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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.

This publication is the printed version of Doing Business 2019. The full report (which includes the data notes, ease of doing business score and ease of doing business ranking chapter and the reform summaries) can be downloaded from the Doing Business website at http://www.doingbusiness.org.
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.
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

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.
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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.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Source: Doing Business database.
\(^2\) Note: Labor market regulation is not included in the ease of doing business ranking.
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
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
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>EODB score change</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>EODB score change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>86.59 +0.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>69.24 +0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>85.24 +0.27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>69.01 +0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>84.64 +0.59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>68.89 -0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China</td>
<td>84.22 +0.04</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>68.83 +0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>84.14 +0.66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>68.63 +1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>83.82 +0.48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>68.33 +2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>82.95 +0.25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>68.25 +0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>82.75 -0.01</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>68.08 -0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>82.65 +0.33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>67.96 +1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Macedonia, FYR</td>
<td>81.55 +0.32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>67.74 +0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>81.28 +2.37</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>67.47 +0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>81.17 +0.00</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>67.40 +1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>80.90 +0.24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>67.23 +6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>80.83 +0.29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>67.19 -0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>80.60 +2.57</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>66.12 +0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>80.50 +0.01</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>66.11 +1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>80.35 +0.05</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>66.08 +0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>80.13 -0.01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>66.03 +1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>79.59 +0.33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>65.89 +0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>79.58 +1.29</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>65.43 +0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>79.35 +0.05</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>65.41 +0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>79.26 +0.38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>65.40 +0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>78.91 -0.51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>65.08 +1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>78.90 0.00</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>64.74 +2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>78.64 +7.10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>63.82 +0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>78.57 +0.03</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>63.77 +0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>78.45 +1.06</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>63.59 +0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>77.89 +0.73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>63.30 +1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>77.88 +4.15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>63.02 +0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>77.68 +0.07</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>62.91 +0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>77.37 +0.61</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>62.60 +0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>77.29 +0.99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>62.41 -0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>76.95 -0.36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>62.20 +0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>76.55 -0.07</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>62.17 +1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>76.10 +0.05</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>62.02 +8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>76.04 +0.10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>61.22 +1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>75.71 +0.72</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>61.15 +0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>75.68 +0.07</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>61.12 +0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>75.65 +0.05</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>61.07 +0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>75.61 +0.02</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>60.98 +1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>75.37 +2.06</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>60.81 -0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>75.17 +0.29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>60.60 +0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>74.33 +4.34</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>60.53 +0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>74.15 +0.44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>60.12 +1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>73.95 +2.24</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>60.01 +2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>73.64 +6.64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>59.63 -0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>73.54 +0.38</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>59.59 +0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>73.49 +0.17</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>59.48 +0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>73.23 +0.64</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>59.40 +0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>72.73 +0.20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>59.22 +2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>72.56 -0.15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>59.17 +0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>72.30 -0.53</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>59.11 +0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>72.28 +0.34</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>58.95 +0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>72.09 -0.18</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>58.90 +0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>72.02 +1.85</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>58.80 +0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>71.81 +0.37</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>58.56 +2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>71.71 +0.44</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>58.22 +0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>71.40 +0.34</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>58.00 +4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>71.24 +0.11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>57.94 +0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>71.02 +2.46</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>57.68 +1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>70.31 +5.25</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>57.13 +0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>69.85 +1.82</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>57.11 +0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>69.51 +0.50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>57.06 +0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Puerto Rico (U.S.)</td>
<td>69.46 +0.20</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep.</td>
<td>56.98 +2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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.
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?](image)

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.

**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

---

**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 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</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.
an amicable mode of dispute settlement. The OHADA Uniform Act adopts a broad scope of application by covering conventional and judicial mediation and sets out the guiding principles for 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>Reforms making it easier to do business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>+10.64</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>+8.87</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>+6.64</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+7.10</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>+6.63</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>+6.32</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+5.25</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>+4.94</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+4.34</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+4.15</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes</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 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
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.23 Such training improves experts’ productivity and

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of topics with media campaign (0–6)</th>
<th>Business regulatory reforms in 2017/18 (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–1</td>
<td>0–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average ease of doing business score (0–100)

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 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 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>Cameroon; 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 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.</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>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Economies</td>
<td>Some highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making it easier to register property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening legal rights of borrowers and lenders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving the sharing of credit information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 Angulatú 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; Uganda</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.
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.

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. 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...
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 startup 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.1 What Doing Business measures—11 areas of business regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

stock exchanges and private credit as a percentage of GDP.
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 2.3 Advantages and limitations of the Doing Business methodology**

<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.
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.8 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 case.

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.9 This year’s report draws on the inputs of more than 13,800 professionals.10 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...
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, Madagascar, 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 2003.11

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.12 The papers cited here are just a few examples of research done in the areas measured by Doing Business.13 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%.14 These reforms also resulted in 14.9% of informal business owners shifting to the
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. 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
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.


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 continuous 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

---

**FIGURE 3.1** Most economies do not legally require training for business registry officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training not required</th>
<th>Training required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Only minimum time: 43%
- Only minimum frequency: 27%
- Minimum time and frequency: 9%
- No minimum time or frequency: 7%

Source: Doing Business database.
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.

**FIGURE 3.2** Economies with training programs tend to score better than those without

![Graph showing the score for starting a business, registering property](image)

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: For training at the business registry, this relationship is significant at the 1% level after controlling for income per capita. For training at the land registry, this relationship is significant at the 5% level after controlling for income per capita.

**FIGURE 3.3** Workshops are the most common channel for communicating changes to registry

![Graph showing the share of economies using communication channel](image)

Source: Doing Business database.

Note: An economy can use multiple channels of communication as listed above. Economies where changes are not communicated (two economies) are excluded from the sample. Workshops refer to the use of presentations for a group of people. Pilot tests refer to the use of small-scale experiments or tests to introduce changes. Dissemination campaigns refer to the use of social media or billboards. Public broadcast refers to using television or radio transmission to convey changes.
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.

When EET programs target budding entrepreneurs, results show significant increases in self-employment, household consumption, and income two years after the intervention. Over time, evaluations find positive and significant effects of EET on business growth such as, for example, enhancing entrepreneurs’ access to credit. Training programs also succeeded in teaching new entrepreneurs managerial skills useful to the operation of their businesses. In addition, business-support interventions for small and medium-size enterprises like training programs help improve firm performance and create jobs. 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.

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.

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. 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](chart1)

**Average time to start a business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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![Average time to transfer property](chart2)

**Average time to transfer property**

<table>
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<td>Used</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

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

![Figure 3.5](image-url)

**FIGURE 3.5** Most OECD high-income economies provide registry training to entrepreneurs

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 Valentovich 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
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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. 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 (REW) 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. 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, 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?

![Graph showing share of economies with internal wiring inspection method (%)](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 is current practice in OECD high-income economies such as Germany and Sweden. These economies do not require internal wiring checks as all electricians (i) must undergo a rigorous professional certification process and (ii) 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 (rightfuly) 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
inspection requirements compared to those with none (figure 4.4).

**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.

**NOTES**
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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.1 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.2

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.3 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 as a law enforcement officer, the customs broker is a third-party, private entity who deals directly with customs officials 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 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 the implementation of new processes or the training of new staff. Training can support the successful implementation of trade-related reforms by communicating relevant information about new programs and their requirements—simply knowing more about reforms could make government employees more likely to adopt them. Indeed, education and training are positively associated with reform implementation. Education and training can also improve communication, which is crucial for conveying pertinent information on new standards.

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 communications 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.

**THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATING AND COMMUNICATING CHANGE**

Training policies typically require the support of the government to be successful, and training in customs is no exception. 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. Education, training and communication can support the successful implementation of trade-related regulatory reforms (box 5.1). 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
BOX 5.1 Promoting reform implementation through education, training and communication

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 in reforming economies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training frequency of customs officials in non-reforming economies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</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, knowledgeable 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.14 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.15

The future orientation of customs will require a transition toward a knowledge-based model.16 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.17 Education also improves the transferability of skills18 and is key to building technology absorption capacity.19

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.

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,
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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. 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,

FIGURE 5.4 Customs brokers are more expensive in economies with greater qualifications requirements


Note: Doing Business collects data on whether the following qualifications are required to operate as a customs broker: university degree, pass an official exam or obtain a license. “One qualification” means that only one of these qualifications is required; “three qualifications” means that a broker must have a university degree, pass an official exam and obtain a license. The average cost to hire a customs broker is calculated based on Doing Business data for 188 economies. Of these, 24 economies do not require any qualifications, 68 require one qualification, 68 require two qualifications and 28 require three qualifications. The “no practice” economies of Eritrea and the Republic of Yemen are excluded from the sample.

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
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. In 87% of economies measured by Doing Business, customs brokers participate in training programs organized by the customs administration. 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**

**In 87% of economies measured by Doing Business, customs brokers participate in training programs organized by the customs administration.**
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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.

- 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.
TABLE 6.1 Principles of judicial training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common principle</th>
<th>European Judicial Training Network principles</th>
<th>International Organization for Judicial Training principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judicial training is multidisciplinary and includes legal and non-legal knowledge, professional skills and values.</td>
<td>Judicial training is a multidisciplinary and practical type of training, essentially intended for the transmission of professional techniques and values complementary to legal education.</td>
<td>Acknowledging the complexity of the judicial role, judicial training should be multidisciplinary and include training in law, non-legal knowledge, skills, social context, values and ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges need to receive initial training.</td>
<td>All judges should receive initial training before or on their appointment.</td>
<td>All members of the judiciary should receive training before or upon their appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous training is a right and responsibility for judges.</td>
<td>All judges should have the right to regular continuous training after appointment and throughout their careers and it is their responsibility to undertake it. They should have time for it as part of their working time. Every Member State should put in place systems that ensure judges are able to exercise this right and responsibility.</td>
<td>All members of the judiciary should also receive regular training throughout their careers. It is the right and the responsibility of all members of the judiciary to undertake training. Each member of the judiciary should have time to be involved in training as part of their judicial work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions responsible for judicial training should determine the content.</td>
<td>In accordance with the principles of judicial independence the design, content and delivery of judicial training are exclusively for national institutions responsible for judicial training to determine.</td>
<td>To preserve judicial independence, the judiciary and judicial training institutions should be responsible for the design, content, and delivery of judicial training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges should train judges.</td>
<td>Training should primarily be delivered by judges who have been previously trained for this purpose.</td>
<td>Training should be judge-led and delivered primarily by members of the judiciary who have been trained for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate education techniques should be used.</td>
<td>Active and modern educational techniques should be given primacy in judicial training.</td>
<td>Judicial training should reflect best practices in professional and adult training program design. It should employ a wide range of up-to-date methodologies, involving new technologies, distance/online learning (complementary when appropriate) and electronic media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate funding should be allocated.</td>
<td>Member States should provide national institutions responsible for judicial training with sufficient funding and other resources to achieve their aims and objectives.</td>
<td>All states should provide their institutions responsible for judicial training with sufficient funding and other resources to achieve their aims and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The senior judiciary should support training.</td>
<td>The highest judicial authorities should support judicial training.</td>
<td>Judicial leaders and the senior judiciary should support judicial training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


for specialized judges has increased. However, just 101 of the 190 economies measured by Doing Business have a specialized commercial jurisdiction 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, including a large number and diverse type of creditors, insolvency representatives, practitioners and the debtor facing financial difficulties. Judges that deal with these types of cases must be highly knowledgeable and develop particular skills (such as financial and accounting skills).

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. Continued
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. 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. 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. 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 scores](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 proportion 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 can act as an essential conduit for the introduction of new laws, methods and practices to the judiciary.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Trainees</th>
<th>Cases Upheld in Second Instance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

![Graph showing decrease in time to resolve insolvency from 2005 to 2013](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.

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 2016.28

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.
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Annex: Labor Market Regulation

*Trends from Doing Business data*

Every economy in the world has a system of laws and regulations that mediates 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 distorting 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.

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

- Given the changing dynamics of work, assessing the right level of regulatory intervention in the labor market is critical. Doing Business measures some key aspects of labor market laws and regulations.
- Doing Business data show that flexible labor regulation is associated with a higher number of newly registered companies.
- In economies with a cumbersome labor regulatory framework, a larger share of firms rely on temporary workers as a share of total workers.
- Low-income economies are among those with the highest severance pay upon dismissal. These economies also have the lowest incidence of unemployment protection schemes.
- National training funds are available in two-thirds of economies globally, the majority of which are in the OECD high-income group.
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 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

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

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


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 costs, employers may be induced to choose to keep senior workers over junior ones.

---

**FIGURE 7.2** Lower-middle-income economies have the most restrictions on night, weekly holiday and overtime work

![Chart showing the share of economies where work restrictions are in place.](source: Doing Business database.)
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%. 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. 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. Unemployment protection policies are critical in promoting inclusive labor markets, human capital development, productivity and economic growth. 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.

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. *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.
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.30 In Brazil the Serviço Nacional de Aprendizagem Industrial (SENAI, the National Service for Industrial Training) and its associated institutions,31 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.32 In East Asia and the Pacific, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic established a national training fund in 2010.33 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 2014.
10. International Labor Organization data (http://www.ilo.org/iolstat); 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 (Serviço Nacional de Aprendizagem Comercial, SENAC), rural areas (Serviço Nacional de Aprendizagem Rural, SENAR), small enterprises (Serviço Brasileiro de Apoio às Micro e Pequenas Empresas, SEBRAE) and transport (Serviço 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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## Country Tables

### AFGHANISTAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>South Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank) 49
  - Score for starting a business (0–100) 92.04
  - Procedures (number) 4.5
  - Time (days) 8.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 6.4
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

- **Registering property** (rank) 186
  - Score for registering property (0–100) 27.50
  - Procedures (number) 9
  - Time (days) 250
  - Cost (% of property value) 5.0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 3.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank) 168
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100) 64.51
  - Procedures (number) 6
  - Time (days) 114
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 2,448.3
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 184
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 34.54
  - Procedures (number) 13
  - Time (days) 199
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 73.0
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 3.0

- **Getting credit** (rank) 199
  - Score for getting credit (0–100) 70.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 10
  - 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) 26
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 71.67
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 9
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 9
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 9
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

- **Paying taxes** (rank) 177
  - Score for paying taxes (0–100) 43.27
  - Payments (number per year) 19
  - Time (hours per year) 270
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 71.4
  - Postfiling index (0–100) 4.46

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 177
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100) 50.00
  - Time to export
    - Documentary compliance (hours) 228
    - Border compliance (hours) 48
    - Cost to export
      - Documentary compliance (US$) 344
      - Border compliance (US$) 453

- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) 181
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 31.76
  - Time (years) 2.0
  - Cost (% of estate) 25.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 26.5
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 5.0

- **Resolving insolvent** (rank) 74
  - Score for resolving insolvent (0–100) 51.78
  - Time (years) 2.0
  - Cost (% of claim value) 29.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 26.5
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18) 12.0

### ALBANIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Europe &amp; Central Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>69.51</td>
<td>4,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank) 50
  - Score for starting a business (0–100) 91.58
  - Procedures (number) 5
  - Time (days) 5
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 11.3
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank) 151
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 57.01
  - Procedures (number) 18
  - Time (days) 299
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 5.6
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank) 140
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100) 57.71
  - Procedures (number) 6
  - Time (days) 134
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 504.7
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 3

- **Registering property** (rank) 98
  - Score for registering property (0–100) 62.08
  - Procedures (number) 5
  - Time (days) 19
  - Cost (% of property value) 9.2
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 15.5

- **Getting credit** (rank) 44
  - Score for getting credit (0–100) 70.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 10
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
  - Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 1.6
  - Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 1.3

- **Protecting minority investors** (rank) 26
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 71.67
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 9
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 9
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 9
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

- **Paying taxes** (rank) 122
  - Score for paying taxes (0–100) 64.91
  - Payments (number per year) 35
  - Time (hours per year) 252
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 37.3
  - Postfiling index (0–100) 60.11

- **Trading across borders** (rank) 24
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100) 96.29
  - Time to export
    - Documentary compliance (hours) 6
    - Border compliance (hours) 9
    - Cost to export
      - Documentary compliance (US$) 10
      - Border compliance (US$) 55

- **Enforcing contracts** (rank) 98
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 56.44
  - Time (years) 5.25
  - Cost (% of claim value) 34.9
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 26.5
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 7.5

- **Resolving insolvent** (rank) 39
  - Score for resolving insolvent (0–100) 67.42
  - Time (years) 2.0
  - Cost (% of estate) 10.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 24.4
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18) 14.0

---

**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.
Getting electricity as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy. 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.

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 economies, the data are for all business sizes.

<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>ALGERIA</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>41,318,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGOLA</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>29,784,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59.48</td>
<td>14,170</td>
<td>102,012</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 economies, the data are for all business sizes.
ARGENTINA

<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>119</td>
<td>58.80</td>
<td>13,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business (rank) 128
Score for starting a business (0–100) 81.99
Procedures (number) 11
Time (days) 11
Cost (% of income per capita) 5.3
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 74
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 51.01
Procedures (number) 21
Time (days) 341
Cost ($ of warehouse value) 2.9
Building quality control index (0–15) 11.0

Getting electricity (rank) 103
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 70.02
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 92
Cost ($ of income per capita) 21.0
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5

Registering property (rank) 119
Score for registering property (0–100) 56.73
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 51.5
Cost (% of property value) 6.6
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 13.5

**Latin America & Caribbean**

Getting credit (rank) 85
Score for getting credit (0–100) 55.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 3
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 45.7

Protecting minority investors (rank) 57
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 61.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 2
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 7
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

Pay taxes (rank) 169
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 49.34
Payments (number per year) 9
Time (hours per year) 311.5
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 106.0
Postfiling index (0–100) 47.94

Trading across borders (rank) 125
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 63.36
Time to export 11
Documentary compliance (hours) 30
Border compliance (hours) 21
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 60
Border compliance (US$) 150

Enforcing contracts (rank) 107
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 55.66
Time (days) 995
Cost (% of claim value) 22.5
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 104
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 41.24
Time (years) 2.4
Cost (% of estate) 16.5
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 21.5
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 9.5

**Europe & Central Asia**

Getting credit (rank) 44
Score for getting credit (0–100) 70.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 80.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 51
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 63.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 6
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 6
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 14
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 7
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 8

Pay taxes (rank) 82
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 74.46
Payments (number per year) 14
Time (hours per year) 262
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 18.5
Postfiling index (0–100) 49.08

Trading across borders (rank) 46
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 89.22
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 2
Border compliance (hours) 39
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 150
Border compliance (US$) 100

Enforcing contracts (rank) 24
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 70.63
Time (days) 570
Cost (% of claim value) 16.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 12.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 95
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 43.99
Time (years) 1.9
Cost (% of estate) 11.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 38.2
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 7.5

**Australia**

Getting credit (rank) 8
Score for getting credit (0–100) 90.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 9
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 64
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 60.66
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 2
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 4
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 9

Pay taxes (rank) 26
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 85.64
Payments (number per year) 11
Time (hours per year) 105
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 47.4
Postfiling index (0–100) 95.34

Trading across borders (rank) 103
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 70.30
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 7
Border compliance (hours) 36
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 264
Border compliance (US$) 766

Enforcing contracts (rank) 5
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 79.00
Time (days) 402
Cost (% of claim value) 23.2
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 15.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 20
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 78.87
Time (years) 1.0
Cost (% of estate) 8.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 82.7
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 11.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### AUSTRIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>45,440</td>
<td>8,809,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Registering property** rank 169
- **Getting credit** rank 85
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)** 55.00
- **Depth of credit information index (0–8)** 7
- **Credit bureau coverage (%) of adults** 52.2
- **Credit registry coverage (%) of adults** 2.2
- **Protecting minority investors** rank 33
- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)** 68.33
- **Extent of disclosure index (0–10)** 5
- **Extent of director liability index (0–10)** 5
- **Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)** 7
- **Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)** 7
- **Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)** 9
- **Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)** 8
- **Paying taxes** rank 40
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)** 83.45
- **Payments (number per year)** 12
- **Time (hours per year)** 131
- **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** 51.5
- **Postfiling index (0–100)** 98.54

### AZERBAIJAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>25</td>
<td>78.64</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>9,862,429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Registering property** rank 17
- **Getting credit** rank 22
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)** 80.00
- **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)** 8
- **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
- **Paying taxes** rank 28
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)** 85.23
- **Payments (number per year)** 6
- **Time (hours per year)** 159
- **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** 40.8
- **Postfiling index (0–100)** 83.79

### BAHAMAS, THE

<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>118</td>
<td>58.90</td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>395,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Registering property** rank 169
- **Getting credit** rank 144
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)** 30.00
- **Depth of credit information index (0–8)** 7
- **Credit bureau coverage (%) of adults** 0.0
- **Credit registry coverage (%) of adults** 0.0
- **Protecting minority investors** rank 132
- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)** 43.33
- **Extent of disclosure index (0–10)** 2
- **Extent of director liability index (0–10)** 5
- **Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)** 8
- **Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)** 7
- **Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)** 1
- **Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)** 3
- **Paying taxes** rank 50
- **Score for paying taxes (0–100)** 80.13
- **Payments (number per year)** 20
- **Time (hours per year)** 197
- **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** 31.5
- **Postfiling index (0–100)** 79.27

**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.
### 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>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAHRAIN</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69.85</td>
<td>20,240</td>
<td>1,492,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank): 66
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 89.07
- Procedures (number): 6.5
- Time (days): 8.5
- Cost (% of income per capita): 1.1
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 3.1

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 57
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 73.80
- Procedures (number): 11
- Time (days): 174
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 3.9
- Building quality control index (0–15): 12.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 82
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 74.82
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 85
- Cost (% of income per capita): 61.0
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 5

- **Registering property** (rank): 26
- Score for registering property (0–100): 81.07
- Procedures (number): 2
- Time (days): 31
- Cost (% of property value): 1.7
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 17.5

### South Asia

<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>BANGLADESH</strong></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>41.97</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>164,669,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank): 138
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 80.82
- Procedures (number): 15.8
- Time (days): 273.5
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.8
- Building quality control index (0–15): 10.0

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 179
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 30.81
- Procedures (number): 8.6
- Time (days): 150.2
- Cost (% of income per capita): 2,155.9
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

- **Registering property** (rank): 183
- Score for registering property (0–100): 28.91
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 270.8
- Cost (% of property value): 7.2
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 6.5

### 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><strong>BARBADOS</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>285,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business** (rank): 101
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 85.15
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 15
- Cost (% of income per capita): 7.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 8.0

- **Dealing with construction permits** (rank): 154
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 56.64
- Procedures (number): 9
- Time (days): 442
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.2
- Building quality control index (0–15): 6.5

- **Getting electricity** (rank): 114
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 65.12
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 88
- Cost (% of income per capita): 6.1
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

- **Registering property** (rank): 129
- Score for registering property (0–100): 54.33
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 105
- Cost (% of property value): 1.9
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 11.5

### 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.

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

- ✔ Trading across borders
- ✗ Postfiling index
- ✔ Credit registry coverage
- ✗ Depth of credit information index
- ✔ Credit bureau coverage
- ✗ Extent of disclosure index
- ✔ Extent of director liability index
- ✗ Extent of shareholder rights index
- ✔ Extent of ownership and control index
- ✗ Extent of corporate transparency index
- ✔ Protecting minority investors
- ✗ Cost to import
- ✔ Credit bureau coverage
- ✗ Credit registry coverage
- ✔ Score for protecting minority investors
- ✗ Cost (% of warehouse value)
- ✔ Building quality control index
- ✗ Procedures (number)
- ✔ Time (hours per year)
- ✗ Total tax and contribution rate
- ✔ Posingilf index
- ✗ Quality of judicial processes index
- ✔ Score for enforcing contracts
- ✗ Quality of judicial processes index
- ✔ Score for resolving insolvency
- ✗ Quality of judicial processes index
BELARUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>93.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>74.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>90.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>92.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BELGIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>93.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4</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>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>67.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>51.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BELIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>73.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>65.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>72.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>32.3</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>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>52.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>75.77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</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>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>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>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>70.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>57.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</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>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>79.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfilling index (0–100)</td>
<td>85.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GNI per capita (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>5,280</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>9,507,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### 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>BENIN</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>51.42</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>11,175,692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 61
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 90.60
- **Procedures (number)**: 6
- **Time (days)**: 85
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 3.6
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 5.2

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 73.98
- **Procedures (number)**: 13
- **Time (days)**: 88
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 2.9
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 0.0

#### Getting electricity
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 176
- **Procedures (number)**: 5
- **Time (days)**: 90
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 11.98
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)**: 0

#### Registering property
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 130
- **Procedures (number)**: 4
- **Time (days)**: 120
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 3.4
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 6.5

### South Asia

<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>BHUTAN</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66.08</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>807,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 91
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 86.38
- **Procedures (number)**: 8
- **Time (days)**: 12
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 3.5
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 68.85
- **Procedures (number)**: 21
- **Time (days)**: 150
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 1.0
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 1.20

#### Getting electricity
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 73
- **Procedures (number)**: 4
- **Time (days)**: 61
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 412.3
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)**: 4

#### Registering property
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 72.99
- **Procedures (number)**: 3
- **Time (days)**: 77
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 5.0
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 23.5

### 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>BOLIVIA</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>11,051,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 178
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 64.33
- **Procedures (number)**: 14
- **Time (days)**: 43.5
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 46.0
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita)**: 8.0

#### Dealing with construction permits
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 55.68
- **Procedures (number)**: 13
- **Time (days)**: 322
- **Cost (% of warehouse value)**: 1.3
- **Building quality control index (0–15)**: 7.0

#### Getting electricity
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 111
- **Procedures (number)**: 8
- **Time (days)**: 42
- **Cost (% of income per capita)**: 63.1
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–4)**: 6

#### Registering property
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 49.90
- **Procedures (number)**: 7
- **Time (days)**: 90
- **Cost (% of property value)**: 4.7
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 7.0

### 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.
- **Reform making it easier to do business**
- **Change making it more difficult to do business**

### COUNTRY TABLES

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190)**
- **Ease of doing business score (0–100)**
- **GNI per capita (US$)**
- **Population**
## Key Indicators

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>209,288,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Brazil

#### Starting a business

- **Ease of doing business rank:** 109
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 80.23
- **Procedures (number):** 13.6
- **Time (days):** 20.5
- **Cost (% of income per capita):** 5.0
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita):** 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits

- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 49.86
- **Procedures (number):** 19.2
- **Time (days):** 434
- **Cost (% of warehouse value):** 0.7
- **Building quality control index (0–15):** 9.0

#### Getting electricity

- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 84.37
- **Procedures (number):** 4
- **Time (days):** 64.4
- **Cost (% of income per capita):** 10.0
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8):** 6

#### Registering property

- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 51.94
- **Procedures (number):** 13.6
- **Time (days):** 31.4
- **Cost (% of property value):** 11.3
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30):** 13.8

#### Getting credit

- **Score for getting credit (0–100):** 50.00
- **Strength of legal rights index (0–12):** 2
- **Depth of credit information index (0–8):** 8
- **Credit bureau coverage (% of adults):** 80.5
- **Credit registry coverage (% of adults):** 78.7

#### Protecting minority investors

- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100):** 65.80
- **Extant of disclosure index (0–10):** 5
- **Extant of director liability index (0–10):** 8
- **Extant of shareholder rights index (0–10):** 7
- **Extant of ownership and control index (0–10):** 6
- **Extant of corporate transparency index (0–10):** 9

#### Trading across borders

- **Score for trading across borders (0–100):** 106
- **Time (days):** 571
- **Cost (% of claim value):** 2.5
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18):** 13.1

#### Resolving insolvency

- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100):** 18.0
- **Time (days):** 39.8
- **Cost (% of estate):** 18.0
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar):** 65.9
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18):** 4.0

### Other Regions

#### Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>63.82</td>
<td>4,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,507,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Europe

#### Starting a business

- **Ease of doing business rank:** 89
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 59.57
- **Procedures (number):** 13
- **Time (days):** 81
- **Cost (% of income per capita):** 14.9
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita):** 11.1

#### Dealing with construction permits

- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 53.22
- **Procedures (number):** 16
- **Time (days):** 193
- **Cost (% of warehouse value):** 16.3
- **Building quality control index (0–15):** 13.0

#### Getting electricity

- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 60.26
- **Procedures (number):** 8
- **Time (days):** 125
- **Cost (% of income per capita):** 331.3
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8):** 6

#### Registering property

- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 61.99
- **Procedures (number):** 7
- **Time (days):** 24
- **Cost (% of property value):** 5.2
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30):** 13.0

#### Getting credit

- **Score for getting credit (0–100):** 55.00
- **Strength of legal rights index (0–12):** 5
- **Depth of credit information index (0–8):** 6
- **Credit bureau coverage (% of adults):** 53.6
- **Credit registry coverage (% of adults):** 0.0

#### Protecting minority investors

- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100):** 56.67
- **Extant of disclosure index (0–10):** 7
- **Extant of director liability index (0–10):** 8
- **Extant of shareholder rights index (0–10):** 6
- **Extant of ownership and control index (0–10):** 3
- **Extant of corporate transparency index (0–10):** 7

#### Trading across borders

- **Score for trading across borders (0–100):** 86.65
- **Time (days):** 595
- **Cost (% of claim value):** 36.0
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18):** 10.5

#### Resolving insolvency

- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100):** 95.0
- **Time (days):** 18
- **Cost (% of estate):** 18.0
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar):** 65.9
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18):** 3.5

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</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>65.40</td>
<td>8,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,291,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

#### Starting a business

- **Ease of doing business rank:** 86
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 76.22
- **Procedures (number):** 9
- **Time (days):** 98
- **Cost (% of income per capita):** 0.6
- **Minimum capital (% of income per capita):** 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits

- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100):** 76.58
- **Procedures (number):** 15
- **Time (days):** 102
- **Cost (% of warehouse value):** 0.4
- **Building quality control index (0–15):** 10.5

#### Getting electricity

- **Score for getting electricity (0–100):** 59.43
- **Procedures (number):** 5
- **Time (days):** 77
- **Cost (% of income per capita):** 266.5
- **Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8):** 0

#### Registering property

- **Score for registering property (0–100):** 65.43
- **Procedures (number):** 4
- **Time (days):** 27
- **Cost (% of property value):** 5.1
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30):** 10.0

#### Getting credit

- **Score for getting credit (0–100):** 85.00
- **Strength of legal rights index (0–12):** 5
- **Depth of credit information index (0–8):** 6
- **Credit bureau coverage (% of adults):** 53.6
- **Credit registry coverage (% of adults):** 0.0

#### Protecting minority investors

- **Score for protecting minority investors (0–100):** 57.67
- **Extant of disclosure index (0–10):** 7
- **Extant of director liability index (0–10):** 8
- **Extant of shareholder rights index (0–10):** 6
- **Extant of ownership and control index (0–10):** 3
- **Extant of corporate transparency index (0–10):** 7

#### Trading across borders

- **Score for trading across borders (0–100):** 93.49
- **Time (days):** 120
- **Cost (% of claim value):** 39.8
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18):** 7.0

#### Resolving insolvency

- **Score for resolving insolvency (0–100):** 97.99
- **Time (days):** 134
- **Cost (% of estate):** 13.7
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar):** 65.9
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18):** 4.0

### Enforcing contracts

- **Score for enforcing contracts (0–100):** 97.99
- **Time (days):** 134
- **Cost (% of estate):** 13.7
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar):** 65.9
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18):** 4.0

### Reform making it easier to do business

- **Score for reforming insolvency (0–100):** 65.9
- **Time (days):** 37
- **Cost (% of claim value):** 2.5
- **Quality of judicial processes index (0–18):** 13.1

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- **Score for change making it more difficult to do business (0–100):** 77
- **Time (days):** 4.0
- **Cost (% of estate):** 12.0
- **Recovery rate (cents on the dollar):** 14.6
- **Strength of insolvency framework index (0–18):** 13.0

**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.
| COUNTRY TABLES | 81 |

堧 Bruins Darussalam

| Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 55 |

- Starting a business (rank) 16
- Score for starting a business (0–100) 94.92
  - Procedures (number) 3.5
  - Time (days) 5.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 1.2
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

- Dealing with construction permits (rank) 55
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.49
  - Procedures (number) 20
  - Time (days) 83
  - Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.9
  - Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

- Getting electricity (rank) 31
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100) 86.57
  - Procedures (number) 5
  - Time (days) 35
  - Cost (% of income per capita) 40.1
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

- Registering property (rank) 142
  - Score for registering property (0–100) 51.48
  - Procedures (number) 7
  - Time (days) 298.5
  - Cost (% of property value) 9.6
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 18.0

Bulgaria

| Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 59 |

- Starting a business (rank) 99
  - Score for starting a business (0–100) 85.83
    - Procedures (number) 18
    - Time (days) 23
    - Cost (% of income per capita) 1.1
    - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

- Dealing with construction permits (rank) 37
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 75.46
    - Procedures (number) 18
    - Time (days) 97
    - Cost (% of warehouse value) 3.8
    - Building quality control index (0–15) 14.0

- Getting electricity (rank) 147
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100) 54.93
    - Procedures (number) 6
    - Time (days) 262
    - Cost (% of income per capita) 428.8
    - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

- Registering property (rank) 67
  - Score for registering property (0–100) 69.32
    - Procedures (number) 8
    - Time (days) 19
    - Cost (% of property value) 2.9
    - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 19.0

Burkina Faso

| Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 151 |

- Starting a business (rank) 79
  - Score for starting a business (0–100) 88.19
    - Procedures (number) 3
    - Time (days) 13
    - Cost (% of income per capita) 42.5
    - Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 6.6

- Dealing with construction permits (rank) 58
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.25
    - Procedures (number) 14
    - Time (days) 121
    - Cost (% of warehouse value) 4.7
    - Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

- Getting electricity (rank) 181
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100) 29.42
    - Procedures (number) 4
    - Time (days) 69
    - Cost (% of income per capita) 9.35
    - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

- Registering property (rank) 145
  - Score for registering property (0–100) 50.47
    - Procedures (number) 4
    - Time (days) 67
    - Cost (% of property value) 12
    - Quality of land administration index (0–30) 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 posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
## DOING BUSINESS 2019

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<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>BURUNDI</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>Score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</th>
<th>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</th>
<th>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</th>
<th>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</th>
<th>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</th>
<th>Paying taxes (rank)</th>
<th>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</th>
<th>Payments (number per year)</th>
<th>Time (hours per year)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
<th>Postfilling index (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>80.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CABO VERDE

<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>131</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>2,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>Score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</th>
<th>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</th>
<th>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</th>
<th>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</th>
<th>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</th>
<th>Paying taxes (rank)</th>
<th>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</th>
<th>Payments (number per year)</th>
<th>Time (hours per year)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
<th>Postfilling index (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>80.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAMBODIA

<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>138</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>1,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>Score for getting credit (0–100)</th>
<th>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</th>
<th>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</th>
<th>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</th>
<th>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</th>
<th>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</th>
<th>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</th>
<th>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</th>
<th>Paying taxes (rank)</th>
<th>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</th>
<th>Payments (number per year)</th>
<th>Time (hours per year)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
<th>Postfilling index (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>61.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CAMEROON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>24,053,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>36.34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CANADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>22</td>
<td>42,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>36,708,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>73.23</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4,659,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>4,659,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.3</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>CHAD</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>161</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effect of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>Postfilting index (0–100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILE</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>56</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effect of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>Postfilting index (0–100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHINA</th>
<th>East &amp; Asia</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Effect of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>Postfilting 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 postfilting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### COLOMBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>69.24</td>
</tr>
<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>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</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>4</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>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>215.5</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>

### COMOROS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>48.66</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>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>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>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>49.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>219.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>57.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONGO, DEM. REP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting a business (rank)</th>
<th>184</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>36.85</td>
</tr>
<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>36.87</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>4</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>

### Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>5,830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>49,065,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trading across borders (rank)</th>
<th>133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>61.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enforcing contracts (rank) | 177 |
| Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) | 34.29 |
| Time (days) | 1,288 |
| Cost (% of claim value) | 45.8 |
| Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) | 9.0 |

### Resolving insolvency (rank) | 40 |
| Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) | 67.40 |
| Time (years) | 1.7 |
| Cost (% of estate) | 8.5 |
| Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) | 67.2 |
| Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) | 10.0 |

### 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 postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### DOING BUSINESS 2019

#### Sub-Saharan Africa

<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>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>5,260,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting credit (rank) 180

- **Score for getting credit** (0–100): 9.88
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 6
- Depth of credit information index (0–8): 1
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 0.0
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 12.4

#### Protecting minority investors (rank) 180

- **Score for protecting minority investors** (0–100): 40.00
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 7
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 1
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 5
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 9
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 3
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 4

#### Paying taxes (rank) 180

- **Score for paying taxes** (0–100): 26.79
- Payments (number per year): 5
- Time (hours per year): 602
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 54.3
- Postfiling index (0–100): 12.29

#### Registering property (rank) 180

- **Score for registering property** (0–100): 37.87
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 134
- Cost (% of property value): 13.9
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 17.5

### Latin America & Caribbean

<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>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>68.89</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>4,905,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting credit (rank) 67

- **Score for getting credit** (0–100): 8.50
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 10
- Depth of credit information index (0–8): 7
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 87.9
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 34.5

#### Protecting minority investors (rank) 67

- **Score for protecting minority investors** (0–100): 48.33
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 5
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 5
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 8
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 9
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 4
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 3

#### Paying taxes (rank) 67

- **Score for paying taxes** (0–100): 77.99
- Payments (number per year): 10
- Time (hours per year): 151
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 58.3
- Postfiling index (0–100): 87.15

### Costa Rica

<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>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>68.89</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>4,905,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting credit (rank) 67

- **Score for getting credit** (0–100): 8.50
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 10
- Depth of credit information index (0–8): 7
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 87.9
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 34.5

#### Protecting minority investors (rank) 67

- **Score for protecting minority investors** (0–100): 48.33
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 5
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 5
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 8
- Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 9
- Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 4
- Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 3

#### Paying taxes (rank) 67

- **Score for paying taxes** (0–100): 77.99
- Payments (number per year): 10
- Time (hours per year): 151
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 58.3
- Postfiling index (0–100): 87.15

### Cote d’Ivoire

<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>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>24,294,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting credit (rank) 122

- **Score for getting credit** (0–100): 7.00
- Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 6
- Depth of credit information index (0–8): 8
- Credit bureau coverage (% of adults): 9.6
- Credit registry coverage (% of adults): 0.3

#### Protecting minority investors (rank) 122

- **Score for protecting minority investors** (0–100): 40.00
- Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 7
- Extent of director liability index (0–10): 1
- Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 5
- 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) 122

- **Score for paying taxes** (0–100): 46.49
- Payments (number per year): 63
- Time (hours per year): 205
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 50.1
- Postfiling index (0–100): 44.90

### 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 | | 87 |

- **CROATIA**
  - Ease of doing business rank (1–190): 58
  - Starting a business (rank): 123
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 82.62
    - Procedures (number): 8
    - Time (days): 22.5
    - Cost (% of income per capita): 6.6
    - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 11.6
  - Dealing with construction permits (rank): 59
    - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 55.70
      - Procedures (number): 22
      - Time (days): 146
      - Cost (% of warehouse value): 10.9
      - Building quality control index (0–15): 12.0
  - Getting electricity (rank): 61
    - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 80.50
      - Procedures (number): 4
      - Time (days): 65
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 27.6
      - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 5
  - ✔ Registering property (rank): 51
    - Score for registering property (0–100): 74.07
      - Procedures (number): 5
      - Time (days): 47
      - Cost (% of property value): 0.2
      - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 23.5
  - ✔ Enforcing contracts (rank): 25
    - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 70.60
      - Time (days): 650
      - Cost (% of claim value): 15.2
      - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 13.0
  - ✔ Resolving insolvency (rank): 59
    - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 56.20
      - Time (days): 3.1
      - Cost (% of estate): 14.5
      - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 34.8
      - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 12.0
  - ✔ GNI per capita (US$): 12,430
    - Population: 4,125,700
  - ✔ Reform making it easier to do business
  - ✔ Change making it more difficult to do business

- **CYPRUS**
  - Ease of doing business rank (1–190): 57
  - Starting a business (rank): 52
    - Score for starting a business (0–100): 91.24
      - Procedures (number): 5
      - Time (days): 6
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 11.9
      - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0
  - Dealing with construction permits (rank): 126
    - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 64.08
      - Procedures (number): 8
      - Time (days): 507
      - Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.0
      - Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0
  - Getting electricity (rank): 70
    - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 78.35
      - Procedures (number): 5
      - Time (days): 137
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 124.2
      - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8
  - ✔ Registering property (rank): 94
    - Score for registering property (0–100): 63.46
      - Procedures (number): 7
      - Time (days): 9
      - Cost (% of property value): 10.3
      - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 23.0
  - ✔ Enforcing contracts (rank): 138
    - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 48.59
      - Time (days): 1,100
      - Cost (% of claim value): 16.4
      - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 8.0
  - ✔ Resolving insolvency (rank): 26
    - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 75.45
      - Time (years): 1.5
      - Cost (% of estate): 14.5
      - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 73.4
      - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 11.5
  - ✔ GNI per capita (US$): 23,719
    - Population: 1,179,551
  - ✔ Reform making it easier to do business
  - ✔ Change making it more difficult to do business

- **CZECH REPUBLIC**
  - Ease of doing business rank (1–190): 35
  - Starting a business (rank): 115
    - Score for starting a business (0–100): 83.56
      - Procedures (number): 6
      - Time (days): 24.5
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 1.0
      - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 8.0
  - Dealing with construction permits (rank): 156
    - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 56.20
      - Procedures (number): 21
      - Time (days): 246
      - Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.2
      - Building quality control index (0–15): 8.0
  - Getting electricity (rank): 10
    - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 95.36
      - Procedures (number): 3
      - Time (days): 60
      - Cost (% of income per capita): 28.1
      - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8
  - ✔ Registering property (rank): 33
    - Score for registering property (0–100): 79.74
      - Procedures (number): 4
      - Time (days): 27.5
      - Cost (% of property value): 0.1
      - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 25.0
  - ✔ Enforcing contracts (rank): 29
    - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 56.38
      - Time (days): 678
      - Cost (% of claim value): 33.8
      - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 9.5
  - ✔ Resolving insolvency (rank): 15
    - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 80.05
      - Time (years): 2.1
      - Cost (% of estate): 17.0
      - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 67.4
      - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 14.0
  - ✔ GNI per capita (US$): 18,160
    - Population: 10,591,323
  - ✔ Reform making it easier to do business
  - ✔ Change making it more difficult to do business

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Starting a business (rank) 42
Score for starting a business (0–100) 92.52
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 3.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 0.2
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 13.2

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 4
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 86.94
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 64
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.3
Builder's quality control index (0–15) 11.0

Getting electricity (rank) 21
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 90.22
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 38
Cost (% of income per capita) 103.4
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

Registering property (rank) 11
Score for registering property (0–100) 89.88
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 4
Cost (% of property value) 0.6
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 24.5

Denmark

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 3

OECD high income

GNI per capita (US$) 55,220
Population 5,769,663

Getting credit (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) 7.4
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 38
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 66.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–8) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 6
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 8
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 9

Paying taxes (rank) 9
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 91.74
Payments (number per year) 10
Time (hours per year) 132
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 23.8
Postfilling index (0–100) 89.06

Trading across borders (rank) 1
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 100.00
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 1
Border compliance (hours) 0
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 0
Border compliance (US$) 0

Enforcing contracts (rank) 14
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 73.92
Time (days) 485
Cost (% of claim value) 23.3
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 14.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 6
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 85.13
Time (years) 1.0
Cost (% of estate) 4.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 88.5
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 12.0

Middle East & North Africa

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 99
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 62.02

Getting credit (rank) 161
Score for getting credit (0–100) 25.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 5
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.4

Protecting minority investors (rank) 2
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 81.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–8) 8
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 7
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 7
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 9
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 7

Paying taxes (rank) 108
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 68.91
Payments (number per year) 35
Time (hours per year) 76
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 37.7
Postfilling index (0–100) 49.57

Trading across borders (rank) 145
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 59.37
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 60
Border compliance (hours) 72
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 95
Border compliance (US$) 1,055

Resolving insolvency (rank) 48
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 60.85
Time (years) 2.3
Cost (% of estate) 11.3
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 37.6
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 13.0

Latin America & Caribbean

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 103
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 61.07

Getting credit (rank) 144
Score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 99
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 51.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–8) 4
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 4
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 3

Paying taxes (rank) 75
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 75.65
Payments (number per year) 37
Time (hours per year) 117
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 32.6
Postfilling index (0–100) 78.91

Trading across borders (rank) 89
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 74.26
Time to export
Documentary compliance (hours) 12
Border compliance (hours) 36
Cost to export
Documentary compliance (US$) 50
Border compliance (US$) 625

Enforcing contracts (rank) 83
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 59.17
Time (days) 681
Cost (% of claim value) 36.0
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 134
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 34.53
Time (years) 4.0
Cost (% of estate) 10.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 29.3
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 6.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the 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>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>10,766,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights (index 0–12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97,553,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (of adults)</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>97,553,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>65.79</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>25.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>84.11</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>42.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights (index 0–12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (of adults)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (of adults)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>71.41</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</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>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>9.5</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.
### DOING BUSINESS 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>6,377,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EQUATORIAL GUINEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQUATORIAL GUINEA</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>1,267,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ERITREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERITREA</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>5,918,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reforming it easier to do business

#### Trading across borders (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,821,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change making it more difficult to do business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>15,519,838</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.
### ESTONIA

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 16

Starting a business (rank) 15
Score for starting a business (0–100) 95.25
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 3.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.1
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 14.6

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 14
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 82.53
Procedures (number) 10
Time (days) 30
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.2
Building quality control index (0–15) 11.0

Getting electricity (rank) 46
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 83.26
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 91
Cost (% of income per capita) 154.2
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

Registering property (rank) 6
Score for registering property (0–100) 91.02
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 17.5
Cost (% of property value) 0.5
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 27.5

Getting credit (rank) 44
Score for getting credit (0–100) 70.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 26.9
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protection minority investors (rank) 83
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 56.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 3
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

Pay taxes (rank) 14
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 89.56
Payments (number per year) 8
Time (hours per year) 50
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 48.7
Postfilling index (0–100) 99.38

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 52.84
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 56.67
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 89.56

### ESWATINI

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 117

Starting a business (rank) 159
Score for starting a business (0–100) 74.55
Procedures (number) 12
Time (days) 30
Cost (% of income per capita) 14.8
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.2

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 107
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 66.81
Procedures (number) 14
Time (days) 16
Cost (% of warehouse value) 3.5
Building quality control index (0–15) 7.0

Getting electricity (rank) 163
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 47.44
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 137
Cost (% of income per capita) 689.2
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 107
Score for registering property (0–100) 58.65
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 21
Cost (% of property value) 14
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.5

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) 43.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0

Protection minority investors (rank) 140
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 41.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 6
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 6
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 3

Pay taxes (rank) 63
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 77.09
Payments (number per year) 33
Time (hours per year) 122
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 35.7
Postfilling index (0–100) 83.15

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 56.79
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 41.67
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 77.09

### ETHIOPIA

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190)** 159

Starting a business (rank) 167
Score for starting a business (0–100) 70.79
Procedures (number) 11
Time (days) 32
Cost (% of income per capita) 52.7
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 168
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 52.84
Procedures (number) 13
Time (days) 134
Cost (% of warehouse value) 14.4
Building quality control index (0–15) 7.0

Getting electricity (rank) 131
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 59.27
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 95
Cost (% of income per capita) 89.1
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 144
Score for registering property (0–100) 51.33
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 52
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 6.0

Getting credit (rank) 175
Score for getting credit (0–100) 15.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 3
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.4

Protection minority investors (rank) 178
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 28.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 3
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 0
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 2
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

Pay taxes (rank) 130
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 63.26
Payments (number per year) 29
Time (hours per year) 300
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 37.7
Postfilling index (0–100) 51.56

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 50.47
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 28.33
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 63.26

---

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 postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Registering property: 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.

FIJI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>25.00</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>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>71.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postinfling index (0–100)</td>
<td>81.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</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>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>79.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postinfling index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>65.00</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>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>90.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postinfling index (0–100)</td>
<td>93.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</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>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>79.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postinfling index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>5</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>0.0</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</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>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>71.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postinfling index (0–100)</td>
<td>81.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>4</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>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>79.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postinfling index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.40</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 postinfling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
Dealing with construction permits

Starting a business

Registering property

Getting electricity

Trading across borders

Enforcing contracts

Resolving insolvency

Country Tables

GABON

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 169
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 45.58
Getting credit (rank) 124
Score for getting credit (0–100) 40.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 2
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 29.0
Protecting minority investors (rank) 161
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 38.13
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 4
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 3
Extens of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

Procedures (number) 11
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
Documentary compliance (hours) 2
Total time and contribution rate (% of profit) 47.1
Posting index (0–100) 42.47
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 64.51
Procedures (number) 12
Time (days) 66
Cost (% of income per capita) 1,294.9
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 3
Score for registering property (rank) 178
Score for registering property (0–100) 37.09
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 102
Cost (% of property value) 11.5
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 4.5

GAMBIA, THE

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 149
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 51.72
Getting credit (rank) 134
Score for getting credit (0–100) 35.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Protecting minority investors (rank) 165
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 36.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 1
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 5

Procedures (number) 7
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 6
Documentary compliance (US$) 0
Total time and contribution rate (% of profit) 51.3
Posting index (0–100) 53.46

GEORGIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 6
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 83.28
Getting credit (rank) 12
Score for getting credit (0–100) 85.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 9
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 8
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Protecting minority investors (rank) 2
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 81.61
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 6
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 9
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 7
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 9
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 9

Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 71
Cost (% of income per capita) 15.6
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5
Score for registering property (rank) 4
Score for registering property (0–100) 92.86
Procedures (number) 1
Time (days) 0
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 21.5

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.
### Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td>43,490</td>
<td>82,695,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 83.58
- Procedures (number): 9
- Time (days): 8
- Cost (% of income per capita): 6.7
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 31.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 78.16
- Procedures (number): 9
- Time (days): 126
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.2
- Building quality control index (0–15): 9.5

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 98.79
- Procedures (number): 3
- Time (days): 28
- Cost (% of income per capita): 38.5
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 8

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 65.70
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 52
- Cost (% of property value): 1.4
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 22.0

### Sub-Saharan Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>28,833,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 84.29
- Procedures (number): 16
- Time (days): 70
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 4.6
- Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 66.16
- Procedures (number): 16
- Time (days): 170
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 12.7
- Building quality control index (0–15): 11.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 74.02
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 78
- Cost (% of income per capita): 90.6
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 4

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 55.54
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 47
- Cost (% of property value): 6.1
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 8.0

### Greece

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.08</td>
<td>18,090</td>
<td>10,760,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- **Score for starting a business (0–100)**: 92.39
- Procedures (number): 16
- Time (days): 125
- Cost (% of income per capita): 1.5
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- **Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)**: 75.29
- Procedures (number): 17
- Time (days): 23
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.9
- Building quality control index (0–15): 13.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- **Score for getting electricity (0–100)**: 79.87
- Procedures (number): 7
- Time (days): 55
- Cost (% of income per capita): 6.9
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 7

#### Registering property (rank)
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 47.59
- Procedures (number): 11
- Time (days): 20
- Cost (% of property value): 4.8
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 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 postfilng index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### GRENADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Starting a business (rank) | 89 |
| Getting credit (rank) | 144 |
| Score for getting credit (0–100) | 30.00 |
| Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 6 |
| Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 0 |
| Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |
| Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 62.53 |
| Procedures (number) | 15 |
| Time (days) | 146 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 1.7 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 5.0 |

| Getting electricity (rank) | 89 |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 73.34 |
| Procedures (number) | 5 |
| Time (days) | 38 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 169.4 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 3 |

| Registering property (rank) | 146 |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 50.14 |
| Procedures (number) | 8 |
| Time (days) | 32 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 7.4 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 7.0 |

### GUATEMALA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Starting a business (rank) | 89 |
| Getting credit (rank) | 22 |
| Score for getting credit (0–100) | 80.00 |
| Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 9 |
| Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 7 |
| Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 7.0 |
| Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 24.2 |

| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 122 |
| Procedures (number) | 11 |
| Time (days) | 230 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 6.3 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 11.0 |

| Getting electricity (rank) | 44 |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 84.12 |
| Procedures (number) | 5 |
| Time (days) | 44 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 515.4 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7 |

| Registering property (rank) | 86 |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 64.90 |
| Procedures (number) | 7 |
| Time (days) | 24 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 17 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 13.5 |

### GUINEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Starting a business (rank) | 111 |
| Getting credit (rank) | 144 |
| Score for getting credit (0–100) | 30.00 |
| Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 6 |
| Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 0 |
| Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |
| Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 50 |
| Procedures (number) | 15 |
| Time (days) | 151 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 1.6 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 12.0 |

| Getting electricity (rank) | 146 |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 55.54 |
| Procedures (number) | 4 |
| Time (days) | 69 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 3.16 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 0 |

| Registering property (rank) | 138 |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 51.92 |
| Procedures (number) | 6 |
| Time (days) | 44 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 7.8 |
| 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.
DOING BUSINESS 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<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>✔ Sorting out debtors (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for sorting out debtors (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<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>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ sorting out debtors (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for sorting out debtors (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ sorting out debtors (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for sorting out debtors (0–100)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>38.61</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.
Latin America & Caribbean

<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>HONDURAS</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>77.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>40.7</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>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>66.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>53.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>73.0</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>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>63.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONG KONG SAR, CHINA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>88.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></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>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>99.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>73.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>87.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>66.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>8.75</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>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>80.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator scores refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>60,830</td>
<td>341,284</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>60,830</td>
<td>341,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>90.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>71.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>92.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>86.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,339,180,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>80.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>77.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>80.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>263,991,379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders (rank)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts (rank)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>47.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of claim value)</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency (rank)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### IRAN, ISLAMIC REP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<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 rank (1–190)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>81,162,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>67.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>69.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>68.86</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>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>63.98</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>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IRAQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<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 rank (1–190)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>38,274,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>76.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>61.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>436.8</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>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IRELAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income</td>
<td>78.91</td>
<td>55,290</td>
<td>4,813,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>95.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>77.49</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>149.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>84.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISRAEL</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>73.23</td>
<td>8,712,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.35</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with permits</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with permits (0–100)</td>
<td>75.10</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>76.24</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITALY</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>72.56</td>
<td>60,551,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>89.50</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>227.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with permits</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>81.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMAICA</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>2,890,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Registering property</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>53.61</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.
## JAPAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>86.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Starting a business

**Getting credit (rank)**
Score for getting credit (0–100) 85

**Protecting minority investors (rank)**
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 64

**Paying taxes (rank)**
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 97

**Registering property (rank)**
Score for registering property (0–100) 48

### Dealing with construction permits

**Getting electricity (rank)**
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 89.88

### Registering property

**Score for registering property (rank)**
Score for registering property (0–100) 74.21

### OECD high income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>75.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>38,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>84.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle East & North Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>60.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>3,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KAZAKHSTAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>92.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>29.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>77.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>7,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reform making it easier to do business

- Trading across borders (rank) | 56 |
- Score for trading across borders (0–100) | 86.51 |
- Time to export | 2.4 |
- Border compliance (hours) | 22.6 |
- Cost to export | 54 |
- Border compliance (hours) | 264.9 |
- Time to import | 3.4 |
- Border compliance (hours) | 39.6 |
- Cost to import | 107 |
- Border compliance (US$) | 299.2 |

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- Enforcing contracts (rank) | 74 |
- Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) | 65.26 |
- Time (days) | 360 |
- Cost (% of claim value) | 23.4 |
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) | 7.5 |

### Resolving insolvency

- Enforcing contracts (rank) | 76 |
- Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) | 55.56 |
- Time (days) | 642 |
- Cost (% of claim value) | 31.2 |
- Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) | 8.0 |

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.
Registering property (rank) 122
Score for registering property (0–100) 55.97
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 49
Cost (% of property value) 6.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 16.0

KIRIBATI
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 158
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 49.07

Getting credit (rank) 172
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

Proving the right to redress (rank) 125
Score for proving the right to redress (0–100) 46.67
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 6
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 5
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 2
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 2

Paying taxes (rank) 96
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 71.42
Payments (number per year) 11
Time (hours per year) 168
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 32.7
Postfiling index (0–100) 26.68

Enforcing contracts (rank) 120
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 53.39
Time (days) 660
Cost (% of claim value) 25.8
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 6.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 168
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 0.00
Time (years) no practice
Cost (% of estate) no practice
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 0.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 0.0

KOREA, REP.
Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 5
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 84.14

Getting credit (rank) 60
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) 100.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 65.7

Proving the right to redress (rank) 23
Score for proving the right to redress (0–100) 73.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 8
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 6
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 7
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 6
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 9

Paying taxes (rank) 24
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 86.91
Payments (number per year) 12
Time (hours per year) 188
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 33.1
Postfiling index (0–100) 93.93

Reform making it easier to do business ✔
Change making it more difficult to do business ❌

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

Starting a business

Dealing with construction permits

Getting electricity

Registering property

KOSOVO

Europe & Central Asia

GNI per capita (US$)

3,890

Population

1,830,700

Starting a business (rank) 13
Score for starting a business (0–100) 95.68
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 5.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.0
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 100
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 67.92
Procedures (number) 12
Time (days) 150
Cost (% of warehouse value) 4.9
Building quality control index (0–15) 9.0

Getting electricity (rank) 113
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 66.16
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 36
Cost (% of income per capita) 20.0
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 2

Registering property (rank) 37
Score for registering property (0–100) 78.13
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 27
Cost (% of property value) 0.3
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 20.5

KUWAIT

Europe & Central Asia

GNI per capita (US$)

31,430

Population

4,136,528

Starting a business (rank) 133
Score for starting a business (0–100) 81.40
Procedures (number) 23
Time (days) 35.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 2.0
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 131
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 62.35
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 231
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) 95
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 71.78
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 65
Cost (% of income per capita) 63.8
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Registering property (rank) 69
Score for registering property (0–100) 67.54
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 35
Cost (% of property value) 2.5
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.0

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Europe & Central Asia

GNI per capita (US$)

1,130

Population

6,201,500

Starting a business (rank) 35
Score for starting a business (0–100) 92.97
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 10
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.9
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 29
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 77.10
Procedures (number) 11
Time (days) 142
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.5
Building quality control index (0–15) 11.0

Getting electricity (rank) 164
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 46.01
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 111
Cost (% of income per capita) 71.0
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 8
Score for registering property (0–100) 90.27
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 3.5
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 24.0

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>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>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>60.93</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.94</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>52.77</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>54.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>64.93</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>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LATVIA</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>14,740</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>79.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>94.13</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>73.46</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>89.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>258.9</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>168.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>81.45</td>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEBANON</th>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>8,310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>54.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>78.63</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>52.69</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Ease of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–130)</td>
<td>89.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>168.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>59.44</td>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
| COUNTRY TABLES | 105 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Saharan Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>2,233,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>Trading across borders (rank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>6,540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>Getting credit (rank)</th>
<th>Trading across borders (rank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilining index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
Dealing with construction permits

**LITHUANIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>65.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>65.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUXEMBOURG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</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>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OECD HIGH INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</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>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MACEDONIA, FYR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</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>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe & Central Asia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>12</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>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### Country Tables

<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>MALAWI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>18,622,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>77.18</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Time (days) 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>67.17</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Time (days) 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100) 44.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days) 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>2,026.3</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cost (% of property value) 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults) 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Cost to export 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100) 62.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Payments (number per year) 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>33.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALAYSIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>31,624,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>82.78</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Time (days) 13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>86.86</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Time (days) 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100) 99.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (days) 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Procedures (number) 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time (days) 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30) 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100) 75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults) 86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit registry coverage (0% of adults)</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>Cost to export 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 81.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100) 76.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Payments (number per year) 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td>52.65</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.
MALDIVES

South Asia

Getting credit (rank) 134
Score for getting credit (0–100) 35.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 2
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 5
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 23.6

Protecting minority investors (rank) 132
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 43.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 0
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 1
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

GNI per capita (US$) 9,570
Population 436,330

MALI

Sub-Saharan Africa

Getting credit (rank) 144
Score for getting credit (0–100) 30.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 6
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 1.6
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 6.1

Protecting minority investors (rank) 149
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 40.00
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 7
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 1
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5
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

GNI per capita (US$) 770
Population 18,541,980

MALT

Middle East & North Africa

Getting credit (rank) 134
Score for getting credit (0–100) 35.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 2
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 5
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 0.0
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 23.6

Protecting minority investors (rank) 132
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 43.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 0
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 5
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 1
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

GNI per capita (US$) 23,810
Population 465,292

Note: Most indicator scores refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### MARSHALL ISLANDS

<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>150</td>
<td>51.62</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 88.64
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 17
- Cost (% of income per capita): 10.6
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 71.00
- Procedures (number): 7
- Time (days): 38
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.1
- Building quality control index (0–15): 1.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 59.47
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 67
- Cost (% of income per capita): 60.2
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

#### Registering property (rank)
- Score for registering property (0–100): 187
- Procedures (number): 0.00
- Time (days): 67
- Cost (% of property value): 0.0
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 0

### MAURITANIA

<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>148</td>
<td>51.99</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 92.18
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 6
- Cost (% of income per capita): 16.2
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits (rank)
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 68.63
- Procedures (number): 13
- Time (days): 104
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 4.2
- Building quality control index (0–15): 7.5

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 54.39
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 67
- Cost (% of income per capita): 4,277.4
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 2

#### Registering property (rank)
- Score for registering property (0–100): 61.32
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 49
- Cost (% of property value): 4.5
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 7.0

### MAURITIUS

<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>20</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>10,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 94.34
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 5
- 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): 82.51
- Procedures (number): 15
- Time (days): 98
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.5
- Building quality control index (0–15): 14.0

#### Getting electricity (rank)
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 86.24
- Procedures (number): 3
- Time (days): 81
- Cost (% of income per capita): 21.9
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

#### Registering property (rank)
- Score for registering property (0–100): 78.74
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 17
- Cost (% of property value): 17.0
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 18.0

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 postfilining index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
MEXICO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 93 |

Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 68.6 |

Procedures (number) | 14.7 |
Time (days) | 82.1 |
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 9.7 |
Building quality control index (0–15) | 11.7 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 99 |
Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 71.06 |
Procedures (number) | 6.8 |
Time (days) | 100.4 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 290.4 |
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7 |

Registering property (rank) | 103 |
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 |

MICRONESIA, FED. STS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>141.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 137 |
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 61.05 |
Procedures (number) | 14 |
Time (days) | 86 |
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 0.5 |
Building quality control index (0–15) | 0.0 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 117 |
Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 64.89 |
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 (rank) | 187 |
Score for registering property (0–100) | 0.00 |
Procedures (number) | no practice |
Time (days) | no practice |
Cost (% of property value) | no practice |
Quality of land administration index (0–30) | no practice |

MOLDOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 172 |
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 52.19 |
Procedures (number) | 28 |
Time (days) | 276 |
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 1.4 |
Building quality control index (0–15) | 12.0 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 81 |
Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 74.88 |
Procedures (number) | 6 |
Time (days) | 87 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 64.7 |
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7 |

Registering property (rank) | 22 |
Score for registering property (0–100) | 82.62 |
Procedures (number) | 5.5 |
Time (days) | 5.5 |
Cost (% of property value) | 1.1 |
Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 22.0 |

Latin America & Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>8,610</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>129,183,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GNI per capita (US$) | 3,590 |
Population | 105,544 |

Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>2,180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,549,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trading across borders (rank) | 66 |
Score for trading across borders (0–100) | 82.09 |
Time to export | Documentary compliance (hours) | 8 |
Border compliance (hours) | 20.4 |
Cost to export | Documentary compliance (US$) | 60 |
Border compliance (US$) | 400 |
Time to import | Documentary compliance (hours) | 17.6 |
Border compliance (hours) | 44.2 |
Cost to import | Documentary compliance (US$) | 100 |
Border compliance (US$) | 450 |

Enforcing contracts (rank) | 43 |
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) | 71.97 |
Time (days) | 340.7 |
Cost (% of claim value) | 33.0 |
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) | 10.1 |

Resolving insolvency (rank) | 32 |
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 insolvency framework index (0–16) | 11.5 |

MICRONESIA, FED. STS.

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 160 |
Score for starting a business (0–100) | 170 |
Procedures (number) | 7 |
Time (days) | 16 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 141.7 |
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0 |

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 137 |
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 61.05 |
Procedures (number) | 14 |
Time (days) | 86 |
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 0.5 |
Building quality control index (0–15) | 0.0 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 117 |
Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 64.89 |
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 (rank) | 187 |
Score for registering property (0–100) | 0.00 |
Procedures (number) | no practice |
Time (days) | no practice |
Cost (% of property value) | no practice |
Quality of land administration index (0–30) | no practice |

MOLDOVA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 47 |
Score for starting a business (0–100) | 14 |
Procedures (number) | 3 |
Time (days) | 4 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 5.0 |
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) | 0.0 |

Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 172 |
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 52.19 |
Procedures (number) | 28 |
Time (days) | 276 |
Cost (% of warehouse value) | 1.4 |
Building quality control index (0–15) | 12.0 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 81 |
Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 74.88 |
Procedures (number) | 6 |
Time (days) | 87 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 64.7 |
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7 |

Registering property (rank) | 22 |
Score for registering property (0–100) | 82.62 |
Procedures (number) | 5.5 |
Time (days) | 5.5 |
Cost (% of property value) | 1.1 |
Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 22.0 |

Getting credit (rank) | 99 |
Score for getting credit (0–100) | 50.00 |
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 10 |
Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 0 |
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

Protecting minority investors (rank) | 185 |
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 25.00 |
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) | 0 |
Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 0 |
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) | 8 |
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 5 |
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 2 |
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 0 |

Paying taxes (rank) | 110 |
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) | 60.50 |
Postfiling index (0–100) | not applicable |

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 (rank) | 123 |
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) | 37.64 |
Time (years) | 5.3 |
Cost (% of estate) | 38.0 |
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) | 3.2 |
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) | 11.5 |

Evaluating the impact of regulatory reform

Reform making it easier to do business ✔

X Change making it more difficult to do business
### Europe & Central Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONGOLIA</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>3,075,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle East & North Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>35,739,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTENEGRO</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>622,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### East Asia & Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST ASIA</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>3,075,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reform making it easier to do business

- **Trading across borders**
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100): 88.75
  - Time to import: 374
  - Cost (% of claim value): 22.9
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 5.5

### Change making it more difficult to do business

- **Resolving insolvency**
  - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 67.99
  - Time (years): 1.4
  - Cost (% of estate): 8.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 50.0
  - Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16): 18.5
<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>MOZAMBIQUE</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>29,668,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3,214.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>73.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to resolve</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to enforce</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to enforce</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>73.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to resolve</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to enforce</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>53.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to enforce</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3,214.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Trading across borders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for trading across borders (0–100)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to export</td>
<td>73.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to export</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (US$)</td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resolving insolvency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for resolving insolvency (0–100)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to resolve</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enforcing contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for enforcing contracts (0–100)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to enforce</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary compliance (hours)</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border compliance (hours)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to import</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentary compliance (US$)</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.
### NEPAL

#### Getting credit (rank)
- **South Asia**: 110
- **Ease of doing business score (0–100)**: 59.63
- **GNI per capita (US$)**: 790
- **Population**: 29,304,998

#### Getting credit (rank)
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)**: 99
- **Strength of legal rights index (0–12)**: 10
- **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)**: 33.1
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 88
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 28.5

### NEW ZEALAND

#### Getting credit (rank)
- **South Asia**: 1
- **Ease of doing business score (0–100)**: 86.59
- **GNI per capita (US$)**: 38,970
- **Population**: 4,793,900

#### Getting credit (rank)
- **Score for getting credit (0–100)**: 100.0
- **Credit registry coverage (% of adults)**: 0.0
- **Score for registering property (0–100)**: 94.89
- **Quality of land administration index (0–30)**: 26.5

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>NICARAGUA</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGER</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>5,470.9</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</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>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>13.5</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 posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
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) | 1.0 | Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 8 |
Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 20.0 |

Registering property (rank) | 13 | Score for registering property (0–100) | 87.26 |
Procedures (number) | 1 | Time (days) | 3 |
Cost (% of property value) | 2.5 |

Oman

Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 13.5 |

Getting electricity (rank) | 19 | Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 90.58 |
Procedures (number) | 4 | Time (days) | 66 |
Cost (% of income per capita) | 1.0 | Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 8 |

Registering property (rank) | 13 | Score for registering property (0–100) | 74.03 |
Procedures (number) | 2 | Time (days) | 16 |
Cost (% of property value) | 0.0 | Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 13.5 |

Pakistan

Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 9.5 |

Getting credit (rank) | 85 | Score for getting credit (0–100) | 55.00 |
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) | 5 |
Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 6 |
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 100.0 |
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

Protecting minority investors (rank) | 15 | Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 75.00 |
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) | 7 |
Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 5 |
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) | 8 |
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 7 |
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 8 |
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 10 |

Paying taxes (rank) | 30 | Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 84.84 |
Payments (number per year) | 5 |
Time (hours per year) | 79 |
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 37.0 |
Polluting index (0–100) | 62.65 |

Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 9.5 |

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) | 7.2 |
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 10.7 |

Protecting minority investors (rank) | 26 | Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 71.67 |
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) | 8 |
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 9 |
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 7 |

Paying taxes (rank) | 173 | Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 47.05 |
Payments (number per year) | 47 |
Time (hours per year) | 293.5 |
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 34.1 |
Polluting index (0–100) | 10.49 |

Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 9.5 |

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 polluting 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  ❌

### PALAU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>55.59</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>21,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- Rank: 129
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 81.95
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 28
- Cost (% of income per capita): 2.9
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 7.8

#### Dealing with construction permits
- Rank: 95
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 68.38
- Procedures (number): 19
- Time (days): 72
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.8
- Building quality control index: 7.0

#### Registering property
- Rank: 43
- Score for registering property (0–100): 75.16
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 14
- Cost (% of property value): 0
- Quality of land administration index: 12.5

#### Getting electricity
- Rank: 149
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 54.83
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 125
- Cost (% of income per capita): 66.5
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

#### Paying taxes
- Rank: 106
- Score for paying taxes (0–100): 69.04
- Payments (number per year): 11
- Time (hours per year): 52
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 75.8
- Postfiling index (0–100): not applicable

### PANAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>4,098,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- Rank: 48
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 92.07
- Procedures (number): 19
- Time (days): 105
- Cost (% of income per capita): 5.4
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

#### Dealing with construction permits
- Rank: 108
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 66.76
- Procedures (number): 18
- Time (days): 105
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 3.6
- Building quality control index: 9.0

#### Getting electricity
- Rank: 30
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 86.65
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 35
- Cost (% of income per capita): 15.7
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 7

#### Registering property
- Rank: 87
- Score for registering property (0–100): 65.18
- Procedures (number): 7
- Time (days): 22.5
- Cost (% of property value): 16
- Quality of land administration index: 11.0

#### Paying taxes
- Rank: 174
- Score for paying taxes (0–100): 46.68
- Payments (number per year): 11
- Time (hours per year): 408
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 37.2
- Postfiling index (0–100): 12.84

### PAPUA NEW GUINEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>60.12</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>8,251,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business
- Rank: 143
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 79.91
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 41
- Cost (% of income per capita): 20.5
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 8.0

#### Dealing with construction permits
- Rank: 124
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 64.41
- Procedures (number): 17
- Time (days): 217
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 1.2
- Building quality control index: 10.0

#### Getting electricity
- Rank: 72
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 78.03
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 66
- Cost (% of income per capita): 2.7
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 4

#### Registering property
- Rank: 121
- Score for registering property (0–100): 56.21
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 72
- Cost (% of property value): 5.2
- Quality of land administration index: 30.5

#### Paying taxes
- Rank: 111
- Score for paying taxes (0–100): 68.70
- Payments (number per year): 39
- Time (hours per year): 203
- Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 39.3
- Postfiling index (0–100): 77.35

---

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.
### PARAGUAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>113</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- Score for starting a business (0–100) 82.44
- Procedures (number) 15
- Time (days) 187
- Cost (% of income per capita) 1.2
- Building quality control index (0–15) 1.0

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.58
- Procedures (number) 15
- Time (days) 87
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2
- Building quality control index (0–15) 1.0

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- Score for getting electricity (0–100) 79.02
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 67
- Cost (% of income per capita) 3.48
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

**Registering property (rank)**

- Score for registering property (0–100) 74.89
- Procedures (number) 6
- Time (days) 46
- Cost (% of property value) 1.5
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.5

### PERU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>68</td>
<td>5,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- Score for starting a business (0–100) 82.44
- Procedures (number) 15
- Time (days) 187
- Cost (% of income per capita) 1.2
- Building quality control index (0–15) 1.0

**Dealing with construction permits (rank)**

- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 73.58
- Procedures (number) 15
- Time (days) 87
- Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2
- Building quality control index (0–15) 1.0

**Getting electricity (rank)**

- Score for getting electricity (0–100) 79.02
- Procedures (number) 5
- Time (days) 67
- Cost (% of income per capita) 3.48
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

**Registering property (rank)**

- Score for registering property (0–100) 74.89
- Procedures (number) 6
- Time (days) 46
- Cost (% of property value) 1.5
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.5

### PHILIPPINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Asia &amp; Pacific</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting a business (rank)**

- Score for starting a business (0–100) 71.97
- 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
- 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) 87.85
- 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
- Procedures (number) 9
- Time (days) 35
- Cost (% of property value) 1.0
- Quality of land administration index (0–30) 12.5

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfilling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>OECD high income</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 33</td>
<td>76.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 40</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 58</td>
<td>81.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTUGAL</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 34</td>
<td>76.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank) 60</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank) 32</td>
<td>86.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUERTO RICO (U.S.)</td>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 64</td>
<td>69.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
QATAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Middle East &amp; North Africa</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>61,070</td>
<td>2,639,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Starting a business (rank) 84  
Score for starting a business (0–100) 87.67  
Procedures (number) 7.5  
Time (days) 8  
Cost (% of income per capita) 7.1  
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0  

✓ Getting credit (rank) 124  
Score for getting credit (0–100) 40.00  
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) 28.2  

Protection minority investors (rank) 178  
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 28.33  
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 2  
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 2  
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 2  
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 2  
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 2  
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 5  

Payment taxes (rank) 2  
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 99.44  
Payments (number per year) 4  
Time (hours per year) 41  
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 11.3  
Postfilling index (0–100) not applicable  

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 20  
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 79.16  
Procedures (number) 16  
Time (days) 58  
Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.0  
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0  

Getting electricity (rank) 69  
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 78.59  
Procedures (number) 4  
Time (days) 90  
Cost (% of income per capita) 12.5  
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5  

Registering property (rank) 20  
Score for registering property (0–100) 83.27  
Procedures (number) 6  
Time (days) 12  
Cost (% of property value) 2.0  
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 24.5  

ROMANIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>52</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>19,586,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✗ Starting a business (rank) 111  
Score for starting a business (0–100) 83.90  
Procedures (number) 6  
Time (days) 35  
Cost (% of income per capita) 0.4  
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.5  

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 146  
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 58.20  
Procedures (number) 24  
Time (days) 260  
Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.1  
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0  

Getting electricity (rank) 154  
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 53.53  
Procedures (number) 9  
Time (days) 174  
Cost (% of income per capita) 449.7  
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7  

Registering property (rank) 44  
Score for registering property (0–100) 74.96  
Procedures (number) 6  
Time (days) 14.5  
Cost (% of property value) 1.3  
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.0  

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>31</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td>9,232</td>
<td>144,495,044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Starting a business (rank) 32  
Score for starting a business (0–100) 93.04  
Procedures (number) 2  
Time (days) 10.1  
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.1  
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0  

✓ Getting credit (rank) 22  
Score for getting credit (0–100) 80.00  
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 9  
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 7  
Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) 55.7  
Credit registry coverage (% of adults) 18.3  

Protection minority investors (rank) 64  
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 60.00  
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 9  
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 4  
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 5  
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  

Payment taxes (rank) 49  
Score for paying taxes (0–100) 80.30  
Payments (number per year) 14  
Time (hours per year) 163  
Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) 40.0  
Postfilling index (0–100) 76.82  

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 48  
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 74.61  
Procedures (number) 15.1  
Time (days) 193.8  
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.2  
Building quality control index (0–15) 14.0  

Getting electricity (rank) 12  
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 94.00  
Procedures (number) 2  
Time (days) 73  
Cost (% of income per capita) 5.7  
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8  

Registering property (rank) 12  
Score for registering property (0–100) 88.74  
Procedures (number) 4  
Time (days) 13  
Cost (% of property value) 2.0  
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 26.0  

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.
**Rwanda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding business (rank)</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>91.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 106 |

| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 67.01 |
| Procedures (number) | 15 |
| Time (days) | 113 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 12.0 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 14.0 |

**Getting electricity (rank) | 68 |

| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 78.72 |
| Procedures (number) | 4 |
| Time (days) | 30 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 2.08 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 5 |

**Registering property (rank) | 2 |

| Score for registering property (0–100) | 93.70 |
| Procedures (number) | 3 |
| Time (days) | 5 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 0.1 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 28.5 |

**San Marino**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding business (rank)</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>83.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 72 |

| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 71.33 |
| Procedures (number) | 15 |
| Time (days) | 145.5 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 5.4 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 13.0 |

**Getting electricity (rank) | 18 |

| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 90.63 |
| Procedures (number) | 3 |
| Time (days) | 45 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 59.0 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 6 |

**Registering property (rank) | 101 |

| Score for registering property (0–100) | 61.52 |
| Procedures (number) | 9 |
| Time (days) | 42.5 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 6.6 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 23.0 |

---

**Sub-Saharan Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>720</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>12,088,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 29 |

| Score for 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 (% of adults) | 20.1 |
| Credit registry coverage (% 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) | 8 |
| Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 9 |
| Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 7 |

**Paying taxes (rank) | 35 |

| Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 85.55 |
| Payments (number per year) | 8 |
| Time (hours per year) | 95.5 |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 33.2 |
| Posting index (0–100) | 63.68 |

---

**East Asia & Pacific**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>4,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>196,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ease of doing business rank (1–190) | 90 |

| Score for getting credit (rank) | 132 |
| 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 (% of adults) | 0.0 |
| Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |

**Protecting minority investors (rank) | 83 |

| Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 56.67 |
| Extent of disclosure index (0–10) | 8 |
| Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 6 |
| Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) | 9 |
| 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 |

**Paying taxes (rank) | 74 |

| Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 75.71 |
| Payments (number per year) | 37 |
| Time (hours per year) | 224 |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 19.3 |
| Posting index (0–100) | 86.55 |

---

**Europe & Central Asia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>48,211</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>33,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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) | 8 |
| Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 5 |
| Credit bureau coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |
| Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 80.1 |

**Protecting minority investors (rank) | 177 |

| Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 30.00 |
| Extent of disclosure index (0–10) | 2 |
| Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 2 |
| Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) | 8 |
| Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 3 |
| Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) | 1 |
| Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 1 |

**Paying taxes (rank) | 42 |

| Score for paying taxes (0–100) | 82.32 |
| Payments (number per year) | 15 |
| Time (hours per year) | 52 |
| Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit) | 35.4 |
| Posting index (0–100) | 67.80 |

---

**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.
<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>SÃO TOME AND PRÍNCIPE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUDI ARABIA</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>20,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting a business
- **Rank**: 148
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 78.32
- Procedures (number): 7
- Time (days): 7
- Cost (% of income per capita): 12.3
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 178.5

Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank**: 111
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 66.64
- Procedures (number): 16
- Time (days): 67
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.2
- Building quality control index (0–15): 5.0

Getting electricity
- **Rank**: 125
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 62.00
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 89
- Cost (% of income per capita): 362.3
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

Registering property
- **Rank**: 173
- Score for registering property (0–100): 41.08
- Procedures (number): 8
- Time (days): 52
- Cost (% of property value): 10.2
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 4.5

SAUDI ARABIA
- **Ease of Doing Business Rank (1–190)**: 92
- **Ease of Doing Business Score (0–100)**: 63.50
- **GNI per Capita (US$)**: 20,880

Starting a business
- **Rank**: 141
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 80.07
- Procedures (number): 11
- Time (days): 18
- Cost (% of income per capita): 6.6
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank**: 36
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 75.71
- Procedures (number): 17
- Time (days): 91.5
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 2.1
- Building quality control index (0–15): 12.0

Getting electricity
- **Rank**: 64
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 79.89
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 68
- Cost (% of income per capita): 31.2
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 6

Registering property
- **Rank**: 24
- Score for registering property (0–100): 81.61
- Procedures (number): 2
- Time (days): 1.5
- Cost (% of property value): 17
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 10.5

SENEGAL
- **Ease of Doing Business Rank (1–190)**: 141
- **Ease of Doing Business Score (0–100)**: 54.15
- **GNI per Capita (US$)**: 950

Starting a business
- **Rank**: 64
- Score for starting a business (0–100): 89.94
- Procedures (number): 4
- Time (days): 6
- Cost (% of income per capita): 32.0
- Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 4.3

Dealing with construction permits
- **Rank**: 140
- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 59.60
- Procedures (number): 14
- Time (days): 177
- Cost (% of warehouse value): 9.8
- Building quality control index (0–15): 10.0

Getting electricity
- **Rank**: 127
- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 61.37
- Procedures (number): 6
- Time (days): 75
- Cost (% of income per capita): 3.41
- Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 5

Registering property
- **Rank**: 118
- Score for registering property (0–100): 57.47
- Procedures (number): 5
- Time (days): 41
- Cost (% of property value): 7.6
- Quality of land administration index (0–30): 10.0

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.
### Dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</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>
<th>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERBIA</strong></td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Saharan Africa</strong></td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe &amp; Central Asia</strong></td>
<td>73.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Serbia

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 48
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 92.59
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 5.5
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 2.2
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

### Seychelles

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 96
- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 78.65
  - Procedures (number): 9
  - Time (days): 9.25
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 13.4
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

### Sub-Saharan Africa

- **Score for starting a business (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

### Sierra Leone

- **Ease of doing business rank (1–190):** 163
- **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

### Sub-Saharan Africa

- **Score for starting a business (0–100):** 77.77
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 77
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 37.77
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 3

### GNI per capita (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>7,022,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>95,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERBIA</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>5,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEYCHELLES</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>95,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA LEONE</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>7,577,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Starting a business (rank) 3
Score for starting a business (0–100) 98.23
Procedures (number) 2
Time (days) 1.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 0.4
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 8
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 84.73
Procedures (number) 10
Time (days) 41
Cost (% of warehouse value) 3.4
Building quality control index (0–15) 12.0

Getting electricity (rank) 16
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 91.33
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 30
Cost (% of income per capita) 2.3
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7

Registering property (rank) 21
Score for registering property (0–100) 83.14
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 4.5
Cost (% of property value) 2.9
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 28.5

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 42
Starting a business (rank) 127
Score for starting a business (0–100) 82.02
Procedures (number) 14
Time (days) 26.5
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.0
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 16.4

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 143
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 59.34
Procedures (number) 14
Time (days) 300
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.2
Building quality control index (0–15) 8.0

Getting electricity (rank) 47
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 83.23
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 89
Cost (% of income per capita) 233.3
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

Registering property (rank) 9
Score for registering property (0–100) 90.17
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 16.5
Cost (% of property value) 0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 25.5

SLOVENIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 40
Starting a business (rank) 38
Score for starting a business (0–100) 92.88
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 8
Cost (% of income per capita) 0.0
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 36.8

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 120
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 65.22
Procedures (number) 17
Time (days) 247.5
Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.8
Building quality control index (0–15) 13.0

Getting electricity (rank) 23
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 89.19
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 38
Cost (% of income per capita) 99.5
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

Registering property (rank) 56
Score for registering property (0–100) 72.10
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 50.5
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 23.0

Note: Most indicator values refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### SOLOMON ISLANDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</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>Easy Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>59.17</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting credit (rank)** | 99 | Score for getting credit (0–100) | 50.00 |
| **Strength of legal rights index (0–12)** | 10 | Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 0 |
| **Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)** | 3.4 | Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |
| **Protecting minority investors (rank)** | 110 | Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 50.00 |
| **Extent of disclosure index (0–10)** | 3 | Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 7 |
| **Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)** | 9 | Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 7 |
| **Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)** | 3 | Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 1 |
| **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** | 32.0 | Postfiling index (0–100) | 100.00 |

**Reform making it easier to do business**

### SOMALIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</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>190</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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) | 0.0 |
| **Protecting minority investors (rank)** | 190 | Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 0.00 |
| **Extent of disclosure index (0–10)** | 0 | Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 0 |
| **Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)** | 0 | Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 0 |
| **Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)** | 0 | Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 0 |
| **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** | 0 | Postfiling index (0–100) | 0 |

**Change making it more difficult to do business**

### SOUTH AFRICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</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>Easy Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66.03</td>
<td>5,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting credit (rank)** | 73 | Score for getting credit (0–100) | 60.00 |
| **Strength of legal rights index (0–12)** | 5 | Depth of credit information index (0–8) | 7 |
| **Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)** | 67.3 | Credit registry coverage (% of adults) | 0.0 |
| **Protecting minority investors (rank)** | 23 | Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) | 73.33 |
| **Extent of disclosure index (0–10)** | 8 | Extent of director liability index (0–10) | 8 |
| **Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)** | 8 | Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) | 8 |
| **Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)** | 7 | Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) | 5 |
| **Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)** | 29.1 | Postfiling index (0–100) | 60.28 |

**Reform making it easier to do business**

**Change making it more difficult to do business**

---

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.
### SOUTH SUDAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>35.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>12,575,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>77.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>27,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>46,572,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>147.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SRI LANKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>61.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>21,444,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfiling index (0–100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COUNTRY TABLES

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

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
ST. LUCIA

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 93

Starting a business
Score for starting a business (0–100) 89.18
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 18
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.1
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 76.33
Procedures (number) 14
Time (days) 11
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.8
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Getting electricity
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 82.97
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 224
Cost (% of property value) 0.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 9.0

Registering property
Score for registering property (0–100) 28.80
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 224
Cost (% of property value) 11.0
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 9.0

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 130

Starting a business
Score for starting a business (0–100) 88.87
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 10
Cost (% of income per capita) 15.4
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 74.42
Procedures (number) 14
Time (days) 92
Cost (% of warehouse value) 2.1
Building quality control index (0–15) 8.0

Getting electricity
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 71.16
Procedures (number) 3
Time (days) 52
Cost (% of income per capita) 47.9
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 5.0

Registering property
Score for registering property (0–100) 43.10
Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 47
Cost (% of property value) 11.8
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 7.0

Latin America & Caribbean

Getting credit (rank) 161
Score for getting credit (0–100) 25.00
Strength of legal rights index (0–12) 5
Depth of credit information index (0–8) 0
Credit bureau coverage % of adults 0.0
Credit registry coverage % of adults 0.0

Protecting minority investors (rank) 122
Score for protecting minority investors (0–100) 48.33
Extent of disclosure index (0–10) 4
Extent of director liability index (0–10) 8
Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10) 8
Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10) 4
Extent of ownership and control index (0–10) 1
Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10) 4

Paying taxes (rank) 124
Score for paying taxes (0–130) 64.81
Payments (number per year) 37
Time (hours per year) 203
Total tax and contribution rate % of profit 49.7
Postfiling index (0–100) 75.73

Trading across borders (rank) 68
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 81.04
Time to export 32
Documentary compliance (hours) 24
Border compliance (hours) 27
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 100
Border compliance (US$) 335

Enforcing contracts (rank) 51
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 65.51
Time (days) 578
Cost (% of claim value) 26.6
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.5

Resolving insolvent (rank) 168
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 0.00
Time (years) no practice
Cost (% of estate) no practice
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 0.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 0.0

Trading across borders (rank) 81
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 77.35
Time to export 47
Documentary compliance (hours) 37
Border compliance (hours) 27
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 89
Border compliance (US$) 311

Enforcing contracts (rank) 56
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 63.66
Time (days) 595
Cost (% of claim value) 30.3
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 11.5

Resolving insolvent (rank) 168
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 0.00
Time (years) no practice
Cost (% of estate) no practice
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 0.0
Strength of insolvency framework index (0–16) 0.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of "no practice" may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
Starting a business (rank) 156
Score for starting a business (0–100) 76.39
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) 120
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 63.98
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 70
Cost (% of income per capita) 2,075.7
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 3

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

Getting electricity (rank) 138
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 58.21
Procedures (number) 4
Time (days) 113
Cost (% of income per capita) 743.2
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 0

Registering property (rank) 160
Score for registering property (0–100) 45.95
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 46
Cost (% of property value) 13.7
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 11.5

Trading across borders (rank) 185
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 18.96
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 190
Border compliance (hours) 180
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 428
Border compliance (US$) 967
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 132
Border compliance (hours) 144
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 420
Border compliance (US$) 1,093

Enforcing contracts (rank) 144
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 47.84
Time (days) 810
Cost (% of claim value) 19.8
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 4.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 118
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 38.73
Time (years) 2.0
Cost (% of estate) 20.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 31.3
Strength of insolvency framework (0–18) 7.0

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 165
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 48.05

Trading across borders (rank) 87
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 75.02
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 12
Border compliance (hours) 84
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 40
Border compliance (US$) 468
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 24
Border compliance (hours) 48
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 40
Border compliance (US$) 658

Enforcing contracts (rank) 187
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 25.94
Time (days) 1,715
Cost (% of claim value) 37.1
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 3.5

Resolving insolvency (rank) 138
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 33.80
Time (years) 5.0
Cost (% of estate) 30.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 7.7
Strength of insolvency framework (0–18) 9.5

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 12
Ease of doing business score (0–100) 81.27

Trading across borders (rank) 18
Score for trading across borders (0–100) 98.04
Time to export Documentary compliance (hours) 1
Border compliance (hours) 2
Cost to export Documentary compliance (US$) 40
Border compliance (US$) 55
Time to import Documentary compliance (hours) 1
Border compliance (hours) 0
Cost to import Documentary compliance (US$) 0
Border compliance (US$) 0

Enforcing contracts (rank) 38
Score for enforcing contracts (0–100) 67.61
Time (days) 483
Cost (% of claim value) 30.4
Quality of judicial processes index (0–18) 12.0

Resolving insolvency (rank) 17
Score for resolving insolvency (0–100) 79.46
Time (days) 2.0
Cost (% of estate) 9.0
Recovery rate (cents on the dollar) 78.0
Strength of insolvency framework (0–18) 12.0

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### SWITZERLAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD high income Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</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>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>87.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>83.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>88.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>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 |
| Procedures (number) | 13 |
| Time (days) | 156 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 0.7 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 9.0 |
| Getting electricity (rank) | 11 |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 94.41 |
| Procedures (number) | 3 |
| Time (days) | 39 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 59.1 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7.0 |
| Registering property (rank) | 16 |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 86.12 |
| Procedures (number) | 4 |
| Time (days) | 16 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 28.0 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 23.5 |

### SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>18,269,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for protecting minority investors (0–100)</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0–10)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>73.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>80.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dealing with construction permits (rank) | 186 |
| Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) | 0.00 |
| 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) | 158 |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 52.07 |
| Procedures (number) | 5 |
| Time (days) | 146 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 223.1 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 0.0 |
| Registering property (rank) | 157 |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 46.88 |
| Procedures (number) | 4 |
| Time (days) | 48 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 28.0 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 10.5 |

### TAIWAN, CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
<td>80.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>24,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>23,571,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit (rank)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for getting credit (0–100)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of legal rights index (0–12)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of credit information index (0–8)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit registry coverage (% of adults)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors (rank)</td>
<td>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>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0–10)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0–10)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes (rank)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for paying taxes (0–100)</td>
<td>85.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (number per year)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (hours per year)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting index (0–100)</td>
<td>92.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score for starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>94.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<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 |
| Procedures (number) | 10 |
| Time (days) | 82 |
| Cost (% of warehouse value) | 0.4 |
| Building quality control index (0–15) | 13.0 |
| Getting electricity (rank) | 8 |
| Score for getting electricity (0–100) | 96.32 |
| Procedures (number) | 3 |
| Time (days) | 22 |
| Cost (% of income per capita) | 31.6 |
| Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) | 7.0 |
| Registering property (rank) | 19 |
| Score for registering property (0–100) | 83.89 |
| Procedures (number) | 3 |
| Time (days) | 8 |
| Cost (% of property value) | 6.2 |
| Quality of land administration index (0–30) | 28.5 |

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the posting index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
<th>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</th>
<th>GNI per capita (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAJIKISTAN</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAILAND</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78.45</td>
<td>5,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europe & Central Asia**

- **Getting credit** rank: 124
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 40.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 4
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 7
  - Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults): 4.49
  - Credit registry coverage (0% of adults): 0.0
- **Protecting minority investors** rank: 38
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 66.67
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 8
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 6
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 6
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 9
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 4
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 7
- **Payings taxes** rank: 136
  - Score for paying taxes (0–130): 61.35
  - Payments (number per year): 6
  - Time (hours per year): 224
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 67.3
  - Postfililing index (0–100): 40.40

**Sub-Saharan Africa**

- **Getting credit** rank: 60
  - 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 (0% of adults): 6.0
  - Credit registry coverage (0% of adults): 0.0
- **Protecting minority investors** rank: 131
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 45.00
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 2
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 6
  - Ease of shareholder suits index (0–10): 8
  - Extent of shareholder rights index (0–10): 4
  - Extent of ownership and control index (0–10): 2
  - Extent of corporate transparency index (0–10): 5
- **Payings taxes** rank: 167
  - Score for paying taxes (0–130): 50.85
  - Payments (number per year): 60
  - Time (hours per year): 207
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 44.0
  - Postfililing index (0–100): 48.39

**East Asia & Pacific**

- **Getting credit** rank: 44
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 70.00
  - Strength of legal rights index (0–12): 7
  - Depth of credit information index (0–8): 7
  - Credit bureau coverage (0% of adults): 60.2
  - Credit registry coverage (0% of adults): 0.0
- **Protecting minority investors** rank: 15
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 75.00
  - Extent of disclosure index (0–10): 6
  - Extent of director liability index (0–10): 7
  - 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): 7
- **Payings taxes** rank: 59
  - Score for paying taxes (0–130): 77.72
  - Payments (number per year): 21
  - Time (hours per year): 229
  - Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit): 29.5
  - Postfililing index (0–100): 73.41

**Note:** Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
### DOING BUSINESS 2019

<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>TIMOR-LESTE</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,296,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOGO</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>7,797,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TONGA</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>108,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reform making it easier to do business**

- **Starting a business**
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 89.41
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 13
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 0.6
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.2

**Dealing with construction permits**

- Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 53.38
  - Procedures (number): 16
  - Time (days): 207
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.5
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 3.0

**Getting electricity**

- Score for getting electricity (0–100): 63.24
  - Procedures (number): 3
  - Time (days): 93
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 1,170.2
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 0

**Registering property**

- Score for registering property (0–100): 0.00
  - Procedures (number): no practice
  - Time (days): no practice
  - Cost (% of property value): no practice
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): no practice

**Trading across borders**

- Score for trading across borders (0–100): 69.90
  - Time to export: 1,285
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 163.2
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 2.5

**Resolving insolvency**

- Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 6.13
  - Time (days): 1,285
  - Cost (% of claim value): 163.2
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 2.5

**Enforcing contracts**

- Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 57.32
  - Time (days): 2.7
  - Cost (% of claim value): 22.0
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 4.5

**Resolving insolvency**

- Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 57.32
  - Time (days): 2.7
  - Cost (% of claim value): 22.0
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 4.5

**Enforcing contracts**

- Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 49.02
  - Time (days): 488
  - Cost (% of claim value): 47.5
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 5.5

**Resolving insolvency**

- Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 46.65
  - Time (days): 3.0
  - Cost (% of estate): 15.0
  - Recovery rate (cents on the dollar): 34.4
  - 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 postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.
## Country Tables

### 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>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60.81</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>1,369,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business**
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 85.57
  - 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**
  - Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100): 64.67
  - Procedures (number): 16
  - Time (days): 253
  - Cost (% of warehouse value): 0.1
  - Building quality control index (0–15): 10.0

- **Getting electricity**
  - 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**
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 158
  - Procedures (number): 9
  - Time (days): 77
  - Cost (% of property value): 0.0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 11.0

- **Getting credit**
  - Score for getting credit (0–100): 60
  - 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**
  - Score for protecting minority investors (0–100): 57
  - 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

- **Trading across borders**
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100): 62.60
  - Time to export: 7 days
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 32
  - Border compliance (hours): 60
  - Cost to export: Documentary compliance (US$): 250
  - Border compliance (US$): 499

### 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>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66.11</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>11,532,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business**
  - Score for starting a business (0–100): 90.23
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 8
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 4.3
  - Minimum capital (% of income per capita): 0.0

- **Dealing with construction permits**
  - 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**
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 82.62
  - 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**
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 64.89
  - Procedures (number): 4
  - Time (days): 39
  - Cost (% of property value): 6.1
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 13.0

### Europe & Central Asia

<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>Turkey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74.33</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>80,745,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Starting a business**
  - 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**
  - 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**
  - Score for getting electricity (0–100): 81.23
  - Procedures (number): 4
  - Time (days): 55
  - Cost (% of income per capita): 39.5
  - Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8): 5

### Reform making it easier to do business

- **Registering property**
  - Score for registering property (0–100): 76.58
  - Procedures (number): 6
  - Time (days): 39
  - Cost (% of property value): 4.0
  - Quality of land administration index (0–30): 23.0

- **Trading across borders**
  - Score for trading across borders (0–100): 70.50
  - Time to export: 6 days
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 3
  - Border compliance (hours): 25
  - Cost to export: Documentary compliance (US$): 500
  - Border compliance (US$): 80

- **Enforcing contracts**
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 68.48
  - Time (years): 2.5
  - Cost (% of estate): 33.5
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 8.0

### Reform making it more difficult to do business

- **Resolving insolvency**
  - 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

- **Enforcing contracts**
  - Score for enforcing contracts (0–100): 59.33
  - Time (years): 56.5
  - Cost (% of claim value): 21.8
  - Quality of judicial processes index (0–18): 7.0

- **Resolving insolvency**
  - Score for resolving insolvency (0–100): 46.9
  - Time (years): 6
  - Documentary compliance (hours): 27
  - Border compliance (hours): 80
  - Cost to import: Documentary compliance (US$): 144
  - Border compliance (US$): 596

### 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.
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![Image](image_url)
<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>UGANDA</td>
<td>Easy of doing business rank (1–190)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Score for starting a business (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.
Dealing with construction permits

Getting electricity

Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 86
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.1
Building quality control index (0–15) 9.0

Getting electricity

Procedures (number) 7
Time (days) 50
Cost (% of income per capita) 2.3
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 8

Registering property

Score for registering property (0–100) 75.34
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 21.5
Cost (% of property value) 8.8
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 25.5

United States

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 8

Starting a business (rank) 53
Score for starting a business (0–100) 91.23
Procedures (number) 6
Time (days) 56.0
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.0
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 26
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 77.88
Procedures (number) 15.8
Time (days) 80.6
Cost (% of warehouse value) 0.8
Building quality control index (0–15) 11.2

Getting electricity (rank) 54
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 82.15
Procedures (number) 4.8
Time (days) 89.6
Cost (% of income per capita) 22.9
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 7.2

Registering property (rank) 38
Score for registering property (0–100) 76.87
Procedures (number) 4.4
Time (days) 15.2
Cost (% of property value) 2.4
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 17.6

Uruguay

Ease of doing business rank (1–190) 95

Starting a business (rank) 65
Score for starting a business (0–100) 89.78
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 6.6
Cost (% of income per capita) 22.6
Minimum capital (% of income per capita) 0.0

Dealing with construction permits (rank) 155
Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100) 56.44
Procedures (number) 21
Time (days) 251
Cost (% of warehouse value) 1.1
Building quality control index (0–15) 9.0

Getting electricity (rank) 55
Score for getting electricity (0–100) 82.12
Procedures (number) 5
Time (days) 48
Cost (% of income per capita) 1.7
Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8) 6

Registering property (rank) 115
Score for registering property (0–100) 57.59
Procedures (number) 9
Time (days) 66
Cost (% of property value) 0.8
Quality of land administration index (0–30) 22.5

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>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>UZBEKISTAN</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67.40</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>32,387,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>95.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoring dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.3</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANUATU</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62.87</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>276,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>81.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of property value)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>58.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoring dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>1,035.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0–8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENEZUELA, RB</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>31,977,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (rank)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting a business (0–100)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>391.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum capital (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits (rank)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>56.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoring dealing with construction permits (0–100)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of warehouse value)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building quality control index (0–15)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity (rank)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of income per capita)</td>
<td>17.650</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property (rank)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score for registering property (0–100)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures (number)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time (days)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost (% of property value)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of land administration index (0–30)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of an economy, though for 11 economies the data are a population-weighted average for the two largest business cities. For some indicators a result of “no practice” may be recorded for an economy; see the data notes for more details. In starting a business, procedures (number), time (days) and cost (% of income per capita) are calculated as the average of both men and women. For the postfiling index, a result of “not applicable” may be recorded for an economy.

Reform making it easier to do business ✔ Change making it more difficult to do business
### VIETNAM

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with property (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>10</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registering property (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paying taxes (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
<th>Postfilind index (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>49.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENFORCING CONTRACTS (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of claim value)</th>
<th>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RESOLVING INSOLVENCY (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of claim value)</th>
<th>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YEMEN, REP.

#### Ease of doing business rank (1–190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>69.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Starting a business (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dealing with property (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>10</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Getting electricity (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</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>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paying taxes (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
<th>Postfilind index (0–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>49.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENFORCING CONTRACTS (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of claim value)</th>
<th>Quality of judicial processes index (0–18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RESOLVING INSOLVENCY (rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
<th>Cost (% of claim value)</th>
<th>Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>50.0</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 postfilinding index, a result of "not applicable" may be recorded for an economy.
### ZAMBIA

<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><strong>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>65.08</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>85.07</td>
<td>71.65</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>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>61.22</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZIMBABWE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business rank (1–190)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ease of doing business score (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting a business</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for starting a business (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>66.48</td>
<td>48.55</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>Score for dealing with construction permits (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>48.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting electricity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for getting electricity (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registering property</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score for registering property (0–100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>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.
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Assia Diakité
ZEP SECURITE

Check Diop
CABINET DU DOCTEUR CHECK DIOP AVOCATS

Yolande Doukoure Séhinabou
DSY ARCHITECTE

Dorothee K. Deesien
ETUDE MAÎTRE DRESSÉN

Salomon Eka
NESTLE (CÔTE D’IVOIRE)

Emiel Emmanuel Essis
GUILLET UNIQUE DE L’INVESTISSEMENT EN CÔTE D’IVOIRE—CEPCI

Ramattou Fall
GUILLET UNIQUE DE L’INVESTISSEMENT EN CÔTE D’IVOIRE—CEPCI

Claude-André Grog
CABINET JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHAUVET

Barname Kabore
CABINET J.K.F.C. CI

Angaman Koudao
KSK SOCIÉTÉ D’AVOCATS

Noël Koffi
CABINET NOEL Y. KOFI

Yocari Grâce Konan
SCPA DOGUE-ABBE YAO & ASSOCIS

Adiaratou Kone
CABINET D’AVOCATS ADIARATOU KONE

Maisoua Kone
ÉTUDE DE MAÎTRE KONE MAHOUA

Youssouf Koné
GROUPEMENT PROFESSIONNEL DES EXPORTATEURS DE CAFÉ ET DE CACAO

Antoine Koné Yoha
OKRYZEMAK ARCHITECTURA

Marc Arthur Kouacou
MAZARS CI

Bénigou Kouarne
STIRAV SARL

Gilles Kouamé
PWC CÔTE D’IVOIRE

David Kouassi
KSK SOCIÉTÉ D’AVOCATS

Maryline Kouassi
KSK SOCIÉTÉ D’AVOCATS

Blaise Kouassi Koudo
SEIO

Micheline Koudou
DELLOITE

Roger Laubhoutet
MOUVEMENT DES PETITES ET MOYENNES ENTREPRISES DE CÔTE D’IVOIRE

Frank Lokrou
CONDICAF

Desire Racine M’Bengue
ATELIER MR-RAUD

Roger M’Bengue
ATELIER MR-RAUD

Djimnasse N’Dongaring
COUR COMMUNE DE JUSTICE ET D’ARBITRAGE (CCJA) DE L’OHAUDA

Georges N’Gaoan
CABINET N’GOAN, ASSAM, & ASSOCIÉS

Isabelle Namkay
CLK AVOCATS

Madou Ouattara
TIERI

Deborah Paint
COCAO TRADE VOIRE

Sandra Andrinana
Rakotomalala

John W. Fooks & Co.

Zinda Sawadogo
KSK SOCIÉTÉ D’AVOCATS

Wanvague Sekengo
SNAP Group

Isabelle Sokolo-Boni
BLE-AKA, BRIZOUDI-BI & ASSOCIS

Mamadou Sylla
LABORATOIRE DU BATIMENT ET DES TRAVAUX PUBLICS

Gwenaëlle Terin
CABINET JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHAUVET

Kofi Noël Yao
CABINET YAO BASKI TILLY

Volana Sandra Zakarai
John W. Fooks & Co.

Seydou Zerbo
SCPA DOGUE-ABBE YAO & ASSOCES

CROATIA

HEP DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OPERATOR LTD.
PWC CROATIA

Ivona Andelovic
VIDOVNIKDRUŠTVO GLJUNSKA I MRKOVSKO D.O.O.

Skugor Ante
LAW FIRM BOŽIĆ, ILIĆ, ŽAIPA AND PARTNERS LTD.

Luka Antunovic
LAW OFFICE IVAN ŽUBRAN AND MELISA BAJC

Andrea August
AGENCY FOR INVESTMENTS AND COMPETITIVENESS

Zoran Avramovic
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Petra Balac
CAJC & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Hrvoje Bardek
BARDEK, LISAC, MŰSEK, SKODO D.O.O. IN COOPERATION WITH CMS RECHNORHWAIG HAINZ

Mariana Bartulovic
LAW FIRM LEKO I PARTNERI

Bojan Blicz
FINA

Zoran Bozak
CROATIAN BANCING ASSOCIATION

Martina Bosak
LAW FIRM LEKO I PARTNERI

Zeljka Brege
COMMERCIAL COURT

Dalibor Briski
GRANT THORNTON

Mijo Brikovic
HRKO D.O.O.

Rajka Bunjevac
CROATIAN CHAMBER OF ARCHITECTS

Belinda Čačić
CAJC & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Danijel Cakovac
MINISTRY OF FINANCE, TAX ADMINISTRATION

Biserka Čičelic-Kućan
CROATIAN NOTARIES CHAMBER

Eva Cotman
LAW FIRM DRAGICEVIC & PARTNERS

Iva Crnogorac
DIVJAK, TOPIC & BAHTARIVCEV

Ivana Ćuk
VUKMIR & ASSOCIATES

Saša Divjak
DIVJAK, TOPIC & BAHTARIVCEV

Luka Dorotic
MADRAGA & PARTNERS

Mladen Dragičević
LAW FIRM DRAGICEVIC & PARTNERS

Mira Dusparić
CROATIAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Božidar Feldman
MATIC, FELDMAN & HERMAN LAW FIRM

Miroslav Filipovic
ARHITEKTI FILIPOVIC

Ivan Franc
ZAGORJE—TEHNOBETON D.O.O.

Mirela Fučkar
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Tomislava Furčić
LAW OFFICE FURČIĆ

Ivan Grguranc
GURGAN & SRIBAR RADIC LAW FIRM

Marta Glasnovic
EY SAVITJUANIE D.O.O.

Dino Gliha
CAJC & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Krešimir Golubovic
GOLMAX D.O.O.

Anja Grgić
MACSEC & PARTNERS LTD.

Iva Grgić
BARDEK, LISAC, MŰSEK, SKODO D.O.O. IN COOPERATION WITH CMS RECHNORHWAIG HAINZ

Sonja Hercog
CROATIAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Sandra Hutter
CROATIAN ENERGY REGULATORY AGENCY

Branimir Ivec
IVEKOVIC LAW OFFICE

Tina Jakupak
COMMERCIAL COURT

Irina Jelić
HANŽEKOVIC & PARTNERS LTD., MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI

Tamara Jelić Kacic
VIDOVNIKDRUŠTVO BARDEK, LISAC, MŰSEK, SKODO D.O.O. IN COOPERATION WITH CMS RECHNORHWAIG HAINZ

Zofija Jerić
AZ PROJEKT

Maja Josipovic
ARHITETKI FILIPOVIC

Ivan Kusalić
MACSEC & PARTNERS LTD.

Ljubomir Krunic
MACSEC & PARTNERS LTD.

Danko Markovic
STATE GEOTECTIC ADMINISTRATION

Ivona Markovic Zunko
VIDAAN ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

Ivan S. Maleš
CROATIAN DRUŠTVO GLJUNSKA I MRKOVSKO D.O.O.

Ivana Marković
MACSEC & PARTNERS LTD.

Danijel Meslin
ZAKOVA LAW FIRM

Josip Martinić
WOLF THEISS

Tina Matić
TN LAW OFFICE

Ema Menđušić Skugor
DIVJAK, TOPIC & BAHTARIVCEV

Danijel Meštrović
BARATIĆ LAW FIRM

Fran Misajić
LAW FIRM BOŽIĆ, ILIĆ, ŽAJA AND PARTNERS LTD.

Filip Milak
CROATIAN NOTARIES CHAMBER

Andrea Milić
LAW FIRM BOŽIĆ, ILIĆ, ŽAJA AND PARTNERS LTD.

Zeljana Muslim
FINANCIAL AGENCY—HITRO HR CENTER

Branka Nemanje
ECOVIS

Jelena Orlic
WOLF THEISS

Tena Juršić
ODVJEŽNOSTI DRUŠTVO GLJUNSKA I MRKOVSKO D.O.O.

Petra Jurković Mutabžija
CROATIAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrijana Kusteljan
ŽUBIĆ I PARTNERI D.O.O.

Irina Konjic
MINISTRY OF FINANCE, TAX ADMINISTRATION

Linda Knžić
DIVJAK, TOPIC & BAHTARIVCEV

Anita Krizmanić
MACSEC & PARTNERS LTD.

Ivan Krahic
PRALJAK & SVIC
Guillermo Cabanellas & Asociados
Chapitre de la Seguridad Social—de Derecho del Trabajo y
Augusto Valenzuela
Superintendente de Bancos
Arías
José Luis Molina del Cid
Arias
Edvin Montoya
Lexincorp
Ernesto Morales
Maria Fernanda Morales Pelleter
MAYORA & MAYORA SC
Carlos Ortega
MAYORA & MAYORA SC
Jorge A. Osy
MUNICIPALIDAD DE GUATEMALA
Erick Palomo
REGISTRO GENERAL
DE LA PROPIEDAD DE GUATEMALA (RGPG)
Claudia Pereira
MAYORA & MAYORA SC
Melida Pineda
CARRILLO & ASOCIADOS
Edi Orlando Pineda Ramírez
SUPERINTENDENCIA DE BANCOS
Rafael Pinto
MAYORA & MAYORA SC
Gabriela Posadas
QII+4 ABOGADOS SA
Marcos Ramirez
CENTRAL LAW
Diego Ramirez Bathen
Grupoo JCC
Carla Beatriz Ramsay Cabrera
DIABLUZ & ASOCIADOS CENTRAL LAW
Evelyn Rebuli
QII+4 ABOGADOS SA
Adela Celeste Rios Cruz De Sandoval
REGISTRO DE GARANTIAS MOBILIARIAS
Cristina Rodriguez
CONSULTORIO—RACSA
Alfredo Rodriguez Mahudd
CONSULTORIO—RACSA
Jose Rosales
GARCIA & BODAN
Louis Alfonso Ruano
CGW
Ricardo Santa Cruz Rubi
AGEXPORT
Alejandro Solares
QII+4 ABOGADOS SA
Claudia Solares
REGISTRO DE GARANTIAS MOBILIARIAS
Klancy Solorzano
MUNICIPALIDAD DE GUATEMALA
Ximena Tercero
ARIAS LAW
Ariel Yarza Torres de Alfaro
SUPERINTENDENCIA DE BANCOS
Augusto Valenzuela
ASOCIACION IBEROAMERICANA DE DERECHO DEL TRABAJO Y DE LA SEGURIDAD SOCIAL—GUILLERMO CABANELLAS
Maria Fernanda Valenzuela Chapetón
VALENZUELA HERRERA & ASOCIADOS
Rodrigo Valladares
REGISTRO MERCANTIL
Juan Carlos Varela Ruan
BUREUET VARELA & ASOCIADOS
Elmer Vargas
PACHECO COTO
Ivar Vega
RV INSTALACIONES
Rudy Villalobos
AGUAGAR CASTILLO LOVE
Marlon Viruta
EY
Krisit Valpella
MAYORA & MAYORA SC
Rogelio Zanetta Gaitán SIGNATUREX
Federico Zelada
CONSULTORIO—RACSA
GUINEA
Díabate Abass
MINISTERIO DE LOS TRABAUNOS PUBLICOS
Yves Constant Amani
CABINET D'AVOCATS BAO & FLS
Pier Kokojo Avude
SYLLA & PARTNERS
Aya Komar
NOTARIE AYLAMA BAH
Soulaïma Balde
NIMBA CONSEL SARL
Mamadou Boubi Baldé
Mamadou Barry
MINISTERE DE LA CONSTRUCTION, DE
L'URBANISME ET HABITAT
Moody Barry
DIRECTION NATIONALE DES IMPOST
Mouhamed Lamine Bayo
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Ismaïla Camara
MAERSK LOGISTICS SA
Issa Camara
DIRECTION NATIONALE DES IMPOST
Mamadouba Sanoussy
Camara
CABINET D'ETUDE SANOUSSY
Souleymane Camara
Francis Charles Haba
CABINET BABADY ET FRANS SCPA
Eric Benjamin Colle
TOREZ MULT-INDUSTRIES SARL
Fatoumata Conde
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Gabriel Curri
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Diablo Alpha Oumar Diop
ORDRE NATIONAL DES ARCHITECTES
Zakaria Diakité
Ahmadou Diallo
CHAMBRE DES NOTAIRES
Mamadou Aliou Diallo
GROUPE MAD
Youssouf Diallo
CHAMBRE DES NOTAIRES
Hann Diawabou Keita
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Karim Dramé
MINISTERE DE LA CONSTRUCTION, DE
L'URBANISME ET HABITAT
Barry Fatoumata
CABINET ACHI PLUS
Mohamed Lamine Fofana
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Naby Mousou Fofana
BANQUE CENTRALE DE GUINEE (BCRG)
Soukéna Fofana
BANQUE CENTRALE DE GUINEE (BCRG)
Guy Laurent Fongi
AFRIL AND FIRST BANK
Joachim Gbilemou
AVOCAT
Morik Kaba
BOLLORE LOGISTICS
Saran Madigbè Kaba
SYLLA & PARTNERS
Fara Anne Camaro
ADMINISTRATION DES GRANDS PROJETS ET DES MARCHES PUBLICS
Diawara Karamokoba
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Arbit Karmim
DIRECTION NATIONALE DES IMPOST
Namory Keita
DIRECTION NATIONALE DES IMPOST
Mariama Cé Cé Diallo
Jean Wogbo Kouyguè
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Houssein Kolda
NIMBA CONSEL SARL
Matthieu Kououma
APPI GUINEE—AGENCE DE
PROMOTION DES INVESTISSEMENTS PRIVES
Noukoua Kououma
ADMINISTRATION DES GRANDS PROJETS ET DES MARCHES PUBLICS
Boua Koyété
SECRETARIAT DU DIALOGUE
PERMANENT PUBLIC-PRIVE
Gbanom Kpomoumbou
TRIBUNAL DE PREMIÈRE INSTANCE DE MAFANCIO
Pierre Lamah
COMMISSION NATIONALE
OHADA DE GUINEE
Soumah Mohamed Lamine
Kaba Mady
ORDRE NATIONAL DES ARCHITECTES
Kaba Moriba
CABINET D'AVOCAT
KABA MORIBA
Raffi Raja
CABINET KOUMY
Drane Rougui
Mamadou Saliou Baldé
MINISTERE DE LA CONSTRUCTION, DE
L'URBANISME ET HABITAT
David Sandounou
BUREAU DES TRAVAUX
tOPOGRAPHIQUES
Youssouf Soumamoro
KBS GUINEE
Ibrahim Sow
APIFRMARINE SARL
Mohamed Sidiki Sylla
SYLLA & PARTNERS
Mohamed Lamine Touré
BANQUE CENTRALE DE GUINEE (BCRG)
Fatoumata Yari Soumah
YASANE
ORCHESTRA BISSAU
BCEAO
CREDITINFO VOLO
Duarte Amaral da Cruz
MCBÀ—SOCIETE DE ADVIADOS RL
Luis Antunes
LUFTEC—TECNICAS ELECTRICAS LDA
Tiago Bastos
AICEP PORTUGAL GLOBAL
Malom Casama
PRIVATE SECTOR REHABILITATION AND
AGRO-INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Januário Pedro Correia
BANCO DA AFRICA OCCIDENTAL
Seco Dafe
BANCO DA AFRICA OCCIDENTAL
Aminata Djalo
MADJIS SARL
Mamadjan Djalo
MADJIS SARL
Neil Gomes Pereira
CENTRO DE FORMALIZACAO DE EMPRESAS
Monica Indamy
BISSAU FIRST INSTANCE COURT,
COMMERCIAL DIVISION
Octávio Lopes
GB LEGAL—MIRANDA
Alliance
Suzette Maria Lopes da Costa
CONSERVATORIA DO REGISTO PREDIAL, COMMERCIAL ET AUTOMOBILE
Gregorio Malu
TRANSMAR SERVICES LDA
Miguel Mangue
ALDI—CONTA LDA
Duarte Marques da Cruz
MCBÀ—SOCIETE DE ADVIADOS RL
Vitor Marques da Cruz
MCBÀ—SOCIETE DE ADVIADOS RL
Marciano Mendes
EQUIPS-ADVOCACIA & CONSULTORIA JURIDICA
Ismael Mendes de Medina
GB LEGAL—MIRANDA
Alliance
Ruth Monteiro
TSK LEGAL ADVOCADOS
E JURISCONSULTOS
Halen Armando Napo
EQUITY-ADVOCACIA & CONSULTORIA JURIDICA
Eduardo Pimentel
CENTRO DE FORMALIZACIÓN DE EMPRESAS
Ana Pinellas Pinto
MIRANDA & ASSOCIADOS—SOCIEDADE DE ADVIADOS, SP RL
Carlos Pinto Pereira
PINTO PEREIRA & ASSOCIADOS
Tony Luís Pires
Dickson Sidi
ARQUITECTOS ESTUDIOS E PROYECTOS
Fernando Tavares
TRANSMAR SERVICES LDA
Fernando Teixeira
ORDEN NACIONAL DOS ARQUITECTOS
Gabriel Uamana
TSK LEGAL ADVOCADOS
E JURISCONSULTOS
GUAYANA
DIGICOM
NOEL’S ELECTRICAL & ENGINEERING SERVICES
RODGUES ARCHITECTS LTD.
Wiston Beckles
CORREIA & CORREIA LTD.
Marcel Bobb
FRASER, HOUSTY & YEARWOOD
ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
Desmond Correia
CORREIA & CORREIA LTD.
Lucia Desir-John
DI & J SHIPPING SERVICES
Orin Hinds
BHIV RESIDENTS
Renford Homer
GUAYANA POWER & LIGHT INC.
Nigel Hughes
HUGHES FIELDS & STOBY
Kalam Azad Jumán-Yassin
GUAYANA OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION
Kashir Khan
KHANS CHAMBERS
Rhonda La Fargue
GUAYANA POWER & LIGHT INC.
Rakesh Latchana
TSK LEGAL ADVOCADOS
E JURISCONSULTOS
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James L. Jeon
SOVING PARTNERS

Changho Jo
SAMIL

SANGWOO LEE

Bo Moon Jung
KIM & CHANG

Haeng Chang Jung
HANARO TNS

Kyung-Won Kang
SAMIL

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

Seoeyeon Kang
LEE & KO

Chul Man Kim
YULCHON LLC

Hyo-Sang Kim
KIM & CHANG

Jennifer Min Sun Kim
SOVING PARTNERS

Jisan Kim
WHITE & CASE

Ki Young Kim
YULCHON LLC

Sun Young Kim
SAMIL

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

Seong Won (David) Kim
HANARO TNS

Yoon Young Kim
YULCHON LLC

Sang-jin Kim
KOREA CUSTOMS

Kyu Wha Lee
KIM & CHANG

Alex Joong-Hyun Lee
SAMIL

Lee & KOREA CUSTOMS

Grace Park
KIM & CHANG

Yon Kyun Oh
KIM & CHANG

Yoon Nam Yoo
KOREA CUSTOMS

Seung Il Park
HMP LAW (PREVIOUSLY

known as HWANG

MOK PARK PC)

Lee & KO

B Garrison

SAMIL

Sang Il Park
KIM & CHANG

Young Min Kim
YON & YANG LLC

Seung Yoon Lee
SOVING PARTNERS

Seung Yoon Lee
KIM & CHANG

Su Yeon Lee
YULCHON LLC

Yong-Hee Lim
SAMIL

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

Young Min Kim
YON & YANG LLC

Rashi Mittal
HEALY CONSULTANTS

GROUP PLC

Hyun Kyung Noh
LEE & KO

Jae Wook Oh
BARUN LAW LLC

Palel Doda
BAKER TILLY KOSOVO

Sokol Emaizaj
BOGA & ASSOCIATES

Miretta Emin
BOGA & ASSOCIATES

Yllka Emin
TAX ADMINISTRATION

OF KOSOVO

Lorena Gega
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

AUDIT SH.P.K.

Jashar Gega
KOSSOVO CUSTOMS

Valon Hasan
LAWYER

Rudina Heni-Puka
KESCO

Rifat Hyseni
TAX ADMINISTRATION

OF KOSOVO

Andrina Ibrahim
BOGA & ASSOCIATES

Bajrush Isufi
INTERLEX ASSOCIATES LLC

Larena Kadi
VALA CONSULTING

Arben Kelmendi
KELMENDI & PARTNERS LLC

Burim Kida
TED AF SH.P.K.

Abedin Matoshi
INTERLEX ASSOCIATES LLC

Leonik Mehmeti
DELOITE

Fitoire Mekaj
BOGA & ASSOCIATES

Delvina Nallbani
BOGA & ASSOCIATES

Dritan Nikaj
RARKFESEN LEASING

KOSSOVO SH.P.K.

Besim Osmani
AB OLIVER & ASSOCIATES LLC

Vedat Osmani
AB OLIVER & ASSOCIATES LLC

Architect Association of

the Republic of KOSOVO (AIAK)

Shyari Bityaj
VALA CONSULTING

Arber Cansha
AMHNG

Ali Curri
KESCO

Fatmir Demaj
PRO TRANSPORT

Naim Devetak
VALA CONSULTING

Paksh Spahi
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT

AND SPATIAL PLANNING

OF KOSOVO

Ardhresa Tuhina
BAKER TILLY KOSOVO

Valon Uka
TLW

Gizim Xharavina
ARCHITECTURAL, DESIGN

AND ENGINEERING

Arta Xhema
BAKER TILLY KOSOVO

Lulzim Zeka
BAKER TILLY KOSOVO

Petri Zeka
BAKER TILLY KOSOVO

Shpend Zeka
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

KOSSOVO

Ruzhi Zemeraj
DELOITE

Ruzhi Zegri
DIAL GLOBAL LLC

Leze Zogaj
2M CONSULTING

Shaha Zyftiu
CENTRAL BANK OF THE

REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO

KUWAIT

KUWAIT INSURANCE COMPANY

TALAL ABU-GHAZALEH

LEGAL (TAG-LEGAL)

Maha Abbas
MACC

Maged Abd Al Had
HORWATH AL-MUHANNA

& CO.

Nader Abdelaziz
ASAR—AL RUWAYEH

& PARTNERS

Maged Abdella
ASAR—AL RUWAYEH

& PARTNERS

Ahmed Abdou
ASAR—AL RUWAYEH

& PARTNERS

Abdulrazaq Abdullah
ABDULRAZAQ AL-MAHDAWI

& PARTNERS LAW FIRM

Hossam Abdullah
AL-HOSSAM LEGAL

Shadi Abdullah
AGILITY KUWAIT

Saray Abou Daya
ICB KUWAIT

Mohammad Abdulwafa
ASAR—AL RUWAYEH

& PARTNERS

Lisa Adlouni
ADLOUNI & PARTNER LAW

FIRM, LEGAL CONSULTANTS

AND ATTORNEYS

Hossam Affy
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

AL-SHATTI & CO.

Adel Al Assou
INTERNATIONAL COUNSEL

BUREAU

Khaled Al Fahad
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Ali Al Faqeen
INTERNATIONAL COUNSEL

BUREAU

Zeyad Al Fleej
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Faisal Al Ghannam
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Hanif Al Gharably
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Sarah F. Al Kandari
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Shahad Al Khubazi
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Osman Al Neghme
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Ibtihal Al Shamali
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Nayef Al Yaseen
RSM ALBADE & CO.

Fahad Al Zumea
KUWAIT UNIVERSITY

Waleed Al-Sawadi
CENTRAL BANK OF KUWAIT

Abdulrah Al-Ayoub
ABDULLAH KH. AL-AYOUB

& ASSOCIATES, MEMBER

OF LEX MUNDI

Abd Al Azeez
MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Anwar Al-Bisher
ALBISHER LEGAL GROUP

Ahmed Alhoayan
ALRAYAI LAW FIRM

Areej Aladlham
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Omar Hamad Yousuf Al-essa
THE LAW OFFICE OF

AL-ESSA & PARTNERS

Mashari Aleyada
ALEYADA GROUP

Lulwah Althahab
MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Nada F.A. Al-Fahad
GEC DAR GULF ENGINEERS

CONSULTANTS

Adwaryah Safakawii
MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

AND INDUSTRY

Hussein Al-Ghareeb
MESHARI AL-JASIMI LAW FIRM

Noz Al-Hamwi
AGILITY KUWAIT

Abdallah Alheireen
INTERNATIONAL COUNSEL

BUREAU

Nora Al-Harou
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Abdullah Alharoon
INTERNATIONAL COUNSEL

BUREAU

Dima Al-Haroon
CAPITAL MARKET

AUTHORITY OF KUWAIT

Khaleel Al-Harooni
INTERNATIONAL COUNSEL

BUREAU

Abdullah Al-mahmoud
MASHORA ADVOCATES &

LEGAL CONSULTANTS

Abdullah Alharafi
INTERNATIONAL COUNSEL

BUREAU

Abdullah Al-Mehri
CREDIT INFORMATION

NETWORK

Fahad Al-Menayes
CREDIT INFORMATION

NETWORK

Hanan Almudthahkah
MINISTRY OF FINANCE
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Arvind Menon
RANHIL BERSEKUTU SDN BHD
Muhammad Kamal
Mohammad Ali
ARITEK KAMAL ALW
Norsheryna Mohamed Ishak
TENAGA NASIONAL BERHAD
Mohammad Ashraf Mohamed
Sapiei
AZMI & ASSOCIATES
Hanani Hayati Mohd Adhan
AZMI & ASSOCIATES
Azmi Mohd Ali
AZMI & ASSOCIATES
Muzzamir Mohd Mydin
AZMI & ASSOCIATES
Zuhaidi Mohd Shahari
AZMI & ASSOCIATES

Kharunajjiah Aqila
Mohd Sofian
AZMI & ASSOCIATES
Dato’ Sri Latifah Mohd Tahir
Chairperson’s Office
Mohd Yusoff Mokhzani Aris
MALAYSIA PRODUCTIVITY CORPORATION
Datuk Hj Mohd Najib
Bin Hj Mohd
CITY HALL OF KUALA LUMPUR
Selina Ng
CREDIT BUREAU MALAYSIA SDN BHD
Swee-Kee Ng
SHEARN DELAMORE & CO.
Anisah Normah binti
Muhammad Nor
FEDERAL COURT OF MALAYSIA
Marhaini Nordin
SHEARN DELAMORE & CO.
Allison Ong
AZMAIN, DAVIDSON & CO.
Hock An Ong
BDO
Effendy Othman
ZAID IBRAHIM & CO. (ZICO)
Ng Oy Moon
CREDIT BUREAU MALAYSIA SDN BHD
King Yong Pang
FERRIER HODGSON MH SDN BHD
Aurobindo Ponniah
PWC MALAYSIA
Azahar Rabu
FIRE AND RESCUE DEPARTMENT OF MALAYSIA
Aminah Bt Abd Rahman
MINISTRY OF URBAN WELLBEING, HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
Rabindra S. Nathan
SHEARN DELAMORE & CO.
Muzawaih Bt Md. Salim
TENAGA NASIONAL BERHAD
Sugumar Saminathan
MALAYSIA PRODUCTIVITY CORPORATION
Zamzuri Selamat
SYARIKAT BEKALAN AIR SELANGOR SDN BHD (SYABAS)
Fiona Sequerah
CHRISTOPHER & LEE ONG
Lee Shih
SKIRNE, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Jagdev Singh
PWC MALAYSIA
Marshan Singh
SKIRNE, MEMBER OF LEX MUNDI
Veerinderjeet Singh
Adeline Thor Sue Lyn
RUSSELL BEDFORD LC & COMPANY—MEMBER OF RUSSELL BEDFORD INTERNATIONAL
Nur Fajarah Sulaiman
CITY HALL OF KUALA LUMPUR
Muhendaran Suppiah
MUHENDARAN SDN BHD
Shariﬁah Ummu Amierah Syed Hamid
AZMI & ASSOCIATES
Esther Tan
ZUL RASFU & PARTNERS, ADVOCATE & SOLICITORS
Gene M. (“GM”) Tan
GM TAN & COMPANY
Kang Peng Tan
KAMARUDIN WEE & CO. ADVOCATES & SOLICITORS
Shu Shuen Tan
ZUL RASFU & PARTNERS, ADVOCATE & SOLICITORS
Raphael Tay
CHOI & COMPANY
Wai Keng Teh
EDUCATIONAL LOGISTICS SDN BHD
Hernant Thakore
RANHIL BERSEKUTU SDN BHD
Kenneth Tong
THE ASSOCIATED CHINESE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY OF MALAYSIA (ACCIM)
Siti Wahida Binti Sheikh Hussin
CREDIT BUREAU MALAYSIA SDN BHD
Elson Wong
ELSON WONG ADVOCATES & SOLICITORS
Keat Ching Wong
ZUL RASFU & PARTNERS, ADVOCATE & SOLICITORS
Michelle Sook King Wong
JEFF LEONG, PSWN & WONG
T. Y. Wong
MERCURY EXPRESS LOGISTICS SDN BHD
Yeoh Keng Yao
TITMAS LOGISTICS SDN BHD
Yau Tze Yip
WONG & PARTNERS
Khairani M. Yusof
MALAYSIA PRODUCTIVITY CORPORATION
Zuraidi Yusof
AHA ARCHITECT
Nor Aznira Zainal Ariffin
COMPANIES COMMISSION
MALDIVES
AVANT-GARDE LAWYERS
BANK OF MALDIVES PLC
MALDIVES MONETARY AUTHORITY
Jumana Ahmed
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Madeeh Ahmed
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Mohamed Ahsan
ARCHENG STUDIO
Mohamed Shahnad Anwar
SUOOG ANWAR & CO.—ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
Jatindra Bhatnay
PWC MALDIVES
Amaan Rahim
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Ali Hussain Didi
Aishath Haifa
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Mohamed Hameed
ANTRAC HOLDING PTY. LTD.
Dheena Hussain
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Hamdulla Hussain
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Suha Hussain
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Abdul Rasheed Ibrahim
CUSTOMS SERVICE
Jihan Ibrahim
ASSA FORWARDING LTD. PTY. LTD.
Yameen Ibrahim
SUOOG ANWAR & CO.—ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
Fathuhulla Ismail
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Safwat Karunaratne
SYARIKAT KEMERDEKANAN MALAYSIA (SYKAM)
Prasanta Misra
PWC MALDIVES
Saffath Mohammad
PRAXIS LAW FIRM
Ibrahim Muthalib
ASSOCIATION OF CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY
Ali Naeem
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Ismail Nashed
MALDIVES CUSTOMS SERVICE
Sulakshan Ramanan
SUOOG ANWAR & CO.—ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW
Mohamed Shafaz Wajeeh
PRAXIS LAW FIRM
Shuaib M. Shah
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Aishath Shaﬁa Shahid
SHAH, HUSSAIN & CO.
BARRISTERS & ATTORNEYS
Husam Shareef
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Mizna Shareef
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Archeing Studio
Fathuhulla Ismail
MALDIVES CUSTOMS SERVICE
Abdulla Waheed
Abdulla Wars
CTL STRATEGIES LLP
Sumudu Wijesundara
MALAYSIA ZADAN JALEEL
CTL STRATEGIES LLP

MALI
BCEAO
CREDIFRINT VOLO
Faradji Baba
TRIBUNAL DE GRANDE INSTANCIA DE LA COMUNE III DE RAMAKO
Oumar Bane
JUSTICE CONSULT
Abou Bemgaly
SOCIETE FRUTTERIE BOUGOUIN SA
Kassé Camara
DRUH-EB
Mahamane I. Cisse
CABINET LEXIS CONSEILS
Aly Coulibaly
DOUANES MALIENNES
Fatoumam Dembele
MINISTERE DE LA JUSTICE, GARDES DES SELAUX
Sekou Dembele
ETAT MAIFI
SEKOU DEMBELE
Moussa Syliam Diakité
SCC INTERNATIONAL
Abou Diallo
AP MALI
Sine Diarra
CABINET COMPATIBLE
Sine Diarra
Fatimata Dicko Zouboye
NOTAIRE
Baba Haidara
ETUDE GAOUSSOU HAIDARA
Adama Kane
SCAE
Abdoul Karim Samba Timbo
AGENCE D’ARCHITECTURE CADET
Gaoussou A.G. Cisse
AGENCE D’ARCHITECTURE CADET
Abdou Karim Kone
CABINET BERTIN—KONE—AVOCATS ASSOCIES
Soumaïguel Maiga
AP MALI
Bérenger Y. Meuke
JURISF CONSULAT
Arielle Razafimahafana
JOHN W. FROOKS & CO.
Oumar Sanogo
DIRECTION DE L’INSPECTION DU TRAVAIL
Mamadou Moustapha Sow
CABINET Soy & ASSOCIÉS
Moussa Ismaïl Touré
AP MALI
Imirane A. Touré
DIRECTION NATIONALE DE L’URBANISME ET DE L’HABITAT
Faradji Baba
ETUDE GAOUSSOU HAIDARA
Baba Traore
BOLLORE AFRIQUE LOGISTICS
Alassane Traoré
ICON SARL

MALTA
Christabelle Agius
Guzh ADVOCATES
Shawn Agius
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR REVENUE
Francesca Anastasi
Guzh ADVOCATES
Anthony Azzopardi
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS
Kevin Azzopardi
MALTA FINANCIAL SERVICES AUTHORITY (MFSA)
Leonard Bonello
GANADO ADVOCATES
Christopher Borg
ENEMALTA PLC
Kris Borg
DR. KRIS BORG & ASSOCIATES—ADVOCATES
Mario Raymond Borg
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR REVENUE
Josianne Brimmer
FENECH & FENECH ADVOCATES
Joseph Buhaigar
MALTA ENTERPRISE
Daniel Buttigieg
FENECH & FENECH ADVOCATES
Stefan Camilleri
CAMILLERI CASSAR ADVOCATES
Joseph Caruana
MALTA FINANCIAL SERVICES AUTHORITY (MFSA)
Michael Caruana
CENTRAL BANK OF MALTA
Laragh Cassar
CAMILLERI CASSAR ADVOCATES
Nicolette Cassar
CENTRAL BANK OF MALTA
Andrea Damamin
CAMILLERI CASSAR ADVOCATES
Kyle DeBattista
CAMILLERI PREZIOSI
Ariane Falzon
Guzh ADVOCATES
Martin Farrugia
BUILDING REGULATION OFFICE
Bettina Gatt
GANADO ADVOCATES
Neville Gatt
PWC MALTA
Joseph Ghiotto
FENECH & FENECH ADVOCATES
Steve Gingell
PWC MALTA
Sandro Grech
SG MALTA LIMITED—CORRESPONDENT OF RUSSELL BEDFORD INTERNATIONAL
Karl Grech Orr
GANADO ADVOCATES
Stefan Grima
ANZ BANK OF VALETTA
Roberta Gulc Hammett
PWC MALTA
Edward Micallef
WORLD EXPRESS LOGISTICS
Henni Mizzi
CAMILLERI PREZIOSI
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MARSHALL ISLANDS

MARSHALLS ENERGY COMPANY
Helkena Anni
MARRSHALL ISLANDS REGISTRY
Kenneth Barden
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
William Brier
MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS
Tatiana E. Cerullo
MARRSHALL ISLANDS LAWYERS
Melvin Dacillo
MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS
Raquel De Leon
MARSHALL ISLANDS SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
Anthony Frazier
Nathan Gaudio
POLES, TUBIN, STRATAKIS & GONZALEZ, LLP
Kenneth Gideon
PI SHIPPING
Avellino R. Gima0 Jr.
MARRSHALL ISLANDS SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
Dwight Heine
MARRSHALL ISLANDS SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
Don Hess
COLLEGE OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS
Jemal Adbe Nasser Ahmed
DIRECTION GENERALE DES DOANIES
Kanee Ali
GUCHET UNIQUE
M氘 FAORAN
Mohamed Lemine Ould Babiye
BANQUE CENTRALE DE MAURITANIA
Cheikh Abdellah Ababou
ETUDE MAITRE CHEIKH
ABDELLAH AHMED BABAOU
Dieng Adama Boubou
BANQUE CENTRALE DE MAURITANIA
Mohamed Marouf Boudzie
MOULAGE CENTRALE DE MAURITANIA
Mohamed Cheikh Abdallah
APACOR—AUDIT FINANCE ASSISTANCE COMPTABLE ORGANISATION SARL
Braham Etety
Fadel Elaoune
MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ECONOMIQUES ET DU DEVELOPPEMENT
Abdelahi Gah
ETUDE GAH
Bouwmiri Hamoud
LAWYER
Cheikh Yousif Jules
CHEIKH JULES LAW OFFICE
Mohamed Koum Maloum
BETEM INGENIERIE DE L'ENERGIE ET DE L'EAU
Hamed Limam
CAUSE NATIONALE DE SECURITE SOCIALE
Moustapha Maouloud
GUCHET UNIQUE
M氘 FAORAN
Mohamed Veydine Ould El Vil
RESEAU DES PETITES ET PETITES ENTREPRISES MAURITANIENNES
Moulaye El Ghali Ould
MOULAGE ELY
Ahmed Ould Radhi
BANQUE CENTRALE DE MAURITANIA
Abdelkader Said
Aliou Sall
ETUDE ME ALIOU
SALL & ASSOCIES
Abdellahi Seyid
UNION NATIONALE DU PATRONAT MAURITANIEN (UNPM)
Mohamed Varguet
MINISTERE DU PETROLE, DE L'ENERGIE ET DES MINES
MAURITIUS

SUPREME COURT
Daygaraen Amoomoogun
MAURITIUS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
Zahra Aouchybour
UTEEM CHAMBERS
Raished Aumajad
ALPEN TRADING LTD.
Keshav Beehary
MCG GROUP LIMITED
Khouswatt Bhveem Singh
NOTARY
Naezer Ahmad Bhalgalo
MORISON (MAURITIUS)
Valerie Bisaur
BLC ROBERT & ASSOCIATES
Deepit Bhmosun
ENSACIRA (MAURITIUS)
Nicolas Carresse
DAGON INGENIER CONSEL LTÉE
Bernard Chan Sing
MAURITIUS NETWORK SERVICES LTD.
Nushrat Chaumo
NOTARY
D. P. Chinien
CORPORATE AND BUSINESS REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT
Stephanie Chong Mei Lin
Ah Tow
MCG GROUP LIMITED
Chandansingh Chutoori
VPYAASS CONSULTING ENGINEER LTD.
Josef Coolen
MCG GROUP LIMITED
Ravin Dajee
BANQUE MAURITIENS COMMERCIAUX
Pavitra Dhar
CUSTOMS HOUSE BROKERS ASSOCIATION
Jayesh Desai
DESI & ASSOCIATES LTD.
Shallnere Dreepaul-Halkere
JURISTCONSULT CHAMBERS
Swailey Duman
UNITED CARGO
Amit Emadi
ASSOCIATION PROFESSIONNELLE DES TRANSPORTERS
Yannick Fok
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (MAURITIUS)
Poonam Gemuul
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (MAURITIUS)
Gilbert Gnary
MCG GROUP LIMITED
Tilottma Gabin Jhury
BANK OF MAURITIUS
Moorari Gujadhur
MADUN GUADHUR CHAMBERS
Gopaul Gupta
VELOGIC LTD.
Arvin Halkoree
JURISTCONSULT CHAMBERS
Navinrathan Jowaweer
WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY
Geetendra Singh Kim Currin
PROPERTY & MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS LTD.
Thierry Koenig
ENSACIRA (MAURITIUS)
Mylene La Yoon Him
MCG GROUP LIMITED
Anthony Leung Shing
PWC MAURITIUS
Benjamin Lowe
PWC MAURITIUS
Jayram Luximon
CENTRAL ELECTRICITY BOARD
Charles Gerard Maguette
A&M BECROTORS
Antish Maroam
ABAX CORPORATE SERVICES LTD.
Bala Moonsamy
CMT INTERNATIONAL LTD.
Ramdas Mootanah
ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN LTD.
Ashwin Mudhoo
JURISTCONSULT CHAMBERS
Loganayagan Munian
ARTISTICO INTERNATIONAL
Khemila Narradoss
JURISTCONSULT CHAMBERS
Preetam Narayan
COMPAINE MAURICIENNE DE TEXTILE
Nicholas Ng
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (MAURITIUS)
Daniel Ng Cheong Hin
MAURITIUS CARGO COMMUNITY SERVICES LTD.
Lovendra Nullah
LOVENDRA NULLAH LAWYER
Stephane Odanyen
JURISTCONSULT CHAMBERS
Jean Christophe
Ohsan-Bellepeau
MADUN GUADHUR CHAMBERS
Tarveen Teeluck
CENTRAL ELECTRICITY BOARD
Vivekanand Sengayen
STEVEN & ASSOCIATES LAW FIRM
Bhavish Seervai
JURISTCONSULT CHAMBERS
Yengambarum Soopramanien
Rapid Cargo Services LTD.
Sunjay Summam
CENTRAL ELECTRICITY BOARD
Menzie Sunglee
CENTRAL ELECTRICITY BOARD
Vidusha Vim Sunkur
MADUN GUADHUR CHAMBERS
Anshee Sunnasse
PWC MAURITIUS
Teerence Tavel
PWC MAURITIUS
Dhaneswaramvikash
Thakoor
BANK OF MAURITIUS
Natasha Tovouk-Kiagoo
JURISTAX
Muhammad R.C.
UTEEM CHAMBERS
Rachel Wan Wing Kai
ENSACIRA (MAURITIUS)
Delpheine Young Sik Yuen
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (MAURITIUS)
MEXICO

ARJPE, VALDES & MARCOS
ABOGADOS—SAN PEDRO GARZA GARCIA
INSTITUTO REGISTRAL Y CATASTRAL DEL ESTADO DE NUEVO LEON
JUNTA LOCAL DE CONCILIACION Y ARBITRAJE CIUDAD DE MEXICO
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Muneeb Ahmed Sheikh
MA ADVOCATES
Kamran Siddiqui
KAMIL & ASSOCIATES, CONSULTING ENGINEERS & ARCHITECTS
Masood Siddiqui
A. SHAKoor & BROS.
Rehan Siddiqui
BALLY TILLY CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
Hameer Arshad Siraj
SRAJUL MAQEU & CO.
Mian Hamdooon Subhani
M.H.S. ASSOCIATES
Namdar Subhani
GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB
Ameena Suhail
QURESHI LAW ASSOCIATES
Haris Syed Raza
GERRY'S DNATA PVT. LTD.
Muhammad Tajir
STATE BANK OF PAKISTAN
Lamya Tajuir
ALI & ASSOCIATES
M. Talha
SUPER LAW SERVICES
Waqas Ahmed Tamimi
DELOTICE KARACHI
Naghma Tehnaz
FEDERAL BOARD OF REVENUE
Fawad Tipu
FIRM & FUNCTION CONSULTING ARCHITECTS & TOWN PLANNERS
Chaudhary Usman
LMIA EBRATHIM HOsAIN, BARRISTERS, ADVOCATES & CORPORATE LEGAL CONSULTANTS
Hamid Rasul
FOTON IV AUTO PARK
Tayyab Raia
TM&T LAW SERVICES
Khalid A. Rehman
SURRIDGE & BEECHEND
Abdul Rehman Baitnai
STATE BANK OF PAKISTAN
Sehrish Saad
AZAM & RAI (ADVOCATES & LEGAL CONSULTANTS)
Saad Saboor
YE
Zeeshan Saffar
MUNAWAR ASSOCIATES CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
Usman Akram Sahi
CORNEILUS LANE & MULTI
Rana Sajjad
RANA IJAZ & PARTNERS
Aftab Salahuddin
YE
Mian Saleem Akhtar
LAWYERS
Inayat Ullah Sandhu
SANDHU & CO. CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
Muhammad Sarfraz
Muhammad Ali Seena
SURRIDGE & BEECHEND
Ali Kabir Shah
ALL & ASSOCIATES
Saima Shaikh
PUNJAB INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY BOARD
Arshad Shehzad
TAXPayers
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
Jelena Bojovic  
NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
Bojana Bregovic  
WOLF THEISS  
Milan Brkovic  
ASSOCIATION OF SERBIAN BANKS  
Olivera Brkovic  
ZAVOIN SEMZ & PARTNERS  
Marina Bulatovic  
WOLF THEISS  
Manja Cabarkapa  
VASOVIĆ & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Ana Calic  
TURUĐIJA PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Dragoljub Cibulic  
BDK ADVOKATI  
Jovan Cirkovic  
HARRISONS  
Vladimir Dabic  
THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR FINANCIAL MARKET DEVELOPMENT  
Marina Dacic  
BELGRADE COMMERCIAL COURT  
Milica Dekleva  
ADVOKTASKA KANCELARIA OLUJAČ & TOĐOROVIĆ  
Ljilja Djerić  
LAW OFFICES POPOVIĆ, POPOVIĆ & PARTNERS  
Uroš Djordjević  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Jelena Kuvelević Džurić  
Veloš Dostanić  
MARIĆ, MALIŠIĆ & DOSTANCIĆ O.A.D.  
Dragan Draca  
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS CONSULTING D.O.O.  
Ilija Dražić  
DRAŽIĆ, BEATOVIĆ & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Dragan Gajin  
DOKLESTIC & PARTNERS  
Jelena Gazveda  
LAW OFFICES JANKOVIC, POPOVIĆ & MITIĆ  
Marina Gligorčević  
BDK ADVOKATI  
Danica Gligorjevíc  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Ksenija Golubić Filipović  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Marija Ilić  
LAW OFFICE IČIĆ  
Mišo Ilić  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Marko Janićević  
TOMIĆ INDUSTRIJA GRUPA LAW OFFICE  
Ana Jankov  
BDK ADVOKATI  
Aleksandar Jovičević  
HARRISONS  
Dušan Karić  
DMK TAX & FINANCE  
Marija Karić  
DMK TAX & FINANCE  
Ivana Kopilović  
KOPILOVIĆ & KOPILOVIĆ  
Filip Kovačević  
DELOITTE D.O.O.  
Vidak Kovačević  
WOLF THEISS  
Ivan Krkuljka  
NINOKVIC LAW OFFICE  
Ana Kristić  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Zach Kuzivić  
KUZIVIĆ & TADIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Rada Lačić  
KOPILOVIĆ & KOPILOVIĆ  
Kosta D. Lazic  
LAW OFFICE KOSTA D. LAZIC  
Milan Lazic  
KN KARANOVIĆ & KOLIKOVIĆ  
Ružica Mačukat  
SERBIAN BUSINESS REGISTERS AGENCY (SBRA)  
Miladin Maglov  
SERBIAN BUSINESS REGISTERS AGENCY (SBRA)  
Aleksandar Mančev  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Aleksandar Marić  
VASOVIĆ & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Predrag Matić  
DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM OPERATOR EPS DISTRIBUTION D.O.O. BEograd (EPSD)  
Ines Matijević-Papulini  
HARRISONS  
Djordje Mijatov  
LAW OFFICE ILIĆ  
Predrag Milenković  
DRAŽIĆ, BEATOVIĆ & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Branko Milovanović  
TEBODIN D.O.O.  
Milena Mitić  
KN KARANOVIĆ & KOLIKOVIĆ  
Aleksandar Mladenović  
MILAĐENOVIC & STANKOVIC IN COOPERATION WITH ROKSA INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM  
Dejan Mirkovac  
HARRISONS  
Vesna Nešić  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Igor Nikolić  
DOKLESTIC & PARTNERS  
Djordje Nikolić  
KOVANOVIC & KOVANOVIC  
Vesna NIKOVIĆ  
NINOKVIC LAW OFFICE  
Bojana Nosković  
WOLF THEISS  
Zvonko Obradović  
SERBIAN BUSINESS REGISTERS AGENCY (SBRA)  
Darija Ognjenović  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Igor Olačić  
AVADSKA KANCELARIJA OLAČIĆ & TOĐOROVIĆ  
Stefan Pavlić  
MILAĐENOVIC & STANKOVIC IN COOPERATION WITH ROKSA INTERNATIONAL LAW FIRM  
Časlav Petrović  
ZAVŠIN SEMZ & PARTNERS  
Jasmina Petrović  
CITY OF BELGRADE, URBANISM DEPARTMENT  
Ana Popović  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Mihajlo Prica  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Jasmina Radovanović  
NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
Branka Rajčić  
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS CONSULTING D.O.O.  
Branimir Rajić  
KARANOVIĆ & KOLIKOVIĆ LAW FIRM  
Milan Savić  
KOPILOVIĆ & KOPILOVIĆ  
Stojan Semzić  
ZAVŠIN SEMZ & PARTNERS  
Marko Srdanović  
MUNICIPALITY OF SURCIN  
Ana Stanković  
DIRECT CAPITAL S, NOVI DOM RED, NEW VENTURE RED  
Dragana Stanović  
USAID BUSINESS ENABLEMENT PROGRAM—BY CARDO EMERGING MARKETS USAID LTD.  
Petar Stojanović  
JOKSOVIĆ, STOJANOVIĆ AND PARTNERS  
Nikola Sugarić  
ZAVŠIN SEMZ & PARTNERS  
Marko Tsenovic  
WOLF THESS  
Ana Tomić  
JOKSOVIĆ, STOJANOVIĆ AND PARTNERS  
Jovana Tomić  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Mile Tomić  
MUNICIPALITY OF SURCIN  
Snežana Tosić  
SERBIAN BUSINESS REGISTERS AGENCY (SBRA)  
Kristina Vojnođić  
TEBODIN CONSULTANTS AND ENGINEERS  
Srečko Vujaković  
MORAČEVIĆ VJOANOVIĆ I PARTNERS IN COOPERATION WITH SCHONHERR  
Tanja Vukotić Marinovkic  
SERBIAN BUSINESS REGISTERS AGENCY (SBRA)  
Milan Vulić  
PRICA & PARTNERS LAW OFFICE  
Đurđa Zejakov  
BDK ADVOKATI  
Milos Živković  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
Igor Živković  
ŽIVKOVIĆ & SAMARDŽIĆ LAW OFFICE  
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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. The report provides quantitative indicators covering 11 areas of the business environment in 190 economies. The goal of the Doing Business series is to provide objective data for use by governments in designing sound business regulatory policies and to encourage research on the important dimensions of the regulatory environment for firms.