<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a business</td>
<td>Procedures, time, cost and paid-in minimum capital to start a limited liability company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with construction permits</td>
<td>Procedures, time and cost to complete all formalities to build a warehouse and the quality control and safety mechanisms in the construction permitting system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting electricity</td>
<td>Procedures, time and cost to get connected to the electrical grid, and the reliability of the electricity supply and the transparency of tariffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registering property</td>
<td>Procedures, time and cost to transfer a property and the quality of the land administration system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting credit</td>
<td>Movable collateral laws and credit information systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting minority investors</td>
<td>Minority shareholders' rights in related-party transactions and in corporate governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying taxes</td>
<td>Payments, time, total tax and contribution rate for a firm to comply with all tax regulations as well as postfiling processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading across borders</td>
<td>Time and cost to export the product of comparative advantage and import auto parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing contracts</td>
<td>Time and cost to resolve a commercial dispute and the quality of judicial processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving insolvency</td>
<td>Time, cost, outcome and recovery rate for a commercial insolvency and the strength of the legal framework for insolvency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing workers</td>
<td>Flexibility in employment regulation and redundancy cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About Doing Business

The Doing Business project provides objective measures of business regulations and their enforcement across 190 economies and selected cities at the subnational and regional level.

The Doing Business project, launched in 2002, looks at domestic small and medium-size companies and measures the regulations applying to them through their life cycle.

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

By gathering and analyzing comprehensive quantitative data to compare business regulation environments across economies and over time, Doing Business encourages economies to compete towards more efficient regulation; offers measurable benchmarks for reform; and serves as a resource for academics, journalists, private sector researchers and others interested in the business climate of each economy.

In addition, Doing Business offers detailed subnational studies, which exhaustively cover business regulation and reform in different cities and regions within a nation. These studies provide data on the ease of doing business, rank each location, and recommend reforms to improve performance in each of the indicator areas. Selected cities can compare their business regulations with other cities in the economy or region and with the 190 economies that Doing Business has ranked.

The first Doing Business study, published in 2003, covered 5 indicator sets and 133 economies. This year’s study covers 11 indicator sets and 190 economies. Most indicator sets refer to a case scenario in the largest business city of each economy, except for 11 economies that have a population of more than 100 million as of 2013 (Bangladesh, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United States) where Doing Business also collected data for the second largest business city. The data for these 11 economies are a population-weighted average for the 2 largest business cities. The project has benefited from feedback from governments, academics, practitioners and reviewers. The initial goal remains: to provide an objective basis for understanding and improving the regulatory environment for business around the world.

To learn more about Doing Business please visit doingbusiness.org.
The Business Environment

For policy makers, knowing where their economy stands in the aggregate ranking on the ease of doing business is useful. It is also helpful to know how it ranks compared with other economies in the region and compared with the regional average. Another perspective is provided by the regional average rankings on the topics included in the ease of doing business ranking and the ease of doing business score.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of doing business

Note: The ease of doing business score captures the gap of each economy from the best regulatory performance observed on each of the indicators across all economies in the Doing Business sample since 2005. An economy’s ease of doing business score is reflected on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest and 100 represents the best performance. The ease of doing business ranking ranges from 1 to 190.

Source: Doing Business database
Rankings on Doing Business topics - European Union (EU)

Regional average ranking (Scale: Rank 190 center, Rank 1 outer edge)
Source: Doing Business database.

Ease of Doing Business scores on Doing Business topics - European Union (EU)

(Scale: Score 0 center, Score 100 outer edge)

Note: The ease of doing business score captures the gap of each economy from the best regulatory performance observed on each of the indicators across all economies in the Doing Business sample since 2005. An economy’s ease of doing business score is reflected on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest and 100 represents the best performance. The ease of doing business ranking ranges from 1 to 190. Source: Doing Business database
Starting a Business

This topic measures the number of procedures, time, cost and paid-in minimum capital requirement for a small- to medium-sized limited liability company to start up and formally operate in each economy’s largest business city.

To make the data comparable across 190 economies, Doing Business uses a standardized business that is 100% domestically owned, has start-up capital equivalent to 10 times the income per capita, engages in general industrial or commercial activities and employs between 10 and 50 people one month after the commencement of operations, all of whom are domestic nationals. Starting a Business considers two types of local limited liability companies that are identical in all aspects, except that one company is owned by 5 married women and the other by 5 married men. The ranking of economies on the ease of starting a business is determined by sorting their scores for starting a business. These scores are the simple average of the scores for each of the component indicators.

The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

What the indicators measure

Procedures to legally start and formally operate a company (number)
- Preregistration (for example, name verification or reservation, notarization)
- Registration in the economy’s largest business city
- Postregistration (for example, social security registration, company seal)
- Obtaining approval from spouse to start a business or to leave the home to register the company
- Obtaining any gender specific document for company registration and operation or national identification card

Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days)
- Does not include time spent gathering information
- Each procedure starts on a separate day (2 procedures cannot start on the same day)
- Procedures fully completed online are recorded as ½ day
- Procedure is considered completed once final document is received
- No prior contact with officials

Cost required to complete each procedure (% of income per capita)
- Official costs only, no bribes
- No professional fees unless services required by law or commonly used in practice

Paid-in minimum capital (% of income per capita)
- Funds deposited in a bank or with third party before registration or up to 3 months after incorporation

Case study assumptions

To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the business and the procedures are used. It is assumed that any required information is readily available and that the entrepreneur will pay no bribes.

The business:
- Is a limited liability company (or its legal equivalent). If there is more than one type of limited liability company in the economy, the limited liability form most common among domestic firms is chosen. Information on the most common form is obtained from incorporation lawyers or the statistical office.
- Operates in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- Performs general industrial or commercial activities such as the production or sale to the public of goods or services. The business does not perform foreign trade activities and does not handle products subject to a special tax regime, for example, liquor or tobacco. It is not using heavily polluting production processes.
- Does not qualify for investment incentives or any special benefits.
- Is 100% domestically owned.
- Has five business owners, none of whom is a legal entity. One business owner holds 30% of the company shares, two owners have 20% of shares each, and two owners have 15% of shares each.
- Is managed by one local director.
- Has between 10 and 50 employees one month after the commencement of operations, all of them domestic nationals.
- Has start-up capital of 10 times income per capita.
- Has an estimated turnover of at least 100 times income per capita.
- Leases the commercial plant or offices and is not a proprietor of real estate.
- Has an annual lease for the office space equivalent to one income per capita.
- Is in an office space of approximately 929 square meters (10,000 square feet).
- Has a company deed that is 10 pages long.

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

Where do the region’s economies stand today?

How easy is it for entrepreneurs in economies in European Union (EU) to start a business? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of starting a business suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ease of Starting a Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Starting a Business

The indicators underlying the rankings may be more revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show what it takes to start a business in each economy in the region: the number of procedures, the time, the cost and the paid-in minimum capital requirement. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

What it takes to start a business in economies in European Union (EU)

Procedure - Men (number)

Source: Doing Business database.
Starting a Business

Time - Men (days)

Source: Doing Business database.
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Cost - Men (% of income per capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cost (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD High Income</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Starting a Business

Paid-in min. capital (% of income per capita)

Source: Doing Business database.
Dealing with Construction Permits

This topic tracks the procedures, time and cost to build a warehouse—including obtaining necessary the licenses and permits, submitting all required notifications, requesting and receiving all necessary inspections and obtaining utility connections. In addition, the Dealing with Construction Permits indicator measures the building quality control index, evaluating the quality of building regulations, the strength of quality control and safety mechanisms, liability and insurance regimes, and professional certification requirements. The most recent round of data collection was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures to legally build a warehouse (number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Submitting all required documents and obtaining all necessary clearances, licenses, permits and certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submitting all required notifications and receiving all necessary inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtaining utility connections for water and sewerage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Registering and selling the warehouse after its completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does not include time spent gathering information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each procedure starts on a separate day—though procedures that can be fully completed online are an exception to this rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procedure is considered completed once final document is received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No prior contact with officials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost required to complete each procedure (% of income per capita)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Official costs only, no bribes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building quality control index (0-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of building regulations (0-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality control before construction (0-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality control during construction (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality control after construction (0-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liability and insurance regimes (0-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional certifications (0-4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case study assumptions

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

The construction company (BuildCo):
- Is a limited liability company (or its legal equivalent) and operates in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- Is 100% domestically and privately owned; has five owners, none of whom is a legal entity. Has a licensed architect and a licensed engineer, both registered with the local association of architects or engineers. BuildCo is not assumed to have any other employees who are technical or licensed experts, such as geological or topographical experts.
- Owns the land on which the warehouse will be built and will sell the warehouse upon its completion.

The warehouse:
- Will be used for general storage activities, such as storage of books or stationery.
- Will have two stories, both above ground, with a total constructed area of approximately 1,300.6 square meters (14,000 square feet). Each floor will be 3 meters (9 feet, 10 inches) high and will be located on a land plot of approximately 929 square meters (10,000 square feet) that is 100% owned by BuildCo, and the warehouse is valued at 50 times income per capita.
- Will have complete architectural and technical plans prepared by a licensed architect. If preparation of the plans requires such steps as obtaining further documentation or getting prior approvals from external agencies, these are counted as procedures.
- Will take 30 weeks to construct (excluding all delays due to administrative and regulatory requirements).

The water and sewerage connections:
- Will be 150 meters (492 feet) from the existing water source and sewer tap. If there is no water delivery infrastructure in the economy, a borehole will be dug. If there is no sewerage infrastructure, a septic tank in the smallest size available will be installed or built.
- Will have an average water use of 662 liters (175 gallons) a day and an average wastewater flow of 568 liters (150 gallons) a day. Will have a peak water use of 1,325 liters (350 gallons) a day and a peak wastewater flow of 1,136 liters (300 gallons) a day.
- Will have a constant level of water demand and wastewater flow throughout the year; will be 1 inch in diameter for the water connection and 4 inches in diameter for the sewerage connection.
Dealing with Construction Permits

Where do the region's economies stand today?

How easy it is for entrepreneurs in economies in European Union (EU) to legally build a warehouse? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of dealing with construction permits suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of dealing with construction permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Dealing with Construction Permits

The indicators underlying the rankings may be more revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show what it takes to comply with formalities to build a warehouse in each economy in the region: the number of procedures, the time and the cost. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

What it takes to comply with formalities to build a warehouse in economies in European Union (EU)

Procedures (number)

![Procedure count chart]

Source: Doing Business database.
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Time (days)

Source: Doing Business database.
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Cost (% of warehouse value)

Source: Doing Business database.
Dealing with Construction Permits

Building quality control index (0-15)
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Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Electricity

This topic measures the procedures, time and cost required for a business to obtain a permanent electricity connection for a newly constructed warehouse. Additionally, the reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index measures reliability of supply, transparency of tariffs and the price of electricity. The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the indicators measure</th>
<th>Case study assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures to obtain an electricity connection (number)</strong></td>
<td><strong>To make the data comparable across economies, several assumptions about the warehouse, the electricity connection and the monthly consumption are used.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submitting all relevant documents and obtaining all necessary clearances and permits</td>
<td><strong>The warehouse:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completing all required notifications and receiving all necessary inspections</td>
<td>- Is owned by a local entrepreneur and is used for storage of goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtaining external installation works and possibly purchasing material for these works</td>
<td>- Is located in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concluding any necessary supply contract and obtaining final supply</td>
<td>- Is located in an area where similar warehouses are typically located and is in an area with no physical constraints. For example, the property is not near a railway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days)</strong></td>
<td>- Is a new construction and is being connected to electricity for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is at least 1 calendar day</td>
<td>- Has two stories with a total surface area of approximately 1,300.6 square meters (14,000 square feet). The plot of land on which it is built is 929 square meters (10,000 square feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each procedure starts on a separate day</td>
<td><strong>The electricity connection:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not include time spent gathering information</td>
<td>- Is a permanent one with a three-phase, four-wire Y connection with a subscribed capacity of 140-kilo-volt-ampere (kVA) with a power factor of 1, when 1 kVA = 1 kilowatt (kW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflects the time spent in practice, with little follow-up and no prior contact with officials</td>
<td>- Has a length of 150 meters. The connection is to either the low- or medium-voltage distribution network and is either overhead or underground, whichever is more common in the area where the warehouse is located and requires works that involve the crossing of a 10-meter road (such as by excavation or overhead lines) but are all carried out on public land. There is no crossing of other owners’ private property because the warehouse has access to a road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost required to complete each procedure (% of income per capita)</strong></td>
<td>- Does not require work to install the internal wiring of the warehouse. This has already been completed up to and including the customer’s service panel or switchboard and the meter base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Official costs only, no bribes</td>
<td><strong>The monthly consumption:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Value added tax excluded</td>
<td>- It is assumed that the warehouse operates 30 days a month from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (8 hours a day), with equipment utilized at 80% of capacity on average and that there are no electricity cuts (assumed for simplicity reasons) and the monthly energy consumption is 26,880 kilowatt-hours (kWh); hourly consumption is 112 kWh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The reliability of supply and transparency of tariffs index (0-8)</strong></td>
<td>- If multiple electricity suppliers exist, the warehouse is served by the cheapest supplier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Duration and frequency of power outages (0-3)</td>
<td>- Tariffs effective in January of the current year are used for calculation of the price of electricity for the warehouse. Although January has 31 days, for calculation purposes only 30 days are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tools to monitor power outages (0-1)</td>
<td><strong>Price of electricity (cents per kilowatt-hour)</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tools to restore power supply (0-1)</td>
<td>• Price based on monthly bill for commercial warehouse in case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Regulatory monitoring of utilities’ performance (0-1) | *Note: Doing Business measures the price of electricity, but it is not included in the ease of doing business score nor in the ranking on the ease of getting electricity.
Getting Electricity

Where do the region’s economies stand today?

How easy it is for entrepreneurs in economies in European Union (EU) to connect a warehouse to electricity? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of getting electricity suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of getting electricity

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Electricity

The indicators underlying the rankings may be more revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show what it takes to get a new electricity connection in each economy in the region: the number of procedures, the time and the cost. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

What it takes to get an electricity connection in economies in European Union (EU)

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Electricity

Time (days)

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Electricity

Cost (% of income per capita)

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Electricity

Reliability of supply and transparency of tariff index (0-8)

Source: Doing Business database.
Registering Property

This topic examines the steps, time and cost involved in registering property, assuming a standardized case of an entrepreneur who wants to purchase land and a building that is already registered and free of title dispute. In addition, the topic also measures the quality of the land administration system in each economy. The quality of land administration index has five dimensions: reliability of infrastructure, transparency of information, geographic coverage, land dispute resolution, and equal access to property rights. The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

### What the indicators measure

**Procedures to legally transfer title on immovable property (number)**
- Preregistration procedures (for example, checking for liens, notarizing sales agreement, paying property transfer taxes)
- Registration procedures in the economy’s largest business city.
- Postregistration procedures (for example, filling title with municipality)

**Time required to complete each procedure (calendar days)**
- Each procedure starts on a separate day - though procedures that can be fully completed online are an exception to this rule
- Procedure is considered completed once final document is received
- No prior contact with officials

**Cost required to complete each procedure (% of property value)**
- Official costs only (such as administrative fees, duties and taxes).
- Value Added Tax, Capital Gains Tax and illicit payments are excluded

**Quality of land administration index (0-30)**
- Reliability of infrastructure index (0-8)
- Transparency of information index (0-6)
- Geographic coverage index (0-8)
- Land dispute resolution index (0-8)
- Equal access to property rights index (-2-0)

### Case study assumptions

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

**The parties (buyer and seller):**
- Are limited liability companies (or the legal equivalent).
- Are located in the periurban (that is, on the outskirts of the city but still within its official limits) area of the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- Are 100% domestically and privately owned.
- Perform general commercial activities.

**The property (fully owned by the seller):**
- Has a value of 50 times income per capita, which equals the sale price.
- Is fully owned by the seller.
- Has no mortgages attached and has been under the same ownership for the past 10 years.
- Is registered in the land registry or cadastre, or both, and is free of title disputes.
- Is located in a periurban commercial zone (that is, on the outskirts of the city but still within its official limits), and no rezoning is required.
- Consists of land and a building. The land area is 557.4 square meters (6,000 square feet). A two-story warehouse of 929 square meters (10,000 square feet) is located on the land. The warehouse is 10 years old, is in good condition, has no heating system and complies with all safety standards, building codes and legal requirements. The property, consisting of land and building, will be transferred in its entirety.
- Will not be subject to renovations or additional construction following the purchase.
- Has no trees, natural water sources, natural reserves or historical monuments of any kind.
- Will not be used for special purposes, and no special permits, such as for residential use, industrial plants, waste storage or certain types of agricultural activities, are required.
- Has no occupants, and no other party holds a legal interest in it.
Registering Property

Where do the region’s economies stand today?
How easy it is for entrepreneurs in economies in European Union (EU) to transfer property? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of registering property suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Registering Property

The indicators underlying the rankings may be more revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show the average recovery rate and the average strength of insolvency framework index. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

What is takes to register property in economies in European Union (EU).

Procedures (number)

Source: Doing Business database.
## Registering Property

### Time (days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean (LAC)</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD High Income</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia (ECA)</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Registering Property

Cost (% of property value)

Source: Doing Business database.
Registering Property

Quality of the land administration index (0-30)

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Credit

This topic explores two sets of issues—the strength of credit reporting systems and the effectiveness of collateral and bankruptcy laws in facilitating lending. The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

### What the indicators measure

**Strength of legal rights index (0-12)**
- Rights of borrowers and lenders through collateral laws (0-10)
- Protection of secured creditors’ rights through bankruptcy laws (0-2)

**Depth of credit information index (0-8)**
- Scope and accessibility of credit information distributed by credit bureaus and credit registries (0-8)

**Credit bureau coverage (% of adults)**
- Number of individuals and firms listed in largest credit bureau as a percentage of adult population

**Credit registry coverage (% of adults)**
- Number of individuals and firms listed in credit registry as a percentage of adult population

### Case study assumptions

Doing Business assesses the sharing of credit information and the legal rights of borrowers and lenders with respect to secured transactions through 2 sets of indicators. The depth of credit information index measures rules and practices affecting the coverage, scope and accessibility of credit information available through a credit registry or a credit bureau. The strength of legal rights index measures the degree to which collateral and bankruptcy laws protect the rights of borrowers and lenders and thus facilitate lending. For each economy it is first determined whether a unitary secured transactions system exists. Then two case scenarios, case A and case B, are used to determine how a nonpossessory security interest is created, publicized and enforced according to the law. Special emphasis is given to how the collateral registry operates (if registration of security interests is possible). The case scenarios involve a secured borrower, company ABC, and a secured lender, BizBank.

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

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

- ABC is a domestic limited liability company (or its legal equivalent).
- ABC has up to 50 employees.
- ABC has its headquarters and only base of operations in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.
- Both ABC and BizBank are 100% domestically owned.

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

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

Where do the region’s economies stand today?
How well do the credit information systems and collateral and bankruptcy laws in economies in European Union (EU) facilitate access to credit? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of getting credit suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of getting credit

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Credit

Another way to assess how well regulations and institutions support lending and borrowing in the region is to see where the region stands in the distribution of scores across regions. The first figure highlights the score on the strength of legal rights index in European Union (EU) and comparator regions. The second figure shows the same thing for the depth of credit information index.

How strong are legal rights for borrowers and lenders

Strength of legal rights index (0-12)

Source: Doing Business database.
Getting Credit

Depth of credit information index (0-8)

Source: Doing Business database.
Protecting Minority Investors

This topic measures the strength of minority shareholder protections against misuse of corporate assets by directors for their personal gain as well as shareholder rights, governance safeguards and corporate transparency requirements that reduce the risk of abuse. The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the indicators measure</th>
<th>Case study assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent of disclosure index (0-10): Disclosure, review, and approval requirements for related-party transactions</td>
<td>To make the data comparable across economies, a case study uses several assumptions about the business and the transaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of director liability index (0-10): Ability of minority shareholders to sue and hold interested directors liable for prejudicial related-party transactions; Available legal remedies (damages, disgorgement of profits, disqualification from managerial position(s) for one year or more, rescission of the transaction)</td>
<td>The business (Buyer):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of shareholder suits index (0-10): Access to internal corporate documents; Evidence obtainable during trial and allocation of legal expenses</td>
<td>- Is a publicly traded corporation listed on the economy's most important stock exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of conflict of interest regulation index (0-30): Shareholders' rights and role in major corporate decisions</td>
<td>- Has a board of directors and a chief executive officer (CEO) who may legally act on behalf of Buyer where permitted, even if this is not specifically required by law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder rights index (0-6): Shareholders' rights and role in major corporate decisions</td>
<td>- Has a supervisory board in economies with a two-tier board system on which Mr. James appointed 60% of the shareholder-elected members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of ownership and control index (0-7): Governance safeguards protecting shareholders from undue board control and entrenchment</td>
<td>- Has not adopted bylaws or articles of association that go beyond the minimum requirements. Does not follow codes, principles, recommendations or guidelines that are not mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of corporate transparency index (0-7): Corporate transparency on ownership stakes, compensation, audits and financial prospects</td>
<td>- Is a manufacturing company with its own distribution network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of shareholder governance index (0-20): Sum of the extent of shareholders rights, extent of ownership and control and extent of corporate transparency indices</td>
<td>The transaction involves the following details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of minority investor protection index (0-50): Sum of the extent of conflict of interest regulation and extent of shareholder governance indices</td>
<td>- Mr. James owns 60% of Buyer, sits on Buyer’s board of directors and elected two directors to Buyer’s five-member board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case study assumptions

To make the data comparable across economies, a case study uses several assumptions about the business and the transaction.

The business (Buyer):
- Is a publicly traded corporation listed on the economy’s most important stock exchange.
- Has a board of directors and a chief executive officer (CEO) who may legally act on behalf of Buyer where permitted, even if this is not specifically required by law.
- Has a supervisory board in economies with a two-tier board system on which Mr. James appointed 60% of the shareholder-elected members.
- Has not adopted bylaws or articles of association that go beyond the minimum requirements. Does not follow codes, principles, recommendations or guidelines that are not mandatory.
- Is a manufacturing company with its own distribution network.

The transaction involves the following details:
- Mr. James owns 60% of Buyer, sits on Buyer’s board of directors and elected two directors to Buyer’s five-member board.
- Mr. James also owns 90% of Seller, a company that operates a chain of retail hardware stores. Seller recently closed a large number of its stores.
- Mr. James proposes that Buyer purchase Seller’s unused fleet of trucks to expand Buyer’s distribution of its food products, a proposal to which Buyer agrees. The price is equal to 10% of Buyer’s assets and is higher than the market value.
- The proposed transaction is part of the company’s principal activity and is not outside the authority of the company.
- Buyer enters into the transaction. All required approvals are obtained, and all required disclosures made—that is, the transaction was not entered into fraudulently.
- The transaction causes damages to Buyer. Shareholders sue Mr. James and the executives and directors that approved the transaction.
Protecting Minority Investors

Where do the region’s economies stand today? How strong are investor protections against self-dealing in economies in European Union (EU)? The global rankings of these economies on the strength of investor protection index suggest an answer. While the indicator does not measure all aspects related to the protection of minority investors, a higher ranking does indicate that an economy’s regulations offer stronger investor protections against self-dealing in the areas measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Paying Taxes

This topic records the taxes and mandatory contributions that a medium-size company must pay or withhold in a given year, as well as the administrative burden of paying taxes and contributions and complying with postfiling procedures (VAT refund and tax audit). The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019 covering for the Paying Taxes indicator calendar year 2018 (January 1, 2018 – December 31, 2018). See the methodology for more information.

### What the indicators measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax payments for a manufacturing company in 2018 (number per year adjusted for electronic and joint filing and payment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Total number of taxes and contributions paid or withheld, including consumption taxes (value added tax, sales tax or goods and service tax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Method and frequency of filing and payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time required to comply with 3 major taxes (hours per year)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collecting information, computing tax payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparing separate tax accounting books, if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completing tax return, filing with agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arranging payment or withholding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total tax and contribution rate (% of commercial profits)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Profit or corporate income tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social contributions, labor taxes paid by employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property and property transfer taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dividend, capital gains, financial transactions taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Waste collection, vehicle, road and other taxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Postfiling Index**

- Time to comply with VAT refund (hours)
- Time to obtain VAT refund (weeks)
- Time to comply with a corporate income tax correction (hours)
- Time to complete a corporate income tax correction (weeks)

### Case study assumptions

Using a case scenario, *Doing Business* records taxes and mandatory contributions a medium-size company must pay in a year, and measures the administrative burden of paying taxes, contributions and dealing with postfiling processes. Information is also compiled on frequency of filing and payments, time taken to comply with tax laws, time taken to comply with the requirements of postfiling processes and time waiting.

To make data comparable across economies, several assumptions are used:

- TaxpayerCo is a medium-size business that started operations on January 1, 2017. It produces ceramic flowerpots and sells them at retail. All taxes and contributions recorded are paid in the second year of operation (calendar year 2018). Taxes and mandatory contributions are measured at all levels of government.

**The VAT refund process:**

- In June 2018, TaxpayerCo makes a large capital purchase: the value of the machine is 65 times income per capita of the economy. Sales are equally spread per month (1,050 times income per capita divided by 12) and cost of goods sold are equally expensed per month (875 times income per capita divided by 12). The machinery seller is registered for VAT and excess input VAT incurred in June will be fully recovered after four consecutive months if the VAT rate is the same for inputs, sales and the machine and the tax reporting period is every month. Input VAT will exceed Output VAT in June 2018.

**The corporate income tax audit process:**

- An error in calculation of income tax liability (for example, use of incorrect tax depreciation rates, or incorrectly treating an expense as tax deductible) leads to an incorrect income tax return and a corporate income tax underpayment. TaxpayerCo discovered the error and voluntarily notified the tax authority. The value of the underpaid income tax liability is 5% of the corporate income tax liability due. TaxpayerCo submits corrected information after the deadline for submitting the annual tax return, but within the tax assessment period.
Where do the region’s economies stand today?

What is the administrative burden of complying with taxes in economies in European Union (EU) —and how much do firms pay in taxes? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of paying taxes offer useful information for assessing the tax compliance burden for businesses. The average ranking of the region provides a useful benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland (Rank 4)</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (Rank 8)</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (Rank 10)</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia (Rank 12)</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia (Rank 16)</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania (Rank 18)</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (Rank 22)</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg (Rank 23)</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (Rank 27)</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Rank 29)</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (Rank 31)</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (Rank 32)</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (Rank 35)</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal (Rank 43)</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria (Rank 44)</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia (Rank 45)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Rank 46)</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (Rank 49)</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic (Rank 53)</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic (Rank 55)</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (Rank 56)</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (Rank 61)</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Rank 63)</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (Rank 72)</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (Rank 77)</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta (Rank 78)</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (Rank 97)</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (Rank 128)</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Average (Rank 44) | 83.1 |

Source: Doing Business database.
Paying Taxes

The indicators underlying the rankings may be more revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show what it takes to comply with tax regulations in each economy in the region—the number of payments per year, the time required to prepare, and file and pay the 3 major taxes (corporate income tax, VAT or sales tax and labor taxes and mandatory contributions), the total tax and contribution rate—as well as a postfiling index that measures the compliance with completing two processes: VAT cash refund and tax audit. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

How easy is it to pay taxes in economies in European Union (EU) - and what are the total tax and contribution rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments (number per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean (LAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia (ECA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD High Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Paying Taxes

Time (hours per year)

Source: Doing Business database.
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Paying Taxes

Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total tax and contribution rate (% of profit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean (LAC)</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD High Income</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia (ECA)</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Paying Taxes

Postfiling index (0-100)

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Doing Business records the time and cost associated with the logistical process of exporting and importing goods. Doing Business measures the time and cost (excluding tariffs) associated with three sets of procedures—documentary compliance, border compliance and domestic transport—within the overall process of exporting or importing a shipment of goods. The most recent round of data collection for the project was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

What the indicators measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentary compliance</th>
<th>Case study assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Obtaining, preparing and submitting documents during transport, clearance, inspections and port or border handling in origin economy</td>
<td>To make the data comparable across economies, a few assumptions are made about the traded goods and the transactions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtaining, preparing and submitting documents required by destination economy and any transit economies</td>
<td><strong>Time:</strong> Time is measured in hours, and 1 day is 24 hours (for example, 22 days are recorded as 22×24=528 hours). If customs clearance takes 7.5 hours, the data are recorded as is. Alternatively, suppose documents are submitted to a customs agency at 8:00a.m., are processed overnight and can be picked up at 8:00a.m. the next day. The time for customs clearance would be recorded as 24 hours because the actual procedure took 24 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Covers all documents required by law and in practice, including electronic submissions of information</td>
<td><strong>Cost:</strong> Insurance cost and informal payments for which no receipt is issued are excluded from the costs recorded. Costs are reported in U.S. dollars. Contributors are asked to convert local currency into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rate prevailing on the day they answer the questionnaire. Contributors are private sector experts in international trade logistics and are informed about exchange rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Border compliance</th>
<th>Assumptions of the case study:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Customs clearance and inspections</td>
<td>- For all 190 economies covered by Doing Business, it is assumed a shipment is in a warehouse in the largest business city of the exporting economy and travels to a warehouse in the largest business city of the importing economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspections by other agencies (if applied to more than 20% of shipments)</td>
<td>- It is assumed each economy imports 15 metric tons of containerized auto parts (HS 8708) from its natural import partner—the economy from which it imports the largest value (price times quantity) of auto parts. It is assumed each economy exports the product of its comparative advantage (defined by the largest export value) to its natural export partner—the economy that is the largest purchaser of this product. Shipment value is assumed to be $50,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Handling and inspections that take place at the economy’s port or border</td>
<td>- The mode of transport is the one most widely used for the chosen export or import product and the trading partner, as is the seaport or land border crossing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic transport</th>
<th>- All electronic information submissions requested by any government agency in connection with the shipment are considered to be documents obtained, prepared and submitted during the export or import process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Loading or unloading of the shipment at the warehouse or port/border</td>
<td>- A port or border is a place (seaport or land border crossing) where merchandise can enter or leave an economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport between warehouse and port/border</td>
<td>- Relevant government agencies include customs, port authorities, road police, border guards, standardization agencies, ministries or departments of agriculture or industry, national security agencies and any other government authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic delays and road police checks while shipment is en route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trading across Borders

Where do the region’s economies stand today?

How easy is it for businesses in economies in European Union (EU) to export and import goods? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of trading across borders suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of trading across borders

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

The indicators reported here are for trading a shipment of goods by the most widely used mode of transport (whether sea or land or some combination of these). The information on the time and cost to complete export and import is collected from local freight forwarders, customs brokers and traders. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

What it takes to trade across borders in economies in European Union (EU)

Time to export: Border compliance (hours)

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Cost to export: Border compliance (USD)

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Time to export: Documentary compliance (hours)

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Cost to export: Documentary compliance (USD)

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Time to import: Border compliance (hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean (LAC)</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia (ECA)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD High Income</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Cost to import: Border compliance (USD)

Source: Doing Business database.
Trading across Borders

Time to import: Documentary compliance (hours)

Source: Doing Business database.
### Trading across Borders

#### Cost to import: Documentary compliance (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regionally Average</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
### Enforcing Contracts

The enforcing contracts indicator measures the time and cost for resolving a commercial dispute through a local first-instance court, and the quality of judicial processes index, evaluating whether each economy has adopted a series of good practices that promote quality and efficiency in the court system. The most recent round of data collection was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the indicators measure</th>
<th>Case study assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time required to enforce a contract through the courts (calendar days)</strong></td>
<td>The dispute in the case study involves the breach of a sales contract between two domestic businesses. The case study assumes that the court hears an expert on the quality of the goods in dispute. This distinguishes the case from simple debt enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time to file and serve the case</td>
<td>To make the data comparable across economies, Doing Business uses several assumptions about the case are used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time for trial and to obtain the judgment</td>
<td>- The dispute concerns a lawful transaction between two businesses (Seller and Buyer), both located in the economy’s largest business city. For 11 economies the data are also collected for the second largest business city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time to enforce the judgment</td>
<td>- The Buyer orders custom-made furniture, then fails to pay alleging that the goods are not of adequate quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost required to enforce a contract through the courts (% of claim value)</strong></td>
<td>- The value of the dispute is 200% of the income per capita or the equivalent in local currency of USD 5,000, whichever is greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average Attorney fees</td>
<td>- The Seller sues the Buyer before the court with jurisdiction over commercial cases worth 200% of income per capita or $5,000 whichever is greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Court costs</td>
<td>- The Seller requests the pretrial attachment of the defendant’s movable assets to secure the claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enforcement costs</td>
<td>- The claim is disputed on the merits because of Buyer’s allegation that the quality of the goods was not adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of judicial processes index (0-18)</strong></td>
<td>- The judge decides in favor of the seller; there is no appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Court structure and proceedings (-1-5)</td>
<td>- The Seller enforces the judgment through a public sale of the Buyer’s movable assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Case management (0-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enforcing Contracts

Where do the region’s economies stand today?

How efficient is the process of resolving a commercial dispute through the courts in economies in European Union (EU)? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of enforcing contracts suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of enforcing contracts.

Source: Doing Business database.
Enforcing Contracts

The indicators underlying the rankings may also be revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show what it takes to enforce a contract through the courts in each economy in the region: the time, the cost and quality of judicial processes index. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Time (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean (LAC)</td>
<td>774.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Average</td>
<td>627.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
<td>622.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD High Income</td>
<td>589.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
<td>581.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia (ECA)</td>
<td>496.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1180.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1120.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>775.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>755.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>685.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>678.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>650.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>650.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>605.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>554.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>514.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>512.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>510.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>505.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>505.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>499.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>485.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>485.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>483.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>469.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>455.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>447.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>397.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>370.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>370.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>121.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Doing Business database.
Enforcing Contracts

Cost (% of claim value)

Source: Doing Business database.
Enforcing Contracts

Quality of judicial processes index (0-18)

Source: Doing Business database.
Resolving Insolvency

Doing Business studies the time, cost and outcome of insolvency proceedings involving domestic legal entities. These variables are used to calculate the recovery rate, which is recorded as cents on the dollar recovered by secured creditors through reorganization, liquidation or debt enforcement (foreclosure or receivership) proceedings. To determine the present value of the amount recovered by creditors, Doing Business uses the lending rates from the International Monetary Fund, supplemented with data from central banks and the Economist Intelligence Unit. The most recent round of data collection was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the indicators measure</th>
<th>Case study assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time required to recover debt (years)</strong></td>
<td>To make the data on the time, cost and outcome comparable across economies, several assumptions about the business and the case are used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Measured in calendar years</td>
<td>- A hotel located in the largest city (or cities) has 201 employees and 50 suppliers. The hotel experiences financial difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Appeals and requests for extension are included</td>
<td>- The value of the hotel is 100% of the income per capita or the equivalent in local currency of USD 200,000, whichever is greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost required to recover debt (% of debtor’s estate)</strong></td>
<td>- The hotel has a loan from a domestic bank, secured by a mortgage over the hotel’s real estate. The hotel cannot pay back the loan, but makes enough money to operate otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Measured as percentage of estate value</td>
<td>In addition, Doing Business evaluates the quality of legal framework applicable to judicial liquidation and reorganization proceedings and the extent to which best insolvency practices have been implemented in each economy covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Court fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Fees of insolvency administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Lawyers’ fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Assessors’ and auctioneers’ fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Other related fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Whether business continues operating as a going concern or business assets are sold piecemeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery rate for creditors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Measures the cents on the dollar recovered by secured creditors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Outcome for the business (survival or not) determines the maximum value that can be recovered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Official costs of the insolvency proceedings are deducted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Depreciation of furniture is taken into account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Present value of debt recovered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength of insolvency framework index (0-16)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Sum of the scores of four component indices:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Commencement of proceedings index (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Management of debtor’s assets index (0-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Reorganization proceedings index (0-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Creditor participation index (0-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolving Insolvency

How efficient are insolvency proceedings in economies in European Union (EU)? The global rankings of these economies on the ease of resolving insolvency suggest an answer. The average ranking of the region and comparator regions provide a useful benchmark for assessing the efficiency of insolvency proceedings. Speed, low costs and continuation of viable businesses characterize the top performing economies.

How economies in European Union (EU) rank on the ease of resolving insolvency

Source: Doing Business database.
Resolving Insolvency

The indicators underlying the rankings may be more revealing. Data collected by Doing Business show the average recovery rate and the average strength of insolvency framework index. Comparing these indicators across the region and with averages both for the region and for comparator regions can provide useful insights.

How efficient is the insolvency process in economies in European Union (EU)

Recovery rate (cents on the dollar)

Source: Doing Business database.
Employing Workers

Doing Business presents detailed data for the employing workers indicators on the Doing Business website (http://www.doingbusiness.org). The study does not present rankings of economies on these indicators or include the topic in the aggregate ease of doing business score or ranking on the ease of doing business.

The most recent round of data collection was completed in May 2019. See the methodology for more information.

### What the indicators measure

#### Hiring
(i) whether fixed-term contracts are prohibited for permanent tasks; (ii) maximum cumulative duration of fixed-term contracts; (iii) length of the maximum probationary period; (iv) minimum wage; (v) ratio of minimum wage to the average value added per worker.

#### Working hours
(i) maximum number of working days allowed per week; (ii) premiums for work: at night, on a weekly rest day and overtime; (iii) whether there are restrictions on work at night, work on a weekly rest day and for overtime work; (iv) length of paid annual leave.

#### Redundancy rules
(i) whether redundancy can be basis for terminating workers; (ii) whether employer needs to notify and/or get approval from third party to terminate 1 redundant worker and a group of 9 redundant workers; (iii) whether the law requires employer to reassign or retrain a worker before making worker redundant; (iv) whether priority rules apply for redundancies and reemployment.

#### Redundancy cost
(i) notice period for redundancy dismissal; (ii) severance payments, and (iii) penalties due when terminating a redundant worker. Data on the availability of unemployment protection for a worker with one year of employment is also collected.

### Case study assumptions

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

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

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

From May 2, 2018 to May 1, 2019, 115 economies implemented 294 business regulatory reforms across the 10 areas measured by Doing Business. Reforms inspired by Doing Business have been implemented by economies in all regions. The following are reforms implemented in European Union (EU) since Doing Business 2011.

✓ = Doing Business reform making it easier to do business. × = Change making it more difficult to do business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium made starting a business easier by eliminating the paid-in minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made starting a business easier by abolishing the requirements to reserve the company name and obtain director signatures for company registration, and by reducing the paid-in minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made starting a business less expensive by reducing the cost to register a company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finland made starting a business easier by reducing the fee and processing time of online business registrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made starting a business easier by reducing the time to register a company with the commercial registry and removing the requirement to obtain a tax clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta made starting a business easier by implementing an online one-stop-shop for registration of employer, employees and value added tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made starting a business easier by allowing voluntary value added tax registration, which is less time consuming than mandatory registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made starting a business easier by abolishing the requirement to obtain and submit information on tax arrears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made starting a business more complicated by introducing fiscal risk assessment criteria for value added tax applications, thereby increasing the time required to register as a value added tax payer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia made starting a business more complicated by requiring companies to report their beneficial ownership separately from business incorporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made starting a business less expensive by introducing lower fees for simple limited liability companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made starting a business easier by creating a unified social security institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta made starting a business easier by removing the requirement for a trading license for general commercial activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made starting a business more difficult by increasing notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made starting a business easier by merging the procedures to register for taxes and for VAT while making name search and reservation faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made starting a business easier by reducing the cost and the time required to register a company in commercial courts by allowing notaries to directly register companies through an online system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland made starting a business easier by removing the requirement that a founder seeking to incorporate a company swear before a commissioner of oaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta simplified the process of starting a business by reducing the time needed to register a company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made starting a business more difficult by increasing the time to register for Value Added Tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark made starting a business easier by introducing an online platform allowing simultaneous completion of business and tax registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Estonia made starting a business simpler by allowing minimum capital to be deposited at the time of company registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany made starting a business easier by making the process more efficient and less costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made starting a business easier by introducing online VAT registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic simplified the process of starting a business by introducing court registration at the one-stop shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden made starting a business easier by requiring the company registry to register a company in five days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement, which in turn reduced the paid-in minimum capital requirement, and by lowering notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria made starting a business easier by lowering registration fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made starting a business easier by reducing notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made starting a business easier by substantially reducing the minimum capital requirement and the paid-in minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark made starting a business easier by reducing the paid-in minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France made starting a business easier by reducing the time it takes to register a company at the one-stop shop (Centre de Formalités des Entreprises).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany made starting a business more difficult by increasing notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made starting a business easier by lowering registration costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary made starting a business more difficult by increasing the paid-in minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy made starting a business easier by reducing both the minimum capital requirement and the paid-in minimum capital requirement and by streamlining registration procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made starting a business more difficult by increasing registration fees, bank fees and notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made starting a business easier by eliminating the need to have a company seal and speeding up the value added tax (VAT) registration at the State Tax Inspectorate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta made starting a business easier by creating an electronic link between the Registrar of Companies and the Inland Revenue Department to facilitate issuance of a tax identification number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made starting a business easier by reducing the time needed to register with the district court and eliminating the need (and therefore the fee) for the verification of signatures by a notary public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made starting a business easier by introducing an electronic system linking several public agencies and thereby simplifying business registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom made starting a business easier by speeding up tax registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made starting a business easier by introducing a simpler form of limited liability company and abolishing the minimum capital requirement for such companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made starting a business easier by making it possible to file the applications for company registration and value added tax registration simultaneously at the commercial registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands made starting a business easier by abolishing the minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement to register the new company at the National Labor Inspectorate and the National Sanitary Inspectorate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement to report to the Ministry of Labor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made starting a business easier by transferring responsibility for issuing the headquarters clearance certificate from the Fiscal Administration Office to the Trade Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made starting a business more difficult by adding a new procedure for establishing a limited liability company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement to obtain a municipal license before starting operations and by improving the efficiency of the commercial registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom made starting a business easier by providing model articles for use in preparing memorandums and articles of association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria made starting a business easier by reducing the cost of registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Year</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary made starting a business more complex by increasing the registration fees for limited liability companies and adding a new tax registration at the time of incorporation and enforcing a requirement for mandatory registration with the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland made starting a business easier by introducing a new online facility for business registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made starting a business easier by introducing online registration for limited liability companies and eliminating the notarization requirement for incorporation documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands made starting a business easier by eliminating the requirement for a declaration of nonobjection by the Ministry of Justice before incorporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made starting a business easier by reducing the time required to obtain a clearance certificate from the fiscal administration agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made starting a business easier by speeding up the processing of applications at the one-stop shop for trading licenses, income tax registration and health insurance registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made starting a business easier by implementing an electronic platform that interconnects several government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made starting a business easier by reducing the minimum capital requirement and introducing a common application for value added tax and company registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made starting a business easier by allowing company founders to choose the amount of minimum capital and make their paid-in capital contribution up to 1 year after the company’s creation, and by eliminating the stamp tax on company’s share capital subscriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made starting a business more difficult by requiring a tax clearance certificate for a new company's headquarters before company registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain eased the process of starting a business by reducing the cost to start a business and decreasing the minimum capital requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria eased business start-up by reducing the minimum capital requirement from 5,000 leva ($3,250) to 2 leva ($1.30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia eased business start-up by allowing limited liability companies to file their registration application with the court registries electronically through the notary public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark eased business start-up by reducing the minimum capital requirement for limited liability companies from 125,000 Danish kroner ($22,850) to 80,000 Danish kroner ($14,620).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany eased business start-up by increasing the efficiency of communications between the notary and the commercial registry and eliminating the need to publish an announcement in a newspaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy made starting a business easier by enhancing an online registration system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania tightened the time limit for completing the registration of a company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg eased business start-up by speeding up the delivery of the business license.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia made starting a business easier through improvements to its one-stop shop that allowed more online services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden cut the minimum capital requirement for limited liability companies by half, making it easier to start a business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dealing with Construction Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made dealing with construction permits less costly by reducing the water contribution for building a warehouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark made dealing with construction permits cheaper by eliminating fees for building permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece streamlined its construction permitting process as building owners must now use their in-house engineer for the intermediate inspection, as opposed to the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining the process of obtaining a building permit. On the other hand, the time to issue building permits has increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Year</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made dealing with construction permits more costly by increasing the administrative fees for building and occupancy permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark made dealing with construction permits more expensive by raising the cost of building permits and the cost of obtaining a water and sewage connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made dealing with construction permits easier by reducing the time needed to obtain technical conditions and the building permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France made dealing with construction permits less expensive by reducing the cost of obtaining a building permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made dealing with construction permits simpler by streamlining the process of obtaining a building permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made dealing with construction permits more time-consuming by increasing the time required to obtain a building permit—despite having streamlined the process by having the building permit issued together with the architectural planning conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made dealing with construction permits easier by reducing the requirements and fees for building permits and carrying out the final building inspection more promptly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made dealing with construction permits easier by reducing the time required for processing building permit applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark made dealing with construction permits more costly by increasing the fee for building permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made dealing with construction permits easier by introducing new time limits for issuing a building permit and by eliminating the Public Health Agency’s role in approving building permits and conducting inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta made dealing with construction permits less costly by significantly reducing the building permit fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made dealing with construction permits easier by eliminating the requirement to obtain a description of the geotechnical documentation of the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia made dealing with construction permits easier by eliminating the requirement to obtain project conditions from the water and sewerage provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece reduced the time required to obtain a construction permit by introducing strict time limits for processing permit applications at the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands made dealing with construction permits simpler by merging several approvals and implementing an online application system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made obtaining construction permits easier by implementing strict time limits to process urban projects and simplifying the associated procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made dealing with construction permits easier by streamlining its inspection system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom made dealing with construction permits easier by increasing efficiency in the issuance of planning permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia replaced the location permit and project design confirmation with a single certificate, simplifying and speeding up the construction permitting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Estonia made dealing with construction permits more complex by increasing the time for obtaining design criteria from the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary implemented a time limit for the issuance of building permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made it easier dealing with construction permits by implementing the 95 day time limit for the approval of project designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania amended regulations related to construction permitting to reduce fees and expedite the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Getting Electricity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made getting electricity easier by launching an integrated digital application and by reducing the cost of new connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Malta increased the reliability of power supply by upgrading its power grid infrastructure and launching a network planning and operations control center.

Poland made getting electricity faster by implementing a new customer service platform that allows the utility to better track applications for new commercial connections.

Belgium made the process of getting electricity faster by improving access to information about the connection process and reducing the time for connection works.

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

Greece made the process of getting electricity easier by eliminating the requirement for customers applying for a connection to certify the electrician’s sworn statement on internal wiring.

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

Croatia improved the reliability of power supply by introducing financial deterrence mechanisms aimed at limiting power outages.

Italy made getting electricity easier by streamlining the application process and reducing the time for the external works and meter installation.

Lithuania made getting electricity easier by streamlining procedures and imposing deadlines for issuing internal wiring inspection certificates.

Bulgaria increased the reliability of power supply by implementing an automatic energy management system, the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA), to monitor outages and service restoration.

The Czech Republic made getting electricity faster by designating personnel to deal with all incoming connection applications.

Lithuania made getting electricity faster by introducing time limits on the utility to conduct necessary connection procedures and lowering the connection tariff.

Poland made getting an electricity connection faster by eliminating the need to secure an excavation permit for external connection works, which reduced the time of mentioned works.

Portugal made getting an electricity connection faster by reducing the time required to approve electrical connection requests.

Spain made getting electricity easier by upgrading Madrid’s electrical grid, thereby allowing more customers to connect to the low-voltage network. Furthermore, the approval process to obtain a new commercial connection was streamlined.

The utility in Cyprus made getting electricity easier by reducing the time required for obtaining a new connection.

The utility in Lithuania has reduced the time of the connection works by enforcing the legal time limit to perform the external connection works.

The utility in Malta reduced the time required for getting an electricity connection by improving its supervision of trenching works.

The utility in Poland reduced delays in processing applications for new electricity connections by increasing human and capital resources and by enforcing service delivery timelines.

Poland made getting electricity less costly by revising the fee structure for new connections.

Italy made getting electricity easier and less costly by improving the efficiency of the utility Acea Distribuzione and reducing connection fees.

Latvia made getting electricity faster by introducing a simplified process for approval of external connection designs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Change Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made it easier to transfer property by decreasing the real estate transfer tax and by reducing the time to register property title transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made transferring property more difficult by increasing the time needed to apply for registration at the Land and Mortgage Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made transferring property more efficient by digitizing its land registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France made registering property easier by implementing an electronic registration system and improving efficiency at the land registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made registering property more burdensome by requiring a property tax certificate for registering a property transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland made property registration more costly by increasing the stamp duty on a non-residential property transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made property transfer less transparent by not publishing statistical data on the number of land disputes for 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made transferring property more difficult by increasing the time to apply for registration at the Land and Mortgage Registry of the relevant court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made registering property more burdensome by reducing the number of officials that can register property transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made it less costly to transfer property by lowering the real estate transfer tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made registering property easier by decreasing the Immovable Property Tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Romania improved the quality of land administration by digitizing ownership and land records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made transferring property easier by introducing online procedures and reducing notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>France made transferring property more expensive by increasing property transfer tax rate and introducing an additional tax for businesses in Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden made it easier to transfer a property by increasing administrative efficiency and introducing an independent and separate mechanism for reporting errors on maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium made transferring property easier by introducing electronic property registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made transferring property easier by introducing a new application form for transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta made the transfer of a property more expensive by introducing the new property transfer tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany made it more expensive to register property by increasing the property transfer tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made it easier to transfer property by reducing the property transfer tax and removing the requirement for the municipal tax clearance certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland made transferring property easier by enhancing its computerized system at the land registry and implementing an online system for the registration of title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made transferring property easier by introducing online procedures and reducing notary fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made transferring property easier by reducing the property transfer tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden made registering property easier by fully implementing a new system for property registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made transferring property more costly by increasing the property transfer tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France made transferring property easier by speeding up the registration of the deed of sale at the land registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy made transferring property easier by eliminating the requirement for an energy performance certificate for commercial buildings with no heating system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands made transferring property easier by increasing the efficiency of the title search process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom made transferring property easier by introducing electronic lodgment for property transfer applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made property transfers faster by computerizing its land registry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Getting Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made accessing credit information more difficult by ending the distribution of individual credit data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium strengthened access to credit by implementing a new Pledge Law which allowed security interest to automatically attach to the proceeds of the original asset, and out of court enforcement of the security interest. Belgium also established a unified and modern collateral registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland improved access to credit information by establishing a new credit registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary improved access to credit information by offering commercial credit scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands improved access to credit information by lowering the minimum loan amount to be included in the credit bureau’s database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia improved access to credit information by reporting both positive and negative data on consumers and commercial borrowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made access to credit information more difficult by stopping the distribution of historical credit data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia improved access to credit information by launching a private credit bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta improved access to credit information by launching a new credit registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus improved access to credit information by allowing credit bureaus to collect and report positive credit information and to report credit histories for both borrowers and guarantors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia improved its credit information system through a new law governing the licensing and functioning of credit bureaus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic improved access to credit information by reporting data on credit payments from automobile retailers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus improved its credit information system by adopting a central bank directive eliminating the minimum threshold for loans to be included in credit bureaus' databases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic improved access to credit by adopting a new legal regime on secured transactions that allows the registration of receivables at the collateral registry and permits out-of-court enforcement of collateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary improved access to credit by adopting a new legal regime on secured transactions that implements a functional approach to secured transactions, extends security interests to the products and proceeds of the original asset, and establishes a unified, and notice-based collateral registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland improved its credit information system by passing a new act that provides for the establishment and operation of a credit registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic improved its credit information system by implementing a new law on the protection of personal data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia improved its credit information system by adopting a new law regulating the public credit registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania strengthened its secured transactions system by broadening the range of movable assets that can be used as collateral, allowing a general description in the security agreement of the assets pledged as collateral and permitting out-of-court enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands weakened its secured transactions system through an amendment to the Collection of State Taxes Act that grants priority outside bankruptcy to tax claims over secured creditors’ claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary improved access to credit information by passing its first credit bureau law mandating the creation of a database with positive credit information on individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania strengthened its legal framework for secured transactions by allowing the automatic extension of security interests to the products, proceeds and replacement of collateral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria made access to credit information more difficult by stopping the distribution of credit reports to financial institutions by the private credit bureau (Experian).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>In Croatia the private credit bureau started to collect and distribute information on firms, improving the credit information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary reduced the amount of credit information available from private credit bureaus by shortening the period for retaining data on defaults and late payments (if repaid) from 5 years to 1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic improved its credit information system by guaranteeing by law the right of borrowers to inspect their own data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus improved access to credit information by establishing its first private credit bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Estonia improved access to credit by amending the Code of Enforcement Procedure and allowing out-of-court enforcement of collateral by secured creditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania’s private credit bureau now collects and distributes positive information on borrowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Year</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece strengthened minority investor protections by requiring greater disclosure and an independent review before the approval of related-party transactions as well as greater corporate transparency of executive compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania strengthened minority investor protections by clarifying ownership and control structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain strengthened minority investor protections by clarifying ownership and control structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus strengthened minority investor protections by increasing disclosure of related-party transactions and strengthening shareholders’ rights and role in major corporate decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary strengthened minority investor protections by allowing parties to pose questions to defendants and witnesses during trial after obtaining the judge's approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania strengthened minority investor protections by introducing greater requirements for the disclosure of the compensation of directors and other high-ranking officers on an individual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania strengthened minority investor protections by increasing corporate transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg strengthened minority investor protections by making it easier to sue directors in case of prejudicial related-party transactions and increasing access to corporate information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia strengthened minority investor protections by requiring detailed internal disclosure of conflicts of interest by directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland strengthened minority investor protections by introducing provisions stipulating that directors can be held liable for breach of their fiduciary duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania strengthened minority investor protections by prohibiting subsidiaries from acquiring shares issued by their parent company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain strengthened minority investor protections by requiring that major sales of company assets be subject to shareholder approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece strengthened investor protections by introducing a requirement for director approval of related-party transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece strengthened investor protections by requiring greater immediate and annual disclosure of material related-party transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands strengthened investor protections through a new law regulating the approval of related-party transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia strengthened investor protections through a new law regulating the approval of related-party transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus strengthened investor protections by requiring greater corporate disclosure to the board of directors, to the public and in the annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania strengthened investor protections by introducing greater requirements for corporate disclosure to the public and in the annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden strengthened investor protections by requiring greater corporate disclosure and regulating the approval of transactions between interested parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paying Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latvia made paying taxes less complicated by improving its online systems for filing corporate income tax return and mandatory labor contributions.

Malta made paying taxes more costly by replacing the capital gains tax with a property transfer tax, increasing the maximum social security contribution paid by employers.

The Netherlands made paying taxes less costly by lowering the rates paid by employers for health insurance contributions, special unemployment insurance, unemployment insurance and real estate taxes. The Netherlands also made paying taxes easier by improving the online system for paying corporate income tax. However, the Netherlands made paying taxes more costly by increasing the rates for disablement insurance contribution paid by employers, polder board tax and motor tax.

Portugal made paying taxes easier and less costly by using better accounting software and enhancing the online filing system of taxes and decreasing the corporate income tax rate.

The Slovak Republic made paying taxes less costly and easier by reducing the motor vehicle tax and the number of property tax payments.

Spain made paying taxes less costly by reducing the property tax rate, vehicle tax rate, tax on property transfer, and abolishing the environmental fee. Spain made paying taxes easier by introducing a new electronic system for filing social security contributions.

Cyprus made paying taxes easier for companies by facilitating online payment of corporate income tax. At the same time, Cyprus raised the contribution rate for social insurance paid by employers, lowered the tax brackets for the social contribution fund, raised the rate on interest income and increased the vehicle tax.

Finland made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate—though it also increased the total rate for social security contributions paid by employers and reduced the allowed deductible amount for owners’ expenses.

France made paying taxes less costly for companies by introducing a credit against corporate income tax and reducing labor tax rates paid by employers.

Greece made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the rates for social security contributions paid by employers, making insurance premiums fully tax deductible and lowering property tax rates. At the same time, it defined entertainment expenses as nondeductible, reduced the depreciation rates for some types of fixed assets and increased the tax on interest income.

Ireland made paying taxes more costly and complicated for companies by increasing landfill levies and by requiring additional financial statements to be submitted with the income tax return.

Latvia made paying taxes more complicated for companies by eliminating the possibility of deducting bad debt provisions. On the other hand, Latvia reduced the rate for social security contributions paid by employers.

The Netherlands made paying taxes more costly for companies by increasing employer-paid labor contributions as well as road taxes, property taxes and polder board taxes.

Poland made paying taxes easier for companies by introducing an electronic system for filing and paying VAT and transport tax—though it also made paying taxes more costly by increasing transport tax rates and contributions to the National Disabled Fund paid by employers.

Portugal made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate and increasing the allowable amount of the loss carried forward. At the same time, Portugal slightly increased the vehicle tax.

Romania made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the rate for social security contributions and the rate for accident risk fund contributions paid by employers.

The Slovak Republic made paying taxes easier for companies by introducing an electronic filing and payment system for VAT—and made paying taxes less costly by reducing the corporate income tax rate and making medical health insurance tax deductible. At the same time, the Slovak Republic reduced the limit on losses carried forward.

Spain made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing rates for corporate income, capital gains and environment taxes—and made it easier by introducing the online Cl@ve system for filing VAT returns. At the same time, Spain reduced the amount allowable for depreciation of fixed assets and raised the ceiling for social security contributions.

The United Kingdom made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate and increasing the wage amount per employee that is exempted from social security contributions paid by employers. On the other hand, the United Kingdom increased municipal tax rates and environment taxes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB2015</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Croatia made paying taxes more complicated for companies by raising the health insurance contribution rate, increasing the Croatian Chamber of Commerce fees and introducing more detailed filing requirements for VAT. On the other hand, it abolished the contribution to the Croatian Chamber of Commerce.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made paying taxes easier for companies by reducing the number of provisional tax installments for corporate income tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary made paying taxes easier and less costly for companies by abolishing the special tax that had been temporarily introduced in 2010 and by reducing the vehicle tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made paying taxes easier for companies by simplifying the VAT return, enhancing the electronic system for filing corporate income tax returns and reducing employers’ social security contribution rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate and introducing a reduced corporate tax rate for a portion of the taxable profits of qualifying small and medium-size enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made paying taxes easier for companies, with the majority now using the electronic system for filing and paying taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the statutory corporate income tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate. On the other hand, it increased the landfill tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made paying taxes easier for companies by introducing an electronic system for social security contributions and promoting e-banking for the chamber of commerce fee and the radio and television fee. Croatia also made paying taxes less costly by reducing the rates for the forest and Chamber of Commerce contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made paying taxes more costly for companies by increasing the corporate income tax rate—though it also reduced the employers’ contribution rate to the social security fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania made paying taxes easier and less costly for companies by reducing the payment frequency for the firm tax from quarterly to twice a year and by reducing the vehicle tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made paying taxes more costly for companies by increasing the corporate income tax rate and by adjusting land appraisal values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the health insurance contribution rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made paying taxes more costly for companies by increasing the special defense contribution rate on interest income and introducing a private sector special contribution and a fixed annual fee for companies registered in Cyprus. At the same time, it simplified tax compliance by introducing electronic filing for corporate income tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic made paying taxes faster for companies by promoting the use of electronic facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany made paying taxes more convenient for companies by canceling ELENA procedures and implementing electronic filing and payment system for most taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary made paying taxes easier for companies by abolishing the community tax. At the same time, Hungary increased health insurance contributions paid by the employer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made paying taxes easier for companies by promoting the use of electronic filing and payment systems—though it also made paying taxes more costly by increasing social security contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made paying taxes easier for companies by implementing electronic filing and payment of social security and health insurance contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia made paying taxes easier and less costly for companies by implementing electronic filing and payment of social security contributions and by reducing the corporate income tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom made paying taxes less costly for companies by reducing the corporate income tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic revised its tax legislation to simplify provisions relating to administrative procedures and relationships between tax authorities and taxpayers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Estonia
In Estonia a municipal sales tax introduced in Tallinn made paying taxes costlier for firms, though a later parliamentary measure abolished local sales taxes effective January 1, 2012.

### Finland
Finland simplified reporting and payment for the value added tax and labor tax.

### Greece
Greece reduced its corporate income tax rate.

### Hungary
Hungary made paying taxes costlier for firms by introducing a sector-specific surtax.

### Romania
Romania made paying taxes easier for companies by introducing an electronic payment system and a unified return for social security contributions. It also abolished the annual minimum tax.

### Bulgaria
Bulgaria reduced employer contribution rates for social security.

### Croatia
Croatia made paying taxes more difficult and costly for companies by introducing a tourist fee.

### Czech Republic
The Czech Republic simplified its labor tax processes and reduced employer contribution rates for social security.

### Estonia
Estonia increased the unemployment insurance contribution rate.

### Hungary
Hungary simplified taxes and tax bases.

### Lithuania
Lithuania reduced corporate tax rates.

### Netherlands
The Netherlands reduced the frequency of filing and paying value added taxes from monthly to quarterly and allowed small entities to use their annual accounts as the basis for computing their corporate income tax.

### Portugal
Portugal introduced a new social security code and lowered corporate tax rates.

### Romania
Romania introduced tax changes, including a new minimum tax on profit, that made paying taxes more costly for companies.

### Slovenia
Slovenia abolished its payroll tax and reduced its corporate income tax rate.

### Sweden
Sweden reduced profit and payroll tax rates.

### Trading across Borders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made exporting easier by enhancing its automated customs data management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made trading across borders easier by implementing a new electronic customs system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made trading across borders easier by implementing a new terminal operating system at the port of Gdansk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made trading across borders easier by improving the physical and information system infrastructure at the port of Rijeka and by streamlining export customs procedures in preparation for accession to the Common Transit Convention of the European Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made trading across borders easier by implementing a system allowing electronic submission of customs declarations for exports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made trading across borders easier by reducing the number of documents required for importing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic reduced the time to export and import by allowing electronic submission of customs declarations and other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary reduced the time to export and import by allowing electronic submission of customs declarations and other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands made importing easier by introducing a new web-based system for cargo release at the port terminals in Rotterdam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made trading across borders easier by implementing an electronic single window for port procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain reduced the time to import by further expanding the use of electronic submission of customs declarations and improving the sharing of information among customs and other agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Enforcing Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany made enforcing contracts easier by introducing electronic filing of the initial complaint and electronic service of process without the need for paper documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an online platform that allows users to file the initial complaint electronically and judges and lawyers to manage cases electronically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a consolidated law on voluntary mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an automated system to assign cases to judges randomly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made enforcing contracts easier by implementing electronic service of process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques used in court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a system that allows users to pay court fees electronically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland made enforcing contracts easier by making performance measurement reports publicly available to show the court’s performance and the progress of cases through the court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic case management system for the use of judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of civil procedure that introduces pre-trial conference as part of the case management techniques used in court. The Slovak Republic also made enforcing contracts easier by reducing the fees that are advanced by the plaintiff to enforce a judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made enforcing contracts easier by reducing court fees for filing a claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece made enforcing contracts easier by amending its rules of civil procedure to introduce tighter rules on adjournments, impose deadlines for key court events and limit the recourses that can be lodged during enforcement proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic filing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a mandatory electronic filing system for court users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic system to handle public sales of movable assets and by streamlining the enforcement process as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a fast-track simplified procedure for claims worth less than €3,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy made enforcing contracts easier by introducing a mandatory electronic filing system for court users, simplifying the rules for electronic service of process and automating the enforcement process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DB2016 Latvia Latvia made enforcing contracts easier by restructuring its courts and by introducing comprehensive specialized laws regulating domestic arbitration and voluntary mediation.

DB2016 Romania Romania made enforcing contracts easier by transferring some enforcement responsibilities from the court to the bailiff, by making it easier for the bailiff to obtain information from third parties and by making use of the electronic auction registry mandatory.

DB2016 United Kingdom The United Kingdom made enforcing contracts more costly by increasing the court fees for filing a claim.

DB2015 Czech Republic The Czech Republic made enforcing contracts easier by amending its civil procedure code and modifying the monetary jurisdictions of its courts.

DB2015 Greece Greece made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic filing system for court users.

DB2015 Ireland Ireland made enforcing contracts easier by modifying the monetary jurisdictions of its courts.

DB2015 Lithuania Lithuania made enforcing contracts easier by introducing an electronic filing system for court users.

DB2015 Portugal Portugal made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new code of civil procedure designed to reduce case backlogs, streamline court procedures, enhance the role of judges and speed up the resolution of standard civil and commercial disputes.

DB2014 Croatia Croatia made enforcing contracts easier by streamlining litigation proceedings and transferring certain enforcement procedures from the courts to state agencies.

DB2014 Czech Republic The Czech Republic made enforcing contracts easier by simplifying and speeding up the proceedings for the execution and enforcement of judgments.

DB2014 Estonia Estonia made enforcing contracts easier by lowering court fees.

DB2014 Italy Italy made enforcing contracts easier by regulating attorneys’ fees and streamlining some court proceedings.

DB2014 Romania Romania made enforcing contracts easier by adopting a new civil procedure code that streamlines and speeds up all court proceedings.

DB2013 Poland Poland made enforcing contracts easier by amending the civil procedure code and appointing more judges to commercial courts.

DB2013 Slovak Republic The Slovak Republic made enforcing contracts easier by adopting several amendments to the code of civil procedure intended to simplify and speed up proceedings as well as to limit obstructive tactics by the parties to a case.

DB2011 United Kingdom The United Kingdom improved the process for enforcing contracts by modernizing civil procedures in the commercial court.

Resolving Insolvency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium made resolving insolvency easier by streamlining the insolvency framework, expanding the scope of the law and introducing new preventive measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland made resolving insolvency easier by introducing new restructuring mechanisms, changing voting procedures for restructuring plans and allowing creditors greater participation in insolvency proceedings. It also established a central restructuring and bankruptcy register and released guidelines for the remuneration of insolvency representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus made resolving insolvency easier by introducing a reorganization procedure as well as provisions to facilitate the continuation of the debtor’s business during insolvency proceedings and allow creditors greater participation in important decisions during the proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania improved its insolvency system by introducing time limits for the observation period (during which a reorganization plan must be confirmed or a declaration of bankruptcy made) and for the implementation of the reorganization plan; by introducing additional minimum voting requirements for the approval of the reorganization plan; and by clarifying rules on voidable transactions and on payment priority for claims of post-commencement creditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium made resolving insolvency more difficult by establishing additional requirements for commencing reorganization proceedings, including the submission of documents verified by external parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia made resolving insolvency easier by introducing a simplified reorganization procedure for small companies and a preventive restructuring procedure for medium-size and large ones, by allowing creditors greater participation in the management of the debtor and by establishing provisions for an increase in share capital through debt-equity swaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain made resolving insolvency easier by introducing new rules for out-of-court restructuring, introducing provisions applicable to prepackaged reorganizations and making insolvency proceedings more public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria made resolving insolvency easier by expanding the basis for commencement of insolvency proceedings and making it easier to void suspect transactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia made resolving insolvency easier by introducing an expedited out-of-court restructuring procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy made resolving insolvency easier through an amendment to its bankruptcy code that introduces a stay period for enforcement actions while the debtor is preparing a restructuring plan, makes it easier to convert from one type of restructuring proceeding to another, facilitates continued operation by the debtor during restructuring and imposes stricter requirements on auditors evaluating a restructuring plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany strengthened its insolvency process by adopting a new insolvency law that facilitates in-court restructurings of distressed companies and increases participation by creditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece enhanced its insolvency process by abolishing the conciliation procedure and introducing a new rehabilitation proceeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania made resolving insolvency easier by establishing which cases against the company’s property shall be taken to the bankruptcy court, tightening the time frame for decisions on appeals, abolishing the court’s obligation to individually notify creditors and other stakeholders about restructuring proceedings and setting new time limits for creditors to file claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland strengthened its insolvency process by updating guidelines on the information and documents that need to be included in the bankruptcy petition and by granting secured creditors the right to take over claims encumbered with financial pledges in case of liquidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal made resolving insolvency easier by introducing a new insolvency law that expedites liquidation procedures and creates fast-track mechanisms both in and out of court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic improved its insolvency process by redefining the roles and powers of creditors and trustees, strengthening the rights of secured creditors and redefining rules for the conversion of restructuring into a bankruptcy proceeding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia strengthened its insolvency process by requiring that the debtor offer creditors payment of at least 50% of the claims within 4 years; giving greater power to the creditors’ committee in a bankruptcy proceeding; prohibiting insolvency administrators from allowing relatives to render services associated with the bankruptcy proceeding; and establishing fines for members of management that violate certain obligations or prohibitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain strengthened its insolvency process by making workouts easier, offering more protections for refinancing agreements, allowing conversion from reorganization into liquidation at any time, allowing reliefs of the stay under certain circumstances and permitting the judge to determine whether an asset of the insolvent company is necessary for its continued operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria passed a new law that simplifies restructuring proceedings and gives preferential consideration to the interests of the debtors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria amended its commerce act to extend further rights to secured creditors and increase the transparency of insolvency proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark introduced new rules on company reorganization, which led to the elimination of the suspension-of-payments regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France passed a law that enables debtors to implement a restructuring plan with financial creditors only, without affecting trade creditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy introduced debt restructuring and reorganization procedures as alternatives to bankruptcy proceedings and extended further rights to secured creditors during insolvency proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia adopted a new insolvency law that streamlines and expedites the insolvency process and introduces a reorganization option for companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania amended its reorganization law to simplify and shorten reorganization proceedings, grant priority to secured creditors and introduce professional requirements for insolvency administrators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Employing Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB Year</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Austria changed regulations pertaining to working time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary changed regulations pertaining to overtime work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy changed regulations pertaining to fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg changed regulations pertaining to paid annual leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Malta changed regulations pertaining to paid annual leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2020</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Slovak Republic increased wage premiums for work performed during days of weekly rest and at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria amended its legislation to extend the duration of the contribution period that is required before an employee can become eligible for unemployment protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France amended its labor code to modify the amount of severance payments for employees after one, five and ten years of employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania changed legislation on working hours, paid annual leave, as well as notice period and severance payments in case of redundancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Luxembourg increased post-natal maternity leave, amended statutory provisions for leave for personal reasons and family leave, introduced state co-financing of professional trainings and amended pre-retirement rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2019</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic changed regulation pertaining to premiums for work on day of weekly rest and night work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finland increased the length of the maximum probationary period for permanent employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2018</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia amended its legislation to extend the duration of the contribution period that is required before an employee can become eligible for unemployment protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Cyprus amended its legislation to allow shops and supermarkets to operate seven days a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France reformed its labor legislation by introducing changes to the administration of labor tribunals, extending Sunday and evening work in areas designated as international tourist zones and facilitating employer dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary amended legislation to remove restrictions limiting the operating hours for retail shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands reduced the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts from 36 to 24 months. Severance pay was introduced for redundancy dismissals for employees with at least 2 years of continuous employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland reduced the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts to 33 months and limited the total number of fixed-term contracts between the same employer and employee to three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2017</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal reduced the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1) Croatia eliminated the requirement to retrain or reassign employees before they can be made redundant. 2) In accordance with the Minimal Wage Act, Art. 1, published in DiLav Settenbrin 2016/330, the minimum wage has been increased from 3,017.61 Kuna/month to 3,029.55 Croatian Kuna/month gross salary, in force for the period of January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany introduced a minimum wage of €8.50 an hour in accordance with the Act on Minimum Wages (Mindestlohngesetz), which took effect on January 1, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary adopted legislation limiting the operating hours for retail shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy adopted the Jobs Act, which simplifies redundancy rules and encourages out-of-court reconciliation, reducing the time and cost for resolving labor disputes. The new legislation also broadens the coverage of unemployment insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2016</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1) Latvia increased the maximum duration of a single fixed-term contract from 36 months to 60. 2) Latvia increased its minimum wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium increased the notice period for redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia lifted the 3-year limit on the duration of first-time fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finland eliminated the requirement to notify a third party before dismissing a redundant employee or group of redundant employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>France substantially amended its labor market regulations, including the provisions dealing with large-scale collective redundancy processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy relaxed the conditions for using fixed-term contracts but reduced their maximum duration to 36 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2015</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal reduced the amount of severance pay per year of service and increased the maximum cumulative duration of fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic abolished the minimum wage for young workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary reduced the premium for night work and weekly holiday work and increased the minimum wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ireland ended a 60% rebate for employers on severance payments and eliminated the requirement for third-party notification when terminating a redundant worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal reduced the wage premium for weekly holiday work and abolished priority rules for redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic reduced the maximum cumulative duration of fixed-term contracts, reintroduced the requirement for third-party notification when terminating an employee, reintroduced mandatory severance pay for workers with more than 2 years of service in the company and increased the minimum wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia abolished priority rules for reemployment, introduced priority rules for massive redundancy dismissals, and changed notice period and severance pay provisions for redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain reduced the maximum cumulative duration of fixed-term contracts and increased the minimum wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2014</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom increased the cap on weekly wage provided to employees on the severance payment and the minimum wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The Czech Republic increased the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts and reduced the severance pay applicable in cases of redundancy dismissals of employees with one year of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia eliminated notification requirements to third parties in cases of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal increased the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts and reduced the severance pay applicable in cases of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>The Slovak Republic increased the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts, eliminated notification requirements to third parties in case of redundancy dismissals and reduced redundancy costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain temporarily allowed unlimited duration of fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2013</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The United Kingdom increased redundancy costs of the severance pay applicable in cases of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium increased the severance payment obligation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece decreased the severance pay applicable in case of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania allowed fixed-term contracts to be concluded for permanent tasks (until 31 July 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania increased the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts and also decreased the severance pay applicable in case of redundancy dismissal of employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2012</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom increased the severance payment obligation applicable in cases of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia increased the mandatory paid annual leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Estonia eliminated the applicable priority rules for dismissals as well as the obligation to notify and obtain the approval of a third party in case of redundancy dismissals. It also removed restrictions on night work and reduced notice period and severance payment applicable in case of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland reduced the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Slovak Republic reduced the maximum duration of fixed-term contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2011</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain reduced the notice period applicable in case of redundancy dismissals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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