41
- **Trading across borders (rank)**: 26
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100): 94.25

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>10,887,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Indicators

- **Getting credit (rank)**: 133
  - DTF score for getting credit (0–100): 35.00
- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 158
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 53.56
- **Registering property (rank)**: 144
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 49.89
- **Trading across borders (rank)**: 89
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100): 71.59

Note: Most indicator results refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilng index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.20</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Rank:** 175
- **Score:** 65.91

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank:** 166
- **Score:** 51.77

#### Getting electricity
- **Rank:** 122
- **Score:** 60.18

#### Registering property
- **Rank:** 97
- **Score:** 61.56

### BOTSWANA

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.94</td>
<td>6,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Rank:** 153
- **Score:** 76.22

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank:** 59
- **Score:** 72.27

#### Getting electricity
- **Rank:** 124
- **Score:** 59.38

#### Registering property
- **Rank:** 81
- **Score:** 65.45

### BRAZIL

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.45</td>
<td>8,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Rank:** 176
- **Score:** 65.05

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank:** 170
- **Score:** 49.83

#### Getting electricity
- **Rank:** 45
- **Score:** 82.46

#### Registering property
- **Rank:** 131
- **Score:** 52.60

### Note:
Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 56

Starting a business (rank) 58
DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 90.23
Procedures (number) 5.5
Time (days) 12.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.1
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 48
DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.62
Procedures (number) 20
Time (days) 83
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.8
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Registering property (rank) 116
DTF score for registering property (0–100) 51.48
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 298.5
Cost (% of property value) 41.5
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 18.0

Registering property (rank) 116
DTF score for registering property (0–100) 51.48
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 298.5
Cost (% of property value) 41.5
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 18.0

Almost all indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### SUB-SARAJANAFICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score</td>
<td>46.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>10,524,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Starting a business** | 98 |
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)** | 85.14 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 16 |
- **Time (days)** | 107 |
- **Cost (% of income per capita)** | 15.4 |
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)** | 0.0 |

#### Dealing with contracts (rank)
- **Dealing with contracts** | 67 |
- **DTF score for dealing with contracts (0–100)** | 71.25 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 16 |
- **Time (days)** | 107 |
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)** | 4.2 |
- **Building quality control index (0–15)** | 11.0 |

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Registering property** | 71 |
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)** | 66.57 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 6 |
- **Time (days)** | 22 |
- **Cost (% of property value)** | 1.1363 |
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)** | 10.0 |

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Getting electricity** | 145 |
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)** | 53.47 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 7 |
- **Time (days)** | 88 |
- **Cost (% of income per capita)** | 1,136.3 |
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)** | 2 |

#### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Paying taxes** | 75 |
- **DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)** | 75.15 |
- **Payments (number per year)** | 30 |
- **Time (hours per year)** | 180 |
- **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** | 36.6 |
- **Pension funding index (0–100)** | 80.65 |

### CAMBODIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score</td>
<td>54.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>15,762,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Starting a business** | 183 |
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)** | 51.91 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 9 |
- **Time (days)** | 99 |
- **Cost (% of income per capita)** | 51.3 |
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)** | 82.5 |

#### Dealing with contracts (rank)
- **Dealing with contracts** | 179 |
- **DTF score for dealing with contracts (0–100)** | 41.73 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 20 |
- **Time (days)** | 652 |
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)** | 5.3 |
- **Building quality control index (0–15)** | 8.0 |

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Registering property** | 123 |
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)** | 55.00 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 7 |
- **Time (days)** | 56 |
- **Cost (% of property value)** | 4.3 |
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)** | 7.5 |

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Getting electricity** | 137 |
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)** | 56.56 |
- **Procedures (number)** | 4 |
- **Time (days)** | 179 |
- **Cost (% of income per capita)** | 1,993.2 |
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)** | 3 |

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
DOING BUSINESS 2018

CAMEROON

Estate of business rank (1–190) 163
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 47.23
Population 23,439,189

Getting credit (rank) 68
DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 60.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 6
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 8.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 138
DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 41.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5
Cost of import 6
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

Payment taxes (rank) 183
DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 36.34
Payments (number per year) 56
Time (hours per year) 624
Total tax and contribution rate ( % of profit) 57.7
Postlifting index (0–100) 49.31

Trading across borders (rank) 186
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 15.99
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 66
Border compliance (hours) 202
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 306
Border compliance (US$) 983

Enforcing contracts (rank) 162
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 41.76
Time (days) 830
Cost (% of claim) 46.6
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 6.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 125
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 36.73
Time (years) 2.8
Cost (% of estate) 33.5
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 16.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 9.0

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Estate of business rank (1–190) 184
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 34.86
Population 4,594,621

Getting credit (rank) 142
DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage ( % of adults) 3.3

Protecting minority investors (rank) 146
DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 40.00
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5
Cost of import 4
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

Payment taxes (rank) 187
DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 18.89
Payments (number per year) 56
Time (hours per year) 483
Total tax and contribution rate ( % of profit) 73.3
Postlifting index (0–100) 5.13

Trading across borders (rank) 145
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 58.64
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 48
Border compliance (hours) 141
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 60
Border compliance (US$) 280

Enforcing contracts (rank) 182
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 30.46
Time (days) 660
Cost (% of claim) 82.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 5.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 150
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 28.13
Time (years) 4.8
Cost (% of estate) 76.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 0.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 9.0

Note: Most indicator results refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postlifting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### CHAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>14,452,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>50.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>171.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>56.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>32.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9,821.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>44.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</td>
<td>71.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>17,909,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>89.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>80.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>70.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</td>
<td>65.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,378,665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>85.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>47.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>247.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>68.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>143.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>76.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Getting credit</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>13,530</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>17,909,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>80.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### East Asia & Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>8,260</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,378,665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Trading across borders</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>69.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document compliance (hours)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document compliance (US$)</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document compliance (hours)</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document compliance (US$)</td>
<td>170.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>78.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Resolving insolvency</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>55.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48,653,419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Trading across borders (rank): 125
- DTF score for trading across borders (0–100): 62.83
- Time to export: 7 days
- Cost to export: 112
- Border compliance (US$): 554
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 5.0

- Enforcing contracts (rank): 127
- DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 34.29
- Time (days): 1,288
- Cost (% of claim): 45.8
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 9.0

| COMOROS | 158 | 795,601 |

- Trading across borders (rank): 111
- DTF score for trading across borders (0–100): 66.87
- Time to export: 7 days
- Cost to export: 112

| CONGO, DEM. REP. | 182 | 78,736,153 |

- Trading across borders (rank): 188
- DTF score for trading across borders (0–100): 1.26
- Time to export: 7 days
- Cost to export: 22,333
- Border compliance (US$): 2,500

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of Doing Business Rank</th>
<th>Overall Distance to Frontier (DTF) Score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per Capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CÔTE D'IVOIRE</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>53.71</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>23,695,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>58.73</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–10)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### CROATIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</td>
<td>71.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>71.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>73.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (US$ per transaction)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of border administration framework index (0–30)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (US$ per transaction)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CYPRUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</td>
<td>71.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>73.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>74.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (US$ per transaction)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of border administration framework index (0–30)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>68.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (US$ per transaction)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CZECH REPUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</td>
<td>76.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>79.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (US$ per transaction)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of border administration framework index (0–30)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong>&lt;br&gt;DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>76.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (US$ per transaction)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5,731,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>49,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>46,980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle East & North Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>942,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>73,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Dominicana Republic

**Ease of doing business rank** (1−190) | 143
---|---
Starting a business (rank) | 116
**DTF score for starting a business (0−100)** | 83.23
Procedures (number) | 7
Time (days) | 16.5
Cost (% of income per capita) | 14.5
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 33.9

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 62
**DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0−100)** | 71.73
Procedures (number) | 15
Time (days) | 184
Cost (% of the value of the property) | 2.8
Building quality control index (0−15) | 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) | 108
**DTF score for getting electricity (0−100)** | 64.74
Procedures (number) | 7
Time (days) | 67
Cost (% of income per capita) | 24.6
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0−8) | 4

Registering property (rank) | 79
**DTF score for registering property (0−100)** | 65.67
Procedures (number) | 6
Time (days) | 45
Cost (% of property value) | 6.1
Quality of land administration index (0−30) | 14.5

ECUADOR

**Ease of doing business rank** (1−190) | 118
---|---
Starting a business (rank) | 168
**DTF score for starting a business (0−100)** | 70.50
Procedures (number) | 11
Time (days) | 48.5
Cost (% of income per capita) | 21.9
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 105
**DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0−100)** | 66.32
Procedures (number) | 17
Time (days) | 132
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 1.9
Building quality control index (0−15) | 8.0

Getting electricity (rank) | 86
**DTF score for getting electricity (0−100)** | 72.18
Procedures (number) | 7
Time (days) | 74
Cost (% of income per capita) | 63.6
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0−8) | 7

Registering property (rank) | 74
**DTF score for registering property (0−100)** | 66.18
Procedures (number) | 8
Time (days) | 38
Cost (% of property value) | 2.1
Quality of land administration index (0−30) | 16.5

EGYPT, ARAB REP.

**Ease of doing business rank** (1−190) | 128
---|---
Starting a business (rank) | 103
**DTF score for starting a business (0−100)** | 84.53
Procedures (number) | 8.5
Time (days) | 14.5
Cost (% of income per capita) | 7.4
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 66
**DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0−100)** | 71.43
Procedures (number) | 9
Time (days) | 172
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 1.9
Building quality control index (0−15) | 14.0

Getting electricity (rank) | 89
**DTF score for getting electricity (0−100)** | 71.24
Procedures (number) | 5
Time (days) | 53
Cost (% of income per capita) | 3.9
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0−8) | 4

Registering property (rank) | 119
**DTF score for registering property (0−100)** | 55.50
Procedures (number) | 8
Time (days) | 75
Cost (% of property value) | 1.1
Quality of land administration index (0−30) | 7.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>66.42</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>6,344,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUATORIAL GUINEA</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>1,221,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERITREA</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>5,869,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resource table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>66.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

- Reform making it easier to do business
- Change making it more difficult to do business
- Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTONIA</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 42</td>
<td>17,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 70.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank) 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 56.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank) 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 89.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payments (number per year) 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 48.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 99.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHIOPIA</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 173</td>
<td>102,043,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank) 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 28.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank) 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 62.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payments (number per year) 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 38.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 50.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIJI</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 159</td>
<td>4,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank) 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 51.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank) 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 66.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payments (number per year) 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 33.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 62.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,495,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>90.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>76.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,896,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>78.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GABON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,979,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Gambia, The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>2,038,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protecting minority investors**
- ITF score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 164
- Procedures (number): 3
- Time (days): 78
- Cost (% of income per capita): 2.5
- Minimal capital (% of income per capita): 0

**Getting electricity**
- ITF score for getting electricity (0–100): 49.29
- Procedures (number): 3
- Time (days): 71
- Cost (% of income per capita): 176.8
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 5

**Registering property**
- ITF score for registering property (0–100): 53.28
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 66
- Cost (% of property value): 7.6
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 8.5

### Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>3,719,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting credit**
- ITF score for getting credit (0–100): 85.00
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 9
- Depth of credit information index (0–8): 8
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 95.7
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 0

**Registering property**
- ITF score for registering property (0–100): 92.85
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 1
- Cost (% of property value): 0.0
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 21.5

### Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>43,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting credit**
- ITF score for getting credit (0–100): 70.00
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 9
- Depth of credit information index (0–8): 8
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 100.0
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 1.9

**Registering property**
- ITF score for registering property (0–100): 65.71
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 52
- Cost (% of property value): 6.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 22.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### GHANA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>57.24</td>
<td>28,206,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank) 110
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 84.02
  - Procedures (number) 8
  - Time (days) 14
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 17.5
  - Minimum cost (% of income per capita) 1.7

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank) 131
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 61.90
  - Procedures (number) 16
  - Time (days) 170
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 5.4
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 9.0

#### Getting electricity (rank) 136
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 56.81
  - Procedures (number) 5
  - Time (days) 78
  - Cost (% of property value) 6.2
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 8.0

#### Registering property (rank) 119
- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 55.50
  - Procedures (number) 6
  - Time (days) 47
  - Cost (% of property value) 6.2
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 8.0

### GREECE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>68.02</td>
<td>10,746,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank) 37
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 92.30
  - Procedures (number) 18
  - Time (days) 12.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 2.2
  - Minimum cost (% of income per capita) 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank) 58
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 72.48
  - Procedures (number) 18
  - Time (days) 124
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.0
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

#### Getting electricity (rank) 76
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 75.97
  - Procedures (number) 7
  - Time (days) 55
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 70.1
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

#### Registering property (rank) 145
- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 49.67
  - Procedures (number) 10
  - Time (days) 20
  - Cost (% of property value) 4.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 4.5

### GRENADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank) 82
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 87.09
  - Procedures (number) 6
  - Time (days) 15
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 15.3
  - Minimum cost (% of income per capita) 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank) 128
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 62.22
  - Procedures (number) 15
  - Time (days) 466
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.0
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 6.0

#### Getting electricity (rank) 73
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 76.41
  - Procedures (number) 5
  - Time (days) 38
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 18.7
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4

#### Registering property (rank) 141
- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 50.15
  - Procedures (number) 8
  - Time (days) 32
  - Cost (% of property value) 7.4
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.0

---

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Doing Business Rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall Distance to Frontier (DTF) Score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per Capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUATEMALA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>79.30</td>
<td>79.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of warehouse value</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>84.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUINEA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>49.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>47.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5,639.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>50.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUINEA-BISSAU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>41.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>63.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>63.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>273.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>29.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1,391.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>54.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>54.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latin America & Caribbean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per Capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>16,582,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trading across borders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enforcing contracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolving insolvency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolving insolvency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,395,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guinea**

**Sub-Saharan Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per Capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>12,395,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guinea**

**Sub-Saharan Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per Capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,815,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trading across borders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enforcing contracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolving insolvency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Score (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting limit, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
GUYANA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Set</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>85.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>54.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of import value)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>58.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>57.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HAITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Set</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>200.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3,522.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HONDURAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Set</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>76.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>53.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

COUNTRY TABLES

拉丁美洲及加勒比

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>指标集</th>
<th>GNI（美元）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>开办企业（排名）</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>达到门槛的时间（天）</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成本（收入占比）</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>最低资本（收入占比）</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

// 这里添加更多指标集的表格信息...

// 注意：大多数指标集针对的是全国最大城市的一项案例情景，但对于11个经济来说，数据是根据两个最大城市的人口加权平均得到的。对于一些指标，结果为“无实践”可能被记录为该经济；请参见数据注释以获取更多细节。在开办企业时，程序（数量）、时间（天）和成本（收入占比）是按男女平均计算的。对于后处理指数，结果为“不适用”可能被记录为该经济。
**DOING BUSINESS 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HONG KONG SAR, CHINA</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,346,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICELAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 5
- **ICELAND**: 5

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 55
- **ICELAND**: 15

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 55
- **ICELAND**: 15

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 5
- **ICELAND**: 64

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 3
- **ICELAND**: 11

**Getting credit (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 29
- **ICELAND**: 68

**Enforcing contracts (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 28
- **ICELAND**: 29

**Resolving insolvency (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 43
- **ICELAND**: 62

**East Asia & Pacific**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HONG KONG SAR, CHINA</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,817,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICELAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 31
- **ICELAND**: 79

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 31
- **ICELAND**: 79

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 64
- **ICELAND**: 71.72

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 4
- **ICELAND**: 11

**Getting credit (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 29
- **ICELAND**: 68

**Enforcing contracts (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 29
- **ICELAND**: 29

**Resolving insolvency (rank)**

- **HONG KONG SAR, CHINA**: 43
- **ICELAND**: 62

**OECD high income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGARY</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 79

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 90

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 110

**Getting credit (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Enforcing contracts (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 13

**Resolving insolvency (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 62

**OECD high income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGARY</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 79

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 90

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 110

**Getting credit (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Enforcing contracts (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 13

**Resolving insolvency (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 62

**OECD high income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGARY</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 79

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 90

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 110

**Getting credit (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Enforcing contracts (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 13

**Resolving insolvency (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 62

**OECD high income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGARY</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 79

**Registering property (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 90

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 110

**Getting credit (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 29

**Enforcing contracts (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 13

**Resolving insolvency (rank)**

- **HUNGARY**: 62

**OECD high income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGARY</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COUNTRY TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.76</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,324,171,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>76.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Getting credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting minority investors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paying taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>94.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>94.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>76.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Getting credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting minority investors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paying taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>94.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>94.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>76.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Getting credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting minority investors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paying taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>94.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>94.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of property value)</th>
<th>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>76.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ITALY

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>31,590</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>66,600,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Getting electricity**
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 85.27
  - Procedures (number): 2
  - Time (days): 12.2
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 48.4
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 9.0

- **Dealing with construction permits**
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 67.26
  - Procedures (number): 14
  - Time (days): 66.9
  - Cost (% of property value): 6.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 26.5

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 81.70
  - Procedures (number): 4
  - Time (days): 16
  - Cost (% of property value): 15.6
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 26.5

- **Enforcing contracts**
  - DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 76.71
  - Procedures (number): 12
  - Time (days): 2.6
  - Cost (% of property value): 11.0

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 77.20
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 13
  - Cost (% of property value): 13.7
  - Minimum capital (% of property value): 0.0

### JAMAICA

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

####Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,660</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,881,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Getting electricity**
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 71.11
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 95
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 237.3
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 7

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 53.70
  - Procedures (number): 8
  - Time (days): 18
  - Cost (% of property value): 9.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 14.0

- **Enforcing contracts**
  - DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 73.36
  - Procedures (number): 12
  - Time (days): 197
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0

### JAPAN

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>38,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>126,994,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Getting electricity**
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 88.88
  - Procedures (number): 3.4
  - Time (days): 97.7
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 0.0
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 73.92
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 13
  - Cost (% of property value): 13.7
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 24.5

#### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>16,900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>83,578,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 81.70
  - Procedures (number): 4
  - Time (days): 16
  - Cost (% of property value): 15.6
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 26.5

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 67.26
  - Procedures (number): 14
  - Time (days): 66.9
  - Cost (% of property value): 6.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 26.5

- **Registering property**
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 77.20
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 13
  - Cost (% of property value): 13.7
  - Minimum capital (% of property value): 0.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jordan</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 60.58</td>
<td>3,955,802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kazakhstan</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 75.44</td>
<td>8,710,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenya</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 65.15</td>
<td>48,461,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JORDAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</th>
<th>110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>84.40</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KAZAKHSTAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>91.95</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>73.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KENYA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>117</th>
<th>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</th>
<th>124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>83.20</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle East & North Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>159</th>
<th>Protecting minority investors (rank)</th>
<th>146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europa & Central Asia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>Protecting minority investors (rank)</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Saharan Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>Protecting minority investors (rank)</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIRIBATI</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**
- **Starting a business**: 147
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)**: 77.47
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 31
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 40.2
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 16.2

**Dealing with construction permits**: 111
- **DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 67.72
  - Procedures (number): 15
  - Time (days): 150
  - Cost ($/m² of warehouse value): 0.3
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 6.0

**Getting electricity**: 168
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 41.50
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 97
  - Cost ($/kWh of income per capita): 4.0
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

**Registering property**: 146
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)**: 49.12
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 513
  - Cost (% of property value): 0.0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 9.0

**KOREA, REP.**

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**
- **Starting a business**: 4
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)**: 95.83
  - Procedures (number): 2
  - Time (days): 4
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 14.6
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**: 28
- **DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 77.74
  - Procedures (number): 10
  - Time (days): 27.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 4.4
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

**Getting electricity**: 2
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 99.89
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 13
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 37.0
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

**Registering property**: 39
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)**: 76.34
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 5.5
  - Cost (% of property value): 5.1
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 27.5

**KOSOVO**

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**
- **Starting a business**: 10
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)**: 95.67
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 5.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 1.0
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**: 122
- **DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 63.72
  - Procedures (number): 15
  - Time (days): 52.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 5.8
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 9.0

**Getting electricity**: 106
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 66.12
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 36
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 211.5
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 2

**Registering property**: 34
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)**: 78.12
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 27
  - Cost (% of property value): 8.7
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 20.5

**OECD high income**

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**
- **Starting a business**: 9
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)**: 95.83
  - Procedures (number): 2
  - Time (days): 4
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 14.6
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**: 28
- **DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 77.74
  - Procedures (number): 10
  - Time (days): 27.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 4.4
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

**Getting electricity**: 2
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 99.89
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 13
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 37.0
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

**Registering property**: 39
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)**: 76.34
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 5.5
  - Cost (% of property value): 5.1
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 27.5

**Europe & Central Asia**

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**
- **Starting a business**: 10
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)**: 95.67
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 5.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 1.0
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**: 122
- **DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 63.72
  - Procedures (number): 15
  - Time (days): 52.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 5.8
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 9.0

**Getting electricity**: 106
- **DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 66.12
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 36
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 211.5
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 2

**Registering property**: 34
- **DTF score for registering property (0–100)**: 78.12
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 27
  - Cost (% of property value): 8.7
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 20.5

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
Starting a business (rank) 149
DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 77.21
Procedures (number) 8.5
Time (days) 38.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.7
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 8.5

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 129
DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 62.20
Procedures (number) 23
Time (days) 236
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.1
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Registering property (rank) 70
DTF score for registering property (0–100) 67.55
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 35
Cost (% of property value) 0.8
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.0

Getting electricity (rank) 97
DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 69.60
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 85
Cost (% of income per capita) 64.2
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Protecting minority investors (rank) 81
DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 55.00
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 4
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 9
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 4
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 3
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 5
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 8

Getting credit (rank) 133
DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 35.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 1
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 6
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 31.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 15.0

Trading across borders (rank) 154
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 54.24
Time to export 90.4
Documentary compliance (hours) 72
Border closure (hours) 96
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 191
Border closure (US$) 602
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 96
Border closure (hours) 89
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 332
Border closure (US$) 491

Enforcing contracts (rank) 73
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 59.58
Time (days) 566
Cost (% of claim) 18.6
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 6.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 110
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 39.44
Time (years) 4.2
Cost (% of estate) 10.0
Reciprocity rate (cents on the dollar) 32.6
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 7.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiltro index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

LAO PDR
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 141
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 53.01
Population 6,758,353

Trading across borders (rank) 124
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 62.98
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 216
Border closure (hours) 12
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 235
Border closure (US$) 73
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 216
Border closure (hours) 14
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 115
Border closure (US$) 153

Resolving insolvency (rank) 168
DTF score for resolving insolvent (0–100) 0.00
Time (years) no practice
Cost (% of estate) no practice
Reciprocity rate (cents on the dollar) 0.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 0.0

LAO PDR
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 141
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 65.23
Population 4,052,584

Trading across borders (rank) 154
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 54.24
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 72
Border closure (hours) 96
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 191
Border closure (US$) 602
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 96
Border closure (hours) 89
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 332
Border closure (US$) 491

Enforcing contracts (rank) 73
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 59.58
Time (days) 566
Cost (% of claim) 18.6
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 6.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 110
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 39.44
Time (years) 4.2
Cost (% of estate) 10.0
Reciprocity rate (cents on the dollar) 32.6
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 7.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiltro index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

KUWAIT
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 96
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 65.70
Population 6,082,700

Trading across borders (rank) 84
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 73.34
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 21
Border closure (hours) 20
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 145
Border closure (US$) 445
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 36
Border closure (hours) 72
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 200
Border closure (US$) 512

Resolving insolvency (rank) 119
DTF score for resolving insolvent (0–100) 37.67
Time (years) 1.5
Cost (% of estate) 15.0
Reciprocity rate (cents on the dollar) 35.2
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 6.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiltro index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
## LATVIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>14,630</td>
<td>1,960,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Starting a business (rank)
- **Starting a business (rank)** 19
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 94.11
- Procedures (number) 4
- Time (days) 5.5
- Cost (% of income per capita) 1.8
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)** 49
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.41
- Procedures (number) 14
- Time (days) 192
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.5
- Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Getting electricity (rank)** 62
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 79.05
- Procedures (number) 4
- Time (days) 107
- Cost (% of property value) 27.8
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

### Registering property (rank)
- **Registering property (rank)** 22
- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 81.87
- Procedures (number) 4
- Time (days) 16.5
- Cost (% of property value) 42.3
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 22.0

### Protecting minority investors (rank)
- **Protecting minority investors (rank)** 43
- DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 63.33
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 5
- Extent of director liability index (0–10) 4
- Cost to import 9
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 7
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 5
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 8

### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Paying taxes (rank)** 13
- DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 89.79
- Payments (number per year) 7
- Time (hours per year) 168.5
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 35.9
- Postfiling index (0–100) 96.11

### Enforcing contracts (rank)
- **Enforcing contracts (rank)** 20
- DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 71.66
- Time (days) 469
- Cost (% of claim) 23.1
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 12.5

### Resolving insolvency (rank)
- **Resolving insolvency (rank)** 53
- DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 59.10
- Time (years) 1.5
- Cost (% of estate) 10.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 40.1
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 12.0

### Getting credit (rank)
- **Getting credit (rank)** 12
- DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 85.00
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 9
- Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 43.1
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 88.8

### Protecting minority investors (rank)
- **Protecting minority investors (rank)** 138
- DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 41.67
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
- Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5
- Cost to import 4
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 1
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 5

### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Paying taxes (rank)** 113
- DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 68.21
- Payments (number per year) 20
- Time (hours per year) 181
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 30.3
- Postfiling index (0–100) 27.48

### Enforcing contracts (rank)
- **Enforcing contracts (rank)** 134
- DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 49.85
- Time (days) 721
- Cost (% of claim) 30.8
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 6.0

### Resolving insolvency (rank)
- **Resolving insolvency (rank)** 147
- DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 29.42
- Time (years) 3.0
- Cost (% of estate) 15.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 31.4
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 4.0

### Getting credit (rank)
- **Getting credit (rank)** 77
- DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 55.00
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7
- Depth of credit information index (0–8) 6
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 7.5
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

### Protecting minority investors (rank)
- **Protecting minority investors (rank)** 108
- DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 50.00
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 3
- Extent of director liability index (0–10) 4
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 9
- Cost to import 6
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 5

### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Paying taxes (rank)** 111
- DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 68.68
- Payments (number per year) 32
- Time (hours per year) 333
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 13.6
- Postfiling index (0–100) 66.94

### Enforcing contracts (rank)
- **Enforcing contracts (rank)** 95
- DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 57.18
- Time (days) 615
- Cost (% of claim) 31.3
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 8.5

### Resolving insolvency (rank)
- **Resolving insolvency (rank)** 124
- DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 36.91
- Time (years) 2.6
- Cost (% of estate) 20.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 27.9
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 7.0

### Note:
Most indicator results refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIBERIA</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>4,613,823</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>90.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4,174.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4,174.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4,174.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4,174.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LUXEMBOURG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>76,660</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100)</td>
<td>69.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>88.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>582,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>83.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to register property</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>84.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>87.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postfilting index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>63.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MACEDONIA, FYR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100)</td>
<td>81.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>93.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,081,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>93.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>78.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>81.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>200.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>74.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MADAGASCAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>162</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100)</td>
<td>47.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>87.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>24,894,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>60.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (hours)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (US$)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>35.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (US$)</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>44.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### DoiNG BUSINESS 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>South Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
<th>Postfiling index (0–100)</th>
<th>DTF score for resuming insolvency (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALAWI</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALDIVES</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMIBIA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Malaysia

Starting a business (rank) 104
DITF score for starting a business (0–100) 84.46
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 5
Cost (% of income per capita) 58.4
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 5.6

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 134
DITF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 61.36
Procedures (number) 13
Time (days) 124
Cost (% of warehouse value) 6.2
Building quality control index (0–15) 6.5

Getting electricity (rank) 154
DITF score for getting electricity (0–100) 51.12
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 120
Cost (% of income per capita) 2,788.6
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 137
DITF score for registering property (0–100) 51.43
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 29
Cost (% of property value) 113.1
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 8.0

Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 48.3
Postfilling index (0–100) 25.71

Registering property (rank) 147
DITF score for registering property (0–100) 48.09
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 15
Cost (% of property value) 124.3
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 12.5

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

Estonia

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 57
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 49.37
Population 1,319,730
GNI per capita (US$) 29,366

Registering property (rank) 147
DITF score for registering property (0–100) 48.09
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 15
Cost (% of property value) 124.3
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 12.5

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

Ghana

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 143
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 52.92
Population 26,364,317
GNI per capita (US$) 1,126

Registering property (rank) 147
DITF score for registering property (0–100) 46.57
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 30
Cost (% of property value) 124.3
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 12.5

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Mauritania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>91.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>66.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of warehouse value</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>61.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mauritius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>82.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>77.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>85.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>68.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>70.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>100.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>60.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</th>
<th>50.88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0% of adults)</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>77.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</th>
<th>72.27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>60.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trading across borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</th>
<th>60.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>77.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>60.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy; for those in economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### MONGOLIA

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>69.03</td>
<td>3,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>90.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>78.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting electricity (rank)</th>
<th>139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registering property (rank)</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>74.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reform making it easier to do business

- **Getting credit (rank) | 20  |
  DTF score for getting credit (0–100) | 80.00 |
  Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 9  |
  Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 7  |
  Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 0  |
  Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 45.0 |

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- **Trading across borders (rank) | 110  |
  DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) | 66.89 |
  Time to export | 20.2 |
  Documentary compliance (hours) | 168 |
  Border compliance (hours) | 62 |
  Cost (% of claim) | 19 |
  Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) | 5.5 |

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilin index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Note: Most indicator scores refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### MYANMAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>171</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### East Asia & Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>1,315</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NAMIBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,620</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilining index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>76.03</td>
<td>17,018,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>87.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>91.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>84.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETHERLANDS</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>86.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>91.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>96.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW ZEALAND</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>86.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>91.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>96.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NIGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>52.34</td>
<td>20,672,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) 24
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 93.65
  - Procedures (number) 3
  - Time (days) 97
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 8.3
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 11.8

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 164
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 53.70
  - Procedures (number) 15
  - Time (days) 91
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 13.2
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 6.0

Getting electricity (rank) 162
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 44.86
  - Procedures (number) 4
  - Time (days) 97
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 5,632.6
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 116
- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 57.15
  - Procedures (number) 4
  - Time (days) 35
  - Cost (% of property value) 6.5
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 4.0

NIGERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>52.03</td>
<td>185,989,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) 130
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 80.80
  - Procedures (number) 15.1
  - Time (days) 110.3
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 18.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 11.8

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 147
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 58.81
  - Procedures (number) 15.1
  - Time (days) 110.3
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 18.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 11.8

Getting electricity (rank) 172
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 34.68
  - Procedures (number) 9.8
  - Time (days) 149.4
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 334.8
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 179
- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 34.08
  - Procedures (number) 11.3
  - Time (days) 68.9
  - Cost (% of property value) 0.5
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.4

NOTES: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Middle East & North Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>12,450</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>55.58</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>21,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 133
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 72.34
  - Time to export
    - Documentation compliance (hours) 63.50
    - Border compliance (hours) 74.80
  - Cost to export
    - Documentation compliance (US$) 120.50
    - Border compliance (US$) 320.50

- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) 126
  - DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 61.30
  - Time (days) 72.50
  - Cost (% of claim) 14.20
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 5.60
  - Border compliance (US$) 480.50

### South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>147</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>1,510</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>193,203,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 171
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 41.50
  - Time to export
    - Documentation compliance (hours) 63.00
    - Border compliance (hours) 71.00
  - Cost to export
    - Documentation compliance (US$) 120.50
    - Border compliance (US$) 320.50

- **Resolving insolvency** (rank) 82
  - DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 45.83
  - Time (years) 4.00
  - Cost (% of estate) 4.00
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 44.50
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18) 7.00

### PAKISTAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>2,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,424,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 72
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 79.39
  - Time to export
    - Documentation compliance (hours) 7.00
    - Border compliance (hours) 52.00
  - Cost to export
    - Documentation compliance (US$) 107.00
    - Border compliance (US$) 261.00

- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) 67
  - DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 60.02
  - Time (days) 598.00
  - Cost (% of claim) 15.10
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 18.60
  - Border compliance (US$) 394.00

### OMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>55.58</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,424,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 72
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 79.39
  - Time to export
    - Documentation compliance (hours) 7.00
    - Border compliance (hours) 52.00
  - Cost to export
    - Documentation compliance (US$) 107.00
    - Border compliance (US$) 261.00

- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) 67
  - DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 60.02
  - Time (days) 598.00
  - Cost (% of claim) 15.10
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 18.60
  - Border compliance (US$) 394.00

### PALAU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>55.58</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,424,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 72
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 79.39
  - Time to export
    - Documentation compliance (hours) 7.00
    - Border compliance (hours) 52.00
  - Cost to export
    - Documentation compliance (US$) 107.00
    - Border compliance (US$) 261.00

- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) 67
  - DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 60.02
  - Time (days) 598.00
  - Cost (% of claim) 15.10
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 18.60
  - Border compliance (US$) 394.00

### Note:
Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting of index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
## COUNTRY TABLES

### PANAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>4,034,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business (rank)**: 39
- **DTF score for starting a business (0–100)**: 92.02
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 6
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 5.7
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 88
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 68.16
  - Procedures (number): 18
  - Time (days): 105
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 9.0

- **Getting electricity (rank)**: 18
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 89.77
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 35
  - Cost (% of property value): 17.2
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

- **Registering property (rank)**: 83
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 65.17
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 22.5
  - Cost (% of property value): 2.4
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 11.0

### PAPUA NEW GUINEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>59.04</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>8,084,991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business (rank)**: 129
  - DTF score for starting a business (0–100): 81.04
    - Procedures (number): 6
    - Time (days): 41
    - Cost (% of income per capita): 11.5
    - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 117
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 64.42
    - Procedures (number): 17
    - Time (days): 217
    - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.2
    - Building quality control index (0–15): 10.0

- **Getting electricity (rank)**: 107
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 65.53
    - Procedures (number): 4
    - Time (days): 66
    - Cost (% of income per capita): 27.2
    - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

- **Registering property (rank)**: 122
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 55.38
    - Procedures (number): 4
    - Time (days): 72
    - Cost (% of property value): 5.2
    - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 4.5

### PARAGUAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>59.18</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>6,725,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business (rank)**: 146
  - DTF score for starting a business (0–100): 77.52
    - Procedures (number): 7
    - Time (days): 35
    - Cost (% of income per capita): 39.9
    - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 72
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 70.52
    - Procedures (number): 14
    - Time (days): 121
    - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.6
    - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

- **Getting electricity (rank)**: 104
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 67.09
    - Procedures (number): 5
    - Time (days): 67
    - Cost (% of income per capita): 16.6
    - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 2

- **Registering property (rank)**: 75
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 66.12
    - Procedures (number): 6
    - Time (days): 46
    - Cost (% of property value): 4.6
    - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 12.0

## Note

Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>PERU</th>
<th>Latvia</th>
<th>Poland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>91.90</td>
<td>94.90</td>
<td>97.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### PORTUGAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>76.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights (index 0–12)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–6)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>83.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate ( % of profit)</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlifting index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>71.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>79.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUERTO RICO (U.S.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>68.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights (index 0–12)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–6)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>52.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate ( % of profit)</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlifting index (0–100)</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>81.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>54.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>84.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QATAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>64.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights (index 0–12)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–6)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>99.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate ( % of profit)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlifting index (0–100)</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>71.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>52.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>38.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postlifting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Europe & Central Asia

#### Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>72.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

#### Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>DTF Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>73.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reform making it easier to do business

- Romania: ✔✓
- Russia: ✓√
- Rwanda: ✔✓

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- Romania: ✔✓
- Russia: ✓√
- Rwanda: ✔✓

### Note

Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilining index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

---

**Example Table**: The table below shows key indicators for doing business in different regions. Each row represents a country or region, and the columns indicate specific business-related metrics such as distance to frontier (DTF) score, getting credit, and trading across borders.

**Example Data**:

- **Romania**
  - Distance to frontier (DTF) score: 72.87
  - Getting credit (rank): 29
  - Trading across borders (rank): 100

- **Russia**
  - Distance to frontier (DTF) score: 75.50
  - Getting credit (rank): 51
  - Trading across borders (rank): 100

- **Rwanda**
  - Distance to frontier (DTF) score: 73.40
  - Getting credit (rank): 6
  - Trading across borders (rank): 87

Note: The data includes various metrics such as time (days), cost (% of income per capita), etc., for different business processes like starting a business, paying taxes, etc. The scores range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating better business environments.
### SAMOA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank) 33
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 4
  - Time (days) 9
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 7.3
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank) 83
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 18
  - Time (days) 58
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.8
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 6.0

#### Getting electricity (rank) 60
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 4
  - Time (days) 34
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 615.2
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4

#### Registering property (rank) 66
- DTF score for registering property (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 5
  - Time (days) 15
  - Recovery (% of property value) 3.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 13.0

### SAN MARINO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank) 112
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 15
  - Time (days) 145.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 5.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank) 68
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 15
  - Time (days) 145.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 5.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

#### Getting electricity (rank) 14
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 3
  - Time (days) 45
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 60.8
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

#### Registering property (rank) 78
- DTF score for registering property (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 9
  - Time (days) 42.5
  - Recovery (% of property value) 4.1
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.0

### SÃO TOME AND PRÍNCIPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank) 148
- DTF score for starting a business (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 6
  - Time (days) 7
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 13.2
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 192.4

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank) 103
- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 16
  - Time (days) 67
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.3
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 5.0

#### Getting electricity (rank) 115
- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 4
  - Time (days) 89
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 378.8
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

#### Registering property (rank) 171
- DTF score for registering property (0–100)
  - Procedures (number) 8
  - Time (days) 52
  - Recovery (% of property value) 10.2
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 4.5

### EAST ASIA & PACIFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>62.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>44.84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>62.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SOUTH AMERICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South America</th>
<th>62.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### NORTH AMERICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North America</th>
<th>62.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### COUNTRY TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WORLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World</th>
<th>62.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Notes:
- Most indicator values refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities.
- For some indicators, a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details.
- In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
SAUDI ARABIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 92
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 62.50
GNI per capita (US$) 21,750
Population 32,273,687

Starting a business (rank) 135
DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 80.04
Procedures (number) 11
Time (days) 18
Cost (% of income per capita) 6.8
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 38
DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.52
Procedures (number) 17
Time (days) 89.5
Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.3
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Getting electricity (rank) 59
DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 79.88
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 68
Cost (% of income per capita) 32.1
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Registering property (rank) 24
DTF score for registering property (0–100) 81.19
Procedures (number) 2
Time (days) 1.5
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 1
DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 75.00
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 4
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 7
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 8
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 9

Getting credit (rank) 90
DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 50.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 2
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 50.2
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Paying taxes (rank) 76
DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 75.00
Payments (number per year) 3
Time (hours per year) 47
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 15.7
Pillar 1 (index) 4.00

Trading across borders (rank) 161
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 49.59
Time (days) 21
Documentary compliance (hours) 81
Border compliance (hours) 69
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 105
Border compliance (US$) 363

Enforcing contracts (rank) 83
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 58.78
Time (days) 575
Cost (% of claim) 27.5
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 8.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 168
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 0.00
Time (years) no practice
Cost (% of estate) no practice
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 0.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 0.0

SENEGAL

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 140
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 53.06
GNI per capita (US$) 950
Population 15,411,614

Starting a business (rank) 63
DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 89.70
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 6
Cost (% of income per capita) 33.8
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 4.6

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 145
DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 59.11
Procedures (number) 14
Time (days) 177
Cost (% of warehouse value) 10.1
Building quality control index (0–15) 10.0

Getting electricity (rank) 118
DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 60.76
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 75
Cost (% of income per capita) 3,619.6
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Registering property (rank) 121
DTF score for registering property (0–100) 55.41
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 56
Cost (% of property value) 7.4
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.0

Getting credit (rank) 142
DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 2.4
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.6

Paying taxes (rank) 178
DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 40.79
Payments (number per year) 58
Time (hours per year) 441
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 45.1
Pillar 1 (index) 42.67

Trading across borders (rank) 135
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 60.85
Time (days) 2
Documentary compliance (hours) 26
Border compliance (hours) 61
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 96
Border compliance (US$) 547

Enforcing contracts (rank) 142
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 48.15
Time (days) 740
Cost (% of claim) 36.4
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 6.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 91
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 44.12
Time (years) 3.0
Cost (% of estate) 20.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 29.7
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 9.0

SERBIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 43
Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 73.13
GNI per capita (US$) 5,280
Population 7,057,412

Starting a business (rank) 32
DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 92.57
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 5.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 2.3
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 10
DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 82.38
Procedures (number) 11
Time (days) 10
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.8
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) 96
DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 69.97
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 125
Cost (% of income per capita) 22.7
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5

Registering property (rank) 57
DTF score for registering property (0–100) 72.59
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 21
Cost (% of property value) 3.1
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 18.0

Getting credit (rank) 55
DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 65.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Paying taxes (rank) 82
DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 73.63
Payments (number per year) 33
Time (hours per year) 225.5
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 39.7
Pillar 1 (index) 91.09

Trading across borders (rank) 23
DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 96.64
Time (days) 1
Documentary compliance (hours) 2
Border compliance (hours) 4
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 35
Border compliance (US$) 47

Enforcing contracts (rank) 60
DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 61.41
Time (days) 635
Cost (% of claim) 40.8
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 13.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 48
DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 60.49
Time (years) 2.0
Cost (% of estate) 20.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 34.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 13.5

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Seychelles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business (rank)</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>78.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Registering property (rank)</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sierra Leone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business (rank)</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>88.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Getting electricity (rank)</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5,365.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Registering property (rank)</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Singapore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business (rank)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>96.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>80.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Getting electricity (rank)</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>91.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ <strong>Registering property (rank)</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>83.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### SLOVAK REPUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 74.90</td>
<td>16,810</td>
<td>5,428,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enforcing contracts
- **2018 DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 58.63**
- **Time (days) 775**
- **Cost (% of claim) 30.6**
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.5**

### SLOVENIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 75.42</td>
<td>21,660</td>
<td>2,064,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enforcing contracts
- **2018 DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 58.63**
- **Time (days) 775**
- **Cost (% of claim) 30.6**
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.5**

### SOLOMON ISLANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 58.13</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>559,419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enforcing contracts
- **2018 DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 53.45**
- **Time (days) 439**
- **Cost (% of claim) 38.0**
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 9.0**

---

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfililing index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMALIA</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH AFRICA</strong></td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH SUDAN</strong></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOMALIA</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH AFRICA</strong></td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH SUDAN</strong></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

**Country Tables**

- Reform making it easier to do business
- Change making it more difficult to do business
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPAIN</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 77.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 84.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 59.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100) 73.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLFI score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.99</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 69.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLFI score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>70.98</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 70.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 777.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100) 45.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLFI score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>70.98</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 777.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. KITTS AND NEVIS</td>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100) 54.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 48.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100) 64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 75.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100) 28.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLFI score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>70.98</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 237.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### ST. LUCIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Table</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62.88</td>
<td>178,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>176,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>88.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>175,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>76.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52.88</td>
<td>174,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59.16</td>
<td>173,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES
### Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 129 | 55.72 | 172,015 |
| Starting a business (rank) | 85 | 61.1 | 171,015 |
| DTF score for starting a business (0–100) | 86.82 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 7 | | |
| Time (days) | 10 | | |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 15.8 | | |
| Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0 | | |
| Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 44 | 74.42 | 170,015 |
| DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 74.42 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 14 | | |
| Time (days) | 92 | | |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 0.1 | | |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 8.0 | | |
| Getting electricity (rank) | 90 | 71.14 | 169,015 |
| DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) | 71.14 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 3 | | |
| Time (days) | 52 | | |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 5.25 | | |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 0 | | |
| Registering property (rank) | 156 | 43.10 | 168,015 |
| DTF score for registering property (0–100) | 43.10 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 7 | | |
| Time (days) | 47 | | |
| Cost (% of property value) | 11.8 | | |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 7.0 | | |
| SUDAN
### Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 170 | 44.46 | 167,015 |
| Starting a business (rank) | 159 | 61.1 | 166,015 |
| DTF score for starting a business (0–100) | 73.51 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 10.5 | | |
| Time (days) | 36.5 | | |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 27.8 | | |
| Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0 | | |
| Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 133 | 61.63 | 165,015 |
| DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 61.63 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 15 | | |
| Time (days) | 270 | | |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 2.0 | | |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 10.0 | | |
| Getting electricity (rank) | 110 | 63.26 | 164,015 |
| DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) | 63.26 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 5 | | |
| Time (days) | 70 | | |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 2.31 | | |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 3 | | |
| Registering property (rank) | 89 | 63.62 | 163,015 |
| DTF score for registering property (0–100) | 63.62 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 6 | | |
| Time (days) | 11 | | |
| Cost (% of property value) | 2.6 | | |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 5.5 | | |

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>7,070</td>
<td>558,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>48.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>75.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risking insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>66.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of property value</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>69.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>77.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
## SWITZERLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</td>
<td>75.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>81,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>8,372,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business** (rank) 73

- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 88.38
- Procedures (number) 6
- Time (days) 10
- Cost (% of income per capita) 2.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 25.4

**Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 62

- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 71.73
- Procedures (number) 13
- Time (days) 156
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.7
- Building quality control index (0–15) 9.0

**Registering property** (rank) 16

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 86.12
- Procedures (number) 4
- Time (days) 16
- Cost (% of property value) 59.2
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.5

**Enforcing contracts** (rank) 68

- DTF score for getting credit (0–100) 68
- Procedures (number) no practice
- Time (days) 39
- Cost (% of property value) 28.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 82.2

**Trading across borders** (rank) 38

- DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 91.79
- Procedures (number) 4
- Time (days) 2
- Cost (% of export) 2.0
- Documentation compliance (hours) 2
- Border compliance (hours) 1

**Registering property** (rank) 18

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 83.89
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 8
- Cost (% of property value) 6.2
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 28.5

**Enforcing contracts** (rank) 45

- DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 66.49
- Time (days) 510
- Cost (% of claim) 24.0
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 10.5

**Resolving insolvency** (rank) 45

- DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 62.63
- Time (years) 3.0
- Cost (% of estate) 4.5
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 46.7
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 12.0

### SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 174

| OECD high income Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100) | 41.55 |
| GNI per capita (US$) | 1,037 |
| Population | 18,430,453 |

**Starting a business** (rank) 133

- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 80.43
- Procedures (number) 0.0
- Time (days) 39
- Cost (% of income per capita) 7.9
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 84.0

**Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 186

- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 0.00
- Procedures (number) no practice
- Time (days) 39
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 0
- Building quality control index (0–15) 0.0

**Registering property** (rank) 155

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 46.88
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 5
- Cost (% of property value) 24.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.5

**Getting electricity** (rank) 153

- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 51.99
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 146
- Cost (% of income per capita) 247.3
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

**Getting electricity** (rank) 153

- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 51.99
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 146
- Cost (% of income per capita) 247.3
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

**Getting electricity** (rank) 153

- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 51.99
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 146
- Cost (% of income per capita) 247.3
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

**Registering property** (rank) 155

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 46.88
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 5
- Cost (% of property value) 24.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.5

**Registering property** (rank) 155

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 46.88
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 5
- Cost (% of property value) 24.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.5

**Registering property** (rank) 155

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 46.88
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 5
- Cost (% of property value) 24.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.5

**Registering property** (rank) 155

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 46.88
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 5
- Cost (% of property value) 24.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.5

### TAIWAN, CHINA

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 15

| OECD high income Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100) | 80.07 |
| GNI per capita (US$) | 23,284 |
| Population | 23,539,816 |

**Starting a business** (rank) 16

- DTF score for starting a business (0–100) 94.43
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 10
- Cost (% of income per capita) 2.0
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 4

- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 86.10
- Procedures (number) 10
- Time (days) 93
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.4
- Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

**Getting electricity** (rank) 93

- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 99.45
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 22
- Cost (% of income per capita) 38.9
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

**Getting electricity** (rank) 93

- DTF score for getting electricity (0–100) 99.45
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 22
- Cost (% of income per capita) 38.9
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

**Registering property** (rank) 93

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 93.93
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 22
- Cost (% of property value) 6.2
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 28.5

**Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 81

- DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.11
- Procedures (number) 4
- Time (days) 11
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.1
- Building quality control index (0–15) 6.2

**Registering property** (rank) 68

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 68
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 10
- Cost (% of property value) 2.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 25.4

**Registering property** (rank) 13

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 13
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 10
- Cost (% of property value) 2.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 25.4

**Registering property** (rank) 13

- DTF score for registering property (0–100) 13
- Procedures (number) 3
- Time (days) 10
- Cost (% of property value) 2.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 25.4

### COUNTRY TABLES

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 55
  - DTF score for trading across borders (0–100) 84.94
  - Time (days) 510
  - Cost (% of claim) 24.0
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 14.0

- **Resolving insolvency** (rank) 55
  - DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 75.11
  - Time (years) 1.9
  - Cost (% of estate) 4.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 82.2
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 11.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score) (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe &amp; Central Asia</strong></td>
<td>56.86</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>8,734,951</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td>61.21</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>57.17</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td>73.03</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>55,572,201</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paying taxes</strong></td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>55.49</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>55.49</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td>92.34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td>90.99</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td>74.58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55,572,201</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td>90.99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55,572,201</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td>61.21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55,572,201</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### TIMOR-LESTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>76.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>268.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>55.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>62.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1,258.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>156</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>82.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>47.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>54.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TONGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>90.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>80.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>76.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

---

### East Asia & Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>48.88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</strong></td>
<td>63.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GNI per capita (US$)</strong></td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>48.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</strong></td>
<td>64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GNI per capita (US$)</strong></td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### East Asia & Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>48.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</strong></td>
<td>63.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GNI per capita (US$)</strong></td>
<td>1,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>48.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100))</strong></td>
<td>64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GNI per capita (US$)</strong></td>
<td>3,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COUNTRY TABLES

- **Trading across borders** (rank) | 98 |
- **DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)** | 69.90 |
- **Time to export** | 33 |
- **Documentary compliance (hours)** | 96 |
- **Border compliance** | 100 |
- **Border compliance (US$)** | 350 |
- **Time to import** | 44 |
- **Documentary compliance (US$)** | 115 |
- **Border compliance (US$)** | 410 |
- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) | 190 |
- **DTF score for enforcing contracts (0–100)** | 6.13 |
- **Time (days)** | 1,285 |
- **Cost (% of claim)** | 163.2 |
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)** | 2.5 |
- **Resolving insolvency** (rank) | 168 |
- **DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)** | 0.00 |
- **Time (years)** | 0.0 |
- **Cost (% of estate)** | 0.0 |
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)** | 0.0 |
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)** | 0.0 |

- **Trading across borders** (rank) | 121 |
- **DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)** | 63.66 |
- **Time to export** | 11 |
- **Documentary compliance (hours)** | 67 |
- **Border compliance** | 252 |
- **Border compliance (US$)** | 612 |
- **Time to import** | 180 |
- **Border compliance (hours)** | 168 |
- **Border compliance (US$)** | 252 |
- **Resolving insolvency** (rank) | 81 |
- **DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)** | 46.41 |
- **Time (years)** | 3.0 |
- **Cost (% of estate)** | 15.0 |
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)** | 34.0 |
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)** | 9.0 |

- **Trading across borders** (rank) | 103 |
- **DTF score for trading across borders (0–100)** | 68.20 |
- **Time to export** | 168 |
- **Documentary compliance (hours)** | 52 |
- **Border compliance** | 148 |
- **Border compliance (US$)** | 330 |
- **Time to import** | 72 |
- **Border compliance (hours)** | 26 |
- **Border compliance (US$)** | 148 |
- **Resolving insolvency** (rank) | 136 |
- **DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100)** | 33.97 |
- **Time (years)** | 2.7 |
- **Cost (% of claim)** | 22.0 |
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)** | 28.3 |
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)** | 6.0 |
### TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>13,364,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>212.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TUNISIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>63.58</td>
<td>11,403,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>712.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>63.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TURKEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>69.14</td>
<td>79,512,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>81.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(rank)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>74.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilng index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>56.94</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>41,487,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank): 165
  - DTF score for starting a business (0–100): 72.25
  - Procedures (number): 13
  - Time (days): 24
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 3.6
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 148
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 58.37
  - Procedures (number): 18
  - Time (days): 122
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 8.0
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 173
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 34.11
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 66
  - Cost (% of property value): 7.59
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

- **Registering property** (rank): 124
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 54.99
  - Procedures (number): 10
  - Time (days): 42
  - Cost (% of property value): 3.1
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 10.5

- **Getting credit** (rank): 55
  - DTF score for getting credit (0–100): 65.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 6
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 6
  - Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 6.4
  - Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 0.0

- **Protecting minority investors** (rank): 108
  - DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 50.00
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 3
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 5
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 7
  - Extent of ownership rights index (0–10): 4
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 6

- **Paying taxes** (rank): 84
  - DTF score for paying taxes (0–100): 73.10
  - Payments (number per year): 31
  - Time (hours per year): 195
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 33.7
  - Posting index (0–100): 72.28

### United Kingdom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>65.75</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>54,004,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank): 52
  - DTF score for starting a business (0–100): 91.05
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 65
  - Cost (% of property value): 0.8
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 35
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 75.81
  - Procedures (number): 10
  - Time (days): 76
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 3.1
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 128
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 58.80
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 281
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 52.5
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

- **Registering property** (rank): 64
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 69.61
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 17
  - Cost (% of property value): 1.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 14.5

- **Getting credit** (rank): 29
  - DTF score for getting credit (0–100): 75.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 8
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 7
  - Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 47.3
  - Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 0.0

- **Protecting minority investors** (rank): 81
  - DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 55.00
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 7
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 2
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 6
  - Extent of ownership rights index (0–10): 5
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 8

- **Paying taxes** (rank): 43
  - DTF score for paying taxes (0–100): 80.77
  - Payments (number per year): 5
  - Time (hours per year): 327.5
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 37.8
  - Posting index (0–100): 85.95

### United Arab Emirates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>78.73</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>40,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>9,269,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank): 51
  - DTF score for starting a business (0–100): 91.16
  - Procedures (number): 14.5
  - Time (days): 8.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 13.4
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 8.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 2
  - DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 86.38
  - Procedures (number): 14
  - Time (days): 50.5
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.3
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 15.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 99.92
  - DTF score for getting electricity (0–100): 99.92
  - Procedures (number): 2
  - Time (days): 10
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 25.2
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

- **Registering property** (rank): 10
  - DTF score for registering property (0–100): 90.02
  - Procedures (number): 2
  - Time (days): 1.5
  - Cost (% of property value): 0.0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 21.0

- **Getting credit** (rank): 90
  - DTF score for getting credit (0–100): 50.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 2
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 8
  - Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 54.5
  - Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 8.8

- **Protecting minority investors** (rank): 10
  - DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 75.00
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 10
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 9
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 4
  - Extent of ownership rights index (0–10): 6
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 9

- **Paying taxes** (rank): 1
  - DTF score for paying taxes (0–100): 99.44
  - Payments (number per year): 4
  - Time (hours per year): 12
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 15.9
  - Posting index (0–100): not applicable

- **Resolving insolvency** (rank): 69
  - DTF score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 49.80
  - Time (years): 3.2
  - Cost (% of estate): 20.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 28.7
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–10): 11.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of *not applicable* may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82.22</td>
<td>42,390</td>
<td>65,637,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82.54</td>
<td>56,180</td>
<td>323,127,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61.99</td>
<td>15,230</td>
<td>3,444,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### UZBEKISTAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>61.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>85.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VANUATU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>72.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1,090.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>65.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VENEZUELA, RB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>351.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>59.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16,713.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTF score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>52.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100)</td>
<td>66.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions)</td>
<td>31,848.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF score (0–100)</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>9,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions)</td>
<td>31,568.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

Getting credit: Report on getting credit in economies.

Paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Registering property: Report on registering property in economies.


Enforcing contracts: Report on enforcing contracts in economies.

Resolving insolvency: Report on resolving insolvency in economies.


Ease of doing business: Overall quality of doing business in economies.

Ease of starting a business: Report on starting a business in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of resolving insolvency: Report on resolving insolvency in economies.

Ease of enforcing contracts: Report on enforcing contracts in economies.

Ease of protecting minority investors: Report on protecting minority investors in economies.

Ease of getting credit: Report on getting credit in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.

Ease of dealing with construction permits: Report on dealing with construction permits in economies.

Ease of getting electricity: Report on getting electricity in economies.

Ease of paying taxes: Report on paying taxes in economies.

Ease of registering property: Report on registering property in economies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAMBIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>48.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>DTF score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>59.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>DTF score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIMBABWE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Overall distance to frontier (DTF) score (0–100)</td>
<td>48.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>DTF score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Regulation of the labor market is an important aspect of the business environment that can influence employment dynamics and productivity. Labor market imperfections can negatively affect job quality and job creation. Regulation can mitigate market failures and contribute to a more productive allocation of labor resources within an economy. While reforms toward more flexible labor regulation could increase employment, labor under-regulation can also have negative impacts by, for example, creating an unsafe workplace or undermining worker quality of life. By setting the right incentives and deterrents for both employers and employees, labor regulation could contribute to labor mobility and productivity growth.

The challenge in developing labor policies is to avoid the extremes of both over- and under-regulation by balancing labor flexibility with worker protection. More flexible regulation may allow an economy to better adjust to economic shocks, variations in the business cycle and long-term structural shifts, such as technological and demographic changes. Data collected for Doing Business 2018 show that 64.7% of economies allow the use of fixed-term contracts for permanent tasks and 78.9% do not have restrictions on night work. In 21.4% of economies the law requires the employer to reassign or retrain a worker before making that worker redundant.

On the other hand, a lack of worker protection can lead to lower standards of living and—with unhealthy and unmotivated employees—poor firm productivity. Doing Business 2018 data show that 68.9% of economies provide at least five fully-paid days of sick leave annually. The under-regulation of the labor market may disproportionately affect specific groups. For female employees, discrimination in access to employment and persistent gaps in income may discourage them from entering the labor market or participating in it to their full potential. Doing Business 2018 data show that 48% of economies prohibit gender-based discrimination in hiring and 40.5% mandate equal remuneration for work of equal value.

In recent years Doing Business has developed a more nuanced approach to its labor market indicators by expanding its methodological scope, going beyond the areas traditionally measured by the report. Historically, Doing Business measured flexibility in the regulation of employment as it relates to the hiring and redundancy of employees and the scheduling of working hours. However, several new components were added since Doing Business 2016, including the availability of at least five fully-paid days of sick leave a year, length of paid maternity leave, unemployment protection, gender nondiscrimination in hiring and equal remuneration for work of equal value. This methodological expansion stemmed from a collaborative dialogue with interested stakeholders and the International Labor Organization. The changes implemented were aimed at providing a more comprehensive measure by setting
the right balance in labor market regulation. The Doing Business labor market indicators serve as an essential resource for academics, journalists, private sector researchers and others interested in labor market regulation.

NOTES

1. Martin and Scarpetta 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</th>
<th>Maximum length of fixed-term contract (months)</th>
<th>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 18, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</th>
<th>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker</th>
<th>Maximum length of probationary period (months)</th>
<th>Maximum number of working days per week</th>
<th>Premium for night work (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Premium for work on weekly rest day (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Premium for overtime work (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Restrictions on night work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on overtime work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</th>
<th>Paid annual leave (working days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>182.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>604.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>936.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>2,068.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,590.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>867.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (Chittagong)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (Dhaka)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>518.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>2,280.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>332.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>291.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (Rio de Janeiro)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>382.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (São Paulo)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>348.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>266.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy rules</td>
<td>Redundancy cost</td>
<td>Job quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</th>
<th>Maximum length of fixed-term contract (months)</th>
<th>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</th>
<th>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker (months)</th>
<th>Maximum length of probationary period (months)</th>
<th>Maximum number of working days per week</th>
<th>Premium for night work (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Premium for work on weekly rest day (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Restrictions on overtime work?</th>
<th>Paid annual leave (working days)</th>
<th>Restrictions on night work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on overtime work for non-nursing women doing same night hours as men?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekly holiday work for non-nursing women doing same night hours as men?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,565.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>393.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Beijing)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>290.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Shanghai)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>353.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>267.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>198.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>588.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>497.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1,076.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>559.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>344.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>334.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>434.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>252.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>745.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>533.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>296.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2,026.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1,765.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy rules</td>
<td>Redundancy cost</td>
<td>Job quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure due to redundancy allowed by law?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party notification if 1 worker is dismissed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party approval if 1 worker is dismissed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party notification if 9 workers are dismissed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party approval if 9 workers are dismissed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining or reassignment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority rules for redundancies?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority rules for reemployment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice period for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance pay for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal remuneration for work of equal value?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender non-discrimination in hiring?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid/unpaid maternity leave mandated by law?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum length of maternity leave (calendar days)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive 100% of wages on maternity leave?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum duration of contribution period (in months) for unemployment protection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether an unemployment protection scheme exists after one year of employment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum duration of contribution period (in months) for unemployment protection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</td>
<td>Maximum length of fixed-term contract (months)</td>
<td>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</td>
<td>Maximum length of probationary period (months)</td>
<td>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker</td>
<td>Maximum number of working days per week</td>
<td>Premium for night work (% of hourly pay)</td>
<td>Premium for work on weekly rest day (% of hourly pay)</td>
<td>Restrictions on on night work?</td>
<td>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</td>
<td>Restrictions on overtime work?</td>
<td>Restrictions on work the same night hours as men</td>
<td>Restrictions on work the same night hours as women</td>
<td>Paid annual leave (working days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,736.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>687.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>250.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>411.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>154.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>460.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>855.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>465.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2,079.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Delhi)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>217.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Mumbai)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (Jakarta)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>248.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (Surabaya)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>300.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,832.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,280.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>1,973.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>213.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (Osaka)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,329.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (Tokyo)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,403.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>299.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>233.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>967.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>198.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy rules</td>
<td>Redundancy cost</td>
<td>Job quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Data for each column represents the proportion of countries with the given regulatory feature.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</th>
<th>Maximum length of fixed-term contract (months)</th>
<th>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</th>
<th>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker</th>
<th>Maximum length of probationary period (months)</th>
<th>Maximum number of working days per week</th>
<th>Premium for night work (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Premium for work on weekly rest day (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Restrictions on night work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on overtime work?</th>
<th>Paid annual leave (working days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>434.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>438.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>141.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>323.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>433.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2,764.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia, FYR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>262.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>257.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>837.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>517.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>236.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (Mexico City)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (Monterrey)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia, Fed. Sts.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>361.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>268.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>931.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,942.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy rules</td>
<td>Redundancy cost</td>
<td>Job quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal due to redundancy allowed by law?</td>
<td>Third-party notification if 1 worker is dismissed?</td>
<td>Third-party approval if 9 workers are dismissed?</td>
<td>Retraining or reassignment?</td>
<td>Priority rules for redundancies?</td>
<td>Priority rules for reemployment?</td>
<td>Notice period for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)?</td>
<td>Severance pay for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)?</td>
<td>Equal remuneration for work of equal value?</td>
<td>Gender non-discrimination in hiring?</td>
<td>Paid/unpaid maternity leave mandated by law?</td>
<td>Minimum length of maternity leave (calendar days)?</td>
<td>Receive 100% of wages on maternity leave?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LABOR MARKET REGULATION DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</th>
<th>Maximum length of fixed-term contract (months)</th>
<th>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</th>
<th>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker</th>
<th>Maximum length of probationary period (months)</th>
<th>Maximum number of working days per week</th>
<th>Premium for night work (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Premium for work on weekly rest day (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Premium for overtime work (% of hourly pay)</th>
<th>Restrictions on night work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on weekend work?</th>
<th>Restrictions on overtime work?</th>
<th>Paid annual leave (working days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>227.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria (Kano)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria (Lagos)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>3,286.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>845.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan (Karachi)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan (Lahore)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>693.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>558.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>365.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>258.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>293.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>540.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>735.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico (U.S.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,256.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>365.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (Moscow)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>299.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (St. Petersburg)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>272.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>207.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2,147.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>160.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>212.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>575.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</td>
<td>Maximum length of fixed-term contract (months)</td>
<td>Minimum wage for a cashier, age 19, with one year of work experience (US$/month)</td>
<td>Ratio of minimum wage to value added per worker</td>
<td>Maximum length of probationary period (months)</td>
<td>Maximum number of working days per week</td>
<td>Premium for night work (% of hourly pay)</td>
<td>Premium for work on weekly rest day (% of hourly pay)</td>
<td>Restrictions on night work?</td>
<td>Restrictions on weekly holiday work?</td>
<td>Restrictions on overtime work?</td>
<td>Restrictions on annual leave (working days)</td>
<td>Paid annual leave (working days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>502.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>919.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>285.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1,005.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>563.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>311.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>215.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>649.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>229.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga¹</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>411.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>243.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>616.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>1,409.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal due to redundancy allowed by law?</td>
<td>Third-party notification if 1 worker is dismissed?</td>
<td>Third-party approval if 9 workers are dismissed?</td>
<td>Retraining or reassignment?</td>
<td>Priority rules for redundancies?</td>
<td>Priority rules for reemployment?</td>
<td>Notice period for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)</td>
<td>Severance pay for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)</td>
<td>Equal remuneration for work of equal value?</td>
<td>Gender non-discrimination in hiring?</td>
<td>Paid/unpaid maternity leave mandated by law?</td>
<td>Minimum length of maternity leave (calendar days)</td>
<td>Receive 100% of wages on maternity leave?</td>
<td>Availability of five fully paid days of sick leave?</td>
<td>Whether an unemployment protection scheme exists after one year of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LABOR MARKET REGULATION DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Hiring</th>
<th>Working hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed-term contracts prohibited for permanent tasks?</td>
<td>Maximum number of fixed-term contracts (months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (New York City)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela, RBh</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- **a.** Including renewals.
- **b.** Economies for which 0.0 is shown have no minimum wage in the private sector.
- **c.** Some answers are not applicable (n.a.) for economies in which there is no statutory provision for a probationary period.
- **d.** Average for workers with 1, 5 and 10 years of tenure.
- **e.** Whether the law requires the employer to reassign or retrain a worker before making the worker redundant.
- **f.** If no maternity leave is mandated by law, parental leave is measured if applicable.
- **g.** The minimum number of days that legally have to be paid by the government, the employer or both.
- **h.** Some answers are not applicable (n.a.) for economies where dismissal due to redundancy is disallowed.
- **i.** Some answers are not applicable (n.a.) for economies that do not have an unemployment protection scheme.

The following data were collected jointly with the World Bank Group’s Women, Business and the Law team:

- Can non-pregnant and non-nursing women work the same night hours as men?
- Equal remuneration for work of equal value?
- Gender non-discrimination in hiring?
- Paid/unpaid maternity leave mandated by law?
- Minimum length of maternity leave (calendar days)?
- Receive 100% of wages on maternity leave?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redundancy rules</th>
<th>Redundancy cost</th>
<th>Job quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal due to redundancy allowed by law?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party notification if 1 worker is dismissed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party approval if 9 workers are dismissed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy reassignment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice period for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance pay for redundancy dismissal (weeks of salary)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority rules for redundancies?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority rules for reemployment?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum length of contribution period (in months) for unemployment protection after one year of employment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum duration of unemployment (calendar days)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Danko Markovinović
STATE GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION

Josip Martinčić
WOLF THESS

Iva Masten
VIDAN ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Tina Matić
TINA MATIĆ LAW OFFICE

Darijan Metrić
VARAŽDIN COUNTY

Damir Milić
THE CITY OF VARAŽDIN

Andrea Mrčela
BOŽIC & PARTNERS

Zeljana Muslim
FINANCIAL AGENCY – HITRO. HR CENTER

Dominik Muslin
DIVJAK, TOPC & BAHTRAJEVIĆ

Vladimir Noiš
EY SAVETOVANJE D.O.O.

Jelena Orlic
WOLF THESS

Marina Pavić
PRALJAK & SVČ

Josip Perić
BOŽIC & PARTNERS

Igor Perić
HIGH COMMERCIAL COURT OF
THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

Jelena Pintal
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Ivan Ploča
ŠAVORČ & PARTNERS

Miroslav Plaš
ŽURIC I PARTNERI D.O.O.

Ljupko Pudov
CROATIAN NOTARIES CHAMBER

Marko Praljak
PRALJAK & SVČ

Branimir Puškar
KÖPER & PARTNER LAW FIRM

Hrvoje Radić
USKUPAR & ŠIRBAR
RADIC LAW FIRM

Josipa Rebić
EY SAVETOVANJE D.O.O.

Tihana Ana Reljic
VIDAN ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Sanja Rodek
LEKO I PARTNERI
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Boris Savorič
ŠAVORČ & PARTNERS

Katrina Savuk
ODVJETNIČKO DRUŠTVO
GLUNSKA & MŠKOVIĆ D.O.O.

Slaven Šegel
ŠEGEL LAW OFFICE

Zvonimir Sever
CROATIAN CHAMBER OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

Dino Simonovski
ŽURIC I PARTNERI D.O.O.

Dušanka Simunović
CROATIAN CHAMBER
OF ARCHITECTS

Ani-Marija Skoko
BARDEK, LSAC, MŠLEC, SKOKO D.O.O. IN
COORDINATION WITH CMS
RECHROHRWIG HANZ
RECHSANWÄLTE GMBH

Valentina Sokol
KÖPER & PARTNER LAW FIRM

Alan Stopić
ALAN SORIC & ALEKSANDRA
TOMKOVIĆ DUNDA
LAW OFFICE

Morena Štolarči
GUZGURJAN & ŠIRBAR
RADIC LAW FIRM

Irena Štribar Radić
GUZGURJAN & ŠIRBAR
RADIC LAW FIRM

Marko Stilinović
CAĆIC & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Jana Stranžarević
CAĆIC & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Vlatko Subotić
MINISTRY OF LABOUR
AND PENSION SYSTEM

Ivana Sučević-Sorčić
MINISTAR

Goranika Sumonja Laktić
LAKTIC & PARTNERS
LAW FIRM LTD.

Marin Švobič
PRALJAK & SVČ

Tea Talabčić
MADRAZZA & PARTNERS

Anca Udajt
PRALJAK & SVČ

Luka Urbanc
ODVJETNIČKO DRUŠTVO
GLUNSKA & MŠKOVIĆ D.O.O.

Hrvoje Vidian
VIDAN ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Igor Vidian
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Željko Vitan
HEP DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM
OPERATOR LTD.

Mario Vukelić
HIGH COMMERCIAL COURT OF
THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

Petar Zivković
DIVJAK, TOPC & BAHTRAJEVIĆ

Jelena Zivković
MŠKOVIĆ & PARTNERS LTD.

Božko Zlopača
CUSTOMS DIRECTORATE OF
CROATIA

Andrež Žmikčić
DIVJAK, TOPC & BAHTRAJEVIĆ
LAW FIRM

Ivan Zornada
WOLF THESS

Anamarić Zuvanic
ODVJETNIČKO DRUŠTVO
GLUNSKA & MŠKOVIĆ D.O.O.

CYPRUS

DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMS & EXCISE

Olga Adamidou
ANTS TRADAFILIDES & SONS LLC

Achilleas Armosouio
ARTEMIS BANK INFORMATION
SYSTEMS LTD.

Irene Anastasiou
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR

Irene Anastasiou
DR. K. CHRYSOSTOMIDES
& CO. LLC

Andreas Andreou
CYPRUS GLOBAL LOGISTICS

Marios Andreou
PWC CYPRUS

Chryso Antoniou
ALEXANDROS ECONOMOU LLC

Ioanna Apostolidou
MINISTRY OF FINANCE,
TAX DEPARTMENT

Katia Argyridou
PWC CYPRUS

Pavlos Aristeidou
HARNEYS

Anita Boyadjian
INFOCREDIT GROUP LTD.

Charalambos Charalambous
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR

Georgia P. Charalambous
DELOITE

Harry S. Charalambous
KPMG

Hadjinicolaou Christina
MINISTRY OF FINANCE,
TAX DEPARTMENT

Antonis Christodoulides
PWC CYPRUS

Stavros Christofili
KPMG

Constantinos Cristofides

Kypros Chrysostomides
DR. K. CHRYSOSTOMIDES
& CO. LLC

Chrysostomos Chrysostomou
TOWN PLANNING AND
HOUSING DEPARTMENT

Chryso Dekaris
DR. K. CHRYSOSTOMIDES
& CO. LLC

Achilleas Demetriades
LELOS P. DEMETRIADES
LAW OFFICE LLC

Eleni DrouSSIOTI
DR. K. CHRYSOSTOMIDES
& CO. LLC

Alexandros Economou
ALEXANDROS ECONOMOU LLC

Leffers S. Eleftheriou
CYPRUS INVESTMENT
PROMOTION AGENCY

Elikkos Elia
DEPARTMENT OF LANDS
AND SURVEYS
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Shirin Ozra Entezari
DR. SHIRIN O. ENTZEZARI & ASSOCIATES

Seyyed Amir Hossein Etesami
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ORGANIZATION OF IRAN

Shahin Fadakar
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Soroosh Falahati
BAYAN EMROOZ INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM

Alahyar Ghajar
TEHRAN MUNICIPALITY - FANAVARIAN SHAHR CO.

Nasim Ghedi
GHEDI & ASSOCIATES LAW OFFICE

S. Arash H. Mirmalek
PERSOL CORPORATION

Amir Hosseini
PERSOL CORPORATION

Nasim Jafarian
GREAT TEHRAN ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION COMPANY (GETEDC)

Mohammad Jallal
IRAN GreatScoring

Jafar Jamali
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ORGANIZATION OF IRAN

Hossein Kakhi
IRAN CUSTOMS OFFICE

Farid Kari
ATEN ASSOCIATES

Majid Mahallati
A.M. MAHALATI & CO.

Gholam Reza Malekshoar
CENTRAL BANK OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Mahnaz Mehrinfar
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Fatemeh Sadat Mirshafi
MINISTRY OF COMMERCES

Ali Mirzaie
STATE ORGANIZATION FOR REGISTRATION OF DEEDS AND PROPERTIES

Golazin Mokhtari
ATEN ASSOCIATES

Hamideh Mokhtarian
Mehr INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM

Mehdi Mousavi
PERSOL CORPORATION

Vahid Nasiri
BAYAN EMROOZ INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM

Farba Norouzi
PARSIAN INSURANCE CO.

Rasoul Norouzi
Zohreh Papi
CENTRAL BANK OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Farmand Pourkarmi
TEHRAN MUNICIPALITY - FANAVARIAN SHAHR CO.

Mohammad Rahmani
BAYAN EMROOZ INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM

Yahya Rayegani
PRAELEGAL IRAN

Atiyeh Rezaei
DR. SHIRIN O. ENTZEZARI & ASSOCIATES

Negin Saberi
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Emadaliin Sazlhei
MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AND FINANCE AFFAIRS

Enqeyh Seyed Sadri
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Ahmad Shabanifard
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AUSTRALIA

Sara Shabanifard
RS COMPONENT

Khatereh Shababazi
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Farzan Shirvanbeigi
TEHRAN MUNICIPALITY - FANAVARIAN SHAHR CO.

Rajat Ratan Sinha
RCS LTD. BUSINESS ADVISORS GROUP

Pedram Soltani
PERSOL CORPORATION

Sepideh Taheri
STATE ORGANIZATION FOR REGISTRATION OF DEEDS AND PROPERTIES

Mohammad Reza Talsi
PERSOL CORPORATION

Ebrahim Tavakoli
BARTAR ASSOCIATES LAW FIRM

Vrej Torossian
TORASSIAN, AVANASSIAN & ASSOCIATES

Gholam Hossein Vahid
DR. VAHIDI & ASSOCIATES

Zohreh Yazdani Paraei
ENGINEER

Ahmad Yousefi
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

Parham Zahedi
GHEDI & ASSOCIATES LAW OFFICE

Hamed Zamani
BARTAR ASSOCIATES LAW FIRM

Elham Zaree
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

IRAQ

EY

GEZARI TRANSPORT IRAGI COMPANY LTD.

Ahmed Abboud Al Janabi
MENA ASSOCIATES, MEMBER OF AMERELLER RECHTSANWÄLTE

Abdulaziz Jabbar Abdulaziz COMPANY REGISTRAR DIRECTOR GENERAL

Mohammad Rasool Jaber
Riyadh Hassan Japak

Shahad Jassim
BHC LAW FIRM LLC

Deepak John
BRIDGEWAY SHIPPING & CLEARING SERVICES

Jwad Kadhim Kareem
AL-SHAMS SHOW

Mohammad Khalil
Ahmed Abbas Khaereem
Mohammad Khaereem
Zaid Mahdi
ADIB COMPANY

Modher Taha Majeed
AL TAMIM & COMPANY ADVOCATES & LEGAL CONSULTANTS

Hassan Melli
HASSAN MEIJI
Ali Mohammad Kanbar
Khalid Mozafar
AL MOAZAN COMPANIES GROUP

Rasha Nadeem
BHC LAW FIRM LLC

Adnan K. Nahidi
SIYAH GROUP

Ammar Najj
CONFLUENT LAW GROUP

Tom Nolda
CONFLUENT LAW GROUP

Ammar Rakabide
AMMAR RALOBBE

Akram Saeed
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

Dhirar Salim
KASB GENERAL CONTRACTING

Kareem Salim Kamash
GENERAL COMMISSION FOR TAXES

Mohammed Mustafa Sami
PROGER SPA

Ahmed Saeude
AHMED SAEUDE

Abdelrahman Sheriff
DLA MATOUK BASSOUNY (PART OF DLA PIPER GROUP)

Stephan Stephen
PWC JORDAN

Khalede Yaseen
JORDANIAN ADVISERS & LEGAL SERVICES

Dahia Zamel
MENA ASSOCIATES, MEMBER OF AMERELLER RECHTSANWÄLTE

Haythem Zayed
PWC JORDAN

IRELAND

ESB INTERNATIONAL

Seán Barton
MCCANN FITZGERALD

John Comerford
COONEY CAREY CONSULTING LTD. - MEMBER OF RUSSELL BERDNI INTERNATIONAL

Miranda Cox
IP RESOURCES

Emma Doherty
MATHESON

Gavin Doherty
EUGENE F. COLLINS SOLICITORS

Gillian Duly
LK SNELLING SOLICITORS, MEMBER OF IUS LABORS

Kenneth Egan
ARThUR COX, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI

Garret Farrell
MATHESON

Laura Feely
EUGENE F. COLLINS SOLICITORS
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Mohammad Zamroni
ZAMRO LAW FIRM

Jacob Zwaan
KPMG

IRAN, ISLAMIC REP.

TRADE PROMOTION ORGANIZATION OF IRAN

Sahra Aalidatlab
STATE ORGANIZATION FOR REGISTRATION OF DEEDS AND PROPERTIES

Carmella Abdolzamad
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Morteza Adab
COMPANY REGISTRATION OFFICE

Ali Ahmad
TEHRAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INDUSTRIES AND MINES

Mousa Ahmadi
ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY

Behrooz Akhlaghi
INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Hamidreza Alipour Shirsavar
ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY

Sepideh Dowlatshahi
OF Gholam Ali Asghari

Ali Amani
DAYA-RAHYAT AUDITING & MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Gholam Ali Asghari
DAYA-RAHYAT AUDITING & MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Zohreh Yazdani Paraei

Laura Feely

Emadaldin Sakhaei

Seyyed Ali Mousavi

Rafeef Hadeed

Mohammed Al-Badri

Hussein Al-Hadeethi

Qussay Jafar Al Alawi

Atiyeh Rezaei

Shahraneh Davani

Hamed Zamani

BARTAR ASSOCIATES LAW FIRM

Solfie Djalgharbeiki

TORKOSNIAN, AVANESIAN & ASSOCIATES

Saeidh Dowlatshahi

BARTAR ASSOCIATES LAW FIRM

Maryam Ebharmi

DENTONS

Maryam Ebharmi Ghaelaezizi

STATE ORGANIZATION FOR REGISTRATION OF DEEDS AND PROPERTIES

Roza Enifar

INTERNATIONAL LAW OFFICE OF DR. BEHRROOZ AKHLAGHI & ASSOCIATES

Zohreh Yazdani Paraei

Rasol Norouzi

Farba Norouzi

Parsiun Insurance Co.

Rasoul Norouzi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Younes Jalal
TRANST JALAL

Nadia Kettani
KETTANI LAW FIRM

Rita Kettani
KETTANI LAW FIRM

Yassir Khalil
YASSIR KHALIL STUDIO

Abdelatif Lahmami
LAHMAMI LAW OFFICE

Hakim Lahou
LAHOUZI-ZOUCHI & ASSOCIES

Mhammed Lahou
ETUDE DE NOTARIAT MODERNE

Zineb Laraki
CABINET ZINEB LARAKI

Mohamed Amine Mahboub
ETUDE DE MEHBOUB

Amine Mahfoud
AMINE MAHFOUD NOTAIRE

Nouredine Marouk
PWC ADVISORY MAROC

Aldi Morsad
CABINET D’AVOCATS MOIRASS

Ahmed Morsad
CABINET D’AVOCATS MOIRASS

Tayeb Mohamed Omar
AVOCAT AU BARREAU DE CASABLANCA

Hicham Oughza
DAR ALKHLIBA

Mohamed Ouakhiou
CHASSAN WATERLOOT & ASSOCIES

Abderrahim Outass
FONCTION LIBERALE

Mohamed Rififi
PWC ADVISORY MAROC

Morgane Saint-Jalms

Mehdil Salmouni-Zerhoune
SALMOUNI-ZERHOUNI LAW FIRM

Ghalia Sebti
AIT MANOS

Farhat Smail
ADMINISTRATION DES DOUANES ET IMPOTS INDIRECTS

Rachid Tahri
ASSOCIATION DES FREIGHT FORWARDERS DU MAROC

Rim Tazi
LPG-CEG AVOCATS

Kenza Yamani
CHASSAN WATERLOOT & ASSOCIES

Amine Zniber
ETUDE DE NOTAIRE ZNIBER

Meryem Zoubir
CHASSAN WATERLOOT & ASSOCIES

MOZAMBIQUE

Henrique Castro Amaro
AMARO ARQUITECTOS E ASSOCIADOS LDA

Carolina Balate
PWC MOZAMBIQUE

Goncalo Barros Cardoso
GUILHERME DANIEL & ASSOCIADOS

Ebrahim Bihkha
PWC MOZAMBIQUE

Abubacar Calu
ELECTROVISO LDA

Eduardo Calu
SAL & CALDEIRA, ADVOCADOS, LDA

Alexandra Carvalho
Monjardino

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

Natifício Chambule
MAPUTO CITY COURT
(COMMERCIAL CHAMBER)

Pedro Chilenge
MOTX MACDONALD PDNA MOZAMBIQUE, LDA

Pedro Couto
CGA - COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS

Avelar da Silva
INTERTEK INTERNATIONAL LTD.

Theria Dal
CGA - COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS

Guilherme Daniel
GUILHERME DANIEL & ASSOCIADOS

Fabricia de Almeida Henrique Henrique
HENRIQUES, ROCHA & ASSOCIADOS (MOZAMBIQUE LEGAL CIRCLE ADVOCADOS)

Arildia de Lurdes Nhingu
CONSERVATORIA DO REGISTO DAS ENTIDADES LEGAIS

Alenio Ogode
FL&A - FERNANDA LOPES & ASSOCIADOS ADVOCADOS

Fulgencio Dimande
MANCA FREIGHT SERVICES SARL

Teresa Empli Falcão
VDA - VIIRA DE ALMEIDA & ASSOCIADOS

Ahmed Essak
PWC MOZAMBIQUE

Vanessa Fernandes
CGA - COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS

Telmo Ferreira
CGA - COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS

Maria Fatima Fonseca
MAPUTO CITY COURT
(COMMERCIAL CHAMBER)

Pinto Fulan
BANCO DE MOZAMBIQUE

Nipul K. Govan
HENRIQUES, ROCHA & ASSOCIADOS (MOZAMBIQUE LEGAL CIRCLE ADVOCADOS)

Jorge Graça
CGA - COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS

Abdul Satar Hamid
BDO MOZAMBIQUE

Zara Jamal
JLA

Adriano João
PWC MOZAMBIQUE

Katia Jussub
CMBA - CARLOS MARTINES & ASSOCIADOS

Girma Langa
SAL & CALDEIRA, ADVOCADOS, LDA

Rui Loforte
CGA - COUTO, GRAÇA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS

B. Longamane
FL&A - FERNANDA LOPES & ASSOCIADOS ADVOCADOS

Fernanda Lopes
FL&A - FERNANDA LOPES & ASSOCIADOS ADVOCADOS

Mara Lopes
HENRIQUES, ROCHA & ASSOCIADOS (MOZAMBIQUE LEGAL CIRCLE ADVOCADOS)

Eugenio Luis
BANCO DE MOZAMBIQUE

Duarte Marques da Cruz
MCMZ - SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS RL

Vitor Marques da Cruz
MCMZ - SOCiedade DE ADVOGADOS RL

Stayfer Marroquin
MARROQUIN, RUTUMULA, MAGCA & ASSOCIADOS

Carlos Martins
CMBA - CARLOS MARTINES & ASSOCIADOS

João Martins
PWC MOZAMBIQUE

Tiago Martins
TRANSATLясь GLOBAL LOGISTICS

João Mário Moreira
VDA - VIIRA DE ALMEIDA & ASSOCIADOS

Ana Berta Mauzne
HENRIQUES, ROCHA & ASSOCIADOS (MOZAMBIQUE LEGAL CIRCLE ADVOCADOS)

Jean-Louis Neves Mandelli
SHERMAN & STERLING LLP

Ildo Nhambanha
BDO MOZAMBIQUE

Kebabot Patel
CONFEDERAÇÃO DAS ASSOCIAÇÕES ECONOMICAS DE MOZAMBIQUE (CTA)

Diana Ramalho
SAL & CALDEIRA, ADVOCADOS, LDA

Aradano Ricardo
ELECTROAMBI

Christopher Tanner
PWC ADVOCATOR

Acacio Tember
MOTX MACDONALD PDNA MOZAMBIQUE, LDA

Constanço Tevete
FL&A - FERNANDA LOPES & ASSOCIADOS ADVOCADOS

Lluvia Tavalo
MANCA FREIGHT SERVICES SARL

Cesar Vamos Ver
SAL & CALDEIRA, ADVOCADOS, LDA

Ricardo Veloso
PWC ANGOLA

Joaquim VilaCulgos
FL&A - FERNANDA LOPES & ASSOCIADOS ADVOCADOS

MYANMAR

AGX LOGISTICS

DUANE MORRIS & SELVAM LLP

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS MYANMAR CO. LTD.

RAJAH & TANN LLP

Quamaruddin Ahmed
BAY LINE SHIPPING PTE. LTD.

Mar Mar Aung
DFDL

Sam Britton
ZICOLAW MYANMAR LTD.

Sher Hann Chuah
TILLEKE & GIBBINS MYANMAR LTD.

William Greenlee
DFDL

Yu Lin Khoo
ZICOLAW MYANMAR LTD.

Nay Myo Myat Ko
CARE FREIGHT SERVICES LTD.

U Moe Kyaw Aye
YANMAR CUSTOMS

Yan Lin
YANSON CITY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BOARDS

Jean Lui
VDB LOI

Ah Lonn Maung
DFDL

Myo Min
YANSON CITY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BOARDS

Nila Mu
DICA

Mya Myint Zu
DFDL

Win Naing
WIN & CHOI LAW FIRM

Nwe Oo
TILLEKE & GIBBINS MYANMAR LTD.

Su Wai Phyo
ZICOLAW MYANMAR LTD.

Key Pwint Phyo Wai
CARE FREIGHT SERVICES LTD.

U San Lwin
JLPM LEGAL SERVICES

Kyaw Soe Min
YANMAR AFRICA BANK

Cheah Swee Gim
KEVIN CHA, YANGON LTD.

Yuwaade Theenanngh
TILLEKE & GIBBINS MYANMAR LTD.

U Myint Than
MYINT THAN & SOI

Danyel Thomson
DFDL

Su Su Tin
WIN THIN & ASSOCIATES

Hnin Thein Wai
ZICOLAW MYANMAR LTD.

Lucy Wayne
LUCY WAYNE & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Hut Khaung Win
YANGON CITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Khin Phyu Win
MYANMAR GLOBAL LAW FIRM

Zaw Win
YANGON CITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Cho Cho Wynn
THILAVA SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Kyaw Ye Tun
MINISTRY OF FINANCE

NAMIBIA

Gino Abzai
KPMG ADVISORY SERVICES (NAMIBIA) PTY. LTD.

Joos Agenbach
KOEP & PARTNERS

Tiaan Bazuin
NAMIBIAN STOCK EXCHANGE

Adeline Beukes
STANDARD BANK NAMIBIA LIMITED

Daneale C. Beukes
ENGULF, STRITIER & PARTNERS

Clifford Bezuendehoung
ENGULF, STRITIER & PARTNERS

Benita Blume
H.D. BOSSAU & CO.

Hanno D. Bossau
H.D. BOSSAU & CO.

Stephanie Busch
ENSARIF | NAMIBIA

Andy Chase
STALCH & PARTNERS

Eli Chase
ADVOCATE

Dirk Hendrik Conradie
CONRADIE & DAMASEB

Myra Craven
ENS

André Davids
MAERSK NAMIBIA PTY. LTD.

Britt du Plessis
STANDARD BANK NAMIBIA

Marcha Erni
TRANSUNION

Johann Espag
CLARKE ARCHITECTS

Ulrich Ettold
ETZOLD-DUENHAGE FIRM

Stefan Hugo
PWC NAMIBIA

Frank Köppinger
KÖPPINGER BOLTMAN

Norbert Liebich
TRANSWORLD CARGO PTY. LTD.

Ammen Lück
PWC NAMIBIA
Usha Pandey
PRADHAN, GHIMRE & ASSOCIATES
Dev Raj Paudyal
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND
Devendra Pradhan
PRADHAN, GHIMRE & ASSOCIATES
Rajan Sharma
NEPAL FREIGHT FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION
P. L. Shrestha
EVERGREEN CARGO SERVICES PVT. LTD.
Rajeshwor Shrestha
Sinha VERMA LAW CONCERN
Ranjit Shrestha
PRADHAN, GHIMRE & ASSOCIATES
Suman Lal Shrestha
H.R. LOGISTIC PVT. LTD.
Mahesh Kumar Thapa
Sinha VERMA LAW CONCERN

NETHERLANDS

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
Joost Achterberg
KENNEDY VAN DER LAAN
Maarten Appels
VAN DOORNE NV
Ruud Bernsden
LIAAND
Gert Jan Boeve
VAN BENTHEM & KEULEN NV
Reint Bolhuis
AKD LAWYERS & CIVIL LAW NOTARIES
Mattieh Bolkenski
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND BV
Roland Brandsma
PWC NETHERLANDS
Ate Bremmer
KENNEDY VAN DER LAAN
Martin Brink
VAN BENTHEM & KEULEN NV
Margriet de Boer
JUST LEGAL ADVOCATUUR BV
Winkeke de Gelder
PWC NETHERLANDS
Taco de Lange
AKD LAWYERS & CIVIL LAW NOTARIES
Rolof de Weij
HOUTHOF BURUMA
Marc Diepstraten
PWC NETHERLANDS
Mengo Duin
VERENIGING VAN ROTTERDAMSE CARGOADRES
Sharon Edoo
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND BV
Noël Ellens
FRUYTIER LAWYERS IN BUSINESS
Arijan Ennema
EKAMATX BV
Jan Hockx
LEXENCE
Mick Hurks
HÖCKER ADVOCATEN
Niels Huurdeman
HOUTHOF BURUMA
Marcel Kettenis
PVC NETHERLANDS
Edwin M.A.J. Kleeistra
STOIJ-KABP ADVISEURS EN ACCOUNTANTS BV
Christian Koedam
PVC NETHERLANDS
Gerard Koster
BAKER & MCKENZIE AMSTERDAM NV
Thomas Kraan
STICHTING BUREAU KREDIET REGISTRATIE
Andrej Kvitowskii
AKADIS BV
Martijn Lentz
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
Lucas Lustermans
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND BV
Danique Meijer
HKV STEVENS LEGAL BV
Sharoon Neven
PWC NETHERLANDS
Matthias Noolander
AUTHORITY FOR CONSUMERS AND MARKETS
Peter Plug
OFFICE OF ENERGY REGULATION
Hugo Reumink
VAN DOORNE NV
Jan Wijlem Schenk
HKV STEVENS LEGAL BV
Rutger Schimmelpenninck
HOUTHOF BURUMA
Jack Schrijver
BAKER & MCKENZIE AMSTERDAM NV
Maaike Sips
PWC NETHERLANDS
Fedor Tarike
BAKER & MCKENZIE AMSTERDAM NV
Manon Uitert
PWC NETHERLANDS
Kor Van Dijk
BAKER & MCKENZIE AMSTERDAM NV
Gert-Jan van Gijs
VAT LOGISTICS (OCEAN FREIGHT) BV
Wies van Kesteren
DE BRAWIJ BLACKSTONE WESTBROEK
Usbrand Van Straten
STIBBE
Frederic Verhoeven
HOUTHOF BURUMA
Janine Verweij
OFFICE OF ENERGY REGULATION
Reinout Vriesendorp
DE BRAUW BLACKSTONE WESTBROEK
Floris-Jan Werners
VAN DOORNE NV
Stephan Westera
LEXENCE
Marnel Willems
FIELDSHIRER NV
Bianco Witjes
LUNAED
Bob Zondervijk
VAN DOORNE NV

NEW ZEALAND

RSM NEW ZEALAND (AUCKLAND)
Mo Al Obaidi
HEKSET HENRY LAWYERS
Michael Brosnan
MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT
Daniel Brunt
NEW ZEALAND CUSTOMS SERVICE
Paul Chambers
ANDERSON CREAGH LAL LIMITED
Philip Coombe
PANALPINA WORLD TRANSPORT LLP
Robyn Cox
MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT
George Cuker
PWC NEW ZEALAND
John Cuthbertson
PWC NEW ZEALAND
Matthew Davie
BILL GULLY
Corey Dixon
PWC NEW ZEALAND
Laura Drake
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Igor Drinkovic
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Ashton Dunn
ASTECH ELECTRICAL LTD.
Jonathan Embil
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Alexandra Flaus
WEBB HENDERSON
Michael Gartshore
WEBB HENDERSON
Ian Gault
BILL GULLY
Tony Gault
PWC NEW ZEALAND
Syvaie Ghany
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Lucy Harris
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
James Hawes
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Matthew Kersey
RUSSELL MCVEAGH
Jeffrey Lai
ANDERSON CREAGH LAL LIMITED
Kate Lane
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Michael Langdon
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Alex MacDuff
RUSSELL MCVEAGH
Annaliese Mcintyre
WEBB HENDERSON
Andrew Minturn
QUALTECH INTERNATIONAL LTD.
Phillipa Muir
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Robert Muir
LAND INFORMATION NEW ZEALAND
Ian Page
BRANZ
Mihai Pascaru
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Jose Paul
AUCKLAND CITY COUNCIL
Marcus Plage
RUSSELL MCVEAGH
Silvana Schenone
MINDER ELLISON RUDD WATTS
Kelvin Sue
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Andrew Tetzlaff
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Jennifer Tunna
LOWINDES
Denny Upton
SIMPSON GRIESON, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Simon Vannini
Mike Whale
LOWINDES

NICARAGUA

Guillermo Abella
INTERMIDAL | CMA CGM
Samantha Aguilar
LATAKAY NICARAGUA
Yara Valeria Aleamán Sequera
ARIAS LAW
Bernardo Araus
BAUERS & LOGISTICS
Huberto Argüello
 CETREX
Alfredo Artiles
KPMG
Maria Alejandra Aubert
Carcamo
GARCA & BOGDAN
Juan Ramon Aviles Molina
LAWYER
Soledad Balladares
SUPERINTENDENCIA DE BANCOS
Henrik Bang
EXPORTADORA ATLANTIC SA
Ana Carolina Baquero Urroz
LATIN ALLIANCE
Minerva Adriana Bellorín Rodriguez
PACHECO COTO
Flavio Andrés Berrios Zepeda
MULTIKONSULT & CIA LTDA
Blanca Buitrago
GARCA & BOGDAN
Edmundo Castillo
EXPERTS CASTILLO Y FIALLOS
Francisco Castro
PWC NICARAGUA
Brenda Darce
CETREX
Maricarmen Espinosa de Molina
MOLINA & ASOCIADOS CENTRAL LAW
Ana Gabriel Espinoza
ARIAS LAW
Maria Antonieta Fiallos
EXPERTS CASTILLO Y FIALLOS
DOING BUSINESS 2018

Anum Azhar
CADD
Faiz-ul Hassan
Asma Hameed Khan
Asma Ghayoor
Salman Chima
Sawad Baluch
Akeel Bilgrami
Muhammad Awais
Huma Ejaz Zaman
Ahsan Hameed Bhatti
Lahore Waste Management Company
Naim Bilgrami
Collaborative Pvt. Ltd.
Huzaima Bukhari
Ajinomoto
Akhtar Bilgrami
EY
Muhammad Ali Seena
Ameena Suhail
Haris Syed Raza
Ameena Suhail
Movahed Mosqueed
Sadia Qureshi
Azeem Majeed
Mawra Ather
Khizar Hayat
Danyal Agencies
Dilawar Hussain
DS Engineering Services
Shaukat Hussain
Syed Intizar Hussain
Ali Haider Motors (Pvt.) Ltd.
Ashaq Iqbal
Qureshi Law Associates
Hasan Irfan Khan
Irfan & Irfan
Fiza Islam
Legis Inn Attorneys & Corporate Consultants
Muzaffar Islam
Legis Inn Attorneys & Corporate Consultants
Ilyas Jabbar
State Bank of Pakistan
Tariq Nasim Jan
Datacheck Pvt. Ltd.
Zafarullah Jan
Karachi International Container Terminal
Ismail Javed
Javed Umar Enterprises
Rubina Javed
Experts International
M. Javed Hassan
Experts International
Babar Kabir
MCC Port Qasim
Naim Karim
LMA Ebrahim Hossain, Barristers, Advocates & Corporate Legal Consultants
Habib Kazi
Khalid Anwer & Co.
Mayhar Kazi
Raja Bakhri Gillette Karachi
Afzal Ahmed Khan
Surridge & Beechano
Ahmad Shahzad Khan
Marium Associates
Ameer Khan
Indus Motors Co. Ltd.
Arif Khan
Qamar Abbas & Co.
Bilal Khan
Ali Haider Motors (Pvt.) Ltd.
Jahan Khan
Shaheen Logistics Pvt. Ltd.
Shehzab N. Khan
Raja Bakhri Gillette
Sharif Khan
MCC Port Qasim
Faiz Ullah Khan Niazi
Saad Rasso Law Associates
Misbah Kokab
TMT Law Services
Muhammad Saleem Kundi
Kund Services Ltd.
Ali Abbas Lali
Saad Rasso Law Associates
Irfan Majeed
Navien Exporters
Moshin Malik
Builders Associates Pvt. Ltd.
Nadeem Malik
Procon Engineering Pvt. Ltd., Part of Master Motor Corporation Pvt. Ltd.
Muhammad Mansoor
UF Logistics
Basheer Mehmoon
Qureshi Law Associates
Aitzaz Manzoor Memon
Raja Bakhri Gillette Karachi
Muhammad Mudassir
Advocate High Court
Syed Muhammad Ijaz
Huzaima & Ikram
Kashif Muzaffar
Legis Inn Attorneys & Corporate Consultants
Mohammad Nadeem
Procon Engineering Pvt. Ltd., Part of Master Motor Corporation Pvt. Ltd.
Muhammad Gohar Nawaz
Lahore Waste Management Company
Faryal Nazir
LMA Ebrahim Hossain, Barristers, Advocates & Corporate Legal Consultants
Omaimah Nazir
Ovais Patel
Datacheck Pvt. Ltd.
Ahmad Pervez Mirza
Architects Association
Faisal Perwaz Umer
Perwaz Umar Enterprises
Shahbakt Pirzada
Raja Bakhri Gillette Karachi
Khushbakt Qaiser
Qaiser & Abbas Attorneys & Corporate Counselors
Zafarish Qaiser
Qaiser & Abbas Attorneys & Corporate Counselors
Naveed Qamar
Procon Engineering Pvt. Ltd., Part of Master Motor Corporation Pvt. Ltd.
Adnan Qureshi
Qureshi Law Associates
Jawaid Qureshi
Pakistan International Container Terminal
Abdul Rahman
Qamar Abbas & Co.
Naseem Rahman
KPMG
Zaki Rahman
LMA Ebrahim Hossain, Barristers, Advocates & Corporate Legal Consultants
Arifan Rana
MCC Port Qasim
Kashif Rasheed
Pak Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.
Ghulam Rasool
Haider Shamsho & Co.
Muhammad Raza
Saad Rasso Law Associates
Tayyab Raza
TMT Law Services
Abdur Razaq
Qamar Abbas & Co.
Khalid A. Rehman
Surridge & Beechano
Saad Sabor
Ahmed Saeed
Saad Rasso Law Associates
Rana Saajid
Rana Iaj & Partners
Aftab Salahuddin
EY
Jawad A. Sarwana
Abraham & Sarwana
Shakil Sarwar
Ghandhara Nissan Ltd.
Mohammad Ali Seena
Surridge & Beechano
Zulfiquar Shah
Land Administration & Revenue Management Information System (LARMS)
Muhammad Shahid
Synthetic Products Enterprises Limited
Shabir Sharif
Mastradez
Arshad Shehzad
Taxpayers
Adnan Sheikh
Akram Sheikh Law Associates
Barrister Shereej
Akram Sheikh Law Associates
Muneeb Ahmed Sheikh
Mandviwalla & Zafar
Muhammad Siddique
Securities and Exchange Commission
Masood Siddiqui
Asharood & Bros
Ameena Suhail
Qureshi Law Associates
Haris Syed Raza
Gerry’s Dnata Pvt. Ltd.
Muhammad Tahir
State Bank of Pakistan
Wasqa Ahmed Taimeni
Deolite Younus Adil, Chartered Accountants
Ali Thaeem
Surridge & Beechano
Saif-ul-Hassan
EY
Farhan Ullah
Attorney
Fiza Usama
Legis Inn Attorneys & Corporate Consultants
Chaudhary Usman
LMA Ebrahim Hossain, Barristers, Advocates & Corporate Legal Consultants
Hana Yahyal
Saiduddin & Co.
Muhammad Yousuf
Haider Shamsi & Co., Chartered Accountants
Syed Zeezan Ali
EY
Palau
Jen Adan
CTSI Logistics
Kenneth Barden
Attorney-at-Law
Tito Cabungan
Palau Public Utility Corporation
Maria Cristina Castro
Western Caroline Trading Co.
Anthony Frazier
Sterling Gabriel
Bureau of Land And Surveys
Wilbert Cameran
Palau Shipping Company, Inc.
Mouias Kangchi
Koror State Government
Carlos Mariano
Carolso Mariano Law Firm
Ramsay Ngeribai
Koror Planning And Zoning Office
Tecair Ropamali
Bureau of Public Works
William L. Ridpath
William L. Ridpath, Attorney-at-law (Amcit)
V. Tike Sral
Financial Institutions Commission
Rhinehart Silas
Bureau of Revenue, Customs and Taxation
Ken Suguama
Palau Public Utility Corporation
Syrceous Tevalai
Bureau of Labour
Panama
Alvaro Aguilar
Lombard Agileur Group
Gabriel Aguilar
Lombard Agileur Group
Aristides Anguizola
Morgan & Morgan
Mercedes Aréuz de Grimaldo
Morgan & Morgan
Khatiya Avast
Patton, Moreno & Asvat
Fernando Aued
Patton, Moreno & Asvat
Francisco A. Barrios G.
PWC Panama
Gustavo Adolfo Bernal
Etesa
Klaus Bieberich Schreibl
Tax&Panama
Giovanna Cardellichio
APC Buró SA
Johanna Castillo
Arias Law

Akkil Hashmi
Synthetic Products Enterprises Limited
Saim Hashmi
Ahmed & Qazi
Faiz-ul Hassan
Land Administration & Revenue Management Information System (LARMIS)
Muhammad Hassan Bakhshi
Association of Builders and Developers of Pakistan (ABAD)
Khizer Hayat
Danyal Agencies
Muhammad Yousuf
Haider Shamsi & Co., Chartered Accountants
Syed Zeezan Ali
EY

EY

EY

EY

EY

EY

EY
Keliaki Soloi 
SOLO SURVEY SERVICES
Leilatuou T. Taimi 
INSTITUTION OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS SAMOA (IPES)
Leilani Va'a-Tamat 
VAAI HOGLAND & TAMATI LAW FIRM
Share Wulf 
MKW LAWYERS

**SAMOANA**

Reno Balsimelli 
UFFICIO URBANISTICA
Dennis Becarri 
AVV. ERIKA MARANI
Gian Luca Belluzzi 
STUDIO COMMERCIALE BELLUZZI
Gianna Burgagni 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE
Cecilia Cardogna 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE
Vincent Cecchetti 
CECCHETTI, ALBANI & ASSOCIATI
Debora Cenni
Alberto Chezzi
STUDIO CHEZZI
Marco Ciacci 
BANCA AGRICOLA
Sara Cupioli
UFFICIO TRIBUTARIO DELLA REPUBBLICA DI SAN MARINO
Alessandro de Mattia 
AZIENDA AUTONOMA DI STATO PER I SERVIZI PUBBLICI
Laura Ferretti
SEGRETARIO DI STATO INDUSTRIA ARTIGIANATO E COMMERCIO TRASPORTI E RICERCA - DIPARTIMENTO ECONOMIA
Marcello Forcellini
STUDIO CHEZI
Davide Gasperoni 
UFFICIO TRIBUTARIO DELLA REPUBBLICA DI SAN MARINO
Simone Gatti
WORLD LINE
Cinzia Guerretti
WORLD LINE
Anna Maria Lonferrini 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE LONFERRINI
Erika Marani 
AVV. ERIKA MARANI
Laura Mazza 
UFFICIO TECNICO DEL CATASTO
Daniela Mila
Gianluca Minguzzi 
ANTAO PROGETTI S.P.A.
Emanuela Montanari
Lorenzo Moretti 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE
Alfredo Nicolini
LAWYER
Sara Pelliccioni 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE
AVV. MAIITED MULARON - AL ASSOCIAZIONE CON BUSSOLETTI NUZZO & ASSOCIATI

Giuseppe Ragini 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE
Daniele Refi 
UFFICIO TECNICO DEL CATASTO
Marco Giancarlo Rossini 
STUDIO LEGALE E NOTARILE

**SÃO TOME AND PRÍNCIPE**

*AGER - AUTORIDADE GERAL DE REGULACAO*
CÂMARA DOS DESPACHANTES ORCADO - SÃO TOME E PRÍNCIPE
Antônio de Barros A. Aguilar
SOCOCGESC
Eudes Aguilar
AGUIAR & PEDRONI STUDIO
Adelino Amado Pereira 
AMADO PEREIRA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCIEDADE DE ADVOGADOS
André Aureliano Aragão 
JURUSCONSULTA & ADVOGADO
Nuno Barata
MIRANDA & ASSOCIADOS
Jeanne Batalha Ferreira 
PWC PORTUGAL
Lara Beirao
CENTRAL BANK OF SÃO TOME E PRÍNCIPE
Angelo De Jesus Bonfim 
AMADO PEREIRA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCIEDADE DE ADVOGADOS
Mira Botelho Bernardo 
TRIBUNAL DE 1A INSTANCIA DE SAO TOME (JUÍZ DE CIVEL)
Sukayna Bрагança
BANCO INTERNACIONAL DE SÃO TOME E PRÍNCIPE
Paula Caldeira Dutschmann 
MIRANDA & ASSOCIADOS
Jaime Carvalho Esteves 
PWC PORTUGAL
Tânia Cascas
MIRANDA & ASSOCIADOS
Mirian Castelo David Pontifício 
BANCO INTERNACIONAL DE SÃO TOME E PRÍNCIPE
Francisco Chibeles 
ECOMOVIL
Olinto Costa
DIRECTORATE OF TAXES
Inês Barbosa Cunha 
PWC PORTUGAL
Jaime de Oliveira 
ODL & ASSOCIADOS
Célia Deus Lima 
ODL & ASSOCIADOS
Cláudia do Carmo Santos 
MIRANDA & ASSOCIADOS
Stela dos Santos Soares 
POSSEER DA COSTA ADVOGADOS ASSOCIADOS

Abdulay Godinho 
DIRECÇÃO DOS REGISTOS E NOTARIAL DE SÃO TOME
Ronísima Gomez Santana 
BANCO INTERNACIONAL DE SÃO TOME E PRÍNCIPE
Fernando Lima da Trindade
MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS, GEOGRAPHICAL-CADASTRI, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND ENVIRONMENT
Pascoal Lima Dos Santos Daio 
LAWYER
João Mayer Moreira 
VDA - VIURA DE ALMEIDA & ASSOCIADOS
Helander Ross Medeiros 
DIRECÇÃO GERAL DOS REGISTOS E DO NOTARIAL
Sílvio Mendes
DIRECÇÃO DE OBRAS PÚBLICAS E URBANISMO
Manuel Moreira 
EGUALDOR - UGENDOR E TRUMSO LDA (AGENTE BELLETRANS)
Raul Mota Cerveira 
VDA - VIURA DE ALMEIDA & ASSOCIADOS
Víctor Nascimento 
DIRECCIÓN DESPACHANTES VICTOR NASCIMENTO
Vinna Neves
STP COUNSEL, MEMBER OF THE MIRANDA ALLIANCE
Zerna Nezef 
STP COUNSEL, MEMBER OF THE MIRANDA ALLIANCE
Ángelo de Jesus Bonfim 
AMADO PEREIRA & ASSOCIADOS, SOCIEDADE DE ADVOGADOS
Guilherme Possier da Costa
POSSEER DA COSTA ADVOGADOS ASSOCIADOS
Cosme Bonfim Ariffa Rota 
CÂMARA DE COMÉRCIO, AGRICULTURA E SERVIÇOS
Ilma Salvetaria 
GIGHE_Unico PARA EMPRESAS

Vitor Santos 
EBIC - EMPRESA DE CONSTRUÇÃO CIVIL
Ednilha Soares Lima 
SOUZA & ASSOCIADOS
Manikson Trigueiros 
POSSEER DA COSTA ADVOGADOS ASSOCIADOS

Omar AlAnsari 
LEGAL ADVISORS, ABDULAZIZ I. AL-AIYAN & PARTNERS IN ASSOCIATION WITH BAKER & MCKINZIE LIMITED
Fayez Al Debs 
PWC SAUDI ARABIA
Abdulraheem Saleh Alrayazi 
Al Sohaibani
Abdulnasir Al Sohaimi
Abdullah Al Tamimi 
AL TAMIMI & COMPANY LAWYERS
Advocates & Legal Consultants
Sulaman Al Tuwazi 
SAUDI ARABIAN GENERAL INVESTMENT AUTHORITY
Khalid Al-Abdulhameem 
CLIFFORD CHANCE

Luay Alamr 
ALAMR GROUP COMPANY FOR ENGINEERING CONSULTANCY
Nizar Al-Awadi 
SAUDI CIVIL ENIGEERING BUREAU - SIMAH
Fahad AlDehais 
EVERSHEDS LAW FIRM
Eisa Alesa 
SAUDI ARABIA CUSTOMS
Nasser Alfaraj 
LEGAL ADVISORS, ABDULAZIZ I. AL-AIYAN & PARTNERS IN ASSOCIATION WITH BAKER & MCKINZIE LIMITED
Afzhan K. Al-Haboudal 
AL-GHIZAWI PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
Fatima Alhasan
LEGAL ADVISORS, ABDULAZIZ I. AL-AIYAN & PARTNERS IN ASSOCIATION WITH BAKER & MCKINZIE LIMITED
Nicholas Diascos Al-Hajalien 
THE LAW FIRM OF SAUDI AL-HAJEALAN

Omar AlHosham 
ALHOSHAN CPAS & CONSULTANTS - MEMBER OF RUSSELL BEDFORD INTERNATIONAL
Abdulaziz Alhussain 
CISCO LAW FIRM
Naf Aljably
NAF ALJALBY LAW FIRM

Sultan Almasoud
SHERMAN & STERLING IN ASSOCIATION WITH DR. SULTAN ALMASOUD & PARTNERS
Saudi Almeihem
DEPARTMENT OF ZAKAT & INCOME TAX
Aiman Meqham Almehegh SHARIF & CO. CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
Nabil Abdullah Al-Mubarak 
Faf Al Namimi 
SAUDI ARABIA CUSTOMS

Sultan Alqudary
SAUDI CIVIL ENGINEERING BUREAU - SIMAH
Waleed Khaled AlRudani
SAUDI ARABIAN GENERAL INVESTMENT AUTHORITY
Ahmad Alsaadhan 
CLIFFORD CHANCE
Abdulmozh AlDhaffii
SAUDI ARABIA CUSTOMS
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
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ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Beng Hong Ong WONG TAN & MOLLY LIM LLC
Tea Han Ping MINISTRY OF MANPOWER
Mark Quek ALLEN & GLEDSHILL LLP
Teck Beng Quek LAND TRANSPORT AUTHORITY
Johnson Rajan INTUIT MANAGEMENT CONSULTANCY
Lim Bok Hwa Sandy JUST R. TRANSPORT ENTERPRISE PTE. LTD.
Jimmy Soh YLJEN LOGISTICS SINGAPORE PTE LTD
Hak Khoon Tan ENERGY MARKET AUTHORITY
Henry Tan NEW TS TAX SERVICES PTE LTD.
Kirsty Tan ALLEN & GLEDSHILL LLP
Martin Tan URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Tay Lek Tan PWC SINGAPORE
Yong Seng Tay ALLEN & GLEDSHILL LLP
Joo Heng Teh TEO JOO HENG ARCHITECTS
Siu Ing Teng SINGAPORE LAND AUTHORITY
Edwin Tong ALLEN & GLEDSHILL LLP
Koong Tang WONG WOH HUP PRIVATE LIMITED
Kok Siong Wong STEVEN TAN RUSSEL BEDFORD Pwc - MEMBER OF RUSSELL BEDFORD INTERNATIONAL
Siew Kwong Wong ENERGY MARKET AUTHORITY
Isaac Yong FIRE SAFETY & SHELTER DEPARTMENT
Lin Zhan REED SMITH
Yin Zhi BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY

SLOVAK REPUBLIC
ZÁRECKÝ ZEMAN
Beáta Babačová ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS S.R.O.
Ján Budínsky ČREV SLOVAKIA CREDIT BUREAU, S.R.O.
Peter Cavojský CLS ČAVOJSKY & PARTNERS, S.R.O.
Katarína Čechová ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS S.R.O.
Tomas Cermak WEINHOLD LEGAL
Tomáš Cibula WHITE & CASE S.R.O.
Peter Drenka HAMALA KLUCH VÍGLASKÝ S.R.O.
Jan Dvořecký SCM LOGISTICS S.R.O.

Matúš Foštík GEOGEOS, CARTOGRAPHY AND CADASTRE AUTHORITY
Marek Folírčík SOURCE PATTON BOOGS
Roman Hamala HAMALA KLUCH VÍGLASKÝ S.R.O.
Tatiana Hrubcová MINISTRY OF ECONOMY
Peter Hodál WHITE & CASE S.R.O.
Veronika Hrušovská PRK PARTNERS S.R.O.
Lucia Hurtatová JNC LEGAL S.R.O.
Miroslav Jakes ZÁRAJOLOVSKÁ DISTRIBUTIVA AS
Mária Jurášová PWC SLOVAKIA
Michaela Jurková ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS S.R.O.
Tomáš Kamenec ZUKÁLOVÁ - ADVOKÁTSKA KANCELÁRIA S.R.O.
Marčák Kapek ZÁRAJOLOVSKÁ DISTRIBUTIVA AS
Kristina Klenova WHITE & CASE S.R.O.
Martin Kluch HAMALA KLUCH VÍGLASKÝ S.R.O.
Ivan KolenciČ ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS S.R.O.
Roman Konrad PROFINAM, S.R.O.
Miroslav Kopac NATIONAL BANK OF SLOVAKIA
Jakub Kovalčík CLS ČAVOJSKY & PARTNERS, S.R.O.
Karol Kováč NOTÁRSKA KOMORA SLOVENSKÉ REPUBLIKY
Gabriela Kúbicová PWC SLOVAKIA
Soňa Lehocká ALIANCIADVOKátOV ČARK, S.R.O.
Alex Medek WHITE & CASE S.R.O.
Nina Molcanova PWC SLOVAKIA
Petra Murínová DEDAK & PARTNERS
Milko Nagy ZÁRAJOLOVSKÁ DISTRIBUTIVA AS
Jaroslav Nizniansky JNC LEGAL S.R.O.
Andrea Oltovská PRK PARTNERS S.R.O.
Simona Rapavá WHITE & CASE S.R.O.
Gerta Sameliová-Flášáková ALIANCIADVOKátOV ČARK, S.R.O.
Zuzana Satková PWC SLOVAKIA
Nikolaeta Scasna PWC SLOVAKIA

Christian Serugova PWC SLOVAKIA
Michal Simunčík ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS S.R.O.
Jaroslav Škubal PRK PARTNERS S.R.O.
Jakub Vojtko JNC LEGAL S.R.O.
Oľkaer Weiss PWC SLOVAKIA
Katarína Zapravná PWC SLOVAKIA
Michal Žďáreček WHITE & CASE S.R.O.
Miroslav Zalčko ČECHOVÁ & PARTNERS S.R.O.
Dagmar Zúkalová ZUKÁLOVÁ - ADVOKÁTSKA KANCELÁRIA S.R.O.

SLOVENIA
Nika Bosnič ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Matiča Dolžec ODD LAW FIRM
Andrej Ekar LOCAL COURT MARIBOR
Moja Fakin FABIAN, PETROVIČ, JERAJ, REJ, REJC ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW LTD.
Aleszander Ferk PWC SVETOVANJE D.O.O.
Ana Filipov FILIPOV O.O.P.D.O.O.
Pavel Flere Alenka Gorenčič DELOITE
Maja Goštinčar LAW FIRM MIRO SENICA AND ATTORNEYS LTD.
Eva Gostisa JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Hermiina Govekar VOČK BANK OF SLOVENIA
Damijan Gregorc LAW FIRM MIRO SENICA AND ATTORNEYS LTD.
Barbara Hocevar PWC SVETOVANJE D.O.O.
Branko Ilic ODD LAW FIRM
Andraž Jadik
Matjaž Jan ODD LAW FIRM
Andrej Jarkovič LAW FIRM ŠEJNEC & JARKOVIČ LTD.
Jernej Jeraj FABIAN, PETROVIČ, JERAJ, REJ, REJC ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW LTD.
Boris Kastelic FINANCIAL INSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
Ljubo Kleindiest TRANSCOOSE SHIPPING
Slovo Koderber ODVETNIK SEDMAK
Miro Košak NOTARY OFFICE KOŠAK
Gregor Kovačič JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Neža Kranjc ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Nina Krističek JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Ursli Križavec SKM LAW FIRM
Sabina Lamut LAMUTS D.O.O.
Bojan Leskovc JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Vesna Ložek ODVETNIŠKA DRUŽBA NEFIAT
Jena Majzel ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Miroslav Marchek PWC SVETOVANJE D.O.O.
Nastja Merlak JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Matjaž Miklavčič SOCDO D.O.O.
Bajan Mijak ENERGY AGENCY OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
Eva Možina SCHOENHERR
Domen Nefiat ODVETNIŠKA DRUŽBA NEFIAT
Mateja Odar ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Neli Okretič JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Ela Omersa FABIAN, PETROVIČ, JERAJ, REJ, REJC ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW LTD.
Sonja Omerza DELOITE
Aljaz Perme Nataša Pipan-Nahrigal ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Petra Plevnik LAW FIRM MIRO SENICA AND ATTORNEYS LTD.
Bojan Podgortek NOTARIAT
Anja Primčič DELOITE
Špela Remec ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Jasmina Reškovič NOTARY OFFICE KOŠAK
Patricija Rot JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Sanja Savič DELOITE
Bostjan Sedmak ODVETNIK SEDMAK
Branka Sedmak JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Andreja Škoči̇ Fabjan DELOITE
Nives Slovenjak SCHOENHERR
Rok Starc NOTARY OFFICE KOŠAK
Gregor Strojin SUPREME COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
Tilen Terlep ODVETNIKI ŠEĽH & PARTNERI
Katarina Vodopivec SUPREME COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
Irena Vodopivec Jean BANK OF SLOVENIA

Ana Vran FABIANI, PETROVIČ, JERAJ, REJC ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW LTD.
Katja Wostner BDO SVETOVANJE D.O.O.
Petro Zapušek JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.
Nina Žefran DELOITE
Tina Žvanut Mlodič JADEK & PENSJA D.O.O. - O.P.

SOLOMON ISLANDS
CREDIT & DATA BUREAU LIMITED
Anthony Frazier
Julie Haro PERSAUD GROUP OF COMPANIES LTD.
Sebastian Kato SOL - LAW
Ku Kaogheike TRACDCO SHIPPING
Judy Kirchner BIS BUSINESS AGENCIES LTD.
Silverio Lepe SOL - LAW
Wayne Morris MORRIS & SOINCOCK CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
Maurice Nonipitu KRAMER ALKENCO
Andrew Radyffy Gregory Joseph Soinocki
MORRIS & SOINCOCK CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
John Sullivan SOL - LAW
Makau Tazini GLOBAL LAWYERS, BARRISTERS & SOLICITOR
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Doing Business 2018 is the 15th in a series of annual reports investigating the regulations that enhance business activity and those that constrain it. The report provides quantitative indicators covering 11 areas of the business environment in 190 economies. The goal of the Doing Business series is to provide objective data for use by governments in designing sound business regulatory policies and to encourage research on the important dimensions of the regulatory environment for firms.