

Institution	Intended to measure	Indicators Quantitative/qualitative/indices/governance/infrastructure etc	Country coverage	Brief comments on and results of the survey
<p>A.T. Kearney / Foreign Policy Magazine</p> <p><a href="#">Globalisation Index</a> Annual (2004)</p>	<p>Index measuring countries global links. Measures the following dimensions: Political engagement, technology, personal contact and economic integration.</p> <p>Aggregate.</p>	<p>Quantitative. 16 indicators including data on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- trade, foreign direct investment, portfolio capital flows, income payments and receipts.</li> <li>- International travel and tourism, international telephone traffic, cross border transfers.</li> <li>- number of internet users, internet hosts and secure servers.</li> <li>- number of international organisations. UN Security Council missions participated in, number of foreign embassies.</li> </ul> <p>Data collected from the IMF and World Bank among others.</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>Ireland, Singapore, Switzerland, Netherlands, Finland, Canada, United States, New Zealand, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, United Kingdom, Australia, Czech Republic, France, Norway, Germany, Slovenia, Malaysia, Slovak Republic, Israel, Croatia, Spain, Italy, Hungary, Panama, Greece, Japan, Botswana, Poland, South Korea, Philippines, Argentina, Tunisia, Taiwan, Chile, Uganda.</p>	<p>Ireland has been top for the last two years. South-east Asia is the most economically integrated region. Botswana was top of the African countries at no. 30. It had the highest level of transfer payments. Kenya was the least globalised SS African country.</p> <p>The index captures the relations with the external environment but does not address the effect of the internal environment.</p>
<p>Freedom House</p> <p><a href="#">Freedom in the World</a> Annual (2004)</p>	<p>Index. Political rights and civil liberties.</p> <p>The rating is derived in large measure from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.</p> <p>Constitutional rights are not assumed to equate to fulfilment of these rights on the ground.</p> <p>Governance</p>	<p>Qualitative. A team of analysts consider evidence about each country including foreign and domestic news reports, nongovernmental organization publications, think tank and academic analyses, individual professional contacts, and visits to the region.</p> <p>A checklist of questions is then completed (see website for details) and countries are classified and given scores as Free (1 - 2.5), Partly Free (3 - 5) or Not Free (5.5 - 7).</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Columbia, Comoros, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Costa Rica</p>	<p>Sudan was the least free sub-Saharan African country, ranked 7. South Africa was the most free, ranked 1.5, followed by Ghana and Botswana both ranked 2. India was ranked 2.5, Bangladesh 4 and Pakistan 5.5. China was ranked 6.5 as was Equatorial Guinea and Somalia. It is a non-profit organisation founded by Eleanor Roosevelt, among others. Published since 1972. Widely used by policy-makers, journalists, and scholars, the 600-page survey is intended to be the definitive report on freedom around the globe.</p>
<p>Commonwealth Business Council (CBC)</p> <p><a href="#">Business Environment Survey</a> Third in a series of Bi-annual surveys (2003)</p>	<p>This benchmarking survey records private sector perceptions of a country's investment climate</p> <p>Aggregate</p>	<p>Qualitative Benchmarking based on 1329 responses from firm surveys with questions in three categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Openness and Accountability: government-business relations, free media, reliable justice, efficient administration, and effective government.</li> <li>2. Business Enablers and Outlook: future outlook, corporate governance, industrial relations, human resources, infrastructure and financial framework.</li> <li>3. Policy Framework: environmental protection, corruption reduction, tax policy, competition policy and consistent policies.</li> </ol> <p>Alongside the private sector survey results are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective indicators on GDP, FDI flows, the trade balance, exports and imports, consumption, savings, external debt and the human development index.</li> <li>Political and economic policy overviews</li> <li>Business (financial and physical) infrastructure summaries</li> <li>Key action points for a policy agenda</li> </ul>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Seychelles, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, United Republic of Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom, Zambia, Zimbabwe.</p>	<p>The index presents detailed analyses of individual countries, but no cross-country comparison. There is a sixteen-point action plan for improving the links between businesses and governments.</p> <p>This is a useful survey including an unusually wide array of indicators. The focus on the Commonwealth countries means that it analyses many small countries not usually considered by benchmarking surveys.</p>
<p>Economist Intelligence Unit</p> <p><a href="#">Business Environment Ranking</a></p>	<p>Index. The quality or attractiveness of the business environment using a standard analytical framework. Designed to reflect the main criteria used by</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative data used.</p> <p>70 indicators (from other existing surveys) in ten categories including: political</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>US, Netherlands, UK,</p>	<p>Canada is ranked top, with China at number 39 and India at 41. Nigeria was bottom at number 60.</p> <p>Good summary of many different aspects of the investment climate. Commercial index, poor coverage</p>

Unknown (2004) Commercial ranking	companies to formulate their global business strategies based on historical conditions and on expectations for the next five years.  Aggregate	environment, macroeconomic environment, market opportunities, policies towards enterprise, competition, foreign investment, foreign trade and exchange controls, taxes, financing, labour market and infrastructure.	Switzerland, Sweden, Australia, Denmark, Germany, Canada, Finland, Singapore, Norway, Hong Kong, Austria, Ireland, Belgium, France, New Zealand, Italy, Taiwan, Korea, Spain, Greece, Portugal, Japan, Israel, Czech Republic, Chile, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Malaysia, South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, Slovakia, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Turkey, Bulgaria, Sri Lanka, India	of Africa, and not available in single report (necessary to purchase country information individually).
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and World Bank  <a href="#">Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey</a> Last published in 2002. Repeated every 3 years	Benchmarking investigating the extent to which government policies and practices facilitate or impede business activity and investment in central and eastern Europe (CEE) and the Commonwealth of the Independent States (CIS).  Aggregate	Qualitative. 6100 firms surveyed, using 9 indicators 1. Firm characteristics 2. Sales of the firm and its suppliers 3. Investment and innovation 4. Employees of the firm 5. Access to infrastructure services 6. Access to financing 7. Government policies and practices, including corruption 8. Laws, business regulation and taxation and their enforcement, and 9. Qualitative perceptions of the business environment.	Asia, Europe  Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, FYR Macedonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan	Improvement in the business environment of the region as a whole, with the strongest improvements in some of the less advanced countries of CEE and the CIS.  The EBRD finances project lending and operational needs by borrowing funds on the international capital markets.  The survey sample is designed to be broadly representative of the population of firms according to their economic significance, sector, size and geographical location within each CIS
International Finance Cooperation  <a href="#">Business Environment in Ukraine</a> Annual (Sept 2003)	Survey to analyze the state of the business enabling environment for SMEs in the Ukraine, promote policy reform on private sector development issues, and act as a tool to monitor the progress of various reforms and changes in the business environment.  Single country	Qualitative. This report concentrates on a number of issues affecting the business climate in which SMEs operate, based on the findings of an independent survey of over 2000 enterprises, conducted in the Spring of 2003. The issues of focus include the availability of competitive external financing, the system of taxation, and a number of regulatory processes: state inspections of enterprises, import and export operations, obtaining permits for business activities, certification, licensing and business registration.	Europe  Ukraine	Survey results show that registration procedures have not undergone any considerable changes or improvements in year on year terms. Neither the time nor the cost of registration has undergone any radical changes in the last two years. A number of problems remain unresolved, such as the availability and transparency of information, adherence to official deadlines for completing registration, and the practice of unofficial payments.  The International Finance Corporation (IFC), established in 1956 as a member of the World Bank Group, promotes sustainable private sector investment in emerging economies. Ukraine became an IFC member country in 1993.
International Institute for Management Development (IMD) World Competitiveness Yearbook  <a href="#">World Competitiveness Scoreboard</a> Annual (2004) since 1989	Index. Ranks countries in terms of "how a nation's environment creates and sustains the competitiveness of enterprises"  Aggregate	Total of 323 criteria, qualitative and quantitative. The soft data comes from the Executive Opinion survey, which yielded 4,166 responses in 2004. The investment climate is defined as the sum of 4 broad factors: Economic performance, Government efficiency, Business efficiency and Infrastructure. Countries also benchmarked by these headings. The rating also caters for size of each economy, differentiating between those with more than 20 million inhabitants and those with less.	Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.  USA, Singapore, Canada, Australia, Iceland, Hong Kong, Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, Ireland, Taiwan, Austria, Switzerland, Netherlands, Malaysia, Norway, New Zealand, Zhejiang, Bavaria, Germany, United Kingdom, Japan, China Mainland, Belgium, Chile, Catalonia, Estonia, Thailand, France, Spain, Ile-De-France, Israel, India, Korea, Scotland, Rhone-Alps, Maharashtra, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Colombia, Hungary, Czech Republic, Greece, Lombardy, Sao Paulo, Jordan, South Africa, Russia, Italy, Philippines, Brazil, Romania, Turkey, Mexico, Poland, Indonesia, Argentina, Venezuela.	The WCS focuses on 'subnational economies' thus it rates areas such as Catalonia, Lombardy and Zhejiang. It is also biased towards Europe and provides only rates. Ranks countries in terms of how a nation's environment creates and sustains the competitiveness of enterprises. In 2004, the USA ranked highest, and Venezuela lowest.  This report contains a wealth of cross-section and time-series information. It is well organised, and presented in an accessible way, which makes the key messages and trends easy to identify.  However, one must question how meaningful the aggregation of so many criteria into one figure can be, and whether the survey data is reliable and comparable across countries. Data worries are compounded by worries over the time that some variables vary (longer than one year) given that they are assessed every year. Also, there is no justification (or discussion) on whether the determinants of the index are a proxy for competitiveness; and on the distinction between the determinants of competitiveness and the indicators of competitiveness.
International Monetary Fund (IMF),  <a href="#">Foreign Direct Investment and the Investment Climate in Commonwealth of Independent States Countries (CIS)</a>	Benchmarking. Investigates the main impediments to a good investment climate  Aggregate	Qualitative and quantitative. Combines info from other investment climate surveys, as well as IMF country staff. Looks at many different aspects of investment climate: the competency and efficiency of the public sector, the tax	Asia, Europe  Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan	IMF staff working on the countries concerned cited burdensome tax systems, widespread corruption, extensive state intervention coupled with weak legal and regulatory frameworks, and incomplete structural reforms as the main impediments.  One may question whether the opinions of IMF country staff are a very scientific measurement

November 2003, one off study		the public sector, the tax system, legal systems and the structural condition of the economy	UN, IMF, ODA, etc.	Start are a very scientific measurement.
Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) World Bank <a href="#">Benchmarking Foreign Direct Investment Competitiveness in Asia</a> One off (2003)	Benchmarking. The survey aims both to give an overview of the competitive environment in the region, and to give sufficient detail to enable benchmarking across a range of factors that motivate investors. The aim is to provide quality, standardised information  Aggregate	Qualitative and quantitative:  1. Publicly available data in eight areas – labour (cost, availability and conditions), real estate cost, market access, utilities, taxes, transportation/shipping infrastructure, business and living conditions;  2. Interviews of 64 companies at 69 operating units. Interviewees were asked to give answers on a scale of 1-5 where qualitative factors were required. Each factor was then weighted according to its importance in the investment decision, each country was then ranked to show its relative competitiveness in each industry.	Asia  China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam	Key findings are: Costs and conditions vary widely between countries, and between sectors within countries;  Poor local language skills are seen to be an impediment to investment in some countries; Both a high skilled work force and a supply of low cost unskilled labour is a concern common to many investors.
Millennium Challenge Corporation US\$ 1 billion for 2004 and US\$5 billion a year by 2006 <a href="#">Millennium Challenge Corporation</a> After being set up two years ago, the first group of eligible countries were announced on May 6th 2004	Benchmarking. To discover which countries qualify for development assistance based on the criteria that a country must rule justly, invest in their people, and encourage economic freedom.  Single country	Quantitative indicators on the topics of resource flows and financing.  Ruling Justly (political rights, civil rights, control of corruption, government effectiveness, rule of law, voice and accountability)  Investing in people (Immunization rates, health expenditures, primary education expenditures, primary education competition)  Economic freedom (Regulatory quality, credit rating, trade policy, inflation, fiscal policy)  The MCC also considers ad hoc qualitative measures of a country's appropriateness.	Africa  Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia	On May 6 2004, based on their benchmarking methodology, the Board of Directors of the MCC selected the 16 countries eligible to apply for MCA assistance. They include: Armenia Benin Bolivia Cape Verde Georgia Ghana Honduras Lesotho Madagascar Mali Mongolia Mozambique Nicaragua Senegal Sri Lanka Vanuatu The following countries do not qualify for aid: Burundi, Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Sudan, Somalia and Zimbabwe  The Millennium Challenge Corporation administers the Millennium Challenge Account. It aims to reduce poverty through economic growth. At the core of its funding decision is a means-tested mechanism that requires countries to show significant improvement and 'good' conduct in the areas of market openness, democracy and the economic freedom, among others.
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development <a href="#">African Economic Outlook 03 / 04</a> Annual (2004)	Benchmarking. Intended to chart the past, present and future performance of the African economy as a whole, as well as disaggregating into individual country analyses.  Aggregate	Quantitative. Analysis of key macroeconomic and structural variables (growth, investment etc.) and short-term projections, supplemented by additional focus on energy supply and poverty.	Africa  Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Czech, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lithuania, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Russia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, UK, Uruguay, USA, Venezuela	Countries are considered individually, however, within the continent central Africa will grow the fastest both this year and next with over 7% growth.  Despite weak world economic growth and continued structural and political constraints in some parts of the continent, Africa has shown relatively good economic progress over the past year. Africa's 2003 growth rate of 3.6 per cent was a four-year high, significantly higher than the 2.7 per cent growth rate in 2002. Three elements have combined to support this recovery: favourable international commodity prices, increases in international aid, and improved security in key areas of the continent.
PwC <a href="#">Opacity Index</a>	Index. The goal is to derive a single score—the O-Factor—that realistically estimates the degree	Qualitative and quantitative. Measures the level of a) corruption, b) legal system, c)	Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America.	5 least opaque: Singapore 29, Chile 36, USA 36, UK 38, Hong Kong 455 most opaque: China 87, Russia 84, Indonesia 75, Turkey 74, South Korea 73 All scores out

<p>Launched in 2001. Next version released in Autumn of 2004, and further reports will be produced every three years.</p>	<p>of opacity</p> <p>Aggregate / Governance</p>	<p>government macroeconomic and fiscal policies, d) accounting standards and practices (including corporate governance and information release), and e) regulatory regime.</p>	<p>Algeria, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>of 100, with greater opacity gaining a higher score</p> <p>Opacity is defined as the lack of clear, accurate, formal, easily discernible and widely accepted practices in international capital markets.</p> <p>The opacity index is linked to the investment environment by calculating the tax equivalent and the risk premium produced by the level of opacity.</p>
<p>The Afrobarometer network includes the Institute for Democracy in Southern Africa, the Centre for Democratic Development, Michigan State University, Policy Research Institutes from the surveyed countries and Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral donors</p> <p><a href="#">Afrobarometer survey</a></p> <p>5 were conducted in 1999 and another 5 in 2000. There were 2 more in 2001</p>	<p>Benchmarking. Using national public attitude surveys each Afrobarometer survey collects data about individual attitudes and behaviour, including innovative indicators especially relevant to developing societies. The topics addressed include democracy, governance, livelihoods, macroeconomics and markets, social capital, conflict and crime, participation and national identity.</p> <p>Aggregate / Governance</p>	<p>Qualitative. A series of qualitative surveys that monitor the following topics: Democracy, Governance, Livelihoods, Macro-economics and markets, Social capital, Conflict and crime, Participation and National identity</p>	<p>Africa</p> <p>Botswana, Cape Verde, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>The survey finds that to many respondents democracy represents freedom, and consequently has high support across the continent. They expect democracy to deliver basic welfare and are not entirely satisfied with the performance so far. People are unsatisfied with economic conditions especially unemployment. They support some economic reform and think corruption is everywhere. Between elections political participation is low.</p> <p>The Afrobarometer surveys, like the governance indicators rely on subjective or perception based measures of the current situation in any country. However, in this case the data is not aggregated into an index. Regional barometers are used in various other regions and ratings. In fact, the Afrobarometer and the Latinobarometro are used as sources for World Bank Governance indicators</p>
<p>The Fraser Institute</p> <p><a href="#">Index of Economic Freedom</a></p> <p>Annual (2004)</p>	<p>Index. The core ingredients of economic freedom are defined by personal choice, protection of private property, and freedom of exchange. Individuals have economic freedom when the following conditions exist: (a) their property acquired without the use of force, fraud, or theft is protected from physical invasions by others and (b) they are free to use, exchange, or give their property to another as long as their actions do not violate the identical rights of others.</p> <p>Aggregate / Governance</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative. The components of the index are: Size of Government, Structure of the Economy and Use of Markets, Monetary Policy and Price Stability, Freedom to Use Alternative Currencies, Legal Structure and Property Rights, International Exchange, and Freedom of Exchange in Capital and Financial Markets.</p> <p>38 variables measured.</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central Africa. Rep., Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Dem. R., Congo, Rep. Of, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Rep., Denmark, Dominican Rep., Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hong Kong,</p>	<p>Hong Kong retains the highest rating for economic freedom (8.7 of 10) closely followed by Singapore at 8.6. New Zealand, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and United States tied for third with ratings of 8.2 out of 10. The other top 10 nations are Australia, Canada, Ireland, and Luxembourg. The bottom five nations ranked are Venezuela, Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Zimbabwe, and Myanmar. Botswana's (18) best among continental sub-Saharan African nations. Chile (22) best record in Latin America</p> <p>The Fraser institute is a Canadian independent public policy organisation, focusing on the role of competitive markets in ensuring the well-being of Canadians. It hosts the Economic Freedom Network that produced the Index of Economic Freedom.</p>
<p>The Heritage Foundation</p> <p><a href="#">Index of Economic Freedom</a></p> <p>Annual (2004) Commercial Index</p>	<p>Index of Economic Freedom</p> <p>Aggregate / Governance</p>	<p>Quantitative. Measures economic freedom according to their trade policy, the fiscal burden of government, public intervention in the economy, monetary policy, capital flows and foreign investment, banking and finance, wages and prices, property rights, regulation, and the informal market.</p>	<p>Africa</p> <p>Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>Top 5: 1. Hong Kong, 2. Singapore, 3. New Zealand, 4. Luxembourg, 5. Ireland Bottom 5: 1. North Korea, 2. Libya, 3. Zimbabwe, 4. Burma, 5. Laos</p> <p>The Heritage Foundation was founded in 1973. It is a research and educational think tank. It formulates and promotes a conservative public policy agenda in the United States of America based on free enterprise, limited government involvement, individual freedom, and a strong national defence.</p>
<p>The World Bank</p> <p><a href="#">Doing Business Indicators</a></p> <p>Bi-annual (2005)</p>	<p>Benchmarking. Considers a variety of investment climate indicators that quantify the costs, both in time and money, of doing business.</p> <p>Aggregate</p>	<p>Quantitative. The publication ranks countries according to various aspects of the regulatory environment, such as the time taken and costs associated with starting or closing a business, getting credit, hiring and firing workers, or enforcing a contract and other economic characteristics of the country</p>	<p>Africa</p> <p>Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>Top ten reformers from the most recent survey: Slovakia, Colombia, Belgium, Finland, India, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal and Spain</p> <p>The Doing Business Indicators provide comparable data across 130 countries. The database differs from existing reports that address business environment issues -- such as EBRD's Transition Report - which tend to rely on business perceptions surveys and analyst assessments. They do not identify the nature of regulatory reforms required to improve the investment climate. Doing Business aims to provide a new set of objective, quantifiable measures of business regulations and their enforcement. For example, it shows that bankruptcy procedures are fastest in Ireland and slowest in India, cheapest in Singapore and most expensive in Macedonia.</p>
<p>The World Bank</p> <p><a href="#">Governance Indicators</a></p>	<p>Benchmarking. Measures perceptions of governance</p> <p>Governance</p>	<p>Six qualitative indicators (Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p>	<p>The study concludes that there is little if any evidence of improvements in global governance over the period considered.</p>

Four time periods covered: 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2002.		Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, and Control of Corruption)Indicators are based on several hundred variables using data sources (subjective or perception-based) from 18 different organizations	Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Beuze, Benin, Bermuda, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso.	The variety of sources and indicators used provides an aggregated indicator Margins of error remain substantial relative to the units in which governance is measured, and these margins of error complicate comparison between countries and over time.
The World Bank –Investment Climate Unit <a href="#">Investment Climate Assessments (ICA)</a> These are ad hoc surveys	Measures the state of the microeconomic and institutional conditions that affect investment. It does not produce a single index but a set of quantitative variables that provide qualified information for country assessments  Single country	Qualitative and quantitative. All assessments include useful sub-national benchmarking across cities and provinces. For example, the assessments on China and India ranked different Chinese cities and Indian states, respectively, on various factors such as labour market flexibility, infrastructure, research and development, and staff quality.	Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.  Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Uganda, Zambia.	Comprehensive assessment of the investment climate in individual countries. Each country ICA can be used as a detailed analytical and policymaking tool.
The World Bank –Investment Climate Unit <a href="#">Firm Analysis and Competitiveness Surveys (FACS)</a> Ad hoc surveys of the manufacturing sector	Benchmarking. Measures the state of the microeconomic and institutional conditions that affect investment. It does not produce a single index but a set of quantitative variables that provide qualified information for country assessments  Aggregate	Qualitative. These are surveys of a country's manufacturing sector or industry. The cover issues around entrepreneurship, technology, labour market, financial markets and contractual relations, conflict resolution, infrastructure, business support, domestic competitiveness, regulation, the effects of SAPs, investors confidence, etc.	Africa  Burundi, Cameroon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Morocco, Zimbabwe	These surveys are mostly carried out within the framework of the Africa Regional Program on Enterprise Development (RPED), which is an ongoing research project with the overall purpose of generating business knowledge and policy advice useful to private sector manufacturing development in Sub-Saharan Africa. It also produces African Private Sector and Investment Climate Assessments.
Transparency Internationa <a href="#">Corruption Perception Index (CPI)</a> Annual (2003)	The index qualitatively measures corruption as perceived by national and foreign businessmen and women, academics and policymakers in each country. It emphasises the effects of corruption on business, trade and justice.  Aggregate / Governance	Qualitative and quantitative. Based on a variety of sources (mostly qualitative surveys) that measure the overall level of corruption and provide a comparable ranking: the World Economic Forum, the Institute for Management and Development, PricewaterhouseCoopers, The World Bank's World Business Environment Survey, The Economist Intelligence Unit, Freedom House, the Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, Gallup International and Columbia University.	Africa  Angola, Botswana, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia, Zambia, Zimbabwe	Finland topped this index as the country with the least corruption, followed by New Zealand, Denmark, Iceland and Singapore. Haiti was perceived as the worst country in this regard. Botswana was the best African country in 31st position and India was 90th.  "Corruption is rampant in 60 countries and public sector is plagued by bribery"  A complete and comparable assessment of corruption in each country.
UNDP: UN Agency <a href="#">Human Development Index (HDI)</a> Annual (2003)	Index. Aims to measure poverty in terms of the capabilities that people lack.  Aggregate	Quantitative. Life expectancy at birth; Adult literacy rate; Combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio; GDP per capita	Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.  Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, China (SAR), Hungary, Iceland, Ireland,	2004 top ten: 1. Norway 2. Sweden 3. Austria 4. Canada 5. Netherlands 6. Belgium 7. Iceland 8. US 9. Japan 10.  Ireland The UNDP has published its Human Development Report since 1990. It is based on the work of Academics such as Frances Stewart and Amartya Sen. The index is used by policy makers, academics and practitioners in designing and targeting social policy around the world. In some cases, the UNDP publishes national Indexes; which are much more detailed.
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) <a href="#">Inward FDI Performance index</a>	Index. The performance of different economies in attracting inward investment during the 3-year periods. Hence, this is a backward looking index	Quantitative. It is measured as the Country's share in Global FDI flow to its share in Global GDP. The indices exclude tax havens, which for tax rather	Africa  Algeria, Angola, Benin,	Top ten (0-10, although countries sometimes put together and negative values are possible): Belgium and Luxembourg 10.955, Angola 6.455, Hong Kong, China 6.387, Ireland 5.861, Malta 4.465, Singapore 3.978, Sweden 3.857, Netherlands 3.740, Denmark 3.365, Brazil 2.945, Spain 2.445

<p>The Performance Index is shown for three-year periods, starting in 1994. The latest covers 2000-2002. This helps to offset annual fluctuations in the data</p>	<p>Aggregate</p>	<p>than productive reasons tend to have massive FDI inflows in relation to their economic size.</p>	<p>Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>3.485, Brunei Darussalam 3.445 The usefulness of these ratings is most clear when they are used together. In this way it is possible to identify four types of economies: -Front Runners: High FDI performance and potential -Above potential economies: High FDI performance, low potential -Below potential economies: Low FDI performance, high FDI potential-Under-performers: Low FDI performance and potential</p>
<p>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) <a href="#">Inward FDI Potential Index</a> The Potential Index is shown for three-year periods, starting in 1988. The latest covers 2000-2002. This helps to offset annual fluctuations in the data</p>	<p>Index. The attractiveness of different economies with respect to attracting foreign investment. Hence, this is a forward looking index  Aggregate</p>	<p>Quantitative. It is estimated as a simple average of 12 criteria:Rate of GDP growth, Per capita GDP, Share of exports in GDP, Telephone lines per 1000 people, Commercial energy use per capita, Share of R&amp;D expenditure in GNI, Share of tertiary students in the population, and country risk</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.  United States, Norway, United Kingdom, Singapore, Canada, Belgium and Luxembourg, Ireland, Qatar, Germany, Sweden, Netherlands, Hong Kong, China, Finland, France, Iceland, Japan, United Arab Emirates, Korea, Republic of, Denmark, Switzerland, Taiwan Province of China, Australia, Israel, Austria, Spain, Italy, Slovenia, Kuwait, Bahrain, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Russian Federation, Malta, Brunei Darussalam, Greece, Portugal, Estonia, China, Bahamas, Hungary,</p>	<p>The results are available online for 3-year periods going back to 1988-90. The recent results for 1999-2001 state that the US has the top score of 0.689, and the top 20 places are dominated by OECD countries except for the presence of East Asian tigers Singapore, Korea, China, and Hong Kong. Many sub-Saharan African and South Asian countries cluster around a score of 0.2 and below. The usefulness of these ratings is most clear when they are used together. In this way it is possible to identify four types of economies: -Front Runners: High FDI performance and potential -Above potential economies: High FDI performance, low potential-Below potential economies: Low FDI performance, high FDI potential-Under-performers: Low FDI performance and potential</p>
<p>UNCTAD <a href="#">Foreign Direct Investment Policy Reviews</a> Reports for 3 or 4 countries are produced every year on an ad hoc basis.</p>	<p>Survey. The UNCTAD Investment Policy Reviews are intended to help countries improve their investment policies and to familiarize Governments and the international private sector with an individual country's investment environment.  Single country</p>	<p>Qualitative analysis of 3 types of benchmark. Specific FDI Measures: Entry and establishment, treatment and protection of FDI. General Investment Measures and Conditions: Foreign exchange controls, Taxation, Employment of non-citizens, Land, Competition policy, Rule of law and respect for property rights, Intellectual property rights, Corporate governance and accounting standards, Licensing and administration of regulationsSectoral Investment Incentives and Related Initiatives: Financial assistance policy, Tax agreements and development approval orders, Sectoral initiatives</p>	<p>Africa, South America  Algeria, Botswana,Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lesotho, Mauritius, Nepal, Peru, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda and Uzbekistan.</p>	<p>The reviews provide information on: 1) The trends and impact of FDI flows 2) Existing conditions of the investment framework, covering criteria such as rule of law, land issues, the environment, technology, intellectual property, capital and financial markets, the import-export regime, and international agreements 3) Recommendations on how to enhance the role of FDI in development and realise a country's FDI potential 4) Recommendations on how to enhance the technological impact of FDI 5) Overall conclusions and policy recommendations It is hoped that the analysis and recommendations contained in these Reviews will contribute to an improvement of policies, promote awareness of investment opportunities and serve as a catalyst for increased investment into these countries.</p>
<p>UNCTAD <a href="#">Investment Compass</a> Launched in 2004, will be updated frequently but actual periods between surveys is not stated.</p>	<p>To provide comparative measures to benchmark country competitiveness in attracting foreign direct investment (FDI). The Investment Compass shows the degree of policy freedom: shown in a graphic format - a hexagon - a country's FDI benchmark organized around six major Areas. These are: 1. Resource Assets 2. Infrastructure 3. Operating Costs 4. Economic Performance and Governance 5. Taxation and Incentives 6. Regulatory Framework  Aggregate</p>	<p>Quantitative. The Investment Compass has selected and developed key indicators considered to have an influence on the investment environment. The Compass makes comparisons on a "horizontal" basis (one country compared to another country, or to a region, or to a 'best performer'), as well as on a "vertical" basis (comparison between indicators for a given country).</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America  Algeria, Armenia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, Columbia, Congo, Congo Democratic Republic of, Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia.</p>	<p>Results in terms of areas, which are broken into groups of variables. These variables are also broken into key indicators. Values of areas, variables and indicators range from 1 to 100. These values are obtained through a 'normalization' technique, where each indicator has been assigned minimum and maximum values. Through a simple arithmetic average, the relevant normalized indicators are aggregated to give the value for each variable, and the relevant variables are aggregated to provide the value for each area. This provides an excellent tool for making investment related comparisons.  Need to register for access. Registration is free.</p>
<p>UNIDO <a href="#">Foreign Direct Investor Perceptions in Sub-Saharan Africa</a></p>	<p>Survey and benchmarking. Aims to match national efforts in Sub Saharan Africa to attract FDI to the motivations and decision criteria of investors, and to</p>	<p>Qualitative. The assessment uses data from survey of 758 enterprises (all with over 30% of foreign capital).The survey consisted of a fixed set of</p>	<p>Africa  Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar,</p>	<p>Finds that over 60% of FDI is in eight sectors (mainly low-tech &amp; resource based). The EU is the largest source of FDI (40% numbers and capital), followed by other African countries (35% numbers and capital).</p>

<p>(2003) hopes to repeat bi-annually so as to enable time-series as well as cross-country comparison.</p>	<p>criteria of investors, and to improve understanding about who is investing in Africa, why and what role the government can play.</p> <p>Aggregate</p>	<p>consisted of a fixed set of questions for profiling investors as well as their motivations, expectations and experience of investing in Africa</p>	<p>Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania &amp; Uganda</p>	<p>numbers and capital); Political and economic stability is most important to investors 60% of FDI is Greenfield, 25% of FDI is joint venture. Overall, local sourcing of inputs was low, but for export-oriented firms it was high (75% of value).</p> <p>Informative introduction section; Analysis by country, by industry and by market (domestic/export); Well written, visually very attractive and easy to navigate.</p>
<p>Vote With Your Feet</p> <p><a href="#">Vote with your Feet</a> Ratings for 1998,1999, 2000 and 2001</p>	<p>Index. Socio-economic indicators including level of solvency and degree of economic freedom</p> <p>Aggregate / Governance</p>	<p>Quantitative. The ranking provides a rating for countries that are attractive for investment based on quantitative socio-economic variables.</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>Singapore, Hong Kong, Northern Mariana Islands, Anguilla, Cayman Islands, Malaysia, Ireland, Latvia, Switzerland, South Korea, Turks and Caicos Islands, Macau, Lithuania, Estonia, Taiwan, Thailand, Russia, Spain, Chile, <del>Andorra, Czech Republic</del></p>	<p>Singapore tops the list followed by Hong Kong and the Northern Mariana Islands. Ireland in 7th place is both the top European and top English speaking country Vote with your feet provides a thorough list of countries and information about them drawn from the Central Intelligence Agency World Fact Book. This is an interesting example of consumers or investors executing their right of exit.</p>
<p>World Economic Forum</p> <p><a href="#">Africa Competitiveness Report</a> Annual (2004) Started in 2001</p>	<p>Benchmarking. Highlights the prospects for growth, obstacles to improving competitiveness and the need to accelerate the pace of economic change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Depict the strengths and weaknesses of national business environments</li> <li>□ To be a tool for policy-makers to identify and address obstacles to growth</li> <li>□ Reveal obstacles to African competitiveness in an increasingly integrated and knowledge-based global economy</li> <li>□ Establish a process whereby governments, business leaders and other stakeholders can evaluate progress on a continual basis</li> </ul> <p>Aggregate</p>	<p>Quantitative. Analysis of over 100 quantitative indicators reveals regional trends and detailed country profiles. show the performance of 25 African economies. As well as using official economic and social statistics, the indicators used offer unique qualitative data on issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· corruption</li> <li>· the impact on business of HIV/AIDS</li> <li>· infrastructure</li> <li>· access to financing.</li> </ul> <p>The Report also offers essays from prominent academics and development experts on a variety of issues relevant to Africa's development agenda.</p>	<p>Africa</p> <p>Botswana, Tunisia, South Africa, Mauritius, Namibia, Gambia, Egypt, Morocco, Tanzania, Ghana, Algeria, Malawi, Senegal, Uganda, Kenya, Nigeria, Zambia, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Madagascar, Zimbabwe, Mali, Angola, Chad.</p>	<p>Top five countries:</p> <p>Botswana 4.56 Tunisia 4.49 South Africa 4.37 Mauritius 4.12 Namibia 3.99</p> <p>This is an excellent resource. It's strength comes from the huge number of different indicators that are considered. However, it does miss out some countries in Africa, although this could reflect the difficulties of getting the information needed for all the indicators in some countries.</p>
<p>World Economic Forum</p> <p><a href="#">Global Competitiveness Report</a> Includes the Growth Competitiveness Index (GCI) and the Business Competitiveness Index (BCI)</p> <p>Bi-annual (2003) Commercial report</p>	<p>Index. These aim to measure the growth prospects and different elements of economic competitiveness in countries. The GCI analysis three categories: the macroeconomic environment, the quality of public institutions and technology. The BCI is measured in terms of the sophistication of company operations and strategy, and the quality of the national business environment.</p> <p>Aggregate</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative. The GCR is based on the information gathered by its annual Executive Opinion Survey. The two indexes combine available hard data and data from the Executive Opinion Survey: qualitative data from informed judgements of thousands of business leaders and decision makers in the economies examined</p> <p>The GCI is itself a composite of 3 indices: technology; public institutions (perceived degree of corruption and the rule of contracts and law, could be considered as an indicator of a government's willingness to pay) and the macroeconomic environment</p> <p>The BCI is all qualitative judgments except for patenting rate and internet/mobile phone penetration</p>	<p>Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, Oceania.</p> <p>Finland, United States, Sweden, Taiwan, Denmark, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, Japan, Iceland, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Germany, Australia, Canada, United Arab Emirates, Austria, New Zealand, Israel, Estonia, Hong Kong SAR, Chile, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Bahrain, Korea, Ireland, Malaysia, Malta, Slovenia, Thailand, Jordan, Lithuania, Greece, Cyprus, Hungary, Czech Republic, South Africa, Tunisia, Slovak Republic, Latvia, Botswana, China, Italy, Mexico, Mauritius, Costa Rica, Trinidad and Tobago, Namibia, El Salvador, Uruguay, India, Morocco, Brazil, Panama, Bulgaria, Poland, Croatia, Egypt, Romania, Colombia, Jamaica, Turkey, Peru, Ghana, Indonesia, Russian Federation, Algeria, Dominican Republic, Sri Lanka, Argentina, Gambia, Philippines, Vietnam, Kenya, Uganda, Guatemala, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Tanzania, Zambia, Macedonia, FYR, Venezuela, Ukraine, Malawi, Mali, Serbia and Montenegro, Ecuador, Pakistan, Mozambique, Nigeria, Georgia, Nicaragua, Madagascar, <del>Lebanon, Bolivia, Zimbabwe</del></p>	<p>Country Rankings 2004-2005:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Finland</li> <li>2. USA</li> <li>3. Sweden</li> <li>4. Taiwan</li> <li>5. Denmark</li> <li>6. Norway</li> <li>7. Singapore</li> <li>8. Switzerland</li> <li>9. Japan</li> <li>10. Iceland</li> </ol> <p>Compared with last year: Sweden, Norway, Taiwan and Japan all rose; while Denmark, Singapore, Switzerland, Iceland all fell. The UK was ranked 11th</p> <p>By looking both at the micro foundations of productivity and the three-macro pillars of the complex growth process, the GCR provides an extremely useful guide to the state of economic development across the world. However, only limited sections available online.</p> <p>One must question how meaningful the aggregation of so many criteria into one figure can be, and whether the survey data is reliable and comparable across countries. Data worries are compounded by worries over the time that some variables vary (longer than one year) given that they are assessed every year. The basis of the weights assigned to factors is limited and the transparency of methodology of the overall index is an issue. Also, there is no justification (or discussion) on whether the determinants of the index are a proxy for</p>