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Doing Business 2019 is the 16th 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.

Regulations affecting 11 areas of the life of a business are covered: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, getting credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts, resolving insolvency and labor market regulation. The labor market regulation data are not included in this year’s ranking on the ease of doing business.

Data in Doing Business 2019 are current as of May 1, 2018. The indicators are used to analyze economic outcomes and identify what reforms of business regulation have worked, where and why.
What gets measured gets done.

Over the past 15 years, no report has illustrated this aphorism better than Doing Business. Anchored in rigorous research and methodology, Doing Business gathers detailed and objective data on 11 areas of business regulation, helping governments diagnose issues in administrative procedures and correct them. The report measures complex regulatory processes by zeroing in on their quantifiable components, which can be contested, compared—over time and across economies—and, ultimately, reformed.

Doing Business has inspired thousands of articles published in peer-reviewed journals and created a platform for informed debate about regulatory and institutional frameworks for economic development. Many Doing Business indicators have been incorporated into the indexes of other institutions, which has spurred more debate about the ideal business climate to drive inclusive, sustainable economic growth.

Since its launch in 2003, Doing Business has inspired more than 3,500 reforms in the 10 areas of business regulation measured by the report. This year, we observed a peak in reform activity worldwide—128 economies undertook a record 314 reforms in 2017/18. Around the world, registering a business now takes an average of 20 days and costs 23% of income per capita, compared to 47 days and 76% of income per capita in 2006. Even more telling, today the average paid-in minimum capital that entrepreneurs must deposit is 6% of income per capita, compared with 145% of income per capita in 2006. The global average time to prepare, file and pay taxes has fallen from 324 hours in 2005 to 237 hours in 2017.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been the region with the highest number of reforms each year since 2012. This year, Doing Business captured a record 107 reforms across 40 economies in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the region’s private sector is feeling the impact of these improvements. The average time and cost to register a business, for example, has declined from 59 days and 192% of income per capita in 2006 to 23 days and 40% of income per capita today. Furthermore, the average paid-in minimum capital has fallen from 212% of income per capita to 11% of income per capita in the same period.

This year’s 10 top improvers include a range of economies—large and small; rich and poor—from five regions. The diversity shows that, regardless of background, any economy can improve business regulation when the will of policy makers is strong. With 13 reforms between them, China and India—two of the world’s largest economies—are among the 10 top improvers. At the same
time Djibouti, a small economy, is also on the list with six reforms. And with a total of 12 business regulatory reforms between them, Afghanistan and Turkey are on the list of 10 top improvers for the first time in the report’s history.

Perhaps most notably, four of the 10 top improvers—Afghanistan, Djibouti, Côte d’Ivoire and Togo—are countries suffering from fragility, conflict and violence. The World Bank Group and other organizations have worked closely with these economies to address pressing humanitarian and developmental needs, while also strengthening their legal and economic institutions.

Doing Business taught us that even with comprehensive evidence, reforms do not necessarily follow. A ranking helps put the information in front of leaders and makes it hard to ignore. The report helped inspire the Human Capital Index (HCI), which we launched at the 2018 Annual Meetings in Indonesia. Like Doing Business, the HCI is based on the idea that, regardless of how complex an area may be, with solid research and methodology it can be measured. These types of data promote reform, not only because they are easy to analyze, trace and act on, but also because they increase transparency and accountability.

Governments have the enormous task of fostering an enabling environment for entrepreneurs and small and medium-size enterprises. Sound and efficient business regulation is critical for entrepreneurship and a thriving private sector. Without them, we have no chance to end extreme poverty and boost shared prosperity around the world.

International institutions and research centers can play a central role by building a solid base of knowledge and data to inform governments, researchers and the general public. With Doing Business, the World Bank Group is fully committed to this mission. The reforms that the report inspires will help people reach their aspirations; drive inclusive, sustainable economic growth; and bring us one step closer to ending poverty on the face of the earth.

Jim Yong Kim
President
World Bank Group
Overview

An economy cannot thrive without a healthy private sector. When local businesses flourish, they create jobs and generate income that can be spent and invested domestically. Any rational government that cares about the economic well-being and advancement of its constituency pays special attention to laws and regulations affecting local small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs). Effective business regulation affords micro and small firms the opportunity to grow, innovate and, when applicable, move from the informal to the formal sector of an economy. Like its 15 predecessors, Doing Business 2019 continues to enable regulators to assess and benchmark their domestic business regulatory environments.

Doing Business advocates for both regulatory quality and efficiency. It is important to have effective rules in place that are easy to follow and understand. To realize economic gains, reduce corruption and encourage SMEs to flourish, unnecessary red tape should be eliminated. However, specific safeguards must be put in place to ensure high-quality business regulatory processes; efficiency alone is not enough for regulation to function well. What use is it when one can transfer property in just a few days and at a low cost, but the property registry contains unreliable information with incomplete geographic coverage? Doing Business exposes cases with evident discrepancies between regulatory quality and efficiency, signaling to regulators what needs to be reformed.

Doing Business 2019 measures the processes for business incorporation, getting a building permit, obtaining an electricity connection, transferring property, getting access to credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, engaging in international trade, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency. Doing Business collects and publishes data on labor market regulation with a focus on the flexibility of employment regulation as well as several aspects of job quality. However, this regulatory area does not constitute part of the ease of doing business ranking (figure 1.1). For more details on the Doing Business indicators, see the data notes at http://www.doingbusiness.org.

Each of the measured business regulatory areas is important to nascent and existing entrepreneurs. However, as Doing Business data show, SME owners face drastically different realities across economies as they set up and operate their businesses. An entrepreneur in Uganda, for example, will spend nearly a month and undertake 13 procedures to set up a new company. The entrepreneur will then be required to manage another 18 interactions with different economic entities.

Doing Business captured a record 314 regulatory reforms between June 2, 2017, and May 1, 2018. Worldwide, 128 economies introduced substantial regulatory improvements making it easier to do business in all areas measured by Doing Business.

The economies with the most notable improvement in Doing Business 2019 are Afghanistan, Djibouti, China, Azerbaijan, India, Togo, Kenya, Côte d’Ivoire, Turkey and Rwanda.

One-third of all business regulatory reforms recorded by Doing Business 2019 were in the economies of Sub-Saharan Africa. With a total of 107 reforms, Sub-Saharan Africa once again has a record number this year.

The BRIC economies—Brazil, the Russian Federation, India and China—introduced a total of 21 reforms, with getting electricity and trading across borders the most common areas of improvement.

The 10 top economies in the ease of doing business ranking share common features of regulatory efficiency and quality, including mandatory inspections during construction, automated tools used by distribution utilities to restore service during power outages, strong safeguards available to creditors in insolvency proceedings and automated specialized commercial courts.

Training opportunities for service providers and users are positively associated with the ease of doing business score. Similarly, increased public-private communication on legislative changes and processes affecting SMEs are associated with more reforms and better performance on the Doing Business indicators.
agencies and wait an additional four months to obtain a building permit. Once the construction of the warehouse is completed, the entrepreneur will need to wait another two months and cash out 7,513.6% of income per capita to obtain a connection to the electrical grid. In contrast, a Danish entrepreneur can expect to be able to register a new business in just 3.5 days, complete all required legal procedures to build a warehouse through seven steps in slightly over two months and secure a reliable electricity connection for about 100% of local income per capita. Differences in regulatory and institutional quality can affect how many new businesses are created and the dynamism of the private sector, which generates jobs and economic opportunities. In Denmark the average number of newly registered companies is eight per 1,000 workers per year, whereas in Uganda this figure is less than one new company per 1,000 workers per year.\(^1\) Many factors explain this difference, including the level of business regulation.\(^2\)

Doing Business does not claim to cover all the areas pertinent to private sector development and growth. The report has a set of clear limitations; Doing Business data alone are not sufficient to assess the overall competitiveness or foreign investment prospects of an economy. Doing Business does not assess market size, the soundness and depth of financial markets, macroeconomic conditions, foreign investment, security or political stability. However, the Doing Business indicators do offer insights for policy makers to identify areas for reform and improve the local business environment. 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?**

Doing Business includes 11 indicator sets that measure aspects of business regulation which are important to domestic small and medium-size companies and national competitiveness. Evidence from economic literature corroborates the economic relevance and importance of the areas measured by Doing Business. In the case of the starting a business indicator set alone, more than 300 research articles have been published in the top 100 academic journals since 2003 assessing how the regulatory environment for entry affects a wide range of economic outcomes such as productivity, growth, employment and informality. Recent research shows the positive effects of improved business regulation. Fewer procedures and lower levels of minimum capital, for example, are positively and significantly associated with the process of starting a business. Where procedures are more complex or unclear, the likelihood of corruption is higher.\(^3\) Another study discusses the benefits to companies of formal registration, such as greater access to new equipment and a larger scale of operations, which can lead to increased competitiveness and productivity.\(^4\)
In the context of construction permitting, simplicity and transparency are key in allowing businesses to expand and build new and safe infrastructure. Research shows that regulatory burdens often pose substantial obstacles for investors. Discrepancies among existing laws, for example, can lead to unnecessary and even contradictory compliance requirements. Furthermore, lengthy processing times for required approvals—as is the case in Ghana—can drive up costs and spur the development of an informal construction sector, where falsified construction permits result in unsafe infrastructure.

Electricity is a necessity for any business to function properly and expand. It is also an important element in the competitiveness and strengthening of human capital in an economy. Research data indicate that higher electricity costs tend to have an adverse impact on businesses. As prices rise, firms shift their focus to less electricity-intensive production processes, resulting in reduced output and productivity. Equally important is the reliability of a power connection. Recent research finds that power outages and deficient power infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa had a measurable negative impact on economic growth over the period 1995–2007.

Similarly, clearly defined regulation and equal access to property rights are essential for enabling businesses to expand their operations. If governments do not put in place adequate land ownership protections and leave investors open to land disputes or property seizures, stakeholders would be disinclined to put money into land and property development projects. A recent study exploring whether political institutions have an impact on the effectiveness of economic reforms in promoting growth finds that financial and trade reforms are more effective in developing economies with sound property rights. This evidence suggests that sufficiently developed property rights may be a precondition for reaping the growth benefits of reform. Ample literature on the importance of property rights finds a strong association between investment, access to finance, productivity and economic growth.

Another area measured by Doing Business is the protection of minority investors. Greater protection helps foster trust and confidence and, in turn, spurs greater access to finance for entrepreneurs. The indicator set focuses on how policy makers mitigate the risk that corporate executives, directors and majority shareholders will use their position to advance their own interests at the expense of the company and other shareholders. Clear rules, robust rights and increased transparency are some of the regulatory instruments at their disposal. Corporate governance is a key determinant of investment efficiency, while shareholders’ ability to sue and hold directors accountable are essential checks and balances.

Finally, the regulation of labor markets is critical as policy makers work to create more and better jobs for their citizens. Labor regulation is also an area of interest to researchers as they strive to assess the optimal balance between adequate worker protections and labor market efficiency. In India, for example, research shows that when faced with restrictive labor laws, firms choose to circumvent such legislation by hiring workers indirectly through contractors, especially in times of economic uncertainty. Another study on foreign investment and the organization of global firms suggests that firms consider the strength of worker bargaining power when making sourcing decisions.

Doing Business 2014 presented a synthesis of the fast-growing literature published in top-ranking economic journals using Doing Business data for analysis or motivation. The chapter reviews the different estimation methods used in economic analysis and summarizes the recent research by area of study and methodology, including firm entry and labor market regulation, trade regulations and cost and tax regulations. Doing Business 2016 also presented an extended review of the literature published in 70 top academic law journals focusing on four sets of indicators: enforcing contracts, getting credit (legal rights), protecting minority investors and resolving insolvency. For further research insights, updated annually, see the chapter About Doing Business and the Doing Business website at http://www.doingbusiness.org/research.

WHERE IS BUSINESS REGULATION BETTER?

Doing Business benchmarks aspects of business regulation and practice using specific case studies with standardized assumptions. Based on an economy’s performance in each of the 11 measured areas, the report scores the efficiency and quality of the business environment. This approach facilitates the comparison of regulation and practice across economies and allows for changes to be tracked over time. The ease of doing business score (box 1.1) serves as the basis for ranking economies on their business environment: to obtain the ranking, economies are sorted by their scores. The ease of doing business score shows an economy’s absolute position to the best regulatory practice, while the ease of doing business ranking is an indication of an economy’s position relative to that of other economies.

The economies that rank highest in the ease of doing business (table 1.1) are those that have consistently well-designed business regulation or whose regulatory environments have thrived thanks to comprehensive reform over the years. The top three economies this year—New Zealand, Singapore and Denmark—exemplify a business-friendly environment. Meanwhile, Mauritius, which joins the group of
The top 20 economies this year (the only Sub-Saharan African economy to do so), has reformed its business environment methodically over time. Indeed, over the past decade Mauritius has reformed more than once in almost all areas measured by Doing Business. Following seven reforms in the area of property registration captured by Doing Business since 2005, for example, the time needed to register property has decreased more than 12 times; the time needed for business incorporation has decreased almost 10 times as a result of four reforms in starting a business.

A continuous and focused reform agenda keeps an economy competitive and vigilant, as others also keep improving. Two economies that enter the top 20 this year—the United Arab Emirates and Malaysia—have maintained such a reform momentum. The United Arab Emirates is the highest-ranking economy in the Middle East and North Africa region, with reforms captured in four areas. Six reforms in Malaysia were measured by Doing Business, resulting in the second highest regional improvement in the ease of doing business score.

Twelve of the top 20 economies are from the OECD high-income group; four are from East Asia and the Pacific, two are from Europe and Central Asia and one each is from Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East and North Africa. Except for low-income economies, all income groups are represented. The regional diversity and varying income levels among the top 20 economies underscore the point that any economy can make it to the top, as long as it has few bureaucratic hurdles and strong laws and regulation. The efficiency and quality of regulation are what matter most for a good performance in the ease of doing business ranking.

The top 20 economies share a number of international good practices. In the area of starting a business, 13 of these economies have at least one procedure that can be completed online in 0.5 days. The electricity distribution utilities in all but one of the top 20 economies use automated tools, allowing for faster, more efficient and more secure restoration of service during power outages. In the areas of construction and land administration, in all top 20 economies mandatory inspections are always done in practice during the construction of a warehouse, and the majority have comprehensive geographic coverage. The quality of legal infrastructure and the strength of legal institutions is also robust. In all top 20 economies, for example, the insolvency framework stipulates that a creditor has the right to object to decisions accepting or rejecting creditors’ claims, providing strong safeguards to creditors in insolvency proceedings. Court automation is prevalent, and judgments are enforced twice as fast on average (95.6 days) than in the remaining economies (200 days). These economies also have strong disclosure requirements in place to prevent the misuse of corporate assets by directors for personal gain. Most mandate that a shareholder must immediately disclose transactions—as well as any conflicts of interest—to other shareholders. To date, no economy has reached the best regulatory performance on all indicators; every economy can progress further by learning from the experience of others.

More trends emerge from the list of the top 50 economies. Regionally, almost 60% of the top 50 economies are from the OECD high-income group, followed by Europe and Central Asia (24%) and East Asia and the Pacific (12%). South Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean are the two regions absent from the top 50 ranking. Upper-middle-income economies represent almost 26% of the top 50 economies. Georgia, Kosovo and Moldova are the three lower-middle-income economies on the list and Rwanda is the only low-income economy. There is, however, a large variation between regions’ regulatory efficiency and regulatory quality (figure 1.2). While four of the 10 top improvers in Doing Business 2019 are Sub-Saharan African economies, the
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TABLE 1.1

Rank

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

Ease of doing business ranking

Economy

EODB
score

EODB
score
change

Rank

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

86.59
85.24
84.64
84.22
84.14
83.28
82.95
82.75
82.65
81.55
81.28
81.27
80.90
80.83
80.60
80.50
80.35
80.13
79.59
79.58
79.35
79.26
78.91
78.90
78.64
78.57
78.45
77.89
77.88
77.68
77.37
77.29
76.95
76.55
76.10
76.04
75.77
75.69
75.65
75.61
75.37
75.17
74.33
74.15
73.95
73.64
73.54
73.49
73.23
72.73
72.56
72.30
72.28
72.09
72.03
71.81
71.71
71.40
71.24
71.02
70.31
69.85
69.51
69.46

0.00
+0.27
+0.59
+0.04
-0.01
+0.48
+0.25
-0.01
+0.33
+0.32
+2.37
0.00
+0.24
+0.29
+2.57
+0.01
+0.05
-0.01
+0.33
+1.29
+0.05
+0.38
-0.51
0.00
+7.10
+0.03
+1.06
+0.73
+4.15
+0.07
+0.61
+0.99
-0.36
-0.07
+0.05
+0.01
+0.72
+0.01
+0.05
+0.02
+2.06
+0.29
+4.34
+0.44
+2.24
+8.64
+0.38
+0.17
+0.64
+0.20
-0.15
-0.53
+0.34
-0.18
+1.85
+0.37
+0.44
+0.34
+0.11
+2.46
+5.25
+1.82
+0.50
+0.20

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

EODB
score

EODB
score
change

Colombia
Luxembourg
Costa Rica
Peru
Vietnam
Kyrgyz Republic
Ukraine
Greece
Indonesia
Mongolia
Jamaica
Uzbekistan
India
Oman
Panama
Tunisia
Bhutan
South Africa
Qatar
Malta
El Salvador
Botswana
Zambia
San Marino
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Samoa
Tonga
Saudi Arabia
St. Lucia
Vanuatu
Uruguay
Seychelles
Kuwait
Guatemala
Djibouti
Sri Lanka
Fiji
Dominican Republic
Dominica
Jordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Lesotho
Namibia
Papua New Guinea
Brazil
Nepal
Malawi
Antigua and Barbuda
Paraguay
Ghana
Solomon Islands
West Bank and Gaza
Eswatini
Bahamas, The
Argentina
Egypt, Arab Rep.
Honduras
Côte d'Ivoire
Ecuador
Philippines
Belize
Tajikistan
Uganda
Iran, Islamic Rep.

69.24
69.01
68.89
68.83
68.36
68.33
68.25
68.08
67.96
67.74
67.47
67.40
67.23
67.19
66.12
66.11
66.08
66.03
65.89
65.43
65.41
65.40
65.08
64.74
63.82
63.77
63.59
63.50
63.02
62.87
62.60
62.41
62.20
62.17
62.02
61.22
61.15
61.12
61.07
60.98
60.81
60.60
60.53
60.12
60.01
59.63
59.59
59.48
59.40
59.22
59.17
59.11
58.95
58.90
58.80
58.56
58.22
58.00
57.94
57.68
57.13
57.11
57.06
56.98

+0.20
0.00
-0.47
+0.56
+1.59
+2.57
+0.94
-0.12
+1.42
+0.27
+0.55
+1.08
+6.63
-0.02
+0.41
+1.51
+0.20
+1.37
+0.64
+0.28
+0.21
+0.46
+1.48
+2.27
+0.27
+0.01
+0.03
+1.62
+0.06
-0.21
+0.34
-0.01
+0.75
+1.01
+8.87
+1.80
+0.04
+0.55
+0.04
+1.42
-0.12
+0.19
+0.24
+1.19
+2.96
-0.32
+0.84
+0.06
+0.41
+2.06
+0.33
+0.39
+0.13
+0.77
+0.87
+2.74
+0.09
+4.94
+0.12
+1.36
+0.02
+0.08
+0.65
+2.34

Rank

Economy

EODB
score

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
171
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190

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

56.78
56.35
55.95
55.64
55.59
55.57
55.53
55.31
55.20
54.80
54.43
54.36
54.15
54.04
53.72
53.63
53.50
52.89
52.71
51.99
51.72
51.62
51.57
51.51
51.42
51.26
50.44
50.32
49.65
49.07
49.06
48.99
48.89
48.84
48.74
48.66
48.05
47.78
47.77
47.41
45.58
45.14
44.72
44.72
43.86
43.51
42.85
41.97
41.94
41.60
41.57
39.83
39.36
38.52
36.90
36.85
35.34
33.44
32.41
30.61
23.07
20.04

EODB
score
change

0.00
+0.01
+0.02
+0.37
+0.01
-1.21
+1.78
+2.53
+6.32
+0.41
+0.10
+0.01
+0.37
+0.07
+1.24
+0.34
+0.23
+1.37
+0.07
+0.92
+0.23
+0.01
+0.12
+2.02
+0.13
+0.11
+1.92
+0.15
+2.06
+0.33
+0.91
0.00
+0.71
+3.75
+0.15
+0.14
-0.05
+0.83
+10.64
+0.73
-0.23
+0.30
+0.04
+0.51
+2.16
-0.04
+0.27
+0.91
+0.28
+1.71
+0.02
+0.36
+1.15
+0.11
+2.67
+0.67
+2.04
+0.23
-0.59
-0.24
+0.13
+0.06

Source: Doing Business database.
Note: The ease of doing business rankings are benchmarked to May 1, 2018, and based on the average of each economy’s ease of doing business 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 2016/17 and 2017/18
(and therefore an improvement in the overall business environment as measured by Doing Business), while a negative change indicates a deterioration and a 0.00 indicates no change in the score.
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region has room for further progress: its average ease of doing business score for regulatory quality is less than 40, compared to 73 in OECD high-income economies. Similarly, the average ease of doing business score for regulatory efficiency is 60, compared to 85 among OECD high-income economies.

Not surprisingly, large gaps exist between the performance of Sub-Saharan Africa and OECD high-income economies (figure 1.3). Sub-Saharan African economies score significantly lower than the most efficient economies in all areas. The gap in the score is significantly wider in the areas of trading across borders (41 points) and getting electricity (36 points). The area with the largest score difference is resolving insolvency, where the gap between Sub-Saharan African economies and the best performers is 44 points.

Substantial variations in performance among Sub-Saharan African economies present an opportunity for policymakers to learn from the experience of their neighbors. In the area of getting credit, for example, officials in Angola (ranked 184) and Eritrea (186) could learn from the experience of Rwanda and Zambia (both ranked 3). The two latter economies share many of the good practices found in OECD high-income economies, including reliable secured transaction laws and robust credit information sharing available through credit bureaus or registries.

Substantial variations in performance among Sub-Saharan African economies present an opportunity for policy makers to learn from the experience of their neighbors. In the area of getting credit, for example, officials in Angola (ranked 184) and Eritrea (186) could learn from the experience of Rwanda and Zambia (both ranked 3). The two latter economies share many of the good practices found in OECD high-income economies, including reliable secured transaction laws and robust credit information sharing available through credit bureaus or registries.

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The ease of doing business score for regulatory efficiency is the aggregate score for the procedures (where applicable), time and cost indicators from the following indicator sets: starting a business (also including the minimum capital requirement indicator), dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, paying taxes (including the postfiling index), trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency. The ease of doing business score for regulatory quality is the aggregate score for getting credit and protecting minority investors as well as the regulatory quality indices from the indicator sets for dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency.
The area of resolving insolvency is the most challenging of all worldwide (figure 1.4), yet this should not discourage economies from taking steps in this direction. For example, in 2017/18, as a result of introducing several changes to its insolvency framework, including facilitating the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings, providing for equal treatment of creditors in reorganization proceedings and granting creditors greater participation in the insolvency proceedings, Kenya progressed toward the best regulatory practice by 14 points in the score for resolving insolvency.

Variation across areas of regulation, as measured by the ease of doing business ranking, is also frequently observed across all economies, regardless of income level. Among high-income economies, for example, New Zealand ranks 1 for starting a business, but 21 for enforcing contracts. Rwanda, a low-income economy, ranks 2 for registering property and 3 for getting credit, but 88 for trading across borders and 51 for starting a business. China is ranked 6 for enforcing contracts but 28 for starting a business, while Morocco—classified as a lower-middle-income economy—ranks 25 for paying taxes but 112 for getting credit.

If the process of starting a business is already relatively easy, but the lack of a credit information system or a collateral register can make it difficult for firms to obtain credit, entrepreneurs will face hurdles that could negatively impact the wider economy as they struggle to meet their potential or compete. The opposite can also be true—an economy can have a high-quality land administration system and reliable credit reporting mechanisms, but cumbersome business incorporation processes. As a result, firms may be discouraged from formal entry, with negative consequences for the economy including lower rates of formal employment and tax collection.

Since Doing Business 2005 more than 3,500 business regulatory reforms have been implemented across the 190 economies measured by Doing Business.

The majority of these reforms have been made in low- and lower-middle-income economies. In this year’s report, 73% of low-income economies and 85% of lower-middle-income economies reformed in at least one area. Such reform dynamism explains the significant improvements in business regulation that low- and lower-middle-income economies have achieved compared to upper-middle-income and high-income economies (figure 1.5).

The three regions which have improved the most since 2004 are Europe and Central Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East and North Africa. Together, these regions have introduced more reforms than the other four regions combined. With 905 reforms, Sub-Saharan Africa holds the record for the highest total number of reforms captured by Doing Business over the past 15 years. Moreover, the region also recorded the highest number of reforms in 11 of those 15 years. For the same

**FIGURE 1.4** Which area is easier for entrepreneurs and which is more difficult?
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Source: Doing Business database.
period, Europe and Central Asia has, however, maintained the highest average number of reforms per economy per year making it easier to do business (2.03), followed by Sub-Saharan Africa (1.26) and South Asia (1.23).

Slowly, but consistently, the economies most in need of business regulatory reform are adopting global good practices and converging toward the best regulatory performance. In 2006 the average time to start a business in Sub-Saharan African economies was 59 days; today the average is 23 days, significantly closer to the high-income economy average of 9 days (figure 1.6). Similarly, the gap between low- and high-income economies on the extent of disclosure index has narrowed over the past decade. In 2009 low-income economies averaged a score of 4.6 on the extent of disclosure index; today their score is almost 6—within 0.4 points of the high-income economy average. Although this shows a substantial gradual convergence, not all areas have experienced the same pace of improvement. Since 2006 low-income economies have reduced the time to pay taxes, for example, by only 29 hours on average, compared to a reduction of 57 hours on average—nearly twice as much—by high-income economies (which had 100-hours faster head start on average to begin with).

Change takes time, especially when the starting point is characterized by weak institutions and costly, cumbersome processes. However, the reform trends captured by Doing Business suggest a strong impetus for change in low- and lower-middle-income economies. Recent research shows that poverty is reduced when economies adopt business-friendly regulation.²¹

WHICH ECONOMIES IMPROVED THE MOST IN DOING BUSINESS IN 2017/18?

Governments worldwide invest substantial effort in changing business regulatory frameworks to make doing business easier for entrepreneurs. Such efforts can range from straightforward changes (for example, reducing the fees for obtaining a building permit in Cambodia or publishing fee schedules and service standards for property transfer in Tunisia) to substantial revisions of legislation (the Kyrgyz Republic’s new civil procedure code) or the establishment of new institutions (such as specialized commercial benches in Ethiopia or intermediate...
customs posts in El Salvador). While the variety of activities that can be undertaken to improve the ease of doing business is extensive, they are all aimed at streamlining processes, increasing procedural and legislative efficiency and improving the accessibility and transparency of information. For more details on how Doing Business identifies changes as a reform, see the data notes at http://www.doingbusiness.org.

In the past year, Doing Business observed a peaking of reform activity worldwide. From June 2, 2017, to May 1, 2018, 128 economies implemented a record 314 regulatory reforms improving the business climate (see table 1A.1 at the end of this chapter). The previous record was set by Doing Business 2017, which captured 290 reforms implemented by 137 economies (figure 1.7). Almost one-third of all reforms recorded in 2017/18 were implemented in two
areas—starting a business and enforcing contracts (table 1.2). Doing Business 2019 also recorded the lowest number of changes to making it more burdensome for businesses to operate since Doing Business 2007.

In 2017/18, one-quarter of economies measured by Doing Business made starting a business easier by reducing the procedures, time or cost associated with company incorporation. Twenty-three of the 50 economies that reformed in this area did so by simplifying preregistration or registration formalities. Such changes can vary from integrating multiple application forms into a single registration template to abolishing requirements for site inspections or bank certificates prior to company incorporation. By allowing voluntary value added tax registration at the time of business incorporation, Georgia reduced its relative gap to the best regulatory performance on starting a business the most in 2017/18. Previously, entrepreneurs had to make a separate visit to the Revenue Service for value added tax registration after company registration. Georgia also enhanced its existing one-stop shop for business incorporation, allowing entrepreneurs to start a company through a single procedure.

The second highest number of business regulatory reforms (49) captured by Doing Business 2019 is in the area of enforcing contracts. This uptick in reform can be attributed mainly to the achievements of 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 Uniform Act on Mediation in 2017 (filling a legislative void that existed in most OHADA member states) which introduced mediation as

### FIGURE 1.7 Doing Business 2019 captured a record 314 reforms in 128 economies
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Source: Doing Business database.


### TABLE 1.2 Starting a business continues to be the most popular area of reform in 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of reform</th>
<th>Number of reforms in 2017/18</th>
<th>Region(s) with the highest share of reformers in 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa and South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The labor market regulation indicators also recorded 19 regulatory changes in Doing Business 2019. These changes are not included in the total reform count.
Over the conduct of mediation.

Doing Business also recorded a historic number of reforms (26) in the area of getting electricity. East Asia and the Pacific has the highest share of reformers, with 28% of economies from this region improving on the getting electricity indicators. Sub-Saharan African economies recorded eight reforms in this area, the highest number of any region worldwide.

The economies of Europe and Central Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa were the most active in reforming their regulatory frameworks in 2017/18, with four of every five economies substantially improving business regulations in both regions. Nineteen economies in Europe and Central Asia implemented a total of 54 regulatory reforms improving the business environment. A total of 107 business regulatory reforms were recorded by Doing Business across 40 economies in Sub-Saharan Africa. Both regions captured reforms in every topic measured by Doing Business. Indeed, reforms undertaken by economies in these two regions represent half of all reforms recorded globally. In 2017/18 Sub-Saharan Africa implemented the most reforms ever recorded by Doing Business and the highest total number of reforming economies.

On average, Sub-Saharan African economies increased their ease of doing business scores by 0.99 points this year, slightly below the average improvement of 1.00 point for economies in Europe and Central Asia. With an increase of 2.73 points on average, South Asian economies recorded the largest score improvement. This achievement is not surprising as the region has the highest average number of reforms per reforming economy—a total of 19 reforms were implemented by five of the eight economies that comprise the region. The lowest share of reformers was observed in the OECD high-income group where 16 of 34 economies implemented a total of 23 reforms (or 7% of the global count). Latin America and the Caribbean (which is the fourth highest scoring region) had the second lowest share of reformers with 56% of economies implementing reforms in 2017/18. Naturally, economies in these two regions had the lowest average increase in their ease of doing business score in 2017/18: +0.16 points on average in OECD high-income economies (which is the highest performing region and therefore has little room for improvement) and +0.22 points on average in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Worldwide, the 10 economies showing the most notable improvement in performance on the Doing Business indicators in 2017/18 are Afghanistan, Djibouti, China, Azerbaijan, India, Togo, Kenya, Côte d’Ivoire, Turkey and Rwanda (table 1.3). Together, these economies implemented a total of 62 business regulatory reforms across all areas measured by Doing Business. Overall, the 10 top improvers implemented the most regulatory reforms in the areas of starting a business, getting credit and paying taxes (with eight reforms in each area). This very diverse set of economies includes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank</th>
<th>Change in ease of doing business score</th>
<th>Starting a business</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>Afghanistan</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>+10.64</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>+8.87</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>+8.64</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+6.63</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>+6.32</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+5.25</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>+4.94</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+4.34</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+4.15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</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 ease of doing business 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 ease of doing business 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 ease of doing business score from the previous year. The improvement in their score is calculated not by using the data published in 2017 but by using comparable data that capture data revisions. The choice of the most improved economies is determined by the largest improvements in the ease of doing business score among those with at least three reforms.
some of the largest and the smallest in the world, showing that economies of all sizes can be successful reformers in Doing Business.

Afghanistan—the top improver in Doing Business 2019—focused on enhancing the legal framework for businesses. Minority investor protections were strengthened substantially, making Afghanistan one of the economies advancing most in this area. A new law on limited liability companies made noteworthy progress toward mitigating the risks of prejudicial conflicts of interest in companies and strengthening corporate governance structures. In addition, the Commercial Procedure Code was amended to grant greater powers to shareholders to challenge related-party transactions. Afghanistan also adopted a new insolvency legal framework in 2018.

The two economies with the largest populations, China and India, demonstrated impressive reform agendas. Both governments took a carefully designed approach to reform, aiming to improve the business regulatory environment over the course of several years. China is the only economy from East Asia and the Pacific to join the Doing Business 2019 list of 10 top improvers. China focused its reform efforts in 2017/18 on increasing the efficiency of business processes. The utility distribution companies in both Beijing and Shanghai undertook several initiatives that significantly reduced the time to obtain a new electricity connection (figure 1.8). China digitalized new grid connection applications offering online payment while eliminating the external site visit from the utility in Beijing. During the first half of 2018, China introduced reform measures to streamline its construction permitting process by implementing unified platforms for all building review processes carried out before the approval of a building permit in both Beijing and Shanghai. The reforms also simplified documentation requirements, improved processing times, expanded public access to information and introduced a unified application for inspections carried out after the completion of construction. Similarly, the District Real Estate Registries of both Beijing and Shanghai implemented a new connected platform streamlining the registration process for new buildings. To facilitate cross-border trade, China implemented a national trade single window linking the customs and tax administration, port authorities, the Ministry of Commerce and other agencies involved in the export and import processes.

India also focused on streamlining business processes. Under its National Trade Facilitation Action Plan 2017-2020, India implemented several initiatives that improved the efficiency of cross-border trade, reducing border and documentary compliance time for both exports and imports (figure 1.9). Enhanced risk-based management now allows exporters to seal their containers electronically at their own facilities; as little as 5% of shipments must undergo physical inspections. India also invested in port equipment, strengthened management and improved electronic document flow. By implementing the Single Window Clearance System in Delhi and the Online Building Permit Approval System in Mumbai during the second half of 2017, India also continued to streamline and centralize its construction permitting process. Regarding getting electricity, newly-adopted regulations from the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission require that electrical connections be completed within 15 days of the application’s acceptance. To comply with this regulation, Tata Power Delhi Distribution deployed more personnel as well as tracking tools and key performance indicators to monitor each commercial connection.

Djibouti and India are the only economies to make the list of 10 top improvers for the second consecutive year. Djibouti introduced a total of 11 business regulatory reforms in the past two editions of Doing Business, while India made 14 sizeable improvements during the same period. Djibouti, the only economy from the Middle East and North Africa region in the list of 10 top improvers this year, has targeted its reform agenda toward strengthening its legal framework. For example, Djibouti implemented strict deadlines for registering the property sale agreement with the Tax Authority and digitizing its land registry. The country also made substantial enhancements to the process of resolving commercial disputes by adopting a new civil

---

**FIGURE 1.8** China significantly reduced the time to get a new electricity connection in 2017/18
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Source: Doing Business database.
procedure code that regulates voluntary conciliation, mediation proceedings and case management techniques, including time standards for key court events. Enforcing contracts is easier following the creation of a dedicated division within the court of first instance to resolve commercial cases. With regards to resolving insolvency, Djibouti established equal treatment of creditors in reorganization proceedings and increased creditors’ participation by granting them the right to approve the appointment of the insolvency representative and the sale of substantial assets of the debtor in the course of insolvency proceedings.

In Europe and Central Asia, Azerbaijan implemented eight reforms making it easier to do business in 2017/18, a record number among the 10 top improvers and globally, and Turkey implemented seven reforms. Several of these reforms involve institutional changes. Azerbaijan opened a single window at the Baku City Executive Office for dealing with construction permits, for example, reducing the time to obtain a building permit by 80 days and the cost by 12,563 manat (about $7,500). Another one-stop shop—the Asan Communal facility—streamlined the process of connecting to the electricity grid. To improve access to credit, Azerbaijan established a new credit bureau and a new unified collateral registry. In Turkey, the government’s reform effort focused on improving the electronic processing of documents and providing more information on specific regulations. Istanbul and other municipalities across the country published on their websites all relevant regulations, fee schedules and pre-application requirements related to construction permits. The Ministry of Justice now publishes all judgments rendered by the Istanbul commercial courts, the civil courts of intellectual and industrial rights and the Istanbul Regional Court of Justice on legal disputes concerning commercial, intellectual and industrial rights since 2014. Furthermore, the Banks Association of Turkey Risk Center began sharing credit information from seven telecommunications companies.

With four economies—Côte d’Ivoire, Kenya, Rwanda and Togo—Sub-Saharan Africa is the most represented region in the Doing Business 2019 list of 10 top improvers. Digitization was a common theme among the business regulatory reforms recorded by these four economies. Côte d’Ivoire and Togo introduced online systems for filing corporate income tax and value added tax returns, while Kenya simplified the process of providing value added tax information by enhancing its existing online system, iTax. Rwanda streamlined the process of starting a business by replacing its electronic billing machine system with new software that allows taxpayers to issue value added tax invoices. The free software, which is provided by the office of the Revenue Authority, allows taxpayers to issue value added tax invoices from any printer, eliminating the previous requirement to purchase and set up a special billing machine. Togo made it faster to check company name availability by fully operationalizing its online one-stop shop. Digital solutions were also implemented in the area of property registration. Togo developed an ambitious digitization project for modernizing its land administration system and, by February 2018, 97.2% of all land titles in Lomé had been scanned. In Kenya, the Ministry of Lands and Physical Planning implemented an online land rent financial management system on the eCitizen portal, enabling property owners to determine the amount owed in land rent, make an online payment and obtain the land rates clearance certificate digitally. Rwanda’s Land Management and Use Authority launched a new website, which now includes statistics regarding the number of land disputes registered in 2017 for all judiciary districts. The National Agricultural Export Development Board of Rwanda also introduced an online system, allowing certificates of origin to be issued electronically.

Brazil, which recorded the largest score improvement in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2017/18, reformed in four areas measured by Doing Business as part of the country’s ongoing effort to strengthen its business environment. Brazil introduced electronic certificates of origin in 2017, for example, following a pilot project that began in October 2016. After signing the Digital Certificates of Origin Act with Argentina under the framework of the Latin American
Integration Association, certificates of origin for auto parts imports from Argentina are now obtained electronically, reducing document preparation and compliance time for Brazilian importers. Brazil made starting a business easier by launching online systems for company registration, moving its score for starting a business (80.23) closer to the global average. Overall, the BRIC economies—Brazil, Russia, India and China—improved their average ease of doing business score by a combined total of almost 19 points across various areas of business regulation. All four economies improved in the area of getting electricity and passed reforms simplifying the process of trading across borders.

Among OECD high-income economies, Belgium recorded the largest improvement in Doing Business 2019 by strengthening access to credit. It also introduced changes to its insolvency legal framework. Two laws relating to reorganization and liquidation were streamlined into one and integrated into the Code of Economic Law. The scope of application of the law, traditionally limited to merchants, was extended to include the liberal professions, “second chance” rules were strengthened and the Code was amended to provide for the digitalization of all insolvency proceedings into a solvency register.

**DOES TRAINING CIVIL SERVANTS AND COMMUNICATING REGULATORY CHANGES AFFECT THE BUSINESS CLIMATE?**

Reform efforts will not always result in immediate improvements; indeed, some may have no impact at all. Efficient design and poor implementation are just two factors that explain why some reforms succeed while others fail. Once new regulation is enacted, it must be brought to practice—the role of dissemination should not be underestimated. The process of improving a business environment often spans several years. Naturally, every case is unique and a variety of factors influence each economic environment; business regulation is only one of those factors. Political stability, the level of economic development, natural resource endowment, cultural specifics, environmental risk and many other elements can each play a consequential role in the ability of an economy to implement regulatory change successfully. While some factors cannot be influenced, others lie within governments’ direct control, for example the level of training provided to civil servants and the way in which regulatory change is communicated.

Doing Business data show that across economies there is a significant positive association between the availability of training programs for public officials and streamlined business regulation (figure 1.10). From the perspective of service providers—such as officers at land registries, judges, prosecutors or engineers—training serves as a platform to acquire new skills and keep existing knowledge up to date. Such training improves experts’ productivity and
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**FIGURE 1.10** More training opportunities for public officials are associated with a higher ease of doing business score

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The count of Doing Business topics for which training is offered to public sector officials ranges from 0 to 5, where each topic with government-provided training counts as 1 (left-hand figure). The topics are as follows: starting a business (+1), registering property (+1), getting electricity (+1), paying taxes (+1) and trading across borders (+1). The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita. The sample comprises 166 economies. The legal degree requirement count (right-hand figure) ranges from 0 to 4 where each type of legal practitioner required to hold an advanced degree counts as 1. The types of legal practitioner are as follows: practicing lawyers (+1), judges (+1), insolvency representatives (+1) and law clerks (+1). The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita. The sample comprises 86 economies.
capacity to serve customers, who in turn become better informed about new regulatory requirements or processes. Those with a better understanding of business regulatory processes are likely to comply more often with the required rules and procedures. Improved understanding, clarity and trust in regulatory requirements are associated with more efficiency in the regulatory framework.24

In the area of judicial performance, those economies that make the training of judges mandatory are more likely to enjoy higher resolution rates and better judicial decisions. Indeed, the training of judges is imperative for increased judicial efficiency and productivity.25, 26 Evidence from Pakistan indicates that reforms which provided judges with training are accompanied by positive effects on judicial efficiency and, consequently, entrepreneurship.27

Beyond training, governments have other options to enhance the implementation of business regulatory reform. Economies in which governments effectively communicate changes to legislative processes tend to be associated with better business regulation and more reforms. While these results cannot be interpreted as causal, they do signal to policy makers that public-private dialogue is a powerful tool for increasing the number of reforms and improving business regulatory efficiency (figure 1.11).

Effective public communication of business regulatory reform not only constitutes good practice—it also improves compliance from the private sector and holds the public sector accountable for regulatory violations.28 Specifically, regulators who conduct workshops with the public or interested stakeholders are more likely to have better efficiency and quality of business legislation in their constituencies. Not surprisingly, economies where governments communicate regulatory changes through media—such as broadcast advertisements and announcements, social media, and mobile applications—are likely to have a higher ease of doing business score. Governments that make changes to laws or procedures publicly available through regulatory websites are also likely to perform better on the Doing Business indicators.

**WHAT IS NEW IN THIS YEAR’S REPORT?**

To further explore the links between training and the successful implementation of business regulation, Doing Business 2019 presents four case studies with a specific focus on training opportunities for public officials and communication of regulatory changes. The case study on starting a business and registering property analyzes new data on training opportunities available to public officials at the business and land registries. It finds that the provision of mandatory training for business registry officers is associated with higher registry efficiency. Similarly, holding annual training for land registry officers is associated with more effective registration procedures. Communicating changes at the business

---

**FIGURE 1.11** Communication of regulatory changes through media campaigns is associated with better business regulation and more reforms

![Graph showing the relationship between communication of regulatory changes through media campaigns and business regulation](source.png)

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The count of topics with media campaign ranges from 0 to 6 where each topic with a media campaign launched to announce changes to regulation counts as 1. The topics are as follows: starting a business (+1), dealing with construction permits (+1), registering property (+1), getting credit (+1), protecting minority investors (+1) or paying taxes (+1). Both the left-hand and right-hand relationships are significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita; both samples comprise 76 economies.
and land registries—through, for example, providing workshops for registry officers or information campaigns for system users—is associated with a lower time to complete transactions.

The case study on getting electricity highlights the benefits of comprehensive wiring regulation. To adequately mitigate safety risks, accreditation systems for electricians are essential, as are inspections of wiring installations and liability regimes. Doing Business data show that where electrical connection processes are efficient, there also tend to be robust quality control standards. Similarly, the case study on trading across borders draws on newly collected data to illustrate that the use of regular training to educate customs clearance officials and customs brokers is positively associated with lower border and documentary compliance times.

The case study on enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency explores the education and training that judges receive worldwide. It features examples of two judicial systems—Indonesia and the United Arab Emirates—each with adequate education and training frameworks in commercial and insolvency matters. The annex presents data analysis for the labor market regulation topic, including general trends and the relationship with firm performance.

NOTES
5. Sutherland 2011.
11. Djankov, La Porta and others 2008.
19. Since 2005 a total of five reforms have been captured in Mauritius in the area of starting a business, but four reforms contributed to the reduction in time for business incorporation.
20. The extent of disclosure index ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating greater disclosure.
22. Twenty-three changes making it more burdensome for businesses to operate were recorded in Doing Business 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to start a business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified preregistration and registration formalities (publication, notarization, inspection, and other requirements)</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Argentina; Bolivia; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Burundi; Côte d’Ivoire; Ethiopia; Guatemala; India; Mauritania; Morocco; Myanmar; New Zealand; Nigeria; Pakistan; Qatar; South Africa; Sudan; Thailand; Togo; Turkey; Vietnam</td>
<td>Argentina made starting a business easier by introducing an expedited process for limited liability companies that includes company incorporation, book legalization and tax and social security registration. India made starting a business easier by fully integrating multiple application forms into a general incorporation form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolished or reduced minimum capital requirement</td>
<td>Central African Republic; Guatemala; Kuwait; Timor-Leste; Togo</td>
<td>Kuwait made starting a business easier by eliminating the paid-in minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut or simplified postregistration procedures (tax registration, social security registration, licensing)</td>
<td>Armenia; Belarus; Brunei Darussalam; Chile; Georgia; India; Indonesia; Kazakhstan; Mauritius; Peru; Philippines; Rwanda; Singapore; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Indonesia made starting a business easier by combining different social security registrations. Mauritius made starting a business easier by linking the database of the business registry with the database of the social security office. Singapore made starting a business easier by abolishing corporate seals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved online procedures</td>
<td>Bolivia; China; Guatemala; Malaysia; Nigeria; Tanzania; Togo; United Arab Emirates; Vietnam</td>
<td>Nigeria made starting a business easier by introducing an online platform to pay stamp duties. Tanzania made starting a business easier by launching online company registrations. Vietnam made starting a business easier by publishing the notice of incorporation online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved one-stop shop</td>
<td>Cameroun; Chad; Djibouti; Egypt; Arab. Rep; Gabon; Guinea; Moldova; Togo; Tunisia</td>
<td>Moldova made starting a business easier by removing the requirement to separately file for registration with the National Bureau of Statistics. Tunisia made starting a business easier by combining different registrations at the one-stop-shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to deal with construction permits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced time for processing permit applications</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Botswana; China; El Salvador; Ethiopia; Greece; Guinea; India; Kosovo; Malaysia; Malta; Russian Federation; Serbia; Sri Lanka; Taiwan; China; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Sri Lanka made dealing with construction permits easier by reducing the processing times to issue several building certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined procedures</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Botswana; China; El Salvador; Greece; India; Kosovo; Malaysia; Malta; Serbia; Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Kosovo made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining the inspection system through the use of an in-house engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted new building regulations</td>
<td>China; Côte d’Ivoire; Gabon; Ghana; Madagascar; Peru; Philippines; Togo</td>
<td>Ghana and Peru strengthened construction quality control by imposing stricter qualification requirements for professionals in charge of technical inspections. The Philippines made the construction sector safer by improving its risk management practices; latent defect liability insurance is now commonly obtained by industry players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transparency</td>
<td>Burundi; China (Beijing); India; Mauritania; Sri Lanka; Turkey; Uruguay</td>
<td>Burundi increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge. Uruguay improved the quality of its building regulations by creating an online portal that provides information on the requirements and fees to obtain a building permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fees</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Cambodia; China; Gabon; Greece; Guinea; India; Macedonia; FYR; Madagascar; Niger; Togo</td>
<td>Macedonia, FYR made the construction permitting process less costly by reducing the land development fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved one-stop shop</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Belarus; China; India; Sri Lanka; Taiwan; China; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Taiwan, China, made dealing with construction permits less time-consuming by improving the efficiency of its single window counter in the Taipei City Construction Management Office. Zimbabwe made dealing with construction permits faster by adopting a one-stop shop for building plan approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved electronic platforms or online services</td>
<td>China; India; Russian Federation; Serbia; Sri Lanka; Taiwan; China; Uruguay</td>
<td>Serbia reduced the time needed to obtain a construction permit by introducing an electronic application system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to get electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated more reliable power supply and transparency of tariff information</td>
<td>Angola; Azerbaijan; Brazil (São Paulo); Gabon; Mozambique; Myanmar; Paraguay; Papua New Guinea; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; South Africa; Togo; Thailand</td>
<td>Gabon improved the regulatory framework of the electricity sector; the national regulator now monitors the utility’s performance on reliability of supply. Papua New Guinea improved the reliability of supply by expanding electricity generation capacities. Paraguay rolled out a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system to monitor power outages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved process efficiency</td>
<td>Algeria; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Hong Kong SAR; China; India (Delhi); Mozambique; Niger; Russian Federation; Rwanda; United Kingdom</td>
<td>Niger made the process for getting an electricity connection faster by increasing the stock of materials the utility carries and by allowing the internal wiring certificate of conformity to be obtained at the same time as the external connection works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined approval process</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam; China; France; Malaysia; Nigeria; Russian Federation; Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand streamlined procedures by setting up a dedicated task force at the utility that coordinates the external works, meter installation and electricity turn-on without the need for customer interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced connection costs</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; China; India (Delhi); Russian Federation; Togo; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>India (Delhi) issued a regulation prescribing new electricity charges. The United Arab Emirates made getting electricity easier by eliminating all costs for commercial and industrial connections of up to 150 kVA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1A.1 Who reduced regulatory complexity and cost or strengthened legal institutions in 2017/18—and what did they do?

### 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 reliability of infrastructure</td>
<td>Croatia; Djibouti; Pakistan; Sri Lanka; Togo</td>
<td>Croatia became fully digitized, increasing the efficiency and transparency of services provided by the Land Registry and Cadaster. Sri Lanka worked toward implementing a fully digital Land Registry and Survey Department by rolling out a geographic information system and creating a Single Window Counter for the issuance of certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased transparency of information</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Croatia; Eswatini; Gabon; Indonesia; Israel; Mauritius; Pakistan; Papua New Guinea; Rwanda; Togo; Tunisia; United Arab Emirates; West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>Gabon and Israel upgraded their official websites to include relevant information to the public at large regarding land registry services. Pakistan and West Bank and Gaza began publishing online official statistics tracking the number of transactions at the immovable property registration agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced taxes or fees</td>
<td>Chad; Congo, Dem. Rep.; Congo, Rep.; Djibouti; Guinea; Togo</td>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep. reduced the cost of securing land and property titles. Guinea reduced the fees to transfer property from 2% to 1.2% of the property value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced time for registering property</td>
<td>China; Djibouti; France; Kenya; Malawi; Malaysia; Morocco; Sri Lanka; Togo; West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>Malawi made property transfer faster by decentralizing the consent to transfer property to local government authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased administrative efficiency</td>
<td>China; Djibouti; Indonesia; Israel; Kenya; Morocco; Niger; Pakistan; Senegal; Sri Lanka; Togo</td>
<td>Niger improved communication between the taxation department and the registration department by merging procedures, making reviewing and approving property transfers significantly faster. Senegal further streamlined the interactions between different departments at the Property Registry (Conservation Foncière).</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>Azerbaijan; Belgium; Kenya; Nicaragua; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates established a modern and unified collateral registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced a functional and secured transactions system</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya strengthened access to credit by implementing a functional secured transactions system. The new law regulates functional equivalents to loans secured with movable property, such as financial leases and fiduciary transfer of title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed for general description of assets that can be used as collateral</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Djibouti allowed the general description of debts and obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded range of movable assets that can be used as collateral</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Belgium, Djibouti; Egypt, Arab. Rep.; Turkey; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep. introduced a new 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>Afghanistan; Belgium; Djibouti; Egypt, Arab. Rep.; India; Sudan; Turkey; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Afghanistan introduced a new law that grants secured creditors absolute priority over other claims within insolvency proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted exemptions to secured creditors from automatic stay in insolvency proceedings</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Rwanda; Sudan</td>
<td>Rwanda adopted a new law on insolvency that contemplates 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>Azerbaijan; Benin; Haiti; Ireland; San Marino</td>
<td>San Marino improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved regulatory framework for credit reporting</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda; Bahamas, The; Grenada; Madagascar</td>
<td>Madagascar 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>Brazil; Côte d’Ivoire; Indonesia; Jamaica; Jordan; Turkey</td>
<td>In Indonesia, one public utility 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>Brunei Darussalam; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>In Brunei Darussalam, the credit registry began offering credit scores to banks and other financial institutions to better inform their lending decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed by law borrowers’ right to inspect data</td>
<td>Mauritania; Qatar</td>
<td>Qatar 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>Côte d’Ivoire; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Zimbabwe expanded the number of borrowers listed by its credit registry with information on their borrowing history from the past five years to more than 5% of the adult population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1A.1 Who reduced regulatory complexity and cost or strengthened legal institutions in 2017/18—and what did they do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening minority investor protections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded shareholders’ role in company management</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Bahrain; China; Cyprus; Djibouti; Dominican Republic; Egypt, Arab Rep.; Jordan; Kenya; Kuwait; Kyrgyz Republic; Lithuania; Mauritius; Papua New Guinea; Philippines; Saudi Arabia; Sudan; Taiwan, China; Tunisia; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>The Philippines issued new rules for companies listed on its stock exchange. Shareholders can now approve the appointment and dismissal of the auditor and companies must establish an audit committee composed exclusively of board members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased disclosure requirements for related-party transactions</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Armenia; Bahrain; Cyprus; Djibouti; Kenya; Kuwait; Tunisia; Ukraine</td>
<td>In Tunisia, an amendment to capital market rules requires that companies promptly make public information on interested party transactions and conflicts of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced access to information in shareholder actions</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Bahrain; China; Djibouti; Jordan; Sudan</td>
<td>Djibouti introduced major changes to its Code of Commerce. Among the changes, any information relevant to the subject matter of the claim must now be made available to shareholders when they bring a lawsuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased director liability</td>
<td>Djibouti; Kenya; Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Kenya enacted the Companies Amendment Act 2017, which holds directors liable for transactions with interested parties valued at 10% or more of a company's assets and that cause damages to the company. Directors involved in prejudicial transactions are now required to pay damages, disgorge profits and may be disqualified from holding similar office for up to five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to pay taxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or enhanced electronic systems</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Bahamas, The; Bhutan; China; Côte d’Ivoire; Cyprus; Finland; Iran, Islamic Rep.; Jordan; Kenya; Mauritius; Panama; Sri Lanka; Thailand; Togo; Turkey</td>
<td>The Bahamas implemented an online system for filing and payment of value added tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced profit tax rate, allowed for more tax-deductible expenses and made changes to tax depreciation rules</td>
<td>Ecuador; France; Georgia; Hungary; India; Russian Federation; Togo</td>
<td>Ecuador introduced a Tax Incentive Law in 2017 allowing businesses to deduct an additional 100% on amounts paid to cover private medical insurance or prepaid health care for its employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced labor taxes and mandatory contributions, or taxes other than profit and labor</td>
<td>China (Beijing); Cyprus; Finland; France; Hungary; India; Uzbekistan; Vietnam</td>
<td>Vietnam reduced the employer's contribution to the labor fund from 1% to 0.5%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced new or significantly revised tax law or tax code</td>
<td>Georgia; India</td>
<td>India introduced the Maharashtra Goods and Services Tax Act 2017 and the Delhi Goods and Services Tax Act 2017, which unified all sales taxes into one new tax called the Goods and Services Tax (GST).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified tax compliance processes or decreased number of tax filings or payments</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Armenia; Azerbaijan; China; Georgia; India; Kenya; Kosovo; Lithuania; Vietnam</td>
<td>Armenia improved the quality of the local accounting software (Arm accounting) for corporate income tax and labor taxes in 2017 by incorporating a wider range of tax calculations. This allowed for the integration of the local accounting software with the tax authority’s secure data transmission and storage system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged or eliminated taxes</td>
<td>China; Cyprus; Ecuador; India; Kenya; Lithuania; Tunisia; Vietnam</td>
<td>Cyprus abolished the immovable property tax and did not extend the levy of the Special Contribution for Employees, Pensioners and Self-Employed Individuals in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved VAT refund process</td>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.; Iran, Islamic Rep.; Kosovo; Mauritius; Mozambique</td>
<td>Mauritius introduced an expedited processing system for the repayment of value added tax refunds and upgraded its online platform to allow for the online submission of invoices and amended corporate tax returns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved tax audit processes and correction of corporate income tax processes</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Iran, Islamic Rep.; Kosovo; Mauritius</td>
<td>In 2017 Afghanistan introduced a new tax administration and law manual with clear rules and guidelines on tax audit and automated the submission of tax returns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Making it easier to trade across borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved electronic submission and processing of documents for exports</td>
<td>Angola; Azerbaijan; China; Congo, Dem. Rep.; India; Iran; Islamic Rep.; Kazakhstan; Kosovo; Lesotho; Lithuania; Malaysia; Morocco; Mozambique; Nigeria; Russian Federation; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Thailand; Turkey; Uganda; Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Kazakhstan made trading across borders easier by introducing an electronic customs declaration system, ASTANA-1 IS, and reducing customs administrative fees. Uganda fully implemented the Centralized Document Processing Centre, an electronic processing platform that centralizes all documentary checks. Traders in Uganda also began using the Uganda Electronic Single Window, which allows for electronic submission of documents as well as for the exchange of information between trade agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or improved electronic submission and processing of documents for imports</td>
<td>Angola; Azerbaijan; Bahrain; Brazil; China; Congo, Dem. Rep.; Ghana; India; Iran; Islamic Rep.; Lesotho; Malaysia; Morocco; Mozambique; Nigeria; Paraguay, Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Turkey; Uganda</td>
<td>Lesotho made importing faster by implementing the Automated System for Customs Data (ASYCUDA), reducing documentary compliance time for imports by two hours. In January 2017, Paraguay introduced the legal validity of the electronic signature for trade operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened border infrastructure for exports</td>
<td>China; El Salvador; India; Malaysia; Morocco; Rwanda; Uganda</td>
<td>El Salvador made exporting easier by introducing an intermediate customs post in Santa Ana, reducing congestion at the Angulautú border crossing. Rwanda reduced border compliance time by having staff from the Rwanda Revenue Authority and the Tanzania Revenue Authority at the Rusomo one-stop border post, the result of the implementation of the Single Customs Territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened border infrastructure for imports</td>
<td>Bahrain; China; India; Malaysia; Morocco; Mozambique; Nigeria; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Uganda</td>
<td>Malaysia strengthened infrastructure at Port Klang by opening a second gate with additional scanners, upgrading the management system, expanding two terminals and decreasing the cut-off time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced customs administration and inspections for exports and imports</td>
<td>Algeria; Azerbaijan; China; Ghana; Guinea; India; Iran; Islamic Rep.; Kazakhstan; Kosovo; Kyrgyz Republic; Lao PDR; Malaysia; Mauritius; Nigeria; Russian Federation; Rwanda; Tajikistan; Turkey; Ukraine</td>
<td>Mauritius made exporting easier by introducing a risk-based management system which reduced border compliance time by 14 hours. Ukraine made trading across borders easier by eliminating the verification requirement on auto-parts. Kosovo also introduced simplified controls at the border with Albania, reducing the number of physical examinations during customs clearance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Making it easier to enforce contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Some highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduced significant changes to the applicable civil procedure or enforcement rules</td>
<td>Albania; Armenia; Djibouti; Kyrgyz Republic; Malawi; Mongolia; Niger; Nigeria (Lagos); Rwanda; São Tomé and Príncipe; Saudi Arabia; Slovenia; Sri Lanka; Ukraine</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic, Slovenia, Sri Lanka and Ukraine amended the civil procedure rules to introduce a pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques used in court. Albania, Armenia, Niger, Nigeria (Lagos) and Ukraine issued new rules of procedure for small claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded court automation by introducing electronic payment, electronic service of process, automatic assignment of cases to judges or by publishing judgments</td>
<td>Canada; Georgia; Jordan; Kazakhstan; Madagascar; Poland; Puerto Rico (U.S.); Slovak Republic; Turkey; Vietnam; Zambia; Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Canada, Jordan and Puerto Rico (U.S.) implemented a platform to pay fees electronically. Georgia, Madagascar and Poland introduced random and automatic assignment of cases to judges throughout the courts. Slovak Republic implemented electronic service of process. Kazakhstan, Turkey, Vietnam and Zimbabwe made decisions rendered in commercial cases publicly available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or expanded the electronic case management system</td>
<td>Denmark; Kazakhstan; Madagascar; Namibia; Puerto Rico (U.S.)</td>
<td>Denmark, Madagascar and Puerto Rico (U.S.) introduced an electronic case management system. Kazakhstan and Namibia introduced the possibility of generating performance measurement reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced electronic filing</td>
<td>Canada; Chile; Denmark; Puerto Rico (U.S.); Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Canada, Chile, Denmark, Puerto Rico (U.S.) and Saudi Arabia introduced an electronic filing system for commercial cases, allowing attorneys to submit the initial summons online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced or expanded specialized commercial court</td>
<td>Djibouti; Ethiopia</td>
<td>Djibouti and Ethiopia introduced dedicated benches to resolve commercial disputes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded the alternative dispute resolution framework</td>
<td>Benin; Burkina Faso; Cameroon; Central African Republic; Chad; Comoros; Congo, Dem. Rep.; Congo, Rep.; Côte d’Ivoire; Djibouti; Equatorial Guinea; Gabon; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau, Ireland; Kyrgyz Republic; Mali; Niger; Senegal; Singapore; Sudan; Togo; Turkey</td>
<td>Djibouti, Ireland and Kyrgyz Republic adopted laws that regulate all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism. Sudan recognized voluntary conciliation and mediation as ways of resolving commercial disputes. Turkey introduced financial incentives for mediation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1A.1 Who reduced regulatory complexity and cost or strengthened legal institutions in 2017/18—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 resolve insolvency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved the likelihood of successful reorganization</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Djibouti; Egypt, Arab. Rep.; Kenya; Morocco; Pakistan; Rwanda; Turkey</td>
<td>Morocco 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>Afghanistan; Egypt, Arab. Rep.; Malaysia; Pakistan</td>
<td>Pakistan introduced the option of reorganization for commercial entities as an alternative to previously available option of liquidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened creditors’ rights</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Djibouti; Kenya; Kyrgyz Republic; Morocco; Rwanda; Sudan; Turkey</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic granted an individual creditor the right to access information about the debtor’s business and financial affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved provisions on treatment of contracts during insolvency</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Azerbaijan; Kenya; Kyrgyz Republic; Pakistan; Sudan</td>
<td>Kenya allowed for the continuation of contracts supplying essential goods and services to the debtor, giving the administrator the power to continue or disclaim contracts of the debtor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined insolvency procedures</td>
<td>Belgium; Burundi</td>
<td>Belgium unified its insolvency legal framework and streamlined provisions related to liquidation and reorganization procedures.</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>Benin; Nepal</td>
<td>Benin increased the maximum length of fixed-term contracts. Nepal allowed fixed-term contracts for permanent tasks and reduced probationary periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended regulation of working hours</td>
<td>Brazil; Canada; Haiti; India (Mumbai); Israel; Lithuania; Nepal; Norway; South Sudan</td>
<td>India (Mumbai) eliminated restrictions on weekly holiday work and introduced a 100% wage premium for work on the weekly rest day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed redundancy rules and cost</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; Brazil; Costa Rica; France; Lithuania; Nepal; South Sudan</td>
<td>France increased severance payments. Lithuania decreased the notice period and severance payments in case of redundancy. Nepal eliminated the third-party approval requirement in case of redundancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed legislation regulating worker protection and social benefits</td>
<td>Bulgaria; Canada; Costa Rica; Israel; Luxembourg; Malaysia; Mali; Mozambique; Nepal; South Sudan; United States (New York)</td>
<td>Canada introduced two days of paid sick leave. Israel, Luxembourg, Nepal and South Sudan increased the duration of paid maternity leave.</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.
About Doing Business

Doing Business is founded on the principle that economic activity benefits from clear and coherent rules: rules that set out strong property rights, facilitate the resolution of disputes and provide contractual partners with protections against arbitrariness and abuse. Such rules are much more effective in promoting growth and development when they are efficient, transparent and accessible to those for whom they are intended. The strength and inclusivity of the rules also have 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 innovative ideas can get started in business and where productive firms can invest, expand and create new jobs. The role of government policy in the daily operations of small and medium-size domestic firms is a central focus of the Doing Business data. The objective is to encourage regulation that is efficient, transparent and easy to implement so that businesses can thrive and promote economic and social progress. Doing Business data focus on the 11 areas of regulation affecting small and medium-size domestic firms in the largest business city of an economy. The project uses standardized case studies to provide objective, quantitative measures that can be compared across 190 economies.

Doing Business also measures features of labor market regulation, which are reported as a separate section and not included in the ranking.

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 (FDI), market capitalization in

FACTORS DOING BUSINESS MEASURES

Doing Business captures several important dimensions of the regulatory environment affecting domestic 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 which are reported as a separate section and not included in the ranking.

Doing Business measures aspects of business regulation affecting small and medium-size domestic firms defined based on standardized case scenarios and located in the largest business city of 190 economies. In addition, for 11 economies a second city is covered.

Doing Business covers 11 areas of business regulation. 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 ease of doing business 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 World Bank Group regional staff.

Over the past 16 years more than 43,800 professionals in 190 economies have assisted in providing the data that inform the Doing Business indicators.

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

There are no methodological changes in Doing Business 2019 data.

TABLE 2.1 What Doing Business measures—11 areas of business regulation

<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 for men and women</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 for men and women</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 postfiling 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 for men and women</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>

stock exchanges and private credit as a percentage of GDP.

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. These surveys provide data highlighting the main obstacles to business activity as reported by entrepreneurs from more than 136,880 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, the 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 ease of doing business score 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 ease of doing business score and the ease of doing business ranking. The ease of doing business score aids in assessing the absolute level of regulatory performance and how it improves over time. The individual indicator scores show the distance of each economy to the best regulatory performance observed in 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 best regulatory performance 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 regulatory 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 (see the chapter on the ease of doing business score and ease of doing business ranking). The ranking on the ease of doing business complements the ease of doing business 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 ease of doing business score. Each topic covered by Doing Business relates to a different aspect of the business regulatory environment. The scores and rankings of each economy vary 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 an economy’s regulatory performance is to look at its scores across topics (see the country tables). Qatar, for example, has an overall ease of doing business score of 65.89, meaning that it is about two-thirds of the way from the worst to the best performance. It scores highly at 99.44 on paying taxes, 87.67 on starting a
An economy’s regulatory environment may be more business-friendly in some areas than in others

![Graph showing Doing Business scores]

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The scores reflected are those for the 10 Doing Business topics included in this year’s aggregate ease of doing business score. The figure is illustrative only; it does not include all 190 economies covered by this year’s report. See the country tables for the scores for each Doing Business topic for all economies.

Business and 83.27 on registering property. At the same time, it has a score of 28.33 for protecting minority investors, 38.12 for resolving insolvency and 40 for getting credit.

**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. Given that Doing Business measures only a few features of each area that it covers, business regulatory reforms should not focus only on these narrow areas and should be evaluated within a broader perspective.

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 total 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 a starting point for this discussion and should be used in conjunction with additional data sources. Other World Bank Group databases that provide comprehensive data related to some areas of Doing Business include: Women,
Business and the Law, which measures legal restrictions on women’s economic opportunities in 189 economies; the Logistic Performance Index, which benchmarks the performance of trade logistics in 160 economies; the World Governance Indicators, which provides data on different dimensions of governance in 214 economies; and Country Policy and Institutional Assessments, which measure the quality of policies and institutions in International Development Association (IDA) economies.5

**ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY**

The Doing Business methodology is designed to be an easily replicable way to benchmark specific characteristics of business regulation—how they are implemented by governments and experienced by private firms on the ground. 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.6 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.7 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of standardized case scenarios</td>
<td>Makes data comparable across economies and methodology transparent</td>
<td>Reduces scope of data; only regulatory reforms in areas measured can be systematically tracked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on largest business city*</td>
<td>Makes data collection manageable (cost-effective) and data comparable</td>
<td>Reduces representativeness of data for an economy if there are significant differences across locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on domestic and formal private sector</td>
<td>Keeps attention on formal sector—where regulations are relevant and firms are most productive</td>
<td>Unable to reflect reality for informal sector—important where that is large—or for foreign firms facing a different set of constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on expert respondents</td>
<td>Ensures that data reflect knowledge of those with most experience in conducting types of transactions measured</td>
<td>Indicators less able to capture variation in experiences among entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the law</td>
<td>Makes indicators “actionable”—because the law is what policy makers can change</td>
<td>Where systematic compliance with the law is lacking, regulatory changes will not achieve full results desired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 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.
BOX 2.1 Subnational Doing Business indicators: the European Union series

Doing Business in the European Union is a series of subnational reports being produced by the World Bank Group at the request of and funded by the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO). A first edition, covering 22 cities in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, was released in 2017. This year, 25 more cities in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Portugal and the Slovak Republic were benchmarked (see map). The next study in the subnational series will cover 24 cities in Greece, Ireland and Italy. The ambition is to continue this series until all member states with at least 4 million inhabitants have been covered. The focus of the series is on indicator sets that measure the complexity and cost of regulatory processes as well as the strength of legal institutions, affecting five stages in the life of a small to medium-size domestic firm: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property and enforcing contracts through a local court.

Because many regulations and administrative measures are implemented or determined by local authorities, subnational Doing Business studies give a nuanced and comprehensive representation of the business regulatory system and the efficacy of the bureaucracy at the local administrative unit level. By providing a factual baseline, along with local examples of good practices, the studies promote peer learning—both within national boundaries and beyond—and convergence among locations toward regulatory good practices.

The results are revealing. The studies show that there remain substantial differences in the business environment both between and within EU member states. And these differences matter. A study that looked at cities in Italy, Poland, Romania and Spain found that firms located in places with a better business environment have a stronger performance in sales, employment and productivity growth as well as in investments. Reducing the cost for local firms to do business would enhance their efficiency and competitiveness abroad and encourage investments, which are critical for regional growth. A European Commission report on competitiveness in low-income and low-growth regions also emphasizes the need to improve public administration and make procedures more transparent.

The findings of the studies indicate how reform-minded officials can make tangible improvements by replicating good practices already existing in other cities in their country. For example, by adopting all the good practices found at the subnational level, all four member states benchmarked in 2018 would move substantially closer to the regulatory best performance.

The insights from the subnational Doing Business in the European Union series will be relevant for the individual country reports produced for the European Semester (the European Union’s economic and fiscal policy coordination framework) and for the Cohesion Policy (the EU’s main investment policy) and will be closely linked with the European Commission’s “lagging regions” initiative, which studies constraints to growth and investment in the low-income and low-growth regions of the European Union.

---

DATA COLLECTION IN PRACTICE

The Doing Business data are based on a detailed reading of domestic laws, regulations and administrative requirements as well as their implementation in practice as experienced by private firms. 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 detailed explanation of the Doing Business methodology, see the data notes at http://www.doingbusiness.org.

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 70% between 2010 and 2018.

Extensive consultations with multiple contributors are conducted by the team to minimize measurement errors 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 set.

Doing Business respondents

More than 43,800 professionals in 190 economies have assisted in providing the data that inform the Doing Business indicators over the past 16 years. This year’s report draws on the inputs of more than 13,800 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

---

FIGURE 2.2   How Doing Business collects and verifies the data
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**Questionnaire development**
- The Doing Business team updates the questionnaires and consults with internal and external experts.

**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.
Doing Business offers policy makers a benchmarking tool useful in stimulating policy debate.

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 start-up 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 the Country Management Units (CMUs) of the World Bank Group in different regions. At a later stage, the team sends the final versions of the reform descriptions to the World Bank Group’s Board of Executive Directors, which then informs the governments of the reforms in their economies. 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. 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 available at the Doing Business website. A transparent complaint procedure allows anyone to challenge the data. From November 2017 to October 2018 the team received and responded to over 150 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 (see 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 70 other economies have also formed such committees. In East Asia and the Pacific, they include Brunei Darussalam; Indonesia; the Republic of Korea; Myanmar; the Philippines; Sri Lanka; Taiwan, China; and Thailand. In the Middle East and North Africa: Algeria, the Arab Republic of Egypt, Israel, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. In South Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India and Pakistan. In Europe and Central Asia: Albania, Azerbaijan, 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. Governments have reported more than 3,500 regulatory reforms, 1,116 of which have been informed by Doing Business since 2003.

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.

Researchers

Doing Business data are widely used by researchers in academia, think tanks, international organizations and other institutions. Since 2003, thousands of researchers have utilized Doing Business data or its conceptual framework to analyze the impact of business regulation on various economic outcomes. This section provides a brief overview of studies published in the top 100 journals during the last 10 years or recently distributed as a working paper of a well-established institution. The papers cited here are just a few examples of research done in the areas measured by Doing Business. A comprehensive review of the literature is provided in the research chapters of Doing Business 2014 and Doing Business 2015.

Regulation of firm entry is one of the most investigated areas of business regulation. The results of this body of research suggest that excessive regulation of entry increases the number of informal businesses and employment. A natural experimental study in Mexico found that reforms that simplified business registration increased registration by 5% and wage employment by 2.2%.

These reforms also resulted in 14.9% of informal business owners shifting to the

Thousands of researchers have utilized Doing Business data or its conceptual framework to analyze the impact of business regulation on various economic outcomes.
formal economy. In Portugal, reforms reducing the time and cost for company formalization increased the number of business start-ups by 17% and created seven new jobs per 100,000 inhabitants per month. These new start-ups were more likely to be female-owned, were smaller and headed by less experienced and less-educated entrepreneurs compared to others, suggesting that the reform created a more inclusive environment for aspiring entrepreneurs.

Efficient and non-distortionary business regulations are crucial for productivity. A study on India, for example, shows that inefficient licensing and size restrictions cause a misallocation of resources, reducing total factor productivity (TFP) by preventing efficient firms from achieving their optimal scale and allowing inefficient firms to remain in the market. The study concludes that removing these restrictions would boost TFP by 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 TFP of the former by about 30% through a rise in bank loans to large firms.

In many economies, companies engaged in international trade struggle with high trade costs arising from transport, logistics and regulations that impede their competitiveness and growth potential. With the Doing Business indicators on trading across borders, 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. According to a study, 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 reduce trade by more than 1% for each day of delay. Delays in customs clearance also negatively impact a firm’s ability to export, particularly when goods are destined for new clients. 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 shown that potential gains for consumers from import competition are reduced in economies with cumbersome regulation.

Even though Doing Business measures aspects of business regulation affecting domestic firms, several studies indicate that better business regulation is associated with higher levels of FDI. Also, the impact of FDI on domestic investment depends on how business-friendly entry regulations are in the host economy. A study shows that FDI can crowd out domestic investment in economies with costly processes for starting a business. Another study points out that economies with simpler processes for starting a business have higher international market integration on average.

A well-designed insolvency framework is a vital determinant of debt recovery. A reform making bankruptcy laws more efficient in Colombia, for example, improved the recovery rate of viable firms significantly. 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. A recent study using Doing Business data showed that insolvency resolution is one of the main drivers behind “missing” corporate bond markets in many economies.

More borrowers gain access to credit in economies with a robust legal system that supports the use of movable assets as collateral and a well-developed credit information sharing system. In a multi-economy study, the introduction of collateral registries for movable assets was shown to increase firms’ access to finance by approximately 8%. Creditors’ ability to use movable assets, vis-à-vis real estate, is shown to increase the debt capacity of firms. 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.

There is also a large body of work investigating the distortionary effects of high tax rates and cumbersome tax codes and procedures. After a tax reform in Brazil, business licensing among retail firms rose by 13%. Research shows that a 10% reduction in tax complexity is comparable to a 1% reduction in effective corporate tax rates and higher tax rates discourage entry. A recent study finds that a lower tax compliance burden has a positive impact on the productivity of small and young firms.

Labor market regulation— as measured by Doing Business—has been shown to have important implications for economies. 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 analyzing the labor market regulation literature points out that the impact of labor market regulation on productivity could be in either direction, and the magnitude of the
impact is modest. The study provides clear evidence that labor market regulation equalizes the income of the covered workers, but youth, women and less-skilled workers generally are left outside this coverage and the benefits.41

Indexes
Doing Business identified 20 different data projects or indexes that use Doing Business as one of its sources of data.42
Most of these projects or institutions use indicator level data and 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. 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.43 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 global driver 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.

WHAT IS NEXT?
The Doing Business team is developing a new indicator set—contracting with the government—that benchmarks the efficiency, quality, transparency, accountability and integrity of public procurement systems around the world. Public procurement refers to the process by which public authorities purchase goods or services from firms. Globally, public procurement accounts for between 10 and 25% of GDP on average, with governments cumulatively spending about $9.5 trillion in public contracts every year. The government is the biggest buyer on many national markets and the policy issues endorsed through public procurement can be a catalyst for economic development, innovation, employment and growth. Inefficient public procurement, on the other hand, is extremely costly. It compromises competition, thus raising the prices paid by governments for goods and services. Also, given the magnitude of the resources involved, the unique purchasing power of governments, the multitude of stakeholders and the complexity of processes, public procurement is particularly vulnerable to fraud and corruption. In the European Union alone, annual losses due to corruption in public procurement could equal approximately €5 billion ($5.7 billion), higher than the GDP of more than 30% of Sub-Saharan African economies.44

Data are collected using a questionnaire that follows the life cycle of a procurement contract in the road infrastructure sector. The questionnaire was built to reflect internationally-recognized good practices in public procurement, peer-reviewed and piloted in 18 economies in late 2017. The team is in the process of collecting data for approximately 85 economies with the aim of publishing the results in the Doing Business website by early 2019 alongside the indicator set’s preliminary methodology. Data collection will then be scaled-up to the full Doing Business sample of 190 economies during the Doing Business 2020 report cycle, when the indicators will be considered for inclusion in the Doing Business rankings.

Doing Business recognizes that the comparability of data over time is vital for both researchers and policy makers. The team has not, therefore, made any methodological changes in this year’s data. This decision is also supported by the Doing Business External Audit Report 2018, which can be accessed at http://www.doingbusiness.org/.

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 ease of doing business score and ease of doing business ranking available at http://www.doingbusiness.org.
7. Schneider 2005; La Porta and Shleifer 2008.
8. For the law library, see the website at http://www.doingbusiness.org/law-library.
9. 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.
10. While about 13,800 contributors provided data for this year’s report, many of them completed a questionnaire for more than one Doing Business indicator set. Indeed, the
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total number of contributions received for this year’s report is more than 17,200, 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.

11. These are reforms for which Doing Business is aware that information provided by Doing Business was used in shaping the reform agenda.

12. The journal and institution rankings are from Research Papers in Economics (RePEc) and cover the last 10 years. They can be accessed at https://ideas.repec.org/top/top.journals.simple10.html and https://ideas.repec.org/top/top.inst.allbest10.html.

13. Since 2003, when the Doing Business report was first published, more than 3,400 research articles discussing how regulation in the areas measured by Doing Business influence economic outcomes have been published in peer-reviewed academic journals and 1,360 of these are published in the top 100 journals. Another 9,450 are published as working papers, books, reports, dissertations or research notes.

25. Freund and Bolaky 2008.
27. Corcoran and Gillanders 2015.
34. Calomiris and others 2017.
37. Lawless 2013.
42. The projects or indexes using Doing Business as a source of data are the following: Citi and Imperial College London’s Digital Money Index; Cornell University and the World Intellectual Property Organization’s Global Innovation Index (GII); DHL’s Global Connectedness Index (GCI); Fraser Institute’s Economic Freedom of the World (EFW) Index; Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom (IEF); INSEAD’s Global Talent Competitiveness Index (GTCI); International Institute for Management Development’s World Competitiveness Yearbook; KPMG’s Change Readiness Index (CRI); Legatum Institute’s Legatum Prosperity Index; Millennium Challenge Corporation’s Open Data Catalog; Oxford University’s International Civil Service Effectiveness (InCiSE) Index; PricewaterhouseCoopers’ Paying Taxes 2018: In-depth Analysis on Tax Systems in 190 Economies Report; TRACE’s Bribery Risk Matrix; U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Global Rule of Law and Business Dashboard; University of Gothenburg’s Quality of Government (QoG) Standard Dataset; and World Economic Forum’s Enabling Trade Index (ETI), Global Competitiveness Index (GCI), Human Capital Index (HCI), Networked Readiness Index (NRI) and Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Index (TTCI).
43. For more on the Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom, see the website at http://heritage.org/index.
Starting a Business and Registering Property

The role of training in facilitating entrepreneurship and property rights

By keeping records of a company’s formal existence and of land ownership rights, business and land registries play a critical role in any economy’s business environment. Registering a new company or a property right is best done when registry officers are well trained and knowledgeable. A combination of targeted training and effective communication to both civil servants and the public can improve the overall quality of the public goods and services provided by business and land registries.

For the first time this year Doing Business collected data on the training and communication of changes provided to both the officers and the users of business and land registries. Regarding registry officers, Doing Business research covered qualification requirements for civil servants, the mandatory training of officers, the frequency and duration of training and how changes in the registries are communicated to them. Data were also collected on training for registry users, including the workshops offered to new business owners and the targeted communication of registry changes to the general public. This case study examines how training contributes to business activity by improving the quality of services provided by business registries (to entrepreneurs) and land registries (to property owners).

The systematic training of registry officers is, therefore, vital for a well-functioning registry system and the effective implementation of government policies to promote entrepreneurship.

Relevance of training in business and land registries

Well-trained staff are more efficient and less prone to making errors when assessing transactions or assisting entrepreneurs. Business registrars typically undertake a series of training programs and examinations to gain the qualifications required to perform their duties. The Canadian province of Alberta, for example, requires aspiring business registrars to complete three levels of exams to receive the highest accreditation for the Corporate Registry Electronic System. To pass these exams, students complete three online courses (costing 365 Canadian dollars—about $282—each) through which they learn how to perform procedures such as registering limited liability partnerships and amending corporate structures, among others.¹

TRAINING REGISTRY OFFICERS

Business and land registry officers play a key role in facilitating the delivery of high-quality services to new entrepreneurs.

- This year Doing Business collected data on training provided to business and land registry officers and users in 183 economies.
- Training opportunities at business and land registries are only provided in a limited number of economies.
- Only 24% of the economies measured for this case study legally require professional training for business registry officers.
- Mandatory training for business registry officers is associated with higher business registry efficiency while annual training for land registry officers is also associated with higher land registry efficiency.
- Communication of changes at the business and land registries—through workshops for registry officers and dissemination campaigns for registry users—is associated with a lower transaction completion time.
Land registrars also play a fundamental role in guaranteeing legal certainty to property rights transactions. To perform their duties local land officers need a range of technical and communication skills that can be attained through staff training programs. Most economies regulate the position of land registrar, typically through minimum skill or education requirements. Of the 183 economies included in this case study, 74% require that land registrars attain a minimum level of education (usually a university degree in law), 47% require a professional qualification and 44% mandate a minimum number of years of experience. Only 15% of economies require a combination of four criteria—typically a minimum level of education, minimum years of experience, professional qualification and being a civil servant. Prospective land registrars in Bulgaria, for example, must have a university degree in law, a license to practice law, evidence of moral integrity and professional standing, no record of intentional criminal offenses, and the candidate must not be an elected member of the Supreme Judicial Council.

Continuous training in business and land registries
Most economies do not have legally binding regulation that mandates training for business registry officers (figure 3.1). Indeed, just 24% of the economies measured for this case study legally require professional training for business registry officers. Such requirements vary significantly among regions—nearly two-thirds (59%) of economies in Europe and Central Asia have a legal requirement for training, but only 11% of economies in the Middle East and North Africa do. Although group classes are the most common form of training, online learning tools are used in about 5% of economies with a legal requirement to provide training to business registry officers. The content of the training is diverse, varying from technical skills (legislative changes, types of entities and incorporation requirements, IT skills) to soft skills (professional ethics, communication skills). In Spain, the Professional Association of Registrars offers online and in-person courses free of charge for registry officers. Topics include the legal forms and corporate structure of a company and the processes of registering or dissolving each type of company, among others.

Slightly more than half of the economies that legally mandate training also define a minimum frequency or duration of that training. In China and Romania, for example, mandatory training programs must be held annually. Registry staff typically make decisions on the duration and frequency of training programs.

The Land Administration Guidelines from the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe suggest that training for land registry officers be practical, available to all who require it and range from university-level courses for comprehensive professional training to short-term courses for the introduction of new techniques. Land registries should provide both formal and in-house training for employees and ensure that staff have adequate time to take advantage of training opportunities. Training is essential to convey registry service standards (procedural times, for example) so that staff understand their duties and are equipped to handle problems when they arise.

Training should not be limited to managers and supervisors. Land registry staff that interact with the public on a daily basis should also be well trained. Capacity-building training programs—such as that provided for the staff of Turkey’s land and cadaster agency in 2018 or the workshop on land records management in Thailand held in 2017—can be important for maintaining the quality of land registry services.

Although most economies do not legally require continuous training, one-third of economies measured by this case study hold regular training programs on
a variety of topics for land registry officials. Routine training is offered in 45% of OECD high-income economies but just 24% of economies in Sub-Saharan Africa. While the topics of these training programs vary, they commonly include administrative processes (offered in 35% of economies with training), property rights (30%), new systems or innovations (27%) and customer service and coordination with other agencies such as the cadaster or tax authority (22%).

Business and land registry efficiency tends to be higher in economies where training is offered to registry staff. Economies with mandatory training for business registry officers have a score for starting a business that is 6 points higher on average than those without it (figure 3.2). Furthermore, economies with annual training programs at the land registry have a higher score (by 7 points on average) for registering property than economies without it.

### Communicating changes to registry officers

Changes to regulations or processes at business and land registries can be communicated to staff in various ways. At business registries, officers learn about changes to the business start-up process through workshops in 66% of economies; in 39% of economies they are informed via pilot tests. Workshops and pilot tests are also the most common means of informing staff of changes to regulations or processes at land registries; 56% of economies mainly use workshops for this purpose while 24% use pilot tests (figure 3.3).

By using pilot testing, business and land registries can identify and address potential challenges before the full implementation of new processes. Pilot tests are most commonly implemented in registries in Europe and Central Asia, where 55% of business registries and 41% of land registries use pilot testing. A significant share of registries in the OECD high-income economies and East Asia and the Pacific also run pilot tests before implementing new processes. Pilot testing is used in less than 20% of economies in Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and North Africa, South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Training registry officers about upcoming changes is associated with a positive impact on the business operating environment. Doing Business data indicate that it takes 12 days less on average to incorporate a business and 29 days less on average to transfer a property in economies with training programs than those without it.
economies where registry officers have received training compared to economies where no training is offered (figure 3.4).

**TRAINING REGISTRY USERS**

Registry users also benefit from training. As the popularity of entrepreneurial training programs has risen in recent years, governments worldwide have taken steps to develop and expand such programs.

**Relevance of training for entrepreneurs**

In 2014, some 230 Entrepreneurship Education and Training (ETT) programs were identified around the world; these include global initiatives like the International Labor Organization’s Know About Business and Start and Improve Your Business and regional programs like Injaz Al-Arab.10

When EET programs target budding entrepreneurs, results show significant increases in self-employment, household consumption, and income two years after the intervention.11 Over time, evaluations find positive and significant effects of EET on business growth such as, for example, enhancing entrepreneurs’ access to credit.12 Training programs also succeeded in teaching new entrepreneurs managerial skills useful to the operation of their businesses.13 In addition, business-support interventions for small and medium-size enterprises like training programs help improve firm performance and create jobs.14 However, depending on the national context and on the audience receiving the program, the impact of training programs can vary widely. An experiment in Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, showed that individuals with an existing business tend to benefit more from training opportunities and make more investments than individuals without a business.15

For more than three decades, the New Enterprise Incentive Scheme—a program run by Australia’s Department of Jobs and Small Business—has provided accredited training and mentoring to help individuals start a business. Delivered by a network of 21 providers nationally, each year the scheme provides 8,600 people with small business training, income support and rental assistance during their first year in business.16

Guatemala’s business registry maintains a budget explicitly dedicated to training system users—the registry has an annual budget of 70,000 quetzales (about $10,000) specifically for training notaries and lawyers. In recent years the land registry spent 208,000 quetzales (about $28,000) to provide training to more than 3,000 system users, mainly notaries and lawyers.

Skills training programs are more successful when the private sector is involved in curriculum development as well as providing on-the-job training via internships or apprenticeships.17 Colombia’s Jóvenes en Acción program, for example, combines classroom instruction with on-the-job training at private companies. This model’s short-term outcomes—namely a higher probability of formal employment and greater earnings—were sustained over the long term.

**Training and information opportunities for registry users**

Registries offer training to start-up firms in just over one-half of OECD high-income economies, the highest share among the regions measured by Doing Business; registries in South Asia offer

---

**FIGURE 3.4** Starting a business and transferring property tend to take less time in economies where workshops are provided to registry staff

![Average time to start a business](image1)

![Average time to transfer property](image2)

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: Both relationships are significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.
the least training to entrepreneurs (figure 3.5). Where training opportunities are offered to entrepreneurs, these usually take the form of group classes, workshops and seminars. Online courses are available in one-third of the economies that offer training.

Training can be offered to anyone starting a business but, in some cases, special learning opportunities are directed to targeted groups, such as youth, elderly and woman entrepreneurs. However, just 17% of economies that provide training implement targeted training programs. In Niger the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the National Employment Promotion Agency run an entrepreneurship training program tailored specifically to young people, including high school students and other youths who did not complete formal education.18

Help desks play a critical role in addressing citizens concerns and inquiries regarding various processes developed by public agencies. By providing access to information help desks act as a strategic educational tool for the public; they allow citizens to have answers to specific inquiries related to procedures. Of the economies included in this case study, 57% have a help desk specifically for property registration available to the public. In general, economies with a publicly-available help desk tend to have a higher score on the quality of land administration index.19 The help desk, which is entirely focused on user and customer satisfaction, improves land registry quality by providing feedback on the types of issues raised by customers, which the registry can then address. Since Peru’s Superintendencia Nacional de los Registros Públicos (SUNARP, the national public registry superintendency) established the Citizen Attention Center in 2014, the help desk has addressed more than half a million inquiries. The center’s lawyers, registration law specialists, provide guidance free of charge on registration and general procedures at the land registry. All citizens have access to this service via e-mail, chat and a free hotline, Aló SUNARP. Economies that have a help desk at the land registry tend to perform better on the ease of registering property indicator set and have a better score in the quality of land administration index.20

**Communication of changes to registry users**

Business and land registries inform the public of changes—for example, to requirements for registering a company or selling a property—using various channels of communication. In a majority of economies, business registries communicate changes to the business start-up process via a dissemination campaign using social media or physical billboards (63%) and public broadcasts on television or radio (65%). Training and workshops are a less-common method of conveying such changes (36%).

Income level plays a role in determining which communication method is used. Business registries in around two-thirds (70%) of low- and middle-income economies use public broadcasting; those in high-income economies rely more heavily on web-based methods of dissemination, such as publication on the business registry’s website.

Similarly, when a new initiative is adopted by the land registry, or when significant changes are made to the legislation or a new system is implemented, registries in 46% of economies communicate those
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**FIGURE 3.5 Most OECD high-income economies provide registry training to entrepreneurs**
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Source: Doing Business database.
changes to the public through a dissemination campaign; 61% rely most heavily on television and radio.

When citizens are made aware of the changes implemented at the business and land registries, they may be more likely to assert their rights with confidence. Doing Business data show that it takes 13 days less on average to start a business and 19 days less on average to transfer a property when a dissemination campaign is used to communicate changes to the public (figure 3.6).

CONCLUSION

Training can be important for ensuring the quality of business and land registries. Data collected for Doing Business 2019 suggest that training initiatives are beneficial to both registry officers and entrepreneurs. Access to training for registry officials and the public can be provided through a variety of channels. Workshops, learning programs, help desks, media broadcasts and awareness campaigns can improve the efficiency of business and land registries and create a well-informed public.

NOTES

This case study was written by Cyriane Coste, Marie Lily Delion, Fatima Hewaidi, Frédéric Meunier, Albert Nogues i Comas, Nadia Novik, Nathalie Reyes, Erick Tjong and Yuriy Valentinovich Avramov.
1. For more information, see the registries training section of the website of the Association of Alberta Registry Agents (AARA) at http://www.aaratraining.com/index.aspx?tabid=1.
3. The share of economies (as measured by this case study) with a legal requirement for training is as follows: Europe and Central Asia (59%); East Asia and the Pacific (28%); OECD high income (27%); Latin America and the Caribbean (16%); Sub-Saharan Africa (16%); South Asia (13%); and Middle East and North Africa (11%).
4. For more information, see the website of the Asociación Profesional de Registradores at http://www.apregistradores.com/.
5. UNECE 1996.
9. The share of economies (as measured by this case study) that hold regular training programs for land registry officials is as follows: OECD high income (45%); East Asia and the Pacific (40%); South Asia (38%); Europe and Central Asia (32%); Middle East and North Africa (32%); Latin America and the Caribbean (29%); and Sub-Saharan Africa (24%).
19. This relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.
20. This relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.
Getting Electricity

Understanding the benefits of wiring regulation

An extensive fire broke out in one of Bamako’s largest markets, the Marché Rose, in December 2017. Business owners watched as their investments were destroyed. After the fire was extinguished, the extent of the damage was clear—hundreds of stalls had been burnt down at a cost of more than 1 billion CFA francs (approximately $1.7 million), most of which was shouldered by small firms. An investigation by the utility later found that faulty installation of electrical wiring caused the fire.

Such incidents act as a reminder that electricity is inherently hazardous. However, electrification is crucial for economic development—its impact on education, labor and income is well documented. Household electrification is estimated to result in an average rise of around 7% in school enrollment, 25% in employment and 30% in income. Where electricity services are deficient, firm performance is negatively impacted. World Bank Enterprise Survey data for 2017 indicate that business owners in developing economies perceive a lack of reliable electricity supply as the biggest obstacle to the operation of their businesses, behind only access to finance, the informal sector and political instability.

There are myriad supply-side impediments to gaining access to electricity. A complicated connection process, for example, can make obtaining a new electricity connection difficult for a newly-incorporated startup. Furthermore, once connected to the grid, firms may face blackouts that force them to halt production or hikes in electricity tariffs that undermine their productivity.

Safety is often absent from the discussion on access to electricity. Faulty wiring can cause direct harm or indirect injury due to fires or explosions. To adequately mitigate safety risks, electricians must be well qualified. However, without a proper accreditation system, asymmetry of information arises—the seller of a good (or service, in this case), has greater knowledge than the buyer. The public is unable to differentiate a good electrician from a bad one. Regulation is also necessary to offset negative market externalities that arise when a firm is not liable for the full cost of an economic decision. Ultimately, the hiring decision will vary depending on the perspective of the consumer—one individual may be willing to hire an unqualified professional while the neighboring community may not (as it would bear the full cost associated with faulty wiring in the case of a fire).

THE HUMAN AND ECONOMIC COST OF FAULTY WIRING

Between 2011 and 2015, fire departments in the United States responded to
nearly 200,000 fires at manufacturing or industrial properties. These fires caused the largest share of civilian deaths and direct property damage, averaging $1.2 billion annually. Most industrial property fires are the result of incidents associated with “electrical distribution and lighting equipment” (figure 4.1). The types of equipment most typically involved in a fire’s ignition are the wiring installation or transformer and power supply. Moreover, the leading cause of ignition is electrical failure (for example, a short circuit or an arc from a broken conductor).

Deadly fires involving electrical failure are common, particularly in developing economies. In South Africa, for example, electrical fires accounted for 80% of the economic loss caused by the 46,000 fires that were attended to in 2015. Improper equipment often causes such fires. In 2012, a fire destroyed a shoe factory in Lahore; investigators later confirmed that a faulty electrical generator was to blame. Incorrect wiring installation is another major cause of electrical fires. Peru’s National Institute of Quality (INACAL) has reported that the main causes of fires in that country are (i) electricians not conforming with wiring codes and standards, and (ii) non-certified electrical engineers performing wiring installation and connection works. Unsurprisingly, data indicate that seven of every 10 fires in urban areas in Peru are the result of defective electricity installations, such as faulty wiring or equipment that does not comply with the norms of the National Electric Code and Norm NTP 370.304 Electrical Installations of Buildings.

ENSURING SAFE ACCESS TO ELECTRICITY MAKES ECONOMIC SENSE

The risks associated with electrical failures undermine firms. At the same time, access to the electrical grid is a key driver of firm production. A casual relationship has been established between electricity consumption and economic growth in India, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. Across Sub-Saharan Africa, it is estimated that the economic growth drag of a weak power infrastructure is about 2 percentage points annually. In Nigeria, increases in energy consumption have been found to spur economic expansion.

Small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) are especially dependent on grid access as they often lack the resources to rely on captive power solutions. Doe and Asamoah (2014) find that without reliable energy supply, SMEs in Ghana struggle to boost output, resulting in low profitability. Similarly, research on electricity provision in India shows that the expansion of the electricity network boosts industrial development and increases the performance of smaller firms.

Given the importance of electricity, managing the risks associated with its use is imperative. The lack of professional certification requirements and quality controls that characterize an inadequately regulated electricity sector reinforce the asymmetry of information individuals face when assessing the qualifications of electricians and engineers. Analogous to Akerlof’s “lemons problem,” unqualified electricians may drive their qualified counterparts out of the market since the latter group will

FIGURE 4.1  Electrical failure is the leading cause of industrial property fires in the United States

Sources: Campbell 2018; National Fire Protection Association.
Note: Data are annual averages for the period 2011–15.
be reluctant to lower their prices if they cannot make a return on their educational investment. In turn, the quality of electrician services will suffer.

Furthermore, in the event that a wiring defect causes a fire, the societal costs can extend beyond the private parties onto neighboring communities. Because private companies do not assume all damages, their decisions may stand in contrast to societal interests. In short, if the electricity market is unregulated, the hiring party may find it economically justifiable to use an unqualified electrician rather than a well-qualified (but more expensive) technician.

A robust regulatory framework governing the electricity sector is necessary to maintain public safety. Regulation must be transparent and cover a broad range of areas. Examples of good practice in electricity sector regulation are highlighted below, as are key findings from a Doing Business cross-economy comparison of electrical wiring safety provisions.

**CLEAR REGULATION: THE FIRST STEP TOWARD ENSURING PUBLIC SAFETY**

A regulatory foundation establishes qualification requirements and electrical installation norms. In nearly all economies private contractors carry out the internal wiring within buildings. And in about one-half of the economies covered by *Doing Business*, private firms undertake the connection works outside the building, from the switchboard to the network. It is, therefore, important that commercial interests not be placed ahead of public safety.

Regulation should provide clear rules on (i) norming electrotechnical equipment, (ii) stipulating professional requirements in relation to electricians and installers, and (iii) establishing an inspection regime to ensure wiring works are up to code. *Doing Business* data show that, across 190 economies, approximately three-quarters of economies have an electricity code or comprehensive legislative text that covers some or all of these areas. Having clear regulation in place establishes a foundation for regulating the electrical profession. The National Electric Code of Barbados, for example, sets forth requirements for professional qualifications to carry out electrical wiring, conditions for inspections of electrical wiring and prerequisites for the professional qualifications necessary to inspect electrical wiring.

Independent regulatory agencies contribute to the design of regulation governing electrical installation safety in good practice economies. An independent regulator can ensure clarity and transparency and form the basis of a system that encourages accountability. In South Africa, for example, the statutory Bureau of Standards (SABS) has an explicit mandate to promote quality in products and services in several sectors, including engineering certifications and electrical appliances.

Common standards and rules encourage shared manufacturing facilities across economies. It is indeed easier for private firms to operate beyond their borders in economies where regulation is similar. The European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization (CENELEC) has strengthened regulatory coherence by aligning the electrical installation standards of the members of the European Union through standard HD 384 on Electrical Installations of Buildings. These standards provide clear guidelines on electrical installations for new buildings. Similarly, the African Electrotechnical Standardization Commission (AFSEC), established in 2008, promotes the harmonization of standards across Africa and aims to incorporate international good practices. It currently has 11 statutory members.

Communication is just as important as regulation—market players must be informed of the rules. A first step, therefore, is to make the laws that stipulate the required professional qualifications for electricians—as well as norms on electrical equipment and installation—available to the public. In most economies, electricity codes and regulations are not publicly available online and only half of economies measured by *Doing Business* provide a list of steps online, which customers must complete to obtain a new connection.

In the event of a legislative change to electricity sector regulation, market participants—including employees of the distribution utility and private contractors—must be informed swiftly. While modes of communicating such changes vary from one economy to another, two-thirds of distribution utilities report organizing training workshops for engineers, technicians and inspectors involved in the connection process when a change in regulation occurs. The majority of economies, however, do not provide public funds for such programs.

**ENSURING ELECTRICIANS HAVE THE RIGHT SKILLS**

When electricians are certified and licensed, the public has proof of their professional qualification and an informed hiring decision can be made. Certification and licensing mechanisms can incentivize qualified professionals to offer their services, as their credentials will allow them to stand out from their uncertified counterparts.
Proof of professional experience and education is commonly required for professionals to carry out electrical installation works. Different approaches exist across economies, however, with regards to licensing. Licenses can be issued by a dedicated public authority—for example, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department in Jamaica—or the national regulatory body, as in the case of Uganda’s Electricity Regulatory Authority. Other economies rely on professional organizations or academic institutions to issue licenses. In Pakistan, electricians performing internal installations are required to be a member of the board of engineers, a professional body that regulates the engineering profession. In the Dominican Republic, licenses are issued by the Colegio Dominicano de Ingenieros Arquitectos y Agrimensores (CODIA, a national engineering association). In other economies, including Brunei Darussalam and Singapore, the utility is responsible for issuing certifications. Such cases are usually confined to smaller economies where the utility is vertically integrated and has broad national coverage.

The requirements to be certified as an electrician also vary widely across economies. In Malaysia, to carry out internal wiring works, one must be registered as a professional engineer and have at least three years of professional experience, have successfully completed the required courses as determined by the Board of Engineers Malaysia and have either undergone a professional assessment examination or be a member of the Institution of Engineers Malaysia.20 In Germany, electrical contractors require a certification which they can only obtain through an Ausbildung, a program that combines an apprenticeship and education. While most economies measured by Doing Business mandate a minimum level of education to undertake internal wiring installations, about 30% of economies have no requirements at all—and many of these economies are in Sub-Saharan Africa (figure 4.2).

While entry into the electrical trade requires regulation, emphasis should also be placed on continuing participation. Many electricians are self-employed and are not associated with a professional body at the time they receive their trade license. As such, keeping them up to date on new regulation or technological changes can be challenging. Most companies lack the financial resources to offer formal training to their employees. In some economies, therefore, the onus is put on electricians to remain active to retain their license.

Hong Kong SAR, China, offers an extensive professional training program—the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Scheme—in which all Registered Electrical Workers (REWds) must participate to renew their registration. The training consists of two modules: (i) statutory requirements in electricity ordinance, wiring regulations and safety protocols; and (ii) dissemination of information on the design, maintenance and testing of electrical installations. The CPD Scheme requires REWs to complete the training, which is provided by various organizations and agencies, within the three years prior to the expiration of their registration.21 Similarly, in the United States, all licensed professional engineers in the state of California are required to obtain 32 hours of continuing education at an approved trainee school—or any federate or state apprenticeship program—every three years prior to the renewal of their license. Elsewhere, the private sector has taken an active role in organizing training programs to improve the qualifications of all construction professionals. The Korea

**FIGURE 4.2** Many African economies lack professional norms to undertake internal wire works

*Source: Doing Business database.*

*Note: Economies in blue have an electricity code (or set of regulations) that sets forth the professional qualifications (education and professional experience, for example) required to legally carry out a building’s internal wiring installation. Economies in grey have no such requirements.*
Electric Association, for example, which is comprised of corporations that are engaged in electricity-related businesses, provides regular training programs taught by leading experts in the industry.

ENSURING THAT INTERNAL INSTALLATIONS ARE SAFE THROUGH MANDATED INSPECTIONS OR LIABILITY REGIMES

Regulatory compliance is as essential as the rules themselves. In 2009, a fire caused by ineffective grounding and aging cables destroyed the building of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Accra, Ghana. As is often the case in economies where there is a shortage of qualified engineers and a large informal sector, although regulation existed—Ghana’s National Wiring Code—it had not been observed. In Kenya, the informal sector, also known as jua kali, is extensively involved in the manufacturing sector. A study of electrical safety management in Kenya’s informal sector shows that most jua kali operators do not follow electrical safety regulations and lack the appropriate equipment for electrical services.22

Despite the information prescribed in electrical codes and other regulation, technical audits often reveal faults in design, installation and maintenance. Inspections provide an incentive to comply with regulation. Initial inspections—carried out before the facility becomes operational—can help identify and fix any nonconformity of the installation.23 In economies where private sector electricians make the external connection to the network, nearly all require that the utility inspect the connection works ahead of the electricity turn-on. Similarly, in about 70% of economies covered by Doing Business inspections of a new building’s electrical wiring are compulsory.

Inspections are typically carried out by the utility, a third-party agency or a certified electrical engineer (figure 4.3). Utilities perform this function in nearly 40% of economies where internal wiring inspections are required. In the United Arab Emirates, the Dubai Electricity and Water Authority (DEWA) checks the internal wiring of the building to ensure compliance with the approved plans. Inspections approval is communicated internally within the utility, allowing DEWA to carry out the external electrical works immediately without the need for the customer to be present.

Third-party bodies carry out inspections in about one-third of economies with internal wiring inspection requirements. In Côte d’Ivoire, a public works institution, the Laboratoire du Bâtiment et des Travaux Publics (LBTP), is tasked with ensuring that all internal electrical installations comply with safety standards. To this end, an inspector examines various points on the installation—the grounding, the electrical panel, and so on. Clients can only apply for a new connection once the installation has been approved and a certificate of conformity has been issued.

In some economies, private certified electrical engineers provide internal wiring inspections. In Croatia, an internal wiring certificate must be submitted before the utility, Hrvatska Elektroprivreda (HEP), installs the meter. This certificate, which

FIGURE 4.3 Who conducts the inspection of the internal wiring installation prior to the electrification of a commercial building?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of economies with internal wiring inspection method (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
proves that the electrical installation has been tested, can be prepared by the client’s electrician, provided they have the required accreditation, or—in most cases—by a third-party firm if the electrician lacks the required accreditation. The utility issues a final connection approval once this documentation is deemed satisfactory.

Because the circumstances surrounding electrical failures vary significantly, blanket recommendations on internal wiring inspection schemes are unhelpful. Mandatory inspections may be advisable in economies with a history of faulty wiring incidents; however, a risk-based approach may be more applicable in economies where the electricity profession is well-regulated and qualification standards are enforced. Despite varied practices, one recommendation holds true across all economies: inspectors should receive adequate training and have relevant qualifications.

Beyond inspections, another way to ensure the safety of internal installations is to implement clear liability regimes, placing an added responsibility on electricians by holding them legally responsible when incidents occur. In the Philippines, for example, the Board of Electrical Engineers can suspend electrical engineers for unprofessional or dishonorable conduct. The law specifies the circumstances under which an electrical engineer can be suspended from professional practice (for example in the case of fraudulent documents). Also, in cases of wiring regulation violations, the law gives any person, firm or association the right to file charges resulting in the revocation of the electrical engineer’s license.

The choice of whether to employ internal wiring inspections or liability regimes (or both) varies from economy to economy as it depends on myriad factors (such as existing regulation, the size of the informal sector or history of wiring incidents). In economies where the electrician profession is well regulated, norms are respected and the informal sector is small, liability regimes may be sufficient to ensure public safety, provided there is an efficient court system to foster accountability. Internal wiring inspections for lower risk constructions may not be necessary, as current practice in OECD high-income economies such as Germany and Sweden. These economies do not require internal wiring checks as all electrical professionals must undergo a rigorous professional certification process and are held legally responsible that the installations they carry out are up to code.

The reality in other economies, however, stands in stark contrast to that of the OECD high-income economies. Many economies lack the qualified professionals needed to impose strict qualification requirements, making the implementation of liability regimes more challenging. Even where the electrician profession is well regulated, unqualified professionals may still offer their services if the informal sector is large and law enforcement is weak. Many economies with these characteristics (rightfully) require that all internal wiring installations be inspected to avoid incidents.

**REGULATION AND EFFICIENCY ARE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE**

Electricity sector regulation is crucial. However, regulation should be designed to transfer the regulatory burden away from end-users. In Mauritania, the utility requires that all electrical materials bought on the private market—including the transformer—be checked by the utility before the private electrical contractor can build a sub-station; this adds time and interactions to the connection process. Alternatively, in Nigeria, materials must be purchased from accredited distributors, which sell transformers that already include a test certificate from the manufacturer.

Doing Business data reveal that economies that provide efficient grid connection services (as measured in terms of time or cost) also tend to have (i) clear legal standards stating the qualifications necessary to carry out the internal works and (ii) a requirement for an inspection of the internal installation. At the global level, those low-income economies that meet at least one of these two criteria connect businesses to the grid in about 25% less time on average. And across income groups, economies with an internal wiring inspection have, on average, lower connection times. “Smart” regulation does not need to come at the expense of an efficient connection process.

Dubai provides a good example of balancing efficiency and wiring compliance. To be certified by the Dubai Electricity and Water Authority (DEWA), practicing electrical engineers must pass the Municipality Exam for Electrical Installation. This requirement allows the utility to minimize the number of procedures needed to complete the process when the application is submitted without jeopardizing wiring safety standards. The internal wiring inspection is scheduled when the application to the utility is submitted through the utility’s online portal by the customer’s electrical contractor. Moreover, due to the standardization of internal wiring guidelines, the external connection works are commenced at the same time the inspection is carried out, with the results communicated internally within DEWA.

Doing Business data suggest that electricity services are in no way made worse where there is regulation that governs internal wiring inspections and qualifications. For example, there are fewer power outages, on average, in economies where an internal wiring inspection is necessary, which in turn may reduce the likelihood of faulty wiring defects. Moreover, across regions and income groups, there is no significant difference in the number of procedures—or even the connection time—in economies with internal wiring guidelines.
CONCLUSION

Established standards for electrical materials, wiring installations and electricians are not only essential for public safety—they also make economic sense. Qualification requirements for professional electricians help individuals overcome the asymmetry of information they would otherwise face. Accreditation systems that focus on both experience and education are essential.

Aligning national norms with international standards can ensure regulatory coherence and facilitate the safe use of electricity. Regulation alone is not sufficient—compliance with the law is just as important. To this end, many economies have instituted inspection regimes for internal wiring installations. Other economies have put in place liability regimes so that the electricians carrying out the wiring installation are held accountable in the case of future incidents.

Doing Business data demonstrate that economies with efficient electrical connection processes tend to have clear legal standards and quality controls for new electrical connections. In other words, regulatory regimes that protect the public from electrical failure incidents also tend to deliver good services to businesses through an efficient grid connection process or a reliable network.
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Nearly a decade ago, the World Customs Organization (WCO) highlighted the importance of education for trade facilitation by advocating for knowledge-based services, training and capacity building. The World Trade Organization’s (WTO) Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) that entered into force in February 2017 further emphasized the importance of these instruments in trade facilitation. The WCO foresaw that the effective use of information and tools—such as electronic platforms and risk-based inspections—by customs professionals would help economies reduce the time and costs associated with trading across borders. In today’s globalized and highly-digitalized trading environment, however, the ability of trade professionals to reap the benefits of these tools depends heavily on training and communication. Indeed, the WTO cites training as one of the most important elements in the successful implementation of trade facilitation measures.

Cross-border trade is a complex endeavor. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the average international trade operation involves between 20 and 30 parties. Trading includes not only government actors such as customs and port authorities but also brokers, commercial banks, vendors, insurance companies and freight forwarders. Customs clearance officials and customs brokers are two of the most important parties involved in a typical international trade transaction. They have different but interconnected roles with regards to education, training and communication since they are the providers and users of customs services, respectively. While the customs clearance official is an employee of the customs administration who acts on behalf of the exporter or importer. Customs officials perform several tasks on behalf of customs administrations including valuation, documentary checks, physical inspections of cargo and post-clearance audits. Customs brokers’ duties include preparing trade documentation, ensuring the proper transfer of cargo as well as advising on exporting and importing requirements. Given these tasks, communication and training on new trade processes, as well as on IT developments, are critical.

Doing Business data show that education and training, together with communication with customs clearance officials and customs brokers, play an important role in the successful implementation of trade-related reforms. Education and training facilitate the implementation of new policies as well as the development of the specific skills or knowledge required by customs officials and customs brokers.
required to make those policies operational. Training can target various staff levels—from senior to operational staff—and encompass different types of programs, including technical training on daily operations, training linked to programs, including technical training staff—and encompass different types of staff levels—from senior to operational.

Training can target various staff levels—from senior to operational staff—and encompass different types of programs, including technical training on daily operations, training linked to programs, including technical training staff—and encompass different types of staff levels—from senior to operational.

A well-trained and educated workforce is equipped with the knowledge to perform their day-to-day duties as well as to increase the efficiency of the overall trade process. By developing workers’ competencies and skills, training can act as a catalyst for improved organizational productivity. Morocco customs has been implementing a series of reforms in the area of human resources and communication since the 1990s. Together with the introduction of an online declaration system and strong anticorruption measures, an improved training system for customs personnel and new communication channels (including a customs intranet and public website) for both staff and the public have substantially improved the efficiency of the customs service. Indeed, improved customs efficiency was associated with a 7.7% increase in customs revenue between 1998 and 2002.

Education, training and communication can support the successful implementation of trade-related regulatory reforms. Since trade facilitation catalyzes economic growth, educating stakeholders to adopt trade reforms effectively should be a central government priority. Bangladesh has identified its top priorities for trade facilitation as capacity building activities at ports and customs offices as well as communicating with relevant actors to ensure the proper adoption of regulations.

Education, training and communication can support the successful implementation of trade-related regulatory reforms. India has supported its ambitious reform agenda by providing regular training to both customs officials and private sector agents, as well as by establishing Customs Clearance Facilitation Committees which bring together actors involved in international trade at regular meetings. Similarly, the Islamic Republic of Iran has invested in training customs officials, setting up “expert pools” of customs officials with existing technical training who are responsible for electronic goods clearance, as assigned by the national single window.

Governments are tasked with designing and implementing their national trade facilitation programs. Because of this, they are often best placed to lead stakeholder education and communication strategies through their customs administrations and National Trade Facilitation Committees. They are also well positioned to provide standardized, harmonized training programs. Furthermore, governments have a stake in educating service providers and users, since the effective implementation of trade reforms will ultimately boost trade volumes. Providing adequate training—especially to firms with limited trading experience—can, for example, result in fewer errors when firms are completing customs documents, contributing to time savings and increased trade volumes. Governments provide trade-related training to customs clearance officials in 98% of economies measured by Doing Business and to customs brokers in 87%.

Significant improvements to Bolivia’s foreign trade regime in 1985 were systematically offset by administrative shortcomings including high levels of bureaucracy and opacity in the public service. To address these issues, starting in 1997 the government introduced a series of initiatives to strengthen public administration, including redesigning the customs administrative structure and implementing educational programs for customs officers. Of these initiatives, education-related policies had the greatest impact. The introduction of a new competitive selection model for customs officers, higher qualification requirements and technical evaluations through exams—as well as mandatory on-the-job training and a required minimum number of training hours—helped to further reduce customs clearance times. Furthermore, even while imports into Bolivia were declining, the effective tax rate increased, reflecting enhanced customs efficiency through corruption reduction and the implementation of new regulations.

Governments use a variety of mechanisms to communicate changes in trade processes to customs officials and customs brokers. Doing Business data show that a workshop is the most commonly-used channel followed by disseminating information on a website (figure 5.1). Interestingly, 65% of
In recent years *Doing Business* has captured reforms that underscore the fundamental role played by education, training and communication in international trade processes. These reforms target not only the qualifications of the customs workforce but also the training provided to government officials and private sector agents when implementing new reforms, conducting pilot tests or communicating changes.

Well-trained customs professionals are more likely to navigate new trade procedures effectively. *Doing Business* data show that the share of governments providing regular training (at least once a year) to customs clearance officials is significantly higher in economies where reforms were implemented than in economies where they were not. A decrease in the time to clear goods at the border in El Salvador, for example, was associated with the 2017 recruitment and training of customs clearance officers. A lack of trained customs officers had previously hampered clearance efficiency, despite the introduction of numerous trade reforms.

### Customs officials are more likely to receive regular training in reforming economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training frequency of customs officials</th>
<th>Training frequency of customs officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in reforming economies</td>
<td>in non-reforming economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular training</td>
<td>Regular training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only with new processes/systems</td>
<td>Only with new processes/systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time training</td>
<td>One-time training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>No training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Doing Business* database.

Note: Reforming economies include 56 economies that implemented trade reforms in *Doing Business* 2018 and *Doing Business* 2019; Non-reforming economies include 132 economies for which no reform was captured in *Doing Business* 2018 or *Doing Business* 2019; “No practice” economies (Eritrea and the Republic of Yemen) are excluded from the sample. One-time training refers to providing training only once over the duration of service. Results hold when comparing economies within the same income group, with one exception in high-income economies; however, the difference is relatively small.

Training has been pivotal when introducing new electronic systems, such as customs management systems or national electronic single windows. *Doing Business* data show that many economies—including Afghanistan, Grenada and Jamaica in 2016, Cabo Verde and the Comoros in 2017 and Angola and Lesotho in 2018—have experienced reductions in the time to prepare documentation following training programs or pilot tests when implementing the Automated System for Customs Data (ASYCUDA) World, a customs data management system developed by UNCTAD. Brazil, Brunei Darussalam and Kenya also experienced positive results following the implementation of national electronic single window systems in 2017; by increasing awareness of the new platforms through training and seminars, they reduced documentary compliance time as measured by *Doing Business*.

A pilot test period, together with effective communication between government agencies, government officials and private sector agents, can also benefit reform implementation. The pilot period allows both for the testing and correction of a new system’s functionality ahead of full implementation and deepens user knowledge of the new procedures. Pilot testing can also serve to mitigate resistance to change among public and private actors. The phased implementation of ASYCUDA in Angola (2017–18) and Lesotho (2015–18) provide good examples of successful pilot test periods. In both economies, ASYCUDA was initially launched as a pilot, allowing customs administrators the opportunity to test implementation issues and traders to get accustomed to the new system before its full launch. Subsequently, ASYCUDA has been used effectively in Angola and Lesotho, decreasing documentary compliance time for exports and imports in both economies.
low-income economies use websites—only slightly below the 76% rate of high-income economies—even though the Internet penetration rate in low-income economies is just 12% (compared to a rate of 82% in high-income economies). This figure can be attributed to the fact that customs officials and brokers typically have greater access to the Internet than the average citizen.

Although governments remain the most important source of capacity-building training for customs officials and brokers, opportunities also exist for private sector involvement. In 2011 Mozambique implemented the Janela Única Electrónica (JUE), an electronic single window system, to streamline and harmonize its customs procedures. The JUE is managed by a private company which provided technical training on its use to all agents involved in international trade to ease the migration from a physical to an online system. Training sessions included specific modules for customs officials, brokers, freight forwarders, shipping line representatives, port operators, port authorities and banks. Additional training is available when new processes are launched or upon request.

THE ROLE OF CUSTOMS CLEARANCE OFFICIALS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

While customs agencies traditionally have been responsible for revenue collection, border management and fraud prevention, they are now also expected to streamline clearance processes while ensuring border security. The new “dynamic” role of customs agencies demands that customs clearance officials maintain a high level of efficiency, knowledgeability and accountability, underscoring the need for well-educated customs personnel.

Education and training support the professional development of customs clearance officials. Such training provides an opportunity for customs agencies to emphasize the importance of integrity at work, deliver anti-corruption messages and promote the agency’s code of conduct. Customs employees should meet the educational requirements defined by customs authorities to qualify for and effectively perform the role of clearance official. For their part, governments should take advantage of training programs offered by international organizations—both for newly recruited employees as well as for experienced customs officers and executives.

The future orientation of customs will require a transition toward a knowledge-based model. Greater investment in the education and skills development of clearance officials is important. The World Bank Group’s Customs Modernization Handbook 2005—which emphasized human resources management—identified the education and training of staff as the most important factor affecting customs performance, a view that has been reiterated by several recent studies.

Education also improves the transferability of skills and is key to building technology absorption capacity. Providing regular training to customs clearance officials is positively related to customs efficiency. Doing Business data indicate that the average time required to clear customs (for both exports and imports) is about 34% lower in economies where clearance officers receive regular training compared to those where no regular training is provided.
This trend holds in three of the income groups (upper middle income, lower middle income, and low income), but does not hold in high-income economies. Sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East and North Africa are the two regions where the difference in clearance time is the most dramatic between economies where regular training is offered and where it is not. In Cabo Verde regular training of customs officials helped the country to successfully upgrade its automated customs data management system from ASYCUDA++ to ASYCUDA World in January 2016. Throughout 2016, Cabo Verde delivered training courses to customs officials, brokers and traders, enabling these actors to take full advantage of the new system, which reduced documentary compliance time by 24 hours for both exports and imports.

The Europe and Central Asia region has the highest share of economies that require a university degree to operate as a customs official (70%), followed by Sub-Saharan Africa (68%). At 29%, the OECD high-income group has the lowest share (figure 5.3). However, a comparison among regions of the average time for export clearance shows that requiring a college degree is not necessarily associated with better customs efficiency; many other variables impact the efficiency of customs procedures (such as technology, legal support, infrastructure, strong anti-corruption measures or membership in a trade agreement). Even though fewer OECD high-income economies require that customs officials have a university degree, candidates are required to complete customs clearance vocational training before their appointment. Furthermore, in economies in Sub-Saharan Africa where a university degree is not required, but regular training is provided to customs officials, the average customs clearance time for both exports and imports is approximately 44% lower than in those where a university degree is required, but no regular training is provided.

**FIGURE 5.2** Economies that offer regular training for customs clearance officials have shorter customs clearance times than those that do not

![Bar chart showing differences in average time to complete customs clearance (hours) between economies offering training and those not offering training.](chart)

**Source:** Doing Business database.
**Note:** Doing Business identified 128 economies where regular training (defined as occurring more than once a year) is provided to customs clearance officials. Doing Business identified 58 economies where such training is not provided.

The experience of the Democratic Republic of Congo highlights the importance of training as well as communicating changes as catalysts to trade reform implementation in Sub-Saharan Africa. In 2016, the country introduced a single window for trade, which began as a pilot. The following year the government continued the implementation of the single window,

**FIGURE 5.3** Requiring customs officials to have a university degree is not necessarily associated with improved customs efficiency

![Bar chart showing average customs clearance time for exports by region and degree requirement.](chart)

**Source:** Doing Business database.
**Note:** The average customs clearance time for exports measures the number of hours needed to complete procedures required by customs authorities only and excludes the time for product-specific inspections such as phytosanitary or technical standard inspections. Regular training is defined as training provided at least once a year.
publishing information on new requirements on its website and providing training workshops to the private sector. The government also opened trade facilitation centers equipped with Internet-connected computers to assist and train users. By implementing the single window together with the accompanying training and communication, the Democratic Republic of Congo reduced document preparation time by 122 hours for exports and 42 hours for imports; border compliance time was also cut, by 219 hours for exports and 252 hours for imports.

THE CUSTOMS BROKER: THE LIAISON BETWEEN TRADERS AND OTHER ACTORS INVOLVED IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

In 156 of the 190 economies measured by Doing Business, customs brokers act as intermediaries between traders and other parties involved in moving goods internationally. Of these, only 56 economies mandate the use of brokers by law. Customs brokers play a pivotal role thanks to their in-depth knowledge of the industry, customs laws, tariffs and regulations; often, brokers are the only channel through which producers can sell their goods internationally. By hiring an agent, firms gain access to international markets without incurring the up-front costs and risks associated with searching for new markets or negotiating deals.20 These responsibilities are transferred to the broker, making the life of the trader easier.

Many economies require brokers to be licensed or to pass an official examination. Indeed, obtaining a license is the most common qualification for customs brokers; 75% of economies measured by Doing Business require brokers to be licensed. In the United States, U.S. Customs and Border Protection regulates customs brokers. Although there is no requirement for brokers in the United States to have a university degree, they must be licensed; this requires passing a background check and an exam to demonstrate their understanding of the harmonization tariff schedule, federal regulations and customs electronic interfaces. Furthermore, the American Customs Association, an independent public intergovernmental organization, offers continued training to licensed customs brokers on recent changes in the law as well as updates in the electronic systems used by the trade community. Requirements in some economies go beyond licenses or education. To become a customs broker in the West African Economic and Monetary Union, for example, a petitioner must deposit a minimum of 25 million CFA francs (around $44,500) with the customs administration as a financial guarantee in the case of errors or fraud.

The customs broker profession is evolving. Ongoing customs reforms, the Internet and e-commerce are prompting some customs brokers to offer more sophisticated services (advisory, for example) rather than merely filing documents for customs clearance.21 Brokers are expected to also support the interests of governments by ensuring compliance with regulations and payment of duties and taxes. It is not, therefore, surprising that many economies require more than one qualification (for example a license and an exam) to operate as a customs broker. In turn, data show that it is more expensive to hire more educated customs brokers, particularly for imports (figure 5.4). Furthermore, in economies that do not require any qualification, high income per capita is not necessarily associated with more expensive brokers; instead, in economies requiring more qualifications, even with lower income levels,
In 87% of economies measured by Doing Business, customs brokers participate in training programs organized by the customs administration.

It is costlier to hire customs brokers. Market segmentation in the customs brokerage profession may also explain the higher cost for brokers in economies with lower income per capita, where a few large companies control a substantial market share.

Requirements for licensing, examinations and training for customs brokers are fundamental, as a lack of these can lead to delays in the clearance process. The WCO recommends that any customs reforms or modernization be accompanied by the necessary training and sharing of information between governments and brokers. Furthermore, the International Trade and Customs Broker Association recommends the establishment of capacity-building initiatives for brokers through certification programs and examinations.

Among economies where the customs administration offers training to customs brokers, 45% offer training only when new processes or systems are launched; 36% offer training on a regular basis (figure 5.5). Doing Business data indicate that the average time for documentary compliance is 41% lower in economies that offer training to customs brokers compared to those where training is not available. This suggests that training could be beneficial in terms of familiarizing brokers with new regulation that could enhance their efficiency in complying with documentary requirements.

**CONCLUSION**

Doing Business data show that educating customs officials and customs brokers through regular training is positively associated with lower border and documentary compliance times. Training is also related to the successful implementation of trade reforms. Indeed, most of the economies that implemented trade reforms as captured by Doing Business provide regular training to customs clearance officials.

Most economies do not require formal higher education to work as a customs clearance official or customs broker. However, many economies do require other types of qualifications, such as obtaining a license or passing exams, to serve as a broker. More educated customs brokers are more expensive to hire, particularly for imports. A majority of customs administrations offer regular training to customs officials. Interestingly, Europe and Central Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa are the two regions with the highest share of economies that require a university degree to operate as a customs clearance official, while the OECD high-income group has the lowest share of economies with this requirement. Economies in South Asia and Europe and Central Asia most commonly provide customs officials with regular training.

**NOTES**
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**FIGURE 5.5** Most economies only provide training to customs brokers when new processes or systems are introduced

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: “Training is offered only once” is defined as providing training only once over the duration of service. The sample includes 183 economies.
**Enforcing Contracts and Resolving Insolvency**

*Training and efficiency in the judicial system*

A well-prepared and robust judiciary is fundamental to the rule of law. The training of judges facilitates the prompt resolution of trials and can lead to judicial decisions of higher quality. Training can also foster greater uniformity and predictability of decisions and can increase public confidence in the legal system’s ability to deal effectively with specialized matters. Well-trained judges maintain the rule of law through enduring principles and predictable processes, while also responding to a rapidly changing society.

Ensuring that the judiciary can handle complex commercial cases efficiently is a fundamental aspect of any rule of law system. For that reason, specialized judicial education and training are critical to guaranteeing the efficiency and quality of court processes. The decisions of judges trained in basic economics, for example, are significantly less likely to be appealed than decisions made by their untrained counterparts. Furthermore, judicial training can prevent ruling errors; courts where judges receive training show lower decision reversal rates. Extensive literature assesses how the regulatory environment for contract enforcement and resolving insolvency affects a broad range of economic outcomes. Empirical research also supports the view that efficient contract enforcement is essential to economic development and sustained growth.

**THE CONCEPT OF JUDICIAL TRAINING**

Despite the long history of courts, the training of judges is a relatively recent phenomenon. The first specialized training schools were established in France, the Netherlands and the United States in the 1960s. Previously, it was believed that judges already had all the required knowledge and, therefore, would not benefit from additional or continuous training. In France judges received no training throughout their careers despite suffering from a poor public image as archaic and cut off from the world and society. After they publicly expressed their distress over their lack of preparation for the growing complexity of legislation, the French National School for the Judiciary was created in 1959.

In recent years, efforts have been made—mainly by the European Union and national judicial schools meeting at international fora—to establish a set of common principles of judicial training (table 6.1). Although these principles are not recognized as international standards, they represent a first effort toward convergence by interested stakeholders.

As law and litigation have grown more complex in recent decades, the need

- Worldwide only 101 of the 190 economies measured by Doing Business have a specialized commercial jurisdiction in place; only 31 have a specialized court handling insolvency cases.
- Judicial training programs can improve judicial performance. Economies with training programs for judges on insolvency-related issues tend to perform better in the Doing Business resolving insolvency indicators.
- Judicial training is a key factor in the successful implementation and positive impact of regulatory reform governing commercial and insolvency court proceedings.
- Training formed a central part of the United Arab Emirates’ strategy to modernize its judiciary and has been instrumental in the successful creation of specialized commercial courts, the introduction of electronic case management systems and the implementation of a new insolvency regime.
- Institutionalized training programs for judges in Indonesia supported the successful implementation of reforms establishing small claims courts and the successful adoption of new insolvency laws, decreasing the time to resolve insolvency cases.
for specialized judges has increased. However, just 101 of the 190 economies measured by Doing Business have a specialized commercial jurisdiction\(^6\) in place, and only 31 economies have a specialized bankruptcy court handling insolvency cases. Having a specialized commercial jurisdiction can result in shorter resolution times (figure 6.1).

Specialized courts are created to handle complex legal issues in the areas of commercial, insolvency, securities or intellectual property law. Such courts require specialized judges with training in specific and complex procedures. In an ever-changing business world, judges’ knowledge must be kept current on the rapidly-evolving business regulatory environment (box 6.1).

Bankruptcy cases, in particular, are complicated due to the demanding interests of the many stakeholders involved.\(^7\) including a large number and diverse type of creditors, insolvency representatives, practitioners and the debtor facing financial difficulties.\(^8\) Judges that deal with these types of cases must be highly knowledgeable and develop particular skills (such as financial and accounting skills).\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.1 Principles of judicial training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial training is multidisciplinary and includes legal and non-legal knowledge, professional skills and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges need to receive initial training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous training is a right and responsibility for judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions responsible for judicial training should determine the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges should train judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate education techniques should be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate funding should be allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The senior judiciary should support training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


![FIGURE 6.1 Solving commercial disputes is 92 days faster in economies with a specialized commercial jurisdiction](source: Doing Business database.
Note: The relationship is significant at the 5% level after controlling for income per capita.)
Companies, corporate finance and capital markets are increasingly complex—they impact wages, financial stability and economic growth. Together with frequent legal and technological changes, this complexity creates obstacles for firms. Businesses must be able to rely on trained, certified professionals (such as accountants, attorneys and judges) to navigate these obstacles. The judiciary’s function as a check and balance hinges upon its ability to maintain practical know-how. Regulatory uncertainty in new, complex areas of corporate law increases the risk for information asymmetry among market players. Judges are expected to stay current on the latest investment instruments. Guaranteeing minority investor protections against accrued risks, digital currencies or initial coin offerings are only several examples of the novelties to which legal professionals must adapt.

Given the multidisciplinary nature of business law—it intersects with economics, finance and accounting—specialized training for judges and legal practitioners can act as a critical, mitigating tool. Indeed, the capacity of judges to fairly and efficiently resolve economic disputes is a function of their knowledge of the law and the facts before them. Training can help improve both their understanding of the law and their ability to grapple with complicated financial or technological concepts.

There is a positive correlation between an economy’s judicial capacity in commercial law and the quality of its business environment, court efficacy and public confidence. Doing Business data for 155 economies show that 120 economies offer training to practicing lawyers, but only 83 provide specialized training on commercial and corporate law. Nearly 76% of high-income economies offer specialized legal training to practicing lawyers while only 24% of low-income economies do.

The requirements to become a judge vary widely across economies. In 10 economies, judicial candidates to courts adjudicating commercial disputes do not require a law degree (but must satisfy alternative requirements). Only 38 economies—including France, Peru and Madagascar—require that candidates have prior experience or specialized knowledge of business law, finance or capital markets. Specialized training on business, corporate law, finance or capital markets is offered to judges in only 55 economies. Among the main reasons for the lack of specialized training globally are court workload and a lack of targeted training directly applicable to the cases for adjudication.
Accumulating job-specific human capital in handling insolvency cases vis-à-vis the general legal knowledge of judges has an outsized effect on bankruptcy outcomes by significantly reducing the duration of the insolvency procedure and achieving more reliable results.10 To successfully carry out a reorganization proceeding, for example, a judge must demonstrate sound accounting and financial skills; therefore, insolvency judges should be designated on their merit and ability to fully understand the financial situation of the debtor, a skill that is not characteristic of an ordinary commercial judge.11 In France, insolvency judges, as a rule, have a good understanding of how the business operates, which ensures a more active involvement of the judges in the hearings and evidentiary stage.12 Insolvency training of the judiciary has a broader impact on the successful implementation of regulatory reforms. By providing quality-based training to judges after insolvency reforms have passed, the system is significantly more likely to operationalize regulatory changes.

Justice systems should act as facilitators of investment and economic growth, not obstacles. Doing Business data suggest that specialized training of lawyers and judges is an area that could benefit from more attention and resources worldwide. Even where continuing training and education are offered, they are seldom mandatory or practical to the cases assigned and often exacerbate judges’ lack of expertise. However, imposing standardized mandatory training is not an adequate solution. Setting minimum standards should not come at the cost of motivation. Instead, integrating training plans into annual judicial performance evaluations (or otherwise creating incentives to continue learning) are opportunities to enhance judicial systems’ indirect but significant role in investment.

a. Palumbo and others 2013; Lorizio and Gurrieri 2014; Magnuson and others 2014.

b. Initial coin offerings are an alternative way of raising capital through the sale of virtual coins or tokens. New businesses can create and sell their own virtual currencies without selling stocks.


on the contracts and assets of the debtor, and so on. Economies with training programs for judges score better and are closer to the best regulatory practice as measured by the Doing Business resolving insolvency indicators (figure 6.2).

Training can act as an essential conduit for the introduction of new laws, methods and practices to the judiciary. Training can, in effect, make the decisions of judges more predictable. By providing all judges with the same information and knowledge on a particular regulatory reform, they will be more likely to interpret the new rules similarly, resulting in more coordinated, uniform decisions. Chile adopted a new insolvency law in 2014 that specifically required insolvency law training for civil judges dealing with insolvency proceedings; the law also mandated that appellate courts adopt measures to guarantee the law’s successful implementation. Since then, judges nationwide have been trained on the new insolvency law and the time to resolve insolvency proceedings has decreased in Santiago. Furthermore, as captured by Doing Business 2018, the time to complete a liquidation procedure after an attempt at reorganization fell from 3.2 to two years. Doing Business data show a positive association between resolving insolvency reforms and training programs (figure 6.3). Indeed, among economies with the same income per capita, economies with training programs are 11% more likely to have reformed in this area in Doing Business 2019.

The cases of Indonesia and the United Arab Emirates provide two examples of economies where training programs have supported the implementation of reforms in the areas of commercial litigation and insolvency. Both countries recently introduced regulatory changes that made it easier to enforce contracts and to resolve insolvency as measured by Doing Business, but they also adopted robust training frameworks for judges which contributed to the successful implementation of these reforms.

**United Arab Emirates**

The United Arab Emirates has been modernizing and improving the quality and efficiency of its judicial system since the early 1990s. The country has effectively redesigned the architecture of its judicial system by implementing court management techniques, adopting new technologies and professionalizing judicial officers within the courts. These efforts have had transformative and positive effects on the judicial system as a whole, but also in the areas of commercial litigation and insolvency specifically. Judicial training has played a fundamental role in boosting the effectiveness of structural reforms, particularly the creation of specialized commercial courts in 2008, the implementation of an electronic case management system in 2014 and the adoption of a new insolvency regime in 2016. Targeted and continuous

---

**FIGURE 6.2** There is a positive association between economies with training programs and a higher resolving insolvency score

![Graph showing the association between training availability and resolving insolvency score](image)

*Source: Doing Business database.*

*Note: The relationship is significant at the 5% level after controlling for income per capita.*

**FIGURE 6.3** Economies with training programs are more likely to have reformed in Doing Business 2019 in the area of resolving insolvency

![Graph showing the percentage of economies with training programs](image)

*Source: Doing Business database.*

*Note: Nine of the 14 economies that reformed in the area of resolving insolvency in 2017/18 have training programs on insolvency law. These economies are Belgium, Djibouti, the Arab Republic of Egypt, Kenya, the Kyrgyz Republic, Malaysia, Pakistan, Rwanda and Turkey. The relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita.*
Training has allowed judges to put legislative reforms into practice and to use new case management tools to reduce delays and improve the quality of their decisions.

Although training of judicial officers has been an integral part of the strategy to modernize the judiciary since the 1990s, it was formally introduced as a fundamental component in the systems of appointment, performance measurement, incentives and promotion for judges with the Dubai Judicial Authority Law of 2016. The law stipulates that prospective judges must pass a training course before their appointment and that they must attend an orientation before sitting on the bench. Additionally, judges’ promotions are linked to their completion of training programs (they are required to attend a minimum number of training programs each year). Indeed, there is a positive association between the accuracy of judgments—understood as the percentage of cases upheld as opposed to the cases overturned or amended by the appellate court—and the number of trainees following the formal inclusion of training in the United Arab Emirates’ judicial authority law (figure 6.4).

Under the direction of the Judicial Council, the general strategy for providing judicial training in the United Arab Emirates is guided by existing needs and the requirements of the judicial inspections done on individual judges. Training is provided by the Dubai Judicial Institute, a dedicated institution for judicial training. The institute offers continuous and specialized training in diverse topics such as legal awareness, Islamic economics and Judicial Council leadership as well as customized training programs. Also, all commercial court judges receive training on every legal reform or new court system implemented within 12 months of the enactment of the reform. Training is also offered in the form of workshops in cooperation with other national and international public institutions and programs funded and provided directly by the courts. Monitoring and evaluation are part of the training system; the Dubai Judicial Institute and the Human Resources Department for the courts measure the impact of every training three months after completion.

Judicial training has played a fundamental role in the United Arab Emirates in the effective implementation of regulatory reforms to improve judicial efficiency and quality in commercial litigation. A commercial court was established in 2008 among six specialized courts. Different circuits were created within the court to hear disputes related to commercial contracts, bankruptcy, intellectual property, banking, commercial companies, exclusive distribution licenses and maritime issues. Judges in each circuit received technical training on these matters. This training has resulted in faster resolution times, lower appeal rates and higher-quality judgments. During the past 3-4 years, around 35% of first instance judgments were appealed and, of these decisions, the appellate court upheld 87-89%. These results suggest that the vast majority of the decisions taken by the commercial court were high-quality decisions in the first place.

The United Arab Emirates also invested resources in providing comprehensive training for judges on new technology. In 2014 Dubai Courts adopted a new case management system and established a Case Management Office in every court to aid the flow of cases and expedite the trial process. A Smart Petitions mobile application also facilitated the filing of petitions, court document submission and payment of court fees. High-quality training allowed these new systems to be used effectively. Following the implementation of these reforms at the commercial court, average resolution times declined. From 2014 to 2018, the average time for filing the case, going through the legal process and obtaining the final judgment decreased from 380 to 351 days. By learning how to use the online case management system, many judges stopped relying on clerks to check and print documents for the case and, by

**FIGURE 6.4** The higher the number of trainees, the more accurate the judgments
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Source: Dubai 2016; Dubai 2017.

Note: Accuracy of judgments is the percentage of cases upheld as opposed to the cases overturned or amended by the appellate court.
ENFORCING CONTRACTS AND RESOLVING INSOLVENCY

the end of 2017, more than 300,000 petitions had been electronically submitted and processed by Dubai Courts.

Specialized training for judges on insolvency procedures was essential for the United Arab Emirates to realize the full benefits of its new insolvency law. Seeking to create a robust legal insolvency framework, the United Arab Emirates adopted a new insolvency law in 2016 that introduced a reorganization procedure and replaced an outdated regime. The adequate application of new insolvency procedures required active court involvement; judges needed relevant bankruptcy experience and training to carry out this role effectively. Judges have been receiving training since the enactment of the law. In 2017 bankruptcy judges participated in two workshops on the new law—one, for 27 bankruptcy judges, was delivered by the Judicial Institute and the other, for 31 judges, was delivered by the U.S. Department of Justice. Senior judges provided additional training programs and workshops.

After several years of promoting a coherent system for judicial training, the United Arab Emirates is experiencing improvements in court efficiency and quality of decisions. Judges are embracing a culture of continuous learning and development, which allows them to acquire specialized skills.

Indonesia

Shaken by the impact of the 1997 Asian financial crisis, Indonesia has worked continuously to improve its commercial regulatory framework. With the assistance of the IMF, the government has focused on bringing commercial sophistication to the courts, including through training. The independence of the judicial system was strengthened in 1999 with the adoption of the so-called “one roof” approach which was implemented following the transfer of administrative control over the courts from the executive branch to the judiciary; fundamental changes were also made to the organization of judicial training. In 2003 the Supreme Court assumed the authority to provide judicial training and became the primary counterpart for international assistance on judicial reform. Within the Supreme Court, the Judicial Training Center (JTC) evolved to be the central unit responsible for developing and organizing judicial training.

The JTC exercises its mandate by operating three separate training programs: integrated initial judicial training, continuing judicial education and certification training. The two-year integrated initial judicial training program, for judge candidates, includes a combination of courses and an internship. The continuing judicial education program, which provides supplementary training for judges who have worked for 1-5 years and 6-10 years, is organized based on training needs. The certification training program is designed for ad-hoc judges and judges serving in special courts and covers specific issues such as, for example, mediation, commercial disputes and fisheries.

The emphasis on training has spilled over to other areas of Indonesia’s legal system. Reforms to improve judicial efficiency were implemented by the Supreme Court, including organizational restructuring, improved work procedures, human resource development, new working groups and a new judicial training center, all of which contributed to reducing the number of unresolved cases from 20,314 in 2004 to 11,479 in 2009. A significant milestone was reached in 2015 when Indonesia introduced a dedicated procedure for small claims that allows for parties’ self-representation. Based on the established small claims procedure, the JTC also developed a five-day small claims court training for judges on efficient case administration. This training resulted in a marked increase in the clearance rate for small claims, from 79% in 2015 to 88% in 2016.

Judicial reform and the development of judicial training in Indonesia are also reflected in the Doing Business data, which show a decrease in the time to resolve a commercial dispute through a local first-instance court, both in Jakarta and Surabaya (figure 6.5).

In the area of resolving insolvency, Indonesia’s 2004 insolvency law included an explicit training provision for prospective judges. Training was also provided for existing commercial court judges with jurisdiction over insolvency cases. As the judges’ expertise...
increased, so did the performance of the courts, as evidenced by their swift adjudication of cases. The latter is also corroborated by Doing Business data. The time to resolve insolvency of small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs), for example, has steadily fallen in Jakarta, from 72 months in 2004 to 13 months in 2012, where it has remained ever since (figure 6.6). Furthermore, although the number of incoming reorganization cases in Jakarta more than doubled—from 66 applications in 2012 to 146 in 2016—the Commercial Court of Central Jakarta continued to consider them at the same pace: 55 closed cases in 2012 compared to 118 in 2016.

Although Indonesia has established an impressive judicial training program, there is room for improvement in terms of the quality of its judicial services. Given the high rotation rate in the judiciary, training programs may require further development. Nonetheless, the focus of the Indonesian government on judicial training is visible, as is the economy’s improvements across the Doing Business metrics.

**CONCLUSION**

Businesses must be able to operate knowing that, if a problem arises, they can rely on the court system to resolve their case in a timely fashion, with a competent judge correctly interpreting and implementing the law. Judges should be well-trained professionals that enjoy the confidence of the business community and society—and that requires a training framework which enables judges to receive comprehensive and continuous training.

Economies worldwide have adopted effective training frameworks for judges. The United Arab Emirates has been particularly active in promoting a coherent system for judicial training with impressive results in court efficiency and quality of decisions. Indonesia’s efforts to train judges following judicial reform bore positive results through a substantial decrease in court backlogs and insolvency case resolution times.

Continuous and comprehensive judicial and court staff training is not, however, the norm in many economies. As evidenced by Doing Business data, the education and skills of court staff—including clerks, registrars and bailiffs—are often disregarded in national training programs in the justice sector, but they are no less important to ensure efficiency and quality in the courts.

**FIGURE 6.6** The time to resolve insolvency of SMEs has steadily decreased in Jakarta

![Graph showing the decrease in time to resolve insolvency](image)

Source: Doing Business database.

*Note:* The time to resolve insolvency of SMEs in Jakarta as measured by Doing Business has remained 13 months since 2012.

**NOTES**

This case study was written by Najah Nina Dannaoui, Maksym Iavarskij, Herve Kaddoura, Klaus Koch-Saldañara, Joseph Antoine Lemoine, Tiziana Londero, Raman Maroz, Madwa-Nika Phanord-Cadet, Marion Pinto, María Antonia Quesada Gámez and María Adelaida Vélez Posada.

3. See Dam 2006; Trebilcock and Leng 2006; Mitman 2016.
5. For more information on the École Nationale de la Magistrature, see https://www.enm.justice.fr.
6. A specialized commercial jurisdiction is established by setting up a dedicated stand-alone court, a specialized commercial section within an existing court or specialized judges within a general civil court.
10. Iverson and others 2018.
12. For more on the perspective of insolvency judges, see Broude and others 2002.
17. HRRC 2014.
18. Cox, Duituturaga and Sholikin 2012.
19. In addition to these tasks, the Judicial Training Center is responsible for administrative and management training within the judiciary.
20. Indonesia, Supreme Court 2012.
22. These data are from the Doing Business database. For more information see http://www.doingbusiness.org/Reforms/Overview/Economy/Indonesia.
23. The clearance rate is the number of decided cases as a share of incoming cases. The calculations are based on the data provided by the Commercial Court of Central Jakarta. For more information see http://pn-jakartapusat.go.id/.
24. Indonesia’s insolvency law is Law No. 37 of 2004 on Bankruptcy and Suspension of Obligation for Payment of Debts.
25. The training provision for judges can be found in Article 302 of Law No. 37 of 2004 on Bankruptcy and Suspension of Obligation for Payment of Debts.
26. Indonesia, Supreme Court 2008; Indonesia, Supreme Court 2011.
28. These data are from the Commercial Court of Central Jakarta database. For more information see http://pn-jakartapusat.go.id/.
Annex: Labor Market Regulation

Trends from Doing Business data

Every economy in the world has a system of laws and regulations that mediate the relationship between employees, employers, trade unions and the government. On the one hand, labor market regulation protects workers from unfair treatment and brings a degree of predictability to contracting; on the other, labor markets may not operate efficiently if overregulated, resulting in productivity and employment losses.1

The question of how economies can design efficient labor policies—that increase employment and productivity without compromising employment protection—has been the subject of intense debate.2 The challenge for governments is to set labor policies on an efficiency range, or “plateau,” while avoiding distortional interventions, or “cliffs,” which could undermine job creation through rigid policies or leave workers wholly unprotected as a result of excessively flexible ones.3 Denmark’s “flexicurity” model has been widely studied because it provides employee protections while maintaining labor market flexibility.4 Many economies that enact more flexible regulation, however, fail to make adequate investments to get the unemployed back into work.

Without adequate social protection and active labor market policies—job assistance programs provided by the state, for example—workers are at the mercy of the employment contract. For firms, this can be equally challenging: instead of focusing on their business, they are faced with the burden of protecting their employees. For employees, such protection is not always reliable and, furthermore, it only covers those in formal employment—everyone else is left unprotected. To extend protection to all, while easing the burden on firms, policy makers should consider enacting national labor policies that provide universal protection, instead of firm-based arrangements.5

By measuring elements of labor market regulation—hiring, working hours, redundancy rules and cost—as well as aspects of job quality (the availability of unemployment protection and sick leave, for example), Doing Business offers a rich dataset of 43 indicators for policy makers to learn from the labor market regulatory experience of 190 economies worldwide. The dataset can be used by governments, employers and researchers to measure excessive or insufficient labor market intervention and investigate the state of social protection in their economies. A researcher could use Doing Business data, for example, to determine whether there is a relationship between the flexibility of an economy’s employment regulations...
and the number of newly registered companies (figure 7.1). Such findings are in line with earlier research showing that stringent labor market regulation coupled with burdensome regulations on entrepreneurial activity is negatively correlated with the entry of new small firms.6

Faced with cumbersome labor laws that result in complex hiring procedures, stringent working hours or high redundancy costs, new businesses may choose to employ workers informally, effectively joining the informal economy.7 The existence of a large informal sector in developing economies is one of the central factors undermining productivity and economic development.8 In Sub-Saharan Africa, informality remained at an average of 75% of total employment from 2000 to 2016.9 In Nepal, 98% of employment is informal.10

Unequivocally, the reach and impact of improvements in labor market regulation in economies with higher levels of informality will not be the same as in economies with lower levels of informality. Nonetheless, research shows that informality is more prevalent in economies with more cumbersome entry regulations and rigid labor laws.11 Therefore, care should be exercised when designing labor market policies to avoid a further increase in the level of informality as a result of rigid labor laws that constrain firm growth. Doing Business data show that there is an association between economies with more flexible labor regulation and a higher number of newly registered businesses. Even formally-established companies may choose to under-hire permanent employees or increase temporary workers when faced with strict regulation governing hiring and redundancy.

Firm-level data also show that where labor market regulation is less flexible, more firms rely on temporary workers as a share of total workers. Conversely, lower labor costs could give more hiring space to start-ups, particularly in times of economic downturn or production shifts.12 These findings suggest that stringent labor regulation is related to an increase in temporary employment relative to permanent employment. Sub-Saharan Africa is the region with the highest proportion of firms that rely on temporary workers as a share of total workers, followed by South Asia and East Asia and the Pacific.13 Understanding these linkages and their consequences is important, given that entrepreneurial activity and job creation play a crucial role in poverty reduction and sustainable development.14

Stringent employment protection can also cause employers to create fewer

**FIGURE 7.1** Stringent labor regulation is associated with fewer newly registered companies and a greater number of firms relying on temporary workers

![Graph showing the relationship between business entry density and rigidity of employment regulation index](image_url)


Note: The rigidity of employment regulation index is the average of four other indices—hiring, working hours, redundancy rules and cost. For an explanation on how these indexes are computed, see the data notes in Doing Business 2013. The business entry density rate is the number of newly registered firms with limited liability per 1,000 working-age people (age 15–64) per calendar year. The relationships are significant at the 5% level after controlling for income per capita and are robust to the removal of the outliers.
permanent jobs as they attempt to circumvent the cost of providing employment protection to permanent employees. While doing so may be a short-term solution for employers, this labor market duality presents significant risks to the economy. These risks—including no overall increase in employment, negative implications for employees’ professional development, the costs associated with unfair dismissal and weak productivity growth—are discussed extensively in the literature.

It is a challenge for any economy to develop labor policies that avoid labor market segmentation and provide a balance between worker protection and flexibility. Measuring labor market regulation assists policy makers in making informed policy decisions. The differences in selected labor market regulation—such as that governing working hours, severance payment, unemployment protection and the availability of national training funds—is discussed below.

**Working hours**

Technological advancements and market dynamics are changing the nature of work. As a result, economies may consider revisiting legal restrictions on non-standard working hours such as night work, weekly holiday or overtime work. Understanding the impacts of regulatory restrictions, including those on working hours, is important for promoting entrepreneurship. According to Doing Business data, 40% of economies have legal restrictions on night work, weekly holiday work or overtime work in the food retail industry. Of these three areas, weekly holiday work is the most restricted. The largest share of high-income economies have restrictions on work performed on a weekly rest day, followed by lower-middle-income economies (figure 7.2).

In Belgium, for example, there is a general prohibition on employing personnel on Sunday; to operate on Sunday, businesses must obtain authorization from the Mayor and Aldermen. Night work is the second most restricted area according to Doing Business data. Upper-middle-income economies have the most limits on night work, followed by the lower-middle-income group. Nine economies reformed in the area of working hours in 2017/18. In India (Mumbai) the Maharashtra Shops and Establishment Act, 2017, increased overtime hours and eliminated work restrictions on the weekly rest day, while introducing a compensatory day off and a 100% wage premium for work on that day. Norway also eased restrictions on night work by allowing employees to work past 9:00 p.m. and until 11:00 p.m. Non-standard work schedules allow businesses to adjust their workforce as they evolve and face new global dynamics. Weekly holiday or night work prohibitions constrain firms and give them less flexibility to meet their employment needs.

**Severance payment and length of employment**

New data show that low- and lower-middle-income economies, which maintain the highest average severance pay as measured by Doing Business, tend to mandate longer minimum lengths of employment before a worker is entitled to severance pay (figure 7.3). Facing higher dismissal pay, employers may be induced to choose to keep senior workers over junior ones.

![FIGURE 7.2](source: Doing Business database.)

Lower-middle-income economies have the most restrictions on night, weekly holiday and overtime work.
available to experienced employees and in economies without unemployment insurance, more vulnerable employees—such as youth, for example—may be left without any income protection. Research shows that youth employment can decrease by roughly 1.5 percentage points when severance pay is increased by 100%.23 The labor market can become segregated between highly protected older workers with job stability, and younger, less experienced workers who are unable to benefit from labor protection mechanisms. Therefore, more flexible regulation should be enacted only once enhanced social assistance and insurance are in place.24 Within the past year, South Sudan adopted legislation introducing severance payments for redundancy termination; France increased severance payments, while Azerbaijan and Lithuania decreased these amounts.

Unemployment protection and skills development

Globally, 40% of economies measured by Doing Business provide unemployment protection, with an 8-month average minimum contribution period before an employee becomes eligible. However, only 5% of low- and lower-middle-income economies require unemployment protection by law. A lack of protection and benefits leaves people vulnerable to poverty, particularly during life events such as poor health or old age.25 Unemployment protection policies are critical in promoting inclusive labor markets, human capital development, productivity and economic growth.26 The need is particularly high in developing economies where informality is predominant. In 2017/18, Malaysia and Nepal introduced unemployment protection schemes, while Bulgaria increased the minimum contribution period for unemployment protection from nine to 10 months. To ensure basic protections for all citizens, effective national level policies should be designed in collaboration with social partners.

Similarly, a lack of training can leave people, especially youth, unprepared for the job market. Economies should continuously improve the skills of the labor force to adapt to rapidly changing business and social environments. Although firms are generally expected to provide training for their employees, professional development as a national policy generates more opportunities for the wider population. India, for example, has set a target of training 500 million people by 2022 to spur employment and national development.27 National training funds are one of the main financing vehicles for putting national skills development policies into practice. Such funds, dedicated to improving the skills of citizens, typically come from a stock or flow of financing outside normal government budget channels.28 Doing Business data indicate that national training funds exist in 60% of economies worldwide at varying levels of development and geography. The OECD high-income group has the largest share of economies with national training funds, followed by Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean (figure 7.4). Training funds in high-income economies are most commonly financed by levies (taxes) on enterprises, while in low-income and lower-middle-income economies the funds primarily come from international donors.29
The benefits of national training programs are yet to be fully evaluated. However, Doing Business data show a negative and significant association between the availability of national training funds and youth unemployment (figure 7.5), suggesting the youth unemployment rate is lower in economies where national training funds are available. Since its creation in 2017 Bolivia’s National Employment Plan has helped generate about 58,000 jobs for young people by providing incentives to companies including co-financing their training. In Brazil the Servicio Nacional de Aprendizagem Industrial (SENAI, the National Service for Industrial Training) and its associated institutions, which operate under the umbrella of the National Confederation of Industry, have graduated 55 million professionals since 1942. The SENAI offers approximately 3,000 courses that train workers in 28 industrial areas. Courses range from professional learning to college and graduate degrees. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Côte d’Ivoire’s Professional Training and Development Fund was created with the core mission of financing employee training initiatives to address the challenge of low education and skills among workers. In East Asia and the Pacific, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic established a national training fund in 2010. The main role of the fund, which is financed through 1% mandatory employee salary contributions, is to foster the development of relevant job skills in the country’s workforce.

CONCLUSION

The Doing Business labor market regulation dataset serves as a tool for policy makers to identify areas for regulatory reform and for researchers to
investigate the links between changes to labor regulation and economic outcomes. Given the changing dynamics of work, determining the right level of regulatory intervention in the labor market is critical. It is important on the one hand to provide businesses with the flexibility to meet their permanent and temporary staffing needs while, on the other, ensuring worker protections and the revision of rigid labor legislation, particularly in developing economies where vulnerable groups may be left behind. Shifts in labor market demand also call for new ways of thinking about skills development and training, including national policies and funding strategies that economies can utilize to prepare their citizens for the future.

NOTES

This case study was written by Lucia Arnal Rodriguez, Liliya F. Bulgakova and Dorina P. Georgieva.
3. The World Bank’s World Development Report 2013 uses the term “plateau” to describe the balance between unemployment protection and labor market flexibility.
8. La Porta and Shleifer 2004.
10. International Labor Organization data (http://www.ilo.org/ilostat); employment in the informal economy as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment.
13. Enterprise Surveys database (http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/), World Bank. The share of firms relying on temporary workers by region is as follows: Sub-Saharan Africa 7.2%, South Asia 6.2%, East Asia and the Pacific 5.1%, the Middle East and North Africa 4.3%, Europe and Central Asia 3.9%, and Latin America and the Caribbean 3.9%.
17. Ulku and Muzi 2015.
18. OECD 2014.
20. As stipulated by Belgium’s Labour Act of March 16, 1971, and sectoral regulations (JIC 119).
21. Doing Business measures severance pay for workers with 1, 5 and 10 years of tenure.
27. For more information on India’s national training policy, see the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning brief on India at http://uil.unesco.org/fileadmin/keydocuments/LifelongLearning/en/UIL_Global_Inventory_of_NQFs_India.pdf.
30. For more information, see the website of Plan Generación de Empleo at http://www.plandeempleo.bo/.
31. The SENAI was followed by four other sector-specific training institutions for commerce (Servício Nacional de Aprendizagem Comercial, SENAC), rural areas (Servício Nacional de Aprendizagem Rural, SENAR), small enterprises (Serviço Brasileiro de Apoio às Micro e Pequenas Empresas, SEBRAE) and transport (Servício Nacional de Aprendizagem do Transporte, SENAT). All of these institutions operate under the same basic structure and legal framework.
32. For more information on the Fonds de Développement de la Formation Professionnelle, see the website at http://www.fdfp.ci/faq.
33. Lao PDR’s national training fund was established by Decree No. 036/PM of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare dated January 22, 2010. The fund is meant to build and develop labor skills at the national and provincial levels by creating opportunities for citizens to receive training and skills development at training centers, schools and colleges. The fund also facilitates academic scholarships, grants and short-term loans.
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Data Notes

The indicators presented and analyzed in Doing Business measure business regulation, the quality and strength of legal frameworks, 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, together 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 13,800 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 2019 team members visited 28 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 2019 has no major methodological change at the indicators level.

LIMITS TO WHAT IS MEASURED

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).
BOX 8.1 Comparing business regulation and learning from good practices at the local level: subnational Doing Business studies

Improving the business regulatory environment by learning from international good practices can propel economies to improve. However, learning from good practices across different locations within the same economy can be an even more powerful motivator. Subnational Doing Business studies expand Doing Business indicators beyond an economy’s largest business city as measured by the annual report. These studies, which are demand driven and conducted at the request of governments, capture differences in regulations or enforcement at the local level, allowing policy makers to effectively target bottlenecks and improve the business environment across their economy.

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 and see how their overall performance in Doing Business would improve if the largest business city were to adopt all the good practices documented within their borders. Subnational studies can prompt discussions of regulatory reform across different levels of government, providing opportunities for local governments and agencies to learn from one another, resulting in local ownership and capacity building.

There can be substantial variations in regulation or in the implementation of national laws across locations within an economy. A subnational Doing Business study completed in 2017 benchmarking Colombia’s 32 departments showed that entrepreneurs face different realities depending on their geographic location. For starting a business, for example, one-third of Colombia’s cities performed similarly to Austria, Germany and Poland—all OECD high-income economies. However, the number of procedures required in the city of Inírida (16) is exceeded by only two of the 10 worst-ranked economies globally (namely República Bolivariana de Venezuela and Equatorial Guinea, with 20 and 16 procedures, respectively).

What is the main lesson? Cooperation between entities facilitates reform. In Colombia, this collaboration took the form of agreements between departmental and municipal governments and Chambers of Commerce to facilitate payment of registration fees and coordinate inspections—and between municipal governments and Curadores Urbanos (private professionals responsible for the administration of building permits) to accelerate the approval of construction permits. Studying good practices in other locations within Colombia (in this case, Manizales) can assist policy makers in replicating them locally.

Since 2005 subnational Doing Business studies have covered 510 locations in 75 economies. These locations represent 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). Eighteen economies—including the Arab Republic of Egypt, Colombia, Mexico, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Russian Federation and South Africa—have undertaken two or more rounds of subnational data collection to measure progress over time. This year subnational studies were completed in four EU member states (25 cities in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Portugal and the Slovak Republic), Nigeria (36 states and the Federal Capital Territory of Abuja) and South Africa (13 locations). Ongoing studies include those in an additional three EU member states (24 cities in Greece, Ireland and Italy), Kazakhstan (16 cities), Mozambique (70 cities) and the United Arab Emirates.

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/en/reports/subnational-reports. For any additional information, please contact the Subnational Doing Business Team at subnational@worldbank.org.
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.

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 2019 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 117,000 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 2018 and Doing Business 2019 is 5.6%.

Governments submit queries on the data and provide new information to Doing Business. During the Doing Business 2019 production cycle the team received 151 such queries from governments. In addition, the team held multiple video conferences with government representatives in 72 economies and in-person meetings with government representatives from 46 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 scores for starting a business. These scores are the simple average of the scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.2).

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 the other by five married men. The 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 post-incorporation 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 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. In the absence of a government officer’s 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 El Salvador in May 2018, for example, the minimum capital requirement was $2,000, of which 5% needed to be paid before registration. Therefore, the paid-in minimum capital recorded for El Salvador is $100, or 2.7% 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 2017/18 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 score 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 relative score gap is classified as a reform, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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. 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: //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 scores for dealing with construction permits. These scores are the simple average of the scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.3).

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Building quality control index</th>
<th>Cost to comply with formalities, as % of warehouse value</th>
<th>Days to comply with formalities to build a warehouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final document is received when 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. In the absence of a government officer’s 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.

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 El Salvador in May 2018, for example, the minimum capital requirement was $2,000, of which 5% needed to be paid before registration. Therefore, the paid-in minimum capital recorded for El Salvador is $100, or 2.7% of income per capita.
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.
- 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 8A.1).
- Is 100% domestically and privately owned.
- Has five owners, none of whom is a 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 be used for general storage activities, such as storage of books or stationery. The warehouse will not be used for any goods requiring special conditions, such as food, chemicals, or pharmaceuticals.
- Will have two stories, both above ground, with a total constructed area of approximately 1,300.6 square meters (14,000 square feet). Each floor will be 3 meters (9 feet, 10 inches) high.
- 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 separate 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 be 150 meters (492 feet) from the existing water source and sewer tap. If there is no water delivery infrastructure in the economy, a borehole will be dug. If there is no sewerage infrastructure, a septic tank in the smallest size available will be installed or built.
- 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 cadastrer, utility companies, 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 done in practice by the majority of companies to build a warehouse are recorded, even if they may be avoided in exceptional cases. For example, obtaining technical conditions for electricity or a clearance of the electrical plans are counted as separate procedures if they are required for obtaining 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 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, specific regulations and fee schedules are used as sources for costs. If several local partners provide different estimates, the median reported value is used.

**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 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 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 of the building 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 if the legally mandated inspections do not occur in practice, if the inspections occur most of the time but not always or if inspections are not mandated by law regardless of whether they commonly occur in practice.

The index ranges from 0 to 3, with higher values indicating better quality control during the construction process. In Antigua and Barbuda, for example, the Development Control Authority is legally mandated to conduct phased inspections under the Physical Planning Act of 2003 (a score of 1). However, the Development Control Authority rarely conducts these inspections in practice (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Antigua and Barbuda a score of 1 on the quality control during construction index.

**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.

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 (a score of 2). However, the final inspection does not occur in practice (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives Haiti a score of 2 on the quality control after construction index.

**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.
- Whether any parties involved in the construction process are 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 is legally 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 2, with higher values indicating more stringent latent defect liability and insurance regimes. In Madagascar, for example, under article 1792 of the Civil Code both the architect who designed the plans and the construction company are legally held liable for latent defects for a period of 10 years after the completion of the building (a score of 1). However, there is no legal requirement for any party to obtain a decennial liability insurance policy to cover structural defects, nor do most parties obtain such insurance in practice (a score of 0). Adding these numbers gives 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 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. 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. A score of 0 is assigned if national or state regulations mandate that the professional must meet only one of the above 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 certification 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 stricter 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 2017 and May 2018 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 their impact on the data, certain changes are classified as reforms and listed in the summaries of *Doing Business* reforms in 2017/18 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 score 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 score gap is classified as a reform, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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. 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 data 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 as well as 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 doing business 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, lastly, 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 scores for getting electricity. These scores are the simple average of the 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 monthly consumption for January**
- 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 January of the current year are used for calculation of the price of electricity for the warehouse. Although January 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. However, internal wiring inspections and certifications that are prerequisites to obtain a new connection are 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.

A procedure is always counted for the external works—whether it is carried out by the utility or a private contractor. However, the external work procedure and the meter installation can be counted as one unique procedure provided two specific conditions are met: (i) both the external works and meter installation are carried out by the same company or agency, and (ii) there is no additional interaction for the customer between the external works and the meter installation (such as, for example, a supply contract that needs to be signed or a security deposit that needs to be paid).

If an internal wiring inspection—or a related certification on the installation—is needed to obtain a new connection, then it is counted as a procedure. However, if an internal inspection and the meter installation occur (i) at the same time, and (ii) without additional follow up or through a separate request, then these are counted as one procedure.
TABLE 8.6 What do the getting electricity indicators measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures to obtain an electricity connection (number)</th>
<th>Cost required to complete each procedure (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitting all relevant documents and obtaining all necessary clearances and permits</td>
<td>Official costs only, no bribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing all required notifications and receiving all necessary inspections</td>
<td>Value added tax excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining external installation works and possibly purchasing material for these works</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding any necessary supply contract and obtaining final supply</td>
<td>Duration and frequency of power outages (0–3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days)</td>
<td>Tools to monitor power outages (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is at least one calendar day</td>
<td>Tools to restore power supply (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each procedure starts on a separate day</td>
<td>Regulatory monitoring of utilities’ performance (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include time spent gathering information</td>
<td>Financial deterrents aimed at limiting outages (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects the time spent in practice, with little follow-up and no prior contact with officials</td>
<td>Transparency and accessibility of tariffs (0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of electricity (cents per kilowatt-hour)</td>
<td>Price based on monthly bill for commercial warehouse in case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: While Doing Business measures the price of electricity, it does not include these data when calculating the score for getting electricity or the ranking on the ease of getting electricity.

**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 indicated by the score for getting electricity or the ranking on the ease of getting electricity. Cost 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, obtaining 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 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-2017 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 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 2018 would have had to put up a security deposit of 64,721 Hong Kong dollars (approximately $8,250) 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 14,008 Hong Kong dollars ($1,780). 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 4,854 Hong Kong dollars ($620).
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 2017, the average total duration of power outages in London was 0.27 hours per customer and the average number of outages experienced by a customer was 0.13. 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. Hence, 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 2017 and May 2018, 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 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 January (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 2017/18 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 score 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 score gap is classified as a reform, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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 limited liability company (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: reliability of infrastructure, transparency of information, geographic coverage, land dispute resolution and equal access to property rights.

The ranking of economies on the ease of registering property is determined by sorting their scores for registering property. These scores are the simple average of the 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 parties
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.

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.
- 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 procedure is chosen if that option is more beneficial to the economy’s score and if it is used by the majority of property owners. Although the buyer may use lawyers or other professionals where necessary in the registration process, it is assumed that the buyer does not employ an outside facilitator in the registration process unless legally or in practice required to do so.

Time
Time is recorded in calendar days. The measure captures the median...
TABLE 8.7 What do the indicators on the efficiency of transferring property measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures to legally transfer title on immovable property (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-registration procedures (for example, checking for liens, notarizing sales agreement, paying property transfer taxes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration procedures in the economy’s largest business city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-registration procedures (for example, filling title with municipality)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time required to complete each procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not include time spent gathering information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each procedure starts on a separate day—though procedures that can be fully completed online are an exception to this rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure is considered completed once final document is received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost required to complete each procedure (% of property value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official costs only (such as administrative fees, duties and taxes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added Tax, Capital Gains Tax and illicit payments are excluded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

duration that property lawyers, notaries or registry officials indicate is necessary to complete a procedure. 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 (again except for procedures that can be fully completed online). It is assumed that the buyer does not waste time and commits to completing each remaining procedure without delay. If a procedure can be accelerated 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:

- 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
### Table 8.8 What do the indicators on the quality of land administration measure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability of infrastructure index (0–8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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><strong>Transparency of information index (0–6)</strong></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><strong>Geographic coverage index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of land registry at the level of the largest business city and the economy&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of mapping agency at the level of the largest business city and the economy&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land dispute resolution index (0–8)</strong></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><strong>Equal access to property rights (-2–0)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal ownership rights to property between unmarried men and women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal ownership rights to property between married men and women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td>Sum of the reliability of infrastructure, transparency of information, geographic coverage, land dispute resolution indices and equal access to property rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 published about property transfers in the largest business city in the past calendar year at the latest on May 1st of the following year; 0 if no such statistics are made publicly available.

- 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 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 the fee schedule for accessing maps is made publicly available. A score of 0.5 is assigned if it can be accessed online or on a public board free of charge; 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 a specific time frame for delivering an updated map. A score of 0.5 is assigned if there is a specific and independent 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 independent mechanism for filing a complaint; 0 if there is only a general mechanism or no mechanism.

The mapping agency commits to a specific time frame for delivering an updated map. A score of 0.5 is assigned if there is a specific and independent 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 independent mechanism for filing a complaint; 0 if there is only a general mechanism or no mechanism.
available to the public, reporting a total of 39,849 property transfers in Amsterdam in 2017 (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.

**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 8, with higher values indicating greater geographic coverage in land ownership registration and cadastral mapping. In Japan, for example, all privately held land plots are formally registered at the land registry in Tokyo and Osaka (a score of 2) and the economy as a whole (a score of 2). Also, all privately held land plots are mapped in both cities (a score of 2) and the economy as a whole (a score of 2). Adding these numbers gives Japan a score of 8 on the geographic coverage 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, out-of-court compensation mechanism to cover 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 (such as the sales, transfer or conveyance deed) 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.
- Whether there is a specific, out-of-court 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). In accordance with the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 and the Money Laundering Regulations 2007, a lawyer 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). The United Kingdom has a national database to verify the accuracy of identity documents (a score of 1). In a land dispute between two British companies over the tenure rights of a property worth $2,026,500, the Land Registration division of the Property Chamber (First-tier Tribunal) 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 1,154
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 unequal property rights between men and women.

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.

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 2017 and May 2018, 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 2017/18 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 score 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 score gap is classified as a reform, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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. 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 measures whether certain features that facilitate lending exist within the applicable collateral and bankruptcy laws. The second 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 scores for getting credit. These scores are the sum of the scores for 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 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 accounts receivable, tangible movable assets and 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 and after-acquired assets, and extends automatically to the products, proceeds and replacements of the original assets.
- All types of debts and obligations can be secured between the parties, and a general description of such debts and obligations is permitted in the collateral agreement and in registration documents.
- 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 not used for the reorganization or sale of the business as a going concern, or if there is a risk to its existence) 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 the assets to be sold through public or private auctions and 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 2017/18 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 on the existence of a secured transaction legal framework which regulates the creation, publicity and enforcement of nonpossessory security interests and their functional equivalents. Each year, new laws and amendments are evaluated to see if they facilitate obtaining credit by small and medium enterprises, allowing for maximum flexibility in the choice of assets which can be used as collateral. Guidelines, model rules, principles, recommendations and case law are excluded.

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, where applicable, a detailed questionnaire on the credit reporting service provider’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 at the credit reporting service provider as well as by contacting third parties and consulting public sources. The questionnaire data are confirmed through teleconference calls or on-site visits.

**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 and cover more than 5% of the adult population. 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). Both the credit registry and the credit bureau distribute data on loan amounts below 1% of income per capita (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 registry coverage**

Credit registry coverage reports the number of individuals and firms listed in a credit registry’s database as of January 1, 2018, 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, 2017, and January 1, 2018. The number is expressed as a percentage of the adult population (the population age 15 to 64 in 2017 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 bureau coverage**

Credit bureau coverage reports the number of individuals and firms listed in a credit bureau’s database as of January 1, 2018, 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, 2017, and January 1, 2018. The number is expressed as a percentage of the adult population (the population age 15 to 64 in 2017 according to the World Bank’s World Development Indicators). A credit bureau 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 2017/18 section of the report 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 in the most up-to-date 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 scores for protecting minority investors. These scores are the simple average of the 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 there are fewer than 10 listed companies 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 in economies with a two-tier board system on which Mr. James appointed 60% of the shareholder-elected members.
- Has not adopted 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, sits on Buyer’s board of directors 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 principal activity 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 was not entered into fraudulently.

### 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 an external body (an independent auditor, for example) must 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. 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 periodic filings (for example, annual reports) 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:

- Whether shareholders can 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% or less of share capital.

- Whether a shareholder plaintiff can 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 shareholders.

- Whether a shareholder plaintiff can hold other executives and directors (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 they cannot be held liable or can be held liable only for fraud, bad faith or gross negligence; 1 if they can be held liable for negligence; 2 if they can be held liable when the transaction is unfair or prejudicial to 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 no; 1 if yes.

- Whether a court can void the transaction upon a successful claim by a shareholder plaintiff. A score of 0 is assigned if rescission is unavailable or 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, however, cannot be 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 Buyer-Seller transaction documents before filing a suit. Alternatively, whether they can request that a government inspector investigate the Buyer-Seller transaction without filing a 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 she/he intends to rely on for her/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 or if the judge can set aside questions for any reason; 2 if yes, without prior approval.

- Whether the standard of proof for civil suits is lower than that for a criminal case. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if yes.
- Whether shareholder plaintiffs can recover their legal expenses from the company. A score of 0 is assigned if no; 1 if plaintiffs can recover their legal expenses from the company upon a successful outcome of their legal action; 2 if plaintiffs 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 related to the transaction (a score of 0). The defendant can examine the documents 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 the 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 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.
- Whether shareholders representing 10% of Buyer’s share capital have the right to call for a meeting of shareholders.
- Whether Buyer must obtain its shareholders’ approval every time it issues new shares.
- Whether shareholders automatically receive preemption rights when Buyer issues new shares.
- Whether shareholders elect and dismiss the external auditor.
- Whether changes to the rights of a class of shares are only possible if the holders of the affected shares approve.
- 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 or almost 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.

**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 chairperson of the board of directors.
- Whether the board of directors must include independent 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 have an 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.
- 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 2017/18 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 scores for paying taxes. These scores are the simple average of the 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 statements. This includes labor contributions. The *Doing Business* measure includes government-mandated contributions paid by the employer to a requited 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 the transactions made over the course of the year in each economy.
FIGURE 8.14  Paying taxes: tax compliance for a local manufacturing company

Rankings are based on scores for four indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours per year to prepare, file returns and pay taxes</th>
<th>Firm tax liability as % of profits before all taxes borne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% Total tax and contribution rate</td>
<td>Payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Postfiling index</td>
<td>Number of tax payments per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score on: number of hours to comply with VAT refund, number of weeks to obtain VAT refund, number of hours to comply with corporate income tax correction, number of weeks to complete a corporate income tax correction

Note: All economies below the threshold receive the same score in the total tax and contribution rate component as the economies at the threshold. If both VAT and corporate income tax apply, the postfiling index is the simple average of the scores for each of the four components: time to comply with VAT refund, time to obtain VAT refund, time to comply with corporate income tax correction and time to complete a corporate income tax correction. 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.

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 correction. 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, 2016. 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 2016, 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 2017, 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 2017). 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

2012 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. In some cases, the cost of living threshold is used to estimate the financial statement variables.
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 2019_ reports the total tax and contribution rate for calendar year 2017. 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 a corporate income tax correction and time to complete a corporate income tax correction. If both VAT and corporate income tax apply, the postfiling index is the simple average of the 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 four components include the time to comply with and complete a tax audit when applicable (see details below). 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, including informal inquiries, formal inquiries and formal tax audits to verify whether such taxpayers have correctly assessed and reported their tax liability and fulfilled other obligations.

The indicators are based on expanded case study assumptions.

Assumptions about the VAT refund process
- In June 2017, 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory rate</th>
<th>Taxable base $b$ (ID)</th>
<th>Actual tax payable $a = r \times b$ (ID)</th>
<th>Commercial profit* $c$ (ID)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate $t = a/c$ (%)</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee paid—Social security contributions (taxable wages)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>511,191,307</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>139,692,432</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.
Input VAT will exceed output VAT in June 2017 (table 8.13).

Assumptions about the corporate income tax correction 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 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 is not subjected to an audit.

For a VAT cash refund due to a capital purchase are pooled into additional review 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.

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 is not 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 27 hours complying with the process of claiming a VAT refund. taxpayers request the VAT refund in the standard VAT return. Taxpayers spend two hours gathering information from internal sources and accounting records to calculate the amount of the VAT refund. There is no additional time for preparing the refund claim because taxpayers indicate in the online VAT return that they want the outstanding VAT balance to be refunded. 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. These documents are submitted electronically at the same time as the submission of the VAT return. 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 tax office. Taxpayers spend 16 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 the tax office (two 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 companies with a request for a VAT cash refund due to
a capital purchase are pooled into additional review 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), 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 time spent waiting for the release of the VAT refund payment from the moment the final audit decision has been issued by the auditor.

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.

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 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 2017 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 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 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 for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. If an economy has a VAT but there is no refund mechanism in place, the economy is assigned a score of 0 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 for time to comply with VAT refund and time to obtain VAT refund. This is the case in Myanmar.

**Time to comply with a corporate income tax correction**

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.

- The process of complying with a corporate income tax correction. This is captured if companies that had a case of self-reporting an error in the corporate income tax return resulting in an underpayment of the corporate income tax due liability were included in the pool of companies that were exposed to additional review in 25% or more of cases. The threshold used for assessing the corporate income tax return resulting in an underpayment of the corporate income 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 be subject to additional review. This brings the total compliance time to two hours.

### Time to complete a corporate income tax correction

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.

Time to complete a corporate income tax correction is recorded as zero if less than 25% of companies will not go through an additional review. In Switzerland, for example, taxpayers with an amended corporate income tax return per the case study scenario are subject to a single-issue audit conducted at the taxpayer’s premises. 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 correction.

If an economy does not levy corporate income tax, the economy will not be scored on the two indicators: time to comply with a corporate income tax correction and time to complete a corporate income tax correction. 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 2017/18 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 score 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 score gap is classified as a reform, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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](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 scores for trading across borders. These scores are the simple average of the scores for the time and cost for documentary compliance and border compliance to export and import (figure 8.17).

Although Doing Business collects and publishes data on the time and cost for domestic transport, it does not use these data in calculating the score for trading across borders or the ranking on the ease of 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 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 8A.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

\[ \text{FIGURE 8.15  What makes up the time and cost to export to an overseas trading partner?} \]

\[ \text{São Paulo} \]

\text{Domestic transport: 8.6 hours, $763} \]

\text{Border compliance: 49 hours, $862} \]

\text{Documentary compliance: 12 hours, $228} \]

\text{China} \]

\[ \text{FIGURE 8.16  What makes up the time and cost to export to a regional trading partner?} \]

\[ \text{Nairobi} \]

\text{Domestic transport: 9 hours, $967} \]

\text{Border compliance: 15.5 hours, $143} \]

\text{Documentary compliance: 19 hours, $191} \]

\[ \text{Uganda} \]

\[ \text{FIGURE 8.17  Trading across borders: time and cost to export and import} \]

\[ \text{Ranks are based on scores for eight indicators} \]

\[ \text{Time for documentary compliance and border compliance when exporting the product of comparative advantage} \]

\[ \text{Cost for documentary compliance and border compliance when exporting the product of comparative advantage} \]

\[ \text{Time for documentary compliance and border compliance when importing auto parts} \]

\[ \text{Cost for documentary compliance and border compliance when importing auto parts} \]

\[ \text{Note: The time and cost for domestic transport and the number of documents to export and import are measured but do not count for the rankings.} \]
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 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 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 8.14). 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 the United States.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentary compliance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining, preparing and submitting documents during transport, clearance, inspections and port or border handling in origin economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining, preparing and submitting documents required by destination economy and any transit economies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers all documents required by law and in practice, including electronic submissions of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic transport</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loading and unloading of shipment at warehouse or border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport by most widely used mode between warehouse and border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport by most widely used mode between border and warehouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic delays and road police checks while shipment is en route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 8.15). 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) 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 2017/18 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 score 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 score gap is classified as a reform, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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 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 scores for enforcing contracts. These scores are the simple average of the scores for each of the component indicators (figure 8.18).

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
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, the name of the relevant court in that city is given as well.

- 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).

### 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. The point is assigned only if this court applies a simplified procedure or if the procedure for small claims is simplified. 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 fast-track 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.

### 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 (-1–5)</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>

**DATA NOTES**

TABLE 8.16 What does the quality of judicial processes index measure?
The index ranges from -1 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). 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 publicly available performance measurement reports 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 a 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 semiautomatically 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 is available that judges can use for at least four of these purposes; 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). A pretrial conference is among the case management techniques used before the District Court of New South Wales (a score of 1). An electronic case management system satisfying the criteria outlined above is available to judges (a score of 1) and to lawyers (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 short message service (SMS), 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 court fees can be paid electronically for cases filed before the competent court, either through a dedicated platform or through online banking. A score of 1 is assigned if fees can be paid electronically and litigants are not required to follow-up with a hard copy of the receipt or produce a stamped copy of the receipt; 0 if not. Electronic payment 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; 0.5 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.

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 valid arbitration clauses or agreements are enforced by local courts in more than 50% of cases. A score of 0.5 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

- 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.

- Whether there are any 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 2017/18 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 score gap, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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 scores for resolving insolvency. These scores are the simple average of the 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 chairperson 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.
- 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 2017 reduced its net worth to a negative figure. It is January 1, 2018. 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 2018 and 2019 as well. But it expects 2018 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 her/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-2017 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
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.
- Whether the debtor (or an insolvency representative on its behalf) can reject overly burdensome contracts. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if rejection of contracts is not possible or if the law contains no provisions on this subject.
- Whether transactions entered into before commencement of insolvency proceedings that give preference to one or several creditors 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 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.
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.

- Whether the insolvency framework requires that creditors whose rights are affected by the reorganization plan are allowed to challenge a decision of the insolvency representative. A score of 1 is assigned if yes; 0 if no.

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 2017/18 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 score gap, except when the change is the result of automatic official fee indexation to a price or wage index (for more details, see the chapter on the ease of doing business score 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 2011) and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law’s Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law (UNCITRAL 2004).

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).

The report does not present rankings of economies on these indicators or include this indicator set in the aggregate score or ranking on the ease of doing business.

Doing Business 2019 presents detailed data for the labor market regulation indicators 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.9
- Is a full-time employee.
- Is not a member of the labor union, unless membership is mandatory.

FIGURE 8.23 What do the labor market regulation indicators cover?
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 nine 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 work on a weekly rest day (as a percentage of hourly pay); (iv) the premium for overtime work (as a percentage of hourly pay); (v) whether there are restrictions on night work; (vi) whether nonpregnant and non-nursing women can work the same night hours as men; (vii) whether there are restrictions on work on a weekly rest day; (viii) whether there are restrictions on overtime work; and (ix) the average paid annual leave for workers with one year of tenure, five 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 one year of tenure, a worker with five 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 2019 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 2017/18 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 International Labor Organization (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 2019 does not present rankings of economies on the labor market regulation indicators.

**NOTES**

1. These are Bangladesh, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia and the United States.
2. This correction rate reflects changes that exceed 5% up or down.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. The nonlinear score for the total tax and contribution rate to the power of 0.8.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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 one, five and 10 years of tenure.
10. The average value added per worker is the ratio of an economy’s income per capita to the working-age population as a percentage of the total population.
11. If no maternity leave is mandated by law, parental leave is measured if applicable.
12. 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.
13. If no maternity leave is mandated by law, parental leave is measured if applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>City or cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Kabul</td>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>Brazzaville</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Jakarta, Surabaya</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Podgorica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Maputo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Luanda</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>St. John’s</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Nicosia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Kathmandu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Asmara</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Kuwait City</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Koror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Roseau</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Managua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Vincent and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grenadines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Baku</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Santo Domingo</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Almaty</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Niamey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Quito</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Lagos, Kano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paramaribo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Manama</td>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Tarawa</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dhaka, Chittagong</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>San Salvador</td>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Muscat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Malabo</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Pristina</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lahore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Minsk</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Asmara</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Kuwait City</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Tallinn</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Panama City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Belize City</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Riga</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Asunción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>Banjul</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Vilnius</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Thimphu</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Maseru</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Quezon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Gaborone</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Libreville</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>Banjul</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Vilnius</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>Bandar Seri Begawan</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Macedonia, FYR</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Ouagadougou</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Antananarivo</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Moscow, St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Bujumbura</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Blantyre</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Kigali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>Praia</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>St. George’s</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Apia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Guatemala City</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Malé</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Douala</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Conakry</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Bambako</td>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>São Tomé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Bissau</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Valletta</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Riyadh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tashkent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Bangui</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>Majuro</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Dakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>N’Djamena</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Port-au-Prince</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Nouakchott</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela, RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Tegucigalpa</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Port Louis</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ho Chi Minh City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Shanghai, Beijing</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico City, Monterrey</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Freetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Reykjavik</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Chişinău</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Bratislava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>Kinshasa</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mumbai, Delhi</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Ulaanbaatar</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ease of Doing Business Score and Ease of Doing Business Ranking

The Doing Business report presents results for two aggregate measures: the ease of doing business score (formerly called the distance to frontier score) and the ease of doing business ranking, which is based on the ease of doing business score. The ease of doing business ranking compares economies with one another; the ease of doing business score benchmarks economies with respect to regulatory best practice, showing the absolute distance to the best regulatory performance on each Doing Business indicator. When compared across years, the ease of doing business 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.

EASE OF DOING BUSINESS SCORE

The ease of doing business 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 and Georgia have the lowest number of procedures required (1). New Zealand also holds the shortest time to start a business (0.5 days), while Slovenia has the lowest cost (0.0). Australia, Colombia and 115 other economies have no paid-in minimum capital requirement (table 9.1).

Calculation of the ease of doing business score

Calculating the ease of doing business 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 $(\text{worst} - y)/(\text{worst} - \text{best})$. In this formulation the highest score represents the best regulatory performance on the indicator across all economies since 2005 or the third year in which data for the indicator were collected. Both the best regulatory performance and the worst regulatory 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 establish the best regulatory performance for an indicator even though it may not have the highest score in a subsequent year. Conversely, an economy may score higher than the best regulatory performance if the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and indicator</th>
<th>Economy establishing best regulatory performance</th>
<th>Best regulatory performance</th>
<th>Worst regulatory 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>Georgia; 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;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>Australia; Colombia&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>400.0&lt;sup&gt;b&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 a best performer as of May 1, 2018.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>No economy was a best performer as of May 1, 2018.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>373&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>No economy was a best performer as of May 1, 2018.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0&lt;sup&gt;b&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; United Kingdom&lt;sup&gt;e&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;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>China; Japan; United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8,100.0&lt;sup&gt;b&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;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;d&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</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210&lt;sup&gt;b&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;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>No economy has reached the best performance yet.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;d&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>Montenegro; Puerto Rico (U.S.)&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>Ecuador; United Kingdom&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&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;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>Cambodia; Kenya</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&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;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>No economy has reached the best performance yet.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>Azerbaijan; France; Lithuania; Norway; Saudi Arabia; Taiwan, China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0&lt;sup&gt;i&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;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>696&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>Canada; Singapore&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.1&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84.0&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>No economy with both CIT and VAT has reached the best performance yet.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to comply with VAT refund (hours)</td>
<td>Croatia; Netherlands&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to obtain VAT refund (weeks)</td>
<td>Austria; Estonia</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>55&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to comply with corporate income tax correction (hours)</td>
<td>Lithuania; Portugal&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>56&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to complete a corporate income tax correction (weeks)</td>
<td>Sweden; United States&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No CIT audit</td>
<td>32&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### TABLE 9.1 Which economies set the best regulatory performance? (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic and indicator</th>
<th>Economy establishing best regulatory performance</th>
<th>Best regulatory performance</th>
<th>Worst regulatory 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(^a)</td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>170(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>Austria; Belgium; Hong Kong SAR, China(^a)</td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>160(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to export</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>Hungary; Luxembourg; Norway(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>France; Netherlands; Portugal(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,060(^a)</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; Malta(^a)</td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>240(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>Bulgaria; France; Germany(^a)</td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>280(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost to import</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>Iceland; Latvia; United Kingdom(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>Armenia; Denmark; Estonia(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>No economy was a best performer as of May 1, 2018.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,340(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim)</td>
<td>No economy was a best performer as of May 1, 2018.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>89.0(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>No economy has reached the best performance 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>No economy was a best performer as of May 1, 2018.</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>0(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>No economy has reached the best performance yet.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0(^d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

a. Worst performance is defined as the 99th percentile among all economies in the Doing Business sample.
b. Worst performance is defined as the 95th percentile among all economies in the Doing Business sample.
c. Another 115 economies also have a paid-in minimum capital requirement of 0.0.
d. Worst performance is the worst value recorded.
e. In 23 other economies it takes no more than 3 procedures to get an electricity connection.
f. Another 24 economies score 8 out of 8 on the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index.
g. Three additional economies score 12 out of 12 on the strength of legal rights index.
h. Another 40 economies score 8 out of 8 on the depth of credit information index.
i. Another 11 economies score 10 out of 10 on the extent of disclosure index.
j. 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.
k. Another 30 economies have a total tax and contribution rate equal to or lower than 26.1% of profit.
l. 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.
m. Another eight economies also have a compliance time for VAT refund of 0 hours.
n. Another 11 economies also have a compliance time for corporate income tax audit of no more than 1.5 hours.
o. Another 94 economies also do not impose a corporate income tax audit.
p. Another 23 economies also have a documentary compliance time to export of no more than 1 hour.
q. Defined as 1 hour even though in many economies the time is less.
r. Another 16 economies also have a border compliance time to export of no more than 1 hour.
s. Another 17 economies also have a documentary compliance cost to export of 0.0.
t. Another 16 economies also have a border compliance cost to export of 0.0.
u. Another 27 economies also have a documentary compliance time to import of no more than 1 hour.
v. Another 22 economies also have a border compliance time to import of no more than 1 hour.
w. Another 27 economies also have a documentary compliance cost to import of 0.0.
x. Another 25 economies also have a border compliance cost to import of 0.0.
EASE OF DOING BUSINESS SCORE AND EASE OF DOING BUSINESS RANKING

Economy reforms after the best regulatory performance is set. For example, the best regulatory performance for the time to get electricity is set at 18 days. In the Republic of Korea it now takes 13 days to get electricity while in the United Arab Emirates it takes just 10 days. Although the two economies have different times, both economies score 100 on the time to get electricity because they have exceeded the threshold of 18 days.

For scores such as those on the strength of legal rights index or the quality of land administration index, the best regulatory performance is set at the highest possible value (although no economy has yet reached that value in the case of the latter). For the total tax and contribution rate, consistent with the use of a threshold in calculating the rankings on this indicator, the best regulatory performance 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 best regulatory performance is defined as the lowest time recorded 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 best regulatory performance 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 ease of doing business score, the scores obtained for individual indicators for each economy are aggregated through simple averaging into one score, first

FIGURE 9.1 How are scores calculated for indicators?

Source: Doing Business database.
for each topic and then across all 10 topics: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, 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 score is indicated on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the worst regulatory performance and 100 the best regulatory performance. All score 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 score in any previous year and its score in Doing Business 2019 illustrates the extent to which the economy has closed the gap between its score and the best regulatory performance over time. In any given year the score measures how far an economy is from the best regulatory 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 score calculation in a different way than any other indicator. The score obtained for the total tax and contribution rate is transformed in a nonlinear fashion before it enters the score for paying taxes. As a result of the nonlinear transformation, an increase in the total tax and contribution rate has a smaller impact on the score for the total tax and contribution rate—and therefore on the 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 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 score is calculated as the population-weighted average of the scores for these two cities (table 9.2). This is done for the aggregate ease of doing business score, the scores for each topic and the scores for all the component indicators for each topic.

**Variability of economies’ scores across topics**
Each Doing Business topic measures a different aspect of the business regulatory environment. The 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 ease of doing business score is 0.49, and the coefficients

---

**FIGURE 9.2 How the nonlinear transformation affects the paying taxes score for the total tax and contribution rate**

![Graph showing the nonlinear transformation affecting the paying taxes score for the total tax and contribution rate](image)

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: The nonlinear paying taxes score for the total tax and contribution rate is equal to the paying taxes score for the total tax and contribution rate to the power of 0.8.
between 2 topics range from 0.34 (between getting credit and paying taxes) to 0.63 (between getting electricity and trading across borders; and also between dealing with construction permits and getting electricity). 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 ease of doing business score is 76.55. It scores 90.89 for starting a business and 100.00 for trading across borders, but 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 scores and the average of its lowest three across the 10 topics included in this year’s aggregate ease of doing business 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 in the degree of priority that governments 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 score gap**

Many topics use the magnitude of the change in their score gap to classify changes as reforms. The change in the score gap is defined as (score\text{current year} - score\text{prior year})/(100 - score\text{prior year}), where “score” is the aggregate score for the specific topic. For indicators using macroeconomic variables, such as the cost of starting a business as a percentage of income per capita, the macroeconomic data for the prior year are used to control for exogenous factors such as a change in income per capita. For example, in 2017/18 Algeria reduced the time to trade across borders, resulting in an improvement in Algeria’s aggregate score for trading across borders from 27.74 to 38.43. This reduced the score gap for Algeria by (27.74 – 38.43)/(100 – 27.74) or 14.79% on trading across borders. This reduced the score for trading across borders from 27.74 to 38.43. This reduced the score gap for Algeria by (27.74 – 38.43)/(100 – 27.74) or 14.79% on trading across borders in Doing Business 2019. For a complete discussion of the methodology for classifying changes as reforms, see the data notes.

**Economies improving the most across three or more Doing Business topics in 2017/18**

Doing Business 2019 uses a simple method to calculate which economies improved the ease of doing business the most. First, it selects the economies that in 2017/18 implemented regulatory reforms making it easier to do business in three or more of the 10 topics included in this year’s aggregate ease of doing business score. Thirty-six economies meet this criterion: Afghanistan; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Burundi; Chad; China; the Democratic Republic of Congo; Côte d’Ivoire; Djibouti; the Arab Republic of Egypt; Ethiopia; France; Gabon; Georgia; Guinea; India; Indonesia; Jordan; Kazakhstan; Kenya; Kosovo; the Kyrgyz Republic; Lithuania; Madagascar; Malaysia; Mauritania; Mauritius; Morocco; Niger; Nigeria; Pakistan; the Russian Federation; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Sri Lanka; Sudan; Thailand; Togo; Tunisia; Turkey; the United Arab Emirates; Uzbekistan; Vietnam; and Zimbabwe. Second, Doing Business sorts these economies within their increase in their ease of doing business score over the previous year and the scores for both years are calculated using the same macroeconomic data (such as income per capita and currency conversion rates) to remove the effect of changes in these variables.

Selecting the economies that implemented regulatory reforms in at least three topics and had the biggest improvements in their ease of doing business scores is intended to highlight economies with ongoing, broad-based reform programs. The improvement in the ease of doing business score is used to identify the top improvers because this allows a focus on the absolute improvement—in contrast with the relative improvement shown by a change in rankings—that economies have made in their regulatory environment for business.

**TABLE 9.2 Weights used in calculating the 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>

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 ease of doing business scores, rounded to two decimals.

<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>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with permits</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</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>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.

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 2017/18

*Doing Business* reforms affecting all sets of indicators included in this year’s report, implemented from June 2017 to May 2018.

- Reform making it easier to do business
- Change making it more difficult to do business

### Afghanistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform category</th>
<th>Reform details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td>Afghanistan made starting a business less costly by reducing the fees for business incorporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td>Afghanistan strengthened access to credit by enacting a new insolvency law. Secured creditors are now given absolute priority over other claims within insolvency proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors</strong></td>
<td>Afghanistan strengthened minority investor protections by requiring greater disclosure of transactions with interested parties, easing shareholder suits by extending access to documents and evidence during trial, increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paying taxes</strong></td>
<td>Afghanistan made paying taxes easier by adopting a new tax administration and law manual with clear rules and guidelines on tax audit, and by automating the submission of tax returns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong></td>
<td>Afghanistan made resolving insolvency easier by improving the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings, introducing the reorganization procedure and granting creditors greater participation in the proceedings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Albania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform category</th>
<th>Reform details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td>Albania made enforcing contracts easier by amending the code of civil procedure to establish a simplified procedure for small claims and introduce time standards for certain court events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Algeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform category</th>
<th>Reform details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td>Algeria made the process for getting an electricity connection easier by streamlining internal administrative processes and by granting new licenses to vendors selling pre-built substations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td>Algeria made importing easier by implementing joint inspections between control agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reforms affecting the labor market regulation indicators are included here but do not affect the ranking on the ease of doing business nor the list of economies that improved the most in 2017/18.
Angola

✓ Getting electricity
Angola 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) for all the outages lasting longer than three minutes (down from 15 minutes previously).

✓ Trading across borders
Angola made exporting and importing easier by implementing an automated customs data management system, ASYCUDA (Automated System for Customs Data) World, and by upgrading its port community system to allow for electronic information exchange between different parties involved in the import/export process.

Antigua and Barbuda

✓ Getting credit
Antigua and Barbuda improved access to credit information through the introduction of regulations that govern the licensing and functioning of credit bureaus in the member states of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Union (ECCU).

Argentina

✓ Starting a business
Argentina made starting a business easier by introducing an expedited process for limited liability companies that includes company incorporation, book legalization, tax and social security registration.

Armenia

✓ Starting a business
Armenia made starting a business easier by allowing voluntary value added tax registration at the time of business incorporation.

✓ Getting electricity
Armenia made getting electricity faster by imposing new deadlines for procedures to obtain a new electrical connection.

✓ Protecting minority investors
Armenia strengthened minority investor protections by increasing disclosure of related-party transactions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

✓ Paying taxes
Armenia made paying taxes easier by introducing administrative measures to ease compliance with corporate income tax, value added tax and labor tax rules.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Armenia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a simplified procedure for small claims and time standards for key court events.

✓ Getting credit
Armenia strengthened access to credit by introducing a new secured transactions law and insolvency law, which implemented a functional secured transactions system, broadened the scope of assets that can be used as collateral and provided secured creditors with grounds for relief and time limits during an automatic stay. Azerbaijan also set up a unified, modern and notice-based collateral registry, and improved access to credit information by establishing a new credit bureau.

✓ Protecting minority investors
Azerbaijan strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

✓ Paying taxes
Azerbaijan made paying taxes easier by introducing electronic invoicing (e-invoicing) and a unified tax return for social security contributions and enhancing the online platform for filing corporate income tax.

✓ Trading across borders
Azerbaijan made trading across borders faster by streamlining electronic customs procedures and fully implementing the “green corridor” gating system.

✓ Resolving insolvency
Azerbaijan made resolving insolvency easier by providing for the avoidance of preferential transactions.

✓ Labor market regulation
Azerbaijan changed regulations pertaining to the notice period for redundancy dismissals and severance payments.
Bahamas, The

- **Getting credit**
  
  The Bahamas improved access to credit information through the introduction of regulations that govern the licensing, functioning and regulation of credit bureaus in the country.

- **Paying taxes**
  
  The Bahamas made paying taxes easier by establishing an online system for filing and paying value added tax.

Bahrain

- **Protecting minority investors**
  
  Bahrain strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

- **Trading across borders**
  
  Bahrain reduced the time needed to import by deploying portal scanners and upgrading the single window system.

Belarus

- **Starting a business**
  
  Belarus made starting a business easier by abolishing the requirement to register the book of Registry of Inspections and allowing its purchase within six months of incorporation.

- **Dealing with construction permits**
  
  Belarus made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining the process at the one-stop shop.

Belgium

- **Getting credit**
  
  Belgium strengthened access to credit by implementing a new Pledge Law which allowed security interest to automatically attach to the products, proceeds and replacements of the original asset, and out-of-court enforcement of the security interest. Belgium also established a unified and modern collateral registry.

- **Resolving insolvency**
  
  Belgium made resolving insolvency easier by streamlining the insolvency framework, expanding the scope of the law and introducing new preventive measures.

Benin

- **Getting credit**
  
  Benin improved access to credit information by launching a new credit bureau.

- **Enforcing contracts**
  
  Benin made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

- **Labor market regulation**
  
  Benin amended its regulations pertaining to fixed-term contracts.

Bhutan

- **Paying taxes**
  
  Bhutan made paying taxes easier by introducing an online platform for filing corporate income tax and personal income tax returns.

Bolivia

- **Starting a business**
  
  Bolivia made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement for name reservation certificates, allowing online publication of the deeds and reducing publication and registration fees at the Ministry of Labor.

- **Getting electricity**
  
  Brazil (São Paulo) improved the reliability of electricity by modernizing its grid network and introducing new software programs allowing better outage management and distribution planning.

- **Registering property**
  
  Brazil (Rio de Janeiro) made registering property more expensive by increasing the municipal property transfer tax.

- **Getting credit**
  
  Brazil improved access to credit information by distributing at least two years of historical data. This reform applies to both Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo.

- **Trading across borders**
  
  Brazil reduced the time required for import documentary compliance by introducing electronic certificates of origin. This reform applies to both Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo.

- **Labor market regulation**
  
  Brazil changed regulations pertaining to intermittent work, work scheduling, compensation, employee termination and union representation. This reform applies to both Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo.

Brunei Darussalam

- **Starting a business**
  
  Brunei Darussalam made starting a business easier by merging the name
verification into the incorporation application, expediting incorporation applications and eliminating the practice of stamping share certificates.

✔ Getting electricity

Brunei Darussalam made getting electricity easier by reducing the number of procedures needed to obtain a new connection.

✔ Getting credit

Brunei Darussalam improved access to credit information by starting to provide consumer and commercial credit scores to banks and financial institutions.

Bulgaria

✔ Labor market regulation

Bulgaria amended its legislation to extend the duration of the contribution period that is required before an employee can become eligible for unemployment protection.

Burkina Faso

✔ Enforcing contracts

Burkina Faso made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Burundi

✔ Starting a business

Burundi made starting a business less expensive by reducing the cost of registering a business.

✔ Dealing with construction permits

Burundi increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.

✔ Resolving insolvency

Burundi made resolving insolvency easier by streamlining the insolvency framework, expanding the scope of the insolvency law and introducing new preventive measures.

Cambodia

✔ Dealing with construction permits

Cambodia made dealing with construction permits less costly by reducing the fees to obtain a building permit.

Cameroon

✔ Starting a business

Cameroon made starting a business easier by publishing notices of company incorporation online through the one-stop shop.

✔ Enforcing contracts

Cameroon made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Canada

✔ Enforcing contracts

Canada made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

✔ Labor market regulation

Canada amended its legislation to increase paid annual leave after five and ten years of employment and introduced two days of paid sick leave.

Chad

✔ Starting a business

Chad made starting a business easier by allowing registration of the articles of association at the one-stop shop.

✔ Registering property

Chad made property registration easier by halving the registration fee.

✔ Enforcing contracts

Chad made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Chile

✔ Starting a business

Chile made starting a business easier by replacing the requirement to print and present sealed accounting books and invoices to the Internal Revenue Service with an electronic system.

✔ Enforcing contracts

Chile made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an e-system that allows plaintiffs to file the initial complaint electronically.

Central African Republic

✔ Starting a business

The Central African Republic made starting a business easier by reducing the paid-in minimum capital requirement for business incorporation.

✔ Enforcing contracts

The Central African Republic made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

China

✔ Starting a business

China made starting a business easier by launching online company registrations and by simplifying social security registrations. This reform applies to both Beijing and Shanghai.

✔ Dealing with construction permits

China streamlined the process of obtaining the building permit, the certificate of completion and registering new buildings with the real estate registry. It also improved its building quality control by introducing stricter qualification requirements for professionals in the construction industry and improving public access to information. This reform applies to both Beijing and Shanghai.
✓ Getting electricity
China made getting electricity easier in Beijing and Shanghai by expanding network capacity so that all connections of power loads of 160kW or less are now made directly to the low voltage network, for which the connection process is carried out entirely by the utility free of charge. The time to obtain an electricity connection was also reduced thanks to the rollout of a new mobile application for customers.

✓ Registering property
China made registering property easier by streamlining administrative procedures and by increasing the reliability and transparency of its land administration system. This reform applies to both Beijing and Shanghai.

✓ Protecting minority investors
China strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring reimbursement of legal expenses incurred by shareholders. This reform applies to both Beijing and Shanghai.

✓ Paying taxes
China made paying taxes easier by abolishing the business tax, allowing for joint filing and payment of all stamp duties and by implementing several administrative reforms to lower the compliance time. These reforms apply to both Beijing and Shanghai. Beijing also made paying taxes less costly by reducing the housing fund rate paid by the employer.

✓ Trading across borders
China reduced the time and cost to export and import by implementing a single window, eliminating administrative charges, increasing transparency and encouraging competition. These reforms apply to both Beijing and Shanghai.

Comoros
✓ Enforcing contracts
The Comoros made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

✓ Registering property
The Democratic Republic of Congo made property registration easier by reducing the fees for securing property titles.

✓ Trading across borders
The Democratic Republic of Congo reduced the time needed to export and import by implementing the national trade single window.

✓ Enforcing contracts
The Democratic Republic of Congo made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Congo, Rep.
✓ Registering property
The Republic of Congo made property registration easier by reducing the property transfer fee.

✓ Enforcing contracts
The Republic of Congo made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Costa Rica
✓ Starting a business
Costa Rica made starting a business more expensive by introducing a new legal entities tax.

Labor market regulation
Costa Rica changed regulations pertaining to the content of dismissal letters, non-discrimination, special protection for employees and limitations to strikes and implemented a new jurisdictional structure of the labor courts.

Côte d’Ivoire
✓ Starting a business
Côte d’Ivoire made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement to notarize company deeds.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Côte d’Ivoire strengthened construction quality control by appointing an independent architect in the commission tasked with reviewing building permit applications.

✓ Getting credit
Côte d’Ivoire improved access to credit information by expanding its credit bureau’s borrower coverage and beginning to distribute data from utility companies.

✓ Paying taxes
Côte d’Ivoire made paying taxes easier by introducing an online platform for filing corporate income tax and value added tax returns.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Côte d’Ivoire made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Croatia
✓ Registering property
Croatia made transferring property more efficient by digitizing its land registry.
Cyprus

- Protecting minority investors
  Cyprus strengthened minority investor protections by increasing disclosure of related-party transactions and strengthening shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions.

- Paying taxes
  Cyprus made paying taxes easier by abolishing the immovable property tax, discontinuing the special contribution for private sector employees, private sector pensioners and self-employed individuals, introducing an online system for filing value added tax returns and value added tax refund claims and reducing the sewerage duty tax rates.

Denmark

- Enforcing contracts
  Denmark made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an online platform that allows users to file the initial complaint electronically and judges and lawyers to manage cases electronically.

Djibouti

- Starting a business
  Djibouti made starting a business easier by creating a one-stop shop for business start-up.

- Registering property
  Djibouti made property transfer easier and more transparent by reducing registration fees, implementing strict deadlines to register the sale agreement with the tax authority, scanning the majority of land titles for Djibouti Ville and by requiring by law that all property sales transactions be registered at the land registry to become opposable to third parties.

- Getting credit
  Djibouti strengthened access to credit by broadening the scope of assets that can be used as collateral, allowing future assets to be used as collateral, allowing general description of debts and obligations and providing secured creditors with absolute priority outside bankruptcy.

- Protecting minority investors
  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 shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

- Enforcing contracts
  Djibouti made enforcing contracts easier by establishing a dedicated division within the first-instance court to resolve commercial cases and by adopting a new Code of Civil Procedure that regulates voluntary conciliation and mediation proceedings, as well as time standards for key court events.

- Resolving insolvency
  Djibouti made resolving insolvency easier by making insolvency proceedings more accessible for creditors and granting them greater participation in the proceedings.

Dominican Republic

- Protecting minority investors
  The Dominican Republic strengthened minority investor protections by increasing the independence of boards of directors, requiring the roles of chairperson and president to fall on different individuals and charging potential acquirers of significant stakes to make their acquisitions through a public offering.

Ecuador

- Paying taxes
  Ecuador made paying taxes easier and less costly by discontinuing the solidarity contributions introduced in 2016 and by allowing employers to deduct an additional 100% on amounts paid to cover private medical insurance.

Egypt, Arab Rep.

- Starting a business
  Egypt made starting a business easier by removing the requirement to obtain a bank certificate and establishing a one-stop shop.

- Getting credit
  Egypt strengthened access to credit by introducing the possibility of granting a nonpossessory security right in a single category of movable assets without requiring a specific description of the collateral. Secured creditors are now given absolute priority over other claims, such as labor and tax, both outside and within bankruptcy proceedings.

- Protecting minority investors
  Egypt strengthened minority investors protections by increasing corporate transparency.

- Paying taxes
  Egypt made paying taxes easier by extending value added tax cash refunds to manufacturers in case of a capital investment.

- Resolving insolvency
  Egypt made resolving insolvency easier by introducing the reorganization procedure, allowing debtors to initiate the reorganization procedure and granting creditors greater participation in the proceedings.
El Salvador

✓ Dealing with construction permits
El Salvador made dealing with construction permits less time-consuming by eliminating the requirement to obtain a feasibility study for rainwater drainage for land plots under 1,000 square meters.

✓ Trading across borders
El Salvador made exporting easier by introducing an intermediate customs post for shipments transiting through the Anguiatú land border.

Equatorial Guinea

✓ Enforcing contracts
Equatorial Guinea made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Eswatini

✓ Registering property
Eswatini made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land registry.

Ethiopia

✓ Starting a business
Ethiopia made starting a business easier by removing the need to obtain a certificate of competence for certain types of businesses.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Ethiopia made the process of obtaining construction permits faster by reducing the time needed to obtain planning consent.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Ethiopia made enforcing contracts easier by establishing specialized benches to resolve commercial cases.

Finland

✓ Paying taxes
Finland made paying taxes less costly by reducing the labor contribution rates paid by employers and by introducing a new and more efficient online portal, MyTax, for filing corporate income tax returns.

France

✓ Getting electricity
France made getting electricity easier by streamlining the application process and reducing the time for the external works.

✓ Registering property
France made registering property easier by implementing an electronic registration system and improving efficiency at the land registry.

✓ Paying taxes
France made paying taxes less costly by decreasing the corporate income tax rate, increasing the rate of the competitiveness and employment tax credit (CICE) and decreasing the rates for the territorial economic contributions as well as social security contributions paid by employers.

Gabon

✓ Starting a business
Gabon made starting a business easier by publishing a notice of incorporation with the company registration at the one-stop shop.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Gabon made dealing with construction permits safer and less expensive by implementing decennial liability and by reducing the cost to obtain a fire safety approval.

✓ Getting electricity
Gabon 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). Gabon also improved the regulatory framework of the electricity sector as the national regulator now monitors the utility’s performance on the reliability of supply.

✓ Registering property
Gabon made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land registry.

✓ Paying taxes
Gabon made paying taxes more difficult by levying two new taxes: the special solidarity contribution tax and the tax for professional training.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Gabon made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Georgia

✓ Starting a business
Georgia made starting a business easier by allowing voluntary value added tax registration at the time of business incorporation.

✓ Paying taxes
Georgia made paying taxes easier by levying income tax on distributed profits rather than on taxable profits. At the same time, Georgia made paying taxes more difficult by requiring value added tax to be imposed on advance payments for goods and services.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Georgia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing random and automatic assignment of cases to judges throughout the courts.
Ghana

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Ghana strengthened construction quality control by imposing stricter qualification requirements for professionals in charge of technical inspections.

✓ Trading across borders
Ghana made importing easier by implementing a paperless customs clearance processing system.

Greece

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Greece streamlined its construction permitting process as building owners must now use their in-house engineer for the intermediate inspection, as opposed to the municipality.

✓ Registering property
Greece made registering property more burdensome by requiring a property tax certificate for registering a property transfer.

Grenada

✓ Getting credit
Grenada improved access to credit information through the introduction of regulations that govern the licensing and functioning of credit bureaus in the member states of the Eastern Caribbean Currency Union (ECCU).

Guatemala

✓ Starting a business
Guatemala made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement, reducing the registration fees and streamlining registration procedures.

Guinea

✓ Starting a business
Guinea made starting a business easier by allowing registration with the labor promotion agency at the one-stop shop.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Guinea made dealing with construction permits less expensive and time-consuming by reducing the cost and the time needed to obtain a building permit.

✓ Registering property
Guinea made property registration easier by reducing the property transfer fee.

✓ Trading across borders
Guinea made importing easier by eliminating pre-shipment inspections for imports.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Guinea made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Guinea-Bissau

✓ Enforcing contracts
Guinea-Bissau made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Haiti

✓ Getting credit
Haiti improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.

Labor market regulation
Haiti amended its legislation pertaining to the 24-hour weekly rest period, weekly holiday and night work premiums, other work-related distribution of hours, services and minimum working age requirements.

Hong Kong SAR, China

✓ Getting electricity
Hong Kong SAR, China, made the process of getting an electricity connection faster by establishing a specialized task force to undertake the trenching, excavation and reinstatement of the underground cables.

Hungary

✓ Paying taxes
Hungary made paying taxes less costly by decreasing the social tax rate paid by the employer and by reducing the corporate income tax rate to a flat rate.

India

✓ Starting a business
India made starting a business easier by fully integrating multiple application forms into a general incorporation form. India also replaced the value added tax with the GST (Goods and Services Tax) for which the registration process is faster. These reforms apply to both Delhi and Mumbai. At the same time, Mumbai abolished the practice of site inspections for registering companies under the Shops and Establishments Act.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
India streamlined the process of obtaining a building permit and made it faster and less expensive to obtain a construction permit. It also improved building quality control by introducing decennial liability and insurance. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✓ Getting electricity
The Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission reduced charges for low voltage connections. Getting electricity was also made easier in Delhi through a reduction in the time for the utility to carry out the external connection works.

✓ Getting credit
India strengthened access to credit by amending its insolvency law. Secured creditors are now given absolute priority over other claims.
within insolvency proceedings. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✓ Paying taxes

India made paying taxes easier by replacing many indirect taxes with a single indirect tax, the GST, for the entire country. India also made paying taxes less costly by reducing the corporate income tax rate and the employees’ provident funds scheme rate paid by the employer. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

✓ Trading across borders

India reduced the time and cost to export and import through various initiatives, including the implementation of electronic sealing of containers, the upgrading of port infrastructure and allowing electronic submission of supporting documents with digital signatures. This reform applies to both Delhi and Mumbai.

Labor market regulation

India (Mumbai) changed regulations pertaining to weekly holiday work, overtime hours and paid annual leave.

Indonesia

✓ Starting a business

Indonesia made starting a business easier by combining different social security registrations and by reducing notarization fees in both Jakarta and Surabaya. Also, different registrations were combined at the one-stop shop in Surabaya.

✓ Registering property

Indonesia made registering property easier by reducing the time to solve land disputes at the first-instance court and enhanced the transparency of the land registry. This reform applies to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

✓ Getting credit

Indonesia improved access to credit information by distributing data from retailers and utility companies. This reform applies to both Jakarta and Surabaya.

Iran, Islamic Rep.

✓ Paying taxes

The Islamic Republic of Iran made paying taxes easier by introducing an online system for filing social security contributions, allowing the possibility of filing value added tax refund claims online, amending corporate income tax returns online and making payment of additional tax liability at the bank.

✓ Trading across borders

The Islamic Republic of Iran made exporting and importing easier by enhancing the national trade single window.

Ireland

✓ Registering property

Ireland made property registration more costly by increasing the stamp duty on a non-residential property transfer.

✓ Getting credit

Ireland improved access to credit information by establishing a new credit registry.

✓ Paying taxes

Ireland made paying taxes more costly by introducing lower exemptions on social security contributions paid by employers for employees hired between January 1, 2016, and December 12, 2016.

Jordan

✓ Getting credit

Jordan improved access to credit information by reporting data on credit payments from a retailer.

✓ Protecting minority investors

Jordan strengthened minority investor protections by extending access to evidence before trial, increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions, clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

✓ Paying taxes

Jordan made paying taxes easier by implementing an online system for filing and payment of general sales tax.

✓ Enforcing contracts

Jordan made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a consolidated law on voluntary mediation.

Kazakhstan

✓ Starting a business

Kazakhstan made starting a business easier by reducing the time required for value added tax registration.

✓ Trading across borders

Kazakhstan made trading across borders easier by introducing an
electronic customs declaration system, ASTANA-1 IS, as well as reducing customs administrative fees.

**Enforcing contracts**

Kazakhstan made enforcing contracts easier by making judgments rendered at all levels in commercial cases publicly available and publishing performance measurement reports on local commercial courts.

**Kenya**

**Registering property**

Kenya made registering property easier by introducing an online system to clear land rent rates.

**Getting credit**

Kenya strengthened access to credit by introducing a new law on secured transactions that created a unified secured transactions legal framework and establishing a new unified and notice-based collateral registry.

**Protecting minority investors**

Kenya strengthened minority investor protections by increasing disclosure requirements, regulating the approval of transactions with interested parties and increasing available remedies if said transactions are prejudicial, increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions and requiring greater corporate transparency.

**Paying taxes**

Kenya made paying taxes easier by merging all permits into a single unified business permit and by simplifying the value added tax schedule on its iTax platform.

**Resolving insolvency**

Kenya made resolving insolvency easier by facilitating the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings, providing for equal treatment of creditors in reorganization proceedings and granting creditors greater participation in the insolvency proceedings.

**Kosovo**

**Dealing with construction permits**

Kosovo made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining the inspection system through the use of an in-house engineer.

**Paying taxes**

Kosovo made paying taxes easier by allowing taxpayers to claim value added tax refund on the standard value added tax return form, by streamlining the value added tax audit process and by eliminating the requirement to report purchases over €500 ($570).

**Trading across borders**

Kosovo made exporting easier by streamlining customs clearance at the border.

**Kuwait**

**Starting a business**

Kuwait made starting a business easier by eliminating the paid-in minimum capital requirement.

**Protecting minority investors**

Kuwait strengthened minority investor protections by requiring an independent review of related-party transactions and clarifying ownership and control structures.

**Kyrgyz Republic**

**Trading across borders**

The Kyrgyz Republic made trading across borders easier by streamlining exports within the Eurasian Economic Union.

**Enforcing contracts**

The Kyrgyz Republic made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques in court and adopting a consolidated law on voluntary mediation.

**Resolving insolvency**

The Kyrgyz Republic made resolving insolvency easier by facilitating the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings and granting creditors greater access to information on the debtor’s financial situation during the proceedings.

**Lao PDR**

**Trading across borders**

Lao PDR made trading across borders faster by streamlining the customs clearance process.

**Latvia**

**Registering property**

Latvia made property transfer less transparent by not publishing statistical data on the number of land disputes for 2017.

**Lesotho**

**Trading across borders**

Lesotho made exporting and importing easier by implementing an automated customs data management system, ASYCUDA.

**Lithuania**

**Protecting minority investors**

Lithuania strengthened minority investor protections by introducing
greater requirements for the disclosure of the compensation of directors and other high-ranking officers on an individual basis.

✔ Paying taxes
Lithuania made paying taxes easier by merging the filing and payment of two labor contributions and issuing pre-populated value added tax returns.

✔ Trading across borders
Lithuania made exporting easier by enhancing its automated customs data management system.

Labor market regulation
Lithuania changed legislation on working hours, paid annual leave, as well as notice period and severance payments in case of redundancy.

Luxembourg
Labor market regulation
Luxembourg increased post-natal maternity leave, amended statutory provisions for leave for personal reasons and family leave, introduced state co-financing of professional training and amended pre-retirement rules.

Macedonia, FYR
✔ Dealing with construction permits
FYR Macedonia made the construction permitting process less costly by reducing the land development fees.

Madagascar
✔ Dealing with construction permits
Madagascar strengthened construction quality control by appointing an independent architect in the commission tasked with reviewing building permit applications and reduced the cost to obtain a building permit.

✔ Getting credit
Madagascar improved access to credit information through the introduction of a new law governing the establishment, licensing and functioning of credit bureaus.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Madagascar made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an automated system that randomly assigns cases to judges and that allows judges to manage cases electronically.

Malawi
✔ Registering property
Malawi made property transfer faster by decentralizing the consent to transfer property to local government authorities.

✔ Enforcing contracts
Malawi made enforcing contracts easier by adopting new civil procedure rules regulating time standards for key court events.

Malaysia
✔ Starting a business
Malaysia made starting a business easier by introducing an online registration system for the goods and service tax.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Malaysia streamlined the process of obtaining a building permit and made it faster to obtain construction permits.

✔ Getting electricity
Malaysia made getting electricity easier by eliminating the site visit for new commercial electricity connections.

✔ Registering property
Malaysia made property transfer simpler by implementing an online single window platform to carry out property searches.

✔ Trading across borders
Malaysia made trading across borders easier by introducing electronic forms and by enhancing its risk-based inspection system. Malaysia also made importing and exporting easier by improving infrastructure and the port operation system at Port Klang.

✔ Resolving insolvency
Malaysia made resolving insolvency easier by introducing the reorganization procedure.

Labor market regulation
Malaysia changed regulations pertaining to unemployment protection.

Mali
✔ Enforcing contracts
Mali made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Labor market regulation
Mali introduced language guaranteeing equal remuneration for work of equal value in the legislation.

Malta
✔ Dealing with construction permits
Malta made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining the process of obtaining a building permit. On the other hand, Malta increased the time to issue a building permit.

Marshall Islands
× Paying taxes
The Marshall Islands made paying taxes more costly by raising the retirement fund rate paid by employers.

Mauritania
✔ Starting a business
Mauritania made starting a business less costly by eliminating the company deed registration fees.

✔ Dealing with construction permits
Mauritania increased the transparency of dealing with construction permits.
by publishing regulations related to construction online free of charge.

**Getting credit**

Mauritania improved its credit information system by guaranteeing by law borrowers’ right to inspect their personal data.

**Mauritius**

- **Starting a business**
  
  Mauritius made starting a business easier by linking the database of the business registry with the database of the social security office. Mauritius also eliminated the requirement for married women to provide a marriage certificate when applying for a national identity card.

- **Registering property**
  
  Mauritius made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land administration system.

- **Protecting minority investors**
  
  Mauritius strengthened minority investor protections by clarifying ownership and control structures and requiring greater corporate transparency.

- **Paying taxes**
  
  Mauritius made paying taxes easier by introducing an expedited processing system for value added tax refunds and by upgrading its online platform to allow for the online submission of invoices and amended corporate income tax returns.

- **Trading across borders**
  
  Mauritius made exporting easier by introducing a risk-based management system.

**Moldova**

- **Starting a business**
  
  Moldova made starting a business easier by removing the requirement to file separately for registration with the national statistics bureau.

**Mongolia**

- **Enforcing contracts**
  
  Mongolia made enforcing contracts easier by reducing the fees that are advanced by the plaintiff to enforce a judgment.

**Morocco**

- **Starting a business**
  
  Morocco made starting a business less costly by abolishing the deed registration fee and stamp duties.

- **Registering property**
  
  Morocco made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land registry and cadaster and by streamlining administrative procedures.

- **Trading across borders**
  
  Morocco made exporting and importing easier by implementing a paperless customs clearance system and improving infrastructure at the port of Tangier.

- **Resolving insolvency**
  
  Morocco made resolving insolvency easier by facilitating the commencement of proceedings, encouraging the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings and by making insolvency proceedings more accessible for creditors and granting them greater participation in the proceedings.

**Mozambique**

- **Starting a business**
  
  Mozambique made starting a business more expensive by increasing the cost to publish the company’s deed. At the same time, Mozambique made starting a business less costly by replacing the business license with a notification of activity for some sectors.

- **Getting electricity**
  
  Mozambique 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). Mozambique also made getting electricity faster by imposing new deadlines for connection procedures and streamlining processes.

- **Paying taxes**
  
  Mozambique made paying taxes easier by reducing the mandatory carry-forward period before taxpayers can request a value added tax cash refund to four months (from 12 months previously).

- **Trading across borders**
  
  Mozambique made trading across borders easier by streamlining the submission of documents for imports, improving infrastructure at the Ressano Garcia border crossing and simplifying export documentary compliance.

- **Labor market regulation**
  
  Mozambique introduced a new social security regulation.

**Myanmar**

- **Starting a business**
  
  Myanmar made starting a business less expensive by reducing the registration fee.

- **Getting electricity**
  
  Myanmar 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). Myanmar also made getting electricity
more transparent by publishing electricity tariffs online.

**Namibia**

✔ **Enforcing contracts**
Namibia made enforcing contracts easier by making performance measurement reports publicly available to show the court’s performance and the progress of cases through the court.

**Nepal**

✗ **Paying taxes**
Nepal made paying taxes more difficult by introducing a new labor contribution (gratuity contribution), medical insurance and accident insurance paid by the employer.

**Labor market regulation**
Nepal changed regulations pertaining to fixed-term contracts, probationary periods, working hours, paid maternity and sick leave, night work for women, third-party approval in case of redundancy and unemployment protection.

**New Zealand**

✔ **Starting a business**
New Zealand made starting a business less expensive by reducing the fees for name search and company incorporation.

**Nicaragua**

✔ **Getting credit**
Nicaragua strengthened access to credit by establishing a unified collateral registry.

**Niger**

✔ **Dealing with construction permits**
Niger made dealing with construction permits less costly by reducing the fees associated with obtaining a building permit.

✔ **Getting electricity**
Niger made the process of getting an electricity connection faster by increasing the stock of material the utility carries and by allowing the internal wiring certificate of conformity to be obtained at the same time as the external connection works.

✔ **Registering property**
Niger made registering property faster by decreasing the time needed to transfer and register property.

**Norway**

**Labor market regulation**
Norway amended its legislation to allow for night work until 11:00 PM if an employer and employee enter into a written agreement.

**Oman**

✗ **Paying taxes**
Oman made paying taxes more costly by increasing the corporate income tax rate and by eliminating the tax exemption on the first 30,000 Omani rials ($78,000) of taxable profits.

**Pakistan**

✔ **Starting a business**
Pakistan made starting a business easier by enhancing the online one-stop registration system, replacing several forms for incorporation with a single application and establishing information exchange between the registry and the tax authority. This change applies to both Karachi and Lahore.

✔ **Registering property**
Pakistan (Lahore) made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land registry.

✔ **Trading across borders**
Nigeria reduced the time needed to export and import by implementing joint inspections, the NICIS2 electronic system and around-the-clock operations at Apapa Port. This reform applies to both Kano and Lagos.

✔ **Enforcing contracts**
Nigeria (Lagos) made enforcing contracts easier by issuing new rules of civil procedure for small claims courts which limit adjournments to unforeseen and exceptional circumstances.

**Pakistan**

✔ **Registering property**
Pakistan (Lahore) made registering property easier by streamlining and automating administrative procedures and by increasing the transparency of its land administration system. Pakistan (Karachi) made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land registry.

✔ **Resolving insolvency**
Pakistan made resolving insolvency easier by introducing the reorganization
procedure and improving the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings. This change applies to both Karachi and Lahore.

Panama

✓ Paying taxes
Panama made paying taxes easier by establishing an online system for filing and payment of corporate income tax, value added tax and real estate tax.

Papua New Guinea

✓ Getting electricity
Papua New Guinea improved the reliability of the electricity supply in Port Moresby by increasing power generation capacity.

✓ Registering property
Papua New Guinea made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land administration system.

✓ Protecting minority investors
Papua New Guinea strengthened minority investor protections by introducing greater requirements for the disclosure of direct and indirect beneficial ownership stakes in publicly-listed companies.

✗ Paying taxes
Papua New Guinea made paying taxes more difficult by mandating bi-weekly reporting and payment of contributions paid by the employer to the superannuation fund.

Paraguay

✓ Getting electricity
Paraguay 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.

✓ Trading across borders
Paraguay reduced the time needed to import by introducing an electronic signature for import customs clearance.

Peru

✓ Starting a business
Peru made starting a business faster by reducing the time required to obtain the municipal license and building safety technical inspection from the district council.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Peru strengthened construction quality control by imposing stricter qualification requirements for professionals in charge of technical inspections.

Philippines

✓ Starting a business
The Philippines made starting a business easier by simplifying tax registration and business licensing processes. At the same time, the Philippines increased tax registration costs.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
The Philippines improved risk management practices in the construction sector, with latent defect liability insurance now commonly obtained by industry players.

✓ Protecting minority investors
The Philippines strengthened minority investor protections by increasing shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions and clarifying ownership and control structures.

✗ Trading across borders
The Philippines made trading across borders more difficult by increasing the number of inspections for importing, thereby increasing the average time for border compliance.

Poland

✗ Paying taxes
Poland made paying taxes more complicated by requiring the monthly reporting of value added tax returns, extending the list of goods and services subject to a reverse charge mechanism and introducing new reporting obligations for SAF-T files.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Poland made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an automated system to assign cases to judges randomly.

Portugal

✗ Registering property
Portugal made registering property more burdensome by reducing the number of officials that can register property transfers.

Puerto Rico (U.S.)

✓ Enforcing contracts
Puerto Rico (territory of the United States) made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a web-based platform that offers lawyers a single access point for electronic filing of the initial complaint and for electronic payment of court fees. The system also allows lawyers and judges to manage case files throughout the litigation process.

Qatar

✓ Starting a business
Qatar made starting a business easier by removing the requirement to open a bank account to deposit the minimum capital.

✓ Getting credit
Qatar improved access to credit information by guaranteeing borrowers the legal right to inspect their credit data from the credit registry.
Romania

Starting a business
Romania made starting a business more cumbersome by introducing fiscal risk assessment criteria for value added tax applications, thereby increasing the time required to register as a value added tax payer.

Russian Federation

Dealing with construction permits
Russia made the process of obtaining a building permit faster by reducing the time needed to obtain construction and occupancy permits. Russia also increased quality control during construction by introducing risk-based inspections. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Getting electricity
Russia made getting electricity faster by imposing new deadlines for connection procedures and by upgrading the utility’s single window as well as its internal processes. Getting electricity was also made cheaper by reducing the costs to obtain a connection to the electric network. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Paying taxes
Russia made paying taxes less costly by allowing a higher tax depreciation rate for fixed assets. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Trading across borders
Russia made trading across borders easier by prioritizing online customs clearance and introducing shortened time limits for its automated completion. This reform applies to both Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Rwanda

Starting a business
Rwanda made starting a business less costly by replacing electronic billing machines with free software for value added tax invoices.

Getting electricity
Rwanda 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). Rwanda also made getting electricity more time and cost efficient by having the utility supply all connection material.

Registering property
Rwanda made registering property easier by improving the land dispute resolution mechanisms of the land administration system.

Getting credit
Rwanda strengthened access to credit by enacting a new insolvency law. An automatic stay is now imposed on secured creditors for a period of six months and the law provides for relief from such stay when the assets are perishable or are not needed for the reorganization of the company.

Trading across borders
Rwanda reduced the time required to export and import by implementing the Single Customs Territory, risk-based inspections and online certificates.

San Marino

Registering property
San Marino made registering property more expensive by increasing the property transfer tax.

Getting credit
San Marino improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.

São Tomé and Príncipe

Enforcing contracts
São Tomé and Príncipe made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of procedural costs that simplified and reduced court fees.

Saudi Arabia

Getting electricity
Saudi Arabia improved the reliability of electricity supply by imposing a new compensation scheme to incentivize the utility to improve service reliability.

Protecting minority investors
Saudi Arabia strengthened minority investor protections by providing clear rules for the liability of directors and increasing the role of shareholders in major decisions.

Trading across borders
Saudi Arabia made exporting and importing easier by launching a new electronic single window and extending the hours of operation of customs at the Jeddah port.

Enforcing contracts
Saudi Arabia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an e-system that allows plaintiffs to file the initial complaint electronically and amending the civil procedure rules to introduce time standards for key court events.
Senegal

✓ Registering property
Senegal made registering property easier by decreasing the time needed to transfer and register property.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Senegal made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Serbia

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Serbia made dealing with construction permits faster by introducing an electronic application system.

Singapore

✓ Starting a business
Singapore made starting a business easier by abolishing the corporate seals.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Singapore made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a consolidated law on voluntary mediation.

Slovak Republic

✓ Enforcing contracts
The Slovak Republic made enforcing contracts easier by implementing electronic service of process.

Slovenia

✓ Starting a business
Slovenia made starting a business more complicated by requiring companies to report their beneficial ownership separately from business incorporation.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Slovenia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques used in court.

South Africa

✓ Starting a business
South Africa made starting a business easier by reducing the time for online business registration.

✓ Getting electricity
South Africa 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).

South Sudan

Labor market regulation
South Sudan introduced a new Labor Act which modified the rules on working hours, leave benefits and severance payments.

Sri Lanka

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Sri Lanka made dealing with construction permits easier by launching a single window, increasing transparency by providing online access to building regulations and reducing the processing times to issue several building certificates.

✓ Registering property
Sri Lanka made property registration easier by implementing a single window to streamline the process of delivering several certificates and increased transparency by providing online access to cadastral information.

✓ Paying taxes
Sri Lanka made paying taxes easier by introducing online systems for filing corporate income tax, value added tax and employee trust fund contributions.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Sri Lanka made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques used in court.

Sudan

✓ Starting a business
Sudan made starting a business easier by removing the requirement to have a site inspection to obtain the certificate of incorporation.

✓ Getting credit
Sudan strengthened access to credit by amending its companies act. An automatic stay is now imposed on secured creditors for a period of 30 days and the law provides for relief from such stay when the assets are perishable or are not needed for the reorganization of the company. Secured creditors are now given absolute priority over other claims, such as labor and tax, within bankruptcy proceedings.

✓ Protecting minority investors
Sudan strengthened minority investor protections by easing access to evidence in shareholder litigation and increasing rights and role of shareholders in private companies.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Sudan made enforcing contracts easier by recognizing voluntary conciliation and mediation as ways of resolving commercial disputes.

✓ Resolving insolvency
Sudan made resolving insolvency easier by facilitating the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings, providing for the rejection of undervalued transactions and overly burdensome contracts and granting creditors greater participation in the proceedings.

Taiwan, China

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Taiwan, China, made dealing with construction permits less time-consuming by improving the efficiency of its single window counter in the Taipei City Construction Management Office.
Protecting minority investors
Taiwan, China, strengthened minority investor protections by enhancing ownership and control structures in listed companies.

Tajikistan
Trading across borders
Tajikistan made trading across borders easier by streamlining customs clearance with Uzbekistan through the Simplified Customs Corridor agreement.

Tanzania
Starting a business
Tanzania made starting a business easier by launching online company registrations.

Thailand
Starting a business
Thailand made starting a business easier by launching online company registrations.
Getting electricity
Thailand made getting electricity easier by streamlining the number of procedures needed to obtain a new connection. Thailand also increased the transparency of electricity tariff changes.
Paying taxes
Thailand made paying taxes easier by enhancing its online platform for calculating and filing corporate income tax.
Trading across borders
Thailand made trading across borders faster by introducing the E-Matching system for electronic cargo control, thereby reducing the time for border compliance.

Timor-Leste
Starting a business
Timor-Leste made starting a business less costly by reducing the paid-in minimum capital requirement.

Togo
Starting a business
Togo made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement, introducing an online platform for company name search, reducing the registration fees and allowing entrepreneurs to pay the fees directly at the one-stop shop.
Dealing with construction permits
Togo made dealing with construction permits safer by implementing decennial liability and insurance and strengthening quality control before construction. Togo also reduced the cost to obtain a building permit.
Getting electricity
Togo 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). Togo also made getting electricity less costly by reducing the amount billed by the utility for the external works as well as the security deposit for a new connection.
Registering property
Togo reduced the time needed to transfer property by scanning the majority of land titles in Lomé and by creating an office exclusively dedicated to property transfers. Togo also reduced the property transfer tax and increased transparency by making information on cadastral plans and land title ownership freely accessible to all citizens.
Paying taxes
Togo made paying taxes easier by introducing an online platform for filing corporate income tax and value-added tax. Togo also made paying taxes less costly by lowering the corporate income tax rate.
Enforcing contracts
Togo made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a law that regulates all aspects of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

Trinidad and Tobago
Paying taxes
Trinidad and Tobago made paying taxes more costly by increasing the corporate income tax rate.

Tunisia
Starting a business
Tunisia made starting a business easier by combining different registrations at the one-stop shop.
Registering property
Tunisia made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the cadaster.
Protecting minority investors
Tunisia strengthened minority investor protections by improving disclosure requirements of related-party transactions to the public and by requiring disclosure of directorships and primary employment.
Paying taxes
Tunisia made paying taxes easier by not extending the exceptional corporate income tax contribution introduced in 2016.
Turkey

✓ Starting a business
Turkey made starting a business easier by removing the paid-in minimum capital requirement and by eliminating the notarization of company documents and legal books.

✓ Dealing with construction permits
Turkey increased the transparency of its building regulations by publishing online all pre-application requirements needed to obtain a construction permit. Turkey also strengthened construction quality control by imposing stricter qualification requirements for professionals in charge of approving architectural plans.

✓ Registering property
Turkey made registering property more expensive by increasing the costs of transferring property.

✓ Getting credit
Turkey strengthened access to credit by extending the security interest to products, proceeds and replacements of the original collateral; secured creditors are now given absolute priority over other claims, such as labor and tax, both outside and within bankruptcy proceedings. Turkey also improved access to credit information by reporting data on arrears from telecommunications companies.

✓ Paying taxes
Turkey made paying taxes easier by improving the online portal for filing and payment of taxes.

✓ Trading across borders
Turkey reduced the time and cost to export and import through various initiatives, including expanding the functionalities of the national trade single window, enhancing the risk management system and lowering customs brokers’ fees.

✓ Enforcing contracts
Turkey made enforcing contracts easier by publishing judgments rendered at all levels in commercial cases and by introducing financial incentives for mediation.

✓ Resolving insolvency
Turkey made resolving insolvency easier by introducing the possibility to obtain post-commencement credit, improving voting arrangements in reorganization and granting creditors greater participation in the proceedings.

Uganda

✓ Trading across borders
Uganda reduced the time needed to export and import by further implementing the Single Customs Territory, as well as by developing the Uganda Electronic Single Window and the Centralized Document Processing Centre.

Ukraine

✗ Dealing with construction permits
Ukraine made construction permitting more costly by increasing the contribution fee to the city social and engineering-transport infrastructure. On the other hand, Ukraine made dealing with construction permits easier by eliminating a requirement that investors obtain clearance from the State Service of Ukraine for Emergency Situations.

✓ Protecting minority investors
Ukraine strengthened minority investor protections by increasing the requirements for the disclosure in annual reports of related-party transactions.

✓ Trading across borders
Ukraine made trading across borders easier by eliminating the verification requirement on auto parts from the State Service of Export Control.

United Arab Emirates

✓ Starting a business
The United Arab Emirates made starting a business easier by improving online registration.

✓ Getting electricity
The United Arab Emirates made getting electricity easier by eliminating all costs for commercial and industrial connections of up to 150 kilo-Volt-Amperes (kVA).

✓ Registering property
The United Arab Emirates made registering property easier by increasing the transparency of the land administration system.

✓ Getting credit
The United Arab Emirates strengthened access to credit by introducing the possibility of granting a nonpossessory security right in a single category of movable assets without requiring a specific description of the collateral, by allowing out-of-court enforcement of the security interest and by establishing a unified and modern collateral registry.

United Kingdom

✓ Getting electricity
The United Kingdom made getting electricity faster by implementing several initiatives to expedite the external connection works performed by sub-contractors.
**United States**

**Labor market regulation**

The United States (New York City) changed regulations pertaining to parental leave.

---

**Uruguay**

✓ **Dealing with construction permits**

Uruguay improved the quality of its building regulations by creating an online portal providing information on the requirements and fees to obtain a building permit.

---

**Uzbekistan**

✓ **Protecting minority investors**

Uzbekistan strengthened minority investor protections by clarifying the ownership and control structures of listed companies.

✓ **Paying taxes**

Uzbekistan made paying taxes less costly by introducing new classification criteria for enterprises. The new classification allows small enterprises to pay a single social contribution at a fixed rate, but not less than 65% of the minimum wage for each employee.

✓ **Trading across borders**

Uzbekistan made trading across borders faster by introducing an electronic application and payment system for several export certificates, reducing the time for export documentary compliance.

---

**Vietnam**

✓ **Starting a business**

Vietnam made starting a business easier by publishing the notice of incorporation online and by reducing the cost of business registration.

✓ **Paying taxes**

Vietnam made paying taxes easier by no longer requiring hard copy submission of the value added tax return and allowing joint payment of the business license tax and value added tax. Vietnam also made paying taxes less costly by reducing the employer’s contribution to the labor fund.

✓ **Enforcing contracts**

Vietnam made enforcing contracts easier by making judgments rendered at all levels in commercial cases available to the public online.

---

**West Bank and Gaza**

✓ **Registering property**

West Bank and Gaza made property registration easier by removing the mandatory requirement to obtain a security check when issuing a purchase permit and publishing official statistics on property transactions at the land registry.

---

**Zambia**

✓ **Enforcing contracts**

Zambia made enforcing contracts easier by making judgments rendered in commercial matters at the appellate and supreme court levels available to the general public online.

---

**Zimbabwe**

✓ **Starting a business**

Zimbabwe made starting a business easier by reducing the time needed to obtain a business license.

✓ **Dealing with construction permits**

Zimbabwe made dealing with construction permits faster by issuing building permits through a one-stop shop.

✓ **Getting credit**

Zimbabwe improved access to credit information by increasing the coverage of the credit registry and providing consumer and commercial credit scores to banks and financial institutions.

✓ **Enforcing contracts**

Zimbabwe made enforcing contracts easier by making judgments rendered at the appellate and supreme court level in commercial cases available to the general public online.
## Country Tables

### South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>sizing a business (rank)</th>
<th>167</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>47.77</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>570</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>35,530,081</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.04</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>71.67</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Ease of doing business (rank)</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>69.51</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,320</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2,642,385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>91.58</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>71.67</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reform making it easier to do business

- **Afghanistan**: Score for registering property (0–100) 27.50
- **Albania**: Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 57.01
- **Europe & Central Asia**: Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 51.78

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- **Afghanistan**: Score for registering property (0–100) 184
- **Albania**: Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 151
- **Europe & Central Asia**: Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 26

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 posftilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Middle East & North Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td>41,318,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>3,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>128.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59.48</td>
<td>14,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td>102,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>108</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>ARGEN rina</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>119</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>58.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>61.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>49.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>311.5</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>47.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>56.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARME nia</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>41</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>75.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>74.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>86.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUSTRALIA</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>80.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>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>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>85.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>95.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protecting minority investors

Getting credit

Paying taxes

Resolving insolvency

Getting electricity

Dealing with construction permits

Trading across borders

Enforcing contracts

Registering property

Trading across borders (rank) 84 77.04

Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 67.51 72.77

Time (days) 277 1.5

Cost (% of claim value) 28.9 10.0

Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 41.5 80.1

Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 11.0 3.0

BAHAMAS, THE

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 118

Ease of doing business score (0–100) 58.90

GNI per capita (US$) 29,170

Population 395,361

Getting credit (rank) 74 105

Score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00 65

Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6 3.0

Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0 3.0

Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0 3.0

Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0 3.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 91 132

Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 43.33 13.5

Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2 1.5

Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5 1.5

Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6 1.5

Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8 1.5

Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 9 1.5

Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 10 1.5

Procedures (number) 17 11.5

Score for registering property (0–100) 84.63

Cost (% of property value) 140.4 1.5

Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 11.9 1.5

Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0 1.5

Time (days) 41 1.5

Cost (% of income per capita) 140.4 1.5

Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7 1.5

Registering property (rank) 74

Getting electricity (rank) 74

Score for getting electricity (0–100) 77.27

Procedures (number) 7

Time (days) 41

Cost (% of income per capita) 140.4

Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

Registering property (rank) 17

Score for registering property (0–100) 84.63

Procedures (number) 3

Time (days) 5.5

Cost (% of property value) 11

Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.5

Registering property

AUSTRIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 26

Ease of doing business score (0–100) 78.57

GNI per capita (US$) 45,440

Population 8,809,212

Getting credit (rank) 32 79.97

Score for getting credit (0–100) 83.45

Time (hours per year) 131

Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 51.5

Postlifting index (0–100) 98.54

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 42

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.08

Procedures (number) 11

Time (days) 222

Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2

Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) 28

Score for getting electricity (0–100) 87.72

Procedures (number) 5

Time (days) 23

Cost (% of income per capita) 88.6

Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

Registering property (rank) 32

Score for registering property (0–100) 79.97

Procedures (number) 3

Time (days) 20.5

Cost (% of property value) 4.6

Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.0

Registering property

AZEBAIJAN

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 25

Ease of doing business score (0–100) 78.64

GNI per capita (US$) 4,080

Population 9,862,429

Getting credit (rank) 61 25

Score for getting credit (0–100) 80.00

Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 8

Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8

Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 41.5

Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 41.5

Protecting minority investors (rank) 2

Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 81.67

Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 10

Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5

Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6

Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 9

Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 7

Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 10

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 61

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.11

Procedures (number) 18

Time (days) 16

Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.9

Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Getting electricity (rank) 74

Score for getting electricity (0–100) 77.27

Procedures (number) 7

Time (days) 41

Cost (% of income per capita) 140.4

Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

Registering property (rank) 17

Score for registering property (0–100) 84.63

Procedures (number) 3

Time (days) 5.5

Cost (% of property value) 11

Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.5

Registering property

BAHAMAS, THE

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 118

Ease of doing business score (0–100) 58.90

GNI per capita (US$) 29,170

Population 395,361

Getting credit (rank) 144 105

Score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00 65

Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6 3.0

Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0 3.0

Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0 3.0

Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0 3.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 132 91

Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 43.33 13.5

Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2 1.5

Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5 1.5

Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6 1.5

Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8 1.5

Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 7 1.5

Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 3 1.5

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 91 91

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 68.64

Procedures (number) 16

Time (days) 180

Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.7

Building quality control index (0–15) 10.0

Getting electricity (rank) 87

Score for getting electricity (0–100) 73.56

Procedures (number) 5

Time (days) 67

Cost (% of income per capita) 97.2

Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4

Registering property (rank) 169

Score for registering property (0–100) 43.31

Procedures (number) 7

Time (days) 122

Cost (% of property value) 4.3

Quality of land administration index (0–30) 3.0

Registering property

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 poslifting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
## Trading across borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69.85</td>
<td>20,240</td>
<td>1,492,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>41.97</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>164,669,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>285,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reform making it easier to do business

- Trading across borders (rank) 27
- Score for trading across borders (0–100) 77.72
- Time to export
  - Documentary compliance (hours) 24
  - Border compliance (hours) 71
- Cost to export
  - Documentary compliance (US$) 100
  - Border compliance (US$) 47

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- Trading across borders (rank) 132
- Score for trading across borders (0–100) 61.88
- Time to export
  - Documentary compliance (hours) 54
  - Border compliance (hours) 41
- Cost to export
  - Documentary compliance (US$) 109
  - Border compliance (US$) 350

### 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.
Getting credit (rank) 85
Score for getting credit (0–100) 55.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 4
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 48.8

Protecting minority investors (rank) 51
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 63.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 2
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 6
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 7
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 8

Payable taxes (rank) 99
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 70.68
Payments (number per year) 7
Time (hours per year) 184
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 53.3
Postfiling index (0–100) 50.00

Enforcing contracts (rank) 29
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 69.44
Time (days) 275
Cost (% of claim value) 24.3
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 8.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 72
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 52.58
Time (years) 1.5
Cost (% of estate) 17.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 39.6
Strenght of insolvency framework index (0–16) 10.0

Europe & Central Asia

GNI per capita (US$) 5,280
Population 9,507,875
Trading across borders (rank) 25
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 96.21
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 4
Border compliance (hours) 5
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 60
Border compliance (US$) 108
Cost to import
Documentary compliance (US$) 0
Border compliance (US$) 0

Belarus

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 37
Getting credit (rank) 85
Score for getting credit (0–100) 55.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 4
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 48.8

Belgium

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 45
Getting credit (rank) 60
Score for getting credit (0–100) 65.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 8
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 5
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 95.7

Belgium

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 125
Getting credit (rank) 122
Score for getting credit (0–100) 20.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 4
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Belize

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 125
Getting credit (rank) 172
Score for getting credit (0–100) 20.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 9
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 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 postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BENIN</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 153</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 51.42</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$) 800</td>
<td>Population 11,175,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 144</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00</td>
<td>Trading across borders (rank) 107</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100) 68.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 10</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 10</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours) 48</td>
<td>Time to export 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 6</td>
<td>Border compliance (hours) 78</td>
<td>Cost to export 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.8</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$) 354</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$) 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1</td>
<td>Cost to import 82</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$) 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$) 599</td>
<td>Cost to import 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank) 176</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130) 44.73</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payment (number per year) 57</td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 270</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax (as % of profit) 57.4</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 49.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 6.5</td>
<td>Time (years) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100) 54.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 11,987.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payments (number per year) 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 11,987.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 11,987.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 68.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100) 77.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita) 412.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100) 72.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHUTAN</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 81</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 66.08</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$) 2,720</td>
<td>Population 807,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 85</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 55.00</td>
<td>Trading across borders (rank) 28</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100) 94.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 10</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 10</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours) 9</td>
<td>Time to export 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 4</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7</td>
<td>Border compliance (hours) 5</td>
<td>Cost to export 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 35.9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 4</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1</td>
<td>Cost to import 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3</td>
<td>Cost to import 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank) 15</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130) 89.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payment (number per year) 18</td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax (as % of profit) 35.3</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 95.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100) 72.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 156</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 50.32</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$) 3,130</td>
<td>Population 11,051,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank) 134</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 35.00</td>
<td>Trading across borders (rank) 96</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100) 71.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 10</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 10</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours) 144</td>
<td>Time to export 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 4</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7</td>
<td>Border compliance (hours) 48</td>
<td>Cost to export 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 52.9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 17.6</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$) 30</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$) 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 1</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1</td>
<td>Cost to import 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 2</td>
<td>Cost to import 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank) 186</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130) 21.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payment (number per year) 42</td>
<td>Time (hours per year) 1,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 83.7</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100) 50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 3.4</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100) 49.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number) 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days) 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets reflect 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.
Dealing with construction permits

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63.82</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>3,507,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>60.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>60.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>47.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>61.99</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>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>59.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade across borders (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>67.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade across borders (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>80.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>82.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>209,288,278</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.

Reform making it easier to do business  Change making it more difficult to do business
DOING BUSINESS 2019

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>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72.03</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>428,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering property (rank)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71.24</td>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>7,075,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering property (rank)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>51.57</td>
<td>19,193,382</td>
<td>15,193,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering property (rank)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of starting a business (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of getting credit (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering property (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of starting a business (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of getting credit (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering property (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reform making it easier to do business | Change making it more difficult to do business |
### BURUNDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>168</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>47.41</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>290</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Rank:** 17
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 94.84
- Procedures (number): 3
- Time (days): 4
- Cost (% of income per capita): 10.7
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 3.0

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank:** 126
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 55.16
- Procedures (number): 15
- Time (days): 70
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 10.7
- Building quality control index (0–15): 4.0

### CABO VERDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>131</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>55.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Rank:** 116
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 83.51
- Procedures (number): 9
- Time (days): 18
- Cost (% of income per capita): 14.4
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank:** 43
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 75.01
- Procedures (number): 16
- Time (days): 108
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 11.1
- Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0

### CAMBODIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>54.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Rank:** 185
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 52.80
- Procedures (number): 9
- Time (days): 99
- Cost (% of income per capita): 47.4
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 76.2

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank:** 179
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 44.23
- Procedures (number): 20
- Time (days): 652
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 3.3
- Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

### 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.
Starting a business (rank) 92
Score for starting a business (0–100) 86.26
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 13.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 24.8
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 12.1

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 132
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 62.04
Procedures (number) 15
Time (days) 135
Cost (% of warehouse value) 13.4
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) 129
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 61.04
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 64
Cost (% of income per capita) 1,557.0
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 176
Score for registering property (0–100) 37.93
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 81
Cost (% of property value) 18.7
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.0

CAMEROON
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 166
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 47.78
GNI per capita (US$) 1,360
Population 24,053,727

Trading across borders (rank) 186
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) 166
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 39.91
Time (days) 830
Cost (% of claim value) 46.6
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 5.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 127
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 36.63
Time (years) 2.8
Cost (% of estate) 33.5
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 15.8
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 9.0

CANADA
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 22
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 79.26
GNI per capita (US$) 42,870
Population 36,708,083

Trading across borders (rank) 50
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 88.36
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 1
Border compliance (hours) 2
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 156
Border compliance (US$) 167

Enforcing contracts (rank) 96
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 57.13
Time (days) 910
Cost (% of claim value) 22.3
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 13
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 81.46
Time (years) 0.8
Cost (% of estate) 7.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 87.5
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 11.0

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 183
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 36.90
GNI per capita (US$) 390
Population 4,659,080

Trading across borders (rank) 163
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 52.36
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) 183
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 31.39
Time (days) 660
Cost (% of claim value) 82.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 5.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 154
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 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

### CHAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>14,899,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors (rank)</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extending of disclosure index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of director liability index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of shareholder rights index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of ownership and control index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of corporate transparency index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders (rank)</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>40.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to export</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (percentage of population)</strong></td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to import</strong></td>
<td>742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (percentage of population)</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts (rank)</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of claim value)</strong></td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</strong></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency (rank)</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of estate)</strong></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery rate (percentage of estate)</strong></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to export</strong></td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>52.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of property value)</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>70.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of property value)</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>83.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of income per capita)</strong></td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>56.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of warehouse value)</strong></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building quality control index (0–15)</strong></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of income per capita)</strong></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>75.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of warehouse value)</strong></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building quality control index (0–15)</strong></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building quality control index (0–15)</strong></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for electricity (rank)</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>85.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of income per capita)</strong></td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property (rank)</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>52.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of property value)</strong></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18,054,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit (rank)</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for getting credit (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</strong></td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</strong></td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors (rank)</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extending of disclosure index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of director liability index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of shareholder rights index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of ownership and control index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of corporate transparency index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders (rank)</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>80.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to export</strong></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (percentage of population)</strong></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to import</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (percentage of population)</strong></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts (rank)</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>65.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of claim value)</strong></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</strong></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency (rank)</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of estate)</strong></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery rate (percentage of estate)</strong></td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</strong></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,386,395,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit (rank)</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for getting credit (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</strong></td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting minority investors (rank)</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extending of disclosure index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of director liability index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of shareholder rights index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of ownership and control index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easing of corporate transparency index (0–10)</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trading across borders (rank)</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>82.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to export</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (percentage of population)</strong></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to import</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage (percentage of population)</strong></td>
<td>122.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border compliance (hours)</strong></td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts (rank)</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>78.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>496.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of claim value)</strong></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</strong></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency (rank)</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</strong></td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (% of estate)</strong></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery rate (percentage of estate)</strong></td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</strong></td>
<td>11.5</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 postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Registering property

**COLOMBIA**

- **Ease of doing business rank** (1–190): 65
- **Ease of doing business score** (0–100): 69.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score or Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>95.00</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>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</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>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>57.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>255.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>48.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONGO, DEM. REP.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>81,339,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score or Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</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>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>36.67</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</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>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>39.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONGO, DEM. REP.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>81,339,988</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.
### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Congo, Rep.</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>64.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>64.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>64.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>6,769.0</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>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Costa Rica</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>79.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.5</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>74</td>
<td>71.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>85.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>164.6</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>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Côte d’Ivoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>93.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>56.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,140.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>58.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</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.
### CROATIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecing minority investors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporting</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting property</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CYPRUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecing minority investors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporting</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting property</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CZECH REPUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecing minority investors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>64.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting property</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.10</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>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DENMARK</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,220</td>
<td>7,693,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>86.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>90.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DJIBOUTI</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>62.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>956,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>85.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>64.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>94.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMINICA</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,990</td>
<td>73,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>89.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>70.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>43.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>4.5</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 posting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### DOING BUSINESS 2019

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>61.12</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>10,766,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business** (rank) 117

- Score for starting a business (0–100) 83.44
- Procedures (number) 11
- Time (days) 16.5
- Cost (% of income per capita) 14.1
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 31.3

**Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 80

- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 70.82
- Procedures (number) 15
- Time (days) 206
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.6
- Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

**Getting electricity** (rank) 116

- Score for getting electricity (0–100) 64.65
- Procedures (number) 7
- Time (days) 67
- Cost (% of income per capita) 27.6
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 4

**Registering property** (rank) 77

- Score for registering property (0–100) 65.73
- Procedures (number) 6
- Time (days) 45
- Cost (% of property value) 1.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 14.5

**Protecting minority investors** (rank) 83

- Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 56.67
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 5
- Extent of director liability index (0–10) 4
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 5

**Paying taxes** (rank) 148

- Score for paying taxes (0–130) 57.44
- Payments (number per year) 7
- Time (hours per year) 317
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 48.8
- Postfiling index (0–100) 10.71

**Enforcing contracts** (rank) 149

- Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 46.86
- Time (days) 590
- Cost (% of claim value) 40.9
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 4.5

**Resolving insolvency** (rank) 124

- Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 37.54
- Time (years) 3.5
- Cost (% of estate) 38.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 8.8
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 10.5

**EGYPT, ARAB REP.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>57.94</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>16,624,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business** (rank) 168

- Score for starting a business (0–100) 70.58
- Procedures (number) 17
- Time (days) 132
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.9
- Building quality control index (0–15) 8.0

**Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 113

- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 66.38
- Procedures (number) 7
- Time (days) 74
- Cost (% of income per capita) 61.4
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

**Registering property** (rank) 75

- Score for registering property (0–100) 65.79
- Procedures (number) 8
- Time (days) 38
- Cost (% of property value) 2.1
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 16.0

**Protecting minority investors** (rank) 125

- Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 46.67
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2
- Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 9
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3

**Paying taxes** (rank) 143

- Score for paying taxes (0–130) 59.38
- Payments (number per year) 8
- Time (hours per year) 664
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 32.3
- Postfiling index (0–100) 49.54

**Trading across borders** (rank) 109

- Score for trading across borders (0–100) 68.65
- Time to export 160
- Documentary compliance (hours) 20
- Border compliance (hours) 72
- Cost to export (Documentary compliance) 50
- Cost to import (Border compliance) 75
- Cost to import (Documentary compliance) 50

**Resolving insolvency** (rank) 158

- Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 25.36
- Time (years) 5.3
- Cost (% of estate) 18.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 18.1
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 5.0

**LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>58.56</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>97,553,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting credit** (rank) 108

- Score for getting credit (0–100) 65.00
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 5
- Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 27.3
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 8.4

**Protecting minority investors** (rank) 72

- Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 58.38
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8
- Extent of director liability index (0–10) 3
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 7

**Paying taxes** (rank) 159

- Score for paying taxes (0–130) 52.73
- Payments (number per year) 29
- Time (hours per year) 392
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 46.4
- Postfiling index (0–100) 36.54

**Trading across borders** (rank) 171

- Score for trading across borders (0–100) 42.23
- Time to export 160
- Documentary compliance (hours) 88
- Border compliance (hours) 48
- Cost to export (Documentary compliance) 100
- Cost to import (Border compliance) 258
- Cost to import (Documentary compliance) 200

**Resolving insolvency** (rank) 101

- Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 42.27
- Time (years) 2.5
- Cost (% of claim value) 22.0
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 23.4
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 9.5

---

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.
Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>6,377,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>1,267,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>5,918,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealing with construction permits

- **El Salvador**
  - Starting a business (rank): 147
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 78.41
    - Procedures (number): 9
    - Time (days): 16.5
    - Cost (% of income per capita): 45.1
    - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 2.7

- **Equatorial Guinea**
  - Starting a business (rank): 184
    - Score for starting a business (0–100): 55.74
      - Procedures (number): 16
      - Time (days): 33
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 101.2
      - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 22.3

- **Eritrea**
  - Starting a business (rank): 187
    - Score for starting a business (0–100): 51.91
      - Procedures (number): 13
      - Time (days): 84
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 23.7
      - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 104.0

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 postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (US$)</td>
<td>1,315,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>104,678,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CO2 Emissions (metric tons per capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO2 emissions per capita</td>
<td>29.5</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIJI</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.15</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>9,056,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>73.39</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>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>67.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINLAND</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.35</td>
<td>44,580</td>
<td>5,511,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.43</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>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>3</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>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRANCE</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77.29</td>
<td>37,970</td>
<td>67,118,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>93.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>24.0</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 postfilling 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>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>6,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.28</td>
<td>3,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GABON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43.94</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFORCING CONTRACTS</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>2,025,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gambia, The**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49.34</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFORCING CONTRACTS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>2,100,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>3,717,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td>3,717,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89.03</td>
<td>3,717,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76.90</td>
<td>3,717,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56.03</td>
<td>3,717,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90.03</td>
<td>3,717,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFORCING CONTRACTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76.90</td>
<td>3,717,100</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.
### Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td>82,695,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trading across borders**
- Time (days): 40
- Cost (% of claim value): 39.7

**Dealing with construction permits**
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 3

**Registering property**
- Procedures (number): 147
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 5.0

### Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td>28,833,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trading across borders**
- Time (days): 472.5
- Cost (% of claim value): 11.4

**Registering property**
- Procedures (number): 147
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 5.0

### Greece

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.08</td>
<td>10,760,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trading across borders**
- Time (days): 31
- Cost (% of claim value): 39.7

**Dealing with construction permits**
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 3

**Registering property**
- Procedures (number): 147
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 5.0

---

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 postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRENADA</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>16,913,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>73.34</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10,782,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUINEA</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>12,717,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform making it easier to do business</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53.87</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>12,717,176</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 posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

---

**Reforming key indicators:**

- **Getting credit**
  - **Score for getting credit**: 30.00
  - **Strength of legal rights index**: 6
  - **Depth of credit information index**: 0
  - **Credit bureau coverage %**: 0.0
  - **Credit registry coverage %**: 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits**
  - **Score for dealing with construction permits**: 43.00
  - **Extent of disclosure index**: 4
  - **Extent of director liability index**: 8
  - **Ease of shareholder suits index**: 8
  - **Extent of shareholder rights index**: 3
  - **Extent of ownership and control index**: 2
  - **Extent of corporate transparency index**: 1

- **Trading across borders**
  - **Score for trading across borders**: 47.82
  - **Total tax and contribution rate %**: 39.00
  - **Quality of judicial processes index**: 0.0

- **Resolving insolvency**
  - **Score for resolving insolvency**: 31.56
  - **Time to export**: 228
  - **Quality of judicial processes index**: 0.6

---

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRENADA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52.71</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>107,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>16,913,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUINEA</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>12,717,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Reforming key indicators:**

- **Getting credit**
  - **Score for getting credit**: 144
  - **Strength of legal rights index**: 6
  - **Depth of credit information index**: 0
  - **Credit bureau coverage %**: 0.0
  - **Credit registry coverage %**: 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits**
  - **Score for dealing with construction permits**: 43.33
  - **Extent of disclosure index**: 4
  - **Extent of director liability index**: 8
  - **Ease of shareholder suits index**: 8
  - **Extent of shareholder rights index**: 3
  - **Extent of ownership and control index**: 2
  - **Extent of corporate transparency index**: 1

- **Trading across borders**
  - **Score for trading across borders**: 61.52
  - **Total tax and contribution rate %**: 39.00
  - **Quality of judicial processes index**: 5.0

- **Resolving insolvency**
  - **Score for resolving insolvency**: 39.10
  - **Time to export**: 3.8
  - **Quality of judicial processes index**: 5.0

---

**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.
Getting credit (rank) 144
Score for getting credit (100) 30.00
Strength of legal rights index (0-12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0-8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.5
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.2

Protecting minority investors (rank) 140
Score for protecting minority investors (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) 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

Paying taxes (rank) 154
Score for paying taxes (1-130) 54.93
Payments (number per year) 46
Time (hours per year) 218
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 45.5
Postfilling index (1-100) 45.34

Enforcing contracts (rank) 169
Score for enforcing contracts (1-130) 38.61
Time (days) 1.785
Cost (% of claim value) 28.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0-18) 8.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 168
Score for resolving insolvency (1-130) 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

Trading across borders (rank) 144
Score for trading across borders (1-130) 59.60
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 60
Border compliance (hours) 118
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 160
Border compliance (US$) 585

Resolving insolvency (rank) 168
Score for resolving insolvency (1-130) 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

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.

---

**GUINEA-BISSAU**

### Sub-Saharan Africa

**GNI per capita (US$)** 660

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>175</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (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>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GUYANA**

### Latin America & Caribbean

**GNI per capita (US$)** 4,460

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>134</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (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>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**HAITI**

### Latin America & Caribbean

**GNI per capita (US$)** 760

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>182</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (100)</td>
<td>10.00</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>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>3.5</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 postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Getting electricity (rank) 153
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 53.78
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 39
Cost (% of income per capita) 73.6
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 95
Score for registering property (0–100) 63.43
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 29
Cost (% of property value) 1.3
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 14.0

HONG KONG SAR, CHINA
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 4

Starting a business (rank) 5
Score for starting a business (0–100) 98.15
Procedures (number) 2
Time (days) 1.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.1
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 1
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 88.24
Procedures (number) 11
Time (days) 72
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.6
Building quality control index (0–15) 14.0

Getting electricity (rank) 3
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 99.38
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 24
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.3
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

Registering property (rank) 53
Score for registering property (0–100) 73.55
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 27.5
Cost (% of property value) 1.7
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 27.5

EAST ASIA & PACIFIC
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 53

Getting credit (rank) 32
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 (0–100) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (0–100) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 11
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 78.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 10
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 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) 1
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 99.71
Payments (number per year) 3
Time (hours per year) 34.5
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 22.9
Postfiling index (0–100) 98.85

HUNGARY
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 53

Getting credit (rank) 32
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 (0–100) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (0–100) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 11
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 75.00
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 7
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 9
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 6
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 5
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

Paying taxes (rank) 1
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 99.71
Payments (number per year) 3
Time (hours per year) 34.5
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 22.9
Postfiling index (0–100) 98.85

OECD high income
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 53

Getting credit (rank) 32
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 (0–100) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (0–100) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 11
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 75.00
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 7
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 9
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 6
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 5
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

Paying taxes (rank) 1
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 99.71
Payments (number per year) 3
Time (hours per year) 34.5
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 22.9
Postfiling index (0–100) 98.85
### Country Tables

#### ICELAND

<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>21</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 79.35</td>
<td>Population 341,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOUTH ASIA

<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>77</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 67.23</td>
<td>Population 1,339,180,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDIA

<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>13</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>Population 263,991,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDONESIA

<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>73</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 67.96</td>
<td>Population 1,820,350,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trading across borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</th>
<th>Time to export</th>
<th>Documentation compliance (hours)</th>
<th>Border compliance (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resolving insolvency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</th>
<th>Time (years)</th>
<th>Cost (% of claim value)</th>
<th>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>81.85</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>81.85</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>81.85</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: Represents the country's position in the Ease of Doing Business Index among 190 economies.
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: A measure of the ease of starting a business, with higher scores indicating easier procedures.
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: A measure of the ease of obtaining access to electricity, with higher scores indicating easier procedures.
- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**: A measure of the ease of resolving insolvency, with higher scores indicating easier procedures.
- **Score for trading across borders (0–100)**: A measure of the ease of trading across borders, with higher scores indicating easier procedures.

*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>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78.91</td>
<td>55,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.72</td>
<td>4,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>56.98</td>
<td>5,400</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.
### COUNTRY TABLES

<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>JAMAICA</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>66.32</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAPAN</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>39</td>
<td>75.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>86.10</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>74.95</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>71.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>74.21</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>71.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JORDAN</th>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>60.47</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>80.69</td>
<td>71.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>34.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.40</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>126.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAZAKHSTAN</th>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.96</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>76.78</td>
<td>79.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56</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>KENYA</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>685.9</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of paying taxes (0–10)</td>
<td>55.97</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIRIBATI</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>49.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3,196.1</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>44.08</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3,196.1</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OECD high income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>OECD high income</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.
### Kosovo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>74.15</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1,830,700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>95.68</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.92</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>66.16</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kuwait

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>62.20</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>4,136,528</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>71.28</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>67.54</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kyrgyz Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>68.33</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>6,201,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.97</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>77.10</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>46.01</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong> (rank)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>90.27</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>24.0</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 possession index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY TABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAO PDR</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>2,270</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>51.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</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 postfilling 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>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESOTHO</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>2,233,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERIA</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>4,731,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBYA</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>6,374,616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doing Business 2019

- **Reform making it easier to do business**
- **Change making it more difficult to do business**

### Key Indicators (2019)

- **Getting credit (rank)**
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)**
- **Payment of legal rights index (0–12)**
- **Depth of credit information index (0–8)**
- **Credit bureau coverage (0–10)**
- **Credit registry coverage (0–10)**

### Additional 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 economies, the data are not available for certain indicators.

---

**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.
## LITHUANIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>80.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,827,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 84.86
- **Procedures (number)**: 13
- **Time (days)**: 74
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 3
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 13.0

### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 84.86
- **Procedures (number)**: 13
- **Time (days)**: 74
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 3
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 13.0

### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 88.43
- **Procedures (number)**: 4
- **Time (days)**: 85
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 38.0
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)**: 8

### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 92.96
- **Procedures (number)**: 3
- **Time (days)**: 3
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 1.7
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 28.5

## LUXEMBOURG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>69.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>70,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>599,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 88.73
- **Procedures (number)**: 11
- **Time (days)**: 157
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 0.7
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 15.0

### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 83.71
- **Procedures (number)**: 11
- **Time (days)**: 157
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 0.7
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 15.0

### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 84.30
- **Procedures (number)**: 5
- **Time (days)**: 56
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 35.3
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)**: 7

### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 63.85
- **Procedures (number)**: 7
- **Time (days)**: 26.5
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 11.1
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 25.5

## MACEDONIA, FYR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>81.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,083,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 92.08
- **Procedures (number)**: 4
- **Time (days)**: 14
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 0.9
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 0.0

### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 83.38
- **Procedures (number)**: 9
- **Time (days)**: 91
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 3.7
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 13.0

### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 81.43
- **Procedures (number)**: 3
- **Time (days)**: 97
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 191.1
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)**: 5

### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 74.50
- **Procedures (number)**: 7
- **Time (days)**: 30
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 17.5
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 25.0

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.

---

### Reforming makes it easier to do business

- **Trading across borders (rank)**: 19
- **Score for trading across borders (0–100)**: 97.83
- **Time to export**
  - **Documentary compliance (hours)**: 3
  - **Border clearance (hours)**: 7
  - **Cost to export**
    - **Documentary compliance (US$)**: 28
    - **Border clearance (US$)**: 58
    - **Cost to import**
      - **Documentary compliance (US$)**: 0
      - **Border clearance (US$)**: 0

### Enforcing contracts (rank)
- **Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)**: 78.80
- **Time (days)**: 370
- **Cost (% of claim value)**: 23.6
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)**: 15.0

### Resolving insolvency (rank)
- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**: 46.87
- **Time (years)**: 2.3
- **Cost (% of estate)**: 15.0
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)**: 40.6
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)**: 8.0

---

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- **Trading across borders (rank)**: 1
- **Score for trading across borders (0–100)**: 100.00
- **Time to export**
  - **Documentary compliance (hours)**: 1
  - **Border clearance (hours)**: 0
  - **Cost to export**
    - **Documentary compliance (US$)**: 0
    - **Border clearance (US$)**: 0

### Enforcing contracts (rank)
- **Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)**: 73.32
- **Time (days)**: 321
- **Cost (% of claim value)**: 9.7
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)**: 8.5

### Resolving insolvency (rank)
- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**: 45.46
- **Time (years)**: 2.0
- **Cost (% of estate)**: 14.5
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)**: 43.1
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)**: 7.0

---

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- **Trading across borders (rank)**: 29
- **Score for trading across borders (0–100)**: 93.87
- **Time to export**
  - **Documentary compliance (hours)**: 2
  - **Border clearance (hours)**: 9

### Enforcing contracts (rank)
- **Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)**: 67.79
- **Time (days)**: 634
- **Cost (% of claim value)**: 28.9
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)**: 14.0

### Resolving insolvency (rank)
- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**: 72.69
- **Time (years)**: 1.5
- **Cost (% of estate)**: 10.0
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)**: 48.0
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)**: 15.0
MADAGASCAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>48.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>40.00</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>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0–100)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0–100)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>51.67</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>10</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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–10)</td>
<td>62.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (0–100)</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>44.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>100</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>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MALAWI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>59.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (0–100)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0–100)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</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 shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–10)</td>
<td>62.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>177.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (0–100)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>33.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MALAYSIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>80.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0–100)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0–100)</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>81.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</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>8</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>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–10)</td>
<td>76.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (0–100)</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>52.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>80.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.5</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>27.5</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 postfilling index, a result of ‘not applicable’ may be recorded for an economy.
### MALDIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY TABLES</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>139</td>
<td>54.43</td>
<td>436,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>89.17</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>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>55.60</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>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>22.8</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>39.97</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>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</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>23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</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>1</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>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>66.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>390.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (1–190)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</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>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>40.00</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>5</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>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>51.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MALI

| Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 145 | | |
| GNI per capita (US$) | 770 | | |
| Population | 18,541,980 | | |
| Starting a business (rank) | 110 | | |
| Score for starting a business (0–100) | 84.05 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 13 | | |
| Time (days) | 124 | | |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 5.9 | | |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 8.5 | | |
| Getting electricity (rank) | 159 | | |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 51.57 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 4 | | |
| Time (days) | 120 | | |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 2,650.5 | | |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 0 | | |
| Registering property (rank) | 141 | | |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 51.51 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 5 | | |
| Time (days) | 57 | | |
| Cost (% of property value) | 11.1 | | |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 8.0 | | |
| Paying taxes (rank) | 165 | | |
| Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 51.55 | | |
| Payments (number per year) | 35 | | |
| Time (hours per year) | 270 | | |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 48.3 | | |
| Postfiling index (0–100) | 25.71 | | |

### MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

| Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 84 | | |
| GNI per capita (US$) | 23,810 | | |
| Population | 465,292 | | |
| Starting a business (rank) | 103 | | |
| Score for starting a business (0–100) | 84.86 | | |
| Procedures (number) | 8 | | |
| Time (days) | 16 | | |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 7.1 | | |
| Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 1.0 | | |
| Paying taxes (rank) | 71 | | |
| Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 76.18 | | |
| Payments (number per year) | 8 | | |
| Time (hours per year) | 139 | | |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 44.0 | | |
| Postfiling index (0–100) | 52.51 | | |

---

**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>MARSHALL ISLANDS</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>51.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>84.64</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.0</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>73</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>71.92</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>59.47</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>0.0</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>187</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAURITANIA</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>51.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>144.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.18</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>0.0</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>92</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4,277.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAURITIUS</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>79.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.0</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>15</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>82.51</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>86.24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>78.74</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.0</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.
### MEXICO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8,610</td>
<td>129,163,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MICRONESIA, FED. STS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>105,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>69.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>290.4</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>
</tbody>
</table>

### EASE OF DOING BUSINESS RANK (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REFORM MAKING IT EASIER TO DO BUSINESS

- **Dealing with building permits**
  - **Score for dealing with building permits (0–100)**: 68.62
  - Procedures (number): 14.7
  - Time (days): 82.1
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 9.7
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 11.7

- **Registering property**
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 60.42
  - Procedures (number): 7.7
  - Time (days): 38.8
  - Cost (% of property value): 5.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 16.3

- **Getting electricity**
  - **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 64.69
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 105
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 342.9
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

- **Registering property**
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 0.00
  - Procedures (number): 0
  - Time (days): 0
  - Cost (% of property value): 0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 0

- **Getting electricity**
  - **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 64.69
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 105
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 342.9
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

- **Registering property**
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 0.00
  - Procedures (number): 0
  - Time (days): 0
  - Cost (% of property value): 0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 0

### GNI PER CAPITA (US$)

- **Starting a business (rank)**: 44
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 70.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 8
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 6
  - Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 15.8
  - Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 0.0

- **Protecting minority investors (rank)**: 33
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 68.33
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 7
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 4
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 8
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 8
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 5
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 9

- **Paying taxes**
  - **Score for paying taxes (0–100)**: 68.78
  - Payments (number per year): 21
  - Time (hours per year): 128
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 60.5
  - Postfiling index (0–100): not applicable

### Trading across borders

- **Score for trading across borders (0–100)**: 84.00
  - Time to export: 340.7
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 26
  - Border compliance (hours): 36
  - Cost to export: 33.0
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 10.1

### Resolving insolvency

- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**: 70.77
  - Time (years): 1.8
  - Cost (% of estate): 18.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 64.7
  - Strength of insololvency framework index (0–16): 11.5

### Enforcing contracts

- **Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)**: 29.39
  - Time (days): 885
  - Cost (% of claim value): 66.0
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 4.5

### Resolving insolvency

- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**: 37.64
  - Time (years): 5.3
  - Cost (% of estate): 38.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 1.2
  - Strength of insololvency framework index (0–16): 11.5

### 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.
### MONGOLIA

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Building quality control index (0–15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MONTENEGRO

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Building quality control index (0–15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MOROCCO

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Building quality control index (0–15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (1–190)</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>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MOZAMBIQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>29,668,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business**

- (Rank) 174
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 67.56
- Procedures (number): 10
- Time (days): 17
- Cost (% of income per capita): 120.5
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**

- (Rank) 84
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 72.57
- Procedures (number): 11
- Time (days): 11
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 6.5
- Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0

**Getting electricity**

- (Rank) 100
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 71.02
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 4
- Cost (% of income per capita): 3,214.4
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 4

**Registering property**

- (Rank) 133
- Score for registering property (0–100): 52.94
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 43
- Cost (% of property value): 5.2
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 7.5

**Paying taxes**

- (Rank) 159
- Score for paying taxes (0–100): 64.04
- Payments (number per year): 37
- Time (hours per year): 200
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 36.1
- Posting index (0–100): 50.19

### MYANMAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>171</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>53,370,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business**

- (Rank) 152
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 77.33
- Procedures (number): 12
- Time (days): 95
- Cost (% of income per capita): 24.8
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**

- (Rank) 81
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 70.35
- Procedures (number): 15
- Time (days): 95
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 3.7
- Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

**Getting electricity**

- (Rank) 64
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 55.67
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 77
- Cost (% of income per capita): 1,147.0
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 1

**Registering property**

- (Rank) 136
- Score for registering property (0–100): 52.30
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 85
- Cost (% of property value): 4.1
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 5.5

### NAMIBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,533,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business**

- (Rank) 172
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 69.06
- Procedures (number): 10
- Time (days): 66
- Cost (% of income per capita): 10.0
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

**Dealing with construction permits**

- (Rank) 83
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 69.79
- Procedures (number): 12
- Time (days): 160
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.2
- Building quality control index (0–15): 8.5

**Getting electricity**

- (Rank) 71
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 78.25
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 37
- Cost (% of income per capita): 30.6
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

**Registering property**

- (Rank) 174
- Score for registering property (0–100): 40.19
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 44
- Cost (% of property value): 13.8
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 9.5

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 posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEPAL</th>
<th>South Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>59.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) | 107 |
Score for starting a business (0–100) | 84.38 |
| Procedures (number) | 2 |
Time (days) | 16.5 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 22.2 |
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0 |

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 48 |
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 57.99 |
| Procedures (number) | 12 |
Time (days) | 117 |
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 14.8 |
Building quality control index (0–15) | 9.0 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 137 |
Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 58.28 |
| Procedures (number) | 5 |
Time (days) | 70 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 88.5 |
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 0 |

Registering property (rank) | 88 |
Score for registering property (0–100) | 64.86 |
| Procedures (number) | 4 |
Time (days) | 6 |
Cost (% of property value) | 4.7 |
Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 5.5 |

Netherlands

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 36 |
Ease of doing business score (0–100) | 76.04 |

Getting credit (rank) | 112 |
Score for getting credit (0–100) | 45.00 |
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 2 |
Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 7 |
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 95.8 |
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

Protecting minority investors (rank) | 72 |
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 58.33 |
| Extent of disclosure index (0–10) | 6 |
| Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 1 |
| Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) | 9 |
| Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 7 |
| Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 6 |
| Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 6 |

Paying taxes (rank) | 118 |
Score for paying taxes (0–10) | 52.87 |
| Payments (number per year) | 39 |
| Time (hours per year) | 353 |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 36.7 |
| Postfilling index (0–100) | 31.35 |

New Zealand

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 1 |
Ease of doing business score (0–100) | 86.59 |

Getting credit (rank) | 1 |
Score for getting credit (0–100) | 100.00 |
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 4 |
Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 8 |
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 100.0 |
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

Protecting minority investors (rank) | 2 |
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 81.67 |
| Extent of disclosure index (0–10) | 10 |
| Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 9 |
| Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) | 9 |
| Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 7 |
| Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 7 |
| Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 7 |

Paying taxes (rank) | 10 |
Score for paying taxes (0–10) | 91.08 |
| Payments (number per year) | 39 |
| Time (hours per year) | 140 |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 34.6 |
| Postfilling index (0–100) | 96.80 |

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NICARAGUA</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,130</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting credit (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.78</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>225.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost (% of warehouse value)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building quality control index (0–15)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.39</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost (% of property value)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 postfilling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIGER</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,615</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting credit (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost (% of warehouse value)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building quality control index (0–15)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost (% of property value)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIGERIA</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,080</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting credit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting credit (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit bureau coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Credit registry coverage ( % of adults)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dealing with construction permits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.84</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>110.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>110.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost (% of warehouse value)</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building quality control index (0–15)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Procedures (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time (days)</strong></td>
<td><strong>115.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>115.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cost (% of property value)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></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.

✓ Reform making it easier to do business  ❌ Change making it more difficult to do business
### NORWAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>82.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>75,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>5,282,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Starting a business (rank)                    | 22           |
| Score for starting a business (0–100)         | 94.31        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 4            |
| Time (days)                                   | 4            |
| Cost (% of income per capita)                 | 0.9          |
| Minimum capital (% of income per capita)      | 4.6          |

| Dealing with construction permits (rank)      | 22           |
| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 78.86 |
| Procedures (number)                           | 11           |
| Time (days)                                   | 110.5        |
| Cost (% of warehouse value)                   | 0.6          |
| Building quality control index (0–15)         | 10.0         |

| Getting electricity (rank)                    | 19           |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100)         | 90.58        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 4            |
| Time (days)                                   | 66           |
| Cost (% of income per capita)                 | 11.0         |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 8 |

| Registering property (rank)                   | 13           |
| Score for registering property (0–100)        | 87.26        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 1            |
| Time (days)                                   | 3            |
| Cost (% of property value)                    | 2.5          |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30)   | 20.0         |

### OMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>67.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>14,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,636,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Starting a business (rank)                    | 37           |
| Score for starting a business (0–100)         | 92.89        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 4.5          |
| Time (days)                                   | 6.5          |
| Cost (% of income per capita)                 | 3.7          |
| Minimum capital (% of income per capita)      | 0.0          |

| Dealing with construction permits (rank)      | 66           |
| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 72.05 |
| Procedures (number)                           | 14           |
| Time (days)                                   | 172          |
| Cost (% of warehouse value)                   | 1.4          |
| Building quality control index (0–15)         | 11.0         |

| Getting electricity (rank)                    | 66           |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100)         | 79.34        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 6            |
| Time (days)                                   | 62           |
| Cost (% of income per capita)                 | 81.5         |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7 |

| Registering property (rank)                   | 52           |
| Score for registering property (0–100)        | 74.03        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 2            |
| Time (days)                                   | 16           |
| Cost (% of property value)                    | 2.0          |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30)   | 13.5         |

### PAKISTAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>55.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>197,015,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Starting a business (rank)                    | 130          |
| Score for starting a business (0–100)         | 81.89        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 18.7         |
| Time (days)                                   | 16.5         |
| Cost (% of income per capita)                 | 6.8          |
| Minimum capital (% of income per capita)      | 0.0          |

| Dealing with construction permits (rank)      | 166          |
| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 53.99 |
| Procedures (number)                           | 18.7         |
| Time (days)                                   | 262.8        |
| Cost (% of warehouse value)                   | 9.0          |
| Building quality control index (0–15)         | 12.3         |

| Getting electricity (rank)                    | 167          |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100)         | 44.75        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 5.4          |
| Time (days)                                   | 161.2        |
| Cost (% of income per capita)                 | 1585.5       |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 0 |

| Registering property (rank)                   | 161          |
| Score for registering property (0–100)        | 45.63        |
| Procedures (number)                           | 7.3          |
| Time (days)                                   | 144.1        |
| Cost (% of property value)                    | 4.2          |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30)   | 9.5          |

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.
### PALAU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business (rank) (1–190)</th>
<th>133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</th>
<th>68.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</th>
<th>149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PANAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</th>
<th>66.76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>65.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAPUA NEW GUINEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>79.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</th>
<th>64.41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for registering property (0–100)</th>
<th>56.21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: Most indicator values refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data is 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.
### PARAGUAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>59.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 77.47 (151)
- Procedures (number): 7
- Time (days): 35
- Cost (% of income per capita): 40.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 70.51 (79)
- Procedures (number): 14
- Time (days): 121
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.6
- Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 70.20 (101)
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 67
- Cost (% of property value): 16.5
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 3

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 66.12 (74)
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 46
- Cost (% of property value): 1.8
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 12.0

#### Protecting minority investors (rank)
- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)**: 41.67 (140)
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 6
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 5
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 6
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 9
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 3
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 2

#### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)**: 63.73 (127)
- Payments (number per year): 20
- Time (hours per year): 378
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 35.0
- Postfilling index (0–100): 46.56

### PERU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 82.44 (125)
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 24.5
- Cost (% of property value): 9.9
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 73.58 (54)
- Procedures (number): 15
- Time (days): 187
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.2
- Building quality control index (0–15): 13.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 79.02 (67)
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 67
- Cost (% of income per capita): 348.4
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 74.89 (45)
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 7.5
- Cost (% of property value): 1.5
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 17.5

#### Protecting minority investors (rank)
- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)**: 63.33 (51)
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 9
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 6
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 6
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 8
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 3
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 6

#### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)**: 65.37 (120)
- Payments (number per year): 9
- Time (hours per year): 260
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 36.8
- Postfilling index (0–100): 19.24

### PHILIPPINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>57.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 71.97 (166)
- Procedures (number): 13
- Time (days): 31
- Cost (% of income per capita): 20.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 2.8

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 68.58 (94)
- Procedures (number): 23
- Time (days): 122
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.5
- Building quality control index (0–15): 13.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 87.45 (29)
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 37
- Cost (% of income per capita): 2.7
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 57.56 (116)
- Procedures (number): 9
- Time (days): 35
- Cost (% of property value): 0.8
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 12.5

#### Protecting minority investors (rank)
- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)**: 43.33 (132)
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 2
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 3
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 7
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 1
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 6
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 7

#### Paying taxes (rank)
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)**: 71.80 (94)
- Payments (number per year): 14
- Time (hours per year): 181
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 42.9
- Postfilling index (0–100): 50.00

---

**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.
### Poland

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: 33

- **Starting a business** (rank): 121
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 82.85
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 37
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 11.8
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 10.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 40
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 75.18
  - Procedures (number): 12
  - Time (days): 153
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.3
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 10.0

- **Registering property** (rank): 58
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 81.35
  - Procedures (number): 4
  - Time (days): 122
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 19.9
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 19.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 32
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 86.45
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 65
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 34.5
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

- **Registering property** (rank): 41
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 76.09
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 33
  - Cost (% of property value): 0.3

### Portugal

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: 34

- **Starting a business** (rank): 57
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 90.89
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 6.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 2.0
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 60
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 73.17
  - Procedures (number): 14
  - Time (days): 160
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.2
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0

- **Registering property** (rank): 36
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 78.36
  - Procedures (number): 1
  - Time (days): 10
  - Cost (% of property value): 7.4
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 20.0

### Puerto Rico (U.S.)

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: 64

- **Starting a business** (rank): 53
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 91.23
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 5.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 1.3
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 141
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 59.38
  - Procedures (number): 22
  - Time (days): 165
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 6.9
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 12.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 38
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 73.43
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 32
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 351.9
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 3

- **Registering property** (rank): 159
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 46.14
  - Procedures (number): 8
  - Time (days): 19.1
  - Cost (% of property value): 0.9
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business score</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>2,639,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73.30</td>
<td>19,586,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Federation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td>144,495,044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reform making it easier to do business | Change making it more difficult to do business |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,586,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Federation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>144,495,044</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.
### Rwanda

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 29
- **Getting credit (rank):** 3
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 95.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 11
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 8
  - Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults): 20.1
  - Credit registry coverage (0% of adults): 9.2
- **Protecting minority investors (rank):** 44
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 76.67
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 8
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 9
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 2.0
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 5
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 9
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 7
- **Trading across borders (rank):** 88
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100): 74.98
  - Time to export: 370
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 30
  - Border compliance (hours): 83
  - Cost to export: Documentary compliance (US$): 110
  - Border compliance (US$): 183
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 14.5
- **Enforcing contracts (rank):** 78
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 59.54
  - Time (days): 230
  - Cost (% of claim value): 82.7
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 14.5
- **Resolving insolvency (rank):** 105
  - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 41.19
  - Time (years): 2.3
  - Cost (% of estate): 5.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 50.4
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 4.5

### Samoa

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 90
- **Getting credit (rank):** 112
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 45.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 9
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 0
  - Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults): 0.0
  - Credit registry coverage (0% of adults): 0.0
- **Protecting minority investors (rank):** 83
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 56.67
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 5
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 6
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 6
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 8
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 3
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 3
- **Trading across borders (rank):** 151
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100): 57.81
  - Time to export: 410
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 30
  - Border compliance (hours): 51
  - Cost to export: Documentary compliance (US$): 230
  - Border compliance (US$): 900
- **Enforcing contracts (rank):** 86
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 58.59
  - Time (days): 455
  - Cost (% of claim value): 24.4
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 5.5
- **Resolving insolvency (rank):** 160
  - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 33.45
  - Time (years): 2.0
  - Cost (% of estate): 38.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 18.6
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 7.5

### San Marino

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 88
- **Getting credit (rank):** 144
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 30.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 1
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 5
  - Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults): 0.0
  - Credit registry coverage (0% of adults): 80.1
- **Trading across borders (rank):** 20
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100): 97.48
  - Time to export: 150
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 30
  - Border compliance (hours): 30
  - Cost to export: Documentary compliance (US$): 100
  - Border compliance (US$): 50
- **Enforcing contracts (rank):** 82
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 59.25
  - Time (days): 575
  - Cost (% of claim value): 13.9
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 5.5
- **Resolving insolvency (rank):** 105
  - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 41.19
  - Time (years): 2.3
  - Cost (% of estate): 5.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 50.4
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 4.5

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 postfilining index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td>12,208,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>196,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammarino</td>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>48,211</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>81.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>362.3</td>
<td>17.2</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>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>79.89</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>20,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENEGAL</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>71.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>57.47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</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.
Dealing with construction permits

- **Indicators**
  - A result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details.

- **Procedures (number)**
  - **Time (days)**
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**
  - **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**

- **Getting electricity**
  - **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**
  - **Procedures (number)**
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**
  - **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**

- **Registering property**
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**
  - **Procedures (number)**
  - **Time (days)**
  - **Cost (% of property value)**
  - **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**

**SERBIA**

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: 48
- **Starting a business (rank)**: 40
  - **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 92.59
  - **Procedures (number)**: 5
  - **Time (days)**: 5.5
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 2.2
  - **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 11
  - **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 84.82
  - **Procedures (number)**: 11
  - **Time (days)**: 106
  - **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 1.7
  - **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 14.0

- **Getting electricity (rank)**: 104
  - **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 70.01
  - **Procedures (number)**: 5
  - **Time (days)**: 153
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 21.2
  - **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)**: 5

- **Registering property (rank)**: 55
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 72.60
  - **Procedures (number)**: 6
  - **Time (days)**: 21
  - **Cost (% of property value)**: 2.8
  - **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 18.0

**SEYCHELLES**

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: 96
- **Starting a business (rank)**: 145
  - **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 78.65
  - **Procedures (number)**: 9
  - **Time (days)**: 57.6
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 13.7
  - **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 118
  - **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 65.50
  - **Procedures (number)**: 16
  - **Time (days)**: 138
  - **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 0.3
  - **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 6.0

- **Getting electricity (rank)**: 118
  - **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 64.30
  - **Procedures (number)**: 6
  - **Time (days)**: 77
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 377.7
  - **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)**: 3

- **Registering property (rank)**: 62
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 70.75
  - **Procedures (number)**: 4
  - **Time (days)**: 33
  - **Cost (% of property value)**: 7.0
  - **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 21.0

**SIERRA LEONE**

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**: 163
- **Starting a business (rank)**: 55
  - **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 91.18
  - **Procedures (number)**: 5
  - **Time (days)**: 8
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 8.4
  - **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits (rank)**: 182
  - **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 38.43
  - **Procedures (number)**: 17
  - **Time (days)**: 182
  - **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 21.4
  - **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 7.0

- **Getting electricity (rank)**: 178
  - **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 31.70
  - **Procedures (number)**: 8
  - **Time (days)**: 82
  - **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 5,027
  - **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)**: 0

- **Registering property (rank)**: 167
  - **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 43.50
  - **Procedures (number)**: 7
  - **Time (days)**: 56
  - **Cost (% of property value)**: 10.7
  - **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 6.5

---

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>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85.24</td>
<td>54,530</td>
<td>5,612,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OECD high income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75.17</td>
<td>16,610</td>
<td>5,439,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75.61</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>2,066,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score for starting a business (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>98.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>84.73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>92.88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registering property**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>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><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>90.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting electricity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>83.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dealing with construction permits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of warehouse value)</th>
<th>Building quality control index (0–15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>84.73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>59.34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>247.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting credit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
<th>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>93.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registering property**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>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><strong>SINGAPORE</strong></td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVAK REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVENIA</strong></td>
<td>90.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25.5</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 postfilng index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Solomon Islands

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

- 115

#### Starting a business (rank)

- 98
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 85.52
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 9
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 28.1
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)

- 53
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 73.00
  - Procedures (number): 13
  - Time (days): 98
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.2
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)

- 92
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 72.58
  - Procedures (number): 4
  - Time (days): 53
  - Cost (% of property value): 1,238.9
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–6): 3

#### Registering property (rank)

- 154
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 47.38
  - Procedures (number): 10
  - Time (days): 86.5
  - Cost (% of property value): 4.7
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 11.0

### Somalia

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

- 190

#### Starting a business (rank)

- 188
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 46.37
  - Procedures (number): 9
  - Time (days): 70
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 195.2
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)

- 186
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 66.00
  - Procedures (number): no practice
  - Time (days): no practice
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): no practice
  - Building quality control index (0–15): no practice

#### Getting electricity (rank)

- 187
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 0.00
  - Procedures (number): no practice
  - Time (days): no practice
  - Cost (% of property value): no practice
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–6): no practice

#### Registering property (rank)

- 153
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 47.87
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 188
  - Cost (% of property value): 1.6
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 7.5

### South Africa

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

- 82

#### Starting a business (rank)

- 134
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 81.22
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 40
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 0.2
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)

- 96
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 68.29
  - Procedures (number): 20
  - Time (days): 155
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.0
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 12.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)

- 109
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 68.79
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 109
  - Cost (% of property value): 156.7
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–6): 4

#### Registering property (rank)

- 106
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 59.32
  - Procedures (number): 7
  - Time (days): 23
  - Cost (% of property value): 8.7
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 15.0

---

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.
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Our indicator sets reflect 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>ST. KITTS AND NEVIS</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>140</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>54.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of branches of foreign banks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of branches of foreign banks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>74.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Buildings quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>70.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Buildings quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LUCIA</td>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of branches of foreign banks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of branches of foreign banks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Buildings quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES</td>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of branches of foreign banks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of branches of foreign banks</td>
<td>0.0</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 posting index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUDAN</strong></td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 162</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 48.84</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$) 2,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURINAME</strong></td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 165</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 48.05</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$) 6,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWEDEN</strong></td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 12</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100) 81.27</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$) 52,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank):
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 76.35
  - Procedures (number): 9.5
  - Time (days): 34.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 20.9
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0
- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 105
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 67.06
  - Procedures (number): 14
  - Time (days): 240
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0
- **Getting electricity** (rank): 93
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 63.98
  - Procedures (number): 5
  - Time (days): 70
  - Cost (% of property value): 2.0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 5.5
- **Registering property** (rank): 93
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 63.67
  - 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.
### SWITZERLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>75.69</td>
<td>8,466,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)
38

#### Starting a business (rank)
77

#### Score for starting a business (0–100)
88.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
69

#### Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)
71.75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)
11

#### Score for getting electricity (0–100)
94.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–6)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)
16

#### Score for registering property (0–100)
86.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
136

#### Score for starting a business (0–100)
80.99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
186

#### Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)
0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>no practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>no practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)
158

#### Score for getting electricity (0–100)
52.07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>223.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–6)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)
157

#### Score for registering property (0–100)
46.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TAIWAN, CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
20

#### Score for starting a business (0–100)
94.43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
2

#### Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)
87.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)
8

#### Score for getting electricity (0–100)
96.32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–6)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)
19

#### Score for registering property (0–100)
83.89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures (number)</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>28.5</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.
TAJIKISTAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) 60
Score for starting a business (0–100) 90.70
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 11
Cost (% of income per capita) 18.0
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 135
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 61.26
Procedures (number) 25
Time (days) 182
Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.0
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Getting electricity (rank) 173
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 34.74
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 133
Cost (% of income per capita) 89.56
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 91
Score for registering property (0–100) 63.86
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 36
Cost (% of property value) 2.9
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.5

TANZANIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) 163
Score for starting a business (0–100) 72.65
Procedures (number) 10
Time (days) 27.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 58.7
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 150
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 57.10
Procedures (number) 24
Time (days) 184
Cost (% of warehouse value) 6.0
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Getting electricity (rank) 83
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 74.61
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 105
Cost (% of income per capita) 77.52
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5

Registering property (rank) 146
Score for registering property (0–100) 50.14
Procedures (number) 8
Time (days) 67
Cost (% of property value) 5.2
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.5

THAILAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>78.45</td>
<td>5,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) 39
Score for starting a business (0–100) 92.72
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 4.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 3.1
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 67
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 71.88
Procedures (number) 19
Time (days) 18
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.7
Building quality control index (0–15) 11.0

Getting electricity (rank) 6
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 98.57
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 30
Cost (% of income per capita) 40.4
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

Registering property (rank) 66
Score for registering property (0–100) 69.47
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 9
Cost (% of property value) 7.2
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 19.0

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 postfilling 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>TIMOR-LESTE</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOGO</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONGA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>4,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business**
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**
  - Procedures (number)
  - Time (days)
  - Cost (% of income per capita)
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita)

**Dealing with construction permits**
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**
- Procedures (number)
- Time (days)
- Cost (% of warehouse value)
- Building quality control index (0–15)

**Getting electricity**
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**
- Procedures (number)
- Time (days)
- Cost (% of income per capita)
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita)
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)

**Registering property**
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**
- Procedures (number)
- Time (days)
- Cost (% of property value)
- Quality of land administration index (0–30)

**Getting credit**
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)**
- Procedures (number)
- Time (days)
- Cost (% of income per capita)
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita)

**Paying taxes**
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)**
- Procedures (number per year)
- Time (hours per year)
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)
- Postfiling index (0–100)

**Protection minority investors**
- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)**
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10)
- Extent of director liability index (0–10)
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)

**Enforcing contracts**
- **Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)**
- Procedures (number)
- Time (days)
- Cost (% of claim value)
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)

**Resolving insolvency**
- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**
- Time (years)
- Cost (% of estate)
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)

**Trading across borders**
- **Score for trading across borders (0–100)**
- Time (days)
- Documentation compliance (hours)
- Border compliance (hours)
- Cost to import
- Documentation compliance (US$)
- Border compliance (US$)

**Value Added Tax (VAT)**
- **Score for VAT (0–100)**
- Time (days)
- Documentation compliance (hours)
- Border compliance (hours)
- Cost to import
- Documentation compliance (US$)
- Border compliance (US$)

**Quality of justice processes index (0–18)**
- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)**
- Time (years)
- Cost (% of claim value)
- Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)
- Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)

**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.
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 105

Starting a business (rank) 76
Score for starting a business (0–100) 88.57
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 10.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 0.7
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 125
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 64.50
Procedures (number) 16
Time (days) 253
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.1
Building quality control index (0–15) 10.0

Getting electricity (rank) 41
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 84.30
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 61
Cost (% of income per capita) 199.0
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Registering property (rank) 158
Score for registering property (0–100) 46.66
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 77
Cost (% of property value) 0.1
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 11.0

Easing the process of doing business

Getting credit (rank) 60
Score for getting credit (0–100) 65.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 6
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 79.2
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 77
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 61.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 4
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 9
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 5
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 3

PAYING TAXES (rank) 166
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 50.97
Payments (number per year) 39
Time (hours per year) 210
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 39.7
Postfilling index (0–100) 8.00

Enforcing contracts (rank) 174
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 35.62
Time (days) 1,340
Cost (% of claim value) 33.5
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 8.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 77
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 48.48
Time (years) 2.5
Cost (% of estate) 25.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 26.2
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 11.0

TUNISIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 80

Starting a business (rank) 63
Score for starting a business (0–100) 90.23
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 5
Cost (% of income per capita) 4.3
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 77
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 70.66
Procedures (number) 17
Time (days) 95
Cost (% of warehouse value) 5.9
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Getting electricity (rank) 51
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 82.42
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 65
Cost (% of income per capita) 66.48
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Registering property (rank) 87
Score for registering property (0–100) 64.89
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 39
Cost (% of property value) 0.1
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 13.0

Easing the process of doing business

Getting credit (rank) 99
Score for getting credit (0–100) 50.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 3
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 28.8

Protecting minority investors (rank) 83
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 56.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 6
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 7
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 4
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

PAYING TAXES (rank) 133
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 62.25
Payments (number per year) 8
Time (hours per year) 144
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 60.2
Postfilling index (0–100) 22.91

Enforcing contracts (rank) 80
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 59.33
Time (days) 565
Cost (% of claim value) 21.8
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 7.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 67
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 54.19
Time (years) 1.3
Cost (% of estate) 7.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 51.3
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 8.5

TURKEY

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 43

Starting a business (rank) 78
Score for starting a business (0–100) 88.21
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 7
Cost (% of income per capita) 10.6
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 59
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.19
Procedures (number) 18
Time (days) 103
Cost (% of warehouse value) 3.9
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) 60
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 81.23
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 55
Cost (% of income per capita) 38.5
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5

Protecting minority investors (rank) 26
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 71.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 7
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 8

PAYING TAXES (rank) 80
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 74.65
Payments (number per year) 10
Time (hours per year) 170
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 40.9
Postfilling index (0–100) 50.00

Enforcing contracts (rank) 19
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 71.78
Time (days) 609
Cost (% of claim value) 24.9
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 15.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 109
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 40.71
Time (years) 5.0
Cost (% of estate) 14.5
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 14.7
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 10.5

Latin America & Caribbean

GNI per capita (US$) 15,350
Population 1,369,125

Trading across borders (rank) 130
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 62.60
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 32
Border compliance (hours) 60
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 250
Border compliance (US$) 499

Enforcing contracts (rank) 174
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 35.62
Time (days) 1,340
Cost (% of claim value) 33.5
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 8.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 77
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 48.48
Time (years) 2.5
Cost (% of estate) 25.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 26.2
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 11.0

Europe & Central Asia

GNI per capita (US$) 10,930
Population 80,745,020

Trading across borders (rank) 42
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 90.27
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 4
Border compliance (hours) 16
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 55
Border compliance (US$) 358

Enforcing contracts (rank) 19
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 71.78
Time (days) 609
Cost (% of claim value) 24.9
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 15.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 109
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 40.71
Time (years) 5.0
Cost (% of estate) 14.5
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 14.7
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 10.5

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.
<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><strong>UGANDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>57.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>54.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UKRAINE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>68.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>91.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>59.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>69.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED ARAB EMIRATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>81.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>94.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>90.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>66.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Credit to export</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Time to import</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Credit to import</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>Documentation index (0–100)</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>60.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>39.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>77.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Credit to export</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Time to import</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Credit to import</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Documentation index (0–100)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>63.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>317.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (years)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Credit to export</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>71.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Credit to export</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>Time to import</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Credit to import</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>Documentation index (0–100)</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>49.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Cost (% of estate)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## United Kingdom

### Getting electricity
- **Score for getting electricity** (rank): 7
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 50
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 2.9
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

### Registering property
- **Score for registering property** (rank): 42
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 21.5
  - Cost (% of property value): 4.8
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 25.5

### Enforcing contracts
- **Score for enforcing contracts** (rank): 68.69
  - Time (days): 437
  - Cost (% of claim value): 45.7
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 15.0

### Trading across borders
- **Score for trading across borders** (rank): 92.01
  - Time to export: 420
  - Cost (% of claim value): 30.5
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 13.8

### Resolving insolvency
- **Score for resolving insolvency** (rank): 90.91
  - Time (years): 1.0
  - Cost (% of estate): 10.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 81.8
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–30): 15.0

## Latin America & Caribbean

### Getting credit
- **Score for getting credit** (rank): 32
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 11
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 8
  - Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 100.0
  - Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 0.0

### Registering property
- **Score for registering property** (rank): 155
  - Procedures (number): 21
  - Time (days): 251
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.1
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 9.0

### Enforcing contracts
- **Score for enforcing contracts** (rank): 100
  - Time (days): 725
  - Cost (% of claim value): 23.2
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 8.0

### Trading across borders
- **Score for trading across borders** (rank): 57.14
  - Time to export: 420
  - Cost (% of claim value): 30.5
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 13.8

### Resolving insolvency
- **Score for resolving insolvency** (rank): 50.00
  - Time (years): 1.0
  - Cost (% of estate): 10.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 81.8
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–30): 15.0
Europe & Central Asia

Country | GNI per capita (US$) | Population | Ease of doing business score (0–100) | Easy of starting a business (rank) | Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank) | Ease of registering property (rank) | Ease of getting electricity (rank) | Ease of paying taxes (rank)
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

**UZBEKISTAN**

- **GNI per capita (US$):** 1,980
- **Population:** 32,367,200
- **Ease of doing business score (0–100):** 67.40
- **Ease of starting a business (rank):** 17
- **Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank):** 61.37
- **Ease of registering property (rank):** 71
- **Ease of getting electricity (rank):** 86.05
- **Ease of paying taxes (rank):** 64

**Country Tables**

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 76
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 95.79
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 61.37
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 66.60
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Note:** Most indicator values reflect the average for the two largest business cities. For some countries, a result of “no practice” or “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

**Easy of doing business score (0–100):** 62.87
- **Score for getting credit (rank):** 32
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 76.92

**Easy of starting a business (rank):** 132
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 58.09
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 90.08
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 49.87
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of dealing with construction permits (rank):** 147
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 58.09
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 49.87
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of registering property (rank):** 79
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 65.64
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of getting electricity (rank):** 107
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 69.06
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 65.64
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of paying taxes (rank):** 58
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 77.85
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Latin America & Caribbean**

Country | GNI per capita (US$) | Population | Ease of doing business score (0–100) | Easy of starting a business (rank) | Easy of dealing with construction permits (rank) | Easy of registering property (rank) | Easy of getting electricity (rank) | Easy of paying taxes (rank)
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

**VENEZUELA, RB**

- **GNI per capita (US$):** 8,132
- **Population:** 31,977,065
- **Ease of doing business score (0–100):** 30.61
- **Ease of starting a business (rank):** 190
- **Ease of dealing with construction permits (rank):** 152
- **Ease of registering property (rank):** 138
- **Ease of getting electricity (rank):** 186
- **Ease of paying taxes (rank):** 189

**Easy of doing business rank (1–190):** 188
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 25.00
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 56.86
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 49.87
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 69.06
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of starting a business (rank):** 190
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 56.86
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 90.08
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 49.87
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of dealing with construction permits (rank):** 152
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 56.86
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 49.87
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of registering property (rank):** 138
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 51.92
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of getting electricity (rank):** 186
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 18.85
- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 51.92
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Easy of paying taxes (rank):** 189
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 15.35
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 86.05
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100):** 64

**Note:** Most indicator values reflect the average for the two largest business cities. For some countries, a result of “no practice” or “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Starting a business (rank)

Score for starting a business (0–100) 84.82
Procedures (number) 8
Time (days) 17
Cost (% of income per capita) 5.9
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank)

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 79.05
Procedures (number) 10
Time (days) 166
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.7
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Registering property (rank)

Score for registering property (0–100) 71.09
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 53.5
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 14.0

Getting electricity (rank)

Score for getting electricity (0–100) 87.94
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 31
Cost (% of income per capita) 1,083.5
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4) 7

Enforcing contracts (rank)

Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 48.52
Time to import 100
Documentary compliance (hours) 50
Border compliance (hours) 55
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 139
Border compliance (US$) 290

Resolving insolvency (rank)

Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 68.92
Time (years) 29.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 7.5

YEMEN, REP.

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 187

Getting credit (rank) 186
Score for getting credit (0–100) 0.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 0
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 1.3

Protecting minority investors (rank) 132
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 43.33
Time to import 25.0
Documentary compliance (hours) 50
Border compliance (hours) 55
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 139
Border compliance (US$) 290

Resolving insolvency (rank) 157
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 35.72
Time (years) 30.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 4.0

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>COUNTRY Tables</th>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZAMBIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,329.1</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZIMBABWE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,631.5</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</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.
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