



The World Justice Project

The World Justice Project | Rule of Law Index[®]

2012



Mark David Agrast
Juan Carlos Botero
Joel Martinez
Alejandro Ponce
Christine S. Pratt



The World Justice Project

The World Justice Project | Rule of Law Index[®]

2012

Mark David Agrast
Juan Carlos Botero
Joel Martinez
Alejandro Ponce
Christine S. Pratt

With the collaboration of:
Kelly Roberts

The World Justice Project

Board of Directors: Sheikha Abdulla Al-Misnad, Emil Constantinescu, Ashraf Ghani, William C. Hubbard, Suet-Fern Lee, Mondli Makhanya, William H. Neukom, Ellen Gracie Northfleet, James R. Silkenat.

Officers: William C. Hubbard, *Chairman of the Board*; William H. Neukom, *Founder, President & CEO*; Deborah Enix-Ross, *Vice President*; Suzanne E. Gilbert, *Vice President*; James R. Silkenat, *Director & Vice President*; Lawrence B. Bailey, *Secretary and Treasurer*; Gerold W. Libby, *General Counsel*.

Executive Director: Juan Carlos Botero.

Chief Research Officer: Alejandro Ponce

Rule of Law Index 2012 Team: Mark David Agrast, *Chair*; Juan Carlos Botero, *Executive Director*; Alejandro Ponce, *Chief Research Officer*; Joel Martinez; Christine S. Pratt; Kelly Roberts; Joshua Steele; Sophie Barral; Alexander E. Davis; Sharanbir S. Grewal; Eric C. Black; Angeles Melano Paz; Chantal V. Bright; Alejandro Mahecha; Paula F. Guevara; Jose Caballero; Victoria Norelid.

The *WJP Rule of Law Index*® 2012 report was made possible by generous support from:

William H. Neukom & Neukom Family Foundation and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

And from the Allen & Overy Foundation; Allen & Overy LLP; American Bar Association; American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section; American Bar Association Health Law Section; American Bar Association Judicial Division; American Bar Association Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice; American Bar Association Section of Antitrust Law; American Bar Association Business Law Section; American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution; American Bar Association Section of Environment, Energy, and Resources; American Bar Association Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities; American Bar Association Section of Intellectual Property Law; American Bar Association Section of International Law; American Bar Association Section of Labor and Employment Law; American Bar Association Section of Litigation; American Bar Association Section of Real Property, Trust and Estate Law; American Bar Association Section of State and Local Government Law; American Bar Association Section of Taxation; Anonymous; Boies, Schiller & Flexner, LLP; The Boeing Company; Carnegie Corporation of New York; Chase Family Philanthropic Fund; Cochinyan & Peralta Law Offices; Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP; E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company; Eastminster Presbyterian Church; The Edward John and Patricia Rosenwald Foundation; The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation; Ford Foundation; Fulbright & Jaworski LLP; Garrigues LLP; GE Foundation; General Electric Company; Gómez-Acebo & Pombo; Google, Inc.; Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation; Haynes and Boone, LLP; Hewlett-Packard Company; Holland & Knight LLP; Hunton & Williams; Intel Corporation; Irish Aid; Johnson & Johnson; Judson Family Fund at The Seattle Foundation; K&L Gates; LexisNexis; Major, Lindsey & Africa; Mason, Hayes+Curran; McKinsey & Company, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; Microsoft Corporation; National Endowment for Democracy; Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP; Oak Foundation; PepsiCo; Roca Junyent; Society of the Cincinnati; Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan; Texas Instruments, Inc.; Troutman Sanders LLP; Turner Freeman Lawyers; U.S. Chamber of Commerce & Related Entities; Uría Menéndez; Viacom International, Inc.; Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.; Welsh, Carson, Anderson & Stowe; White & Case LLP; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; Winston & Strawn LLP; and individual supporters listed in the last section of this report.

ISBN (print version): 978-0-9882846-2-3

ISBN (online version): 978-0-9882846-3-0

Copyright 2012 by The World Justice Project. The *WJP Rule of Law Index* and The *World Justice Project Rule of Law Index* are trademarks of The World Justice Project. All rights reserved. Requests to reproduce this document should be sent to Alejandro Ponce, the World Justice Project, 740 Fifteenth Street, N.W. 2nd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 U.S.A. E-mail: poncea@wjpnet.org

Graphic design: Joshua Steele.

Suggested citation: Agrast, M., Botero, J., Martinez, J., Ponce, A., & Pratt, C. *WJP Rule of Law Index*® 2012. Washington, D.C.: The World Justice Project.

Contents

1	■■	Preface
2	■■	Executive Summary
5	■■	Part I: Constructing the WJP Index
22	■■	Part II: The Rule of Law Around the World
24		Regional Highlights
57		Country Profiles
156		Data Tables
182		Data Notes
191	■■	Part III: Statistical Audit
201	■■	Part IV: Contributing Experts
229	■■	Part V: Acknowledgments
233	■■	About The World Justice Project

Preface

“The rule of law is the foundation for communities of opportunity and equity—it is the predicate for the eradication of poverty, violence, corruption, pandemics, and other threats to civil society.”

WILLIAM H. NEUKOM, FOUNDER, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF
THE WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT

The goal of The World Justice Project (WJP) is to advance the rule of law around the world. Establishing the rule of law is fundamental to achieving communities of opportunity and equity - communities that offer sustainable economic development, accountable government, and respect for fundamental rights. Without the rule of law, medicines do not reach health facilities due to corruption; women in rural areas remain unaware of their rights; people are killed in criminal violence; and firms’ costs increase because of expropriation risk. The rule of law is the key to improving public health, safeguarding participation, ensuring security, and fighting poverty.

97
countries
covered

Strengthening the rule of law is a major goal of governments, donors, businesses, and civil society organizations around the world. To be effective, however, rule of law development requires clarity about the fundamental features of the rule of law as well as an adequate basis for its evaluation and measurement. Against this backdrop, the World Justice Project has developed the WJP Rule of Law Index—a quantitative assessment tool designed to offer a comprehensive picture of the extent to which countries adhere to the rule of law in practice. The *WJP Rule of Law Index 2012* report, the third in an annual series, builds on five years of development, intensive consultation, and vetting with academics, practitioners, and community leaders from over 100 countries and 17 professional disciplines. This year’s report introduces the data results and Index scores for 97 countries, together with key findings and background on the development of the Index and its methodology.

The WJP Rule of Law Index 2012 looks at 48 rule of law indicators organized around nine conceptual dimensions: limited government powers; absence of corruption; order and security; fundamental rights; open government; regulatory enforcement; civil justice; criminal justice; and informal justice. The Index scores and rankings are constructed from over 400 variables drawn from two original sources of data collected from independent sources by the World Justice Project in each country: a General Population Poll (GPP) and a series of Qualified Respondents’ Questionnaires (QRQ). To date, over 97,000 people and 2,500 experts from around the world have participated in this project.

More than
97,000
people and
2,500
experts participated

The Index is intended for a broad audience of policy-makers, civil society, practitioners, academics, and other constituencies. The rule of law is not the rule of lawyers and judges. All elements of society are stakeholders in the rule of law. It is our hope that over time, this tool will help identify strengths and weaknesses in each country under review and encourage policy choices that advance the rule of law.

Executive Summary

The WJP Rule of Law Index is a quantitative assessment tool designed by the World Justice Project to offer a comprehensive picture of the extent to which countries adhere to the rule of law, not in theory, but in practice. The WJP Rule of Law Index is derived from a set of principles that constitute a working definition of the rule of law. Adherence to these principles is measured by means of a large set of performance indicators that provide a comprehensive and multidimensional picture of the status of the rule of law in each country.

Rather than looking at laws, actors, or institutional arrangements, the WJP Rule of Law Index assesses a nation's adherence to the rule of law by examining practical situations in which a rule of law deficit could affect the daily lives of ordinary people. For instance, the Index evaluates whether citizens can access public services without the need to bribe a government officer; whether a basic dispute among neighbors or companies can be resolved peacefully and cost-effectively by an independent adjudicator; and whether people can conduct their daily activities without fear of crime or police abuse. These are among the common situations that occur in the lives of people and that are directly influenced by the degree of rule of law in the society.

The Index provides new data on nine dimensions of the rule of law:

1. Limited government powers
2. Absence of corruption
3. Order and security
4. Fundamental rights
5. Open government
6. Regulatory enforcement
7. Civil justice
8. Criminal justice
9. Informal justice

These nine dimensions, or factors, are further disaggregated into 48 sub-factors. The scores of these sub-factors are built from over 400 variables drawn from assessments of the general public (1,000 respondents per country) and local legal experts.¹ The outcome of this exercise is one of the world's most comprehensive data sets measuring the extent to which countries adhere to the rule of law - not in theory but in practice.

¹ We are grateful for the generous engagement of the over 2,500 academics and practitioners around the world who contributed their time and expertise to the qualified respondents' questionnaires, and the 97,000 individuals who participated in the general population poll.

DEFINING THE RULE OF LAW

As used by the World Justice Project, the rule of law refers to a system in which the following four universal principles are upheld:

- I. The government and its officials and agents are accountable under the law.
- II. The laws are clear, publicized, stable, and fair, and protect fundamental rights, including the security of persons and property.
- III. The process by which the laws are enacted, administered, and enforced is accessible, fair, and efficient.
- IV. Justice is delivered by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are of sufficient number, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.

These principles are derived from international sources that enjoy broad acceptance across countries with differing social, cultural, economic, and political systems, and incorporate both substantive and procedural elements.

THE WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX 2012

This report, the third in an annual series, presents the framework of the WJP Rule of Law Index and summarizes the results and lessons learned during the WJP's implementation of the Index in

97 countries and jurisdictions.² These countries account for more than 90 percent of the world's population. This year's report is based on data collected and analyzed during the second quarter of 2012, with the exception of general population data for the countries indexed in 2011, which was obtained during the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2011.

It should be noted that because country scores are normalized across the entire sample of indexed countries and this year's report measures 31 additional countries that were not included in the *2011* report, individual country findings in the *2012* report are not comparable to the results from prior years.

USES OF THE INDEX

The WJP Rule of Law Index is an instrument for strengthening the rule of law. It offers reliable, independent, and disaggregated information for policy makers, businesses, non-governmental organizations, and other constituencies to:

- » Assess a nation's adherence to the rule of law in practice;
- » Identify a nation's strengths and weaknesses in comparison to similarly situated countries; and
- » Track changes over time.

The WJP Rule of Law Index enters a crowded field of indicators on different aspects of the rule of law, but it has a number of features that set it apart:

² As used in this volume, "country" includes autonomous jurisdictions, such as Hong Kong SAR, China.

- » **Comprehensiveness:** While other indices cover aspects of the rule of law, they do not yield a full picture of rule of law compliance.
- » **New data:** The Index findings are based almost entirely on new data collected by the WJP from independent sources. This contrasts it with other indices based on data aggregated from third-party sources, or on sources that are self-reported by governments or other interested parties.
- » **Rule of law in practice:** The Index measures adherence to the rule of law by looking not to the laws as they are written, but rather at how they are actually applied in practice.
- » **Anchored in actual experiences:** The Index combines expert opinion with rigorous polling of the general public to ensure that the findings reflect the conditions experienced by the population, including marginalized sectors of society.
- » **Action oriented:** Findings are presented in disaggregated form, identifying strong and weak performers across the nine rule-of-law dimensions examined in each country.

Despite these methodological strengths, the findings should be interpreted in light of certain inherent limitations. The Index is a diagnostic tool that provides a general assessment of the health of the rule of law in a given country at a particular moment in time. It does not explain the causes of the conditions it describes, nor does it prescribe remedies. In addition, no single index can convey a full picture of a country's situation. Rule of law analysis requires a careful consideration of multiple

dimensions that vary from country to country and a combination of sources, instruments, and methods.

ABOUT THE WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT

The World Justice Project (WJP) is an independent, non-profit organization working to strengthen the rule of law throughout the world. It is based on two complementary premises: first, the rule of law is the foundation for communities of opportunity and equity; and second, multidisciplinary collaboration is the most effective way to advance the rule of law. The WJP's work is being carried out through three complementary and mutually reinforcing program areas: Research and Scholarship, the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index, and Mainstreaming through practical on-the-ground programs to advance the rule of law. The World Justice Project engages leaders in countries across the globe and from many professional disciplines to advance the rule of law. Through this multi-pronged approach, the Project seeks to spur government reforms, develop practical on-the-ground programs that support the rule of law, and increase understanding of the importance of the rule of law to people and the communities in which they live. Further details are provided in the last section of this report and at www.worldjusticeproject.org.

Part I: Constructing the WJP Rule of Law Index



Constructing the WJP Rule of Law Index

INTRODUCTION

The WJP Rule of Law Index is an innovative quantitative assessment tool designed to offer a detailed and comprehensive picture of the extent to which countries adhere to the rule of law in practice. The Index provides new data on nine dimensions of the rule of law: limited government powers; absence of corruption; order and security; fundamental rights; open government; regulatory enforcement; civil justice; criminal justice; and informal justice. These nine aggregate indicators (factors) are further disaggregated into 48 specific indicators (sub-factors).

The Index looks at a nation's adherence to the rule of law from the bottom up, that is, from the perspective of ordinary people who are directly affected by the degree of rule of law in their societies. It examines practical, everyday situations, such as whether people can access public services without the need to bribe a government officer; whether a basic dispute among neighbors or companies can be resolved peacefully and cost-effectively by an independent adjudicator; or whether people can conduct their daily activities without fear of crime or police abuse. Findings are based on data derived from a poll of the general public and detailed questionnaires administered to local experts. The WJP Rule of Law Index

2012, the third report in an annual series, introduces scores and rankings for 97 countries. To date, over 2,500 experts and 97,000 other individuals from around the world have participated in this project.

It should be emphasized that the Index is intended to be applied in countries with vastly differing social, cultural, economic, and political systems. No society has ever attained - let alone sustained - a perfect realization of the rule of law. Every nation faces the perpetual challenge of building and renewing the structures, institutions, and norms that can support and sustain a rule of law culture.

DEFINING THE RULE OF LAW

The design of the Index began with the effort to formulate a set of principles that would constitute a working definition of the rule of law. The principles were derived to the extent possible from established international standards and norms, and informed by a thorough review of national constitutions and scholarly literature. The principles and the factors derived from them were tested and refined through extensive consultations with experts from around the world to ensure, among other

things, their cultural competence, and to avoid Western, Anglo-American, or other biases.

Any effort to define the rule of law must grapple with the distinction

between what scholars call a “thin” or minimalist conception of the rule of law that focuses on formal, procedural rules, and a “thick” conception that includes substantive characteristics, such as self-government and various fundamental

Box 1 : The rule of law in everyday life

Suppose the owner of a small business has a dispute with a client over a large, unpaid bill. What if her only recourse to settle the dispute is through the threat of physical violence? Consider the bridges, roads, or runways we traverse daily—or the offices and buildings in which we live, work, and play. What if building codes governing their design and safety were not enforced? Or suppose someone broke into your home and stole your belongings, and there was no means to reclaim your property and bring the perpetrator to justice? Although we may not be aware of it, the rule of law is a profoundly important part of our lives. It is the foundation for a system of rules to keep us safe, solve disputes, and enable us to prosper. Let’s consider a few examples:

a. Business environment

Imagine an investor seeking to commit resources abroad. She would probably think twice before investing in a country where corruption is rampant, property rights are ill-defined, and contracts are difficult to enforce. Uneven enforcement of regulation, corruption, insecure property rights, and ineffective means to settle disputes undermine legitimate business and drive away both domestic and foreign investment.

b. Public works

Safe and reliable physical structures are essential to a thriving economy and an efficient society. Yet corrupt practices in the construction process abound, discouraging honest practitioners from entering the market through prohibitive bribery and kickback costs. In many cases, for instance, it has been alleged that government officials and contractors have been complicit in using low-quality materials in order to pocket the surplus. Transparency in the procurement process and effectively enforced regulations and safety codes help curtail illegal practices and increase the reliability and security of physical infrastructure.

c. Public health

Maintaining the physical health of a society is hugely reliant on its health care delivery systems. Absenteeism, mismanagement, bribes, and informal payments undermine health care delivery and waste scarce resources. Unfortunately, it is in poor countries that people are most likely to have to pay bribes to obtain medical attention. As a result, many people do not receive adequate medical care.

d. Environment

Countries around the world have laws to protect the environment. Unfortunately, these laws are not always enforced. Weak enforcement of environmental laws can lead to major problems, including pollution, deforestation, loss of biodiversity, natural disasters, and poor waste management. Effective enforcement and appropriate management are useful tools in protecting the environment and public health without unduly constraining economic development. Adherence to the rule of law is essential to hold the government, businesses, civil society organizations, and communities accountable for sound environmental policies.

The rule of law affects all of us in our everyday lives. It is not important only to lawyers and judges; it matters to businessmen, builders, consumers, doctors, and journalists. Every sector of society is a stakeholder in the rule of law.

rights and freedoms. On the one hand, it was felt that if the Index was to have utility and gain wide acceptance, the definition must be broadly applicable to many types of social and political systems, including some which lack many of the features that characterize democratic nations. On the other hand, it was recognized that the rule of law must be more than merely a system of rules - that indeed, a system of positive law that fails to respect core human rights guaranteed under international law is at best “rule *by* law”, and does not deserve to be called a rule of law system. In the words of Arthur Chaskalson, former Chief Justice of South Africa,

[T]he apartheid government, its officers and agents were accountable in accordance with the laws; the laws were clear; publicized, and stable, and were upheld by law enforcement officials and judges. What was missing was the substantive component of the rule of law. The process by which the laws were made was not fair (only whites, a minority of the population, had the vote). And the laws themselves were not fair. They institutionalized discrimination, vested broad discretionary powers in the executive, and failed to protect fundamental rights. Without a substantive content there would be no answer to the criticism, sometimes voiced, that the rule of law is ‘an empty vessel into which any law could be poured.’

The four “universal principles” that emerged from our deliberations are featured in Box 2.

These principles represent an effort to strike a balance between thinner and thicker conceptions of the rule of law, incorporating both substantive and procedural elements - a decision which was broadly endorsed by the many international experts with whom we have consulted. A few examples may be instructive:

Box 2 : Four Universal Principles of the Rule of Law

The WJP uses a working definition of the rule of law based on four universal principles:

- The government and its officials and agents are accountable under the law.
 - The laws are clear, publicized, stable and fair, and protect fundamental rights, including the security of persons and property.
 - The process by which the laws are enacted, administered and enforced is accessible, fair and efficient.
 - Justice is delivered by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are of sufficient number, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.
- » The principles address the extent to which a country provides for fair participation in the making of the laws—certainly an essential attribute of self-government. But the principles do not address the further question of whether the laws are enacted by democratically elected representatives.
 - » The principles address the extent to which a country protects fundamental human rights. But given the impossibility of assessing adherence to the full panoply of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental rights recognized in the Universal Declaration, the principles treat a more modest menu of rights, primarily civil and political, that are firmly established under international law and bear the most immediate relationship to rule of law concerns.
 - » The principles address access to justice, but chiefly in terms of access to legal representation and access to the courts, rather than in the “thicker” sense in which access to justice is sometimes seen as synonymous with broad legal empowerment of the poor and

disfranchised. Delivery of justice in this more limited sense is a critical cornerstone for the implementation of policies and rights that empower the poor.

In limiting the scope of the principles in this fashion, we do not wish to suggest any disagreement with a more robust and inclusive vision of self-government, fundamental rights, or access to justice, all of which are addressed in other important and influential indices, as well as in various papers developed by WJP scholars. Indeed, it is among the premises of the project as a whole that a healthy rule of law is critical to advancing such goals.

Moreover, the WJP's conception of the rule of law is not incompatible with the notion that these universal principles

may interact with each other in multiple ways. For example, concrete improvements in one dimension of the rule of law may affect societies in more than one way, depending on the prevailing cultural and institutional environments. It is our hope that by providing data on nine independent dimensions of the rule of law, the Index will become a useful tool for academics and other constituencies to further our understanding of these interactions.

THE 2012 WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX

The WJP Rule of Law Index measures adherence to the rule of law principles through a comprehensive and multidimensional set of outcome indicators that reveal the extent to which these principles are observed in practice. The 2012 Index comprises nine aggregate indicators (or factors). The factors are further disaggregated into 48 specific indicators (or sub-factors). These indicators are presented in the table on the following page and described in detail in the section below.

Limited Government Powers

Factor 1 measures the extent to which those who govern are bound by law. It comprises the means, both constitutional and institutional, by which the powers of the government and its officials and agents are limited and by which they are held accountable under the law. It also includes nongovernmental checks on the government's power, such as a free and independent press.

Box 3 : Updates to the Conceptual Framework

The *WJP Rule of Law Index 2012* report introduces several conceptual changes. First, several sub-factors from the *Index 2011* report have been adjusted in the *Index 2012* report: sub-factor 7.1 (people are aware of available remedies), sub-factor 7.2 (people can access and afford legal advice and representation), and sub-factor 7.3 (people can access and afford civil courts) from the *Index 2011* report have been merged to form sub-factor 7.1 (people have access to affordable civil justice) of the current report. Second, sub-factor 5.1 (the laws are comprehensible to the public) and sub-factor 5.2 (the laws are publicized and widely accessible) have been combined into sub-factor 5.1 (the laws are publicized and accessible) of this year's report. Similarly, sub-factor 5.5 (official drafts of laws are available to the public) and sub-factor 5.6 (official information is available to the public) have been merged into sub-factor 5.4 (official information is available on request). Third, for the first time data has been collected on sub-factor 2.4 (government officials in the legislative branch do not use public office for private gain). Finally, in the measurement of Factor 2 (Absence of Corruption), several variables related to the crime of embezzlement have been incorporated into the Index.

THE WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT RULE OF LAW INDEX

The rule of law is a system in which the following four universal principles are upheld:

- › The government and its officials and agents are accountable under the law.
- › The laws are clear, publicized, stable and fair, and protect fundamental rights, including the security of persons and property.
- › The process by which the laws are enacted, administered, and enforced is accessible, efficient, and fair.
- › Justice is delivered by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are of sufficient number, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.

These four universal principles which comprise the WJP's notion of the rule of law are further developed in the nine factors of the WJP Rule of Law Index.

Factors & Sub-Factors

FACTOR 1: Limited Government Powers

- 1.1 Government powers are defined in the fundamental law
- 1.2 Government powers are effectively limited by the legislature
- 1.3 Government powers are effectively limited by the judiciary
- 1.4 Government powers are effectively limited by independent auditing and review
- 1.5 Government officials are sanctioned for misconduct
- 1.6 Government powers are subject to non-governmental checks
- 1.7 Transition of power is subject to the law

FACTOR 2: Absence of Corruption

- 2.1 Government officials in the executive branch do not use public office for private gain
- 2.2 Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain
- 2.3 Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain
- 2.4 Government officials in the legislative branch do not use public office for private gain

FACTOR 3: Order and Security

- 3.1 Crime is effectively controlled
- 3.2 Civil conflict is effectively limited
- 3.3 People do not resort to violence to redress personal grievances

FACTOR 4: Fundamental Rights

- 4.1 Equal treatment and absence of discrimination
- 4.2 The right to life and security of the person is effectively guaranteed
- 4.3 Due process of law and rights of the accused
- 4.4 Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed
- 4.5 Freedom of belief and religion is effectively guaranteed
- 4.6 Freedom from arbitrary interference with privacy is effectively guaranteed
- 4.7 Freedom of assembly and association is effectively guaranteed
- 4.8 Fundamental labor rights are effectively guaranteed

FACTOR 5: Open Government

- 5.1 The laws are publicized and accessible
- 5.2 The laws are stable
- 5.3 Right to petition the government and public participation
- 5.4 Official information is available on request

FACTOR 6: Regulatory Enforcement

- 6.1 Government regulations are effectively enforced
- 6.2 Government regulations are applied and enforced without improper influence
- 6.3 Administrative proceedings are conducted without unreasonable delay
- 6.4 Due process is respected in administrative proceedings
- 6.5 The Government does not expropriate without adequate compensation

FACTOR 7: Civil Justice

- 7.1 People can access and afford civil justice
- 7.2 Civil justice is free of discrimination
- 7.3 Civil justice is free of corruption
- 7.4 Civil justice is free of improper government influence
- 7.5 Civil justice is not subject to unreasonable delays
- 7.6 Civil justice is effectively enforced
- 7.7 ADRs are accessible, impartial, and effective

FACTOR 8: Criminal Justice

- 8.1 Criminal investigation system is effective
- 8.2 Criminal adjudication system is timely and effective
- 8.3 Correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior
- 8.4 Criminal system is impartial
- 8.5 Criminal system is free of corruption
- 8.6 Criminal system is free of improper government influence
- 8.7 Due process of law and rights of the accused

FACTOR 9: Informal Justice

- 9.1 Informal justice is timely and effective
- 9.2 Informal justice is impartial and free of improper influence
- 9.3 Informal justice respects and protects fundamental rights

Box 4 : The WJP Rule of Law Index methodology in a nutshell

The production of the WJP Rule of Law Index may be summarized in ten steps:

1. The WJP developed the conceptual framework summarized in the Index's 9 factors and 48 sub-factors, in consultation with academics, practitioners, and community leaders from around the world.
2. The Index team developed a set of five questionnaires based on the Index's conceptual framework, to be administered to experts and the general public. Questionnaires were translated into several languages and adapted to reflect commonly used terms and expressions.
3. The team identified, on average, more than 300 potential local experts per country to respond to the qualified respondents' questionnaires, and engaged the services of leading local polling companies.
4. Polling companies conducted pre-test pilot surveys of the general public in consultation with the Index team, and launched the final survey.
5. The team sent the questionnaires to local experts and engaged in continual interaction with them.
6. The Index team collected and mapped the data onto the 48 sub-factors.
7. The Index team constructed the final scores using a five-step process:
 - a. Codified the questionnaire items as numeric values.
 - b. Produced raw country scores by aggregating the responses from several individuals (experts or general public).
 - c. Normalized the raw scores.
 - d. Aggregated the normalized scores into sub-factors and factors using simple averages.
 - e. Produced the final rankings using the normalized scores.
8. The data were subject to a series of tests to identify possible biases and errors. For example, the Index team cross-checked all sub-factors against more than 60 third-party sources, including quantitative data and qualitative assessments drawn from local and international organizations.
9. A sensitivity analysis was conducted by the Econometrics and Applied Statistics Unit of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, in collaboration with the Index team, to assess the statistical reliability of the results.
10. Finally, the data were organized into country reports, tables, and figures to facilitate their presentation and interpretation.

This factor is particularly difficult to measure in a standardized manner across countries, since there is no single formula for the proper distribution of powers among organs of the government to ensure that each is held in check. Governmental checks take many forms; they do not operate solely in systems marked by a formal separation

of powers, nor are they necessarily codified in law. What is essential is that authority is distributed, whether by formal rules or by convention, in a manner that ensures that no single organ of government has the practical ability to exercise unchecked power.¹

¹ The Index does not address the further question of whether the laws are enacted by democratically elected representatives.

The first sub-factor measures the effective limitation of government powers in the fundamental law, including provisions that prohibit constitutional amendments and suspensions of constitutional rights and privileges except in accordance with the rules and procedures provided in the fundamental law itself. The remaining six sub-factors address the effectiveness of the institutional checks on government power by the legislature, the judiciary, and independent auditing and review agencies²; whether government officials are sanctioned for misconduct; and the effectiveness of non-governmental oversight by the media and civil society, which serve an important role in monitoring government actions and holding officials accountable. The last sub-factor concerns the extent to which transitions of power occur in accordance with the law. This sub-factor does not address the issue of whether transitions of political power take place through democratic elections. Rather, it examines whether the rules for the orderly transfer of power are actually observed. This sub-factor looks at the prevalence of electoral fraud and intimidation (for those countries in which elections are held), the frequency of coups d'états, and the extent to which transition processes are open to public scrutiny.

Absence of Corruption

Factor 2 measures the absence of corruption. The Index considers three

² This includes a wide range of institutions, from financial comptrollers and auditing agencies to the diverse array of entities that monitor human rights compliance (e.g. "Human Rights Defender", "Ombudsman", "People's Advocate", "Defensor del Pueblo", "Ouvidoria", "Human Rights Commissioner", "Öiguskantsler", "Médiateur de la République", "Citizen's Advocate", "Avocatul Poporului"). In some countries these functions are performed by judges or other state officials; in others, they are carried out by independent agencies.

forms of corruption: bribery, improper influence by public or private interests, and misappropriation of public funds or other resources.

These three forms of corruption are examined with respect to government officers in the executive branch (including the police and the military), and those in the judiciary and the legislature. This factor encompasses a wide range of possible situations in which corruption - from petty bribery to major kinds of fraud - can occur, including the provision of public services, procurement procedures, and administrative enforcement of environmental, labor, and health and safety regulations, among others.

Order and Security

Factor 3 measures how well the society assures the security of persons and property. Security is one of the defining aspects of any rule of law society and a fundamental function of the state. It is also a precondition for the realization of the rights and freedoms that the rule of law seeks to advance.

This factor includes three dimensions: absence of crime (particularly conventional crime³); absence of political violence (including terrorism, armed conflict, and political unrest); and absence of violence as a socially acceptable means to redress personal grievances.

Fundamental Rights

Factor 4 measures protection of

³ In this category, we include measures of criminal victimization, such as homicide, kidnapping, burglary, armed robbery, extortion, and fraud.

fundamental human rights. It recognizes that the rule of law must be more than merely a system of rules - that indeed, a system of positive law that fails to respect core human rights established under international law is at best “rule by law”, and does not deserve to be called a rule of law system.

More than 60 years after its adoption, the Universal Declaration remains the touchstone for determining which rights may be considered fundamental, even as newer rights continue to emerge and gain acceptance. At WJP regional meetings conducted from 2008 to 2011, there was spirited discussion over which rights should be encompassed within the Index. Many urged that the list be confined to civil and political rights, particularly freedom of thought and opinion, which bear an essential relationship to the rule of law itself. Others argued for a broader treatment that would encompass social, economic, and cultural rights.

Although the debate may never be fully resolved, it was determined as a practical matter that since there are many other indices that address human rights in all of these dimensions, and as it would be impossible for the Index to assess adherence to the full range of rights, the Index should focus on a relatively modest menu of rights that are firmly established under international law and are most closely related to rule of law concerns. Accordingly, Factor 4 covers effective enforcement of laws that ensure equal protection⁴; freedom

4 The laws can be fair only if they do not make arbitrary or irrational distinctions based on economic or social status—the latter defined to include race, color, ethnic or social origin, caste, nationality, alienage, religion, language, political opinion or affiliation, gender, marital status, sexual orientation or gender identity, age, and disability. It must be acknowledged that for some societies, including some traditional societies, certain of these categories may be problematic. In addition, there may be differences both within and among such societies as to whether a given distinction is

of thought, religion, and expression; freedom of assembly and association; fundamental labor rights (including the right to collective bargaining, the prohibition of forced and child labor, and the elimination of discrimination)⁵; the rights to privacy and religion; the right to life and security of the person⁶; and due process of law and the rights of the accused.⁷

Open government

Factor 5 measures open government, which is essential to political participation and access to information, empowering citizens to voice their concerns and demand accountability from their government.

This factor measures the extent to which the society has clear, publicized, and stable laws; whether administrative proceedings are open to public participation; and whether official information, including drafts of laws and regulations, is available to the public.

The first of these elements relates to the clarity, publicity, and stability that are required for the public to know what the law is and what conduct is permitted and prohibited. The law must be comprehensible and its

arbitrary or irrational. Despite these difficulties, it was determined that only an inclusive list would accord full respect to the principles of equality and non-discrimination embodied in the Universal Declaration and emerging norms of international law.

5 Sub-factor 4.8 includes the four fundamental principles recognized by the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of 1998: (1) the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; (2) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor; (3) the effective abolition of child labor; and (4) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

6 Sub-factor 4.2 concerns police brutality and other abuses—including arbitrary detention, torture and extrajudicial execution—perpetrated by agents of the state against criminal suspects, political dissidents, members of the media, and ordinary people.

7 This includes the presumption of innocence and the opportunity to submit and challenge evidence before public proceedings; freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, torture and abusive treatment; and access to legal counsel and translators.

meaning sufficiently clear, publicized, and explained to the general public in plain language for them to be able to abide by it. This is one of the most basic preconditions for achieving and maintaining a rule of law society capable of guaranteeing public order, personal security, and fundamental rights.

The second element encompasses the opportunity to participate in the process by which the laws are made and administered. Among the indicia of participation are: whether people have the ability to petition the government; whether proceedings are held with timely notice and are open to the public; and whether drafts of legislation, records of legislative and administrative proceedings, and other kinds of official information are available to the public.

Regulatory enforcement

Factor 6 measures the extent to which regulations are fairly and effectively enforced. Regulations are a pervasive feature of modern societies, and it is important that they be enforced in accordance with administrative procedures that are fair, consistent, and predictable, without improper influence by public officials or private interests, and that private property not be taken without adequate compensation.

The factor does not assess which activities a government chooses to regulate or how much regulation of a particular activity is appropriate. Rather, it examines how regulations are implemented and enforced. To facilitate comparisons, the factor considers areas that all countries regulate to one degree

or another, such as public health, workplace safety, environmental protection, and commercial activity.

Civil Justice

Factor 7 measures whether ordinary people can resolve their grievances peacefully and effectively through the civil justice system. Effective civil justice requires that the system be accessible, affordable, effective, impartial, and culturally competent. Accessibility includes general awareness of available remedies; availability and affordability of legal advice and representation; and absence of excessive or unreasonable fees, procedural hurdles, linguistic or physical barriers and other impediments. Impartiality includes absence of arbitrary or irrational distinctions based on social or economic status and other forms of bias, as well as decisions that are free of improper influence by public officials or private interests. Effective civil justice also requires that court proceedings are conducted and judgments enforced fairly and effectively and without unreasonable delay.

This factor also measures the accessibility, impartiality, and efficiency of mediation and arbitration systems that enable parties to resolve civil disputes.

Criminal Justice

Factor 8 deals with the criminal justice system. An effective criminal justice system is a key aspect of the rule of law, as it constitutes the natural mechanism to redress grievances and bring action

Table 1: Countries Indexed in 2012

Country	Region	Income
Albania	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Lower middle income
Argentina	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Australia	East Asia & Pacific	High income
Austria	Western Europe & North America	High income
Bangladesh	South Asia	Low income
Belarus	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Belgium	Western Europe & North America	High income
Bolivia	Latin America & Caribbean	Lower middle income
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Botswana	Sub-Saharan Africa	Upper middle income
Brazil	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Bulgaria	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Burkina Faso	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Cambodia	East Asia & Pacific	Low income
Cameroon	Sub-Saharan Africa	Lower middle income
Canada	Western Europe & North America	High income
Chile	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
China	East Asia & Pacific	Upper middle income
Colombia	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Cote d'Ivoire	Sub-Saharan Africa	Lower middle income
Croatia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	High income
Czech Republic	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	High income
Denmark	Western Europe & North America	High income
Dominican Republic	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Ecuador	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Egypt	Middle East & North Africa	Lower middle income
El Salvador	Latin America & Caribbean	Lower middle income
Estonia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	High income
Ethiopia	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Finland	Western Europe & North America	High income
France	Western Europe & North America	High income
Georgia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Lower middle income
Germany	Western Europe & North America	High income
Ghana	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Greece	Western Europe & North America	High income
Guatemala	Latin America & Caribbean	Lower middle income
Hong Kong SAR, China	East Asia & Pacific	High income
Hungary	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	High income
India	South Asia	Lower middle income
Indonesia	East Asia & Pacific	Lower middle income
Iran	Middle East & North Africa	Upper middle income
Italy	Western Europe & North America	High income
Jamaica	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Japan	East Asia & Pacific	High income
Jordan	Middle East & North Africa	Upper middle income
Kazakhstan	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Kenya	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Kyrgyzstan	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Low income
Lebanon	Middle East & North Africa	Upper middle income
Liberia	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Macedonia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Madagascar	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Malawi	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Malaysia	East Asia & Pacific	Upper middle income
Mexico	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Moldova	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Lower middle income
Mongolia	East Asia & Pacific	Lower middle income
Morocco	Middle East & North Africa	Lower middle income
Nepal	South Asia	Low income
Netherlands	Western Europe & North America	High income
New Zealand	East Asia & Pacific	High income
Nicaragua	Latin America & Caribbean	Lower middle income
Nigeria	Sub-Saharan Africa	Lower middle income
Norway	Western Europe & North America	High income
Pakistan	South Asia	Lower middle income
Panama	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Peru	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Philippines	East Asia & Pacific	Lower middle income
Poland	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	High income
Portugal	Western Europe & North America	High income
Republic of Korea	East Asia & Pacific	High income
Romania	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Russia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Senegal	Sub-Saharan Africa	Lower middle income
Serbia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
Sierra Leone	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Singapore	East Asia & Pacific	High income
Slovenia	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	High income
South Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa	Upper middle income
Spain	Western Europe & North America	High income
Sri Lanka	South Asia	Lower middle income
Sweden	Western Europe & North America	High income
Tanzania	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Thailand	East Asia & Pacific	Upper middle income
Tunisia	Middle East & North Africa	Upper middle income
Turkey	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Upper middle income
United Arab Emirates	Middle East & North Africa	High income
Uganda	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income
Ukraine	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Lower middle income
United Kingdom	Western Europe & North America	High income
United States	Western Europe & North America	High income
Uruguay	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Uzbekistan	Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Lower middle income
Venezuela	Latin America & Caribbean	Upper middle income
Vietnam	East Asia & Pacific	Lower middle income
Zambia	Sub-Saharan Africa	Lower middle income
Zimbabwe	Sub-Saharan Africa	Low income

against individuals for offenses against society.

Effective criminal justice systems are capable of investigating and adjudicating criminal offenses effectively and impartially, while ensuring that the rights of suspects and victims are protected. An assessment of such systems, however, should take into consideration the entire system; including police, lawyers, prosecutors, judges, and prison officers.

The sub-factors included in this factor investigate whether the criminal investigation and adjudication systems are effective; whether the criminal justice system is impartial and free of improper influence; whether due process of law during arrest and detention, as well as the rights of the accused are effectively protected⁸; and whether correctional systems are effective in reducing criminal behavior.

Informal Justice

Finally, factor 9 concerns the role played in many countries by traditional, or ‘informal’, systems of law—including traditional, tribal, and religious courts as well as community-based systems—in resolving disputes. These systems often play a large role in cultures in which formal legal institutions fail to provide effective remedies for large segments of the population or when formal institutions are perceived as remote, corrupt, or ineffective. This factor covers two concepts: (1) whether traditional, communal and

⁸ Sub-factor 8.7 includes the presumption of innocence and the opportunity to submit and challenge evidence before public proceedings; freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, torture and abusive treatment; and access to legal counsel and translators.

Box 5 : Law in practice vs. law on books

In order to evaluate the rule of law in a given country, it is important to have an understanding of the country’s laws and institutions. However, this is not enough. It is necessary to look not only at the laws as written (*de jure*) but at how they are actually implemented in practice and experienced by those who are subject to them (*de facto*). The WJP’s Rule of Law Index methodology focuses entirely on adherence to the rule of law in practice.

religious dispute resolution systems are impartial and effective; and (2) the extent to which these systems respect and protect fundamental rights.⁹

MEASURING THE RULE OF LAW

The WJP Rule of Law Index seeks to quantify systematically and comprehensively a set of rule of law outcomes by linking these concepts to concrete questions. These questions are administered to a representative sample of the general public and to local experts, and are analyzed and cross-checked using a rigorous triangulation methodology. The result of this exercise is one of the world’s most comprehensive data sets on adherence to the rule of law in practice.

APPROACH

The WJP Rule of Law Index 2012 uses a bottom up approach to assess a nation’s adherence to the rule of law. Its focus is on practical outcomes, such

⁹ Significant effort has been devoted during the last three years to collecting data on informal justice in a dozen countries. Nonetheless, the complexities of these systems and the difficulties of measuring their fairness and effectiveness in a manner that is both systematic and comparable across countries, make assessments extraordinarily challenging. Although the WJP has collected data on this dimension, it is not included in the aggregated scores and rankings.

as whether people have access to the courts or whether crime is effectively controlled. Our aim is to provide a picture of where countries stand with regard to a number of widely accepted outcomes that rule of law societies seek to achieve, as opposed to evaluating the institutional means, such as the legal and regulatory frameworks, by which a given society may seek to attain them. In short, the Index looks at outcomes, such as respect for fundamental rights, absence of corruption, and delivery of justice, rather than inputs, such as the number of courts, the number of police officers, and the judicial budget.

DATA AND AGGREGATION

The Index scores are constructed from over 400 variables mapped onto the 48 sub-factors of the Index. These variables are drawn from two novel data sources collected by the World Justice Project in each country: (1) a general population poll (GPP) conducted by leading local polling companies using a representative sample of 1,000 respondents in the three largest cities in each country; and (2) qualified respondents' questionnaires (QRQ) consisting of closed-ended questions completed by in-country practitioners and academics with expertise in civil and commercial law, criminal justice, labor law, and public health.

The QRQ is administered on a yearly basis in each surveyed country, and the GPP is carried out every three years. In addition, some variables from third-party sources have been incorporated

into this version of the Index to account for certain conduct, such as terrorist bombings and battle-related deaths, that may not be captured through general population polls or expert opinion.¹⁰ These data are aggregated to create the numerical scores and rankings.

The 2012 Index assesses 97 countries, which together account for more than 90 percent of the world's population. The country scores and rankings are based on data collected and analyzed during the second quarter of 2012, with the exception of general population data for the countries indexed in 2011, which were gathered during the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2011. A detailed description of the process by which data is collected and the rule of law is measured is provided in the final section of this report, and in Botero and Ponce (2012).

USING THE WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX

The WJP Rule of Law Index is intended for multiple audiences. It is designed to offer a reliable and independent data source for policy makers, businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and other constituencies to assess a nation's adherence to the rule of law in practice, as perceived and experienced by the average person; identify a nation's strengths and weaknesses in comparison to similarly situated countries; and track changes over time.

¹⁰ These variables include, among others, the number of events and deaths resulting from high-casualty terrorist bombings (From the Center for Systemic Peace), the number of battle-related deaths, and the number of casualties resulting from "one-sided violence" (From the Uppsala Conflict Data Program). These indicators are proxies for civil conflict (sub-factor 3.2).

The WJP Rule of Law Index has a number of distinguishing features:

- » **Comprehensiveness.** Various other indices address aspects of the rule of law. The WJP Rule of Law Index provides a comprehensive picture of rule of law compliance in a large number of countries.
- » **New data.** The Index findings are based almost entirely on new data collected by the WJP from independent sources. This contrasts with indices based on data aggregated from third-party sources, or on sources that are self-reported by governments or other interested parties.
- » **Rule of law in practice.** The Index measures adherence to the rule of law by looking not to the laws as written, but at how they are actually applied in practice.
- » **Anchored in actual experiences.** The Index combines expert opinion with rigorous polling of the general public to ensure that the findings reflect the conditions experienced by the population, including marginalized sectors of society.
- » **Action oriented.** Findings are presented in disaggregated form, identifying areas of strength and weakness across the nine dimensions of the rule of law examined in each country.

These features make the Index a powerful tool that can inform policy debates both within and across countries. However, the Index's findings must be interpreted in light of certain inherent limitations.

1. The WJP Rule of Law Index does not provide specific recipes or identify priorities for reform.

2. The Index data is not intended to establish causation or to ascertain the complex relationship among different rule of law dimensions in various countries.
3. The Index's rankings and scores are the product of a rigorous data collection and aggregation methodology. Nonetheless, as with all measures, they are subject to measurement error.¹¹
4. Indices and indicators are subject to potential abuse and misinterpretation. Once released to the public, they can take on a life of their own and be used for purposes unanticipated by their creators. If data is taken out of context, it can lead to unintended or erroneous policy decisions.
5. Rule of law concepts measured by the Index may have different meanings across countries. Users are encouraged to consult the specific definitions of the variables employed in the construction of the Index, which are discussed in greater detail in Botero and Ponce (2012).
6. The Index is generally intended to be used in combination with other instruments, both quantitative and qualitative. Just as in the areas of health or economics no single index conveys a full picture of a country's situation. Policymaking in the area of rule of law requires careful consideration of all relevant dimensions—which may vary from country to country—and a combination of sources, instruments and methods.

¹¹ Users of the Index for policy debate who wish to have a thorough understanding of its methodology are encouraged to review the following papers: (a) Botero, J and Ponce, A. (2012) "Measuring the Rule of Law 2012 Update", and (b) Saisana, M and Saltelli, A. (2011) "Statistical Audit of the WJP Rule of Law Index", available online at: www.worldjusticeproject.org.

7. Pursuant to the sensitivity analysis of the Index data conducted in collaboration with the Econometrics and Applied Statistics Unit of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, confidence intervals have been calculated for all figures included in the WJP Rule of Law Index 2012. These confidence intervals and other relevant considerations regarding measurement error are reported in Saisana and Saltelli (2012) and Botero and Ponce (2012).

information for further refinement of the Index methodology and measurement, as well as an opportunity to disseminate the results of both the Index and WJP programs.

» WJP scholars will provide conceptual and methodological advice for the improvement and expansion of the Index, and the Index's findings and data will be made available to researchers around the world.

COMPLEMENTARITY WITH OTHER WJP INITIATIVES

The Index's development is highly integrated with other dimensions of the WJP.

- » The Index findings for a growing number of countries will be presented and discussed in detail at successive World Justice Forums and WJP regional conferences.
- » Many of the issues identified by the Index in various countries will become fertile areas for the design of rule of law programs by Forum participants.
- » The results of various WJP programs will be presented at each World Justice Forum, enabling a more detailed discussion of concrete issues covered by the Index.
- » Detailed discussions of Index findings at successive World Justice Forums and regional outreach meetings will generate useful

Part II: The Rule of Law |

Regional Highlights

The following section provides an overview of regional trends revealed by the *WJP Rule of Law Index 2012* report, which covers 97 countries. This section also presents highlights for all indexed countries in each of seven regions: Western Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, East Asia and Pacific, South Asia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Middle East and North Africa, and Sub-Saharan Africa. The detailed rankings and scores are shown in the country profiles and the data tables at the end of the report. Additional information is available at www.worldjusticeproject.org.^{1,2}

¹ Country assessments are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the World Justice Project, or its Officers, Directors, and Honorary Chairs.

² Mr. Agrast did not participate in the collection and analysis of the data and results.



Western Europe & North America

Countries in Western Europe and North America tend to outperform most other countries in all dimensions. These countries are characterized by relatively low levels of corruption, open and accountable governments, and effective criminal justice systems. The greatest weakness in Western Europe and North America appears to be related to the accessibility of the civil justice system, especially for marginalized segments of the population. This is an area that requires attention from both policy makers and civil society. While protection of fundamental rights in this region is the highest in the world, police discrimination against foreigners and ethnic minorities is an issue of concern in most countries.

Austria ranks among the top 10 globally in five dimensions of the rule of law and among the top 20 in the remaining categories. The government is accountable and free of corruption, and fundamental rights are strongly protected. Although the country is very open, people in Austria face more difficulties in accessing official documentation than do individuals in most developed nations. The country's courts are accessible and free of improper influence. However, discrimination by judicial personnel and law enforcement officers against disadvantaged groups is perceived to be a problem.

Belgium ranks in the top 20 worldwide in seven of the eight dimensions measured by the Index. The country scores well in government accountability (ranking sixteenth) and protection of fundamental rights (eleventh), although police discrimination against foreigners

is perceived to be a significant problem. The judicial system is relatively independent, accessible, and affordable. However, judicial delays in civil cases are a source of concern.

Canada performs well in all eight dimensions of the rule of law. The government is accountable (ranking fifteenth), corruption is minimal (ranking twelfth) and the country generally observes fundamental rights (ranking eighteenth), although discrimination against immigrants and the poor is a source of concern. The country is relatively safe from crime, civil courts are accessible and independent, and the criminal justice system is effective in bringing offenders to justice. However, delays in court processes are perceived to be a problem.

Denmark is the world leader in two dimensions—government accountability and criminal justice—and places in the top 10 in all dimensions. Denmark's public institutions are transparent, efficient, and free of corruption. The

COUNTRIES

Austria
Belgium
Canada
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany
Greece
Italy
Netherlands
Norway
Portugal
Spain
Sweden
United Kingdom
United States

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR: WESTERN EUROPE & NORTH AMERICA

12/97 LIMITED GOVERNMENT POWERS

13/97 ABSENCE OF CORRUPTION

17/97 ORDER AND SECURITY

12/97 FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

14/97 OPEN GOVERNMENT

14/97 REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT

14/97 CIVIL JUSTICE

14/97 CRIMINAL JUSTICE

country is relatively safe from crime and the criminal justice system is effective in bringing offenders to justice; however, police discrimination against foreigners and ethnic minorities is perceived to be a problem.

Finland ranks in the top five in the world in six dimensions and in the top 10 in all dimensions. The country has well-functioning, accountable, and transparent institutions and the court system is independent and free of improper influence. The criminal justice system ranks second overall, but police discrimination against foreigners and ethnic minorities is perceived to be a problem.

France ranks in the top 15 worldwide in five of the eight dimensions of the rule of law. The country's notable strengths include absence of corruption (ranking thirteenth) and an independent, accessible, and affordable civil justice system (eighteenth). However, judicial delays are a weakness in both civil and criminal justice, where cases can take years to resolve. France earns high marks in the areas of effective regulatory enforcement (ranking thirteenth) and protection of fundamental rights (fourteenth), but police discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities is perceived to be a problem.

Germany ranks in the top 10 worldwide in three dimensions and performs well overall. Government accountability is strong (ninth out of ninety seven countries) and corruption is minimal (eleventh). The country's civil justice system ranks third overall and is characterized by the affordability of attorneys, accessibility and efficiency

of courts, and lack of undue influence. Police discrimination against foreigners, however, is perceived to be a problem.

Greece is the weakest performer of the countries in the Western Europe and North America region measured by the Index. The country has a fair system of checks and balances (ranking thirty-first), but its administrative agencies are inefficient, lax in enforcing regulations, and affected by improper influence. The civil justice system is independent, but slow, and while the country is relatively safe from crime, riots in the streets are a common occurrence. Overall, Greece earns high marks in protecting basic rights and liberties, but discrimination against disadvantaged groups is perceived to be a problem.

Italy ranks in the top -third worldwide, but underperforms most of its regional peers in most rule of law dimensions. The country scores twenty-seventh globally in checks on the government's power, but corruption and impunity of government officials undermine the performance of the state institutions. The country ranks second to last among high-income countries in open government and third to last in regulatory enforcement. The country's civil justice system is independent but slow. Overall, Italy has a good record in observing fundamental rights, but discrimination against disadvantaged groups is perceived to be a problem.

The **Netherlands** ranks among the top five in the world in three dimensions measured by the Index—absence of corruption, open government, and civil justice—and performs very well

Box 6 : Equal Access to Justice


As understood by the World Justice Project, access to justice refers to the ability of all people to seek and obtain effective remedies through accessible, affordable, impartial, efficient, effective, and culturally competent institutions of justice. Well-functioning dispute resolution systems enable people to protect their rights against infringement by others, including powerful parties and the state.

All around the world, people's ability to use legal channels to resolve their disputes is often impeded by obstacles such as financial barriers, language problems, complexity of procedures, or simply lack of knowledge, disempowerment, and exclusion. This problem is not restricted to developing countries. In many developed nations, the formal civil justice systems, although independent and free of improper influence, remain largely inaccessible to disadvantaged groups.

The cases of Finland and the United States provide an illustrative example. When facing a common civil dispute (in this case, an unpaid debt), most people in Finland, regardless of their socio-economic status, tend to use formal dispute-resolution channels, while only a few choose to take no action. The situation is quite different in the United States. While high-income

Figure 1: Access to civil justice in high income countries

Score of factor 7, where 1 signifies higher adherence to the rule of law



Americans behave similarly to the Finnish, low-income people act very differently—only a few use the court system (including small-claims courts), while many take no action to resolve their disputes. The variances between countries might be attributable to differences in attorney's fees, availability of legal services, awareness of available remedies, disempowerment, different institutional settings, or differences related to the organization of the society, to mention just a few. For example, in the United States, among the low income litigants, 81% did not seek legal assistance because they felt that they could not afford the lawyer's fees, compared to 48% of the high income litigants. In Finland, this difference between high and low income litigants is not as pronounced as in the United States. While the causes of these patterns are subject to debate, few will disagree with the view that more work is needed to ensure that all people are able to benefit from a functioning civil justice system.

Figure 2: Use of legal assistance in Finland and in the United States

% of respondents who did not use legal assistance because they considered they could not afford a lawyer's fees





Figure 3: Use of formal dispute mechanisms in Finland and the United States

% of respondents who filed a lawsuit in court (including small claims court) to resolve a civil dispute vs. % who took no action to resolve the dispute, grouped by household income level



in most other dimensions. The overall regulatory environment is transparent and efficient. The country's courts are accessible and free of improper influence, with criminal courts outperforming most other countries on respect for due process of law. Labor market discrimination is perceived to be a problem.

Norway is the world leader in civil justice and ranks globally among the top 10 in all but one dimension (it ranks eleventh in order and security). The government is accountable and open and Norway's regulatory agencies are effective in enforcing regulations (ranking sixth). The court system operates independently and is free of improper influence, but it is not as speedy as others in the region. Police discrimination against foreigners and ethnic minorities is perceived to be a problem.

Portugal places in the top-third worldwide, but does lag most of its regional peers in many of the eight rule of law dimensions covered by the Index. The country ranks twenty-fourth in checks on the government's power and twenty-ninth on corruption. Administrative agencies are relatively effective in enforcing regulations, albeit less efficiently than those in most other countries in the region. The civil courts are independent, but slow and inefficient. Portugal's lowest score is in the area of order and security (ranking forty-fifth), mainly because people are increasingly resorting to violence to express discontent. Its highest score is on respect for fundamental rights (ranking twenty-first).

Spain scores relatively well in the

areas of government accountability, absence of corruption, access to legal counsel, and respect for due process of law. The country ranks sixth worldwide for protection of fundamental rights. However, Spain lags behind its regional and income-group peers in providing mechanisms for public participation—including the right to petition public authorities—and in effectively enforcing government regulations, where it ranks twenty-second. Judicial delays, ineffective enforcement of civil justice, and police discrimination are also areas in need of attention.

Sweden ranks first worldwide in four of eight dimensions—absence of corruption, fundamental rights, open government, and regulatory enforcement—and places in the top 10 in all dimensions. Sweden's administrative agencies and courts are rated among the most effective and transparent in the world. The country generally observes fundamental rights. Sweden's lowest score is in the area of civil justice, mainly because of perceived delays in court processes.

The **United Kingdom** ranks among the top 15 globally in six of the eight dimensions measured by the Index. The country scores well on government accountability (ranking thirteenth) and corruption is minimal (ranking fifteenth). Fundamental rights are well protected and the country is relatively safe from crime. The court system is independent and free of undue influence, but it is not as accessible and affordable as others in the region.

The **United States** performs well in most dimensions of the rule of law. The country has a well-functioning

system of checks and balances (ranking seventeenth) and scores well in respect for fundamental rights, including the rights of association, opinion and expression, religion, and petition. The civil justice system is independent and free of undue influence, but it lags behind in providing access to disadvantaged groups. Legal assistance is frequently expensive or unavailable, and the gap between rich and poor individuals in terms of both actual use of and satisfaction with the civil court system is significant (see Box 6). In addition, there is a perception that ethnic minorities and foreigners receive unequal treatment.



East Asia & Pacific

The East Asia and Pacific (EAP) region is one of the most diverse and complex regions in the world. Taken as a whole, the EAP region falls in the upper half of the global rankings in most categories; however, there are important differences in rule of law outcomes across countries encompassing the region. Wealthy nations, such as Australia, New Zealand, and Japan rank among the top 15 globally in nearly all categories measured by the Index, yet lag behind regional peers in guaranteeing equal treatment to disadvantaged groups. In contrast, middle income countries in the region face challenges in combating corruption, strengthening accountability, and improving how effectively and efficiently government agencies and courts function. In countries such as Malaysia, Vietnam, and China, judicial independence is an area in need of attention, as is the poor record on respect for fundamental rights, including labor rights, freedom of assembly, and freedom of opinion and expression. Accessibility of official information in East Asia and Pacific countries is lower than in other regions of the world.

Australia ranks among the top ten globally in five of the eight dimensions measured by the Index. The civil courts are efficient and independent, although access to affordable legal counsel remains limited, particularly for disadvantaged groups. The country ranks among the best in the world in protecting most fundamental rights, but lags behind most other high income countries in guaranteeing equal treatment and non-discrimination, especially for immigrants and low-income people.

Cambodia is ranked lower than most other countries in the region on all dimensions. The overall legal and institutional environment remains quite weak, which is highlighted by the low scores in key areas, including effective limits on government powers (ranking ninetieth); regulatory enforcement; access to civil justice; and absence of corruption (ranked eighty-fifth). Property rights are very weak, and police abuses remain a significant problem. On the other hand, Cambodia has lower crime rates than most countries in the low income group.

China scores well on public safety, ranking thirty-second overall and fourth among its income peers. The criminal justice system is relatively effective, but compromised by political interference and violations of due process of law. Administrative agencies are lax in enforcing regulations and vulnerable to improper influence (ranking eightieth). The civil court system is relatively speedy and accessible, but judicial

COUNTRIES

- Australia
- Cambodia
- China
- Hong Kong SAR, China
- Indonesia
- Japan
- Republic of Korea
- Malaysia
- Mongolia
- New Zealand
- Philippines
- Singapore
- Thailand
- Vietnam

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR: EAST ASIA & PACIFIC



independence is a concern. Effective checks on the executive are limited (ranking eighty-sixth). Indicators of fundamental rights are weak, ranking ninety-fourth, which chiefly reflects substantial limitations on freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

The jurisdiction of **Hong Kong SAR, China** ranks in the top 10 in four dimensions. Hong Kong places second in providing order and security and eighth for the effectiveness of its criminal justice system. Administrative agencies and courts are efficient and free of corruption (ranked ninth), although not entirely free of government interference. The jurisdiction lags behind others in the region in guaranteeing fundamental rights and freedoms to its people (ranking thirty-first).

Indonesia is in the top half of the rankings among lower-middle income countries in most dimensions. The country ranks first among lower middle income countries for checks on government power (ranked twenty-ninth overall) and open government (ranked thirty-fifth overall). Indonesians enjoy higher degrees of participation in the administration of the laws than individuals in other East Asia and Pacific region countries. On the other hand, the country faces challenges in the functioning of government agencies and courts. Corruption is pervasive, ranking last in the region and eighty-sixth globally. The courts are perceived to be independent of government control, but affected by powerful private interests and corruption. The civil justice system remains underdeveloped (ranking sixty-sixth overall and tenth among lower-middle income countries), attributable in part to the lack of

affordable legal services, deficient enforcement mechanisms, and the lengthy duration of cases. Police abuses and harsh conditions at correctional facilities are also significant problems.

Japan ranks among the highest performers in the East Asia and Pacific region in most dimensions. The country's courts are among the best in the world and Japan ranks second in the world for the effectiveness of its regulatory agencies. Security is high (ranking seventh in the world) and the criminal justice system is effective (ranking twenty-third), although due process violations are a cause of concern.

Malaysia's government is relatively accountable in comparison with other upper-middle income countries, although political interference and impunity exist. The civil court system ranks thirty-ninth globally and eighth among upper-middle income countries. Malaysia scores well on public safety, ranking first among its income peers, although abuses by the police are a problem. Accessibility of official information is limited. Violations of fundamental rights (ranking seventy-third), most notably freedom of opinion and expression, are also areas of concern.

Mongolia ranks fifth among lower-middle income countries on order and security and second on protection of fundamental rights. The country also scores relatively well on civil and criminal justice. The press and civil society organizations generally operate without government interference. The country's weakest performance is in the area of open government, ranking

Box 7 : Impunity

The principle that no one is above the law is fundamental to the rule of law, and requires that all people, including government officials and agents, be subject to the same rules as everybody else. In countries where the rule of law is strong, government officials are punished for misconduct. In countries where the rule of law is weak, those who are politically connected are rarely punished for breaking the law, and impunity flourishes.


Impunity for violations of the law by government officials can manifest itself in a variety of ways. In the most atrocious cases, systematic human rights violations go unpunished; on a smaller scale, pervasive corruption and patronage can prevent crooked police from being fired or members of congress from being investigated for misdeeds. The WJP Rule of Law Index addresses impunity in Factor 1 under sub-factor 1.5 (government officials are sanctioned for misconduct), and focuses on the executive

branch, legislative branch, judicial branch, and police forces.

To various degrees, all countries struggle with this kind of impunity. Still, when measured by sub-factor 1.5, there are large variations in performance among individual countries and within regions (figure 4). By allowing those who break the law to go unpunished, the consequences of impunity strike at the very core of justice. Impunity undermines respect for fundamental rights, breeds corruption, and leads to a vicious cycle of law-breaking, as it neutralizes the deterrent effect of punishment. Impunity also erodes the public trust in state institutions, signals to citizens that laws do not matter, and acts as a drag on development. With so much at risk, more needs to be done to hold officials accountable and build cultures that respect the rule of law. As the data shows, there is ample room for improvement for all countries.

Figure 4: Impunity around the world

Regional sub-factor 1.5 scores, where higher marks signify higher adherence to the rule of law



ninety-third overall and next to last among its income peers. This deficiency is explained by severe limitations on citizens' right to petition the government and access to official information. Other areas of concern are corruption, particularly in the legislature, and unchecked influence of powerful private interests on all branches of government.

New Zealand stands out as the best performer in the region and is in the top ten in the world in seven of the eight dimensions measured by the Index. Government agencies and courts are efficient, transparent, and free of corruption. Fundamental rights are strongly protected. The judicial system is accessible, independent, and effective.

Table 2: Rule of law rankings in Brazil, China, India, and Russia (BRIC Economies)

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Brazil	35	38	69	33	31	37	43	52
China	86	40	32	94	69	80	82	39
India	37	83	96	64	50	79	76	64
Russia	92	71	92	83	74	68	65	78

The **Philippines** stands out among lower-middle income countries for having reasonably effective checks on government power (ranking sixth among its income group), including a vibrant civil society, a free media, and an independent judiciary. The Philippines ranks fifth among lower-middle income countries in effective regulatory enforcement. Civil conflict and political violence are significant challenges. The country also has problems with respect to protection of fundamental rights (ranking fifty-ninth overall), particularly in regard to violations against the right to life and security of the person, police abuses, due process violations, and harsh conditions at correctional facilities. The civil court system scores poorly (ranking eighty-fourth globally) due to deficient enforcement mechanisms, corruption among judges and law enforcement officers, and the lengthy duration of cases.

The **Republic of Korea** presents a strong and fairly even picture across most of the dimensions measured by the Index. Administrative agencies are perceived to be transparent and free of corruption, although slightly lax in enforcing regulations. Fundamental rights are well protected and the country is relatively safe from crime. The country's lowest score is in the area of government accountability (ranking twenty-eighth), which is partly a reflection of political interference within the legislature and the judiciary.

Singapore ranks first in the world in providing security to its citizens and places in the top 10 in four other dimensions. The public administration of the country is effective and corruption is minimal (ranking seventh). The criminal justice system is among the most effective in the world (ranking third). The country's lowest score is in the area of fundamental rights (ranking twenty-sixth), which is a reflection of substantial limitations on freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

Thailand earns high marks on absence of crime and effectiveness of the criminal justice system (ranking thirty-fifth globally and seventh among its income peers). However, civil conflict and political violence are significant problems. Corruption is common, particularly within the legislature and the police. The country's lowest scores are in the dimension of civil justice (ranking eightieth), partly because of delays in processing cases and difficulties in enforcing court decisions.

Vietnam faces challenges in terms of accountability and constraints on the executive branch (ranking eighty-second), owing to political interference in the legislature and the judiciary. Despite ongoing reforms, regulatory agencies are opaque and inefficient and corruption is prevalent. The country's civil justice system, although accessible, is undermined by corruption and political interference.

Eastern Europe & Central Asia

Performances vary greatly amongst countries in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ECA) region covered by the Index, with some nations scoring nearly the same as the strongest performers in the world. Accountability remains a major challenge throughout the region, with many countries failing to consolidate adequate systems for curtailing abuse of power. In addition, regulatory agencies and courts are often inefficient and subject to undue influence. The region's best scores are in the area of order and security, due to relatively low crime rates and limited outbreaks of violence.

Albania has significant problems in a number of rule of law dimensions. Checks on executive power are weak, (ranking seventy-first) and official corruption is pervasive (ranking eighty-fourth). Rules and regulations are difficult to enforce, and the judiciary is plagued by corruption and political interference. Police abuses and harsh conditions at correctional facilities are also significant problems. On the other hand, Albania ranks first among lower middle-income countries in protection of freedom of speech, religion, and assembly.

Belarus outperforms most of its income-level and regional peers in several rule of law dimensions, including order and security (ranking thirty-third globally), regulatory enforcement (ranking thirty-fifth), and civil and criminal justice (ranking twenty-sixth and thirty-fourth), respectively. On the other hand, the country shows severe deficiencies in government accountability (ranking ninety-first), very weak protection of fundamental rights (ranking eighty-fourth) and lack

of governmental openness (ranking eighty-seventh). Major problems include lack of independence of the judiciary and the legislature, severe restrictions on freedom of opinion and expression, privacy, and association, and limitations on citizens' right to petition the government and to access official information.

Bosnia and Herzegovina ranks second among upper middle income countries in delivering effective criminal justice. The country ranks seventh among its income group in protecting fundamental rights and providing order and security. The country's weakest performance is in the dimension of civil justice (ranking twentieth among upper middle income countries and sixty-fourth overall), mainly due to severe delays and ineffective enforcement mechanisms. Other areas of concern are official corruption, particularly among the executive and the legislature, lack of effective sanctions for official misconduct, and discrimination against ethnic minorities.

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR:

EASTERN EUROPE & CENTRAL ASIA

LIMITED GOVERNMENT POWERS 57/97

52/97 ABSENCE OF CORRUPTION

37/97 ORDER AND SECURITY

45/97 FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

51/97 OPEN GOVERNMENT

51/97 REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT

49/97 CIVIL JUSTICE

50/97 CRIMINAL JUSTICE

COUNTRIES

Albania
Bangladesh
Belarus
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Czech Republic
Estonia
Georgia
Hungary
Kazakhstan
Kyrgyzstan
Macedonia
Moldova
Poland
Romania
Russia
Serbia
Slovenia
Turkey
Ukraine
Uzbekistan

Bulgaria outperforms most upper-middle income countries in protecting the security of its citizens from crime and in respecting the freedoms of speech, religion, and assembly. The right to petition the government and citizen participation are also significant strengths. The country faces challenges in the dimensions of government accountability, corruption, and regulatory enforcement, (ranking sixtieth, fifty-third, and fifty-fifth, respectively). The criminal justice system scores poorly (ranking eighty-first), and discrimination against minorities is a significant problem.

Croatia falls in the middle of the rankings in most categories. Despite recent progress, Croatia's institutions lag behind those of other high-income countries. Its public administrative bodies, for example, are inefficient, and the judicial system, while generally accessible, is slow and subject to improper influence. The country is relatively safe from crime, but corruption is an area of concern (ranking last among high-income countries).

The **Czech Republic** outperforms its regional peers in several dimensions of the rule of law, including checks on government power (ranking third within the region and twenty-fifth overall) and regulatory enforcement (ranking fifth in the region and twenty-eighth overall). Courts are independent, but very slow. Other areas in need of attention include corruption among government officials (ranking thirty-second) and lack of effective sanctions for official misconduct.

Estonia leads the region in all but two dimensions and ranks globally among

the top 20 in all but one dimension, thanks to its well-functioning and open institutions. Administrative agencies and courts are accountable, effective, and free of corruption, and fundamental rights are strongly protected. On the other hand crime rates in Estonia are higher than in most of its high income peers. Judicial delays are another area in need of attention.

Georgia is the leader among lower-middle income countries in four dimensions—absence of corruption, regulatory enforcement, civil justice, and criminal justice. The country ranks sixty-sixth in the world in providing effective checks on the government's power and fifty-fourth in open government. Political interference within the legislature and the judiciary is common. Although the country is relatively safe from crime, outbreaks of violence in and around the borders are a source of concern.

Hungary ranks in the top-third worldwide in most dimensions of the rule of law, but lags behind its regional and income group peers. The country ranks third to last among high income countries for effective checks on government powers, due in part to political interference among the different branches of government. Corruption is relatively low (ranking twenty-sixth globally) and administrative agencies are relatively effective in enforcing regulations (ranking twenty-seventh). The country is relatively safe from crime. The civil justice system ranks forty-fifth globally and second to last among high-income countries, mainly because of lengthy delays in the resolution of cases, discrimination against marginalized groups, and difficulties enforcing court decisions.

Box 8 : Regulatory compliance around the world

Public enforcement of government regulations is pervasive in modern societies as an instrument to induce behavior with the goal of guaranteeing that the public interest is not subordinated to those of regulated entities. Around the world, regulations vary widely due to differences in policies, institutional environments, and political choices. Whatever those choices may be, regulations are futile if they are not properly enforced by authorities. Ensuring compliance with the regulatory framework is thus a key feature of the rule of law. Besides enforcement, accountability is vital when it comes to regulating an activity, as it ensures that administrative agencies act within the limits authorized by law.


The WJP Rule of Law Index addresses regulatory enforcement in Factor 6. This factor does not look at the level of regulation of activities; instead, it assesses the effectiveness of regulatory enforcement in practice; the absence of improper influence by public officials or private interests; the adherence to due process of law in administrative procedures; and the absence of government expropriation of private property without adequate compensation. Rather than analyzing specific statutes, the Index uses

simple scenarios to explore the outcomes associated with activities that are regulated in all jurisdictions, such as environmental regulations, public health requirements, workplace safety conditions, and permits and licenses, under the assumption that the performance of government agencies in those cases is a good proxy for their functioning in other more complex areas.

Shaped by their income, institutional environment and history, regulatory compliance varies greatly across countries (see Figure 5). On a scale between 0 and 1, where 1 signifies higher adherence to the rule of law, the index of regulatory enforcement has an average value of 0.72 in high-income countries, 0.51 in upper middle income countries, 0.45 in lower-middle income countries, and 0.40 in low-income countries. In general, as economies develop, they find more effective ways to implement existing regulations within the limits imposed by law, but this is not always the case. As countries engage in regulatory reforms, special efforts should be made to improve the mechanisms that are used to guarantee that such laws are implemented and enforced in an efficient, effective, and accountable manner.

Figure 5: Regulatory enforcement around the world

Countries grouped in tertiles according to their factor 6 score



Kazakhstan faces serious challenges in terms of accountability and constraints on the executive branch (ranking eighty-ninth) due to political interference in the legislature, the judiciary, and the electoral process. Another area of concern is open government, on which Kazakhstan ranks second to last among upper-middle income countries. The civil courts are relatively efficient, but subject to undue influence. On the other hand, the country is relatively safe from crime and violence (ranking forty-sixth overall and eleventh among its income peers).

Kyrgyzstan ranks seventy-sixth in establishing effective limits on government power and ninety-third in corruption. Administrative agencies are lax in enforcing regulations (ranking seventy-third) and the performance of civil courts is poor (ranking second to last in the region). The country is relatively safe from crime, but its criminal justice system ranks last in the region and ninetieth overall, mainly due to weaknesses in the criminal investigation system, corruption among judges and law enforcement officials, and violations of due process and rights of the accused.

Macedonia earns high marks for open government (ranking twenty-third overall and third among upper middle income countries) and regulatory enforcement (ranking thirty-fourth overall and fifth among its income group). Although corruption is low in comparison with its peers (ranking seventh by income-level and eighth regionally) and transitions of power occur in accordance with law, the system of checks and balances is relatively weak (ranking fifty-ninth overall and

eighteenth among upper middle income countries), as neither the legislature nor the courts exercise an effective limit on the government's powers. Civil justice is accessible, despite excessive delays. Limitations on the freedom of the press and discrimination against marginalized groups are sources of concern.

Moldova outperforms most of its regional and income-level peers in delivering order and security (ranking fourth among lower middle income countries and eleventh in the region). Government accountability is weak due to widespread corruption, ineffective checks on the government's power, and impunity for misconduct by government officials. The delivery of civil and criminal justice is hampered by government interference, corruption, inefficiency, and the poor condition of correctional facilities. Regulatory enforcement is weak (ranking twentieth in the region and nineteenth by income level). Police abuse, violations of due process, and discrimination against minorities and marginalized groups are areas in need of attention.

Poland's public institutions rank twenty-seventh in absence of corruption and twenty-sixth in effectiveness of regulatory enforcement. Overall, the country has a good record in protecting fundamental rights, although discrimination against disadvantaged groups is an area of concern. Poland's lowest scores come in the dimensions of open government (ranking twenty-ninth) and access to civil justice (ranking twenty-seventh), mainly because of lengthy delays in the resolution of cases and difficulties enforcing court decisions. Delays in administrative proceedings are another area in need of attention.

Romania performs best in the dimensions of security and respect for fundamental rights (ranking second among upper-middle income countries in both dimensions), and in criminal justice (ranking fifth among its income peers and thirty-third globally). The country does less well on administrative and judicial efficiency. Enforcement of regulations is weak (ranking forty-fourth) and corruption persists (forty-fifth). Harsh treatment of prisoners and detainees is an area of concern.

Russia shows serious deficiencies in checks and balances among the different branches of government (ranking ninety-second), with an institutional environment characterized by corruption, impunity, and political interference. Civil courts, although accessible and relatively efficient, are perceived to be corrupt. The criminal justice system is relatively effective, but is compromised by corruption and violations of due process of law. Protection of property rights and violations of fundamental rights, such as freedom of opinion, freedom of association, and privacy are also areas of concern. Notable strengths include strong enforcement of labor rights and a relatively efficient disposition of administrative proceedings.

Serbia ranks in the bottom half of upper middle income countries on nearly all dimensions of the rule of law. Its system of checks and balances ranks sixty-seventh overall and twelfth among its regional peers. Transitions of power occur in accordance with the law. The judicial system is compromised by inefficiency, corruption and political influence. Regulatory enforcement is

ineffective (ranking seventy-fourth overall, eighteenth regionally and twenty-sixth among upper middle income countries). Ethnic tensions, discrimination against minorities, lack of effective sanctions for official misconduct, and violations of the right to privacy are sources of concern.

Slovenia outperforms most countries in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia region in most dimensions of the rule of law, particularly in the areas of open government (ranking twenty-second overall and second in the region), limited government powers (thirtieth overall and fourth in the region), protection of fundamental rights (nineteenth overall and fourth in the region), and absence of corruption (thirty-first overall and fifth in the region). Problems include delays and inadequate enforcement of administrative and judicial decisions, and police corruption.

Turkey ranks in the middle of Eastern European and Central Asian nations in most dimensions. The country performs relatively well in regulatory enforcement (ranking thirty-ninth) and its civil justice system ranks forty-fourth. Turkey receives lower marks in the dimensions of government accountability (ranking sixty-eighth) and fundamental rights (ranking seventy-sixth), mainly because of deficiencies in the functioning of auditing mechanisms, political interference within the legislature and the judiciary, and a poor record on freedom of expression and privacy.

Ukraine ranks eighty-seventh in government accountability due to political interference, impunity, and corruption. Administrative agencies

are ineffective in enforcing regulations (ranking ninety-first globally and second to last among lower-middle income countries), and the courts, although accessible, are inefficient and corrupt. On the other hand, the country obtains relatively high marks in protecting basic civil liberties, such as freedom of religion, and it is relatively safe from crime (ranking forty-fourth). Property rights are weak.

Uzbekistan scores very highly in delivering order and security to its people (ranking eighth in the world). However, security comes at the expense of extreme restrictions on fundamental rights (ranking ninety-fifth, and last among its income and regional peers), including on freedoms of speech, press, and association, right to life and security of the person, and privacy. The country ranks last in the world in providing effective checks on the government's power. The judiciary and the legislature are not independent of government control and all branches of government are perceived to be severely affected by corruption. Nonetheless, the country outperforms most of its regional peers in regulatory enforcement and civil justice.

Middle East & North Africa

The *WJP Rule of Law Index 2012* report covers seven countries in the Middle East and North Africa region: Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, and the United Arab Emirates. Overall, the region receives middling scores for most factors, although the Arab Spring has put several countries on the road towards establishing governments which are more open and accountable, and functioning systems of checks and balances. Compared to the rest of the world, crime is low. The region's lowest scores are in the area of fundamental rights due to restrictions on freedom of religion and free speech, and discrimination against women and minorities.

Egypt is in the process of establishing a functioning system of checks and balances (ranked fortieth overall and first in the region) and an open government (ranking fifty-first overall and second in the region). Administrative agencies are inefficient, lax in enforcing regulations, and affected by improper influence. The civil justice system is slow and subject to political pressure. Security is the lowest in the region and people frequently resort to violence to resolve grievances. Violations of fundamental rights, most notably freedom of religion, privacy, due process, and discrimination against women and minorities are also areas of concern.

Iran's system of law enforcement is relatively strong but is often used as an instrument to perpetrate abuses. The country ranks last in the world on protection of fundamental rights. Government accountability is weak (ranking eighty-fifth globally and last

within the region), and corruption persists. Administrative agencies are relatively effective in enforcing regulations (ranking forty-first overall and eleventh among upper-middle income countries), and courts are accessible and relatively speedy, but subject to political interference.

Jordan is in the top half of the rankings among upper-middle income countries in most dimensions, with relatively high marks in the areas of security, civil and criminal justice, absence of corruption, and effective regulatory enforcement. Property rights are also well protected. Protection of fundamental rights is weak (ranking seventy-fifth), particularly with regard to discrimination and labor rights.

Lebanon ranks first in the region on protection of fundamental rights (ranked thirty-ninth globally), and has relatively effective checks on government power (ranking forty-fourth), including a vibrant civil society and a free media. The country ranks poorly on measures

COUNTRIES

Egypt
Iran
Jordan
Lebanon
Morocco
Tunisia
United Arab Emirates

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR:

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA



of corruption (sixty-second) and government agencies struggle with inefficiencies. The country is relatively safe from crime, but political violence is a major problem. The civil court system ranks poorly (seventy-seventh), mainly because of corruption, delays, discrimination against marginalized groups, and the lack of due process in criminal cases. Harsh conditions in correctional facilities are also a source of concern.

Morocco has seen improvements as a result of ongoing reforms in the areas of open government (ranking thirty-ninth and government accountability (ranking forty-third). Despite the progress achieved, substantial challenges remain

in the dimensions of corruption (ranking eightieth), regulatory enforcement (ranking sixty-first), and protection of fundamental rights (ranking eightieth). The civil justice system ranks forty-eighth overall and third among lower-middle income countries and the criminal justice system ranks poorly (eighty-ninth), due in large part to lack of due process. On the other hand, Morocco outperforms most lower-middle income countries in protecting the security of its citizens from crime.

Tunisia ranks near the top among the countries in the region. The country's administrative agencies are effective in enforcing regulations (ranking thirty-eighth overall) and civil courts, although

Box 9 : Value of Indicators

Indices and indicators are very useful tools. The systematic tracking of infant mortality rates, for instance, has greatly contributed to improving health outcomes around the globe. In a similar fashion, the WJP Rule of Law Index monitors the health of a country's institutional environment—such as whether government officials are accountable under the law, and whether legal institutions protect fundamental rights and provide ordinary people access to justice. By producing independent, comprehensive, and policy-oriented rule of law indicators worldwide, the Index aims to be a reliable source of impartial data that can be used to measure and assess a nation's adherence to the rule of law in practice, and help identify priorities for reform. In these ways, the Index can be a powerful tool for mobilizing efforts by policymakers and civil society to strengthen the rule of law.

One example of the usefulness of the Index in informing policy debates comes from the work of the WJP in Tunisia. In May 2012, the WJP hosted a small, country-level workshop in Tunis, which convened more than two dozen well-placed representatives of Tunisia's civil society, government, media, and business sectors to come together to assess rule of law challenges facing Tunisia and develop recommendations for the country's ongoing reform process in the aftermath of the Tunisian revolution. At the meeting, new polling data from the WJP Rule of Law Index was used to help identify strengths and weaknesses of the rule of law in Tunisia. Workshop participants discussed the transition in Tunisia in light of the Index findings and international examples of constitutional transition processes in Afghanistan, Spain, Colombia, and South Africa. They developed a set of recommendations and presented them to the press and to Tunisian government leaders.

The outcome of this engagement was a document both produced and owned by Tunisians, which discussed the importance of the rule of law to Tunisia's historic transition. This project exemplifies the value of indices and indicators in informing policy discussions and the transformative power of multidisciplinary collaboration in strengthening the rule of law.

slow, are relatively accessible and free of political influence. Corruption is not as pervasive as in most other countries of the region (ranking thirty-ninth) and security is relatively high (ranking thirty-first). Tunisia's weakest performance is in the area of open government, where it ranks fifty-fifth globally, and fourth among its regional peers and on protection of fundamental rights (ranking sixty-third).

The **United Arab Emirates** leads the region in several dimensions of the rule of law. Public institutions in the country are relatively well developed and free of corruption (ranking twenty-third globally), and government officers are held accountable for misconduct. The country is safe from crime and violence (ranking fifth in the world) and the civil court system is efficient and relatively independent, although discrimination against marginalized groups is a problem. On the other hand, the formal system of checks and balances remains weak, and the country has a poor record on respect for fundamental rights (ranking eighty-second), including labor rights, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of opinion and expression. Accessibility of official information is lower than in other high income countries.



Latin America & the Caribbean

COUNTRIES

- Argentina
- Bolivia
- Brazil
- Chile
- Colombia
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- El Salvador
- Guatemala
- Jamaica
- Mexico
- Nicaragua
- Panama
- Peru
- Uruguay
- Venezuela

Latin America presents a picture of sharp contrasts. In spite of recent movements toward openness and political freedoms that have positioned many countries at the forefront of protecting basic rights and civil liberties, the region's public institutions remain fragile. Corruption and a lack of government accountability are still prevalent, and the perception of impunity remains widespread. Furthermore, public institutions in Latin America are not as efficient as those of countries in other regions, and police forces struggle to provide protection from crime and to punish perpetrators for abuses. Crime rates in Latin American countries are the highest in the world and their criminal investigation and adjudication systems rank among the worst.

Argentina faces challenges in many dimensions of the rule of law. Government accountability is weak, partly because of the poor performance of government agencies in investigating allegations of misconduct, as well as political interference with law enforcement agencies and the judiciary. Regulatory agencies are perceived as ineffective (ranking seventy-fifth globally and fourth to last in the region) and property rights are weak. Another area of concern is the high incidence of crime. In contrast, Argentina performs well on protection of fundamental rights, including freedom of religion and freedom of assembly and association. The court system, although slow and not fully independent, is relatively accessible.

Bolivia is one of the weakest performers in the region in many dimensions

of the rule of law. The country faces challenges in terms of transparency and accountability of public institutions, reflecting a climate characterized by impunity, corruption, and political interference. The judicial system is inefficient and affected by corruption. The country performs poorly in the areas of discrimination and respect for fundamental rights, most notably freedom of opinion and expression. Property rights are weak, and police abuses are a significant problem. Bolivia's best performance is in the area of order and security, where it ranks sixty-third globally, and fourth among its regional peers.

Brazil follows Chile and Uruguay as the third-best performer in the region and has the highest marks overall among the BRIC economies. The country has a good system of checks on executive power (ranked thirty-fifth), although a perceived culture of impunity among government officials is a source of concern. Fundamental rights are generally respected, with Brazil ranking

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR:

LATIN AMERICA & THE CARIBBEAN



fifth among upper middle income countries and fourth among its regional peers. Regulatory agencies are perceived as relatively independent, but inefficient. The civil justice system is relatively accessible (ranking forty-third globally and third in the region), although court procedures are prone to delays and decisions are sometimes difficult to enforce. Brazil's lowest score is in the area of order and security, ranking sixty-ninth among all indexed countries, due to high crime rates. Police abuses and harsh conditions in correctional facilities are also a problem.

Chile leads the region in four dimensions of the rule of law, and ranks in the top 25 worldwide in six dimensions. The government is accountable and courts are transparent and efficient. While Chile's crime rates are relatively high in comparison to other upper middle income countries, the criminal justice system is effective and generally adheres to due process. Areas in need of attention include discrimination against low income groups and ethnic minorities, harsh conditions in correctional facilities, and criminal recidivism.

Colombia outperforms most Latin American countries in the dimensions of regulatory enforcement (ranking fifth in the region) and open government (ranking seventh in the region and thirty-eighth globally). The judicial system is independent and one of the most accessible and affordable in the region; however, it is afflicted by delays and lack of effectiveness in the investigation and prosecution of crimes. Colombia faces serious challenges in the area of order and security

(ranking ninety-fifth), which is partly attributable to the presence of powerful criminal organizations. Police abuses, violations of human rights, and poor conditions at correctional facilities are also significant problems. Civil conflict remains an area of concern.

The **Dominican Republic** performs relatively well in open government (ranking thirty-sixth overall and sixth in Latin America), and has a relatively efficient civil court system. However, crime and vigilante justice, lack of accountability for misconduct of government officers, corruption, and poor conditions at correctional facilities require attention.

Ecuador underperforms the majority of Latin American countries in most dimensions of the rule of law. Security is a major concern (ranking eighty-fifth). Government accountability is weak and checks on the executive are limited (ranking eighty-first globally and thirteenth in the region). Administrative agencies fall within regional standards, but they are not as effective in enforcing regulations as others in the region. Civil courts are inefficient, and vulnerable to corruption and political interference (ranking eighty-fifth globally and third to last among upper-middle income countries). Protection of property rights is weak. On the other hand, the Ecuadorian criminal justice system, although not free of problems, ranks better than most other systems in the region. Ecuador performs relatively well in protecting labor rights.

El Salvador falls in the middle of the global rankings in most categories. The country ranks relatively well in the areas of regulatory enforcement and

access to civil justice, particularly when compared with countries at similar stages of economic development. The country faces serious challenges in the area of security, and in criminal justice—where it ranks second to last in the world—chiefly because of corruption among judges and law enforcement officials, police abuses, and harsh conditions at correctional facilities.

Guatemala places in the bottom half of Latin American countries in most dimensions of the rule of law. Its civil and criminal justice systems rank eighty-eighth and eighty-fourth, respectively, and the country suffers from widespread crime and corruption. Guatemala performs relatively well on freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and effective protection of the right to petition the government when compared with its income-group peers.

Jamaica performs strongly in guaranteeing freedom of religion and freedom of opinion and expression. The judicial system is independent and relatively free of corruption, but it is also slow and ineffective. Police abuses and harsh conditions at correctional facilities are a source of concern. The country's main weaknesses lie in the dimensions of security and open government, in which the country ranks twenty-third and twenty-fourth, respectively among upper-middle income countries. Vigilante justice and organized crime are among the areas in need of attention.

Mexico has a long constitutional tradition with an independent judiciary and strong protections for free speech and freedom of religion. Mexico stands

out among Latin American countries for effective checks on government power (ranking sixth in the region) and an open government (ranking thirty-second globally and fifth within the region). Corruption is a serious problem in all branches of government (ranking seventy-fourth), and Mexico's police forces struggle to guarantee the security of its citizens against crime and violence (ranking ninety-first). The criminal justice system also ranks ninety-first, mainly because of weaknesses in the criminal investigation and adjudication systems, prevalent discrimination against vulnerable groups, corruption among judges and law enforcement officials, and violations of due process of law and the rights of the accused. Failures to prosecute government officials who commit violations and corrupt acts are also a cause of concern.

Nicaragua ranks ninety-third in government accountability due to the erosion of checks on the executive branch and political interference within the legislature and the judiciary. The performance of administrative agencies is on par with other countries in the region. Civil courts, however, are inefficient and corrupt, even by regional standards (ranking eighty-sixth overall and twelfth in the region). Although not as large a problem as in other countries of the region, crime is an area in need of attention. Nicaragua performs better on measures of openness and civic participation (ranking fifty-second) and labor rights are relatively well protected.

Panama ranks particularly well on open government (ranking twenty-eighth overall and third in the region) and protection of fundamental rights (forty-

Box 10 : Crime rates in Latin America

Crime rates in Latin America are among the highest in the world (Figure 6). Although there are many different contributing factors, one of the most important relates to deficiencies in the criminal justice system. A well-functioning criminal justice system serves to inhibit crime by providing strong disincentives to potential lawbreakers. An ineffective and corrupt system, on the other hand, provides little deterrence to criminal behavior.

With high crime rates prevalent throughout Latin America, the state of the region's criminal justice system is a cause for concern. Criminal investigations in much of the region are ineffective and criminal adjudications are often unreliable, resulting in low arrest and conviction rates (Figure 7). Systemic corruption among judges and law enforcement officials (second only to sub-Saharan Africa) adds to the problem. In many countries, the possibility for offenders to buy

their way out of punishment renders the entire system toothless. Moreover, in many countries, when perpetrators are caught and imprisoned, they continue to engage in criminal activity from within the prison system. Sub-factor 8.3 measures whether a country's correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior. Latin America ranks last overall, and contains seven of the 13 weakest performers.

An ineffective criminal justice system undermines public confidence and can lead to the adoption of harsh measures that violate rights without enhancing public safety. Reducing crime rates in Latin America requires, among other things, comprehensive reform of the criminal justice system that embraces all the actors in order to build a system that deters crime and incapacitates offenders while respecting human rights.

Figure 6: Burglary rates in Latin America

% of people who have experienced a burglary





Figure 7: Conviction rates in Latin America

% of perpetrators of burglaries who are captured, prosecuted, and punished



fifth overall and seventh in the region). Administrative agencies are inefficient in enforcing regulations, although their performance is on par with most other nations in the region (ranking fifty-first overall). The judiciary is inefficient and influenced by other branches of government. Crime is a significant problem, although not as high as in most of the region. The criminal justice system has substantial deficiencies (ranking eighty-second globally and twenty-eighth among upper middle income countries).

Peru ranks in the middle of Latin American countries in most dimensions. It scores well with regard to checks on executive power (thirty-second globally and third in the region) as well as in protection of fundamental rights, including freedom of thought and religion and freedom of opinion and expression. The country ranks poorly on measures of corruption (seventy-fifth overall and twenty-eighth among upper-middle income countries) and government agencies struggle with inefficiencies. The civil justice system is perceived as slow, expensive, and inaccessible, particularly for disadvantaged groups. The criminal justice system ranks fifty-seventh—due chiefly to corruption and deficiencies in the criminal investigation and adjudication systems.

Uruguay is the region's second best performer. The country scores relatively well on government accountability (ranking twenty-sixth) and absence of corruption (ranking seventeenth). Administrative agencies are effective in enforcing regulations and civil courts are independent, accessible, and free of improper influence. Uruguay's lowest

score is in the area of security, on which it ranks fifty-sixth. The country also faces challenges in strengthening the functioning of its criminal justice system (ranking forty-fifth).

Venezuela is the weakest performer in the region in most dimensions of the rule of law. Government accountability is weak (ranking third to last in the world), corruption is widespread (ranking eighty-first), crime and violence are common (ranking ninetieth), government institutions are not transparent, and the criminal justice system is ineffective and subject to political influence (ranking last in the world). The country also displays serious flaws in guaranteeing respect for fundamental rights, in particular, freedom of opinion and expression, and the right to privacy. Property rights are weak. Venezuela's strongest scores are in the areas of religious freedom, accessibility of the civil courts, and protection of labor rights.

Sub-Saharan Africa

When examined holistically as a region, Sub-Saharan Africa (AFR) lags behind other regions around the world in nearly all dimensions of the rule of law. Despite ongoing reforms, many countries lack adequate checks on executive authority, and government accountability is also weak. Many public institutions and courts throughout the region are inefficient and vulnerable to undue influence. Crime and vigilante justice also weigh heavily on the region. Although the region's record on fundamental rights is mixed, most countries do relatively well in protecting the fundamental freedoms of speech, religion, and assembly. Top performers in the region include Botswana and Ghana, which have begun to outperform some higher income countries in several dimensions.

Botswana ranks first in the region in all dimensions of the rule of law but one. There is an effective system of checks and balances, including an independent judiciary and a free press. Corruption is minimal and all branches of government operate effectively. Fundamental rights are generally respected (ranking fifth in the region), although limitations on the right to privacy and discrimination against immigrants and ethnic minorities are areas of concern. Although the civil and criminal justice systems compare favorably to other countries in the region, delays and the poor condition of correctional facilities are areas in need of attention.

Burkina Faso outperforms most of its regional and income peers in all but one dimension of the rule of law. As compared to other countries in the region, the country scores well in the areas of

regulatory enforcement and civil justice, ranking third and fourth in the region, respectively. The country also performs relatively well in freedom of speech, assembly, and religion, and protection of fundamental labor rights. The country ranks seventy-ninth in government accountability due to the lack of rigorous checks on the executive and political interference among the different branches of government. Although not as pervasive as in other parts of Africa, corruption is commonplace, and crime and vigilante justice are significant challenges. The criminal justice system also requires attention (ranking sixty-third overall and ninth within the region), particularly as concerns the lack of due process and harsh conditions in correctional facilities.

Cameroon lags behind its regional and income peers in most categories. The country faces challenges in terms of accountability and the functioning of public institutions. Checks and balances are poor (ranking ninety-fourth overall

COUNTRIES

Botswana
Burkina Faso
Cameroon
Côte d'Ivoire
Ethiopia
Ghana
Kenya
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Nigeria
Senegal
Sierra Leone
South Africa
Tanzania
Uganda
Zambia
Zimbabwe

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR: SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

LIMITED GOVERNMENT POWERS	63/97
ABSENCE OF CORRUPTION	67/97
ORDER AND SECURITY	71/97
FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	68/97
OPEN GOVERNMENT	70/97
REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT	68/97
CIVIL JUSTICE	58/97
CRIMINAL JUSTICE	67/97

and second to last within the region), and corruption is pervasive (ranking last in the world). The civil court system is slow and subject to political influence. The country scores poorly on respect for fundamental rights (ranking ninetieth), including freedom of assembly, opinion, and expression, as well as labor rights. Cameroon has a relatively low incidence of crime, but police abuses, a high incidence of mob and vigilante justice, and harsh conditions in correctional facilities are areas in need of attention.

Cote D'Ivoire is in the lower half of the regional rankings on most rule of law dimensions. It ranks eightieth globally and fifteenth in the region on checks on government power due to limitations on the independence of the judiciary and the legislature and governmental pressure on the media and civil society organizations. Conflict-related violence and violations of fundamental rights are serious concerns, including torture, disappearances, and extrajudicial execution of political opponents, and restrictions on freedom of speech and privacy. The civil justice system functions relatively well (ranking eighth among lower middle-income countries). The criminal system ranks eighty-fifth, due in part to violations of due process and poor conditions of correctional facilities. The country's best performance is in the area of effective regulatory enforcement—ranking sixth in the region and seventh among lower middle-income countries.

Ethiopia is in the bottom half of the rankings among low income countries in most dimensions. Accountability is very weak by regional standards (ranking eighty-eighth globally and

third to last among low income nations) and corruption is prevalent. The performance of regulatory agencies and courts is weak. The country has a very poor record in protecting fundamental rights, ranking ninety-second globally and second to last in the region. Of greatest concern are restrictions limiting freedom of speech and assembly as well as illegal detentions and due process violations. Property rights are weak.

Ghana is the strongest performer among low-income countries in most dimensions. The country has strong protections for fundamental rights (ranking twenty-ninth overall and first in the region), a functioning system of checks and balances (ranking twenty-third overall and second in the region) and an open government (ranking thirtieth overall and third in the region). Administrative efficiency and corruption are a challenge, although the country outperforms most of its regional peers in both dimensions. The civil justice system is relatively independent, but slow and inaccessible to most people. Security from crime (ranking sixty-first), vigilante justice, and deficiencies in the criminal investigation and adjudication systems, are areas that require attention.

Kenya ranks seventy-fifth in government accountability, which is partly attributable to the inability of the legislature and the judiciary to act as an effective check on the executive branch. Corruption is widespread and regulatory enforcement is ineffective by regional standards. Crime and vigilante justice are areas of concern. On the other hand, the country scores relatively well in open government, where it ranks fifth among countries in

Box 11 : Fundamental Rights

Under the rule of law, fundamental rights must be recognized and effectively guaranteed. The WJP Rule of Law Index considers the effective protection of fundamental rights in factor 4. The scores of this factor and its components measure how well countries uphold and protect a modest menu of rights and freedoms that are firmly established under international law including the right to equal treatment and the absence of discrimination, the right to life and security of the person, the due process of the law and rights of the accused, the freedom of opinion and expression, the freedom of belief and religion, the absence of any arbitrary interference of privacy, the freedom of assembly and association, and the protection of fundamental labor rights.


Effective protection of fundamental rights varies greatly across the world (Figure 8), and although some countries struggle more than others, no one has a perfect record. Wealthy countries in Western Europe, North America, and Asia face challenges in combating discriminatory practices against women, ethnic minorities, foreign immigrants, and

the poor. In the Asia Pacific region, countries such as Cambodia, China, and Vietnam score poorly on respect for basic liberties –most notably freedom of speech and freedom of assembly– and on enforcing prohibitions against child and forced labor. Countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia struggle to guarantee protection for whistleblowers, and in Latin America due process violations and harsh treatment of prisoners and detainees are sources of concern. Countries in the Middle East and North Africa lag in guaranteeing equal treatment to women and in protecting fundamental freedoms. In South Asia, civil conflict creates situations conducive to violations of the right to life, and in Sub-Saharan Africa the poor continue to receive unequal treatment under the law.

Despite differences in legal systems, conceptual meaning, and specific entitlements, all governments agree that it is necessary to guarantee fundamental rights. The pathway to achieve and enjoy such rights, however, is the challenge.

Figure 8: Fundamental Rights around the world

Countries grouped in quartiles according to their factor 4 score.



Sub-Saharan Africa. The country also performs relatively well on freedom of religion and freedom of assembly and association.

Liberia's scores reflect recent advances toward a functioning system of checks and balances and a sound institutional environment. The country ranks relatively well in the area of government accountability (fourth among low-income countries) but lacks effective sanctions to punish official misconduct. Despite ongoing reforms, the quality of administrative agencies and the judiciary are hampered by corruption and a lack of resources. On the other hand, Liberia outperforms its regional peers in protecting freedom of speech, religion and assembly.

Madagascar is in the upper half of low income countries on all dimensions of the rule of law. However, the country has relatively weak checks on government powers (ranking seventy-third overall and tenth within the region) and widespread corruption (seventy-second overall and eleventh in the region). Following the 2009 coup, the absence of legitimate mechanisms for the orderly transition of power remains a major rule of law concern. There are significant limitations on freedom of speech and privacy, as well as on the ability to petition the government and to access official information. Police abuses and delays in the justice system are also areas of concern. The country's strongest scores are in the areas of order and security (ranking second in the region and first among low income countries), and delivery of criminal justice (ranking second regionally and by income level).

Malawi achieves its highest scores in the dimensions of civil justice (ranking thirty-fifth overall and third in the region) and order and security (ranking fifty-seventh overall and fourth in the region). Its weakest performance is in protection of fundamental rights (eighty-first overall and twelfth in the region), and checks on government powers (ranking sixty-fifth overall and ninth in the region). The judiciary is relatively independent, accessible, effective and free of corruption. Enforcement of government regulations, availability of official information, violations of due process, and poor conditions of correctional facilities are areas of concern.

Nigeria ranks near the bottom half of lower middle-income countries in most dimensions. Checks on the executive branch are relatively weak (ranking seventy-fourth) and corruption is endemic (ranking ninety-fifth). The country is afflicted with civil conflict and political violence. Crime and vigilante justice are serious problems (ranking ninety-fourth), as is the performance of the criminal justice system (ranked ninety-fourth overall and last in the region). Nigeria's best performance is in the area of civil justice, where it ranks fifty-third globally and fourth among its income peers.

Senegal is in the top half of the rankings among lower-middle income countries in most dimensions, owing to ongoing reforms. The country scores relatively well on checks on government power (ranking forty-second overall and fourth among its income group). Administrative proceedings are more efficient than elsewhere in the region and the civil justice system is

relatively independent, but slow and inaccessible to most people. Corruption is a problem, as is open government, on which the country ranks seventy-fifth. The country ranks forty-seventh in protecting fundamental rights and fourth within the region, although police abuses and harsh treatment of prisoners are a source of concern.

Sierra Leone ranks second among low income countries, and fifth in the region with respect to checks on government power. The judiciary and the legislature are relatively independent, and the press and civil society organizations are mostly free from government interference. Major problems include high crime rates, generalized corruption, ineffective regulatory enforcement, lack of availability of official information, and severe deficiencies in the criminal justice system.

South Africa is in the top half of the rankings among upper-middle income countries in most dimensions. The country has relatively effective checks on government power (ranking thirty-fourth) and an open government (ranking twenty-seventh). The country's civil justice system is independent, but slow. The lack of security and the prevalence of crime and vigilante justice are serious problems (ranking eighty-eighth overall). The country has a relatively ineffective criminal justice system, and the condition of correctional facilities is poor.

Tanzania ranks in the upper half of low income countries in most dimensions of the rule of law. The country's highest marks are in the dimension of limited government powers (ranking third among low income countries and sixth

in the region). However, the judiciary is inefficient and affected by corruption. Crime and vigilante justice are major problems. Poor regulatory enforcement and lack of access to official information are other areas of concern.

Uganda ranks below the majority of countries in the region in all dimensions of the rule of law. Government accountability is weak by regional standards (ranking seventy-eighth) and administrative agencies are inefficient and affected by corruption (ranking eighty-second overall and fourteenth within the region). Protection of fundamental rights is weak (ranking eighty-sixth), and civil conflict and political violence remain significant challenges. Courts, although relatively independent, are under-resourced, slow, and inaccessible to most people.

Zambia ranks in the lower half of lower middle income countries in most dimensions of the rule of law. It scores relatively well on checks on government power (ninth in its income group and eighth in the region). The legislature and judiciary are vulnerable to government interference, and transitions of power occur in accordance with the law. Protection of fundamental rights, including freedom of speech and assembly, is very weak, ranking ninety-first overall and twenty-first among lower middle-income countries. Other rule of law concerns include the limited availability of official information, delays in judicial and administrative proceedings, vigilante justice, discrimination against marginalized segments of society, and poor conditions of correctional facilities. The country's best performance is on corruption (ranking sixth among its income group and sixth in the region).

Zimbabwe is among the weakest performers worldwide in most dimensions of the rule of law. Checks on government power are extremely weak, (ranking ninety-sixth), and the country fails to protect fundamental rights (ranked ninety-sixth and last among its regional and income peers), including freedom of speech, assembly and association. Corruption is pervasive and voting irregularities are rampant. Open government and protection of property from expropriation are very weak. Zimbabwe's best performance is in the dimension of effective criminal justice (ranking tenth in the region and eighth among low income countries), despite severe violations of due process of law and the rights of the accused.

South Asia

Although many countries in the region have made efforts to strengthen governance, South Asia, as a region, is the weakest performer overall in most dimensions of the rule of law. These countries are characterized by high levels of corruption and a lack of government accountability. Administrative agencies are inefficient and civil courts are slow. Civil conflict and insecurity are major threats to stability and progress. The region has relatively low crime rates. Criminal justice systems, although not without problems, perform slightly better than those in other regions of the world.

Bangladesh scores poorly in government accountability (ranking eighty-third globally and twelfth among low-income countries), and administrative agencies and courts are extremely inefficient and corrupt. The country faces serious challenges in the dimension of civil justice, in which it ranks last in the world, mainly because of the lengthy duration of cases and judicial corruption. Human rights violations and police abuses are also a significant problem. Bangladesh's best performance is in the area of order and security, where it ranks seventy-second globally and ninth among low-income countries. The country has lower crime rates than many countries with higher levels of economic development, although mob justice is a persistent problem.

India has a robust system of checks and balances (ranked thirty-seventh worldwide and second among lower middle income countries), an independent judiciary, strong protections for freedom of speech, and a relatively open

government (ranking fiftieth globally and fourth among lower-middle income countries). Administrative agencies do not perform well (ranking seventy-ninth), and the civil court system ranks poorly (ranking seventy-eighth), mainly because of deficiencies in the areas of court congestion, enforcement, and delays in processing cases. Corruption is a significant problem (ranking eighty-third), and police discrimination and abuses are not unusual. Order and security — including crime, civil conflict, and political violence— is a serious concern (ranked second lowest in the world).

Nepal outperforms its regional peers and most other low income countries in several dimensions of the rule of law. The country's best scores are in the areas of criminal justice (ranking first among low income countries and second in the region), protection of fundamental rights (ranking third among low income countries and second in the region), and absence of crime. Rule of law areas of particular concern in the country

COUNTRIES

Bangladesh
India
Nepal
Pakistan
Sri Lanka

AVERAGE RANKINGS FOR:

SOUTH ASIA



include endemic corruption, especially among the judiciary and the legislature, severe limitations in the accessibility and affordability of civil justice, delays in administrative and judicial proceedings, instability of the legal framework, and impunity for governmental abuses and human rights violations.

Pakistan shows weaknesses in most dimensions when compared to its regional and income group peers. Low levels of government accountability are compounded by the prevalence of corruption, a weak justice system, and a poor security situation, particularly related to terrorism and crime. The country scores more strongly on judicial independence and fairness in administrative proceedings.


Sri Lanka outperforms its regional peers in all but two dimensions of the rule of law. The country also outpaces most lower-middle income countries in several areas, ranking second in criminal justice, and third in the dimensions of open government, effective regulatory enforcement, and absence of corruption. On the other hand, violence and human rights violations related to the legacy of a protracted civil conflict are serious problems. Other areas of concern are vigilante justice, delays and barriers to access civil justice, and lack of accessibility of official information.

Country Profiles |

Country Profiles

This section presents profiles for the 97 countries and one additional jurisdiction included in the 2012 administration of Index

HOW TO READ THE COUNTRY PROFILES



2 SECTION 2—DISAGGREGATED SCORES

Section 2 displays four graphs that show the country's disaggregated scores for each of the sub-factors that compose the WJP Rule of Law Index.

Each graph shows a circle that corresponds to one concept measured by the Index. Each sub-factor is represented by a radius running from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle

corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00) and the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score for each sub-factor (1.00). Higher scores signify a higher adherence to the rule of law.

The country scores are shown in purple. The graphs also show the average scores of all countries indexed within the region (in green) and all countries indexed with comparable per capita income levels (in orange). As a point of reference, the graphs also show the score achieved for each sub-factor by the top performer amongst all 97 countries indexed (in black).

Highest possible score (1.00)

Lowest possible score (0.00)

A **sub-factor** is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery

Green Line: Regional Peers

Orange Line: Income-level Peers

Purple Line: Featured Country

Each country profile presents the featured country's scores for each of the WJP Rule of Law Index's factors and sub-factors, and draws comparisons between the scores of the featured country and the scores of other indexed countries that share regional and income level similarities. All variables used to score each of the eight independent factors are coded and rescaled to range between 0 and 1, where 1 signifies the highest score and 0 signifies the lowest score.

1 SECTION 1—SCORES FOR THE RULE OF LAW FACTORS

The table in Section 1 displays the featured country's aggregate scores by factor and the country's rankings within its regional and income level groups.

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Lower middle income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.46	71/97	14/21	14/23
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.31	84/97	18/21	15/23
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.73	50/97	19/21	7/23
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.63	42/97	11/21	1/23
3m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.44	60/97	13/21	10/23
53% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.43	76/97	19/21	13/23
19% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.51	61/97	14/21	9/23
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.41	74/97	15/21	11/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
42m (2012)
93% Urban
13% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.46	70/97	11/16	22/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.47	50/97	5/16	16/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.60	80/97	10/16	24/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.63	43/97	6/16	13/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.48	49/97	8/16	16/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.43	75/97	14/16	27/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.54	49/97	4/16	14/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.43	66/97	7/16	22/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Argentina (purple square) Top Score (black circle) Upper middle income (orange square) Latin America & Caribbean (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.88	5/97	1/14	5/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.90	8/97	3/14	8/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.86	15/97	5/14	14/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.84	8/97	2/14	8/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.84	5/97	2/14	5/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.83	5/97	2/14	5/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.72	12/97	4/14	12/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.72	17/97	5/14	17/29

Region
East Asia & Pacific


Population
22M (2012)
89% Urban
50% in three largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.82	8/97	6/16	8/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.77	20/97	13/16	19/29
Western Europe & North America	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.89	9/97	4/16	8/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.82	10/97	7/16	10/29
8m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.80	11/97	7/16	11/29
68% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.84	4/97	3/16	4/29
27% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.74	10/97	7/16	10/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.75	15/97	9/16	15/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Austria ● Top Score ■ High income ▲ Western Europe & North America


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.40	83/97	5/5	12/15
Region South Asia	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.29	89/97	4/5	12/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.62	72/97	2/5	9/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.43	87/97	4/5	12/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.35	89/97	4/5	12/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.36	90/97	5/5	11/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.32	97/97	5/5	15/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.38	83/97	5/5	12/15
	Population				
161m (2012)					
28% Urban					
7% in three largest cities					


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Bangladesh
- Top Score
- Low income
- ▲ South Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia

Population
9m (2012)
75% Urban
28% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.34	91/97	19/21	28/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.50	44/97	10/21	12/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.78	33/97	9/21	5/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.45	84/97	20/21	28/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.36	87/97	20/21	30/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.56	35/97	8/21	6/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.63	26/97	3/21	5/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.59	34/97	8/21	6/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key ■ Belarus ● Top Score ■ Upper middle income ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.78	16/97	11/16	16/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.78	16/97	11/16	16/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.84	20/97	11/16	17/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.81	11/97	8/16	11/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.67	21/97	12/16	19/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.70	20/97	12/16	18/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.68	19/97	11/16	18/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.72	19/97	10/16	18/29
Region					
Western Europe & North America					
Population					
10M (2012)					
97% Urban					
18% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



BOLIVIA

La Paz, Santa Cruz, Cochabamba

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
10M (2012)
67% Urban
49% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.38	84/97	14/16	19/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.24	96/97	16/16	22/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.67	63/97	4/16	10/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.49	77/97	15/16	15/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.41	72/97	13/16	13/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.37	87/97	15/16	20/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.38	92/97	15/16	22/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.28	95/97	14/16	22/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Upper middle income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.55	54/97	8/21	15/30
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.47	51/97	12/21	17/30
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.76	38/97	12/21	7/30
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.67	36/97	9/21	7/30
4m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.49	45/97	9/21	14/30
48% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.53	45/97	11/21	14/30
14% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.50	64/97	15/21	20/30
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.62	29/97	6/21	2/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa

Population
2m (2012)
49% Urban
18% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.73	20/97	1/18	2/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.75	22/97	1/18	2/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.76	37/97	1/18	6/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.59	51/97	5/18	16/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.67	20/97	1/18	2/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.71	17/97	1/18	1/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.65	21/97	1/18	3/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.72	18/97	1/18	1/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Botswana (purple square), Top Score (black circle), Upper middle income (orange square), Sub-Saharan Africa (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
199m (2012)
87% Urban
19% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.62	35/97	4/16	6/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.52	38/97	3/16	8/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.64	69/97	6/16	18/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.69	33/97	4/16	5/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.54	31/97	4/16	7/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.56	37/97	3/16	7/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.55	43/97	3/16	11/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.49	52/97	3/16	15/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key Brazil Top Score Upper middle income Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
7m (2012)
71% Urban
27% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.51	60/97	10/21	19/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.46	53/97	13/21	19/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.74	47/97	17/21	12/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.68	34/97	7/21	6/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.53	33/97	5/21	9/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.50	55/97	12/21	19/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.57	40/97	8/21	9/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.39	81/97	19/21	27/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



BURKINA FASO

Ouagadougou, Bobo-Dioulasso, Dedougou

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.43	79/97	14/18	11/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.50	47/97	3/18	1/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.70	55/97	3/18	4/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.59	55/97	6/18	4/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.41	73/97	8/18	7/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.56	33/97	3/18	1/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.59	36/97	4/18	3/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.45	63/97	9/18	7/15

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.34	90/97	14/14	14/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.31	85/97	13/14	11/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.70	54/97	12/14	3/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.43	88/97	13/14	13/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.37	83/97	12/14	10/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.33	94/97	14/14	14/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.37	94/97	14/14	13/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.40	77/97	14/14	11/15

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Cambodia ● Top Score ■ Low income ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income Lower middle income
 Region Sub-Saharan Africa
 Population 20M (2012)
 58% Urban
 20% in three largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.31	94/97	17/18	22/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.20	97/97	18/18	23/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.62	75/97	10/18	15/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.42	90/97	15/18	20/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.27	95/97	16/18	23/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.28	96/97	17/18	23/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.35	95/97	17/18	23/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.32	93/97	17/18	20/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Cameroon ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.78	15/97	10/16	15/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.81	12/97	7/16	12/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.88	10/97	5/16	9/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.78	18/97	12/16	18/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.84	6/97	4/16	6/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.79	12/97	8/16	12/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.72	13/97	9/16	13/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.75	13/97	8/16	13/29

Region
Western Europe
& North America


Population
34m (2012)
81% Urban
34% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
17m (2012)
89% Urban
40% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.74	19/97	1/16	1/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.74	24/97	2/16	3/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.70	53/97	1/16	13/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.73	24/97	2/16	3/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.68	18/97	1/16	1/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.66	23/97	2/16	3/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.66	20/97	2/16	2/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.60	32/97	1/16	4/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Chile
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
East Asia &
Pacific

Population
1343m (2012)
49% Urban
4% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.36	86/97	13/14	26/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.52	40/97	8/14	10/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.78	32/97	9/14	4/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.35	94/97	14/14	29/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.42	69/97	11/14	23/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.41	80/97	12/14	28/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.43	82/97	12/14	27/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.54	39/97	11/14	8/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — China (purple square) ● Top Score (black circle) — Upper middle income (orange square) ▲ East Asia & Pacific (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
45m (2012)
75% Urban
35% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.55	53/97	7/16	14/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.44	59/97	8/16	20/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.43	95/97	16/16	30/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.55	65/97	13/16	21/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.51	38/97	7/16	11/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.52	49/97	5/16	16/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.53	51/97	5/16	15/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.43	68/97	8/16	23/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key Colombia Top Score Upper middle income Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa
Population
22m (2012)
51% Urban
32% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.43	80/97	15/18	17/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.39	70/97	10/18	11/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.58	84/97	13/18	19/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.50	72/97	11/18	14/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.37	81/97	12/18	16/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.48	58/97	6/18	7/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.51	60/97	11/18	8/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.37	85/97	13/18	16/23


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Cote d'Ivoire
- Top Score
- Lower middle income
- Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.61	36/97	6/21	28/29
Region Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.55	37/97	9/21	29/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.77	34/97	10/21	26/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.67	35/97	8/21	28/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.53	34/97	6/21	24/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.48	57/97	13/21	29/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.51	58/97	13/21	29/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.53	42/97	11/21	28/29
	Population				
4m (2012)					
58% Urban					
37% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.71	25/97	3/21	22/29
Region Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.62	32/97	6/21	27/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.81	26/97	5/21	22/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.79	15/97	3/21	15/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.49	46/97	10/21	27/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.59	28/97	5/21	24/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.65	23/97	2/21	20/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.70	20/97	3/21	19/29
	Population				
10m (2012)					
74% Urban					
34% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.93	1/97	1/16	1/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.95	2/97	2/16	2/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.91	4/97	2/16	4/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.91	2/97	2/16	2/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.82	8/97	6/16	8/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.85	3/97	2/16	3/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.79	6/97	5/16	6/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.87	1/97	1/16	1/29

Region
Western Europe
& North America


Population
6m (2012)
87% Urban
61% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
10M (2012)
70% Urban
47% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.53	57/97	8/16	17/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.36	77/97	13/16	29/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.60	78/97	8/16	22/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.67	37/97	5/16	8/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.52	36/97	6/16	10/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.45	66/97	11/16	23/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.51	59/97	6/16	17/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.47	53/97	4/16	16/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
15m (2012)
68% Urban
42% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.41	81/97	13/16	24/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.47	52/97	6/16	18/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.56	85/97	13/16	25/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.56	62/97	12/16	19/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.38	80/97	14/16	27/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.46	62/97	10/16	22/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.42	85/97	11/16	28/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.44	65/97	6/16	21/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Ecuador
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Lower middle income	Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.58	40/97	1/7	3/23
income	Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.51	41/97	4/7	2/23
Region	Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.67	65/97	7/7	12/23
Middle East & North Africa	Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.43	89/97	6/7	19/23
Population	Factor 5:	Open Government	0.48	51/97	2/7	5/23
84m (2012)	Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.42	77/97	6/7	14/23
44% Urban	Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.47	73/97	6/7	13/23
31% in three largest cities	Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.45	56/97	5/7	6/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Lower middle income	Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.50	64/97	10/16	11/23
income	Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.45	54/97	7/16	5/23
Region	Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.58	83/97	12/16	18/23
Latin America & Caribbean	Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.58	57/97	10/16	8/23
Population	Factor 5:	Open Government	0.37	82/97	15/16	17/23
6m (2012)	Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.52	50/97	6/16	4/23
65% Urban	Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.49	67/97	9/16	11/23
49% in three largest cities	Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.25	96/97	15/16	23/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key ■ El Salvador ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.79	12/97	1/21	12/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.77	19/97	1/21	18/29
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.82	23/97	4/21	20/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.79	13/97	2/21	13/29
1m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.71	17/97	1/21	17/29
70% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.73	16/97	1/21	16/29
46% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.71	16/97	1/21	15/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.75	14/97	1/21	14/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.36	88/97	16/18	13/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.44	58/97	8/18	4/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.56	86/97	14/18	13/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.41	92/97	17/18	14/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.29	94/97	15/18	13/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.36	89/97	14/18	10/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.46	76/97	15/18	10/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.49	49/97	4/18	3/15


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Ethiopia
- Top Score
- Low income
- ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.89	4/97	4/16	4/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.93	4/97	4/16	4/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.92	3/97	1/16	3/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.90	4/97	4/16	4/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.84	7/97	5/16	7/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.82	8/97	6/16	8/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.79	5/97	4/16	5/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.87	2/97	2/16	2/29

Region
Western Europe
& North America

Population


5m (2012)
84% Urban
38% in three largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.80	11/97	8/16	11/29
Region Western Europe & North America	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.80	13/97	8/16	13/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.84	18/97	10/16	16/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.79	14/97	10/16	14/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.75	14/97	10/16	14/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.76	13/97	9/16	13/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.68	18/97	10/16	17/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.69	22/97	12/16	21/29
	Population				
65m (2012)					
86% Urban					
20% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
5m (2012)
53% Urban
41% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.48	66/97	11/21	12/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.77	21/97	2/21	1/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.84	19/97	2/21	2/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.61	49/97	13/21	4/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.47	54/97	11/21	7/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.63	25/97	2/21	1/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.61	31/97	5/21	1/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.66	25/97	4/21	1/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Georgia (purple square) ● Top Score (black circle) — Lower middle income (orange square) ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.82	9/97	7/16	9/29
Region Western Europe & North America	Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.82	11/97	6/16	11/29
	Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.86	13/97	7/16	12/29
	Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.80	12/97	9/16	12/29
	Factor 5:	Open Government	0.73	16/97	11/16	16/29
	Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.73	15/97	10/16	15/29
	Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.80	3/97	3/16	3/29
	Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.76	9/97	6/16	9/29
	Population					
81m (2012)						
74% Urban						
15% in three largest cities						

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.72	23/97	2/18	1/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.45	55/97	5/18	2/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.68	61/97	5/18	7/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.72	29/97	1/18	1/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.55	30/97	3/18	1/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.52	47/97	5/18	2/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.61	32/97	2/18	1/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.45	61/97	8/18	6/15

Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa


Population
25m (2012)
52% Urban
20% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.64	31/97	16/16	26/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.56	34/97	16/16	28/29
Western Europe & North America	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.73	49/97	16/16	29/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.72	28/97	16/16	25/29
11M (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.51	41/97	15/16	26/29
61% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.54	43/97	16/16	28/29
46% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.61	30/97	15/16	24/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.50	46/97	16/16	29/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Greece ● Top Score ■ High income ▲ Western Europe & North America


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



GUATEMALA

Guatemala City, Villa Nueva, Mixco

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
14m (2012)
50% Urban
39% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.52	58/97	9/16	8/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.29	88/97	15/16	18/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.59	82/97	11/16	17/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.59	52/97	8/16	6/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.46	58/97	10/16	8/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.43	72/97	13/16	12/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.41	88/97	13/16	20/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.37	84/97	12/16	15/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



HONG KONG SAR, CHINA

Hong Kong

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.73	22/97	5/14	20/29
Region East Asia & Pacific	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.89	9/97	4/14	9/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.93	2/97	2/14	2/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.71	31/97	6/14	27/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.82	10/97	4/14	10/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.75	14/97	5/14	14/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.71	17/97	6/14	16/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.76	8/97	3/14	8/29
	Population 7m (2012) 100% Urban 99% in three largest cities				


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Hong Kong SAR, China
- Top Score
- High income
- ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



HUNGARY

Budapest, Debrecen, Miskolc

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.63	33/97	5/21	27/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.72	26/97	3/21	22/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.83	21/97	3/21	18/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.72	30/97	6/21	26/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.52	37/97	7/21	25/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.60	27/97	4/21	23/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.55	45/97	10/21	28/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.64	27/97	5/21	25/29
Region	Eastern Europe & Central Asia				
Population	10M (2012)				
	70% Urban				
	37% in three largest cities				

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income Lower middle income
Region South Asia

Population 1205m (2012)
31% Urban
4% in three largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.61	37/97	1/5	2/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.32	83/97	3/5	14/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.39	96/97	4/5	22/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.56	64/97	3/5	11/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.48	50/97	2/5	4/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.41	79/97	3/5	16/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.45	78/97	2/5	15/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.44	64/97	3/5	8/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ India ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ South Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income Lower middle income
 Region East Asia & Pacific
 Population 249m (2012)
 49% Urban
 17% in three largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.64	29/97	7/14	1/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.30	86/97	14/14	16/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.72	52/97	11/14	9/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.56	61/97	10/14	10/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.53	35/97	7/14	1/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.50	54/97	10/14	6/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.49	66/97	9/14	10/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.45	62/97	12/14	7/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Indonesia ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Middle East &
North Africa
Population
78m (2012)
71% Urban
17% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.37	85/97	7/7	25/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.49	49/97	5/7	15/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.68	62/97	6/7	17/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.27	97/97	7/7	30/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.38	78/97	7/7	26/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.54	41/97	4/7	11/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.62	28/97	2/7	6/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.45	59/97	6/7	19/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.67	27/97	15/16	23/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.62	30/97	15/16	25/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.76	36/97	14/16	27/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.72	27/97	15/16	24/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.49	47/97	16/16	28/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.56	36/97	15/16	27/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.56	41/97	16/16	27/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.67	24/97	13/16	23/29
Region					
Western Europe & North America					
Population					
61m (2012)					
68% Urban					
8% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
3m (2012)
52% Urban
44% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.60	38/97	5/16	7/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.51	42/97	4/16	11/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.60	79/97	9/16	23/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.59	54/97	9/16	17/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.41	70/97	12/16	24/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.55	40/97	4/16	10/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.51	62/97	7/16	18/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.42	73/97	10/16	25/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key Jamaica Top Score Upper middle income Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.80	10/97	3/14	10/29
Region East Asia & Pacific	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.84	10/97	5/14	10/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.89	7/97	3/14	7/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.78	17/97	3/14	17/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.82	9/97	3/14	9/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.87	2/97	1/14	2/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.77	8/97	2/14	8/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.68	23/97	6/14	22/29
	Population				
127m (2012)					
67% Urban					
33% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).



Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Middle East &
North Africa
Population
7m (2012)
79% Urban
49% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.55	51/97	6/7	13/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.57	33/97	2/7	5/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.75	42/97	3/7	10/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.50	75/97	3/7	24/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.46	56/97	5/7	19/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.59	29/97	2/7	4/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.65	25/97	1/7	4/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.52	44/97	3/7	11/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Jordan
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- Middle East & North Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia

Population
17m (2012)
59% Urban
16% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.35	89/97	18/21	27/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.38	73/97	16/21	26/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.74	46/97	16/21	11/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.50	74/97	17/21	23/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.36	85/97	19/21	29/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.44	71/97	16/21	25/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.49	69/97	18/21	22/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.46	55/97	12/21	17/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Kazakhstan (purple square) ● Top Score (black circle) — Upper middle income (orange square) ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.45	75/97	12/18	8/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.27	91/97	15/18	13/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.62	74/97	9/18	10/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.54	68/97	8/18	6/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.44	64/97	5/18	4/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.39	82/97	12/18	8/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.47	71/97	13/18	8/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.40	76/97	12/18	10/15
Region					
Sub-Saharan Africa					
Population					
43m (2012)					
24% Urban					
10% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.44	76/97	15/21	9/15
Region Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.26	93/97	20/21	15/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.74	48/97	18/21	2/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.51	71/97	16/21	9/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.44	61/97	14/21	3/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.43	73/97	17/21	7/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.46	74/97	20/21	9/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.35	90/97	21/21	14/15
	Population				
5m (2012)					
35% Urban					
23% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Middle East &
North Africa

Population
4m (2012)
87% Urban
42% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.57	44/97	4/7	10/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.42	62/97	6/7	22/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.68	60/97	5/7	16/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.65	39/97	1/7	10/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.47	53/97	3/7	17/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.38	85/97	7/7	29/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.45	77/97	7/7	24/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.49	51/97	4/7	14/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Lebanon
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ Middle East & North Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.53	56/97	7/18	4/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.36	78/97	13/18	9/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.56	87/97	15/18	14/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.52	70/97	10/18	8/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.39	76/97	10/18	8/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.23	97/97	18/18	15/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.33	96/97	18/18	14/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.35	92/97	16/18	15/15

Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa


Population
4m (2012)
48% Urban
25% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
2m (2012)
59% Urban
35% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.52	59/97	9/21	18/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.55	36/97	8/21	7/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.75	41/97	14/21	9/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.64	41/97	10/21	12/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.62	23/97	3/21	3/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.56	34/97	7/21	5/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.53	52/97	11/21	16/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.53	41/97	10/21	9/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.45	73/97	10/18	7/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.39	72/97	11/18	7/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.76	39/97	2/18	1/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.58	58/97	7/18	5/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.50	44/97	4/18	2/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.46	63/97	7/18	3/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.53	50/97	8/18	5/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.49	47/97	2/18	2/15
Region					
Sub-Saharan Africa					
Africa					
Population					
22m (2012)					
33% Urban					
8% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Madagascar ● Top Score ■ Low income ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.49	65/97	9/18	6/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.44	57/97	7/18	3/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.69	57/97	4/18	5/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.47	81/97	12/18	10/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.43	68/97	6/18	5/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.45	65/97	8/18	4/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.59	35/97	3/18	2/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.45	58/97	7/18	5/15

Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa


Population
16m (2012)
20% Urban
10% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
East Asia &
Pacific
Population
29m (2012)
73% Urban
35% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.57	45/97	8/14	11/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.69	28/97	7/14	4/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.86	16/97	6/14	1/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.50	73/97	11/14	22/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.48	48/97	9/14	15/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.52	46/97	7/14	15/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.57	39/97	7/14	8/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.61	31/97	7/14	3/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key Malaysia Top Score Upper middle income East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



MEXICO

Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
115m (2012)
78% Urban
25% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.55	50/97	6/16	12/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.37	74/97	11/16	27/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.50	91/97	15/16	28/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.56	60/97	11/16	18/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.53	32/97	5/16	8/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.49	56/97	8/16	20/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.40	89/97	14/16	29/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.35	91/97	13/16	29/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Mexico (Purple square)
- Top Score (Black circle)
- Upper middle income (Orange square)
- Latin America & Caribbean (Green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
4m (2012)
48% Urban
27% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.43	77/97	16/21	16/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.33	79/97	17/21	12/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.77	35/97	11/21	4/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.54	66/97	15/21	12/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.43	66/97	17/21	12/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.39	84/97	20/21	19/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.42	87/97	21/21	19/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.40	75/97	16/21	12/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key Moldova Top Score Lower middle income Eastern Europe & Central Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
East Asia &
Pacific
Population
3m (2012)
62% Urban
43% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.50	63/97	11/14	10/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.40	67/97	12/14	9/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.75	43/97	10/14	5/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.62	46/97	8/14	2/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.35	93/97	14/14	22/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.48	60/97	11/14	8/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.53	54/97	8/14	5/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.54	38/97	10/14	4/23


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Mongolia
- Top Score
- Lower middle income
- East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income

Region
Middle East &
North Africa

Population
32m (2012)
57% Urban
32% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.57	43/97	3/7	5/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.33	80/97	7/7	13/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.72	51/97	4/7	8/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.48	80/97	4/7	17/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.51	39/97	1/7	2/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.47	61/97	5/7	9/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.54	48/97	5/7	3/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.35	89/97	7/7	19/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.51	62/97	3/5	5/15
Region South Asia	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.40	68/97	2/5	6/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.69	58/97	1/5	6/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.59	53/97	2/5	3/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.38	79/97	3/5	9/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.44	70/97	2/5	6/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.43	83/97	3/5	11/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.54	40/97	2/5	1/15
	Population				
30m (2012)					
19% Urban					
10% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



NETHERLANDS

Amsterdam, s'Gravenhage, Rotterdam

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.86	7/97	5/16	7/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.93	5/97	5/16	5/29
Western Europe & North America	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.86	14/97	8/16	13/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.84	9/97	6/16	9/29
17m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.90	2/97	2/16	2/29
83% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.83	7/97	5/16	7/29
29% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.80	2/97	2/16	2/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.80	6/97	5/16	6/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



NEW ZEALAND

Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.87	6/97	2/14	6/29
Region East Asia & Pacific	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.92	6/97	1/14	6/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.87	12/97	4/14	11/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.86	5/97	1/14	5/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.84	4/97	1/14	4/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.82	9/97	3/14	9/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.76	9/97	3/14	9/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.79	7/97	2/14	7/29
	Population				
4m (2012)					
86% Urban					
53% in three largest cities					


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- New Zealand (Purple square)
- Top Score (Black circle)
- High income (Orange square)
- East Asia & Pacific (Green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
6m (2012)
58% Urban
47% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.31	93/97	15/16	21/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.40	69/97	10/16	10/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.64	68/97	5/16	14/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.54	67/97	14/16	13/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.48	52/97	9/16	6/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.45	67/97	12/16	11/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.42	86/97	12/16	18/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.42	70/97	9/16	9/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income Lower middle income
 Region Sub-Saharan Africa
 Population 170m (2012)
 50% Urban
 8% in three largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.45	74/97	11/18	15/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.25	95/97	17/18	21/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.47	94/97	18/18	21/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.45	85/97	13/18	18/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.35	90/97	14/18	19/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.42	78/97	10/18	15/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.53	53/97	9/18	4/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.28	94/97	18/18	21/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Nigeria ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.90	3/97	3/16	3/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.94	3/97	3/16	3/29
Western Europe & North America	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.87	11/97	6/16	10/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.90	3/97	3/16	3/29
5m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.84	3/97	3/16	3/29
79% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.83	6/97	4/16	6/29
43% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.82	1/97	1/16	1/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.85	4/97	3/16	4/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
South Asia

Population
190m (2012)
36% Urban
15% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.46	69/97	4/5	13/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.28	90/97	5/5	19/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.29	97/97	5/5	23/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.40	93/97	5/5	22/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.35	92/97	5/5	21/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.36	88/97	4/5	21/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.39	91/97	4/5	21/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.39	80/97	4/5	14/23


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Pakistan
- Top Score
- Lower middle income
- ▲ South Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
4m (2012)
75% Urban
44% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.45	72/97	12/16	23/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.41	64/97	9/16	23/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.68	59/97	3/16	15/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.63	45/97	7/16	14/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.60	28/97	3/16	6/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.52	51/97	7/16	17/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.51	63/97	8/16	19/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.38	82/97	11/16	28/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Panama
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Latin America &
Caribbean
Population
30m (2012)
77% Urban
34% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.64	32/97	3/16	4/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.37	75/97	12/16	28/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.62	73/97	7/16	21/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.70	32/97	3/16	4/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.43	67/97	11/16	22/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.48	59/97	9/16	21/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.43	81/97	10/16	26/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.45	57/97	5/16	18/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key Peru Top Score Upper middle income Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
East Asia &
Pacific
Population
104m (2012)
49% Urban
18% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.56	46/97	9/14	6/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.41	63/97	10/14	8/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.60	77/97	14/14	16/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.57	59/97	9/14	9/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.46	59/97	10/14	9/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.51	52/97	8/14	5/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.43	84/97	13/14	17/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.42	72/97	13/14	10/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — ■ Philippines ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.78	14/97	2/21	14/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.72	27/97	4/21	23/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.81	27/97	6/21	23/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.85	7/97	1/21	7/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.59	29/97	4/21	23/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.61	26/97	3/21	22/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.63	27/97	4/21	22/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.73	16/97	2/21	16/29
Region	Eastern Europe & Central Asia				
Population	38m (2012)				
	61% Urban				
	14% in three largest cities				

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.71	24/97	14/16	21/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.68	29/97	14/16	24/29
Western Europe & North America	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.74	45/97	15/16	28/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.75	21/97	13/16	21/29
11M (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.62	25/97	13/16	21/29
61% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.57	32/97	14/16	26/29
45% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.62	29/97	14/16	23/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.62	28/97	15/16	26/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Seoul, Busan, Incheon

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.66	28/97	6/14	24/29
Region East Asia & Pacific	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.74	25/97	6/14	21/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.82	25/97	8/14	21/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.76	20/97	4/14	20/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.74	15/97	5/14	15/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.67	21/97	6/14	19/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.72	14/97	5/14	14/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.76	10/97	4/14	10/29
	Population				
49m (2012)					
83% Urban					
61% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



ROMANIA

Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, Iasi

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia

Population
22m (2012)
57% Urban
15% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.58	39/97	7/21	8/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.50	45/97	11/21	13/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.80	28/97	7/21	2/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.73	23/97	5/21	2/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.51	40/97	8/21	12/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.54	44/97	10/21	13/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.59	37/97	7/21	7/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.60	33/97	7/21	5/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Romania (purple square) ● Top Score (black circle) — Upper middle income (orange square) ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
142m (2012)
74% Urban
13% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.31	92/97	20/21	29/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.39	71/97	15/21	25/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.49	92/97	21/21	29/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.47	83/97	19/21	27/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.41	74/97	18/21	25/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.45	68/97	15/21	24/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.50	65/97	16/21	21/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.40	78/97	17/21	26/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Russia (Purple square)
- Top Score (Black circle)
- Upper middle income (Orange square)
- Eastern Europe & Central Asia (Green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Lower middle income	Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.57	42/97	4/18	4/23
income	Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.49	48/97	4/18	4/23
Region	Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.65	66/97	7/18	13/23
Sub-Saharan Africa	Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.62	47/97	4/18	3/23
Africa	Factor 5:	Open Government	0.41	75/97	9/18	14/23
Population	Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.58	31/97	2/18	2/23
13m (2012)	Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.58	38/97	5/18	2/23
43% Urban	Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.46	54/97	6/18	5/23
22% in three largest cities						

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Senegal ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia

Population
7m (2012)
56% Urban
31% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.48	67/97	12/21	20/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.42	61/97	14/21	21/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.75	40/97	13/21	8/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.61	48/97	12/21	15/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.44	65/97	16/21	21/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.43	74/97	18/21	26/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.47	72/97	19/21	23/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.45	60/97	13/21	20/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Serbia (purple square) ● Top Score (black circle) — Upper middle income (orange square) ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.55	49/97	5/18	2/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.36	76/97	12/18	8/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.64	67/97	8/18	8/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.63	44/97	3/18	2/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.26	96/97	17/18	14/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.33	93/97	16/18	13/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.54	47/97	7/18	4/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.36	87/97	15/18	13/15
Region					
Sub-Saharan Africa					
Africa					
Population					
5m (2012)					
39% Urban					
27% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.73	21/97	4/14	19/29
Region East Asia & Pacific	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.91	7/97	2/14	7/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.93	1/97	1/14	1/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.73	26/97	5/14	23/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.67	19/97	6/14	18/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.80	10/97	4/14	10/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.79	4/97	1/14	4/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.87	3/97	1/14	3/29
	Population 5m (2012) 100% Urban 100% in three largest cities				


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Singapore
- Top Score
- High income
- ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.64	30/97	4/21	25/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.62	31/97	5/21	26/29
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.80	29/97	8/21	24/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.78	19/97	4/21	19/29
2m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.63	22/97	2/21	20/29
50% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.59	30/97	6/21	25/29
21% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.60	34/97	6/21	26/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.59	36/97	9/21	27/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



SOUTH AFRICA

Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income
Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa
Population
49m (2012)
62% Urban
16% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.62	34/97	3/18	5/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.50	46/97	2/18	14/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.56	88/97	16/18	26/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.64	40/97	2/18	11/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.61	27/97	2/18	5/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.54	42/97	4/18	12/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.55	46/97	6/18	13/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.49	48/97	3/18	13/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — South Africa (purple square), Top Score (black circle), Upper middle income (orange square), Sub-Saharan Africa (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.75	18/97	13/16	18/29
Region Western Europe & North America	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.80	14/97	9/16	14/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.79	30/97	13/16	25/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.86	6/97	5/16	6/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.61	26/97	14/16	22/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.67	22/97	13/16	20/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.65	24/97	13/16	21/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.69	21/97	11/16	20/29
	Population				
47m (2012)					
77% Urban					
29% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
South Asia

Population
21m (2012)
15% Urban
8% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.56	47/97	2/5	7/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.51	43/97	1/5	3/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.54	89/97	3/5	20/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.60	50/97	1/5	5/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.50	43/97	1/5	3/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.52	48/97	1/5	3/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.52	55/97	1/5	6/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.62	30/97	1/5	2/23


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Sri Lanka
- Top Score
- Lower middle income
- ▲ South Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.92	2/97	2/16	2/29
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.96	1/97	1/16	1/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.89	6/97	3/16	6/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.93	1/97	1/16	1/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.93	1/97	1/16	1/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.89	1/97	1/16	1/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.78	7/97	6/16	7/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.82	5/97	4/16	5/29

Region
Western Europe
& North America


Population
9m (2012)
85% Urban
41% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.55	52/97	6/18	3/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.41	66/97	9/18	5/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.61	76/97	11/18	11/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.53	69/97	9/18	7/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.41	71/97	7/18	6/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.44	69/97	9/18	5/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.48	70/97	12/18	7/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.49	50/97	5/18	4/15

Region
Sub-Saharan
Africa


Population
43m (2012)
27% Urban
10% in three
largest cities

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



THAILAND

Bangkok, Nonthaburi, Pak Kret

1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
East Asia &
Pacific

Population
67m (2012)
34% Urban
22% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.53	55/97	10/14	16/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.41	65/97	11/14	24/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.63	71/97	13/14	20/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.66	38/97	7/14	9/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.50	42/97	8/14	13/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.51	53/97	9/14	18/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.43	80/97	11/14	25/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.59	35/97	8/14	7/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Thailand
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Middle East &
North Africa

Population
11M (2012)
66% Urban
27% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.58	41/97	2/7	9/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.52	39/97	3/7	9/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.79	31/97	2/7	3/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.56	63/97	2/7	20/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.46	55/97	4/7	18/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.55	38/97	3/7	8/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.56	42/97	4/7	10/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.52	43/97	2/7	10/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Tunisia (purple square) — Top Score (black circle) — Upper middle income (orange square) — Middle East & North Africa (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia

Population
80m (2012)
70% Urban
27% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.47	68/97	13/21	21/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.55	35/97	7/21	6/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.63	70/97	20/21	19/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.49	76/97	18/21	25/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.46	57/97	12/21	20/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.55	39/97	9/21	9/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.55	44/97	9/21	12/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.42	71/97	14/21	24/30

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key — Turkey (purple square) ● Top Score (black circle) — Upper middle income (orange square) ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia (green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.55	48/97	5/7	29/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.74	23/97	1/7	20/29
Middle East & North Africa	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.91	5/97	1/7	5/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.47	82/97	5/7	29/29
5m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.44	63/97	6/7	29/29
84% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.65	24/97	1/7	21/29
99% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.60	33/97	3/7	25/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.75	12/97	1/7	12/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key ■ United Arab Emirates ● Top Score ■ High income ▲ Middle East & North Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.43	78/97	13/18	10/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.32	82/97	14/18	10/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.48	93/97	17/18	15/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.43	86/97	14/18	11/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.36	86/97	13/18	11/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.38	86/97	13/18	9/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.51	57/97	10/18	6/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.43	69/97	11/18	9/15
Region					
Sub-Saharan Africa					
Africa					
Population					
34m (2012)					
13% Urban					
5% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Uganda ● Top Score ■ Low income ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
45m (2012)
69% Urban
14% in three
largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.36	87/97	17/21	20/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.25	94/97	21/21	20/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.74	44/97	15/21	6/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.58	56/97	14/21	7/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.44	62/97	15/21	11/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.35	91/97	21/21	22/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.52	56/97	12/21	7/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.39	79/97	18/21	13/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key ■ Ukraine ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ Eastern Europe & Central Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



UNITED KINGDOM

London, Birmingham, Glasgow

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.79	13/97	9/16	13/29
Region	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.80	15/97	10/16	15/29
Western Europe & North America	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.84	17/97	9/16	15/29
Population	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.78	16/97	11/16	16/29
63m (2012)	Factor 5: Open Government	0.78	12/97	8/16	12/29
80% Urban	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.79	11/97	7/16	11/29
32% in three largest cities	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.72	11/97	8/16	11/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.75	11/97	7/16	11/29

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



UNITED STATES

New York, Los Angeles, Chicago

1. WJP Rule of Law Index


Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
High income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.77	17/97	12/16	17/29
Region Western Europe & North America	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.78	18/97	12/16	17/29
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.83	22/97	12/16	19/29
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.73	25/97	14/16	22/29
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.77	13/97	9/16	13/29
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.70	19/97	11/16	17/29
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.65	22/97	12/16	19/29
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.65	26/97	14/16	24/29
	Population				
314m (2012)					
82% Urban					
13% in three largest cities					

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).




Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
3m (2012)
93% Urban
45% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.70	26/97	2/16	3/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.78	17/97	1/16	1/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.70	56/97	2/16	14/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.75	22/97	1/16	1/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.62	24/97	2/16	4/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.71	18/97	1/16	2/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.71	15/97	1/16	1/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.50	45/97	2/16	12/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Uruguay
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Lower middle
income
Region
Eastern Europe &
Central Asia
Population
28m (2012)
36% Urban
11% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.24	97/97	21/21	23/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.30	87/97	19/21	17/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.89	8/97	1/21	1/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.34	95/97	21/21	23/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.36	88/97	21/21	18/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.46	64/97	14/21	10/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.49	68/97	17/21	12/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.36	88/97	20/21	18/23


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Uzbekistan
- Top Score
- Lower middle income
- Eastern Europe & Central Asia


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income
Upper middle
income

Region
Latin America &
Caribbean

Population
28m (2012)
94% Urban
38% in three
largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.25	95/97	16/16	30/30
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.32	81/97	14/16	30/30
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.51	90/97	14/16	27/30
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.48	78/97	16/16	26/30
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.36	84/97	16/16	28/30
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.33	95/97	16/16	30/30
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.38	93/97	16/16	30/30
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.24	97/97	16/16	30/30


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Venezuela
- Top Score
- Upper middle income
- ▲ Latin America & Caribbean


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income Lower middle income

Region East Asia & Pacific

Population 92m (2012)
31% Urban
17% in three largest cities


WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.40	82/97	12/14	18/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.43	60/97	9/14	7/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.82	24/97	7/14	3/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.48	79/97	12/14	16/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.35	91/97	13/14	20/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.39	83/97	13/14	18/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.43	79/97	10/14	16/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.57	37/97	9/14	3/23

2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors


In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).

Key: ■ Vietnam ● Top Score ■ Lower middle income ▲ East Asia & Pacific


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income Lower middle income

Region Sub-Saharan Africa

Population 14m (2012)
36% Urban
20% in three largest cities

WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS		SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Factor 1:	Limited Government Powers	0.51	61/97	8/18	9/23
Factor 2:	Absence of Corruption	0.44	56/97	6/18	6/23
Factor 3:	Order and Security	0.67	64/97	6/18	11/23
Factor 4:	Fundamental Rights	0.41	91/97	16/18	21/23
Factor 5:	Open Government	0.39	77/97	11/18	15/23
Factor 6:	Regulatory Enforcement	0.41	81/97	11/18	17/23
Factor 7:	Civil Justice	0.46	75/97	14/18	14/23
Factor 8:	Criminal Justice	0.37	86/97	14/18	17/23


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Zambia
- Top Score
- Lower middle income
- ▲ Sub-Saharan Africa


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



1. WJP Rule of Law Index

Income	WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX FACTORS	SCORE	GLOBAL RANKING	REGIONAL RANKING	INCOME GROUP RANKING
Low income	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	0.25	96/97	18/18	15/15
	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	0.26	92/97	16/18	14/15
	Factor 3: Order and Security	0.59	81/97	12/18	12/15
	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	0.31	96/97	18/18	15/15
	Factor 5: Open Government	0.24	97/97	18/18	15/15
	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	0.35	92/97	15/18	12/15
	Factor 7: Civil Justice	0.40	90/97	16/18	12/15
	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	0.43	67/97	10/18	8/15

Region
Sub-Saharan Africa

Population
13m (2012)
39% Urban
41% in three largest cities


2. Scores for all WJP Rule of Law Index sub-factors

In each graph, a sub-factor is represented by a radius from the center of the circle to the periphery. The center of each circle corresponds to the lowest possible score for each sub-factor (0.00); the outer edge of the circle marks the highest possible score (1.00).


Key

- Zimbabwe (Purple square)
- Top Score (Black circle)
- Low income (Orange square)
- Sub-Saharan Africa (Green triangle)


Accountable Government




Security and Fundamental Rights



Open Government and Regulatory Enforcement



Delivery of Justice



Data Tables |

Countries Ranked by Factor

FACTOR 1: LIMITED GOVERNMENT POWERS

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Denmark	0.93	1/97	1/16	1/29
Sweden	0.92	2/97	2/16	2/29
Norway	0.90	3/97	3/16	3/29
Finland	0.89	4/97	4/16	4/29
Australia	0.88	5/97	1/14	5/29
New Zealand	0.87	6/97	2/14	6/29
Netherlands	0.86	7/97	5/16	7/29
Austria	0.82	8/97	6/16	8/29
Germany	0.82	9/97	7/16	9/29
Japan	0.80	10/97	3/14	10/29
France	0.80	11/97	8/16	11/29
Estonia	0.79	12/97	1/21	12/29
United Kingdom	0.79	13/97	9/16	13/29
Poland	0.78	14/97	2/21	14/29
Canada	0.78	15/97	10/16	15/29
Belgium	0.78	16/97	11/16	16/29
United States	0.77	17/97	12/16	17/29
Spain	0.75	18/97	13/16	18/29
Chile	0.74	19/97	1/16	1/30
Botswana	0.73	20/97	1/18	2/30
Singapore	0.73	21/97	4/14	19/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.73	22/97	5/14	20/29
Ghana	0.72	23/97	2/18	1/15
Portugal	0.71	24/97	14/16	21/29
Czech Republic	0.71	25/97	3/21	22/29
Uruguay	0.70	26/97	2/16	3/30
Italy	0.67	27/97	15/16	23/29
Republic of Korea	0.66	28/97	6/14	24/29
Indonesia	0.64	29/97	7/14	1/23
Slovenia	0.64	30/97	4/21	25/29
Greece	0.64	31/97	16/16	26/29
Peru	0.64	32/97	3/16	4/30
Hungary	0.63	33/97	5/21	27/29
South Africa	0.62	34/97	3/18	5/30
Brazil	0.62	35/97	4/16	6/30
Croatia	0.61	36/97	6/21	28/29
India	0.61	37/97	1/5	2/23
Jamaica	0.60	38/97	5/16	7/30
Romania	0.58	39/97	7/21	8/30
Egypt	0.58	40/97	1/7	3/23
Tunisia	0.58	41/97	2/7	9/30
Senegal	0.57	42/97	4/18	4/23
Morocco	0.57	43/97	3/7	5/23
Lebanon	0.57	44/97	4/7	10/30
Malaysia	0.57	45/97	8/14	11/30
Philippines	0.56	46/97	9/14	6/23
Sri Lanka	0.56	47/97	2/5	7/23
UAE	0.55	48/97	5/7	29/29
Sierra Leone	0.55	49/97	5/18	2/15
Mexico	0.55	50/97	6/16	12/30
Jordan	0.55	51/97	6/7	13/30
Tanzania	0.55	52/97	6/18	3/15
Colombia	0.55	53/97	7/16	14/30
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.55	54/97	8/21	15/30
Thailand	0.53	55/97	10/14	16/30
Liberia	0.53	56/97	7/18	4/15
Dominican Republic	0.53	57/97	8/16	17/30
Guatemala	0.52	58/97	9/16	8/23
Macedonia	0.52	59/97	9/21	18/30
Bulgaria	0.51	60/97	10/21	19/30
Zambia	0.51	61/97	8/18	9/23
Nepal	0.51	62/97	3/5	5/15
Mongolia	0.50	63/97	11/14	10/23
El Salvador	0.50	64/97	10/16	11/23
Malawi	0.49	65/97	9/18	6/15
Georgia	0.48	66/97	11/21	12/23
Serbia	0.48	67/97	12/21	20/30
Turkey	0.47	68/97	13/21	21/30
Pakistan	0.46	69/97	4/5	13/23
Argentina	0.46	70/97	11/16	22/30
Albania	0.46	71/97	14/21	14/23
Panama	0.45	72/97	12/16	23/30
Madagascar	0.45	73/97	10/18	7/15
Nigeria	0.45	74/97	11/18	15/23
Kenya	0.45	75/97	12/18	8/15
Kyrgyzstan	0.44	76/97	15/21	9/15
Moldova	0.43	77/97	16/21	16/23
Uganda	0.43	78/97	13/18	10/15
Burkina Faso	0.43	79/97	14/18	11/15
Cote d'Ivoire	0.43	80/97	15/18	17/23
Ecuador	0.41	81/97	13/16	24/30
Vietnam	0.40	82/97	12/14	18/23
Bangladesh	0.40	83/97	5/5	12/15
Bolivia	0.38	84/97	14/16	19/23
Iran	0.37	85/97	7/7	25/30
China	0.36	86/97	13/14	26/30
Ukraine	0.36	87/97	17/21	20/23
Ethiopia	0.36	88/97	16/18	13/15
Kazakhstan	0.35	89/97	18/21	27/30
Cambodia	0.34	90/97	14/14	14/15
Belarus	0.34	91/97	19/21	28/30
Russia	0.31	92/97	20/21	29/30
Nicaragua	0.31	93/97	15/16	21/23
Cameroon	0.31	94/97	17/18	22/23
Venezuela	0.25	95/97	16/16	30/30
Zimbabwe	0.25	96/97	18/18	15/15
Uzbekistan	0.24	97/97	21/21	23/23

FACTOR 2: ABSENCE OF CORRUPTION

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Sweden	0.96	1/97	1/16	1/29
Denmark	0.95	2/97	2/16	2/29
Norway	0.94	3/97	3/16	3/29
Finland	0.93	4/97	4/16	4/29
Netherlands	0.93	5/97	5/16	5/29
New Zealand	0.92	6/97	1/14	6/29
Singapore	0.91	7/97	2/14	7/29
Australia	0.90	8/97	3/14	8/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.89	9/97	4/14	9/29
Japan	0.84	10/97	5/14	10/29
Germany	0.82	11/97	6/16	11/29
Canada	0.81	12/97	7/16	12/29
France	0.80	13/97	8/16	13/29
Spain	0.80	14/97	9/16	14/29
United Kingdom	0.80	15/97	10/16	15/29
Belgium	0.78	16/97	11/16	16/29
Uruguay	0.78	17/97	1/16	1/30
United States	0.78	18/97	12/16	17/29
Estonia	0.77	19/97	1/21	18/29
Austria	0.77	20/97	13/16	19/29
Georgia	0.77	21/97	2/21	1/23
Botswana	0.75	22/97	1/18	2/30
UAE	0.74	23/97	1/7	20/29
Chile	0.74	24/97	2/16	3/30
Republic of Korea	0.74	25/97	6/14	21/29
Hungary	0.72	26/97	3/21	22/29
Poland	0.72	27/97	4/21	23/29
Malaysia	0.69	28/97	7/14	4/30
Portugal	0.68	29/97	14/16	24/29
Italy	0.62	30/97	15/16	25/29
Slovenia	0.62	31/97	5/21	26/29
Czech Republic	0.62	32/97	6/21	27/29
Jordan	0.57	33/97	2/7	5/30
Greece	0.56	34/97	16/16	28/29
Turkey	0.55	35/97	7/21	6/30
Macedonia	0.55	36/97	8/21	7/30
Croatia	0.55	37/97	9/21	29/29
Brazil	0.52	38/97	3/16	8/30
Tunisia	0.52	39/97	3/7	9/30
China	0.52	40/97	8/14	10/30
Egypt	0.51	41/97	4/7	2/23
Jamaica	0.51	42/97	4/16	11/30
Sri Lanka	0.51	43/97	1/5	3/23
Belarus	0.50	44/97	10/21	12/30
Romania	0.50	45/97	11/21	13/30
South Africa	0.50	46/97	2/18	14/30
Burkina Faso	0.50	47/97	3/18	1/15
Senegal	0.49	48/97	4/18	4/23
Iran	0.49	49/97	5/7	15/30
Argentina	0.47	50/97	5/16	16/30
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.47	51/97	12/21	17/30
Ecuador	0.47	52/97	6/16	18/30
Bulgaria	0.46	53/97	13/21	19/30
El Salvador	0.45	54/97	7/16	5/23
Ghana	0.45	55/97	5/18	2/15
Zambia	0.44	56/97	6/18	6/23
Malawi	0.44	57/97	7/18	3/15
Ethiopia	0.44	58/97	8/18	4/15
Colombia	0.44	59/97	8/16	20/30
Vietnam	0.43	60/97	9/14	7/23
Serbia	0.42	61/97	14/21	21/30
Lebanon	0.42	62/97	6/7	22/30
Philippines	0.41	63/97	10/14	8/23
Panama	0.41	64/97	9/16	23/30
Thailand	0.41	65/97	11/14	24/30
Tanzania	0.41	66/97	9/18	5/15
Mongolia	0.40	67/97	12/14	9/23
Nepal	0.40	68/97	2/5	6/15
Nicaragua	0.40	69/97	10/16	10/23
Cote d'Ivoire	0.39	70/97	10/18	11/23
Russia	0.39	71/97	15/21	25/30
Madagascar	0.39	72/97	11/18	7/15
Kazakhstan	0.38	73/97	16/21	26/30
Mexico	0.37	74/97	11/16	27/30
Peru	0.37	75/97	12/16	28/30
Sierra Leone	0.36	76/97	12/18	8/15
Dominican Republic	0.36	77/97	13/16	29/30
Liberia	0.36	78/97	13/18	9/15
Moldova	0.33	79/97	17/21	12/23
Morocco	0.33	80/97	7/7	13/23
Venezuela	0.32	81/97	14/16	30/30
Uganda	0.32	82/97	14/18	10/15
India	0.32	83/97	3/5	14/23
Albania	0.31	84/97	18/21	15/23
Cambodia	0.31	85/97	13/14	11/15
Indonesia	0.30	86/97	14/14	16/23
Uzbekistan	0.30	87/97	19/21	17/23
Guatemala	0.29	88/97	15/16	18/23
Bangladesh	0.29	89/97	4/5	12/15
Pakistan	0.28	90/97	5/5	19/23
Kenya	0.27	91/97	15/18	13/15
Zimbabwe	0.26	92/97	16/18	14/15
Kyrgyzstan	0.26	93/97	20/21	15/15
Ukraine	0.25	94/97	21/21	20/23
Nigeria	0.25	95/97	17/18	21/23
Bolivia	0.24	96/97	16/16	22/23
Cameroon	0.20	97/97	18/18	23/23

FACTOR 3: ORDER AND SECURITY

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Singapore	0.93	1/97	1/14	1/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.93	2/97	2/14	2/29
Finland	0.92	3/97	1/16	3/29
Denmark	0.91	4/97	2/16	4/29
UAE	0.91	5/97	1/7	5/29
Sweden	0.89	6/97	3/16	6/29
Japan	0.89	7/97	3/14	7/29
Uzbekistan	0.89	8/97	1/21	1/23
Austria	0.89	9/97	4/16	8/29
Canada	0.88	10/97	5/16	9/29
Norway	0.87	11/97	6/16	10/29
New Zealand	0.87	12/97	4/14	11/29
Germany	0.86	13/97	7/16	12/29
Netherlands	0.86	14/97	8/16	13/29
Australia	0.86	15/97	5/14	14/29
Malaysia	0.86	16/97	6/14	1/30
United Kingdom	0.84	17/97	9/16	15/29
France	0.84	18/97	10/16	16/29
Georgia	0.84	19/97	2/21	2/23
Belgium	0.84	20/97	11/16	17/29
Hungary	0.83	21/97	3/21	18/29
United States	0.83	22/97	12/16	19/29
Estonia	0.82	23/97	4/21	20/29
Vietnam	0.82	24/97	7/14	3/23
Republic of Korea	0.82	25/97	8/14	21/29
Czech Republic	0.81	26/97	5/21	22/29
Poland	0.81	27/97	6/21	23/29
Romania	0.80	28/97	7/21	2/30
Slovenia	0.80	29/97	8/21	24/29
Spain	0.79	30/97	13/16	25/29
Tunisia	0.79	31/97	2/7	3/30
China	0.78	32/97	9/14	4/30
Belarus	0.78	33/97	9/21	5/30
Croatia	0.77	34/97	10/21	26/29
Moldova	0.77	35/97	11/21	4/23
Italy	0.76	36/97	14/16	27/29
Botswana	0.76	37/97	1/18	6/30
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.76	38/97	12/21	7/30
Madagascar	0.76	39/97	2/18	1/15
Serbia	0.75	40/97	13/21	8/30
Macedonia	0.75	41/97	14/21	9/30
Jordan	0.75	42/97	3/7	10/30
Mongolia	0.75	43/97	10/14	5/23
Ukraine	0.74	44/97	15/21	6/23
Portugal	0.74	45/97	15/16	28/29
Kazakhstan	0.74	46/97	16/21	11/30
Bulgaria	0.74	47/97	17/21	12/30
Kyrgyzstan	0.74	48/97	18/21	2/15
Greece	0.73	49/97	16/16	29/29
Albania	0.73	50/97	19/21	7/23
Morocco	0.72	51/97	4/7	8/23
Indonesia	0.72	52/97	11/14	9/23
Chile	0.70	53/97	1/16	13/30
Cambodia	0.70	54/97	12/14	3/15
Burkina Faso	0.70	55/97	3/18	4/15
Uruguay	0.70	56/97	2/16	14/30
Malawi	0.69	57/97	4/18	5/15
Nepal	0.69	58/97	1/5	6/15
Panama	0.68	59/97	3/16	15/30
Lebanon	0.68	60/97	5/7	16/30
Ghana	0.68	61/97	5/18	7/15
Iran	0.68	62/97	6/7	17/30
Bolivia	0.67	63/97	4/16	10/23
Zambia	0.67	64/97	6/18	11/23
Egypt	0.67	65/97	7/17	12/23
Senegal	0.65	66/97	7/18	13/23
Sierra Leone	0.64	67/97	8/18	8/15
Nicaragua	0.64	68/97	5/16	14/23
Brazil	0.64	69/97	6/16	18/30
Turkey	0.63	70/97	20/21	19/30
Thailand	0.63	71/97	13/14	20/30
Bangladesh	0.62	72/97	2/5	9/15
Peru	0.62	73/97	7/16	21/30
Kenya	0.62	74/97	9/18	10/15
Cameroon	0.62	75/97	10/18	15/23
Tanzania	0.61	76/97	11/18	11/15
Philippines	0.60	77/97	14/14	16/23
Venezuela	0.60	78/97	8/16	22/30
Jamaica	0.60	79/97	9/16	23/30
Argentina	0.60	80/97	10/16	24/30
Zimbabwe	0.59	81/97	12/18	12/15
Guatemala	0.59	82/97	11/16	17/23
El Salvador	0.58	83/97	12/16	18/23
Cote d'Ivoire	0.58	84/97	13/18	19/23
Ecuador	0.56	85/97	13/16	25/30
Ethiopia	0.56	86/97	14/18	13/15
Liberia	0.56	87/97	15/18	14/15
South Africa	0.56	88/97	16/18	26/30
Sri Lanka	0.54	89/97	3/5	20/23
Venezuela	0.51	90/97	14/16	27/30
Mexico	0.50	91/97	15/16	28/30
Russia	0.49	92/97	21/21	29/30
Uganda	0.48	93/97	17/18	15/15
Nigeria	0.47	94/97	18/18	21/23
Colombia	0.43	95/97	16/16	30/30
India	0.39	96/97	4/5	22/23
Pakistan	0.29	97/97	5/5	23/23

FACTOR 4: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Sweden	0.93	1/97	1/16	1/29
Denmark	0.91	2/97	2/16	2/29
Norway	0.90	3/97	3/16	3/29
Finland	0.90	4/97	4/16	4/29
New Zealand	0.86	5/97	1/14	5/29
Spain	0.86	6/97	5/16	6/29
Poland	0.85	7/97	1/21	7/29
Australia	0.84	8/97	2/14	8/29
Netherlands	0.84	9/97	6/16	9/29
Austria	0.82	10/97	7/16	10/29
Belgium	0.81	11/97	8/16	11/29
Germany	0.80	12/97	9/16	12/29
Estonia	0.79	13/97	2/21	13/29
France	0.79	14/97	10/16	14/29
Czech Republic	0.79	15/97	3/21	15/29
United Kingdom	0.78	16/97	11/16	16/29
Japan	0.78	17/97	3/14	17/29
Canada	0.78	18/97	12/16	18/29
Slovenia	0.78	19/97	4/21	19/29
Republic of Korea	0.76	20/97	4/14	20/29
Portugal	0.75	21/97	13/16	21/29
Uruguay	0.75	22/97	1/16	1/30
Romania	0.73	23/97	5/21	2/30
Chile	0.73	24/97	2/16	3/30
United States	0.73	25/97	14/16	22/29
Singapore	0.73	26/97	5/14	23/29
Italy	0.72	27/97	15/16	24/29
Greece	0.72	28/97	16/16	25/29
Ghana	0.72	29/97	1/18	1/15
Hungary	0.72	30/97	6/21	26/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.71	31/97	6/14	27/29
Peru	0.70	32/97	3/16	4/30
Brazil	0.69	33/97	4/16	5/30
Bulgaria	0.68	34/97	7/21	6/30
Croatia	0.67	35/97	8/21	28/29
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.67	36/97	9/21	7/30
Dominican Republic	0.67	37/97	5/16	8/30
Thailand	0.66	38/97	7/14	9/30
Lebanon	0.65	39/97	1/7	10/30
South Africa	0.64	40/97	2/18	11/30
Macedonia	0.64	41/97	10/21	12/30
Albania	0.63	42/97	11/21	1/23
Argentina	0.63	43/97	6/16	13/30
Sierra Leone	0.63	44/97	3/18	2/15
Panama	0.63	45/97	7/16	14/30
Mongolia	0.62	46/97	8/14	2/23
Senegal	0.62	47/97	4/18	3/23
Serbia	0.61	48/97	12/21	15/30
Georgia	0.61	49/97	13/21	4/23
Sri Lanka	0.60	50/97	1/5	5/23
Botswana	0.59	51/97	5/18	16/30
Guatemala	0.59	52/97	8/16	6/23
Nepal	0.59	53/97	2/5	3/15
Jamaica	0.59	54/97	9/16	17/30
Burkina Faso	0.59	55/97	6/18	4/15
Ukraine	0.58	56/97	14/21	7/23
El Salvador	0.58	57/97	10/16	8/23
Madagascar	0.58	58/97	7/18	5/15
Philippines	0.57	59/97	9/14	9/23
Mexico	0.56	60/97	11/16	18/30
Indonesia	0.56	61/97	10/14	10/23
Ecuador	0.56	62/97	12/16	19/30
Tunisia	0.56	63/97	2/7	20/30
India	0.56	64/97	3/5	11/23
Colombia	0.55	65/97	13/16	21/30
Moldova	0.54	66/97	15/21	12/23
Nicaragua	0.54	67/97	14/16	13/23
Kenya	0.54	68/97	8/18	6/15
Tanzania	0.53	69/97	9/18	7/15
Liberia	0.52	70/97	10/18	8/15
Kyrgyzstan	0.51	71/97	16/21	9/15
Cote d'Ivoire	0.50	72/97	11/18	14/23
Malaysia	0.50	73/97	11/14	22/30
Kazakhstan	0.50	74/97	17/21	23/30
Jordan	0.50	75/97	3/7	24/30
Turkey	0.49	76/97	18/21	25/30
Bolivia	0.49	77/97	15/16	15/23
Venezuela	0.48	78/97	16/16	26/30
Vietnam	0.48	79/97	12/14	16/23
Morocco	0.48	80/97	4/7	17/23
Malawi	0.47	81/97	12/18	10/15
UAE	0.47	82/97	5/7	29/29
Russia	0.47	83/97	19/21	27/30
Belarus	0.45	84/97	20/21	28/30
Nigeria	0.45	85/97	13/18	18/23
Uganda	0.43	86/97	14/18	11/15
Bangladesh	0.43	87/97	4/5	12/15
Cambodia	0.43	88/97	13/14	13/15
Egypt	0.43	89/97	6/7	19/23
Cameroon	0.42	90/97	15/18	20/23
Zambia	0.41	91/97	16/18	21/23
Ethiopia	0.41	92/97	17/18	14/15
Pakistan	0.40	93/97	5/5	22/23
China	0.35	94/97	14/14	29/30
Uzbekistan	0.34	95/97	21/21	23/23
Zimbabwe	0.31	96/97	18/18	15/15
Iran	0.27	97/97	7/7	30/30

FACTOR 5: OPEN GOVERNMENT

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Sweden	0.93	1/97	1/16	1/29
Netherlands	0.90	2/97	2/16	2/29
Norway	0.84	3/97	3/16	3/29
New Zealand	0.84	4/97	1/14	4/29
Australia	0.84	5/97	2/14	5/29
Canada	0.84	6/97	4/16	6/29
Finland	0.84	7/97	5/16	7/29
Denmark	0.82	8/97	6/16	8/29
Japan	0.82	9/97	3/14	9/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.82	10/97	4/14	10/29
Austria	0.80	11/97	7/16	11/29
United Kingdom	0.78	12/97	8/16	12/29
United States	0.77	13/97	9/16	13/29
France	0.75	14/97	10/16	14/29
Republic of Korea	0.74	15/97	5/14	15/29
Germany	0.73	16/97	11/16	16/29
Estonia	0.71	17/97	1/21	17/29
Chile	0.68	18/97	1/16	1/30
Singapore	0.67	19/97	6/14	18/29
Botswana	0.67	20/97	1/18	2/30
Belgium	0.67	21/97	12/16	19/29
Slovenia	0.63	22/97	2/21	20/29
Macedonia	0.62	23/97	3/21	3/30
Uruguay	0.62	24/97	2/16	4/30
Portugal	0.62	25/97	13/16	21/29
Spain	0.61	26/97	14/16	22/29
South Africa	0.61	27/97	2/18	5/30
Panama	0.60	28/97	3/16	6/30
Poland	0.59	29/97	4/21	23/29
Ghana	0.55	30/97	3/18	1/15
Brazil	0.54	31/97	4/16	7/30
Mexico	0.53	32/97	5/16	8/30
Bulgaria	0.53	33/97	5/21	9/30
Croatia	0.53	34/97	6/21	24/29
Indonesia	0.53	35/97	7/14	1/23
Dominican Republic	0.52	36/97	6/16	10/30
Hungary	0.52	37/97	7/21	25/29
Colombia	0.51	38/97	7/16	11/30
Morocco	0.51	39/97	1/7	2/23
Romania	0.51	40/97	8/21	12/30
Greece	0.51	41/97	15/16	26/29
Thailand	0.50	42/97	8/14	13/30
Sri Lanka	0.50	43/97	1/5	3/23
Madagascar	0.50	44/97	4/18	2/15
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.49	45/97	9/21	14/30
Czech Republic	0.49	46/97	10/21	27/29
Italy	0.49	47/97	16/16	28/29
Malaysia	0.48	48/97	9/14	15/30
Argentina	0.48	49/97	8/16	16/30
India	0.48	50/97	2/5	4/23
Egypt	0.48	51/97	2/7	5/23
Nicaragua	0.48	52/97	9/16	6/23
Lebanon	0.47	53/97	3/7	17/30
Georgia	0.47	54/97	11/21	7/23
Tunisia	0.46	55/97	4/7	18/30
Jordan	0.46	56/97	5/7	19/30
Turkey	0.46	57/97	12/21	20/30
Guatemala	0.46	58/97	10/16	8/23
Philippines	0.46	59/97	10/14	9/23
Albania	0.44	60/97	13/21	10/23
Kyrgyzstan	0.44	61/97	14/21	3/15
Ukraine	0.44	62/97	15/21	11/23
UAE	0.44	63/97	6/7	29/29
Kenya	0.44	64/97	5/18	4/15
Serbia	0.44	65/97	16/21	21/30
Moldova	0.43	66/97	17/21	12/23
Peru	0.43	67/97	11/16	22/30
Malawi	0.43	68/97	6/18	5/15
China	0.42	69/97	11/14	23/30
Jamaica	0.41	70/97	12/16	24/30
Tanzania	0.41	71/97	7/18	6/15
Bolivia	0.41	72/97	13/16	13/23
Burkina Faso	0.41	73/97	8/18	7/15
Russia	0.41	74/97	18/21	25/30
Senegal	0.41	75/97	9/18	14/23
Liberia	0.39	76/97	10/18	8/15
Zambia	0.39	77/97	11/18	15/23
Iran	0.38	78/97	7/7	26/30
Nepal	0.38	79/97	3/5	9/15
Ecuador	0.38	80/97	14/16	27/30
Cote d'Ivoire	0.37	81/97	12/18	16/23
El Salvador	0.37	82/97	15/16	17/23
Cambodia	0.37	83/97	12/14	10/15
Venezuela	0.36	84/97	16/16	28/30
Kazakhstan	0.36	85/97	19/21	29/30
Uganda	0.36	86/97	13/18	11/15
Belarus	0.36	87/97	20/21	30/30
Uzbekistan	0.36	88/97	21/21	18/23
Bangladesh	0.35	89/97	4/5	12/15
Nigeria	0.35	90/97	14/18	19/23
Vietnam	0.35	91/97	13/14	20/23
Pakistan	0.35	92/97	5/5	21/23
Mongolia	0.35	93/97	14/14	22/23
Ethiopia	0.29	94/97	15/18	13/15
Cameroon	0.27	95/97	16/18	23/23
Sierra Leone	0.26	96/97	17/18	14/15
Zimbabwe	0.24	97/97	18/18	15/15

FACTOR 6: REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Sweden	0.89	1/97	1/16	1/29
Japan	0.87	2/97	1/14	2/29
Denmark	0.85	3/97	2/16	3/29
Austria	0.84	4/97	3/16	4/29
Australia	0.83	5/97	2/14	5/29
Norway	0.83	6/97	4/16	6/29
Netherlands	0.83	7/97	5/16	7/29
Finland	0.82	8/97	6/16	8/29
New Zealand	0.82	9/97	3/14	9/29
Singapore	0.80	10/97	4/14	10/29
United Kingdom	0.79	11/97	7/16	11/29
Canada	0.79	12/97	8/16	12/29
France	0.76	13/97	9/16	13/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.75	14/97	5/14	14/29
Germany	0.73	15/97	10/16	15/29
Estonia	0.73	16/97	1/21	16/29
Botswana	0.71	17/97	1/18	1/30
Uruguay	0.71	18/97	1/16	2/30
United States	0.70	19/97	11/16	17/29
Belgium	0.70	20/97	12/16	18/29
Republic of Korea	0.67	21/97	6/14	19/29
Spain	0.67	22/97	13/16	20/29
Chile	0.66	23/97	2/16	3/30
UAE	0.65	24/97	1/7	21/29
Georgia	0.63	25/97	2/21	1/23
Poland	0.61	26/97	3/21	22/29
Hungary	0.60	27/97	4/21	23/29
Czech Republic	0.59	28/97	5/21	24/29
Jordan	0.59	29/97	2/7	4/30
Slovenia	0.59	30/97	6/21	25/29
Senegal	0.58	31/97	2/18	2/23
Portugal	0.57	32/97	14/16	26/29
Burkina Faso	0.56	33/97	3/18	1/15
Macedonia	0.56	34/97	7/21	5/30
Belarus	0.56	35/97	8/21	6/30
Italy	0.56	36/97	15/16	27/29
Brazil	0.56	37/97	3/16	7/30
Tunisia	0.55	38/97	3/7	8/30
Turkey	0.55	39/97	9/21	9/30
Jamaica	0.55	40/97	4/16	10/30
Iran	0.54	41/97	4/7	11/30
South Africa	0.54	42/97	4/18	12/30
Greece	0.54	43/97	16/16	28/29
Romania	0.54	44/97	10/21	13/30
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.53	45/97	11/21	14/30
Malaysia	0.52	46/97	7/14	15/30
Ghana	0.52	47/97	5/18	2/15
Sri Lanka	0.52	48/97	1/5	3/23
Colombia	0.52	49/97	5/16	16/30
El Salvador	0.52	50/97	6/16	4/23
Panama	0.52	51/97	7/16	17/30
Philippines	0.51	52/97	8/14	5/23
Thailand	0.51	53/97	9/14	18/30
Indonesia	0.50	54/97	10/14	6/23
Bulgaria	0.50	55/97	12/21	19/30
Mexico	0.49	56/97	8/16	20/30
Croatia	0.48	57/97	13/21	29/29
Cote d'Ivoire	0.48	58/97	6/18	7/23
Peru	0.48	59/97	9/16	21/30
Mongolia	0.48	60/97	11/14	8/23
Morocco	0.47	61/97	5/7	9/23
Ecuador	0.46	62/97	10/16	22/30
Madagascar	0.46	63/97	7/18	3/15
Uzbekistan	0.46	64/97	14/21	10/23
Malawi	0.45	65/97	8/18	4/15
Dominican Republic	0.45	66/97	11/16	23/30
Nicaragua	0.45	67/97	12/16	11/23
Russia	0.45	68/97	15/21	24/30
Tanzania	0.44	69/97	9/18	5/15
Nepal	0.44	70/97	2/5	6/15
Kazakhstan	0.44	71/97	16/21	25/30
Guatemala	0.43	72/97	13/16	12/23
Kyrgyzstan	0.43	73/97	17/21	7/15
Serbia	0.43	74/97	18/21	26/30
Argentina	0.43	75/97	14/16	27/30
Albania	0.43	76/97	19/21	13/23
Egypt	0.42	77/97	6/7	14/23
Nigeria	0.42	78/97	10/18	15/23
India	0.41	79/97	3/5	16/23
China	0.41	80/97	12/14	28/30
Zambia	0.41	81/97	11/18	17/23
Kenya	0.39	82/97	12/18	8/15
Vietnam	0.39	83/97	13/14	18/23
Moldova	0.39	84/97	20/21	19/23
Lebanon	0.38	85/97	7/7	29/30
Uganda	0.38	86/97	13/18	9/15
Bolivia	0.37	87/97	15/16	20/23
Pakistan	0.36	88/97	4/5	21/23
Ethiopia	0.36	89/97	14/18	10/15
Bangladesh	0.36	90/97	5/5	11/15
Ukraine	0.35	91/97	21/21	22/23
Zimbabwe	0.35	92/97	15/18	12/15
Sierra Leone	0.33	93/97	16/18	13/15
Cambodia	0.33	94/97	14/14	14/15
Venezuela	0.33	95/97	16/16	30/30
Cameroon	0.28	96/97	17/18	23/23
Liberia	0.23	97/97	18/18	15/15

FACTOR 7: CIVIL JUSTICE

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Norway	0.82	1/97	1/16	1/29
Netherlands	0.80	2/97	2/16	2/29
Germany	0.80	3/97	3/16	3/29
Singapore	0.79	4/97	1/14	4/29
Finland	0.79	5/97	4/16	5/29
Denmark	0.79	6/97	5/16	6/29
Sweden	0.78	7/97	6/16	7/29
Japan	0.77	8/97	2/14	8/29
New Zealand	0.76	9/97	3/14	9/29
Austria	0.74	10/97	7/16	10/29
United Kingdom	0.72	11/97	8/16	11/29
Australia	0.72	12/97	4/14	12/29
Canada	0.72	13/97	9/16	13/29
Republic of Korea	0.72	14/97	5/14	14/29
Uruguay	0.71	15/97	1/16	1/30
Estonia	0.71	16/97	1/21	15/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.71	17/97	6/14	16/29
France	0.68	18/97	10/16	17/29
Belgium	0.68	19/97	11/16	18/29
Chile	0.66	20/97	2/16	2/30
Botswana	0.65	21/97	1/18	3/30
United States	0.65	22/97	12/16	19/29
Czech Republic	0.65	23/97	2/21	20/29
Spain	0.65	24/97	13/16	21/29
Jordan	0.65	25/97	1/7	4/30
Belarus	0.63	26/97	3/21	5/30
Poland	0.63	27/97	4/21	22/29
Iran	0.62	28/97	2/7	6/30
Portugal	0.62	29/97	14/16	23/29
Greece	0.61	30/97	15/16	24/29
Georgia	0.61	31/97	5/21	1/23
Ghana	0.61	32/97	2/18	1/15
UAE	0.60	33/97	3/7	25/29
Slovenia	0.60	34/97	6/21	26/29
Malawi	0.59	35/97	3/18	2/15
Burkina Faso	0.59	36/97	4/18	3/15
Romania	0.59	37/97	7/21	7/30
Senegal	0.58	38/97	5/18	2/23
Malaysia	0.57	39/97	7/14	8/30
Bulgaria	0.57	40/97	8/21	9/30
Italy	0.56	41/97	16/16	27/29
Tunisia	0.56	42/97	4/7	10/30
Brazil	0.55	43/97	3/16	11/30
Turkey	0.55	44/97	9/21	12/30
Hungary	0.55	45/97	10/21	28/29
South Africa	0.55	46/97	6/18	13/30
Sierra Leone	0.54	47/97	7/18	4/15
Morocco	0.54	48/97	5/7	3/23
Argentina	0.54	49/97	4/16	14/30
Madagascar	0.53	50/97	8/18	5/15
Colombia	0.53	51/97	5/16	15/30
Macedonia	0.53	52/97	11/21	16/30
Nigeria	0.53	53/97	9/18	4/23
Mongolia	0.53	54/97	8/14	5/23
Sri Lanka	0.52	55/97	1/5	6/23
Ukraine	0.52	56/97	12/21	7/23
Uganda	0.51	57/97	10/18	6/15
Croatia	0.51	58/97	13/21	29/29
Dominican Republic	0.51	59/97	6/16	17/30
Cote d'Ivoire	0.51	60/97	11/18	8/23
Albania	0.51	61/97	14/21	9/23
Jamaica	0.51	62/97	7/16	18/30
Panama	0.51	63/97	8/16	19/30
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.50	64/97	15/21	20/30
Russia	0.50	65/97	16/21	21/30
Indonesia	0.49	66/97	9/14	10/23
El Salvador	0.49	67/97	9/16	11/23
Uzbekistan	0.49	68/97	17/21	12/23
Kazakhstan	0.49	69/97	18/21	22/30
Tanzania	0.48	70/97	12/18	7/15
Kenya	0.47	71/97	13/18	8/15
Serbia	0.47	72/97	19/21	23/30
Egypt	0.47	73/97	6/7	13/23
Kyrgyzstan	0.46	74/97	20/21	9/15
Zambia	0.46	75/97	14/18	14/23
Ethiopia	0.46	76/97	15/18	10/15
Lebanon	0.45	77/97	7/7	24/30
India	0.45	78/97	2/5	15/23
Vietnam	0.43	79/97	10/14	16/23
Thailand	0.43	80/97	11/14	25/30
Peru	0.43	81/97	10/16	26/30
China	0.43	82/97	12/14	27/30
Nepal	0.43	83/97	3/5	11/15
Philippines	0.43	84/97	13/14	17/23
Ecuador	0.42	85/97	11/16	28/30
Nicaragua	0.42	86/97	12/16	18/23
Moldova	0.42	87/97	21/21	19/23
Guatemala	0.41	88/97	13/16	20/23
Mexico	0.40	89/97	14/16	29/30
Zimbabwe	0.40	90/97	16/18	12/15
Pakistan	0.39	91/97	4/5	21/23
Bolivia	0.38	92/97	15/16	22/23
Venezuela	0.38	93/97	16/16	30/30
Cambodia	0.37	94/97	14/14	13/15
Cameroon	0.35	95/97	17/18	23/23
Liberia	0.33	96/97	18/18	14/15
Bangladesh	0.32	97/97	5/5	15/15

FACTOR 8: CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Country	Score	Global Ranking	Regional Ranking	Income Group Ranking
Denmark	0.87	1/97	1/16	1/29
Finland	0.87	2/97	2/16	2/29
Singapore	0.87	3/97	1/14	3/29
Norway	0.85	4/97	3/16	4/29
Sweden	0.82	5/97	4/16	5/29
Netherlands	0.80	6/97	5/16	6/29
New Zealand	0.79	7/97	2/14	7/29
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.76	8/97	3/14	8/29
Germany	0.76	9/97	6/16	9/29
Republic of Korea	0.76	10/97	4/14	10/29
United Kingdom	0.75	11/97	7/16	11/29
UAE	0.75	12/97	1/7	12/29
Canada	0.75	13/97	8/16	13/29
Estonia	0.75	14/97	1/21	14/29
Austria	0.75	15/97	9/16	15/29
Poland	0.73	16/97	2/21	16/29
Australia	0.72	17/97	5/14	17/29
Botswana	0.72	18/97	1/18	1/30
Belgium	0.72	19/97	10/16	18/29
Czech Republic	0.70	20/97	3/21	19/29
Spain	0.69	21/97	11/16	20/29
France	0.69	22/97	12/16	21/29
Japan	0.68	23/97	6/14	22/29
Italy	0.67	24/97	13/16	23/29
Georgia	0.66	25/97	4/21	1/23
United States	0.65	26/97	14/16	24/29
Hungary	0.64	27/97	5/21	25/29
Portugal	0.62	28/97	15/16	26/29
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.62	29/97	6/21	2/30
Sri Lanka	0.62	30/97	1/5	2/23
Malaysia	0.61	31/97	7/14	3/30
Chile	0.60	32/97	1/16	4/30
Romania	0.60	33/97	7/21	5/30
Belarus	0.59	34/97	8/21	6/30
Thailand	0.59	35/97	8/14	7/30
Slovenia	0.59	36/97	9/21	27/29
Vietnam	0.57	37/97	9/14	3/23
Mongolia	0.54	38/97	10/14	4/23
China	0.54	39/97	11/14	8/30
Nepal	0.54	40/97	2/5	1/15
Macedonia	0.53	41/97	10/21	9/30
Croatia	0.53	42/97	11/21	28/29
Tunisia	0.52	43/97	2/7	10/30
Jordan	0.52	44/97	3/7	11/30
Uruguay	0.50	45/97	2/16	12/30
Greece	0.50	46/97	16/16	29/29
Madagascar	0.49	47/97	2/18	2/15
South Africa	0.49	48/97	3/18	13/30
Ethiopia	0.49	49/97	4/18	3/15
Tanzania	0.49	50/97	5/18	4/15
Lebanon	0.49	51/97	4/7	14/30
Brazil	0.49	52/97	3/16	15/30
Dominican Republic	0.47	53/97	4/16	16/30
Senegal	0.46	54/97	6/18	5/23
Kazakhstan	0.46	55/97	12/21	17/30
Egypt	0.45	56/97	5/7	6/23
Peru	0.45	57/97	5/16	18/30
Malawi	0.45	58/97	7/18	5/15
Iran	0.45	59/97	6/7	19/30
Serbia	0.45	60/97	13/21	20/30
Ghana	0.45	61/97	8/18	6/15
Indonesia	0.45	62/97	12/14	7/23
Burkina Faso	0.45	63/97	9/18	7/15
India	0.44	64/97	3/5	8/23
Ecuador	0.44	65/97	6/16	21/30
Argentina	0.43	66/97	7/16	22/30
Zimbabwe	0.43	67/97	10/18	8/15
Colombia	0.43	68/97	8/16	23/30
Uganda	0.43	69/97	11/18	9/15
Nicaragua	0.42	70/97	9/16	9/23
Turkey	0.42	71/97	14/21	24/30
Philippines	0.42	72/97	13/14	10/23
Jamaica	0.42	73/97	10/16	25/30
Albania	0.41	74/97	15/21	11/23
Moldova	0.40	75/97	16/21	12/23
Kenya	0.40	76/97	12/18	10/15
Cambodia	0.40	77/97	14/14	11/15
Russia	0.40	78/97	17/21	26/30
Ukraine	0.39	79/97	18/21	13/23
Pakistan	0.39	80/97	4/5	14/23
Bulgaria	0.39	81/97	19/21	27/30
Panama	0.38	82/97	11/16	28/30
Bangladesh	0.38	83/97	5/5	12/15
Guatemala	0.37	84/97	12/16	15/23
Cote d'Ivoire	0.37	85/97	13/18	16/23
Zambia	0.37	86/97	14/18	17/23
Sierra Leone	0.36	87/97	15/18	13/15
Uzbekistan	0.36	88/97	20/21	18/23
Morocco	0.35	89/97	7/7	19/23
Kyrgyzstan	0.35	90/97	21/21	14/15
Mexico	0.35	91/97	13/16	29/30
Liberia	0.35	92/97	16/18	15/15
Cameroon	0.32	93/97	17/18	20/23
Nigeria	0.28	94/97	18/18	21/23
Bolivia	0.28	95/97	14/16	22/23
El Salvador	0.25	96/97	15/16	23/23
Venezuela	0.24	97/97	16/16	30/30

Factors & Subfactors

FACTOR 1: LIMITED GOVERNMENT POWERS

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	1.2 Government powers are effectively limited by the legislature	1.3 Government powers are effectively limited by the judiciary	1.4 Government powers are effectively limited by independent auditing and review	1.5 Government officials are sanctioned for misconduct	1.6 Government powers are subject to non-governmental checks	1.7 Transfers of power occur in accordance with the law
Albania	0.46	0.57	0.34	0.37	0.34	0.61	0.52
Argentina	0.46	0.50	0.39	0.44	0.26	0.54	0.63
Australia	0.88	0.91	0.88	0.85	0.81	0.88	0.97
Austria	0.82	0.88	0.80	0.70	0.69	0.90	0.97
Bangladesh	0.40	0.52	0.41	0.39	0.26	0.42	0.41
Belarus	0.34	0.28	0.26	0.41	0.49	0.25	0.32
Belgium	0.78	0.83	0.72	0.81	0.74	0.76	0.82
Bolivia	0.38	0.37	0.25	0.38	0.36	0.41	0.49
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.55	0.65	0.51	0.53	0.39	0.55	0.63
Botswana	0.73	0.76	0.79	0.59	0.70	0.76	0.80
Brazil	0.62	0.73	0.62	0.46	0.38	0.73	0.81
Bulgaria	0.51	0.51	0.41	0.46	0.34	0.68	0.68
Burkina Faso	0.43	0.40	0.41	0.39	0.36	0.50	0.53
Cambodia	0.34	0.43	0.26	0.24	0.37	0.36	0.38
Cameroon	0.31	0.24	0.27	0.44	0.38	0.36	0.16
Canada	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.81	0.71	0.76	0.85
Chile	0.74	0.78	0.66	0.76	0.59	0.74	0.89
China	0.36	0.65	0.45	0.35	0.37	0.11	0.25
Colombia	0.55	0.61	0.49	0.46	0.44	0.61	0.66
Cote d'Ivoire	0.43	0.46	0.35	0.41	0.41	0.45	0.48
Croatia	0.61	0.67	0.49	0.56	0.48	0.68	0.79
Czech Republic	0.71	0.79	0.68	0.69	0.53	0.74	0.84
Denmark	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.94	0.89	0.95	0.96
Dominican Republic	0.53	0.61	0.43	0.39	0.37	0.72	0.66
Ecuador	0.41	0.40	0.28	0.38	0.34	0.51	0.53
Egypt	0.58	0.66	0.64	0.53	0.49	0.60	0.53
El Salvador	0.50	0.69	0.43	0.30	0.28	0.63	0.63
Estonia	0.79	0.77	0.81	0.78	0.78	0.77	0.87
Ethiopia	0.36	0.41	0.34	0.39	0.49	0.25	0.28
Finland	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.91	0.87	0.88	0.94
France	0.80	0.81	0.75	0.70	0.71	0.83	0.98
Georgia	0.48	0.49	0.38	0.43	0.59	0.58	0.44
Germany	0.82	0.86	0.82	0.76	0.76	0.80	0.92
Ghana	0.72	0.84	0.70	0.52	0.55	0.85	0.88
Greece	0.64	0.66	0.58	0.58	0.44	0.73	0.86
Guatemala	0.52	0.61	0.43	0.42	0.26	0.66	0.76
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.73	0.89	0.82	0.74	0.76	0.50	0.64
Hungary	0.63	0.59	0.64	0.42	0.57	0.71	0.83
India	0.61	0.71	0.67	0.49	0.36	0.72	0.71
Indonesia	0.64	0.74	0.54	0.57	0.59	0.73	0.68
Iran	0.37	0.49	0.48	0.32	0.29	0.31	0.33
Italy	0.67	0.73	0.67	0.64	0.54	0.70	0.75
Jamaica	0.60	0.67	0.65	0.52	0.40	0.63	0.72
Japan	0.80	0.89	0.84	0.64	0.79	0.84	0.81
Jordan	0.55	0.62	0.61	0.65	0.58	0.49	0.34
Kazakhstan	0.35	0.36	0.31	0.33	0.37	0.35	0.35
Kenya	0.45	0.56	0.39	0.36	0.34	0.60	0.43
Kyrgyzstan	0.44	0.58	0.30	0.29	0.31	0.57	0.56
Lebanon	0.57	0.74	0.47	0.45	0.43	0.76	0.56

FACTOR 1: LIMITED GOVERNMENT POWERS

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	1.2 Government powers are effectively limited by the legislature	1.3 Government powers are effectively limited by the judiciary	1.4 Government powers are effectively limited by independent auditing and review	1.5 Government officials are sanctioned for misconduct	1.6 Government powers are subject to non-governmental checks	1.7 Transfers of power occur in accordance with the law
Liberia	0.53	0.73	0.49	0.25	0.32	0.69	0.71
Macedonia	0.52	0.51	0.40	0.56	0.43	0.52	0.69
Madagascar	0.45	0.50	0.40	0.45	0.44	0.47	0.45
Malawi	0.49	0.53	0.51	0.43	0.44	0.49	0.51
Malaysia	0.57	0.69	0.59	0.56	0.58	0.40	0.59
Mexico	0.55	0.72	0.49	0.49	0.29	0.63	0.68
Moldova	0.43	0.53	0.34	0.42	0.29	0.50	0.53
Mongolia	0.50	0.62	0.42	0.35	0.38	0.62	0.61
Morocco	0.57	0.67	0.53	0.42	0.49	0.55	0.77
Nepal	0.51	0.60	0.55	0.35	0.32	0.60	0.61
Netherlands	0.86	0.87	0.84	0.86	0.77	0.90	0.91
New Zealand	0.87	0.91	0.87	0.80	0.80	0.88	0.90
Nicaragua	0.31	0.38	0.24	0.24	0.19	0.50	0.30
Nigeria	0.45	0.62	0.49	0.24	0.32	0.55	0.48
Norway	0.90	0.92	0.91	0.84	0.89	0.90	0.93
Pakistan	0.46	0.55	0.52	0.31	0.30	0.58	0.50
Panama	0.45	0.37	0.31	0.43	0.27	0.57	0.77
Peru	0.64	0.72	0.49	0.62	0.38	0.76	0.85
Philippines	0.56	0.76	0.54	0.51	0.43	0.69	0.46
Poland	0.78	0.83	0.72	0.75	0.61	0.84	0.96
Portugal	0.71	0.76	0.65	0.66	0.56	0.75	0.90
Republic of Korea	0.66	0.54	0.55	0.67	0.60	0.71	0.90
Romania	0.58	0.59	0.51	0.50	0.47	0.69	0.72
Russia	0.31	0.32	0.27	0.33	0.29	0.33	0.34
Senegal	0.57	0.51	0.44	0.62	0.51	0.65	0.72
Serbia	0.48	0.55	0.31	0.45	0.31	0.57	0.69
Sierra Leone	0.55	0.67	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.67	0.63
Singapore	0.73	0.65	0.70	0.88	0.82	0.51	0.82
Slovenia	0.64	0.71	0.54	0.66	0.49	0.68	0.77
South Africa	0.62	0.62	0.63	0.53	0.43	0.70	0.73
Spain	0.75	0.80	0.74	0.60	0.58	0.85	0.95
Sri Lanka	0.56	0.60	0.59	0.50	0.48	0.63	0.58
Sweden	0.92	0.89	0.88	0.93	0.88	0.94	0.99
Tanzania	0.55	0.66	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.59	0.56
Thailand	0.53	0.67	0.49	0.46	0.48	0.66	0.45
Tunisia	0.58	0.68	0.55	0.51	0.50	0.60	0.61
Turkey	0.47	0.52	0.46	0.39	0.45	0.43	0.60
UAE	0.55	0.50	0.61	0.63	0.72	0.32	0.54
Uganda	0.43	0.46	0.48	0.36	0.44	0.47	0.39
Ukraine	0.36	0.41	0.23	0.25	0.25	0.52	0.51
United Kingdom	0.79	0.80	0.76	0.79	0.74	0.77	0.85
United States	0.77	0.88	0.76	0.75	0.66	0.80	0.77
Uruguay	0.70	0.72	0.68	0.54	0.64	0.74	0.91
Uzbekistan	0.24	0.05	0.19	0.32	0.36	0.13	0.37
Venezuela	0.25	0.29	0.23	0.14	0.14	0.40	0.30
Vietnam	0.40	0.33	0.28	0.47	0.58	0.27	0.50
Zambia	0.51	0.53	0.35	0.62	0.52	0.37	0.64
Zimbabwe	0.25	0.36	0.29	0.22	0.36	0.13	0.14

FACTOR 2: ABSENCE OF CORRUPTION

Country	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	2.1 Government officials in the Executive Branch do not use public office for private gain	2.2 Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain	2.3 Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain	2.4 Government officials in the legislature do not use public office for private gain
Albania	0.31	0.40	0.24	0.41	0.20
Argentina	0.47	0.45	0.63	0.54	0.28
Australia	0.90	0.89	0.94	0.94	0.82
Austria	0.77	0.76	0.88	0.91	0.54
Bangladesh	0.29	0.34	0.25	0.23	0.34
Belarus	0.50	0.52	0.47	0.65	0.38
Belgium	0.78	0.78	0.88	0.87	0.60
Bolivia	0.24	0.34	0.22	0.22	0.19
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.47	0.43	0.51	0.64	0.29
Botswana	0.75	0.72	0.80	0.77	0.71
Brazil	0.52	0.52	0.67	0.64	0.25
Bulgaria	0.46	0.45	0.47	0.57	0.33
Burkina Faso	0.50	0.51	0.58	0.52	0.38
Cambodia	0.31	0.39	0.19	0.19	0.47
Cameroon	0.20	0.23	0.28	0.19	0.11
Canada	0.81	0.80	0.88	0.85	0.69
Chile	0.74	0.78	0.78	0.83	0.56
China	0.52	0.49	0.40	0.65	0.53
Colombia	0.44	0.52	0.51	0.52	0.20
Cote d'Ivoire	0.39	0.44	0.35	0.47	0.32
Croatia	0.55	0.52	0.62	0.66	0.39
Czech Republic	0.62	0.61	0.79	0.78	0.29
Denmark	0.95	0.94	0.96	0.96	0.95
Dominican Republic	0.36	0.42	0.46	0.45	0.10
Ecuador	0.47	0.55	0.33	0.61	0.38
Egypt	0.51	0.55	0.58	0.50	0.43
El Salvador	0.45	0.47	0.44	0.63	0.27
Estonia	0.77	0.75	0.86	0.91	0.58
Ethiopia	0.44	0.46	0.31	0.49	0.50
Finland	0.93	0.95	0.97	0.97	0.84
France	0.80	0.79	0.84	0.90	0.68
Georgia	0.77	0.76	0.64	0.98	0.70
Germany	0.82	0.83	0.82	0.88	0.66
Ghana	0.45	0.45	0.64	0.27	0.43
Greece	0.56	0.48	0.71	0.77	0.29
Guatemala	0.29	0.39	0.28	0.40	0.11
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.89	0.85	0.93	0.90	0.88
Hungary	0.72	0.66	0.82	0.86	0.55
India	0.32	0.32	0.49	0.29	0.19
Indonesia	0.30	0.41	0.34	0.37	0.11
Iran	0.49	0.46	0.54	0.54	0.40
Italy	0.62	0.61	0.79	0.82	0.27
Jamaica	0.51	0.52	0.70	0.59	0.24
Japan	0.84	0.87	0.84	0.90	0.77
Jordan	0.57	0.59	0.67	0.62	0.40
Kazakhstan	0.38	0.41	0.36	0.45	0.30
Kenya	0.27	0.32	0.44	0.26	0.06
Kyrgyzstan	0.26	0.38	0.17	0.37	0.13
Lebanon	0.42	0.38	0.49	0.55	0.27

FACTOR 2: ABSENCE OF CORRUPTION

Country	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	2.1 Government officials in the Executive Branch do not use public office for private gain	2.2 Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain	2.3 Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain	2.4 Government officials in the legislature do not use public office for private gain
Liberia	0.36	0.31	0.45	0.45	0.22
Macedonia	0.55	0.61	0.40	0.74	0.44
Madagascar	0.39	0.46	0.43	0.39	0.28
Malawi	0.44	0.41	0.65	0.38	0.31
Malaysia	0.69	0.63	0.66	0.75	0.71
Mexico	0.37	0.49	0.34	0.31	0.33
Moldova	0.33	0.45	0.17	0.41	0.29
Mongolia	0.40	0.45	0.46	0.54	0.16
Morocco	0.33	0.37	0.38	0.28	0.28
Nepal	0.40	0.50	0.30	0.61	0.18
Netherlands	0.93	0.91	0.93	0.96	0.92
New Zealand	0.92	0.90	0.94	0.95	0.89
Nicaragua	0.40	0.56	0.23	0.50	0.29
Nigeria	0.25	0.26	0.46	0.21	0.05
Norway	0.94	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.91
Pakistan	0.28	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.15
Panama	0.41	0.49	0.38	0.58	0.19
Peru	0.37	0.46	0.36	0.34	0.30
Philippines	0.41	0.47	0.39	0.61	0.19
Poland	0.72	0.65	0.80	0.88	0.54
Portugal	0.68	0.66	0.77	0.82	0.46
Republic of Korea	0.74	0.75	0.84	0.86	0.49
Romania	0.50	0.47	0.62	0.64	0.27
Russia	0.39	0.46	0.42	0.46	0.22
Senegal	0.49	0.53	0.46	0.60	0.37
Serbia	0.42	0.39	0.45	0.56	0.30
Sierra Leone	0.36	0.40	0.35	0.30	0.39
Singapore	0.91	0.88	0.92	0.88	0.95
Slovenia	0.62	0.61	0.75	0.60	0.52
South Africa	0.50	0.39	0.67	0.61	0.33
Spain	0.80	0.74	0.84	0.90	0.72
Sri Lanka	0.51	0.52	0.64	0.62	0.26
Sweden	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.98	0.95
Tanzania	0.41	0.44	0.41	0.40	0.38
Thailand	0.41	0.43	0.58	0.56	0.06
Tunisia	0.52	0.55	0.55	0.48	0.49
Turkey	0.55	0.51	0.61	0.54	0.55
UAE	0.74	0.76	0.78	0.71	0.73
Uganda	0.32	0.30	0.43	0.25	0.31
Ukraine	0.25	0.24	0.38	0.38	0.02
United Kingdom	0.80	0.82	0.87	0.85	0.66
United States	0.78	0.77	0.88	0.83	0.62
Uruguay	0.78	0.82	0.81	0.77	0.71
Uzbekistan	0.30	0.29	0.29	0.33	0.30
Venezuela	0.32	0.39	0.24	0.37	0.29
Vietnam	0.43	0.40	0.28	0.47	0.57
Zambia	0.44	0.41	0.49	0.38	0.48
Zimbabwe	0.26	0.28	0.40	0.24	0.13

FACTOR 3: ORDER AND SECURITY

Country	Factor 3: Order and Security	3.1 Crime is effectively controlled	3.2 Civil conflict is effectively limited	3.3 People do not resort to violence to redress personal grievances
Albania	0.73	0.86	1.00	0.33
Argentina	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.23
Australia	0.86	0.85	1.00	0.72
Austria	0.89	0.92	1.00	0.73
Bangladesh	0.62	0.67	1.00	0.20
Belarus	0.78	0.82	0.92	0.60
Belgium	0.84	0.82	1.00	0.69
Bolivia	0.67	0.66	1.00	0.36
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.76	0.85	1.00	0.44
Botswana	0.76	0.67	1.00	0.62
Brazil	0.64	0.44	1.00	0.46
Bulgaria	0.74	0.79	1.00	0.43
Burkina Faso	0.70	0.79	1.00	0.32
Cambodia	0.70	0.84	0.92	0.35
Cameroon	0.62	0.74	0.83	0.28
Canada	0.88	0.90	1.00	0.74
Chile	0.70	0.77	1.00	0.34
China	0.78	0.75	0.92	0.68
Colombia	0.43	0.39	0.58	0.31
Cote d'Ivoire	0.58	0.60	0.75	0.37
Croatia	0.77	0.87	1.00	0.43
Czech Republic	0.81	0.80	1.00	0.63
Denmark	0.91	0.89	1.00	0.85
Dominican Republic	0.60	0.58	1.00	0.22
Ecuador	0.56	0.42	1.00	0.27
Egypt	0.67	0.82	0.92	0.27
El Salvador	0.58	0.46	1.00	0.28
Estonia	0.82	0.79	1.00	0.68
Ethiopia	0.56	0.69	0.58	0.41
Finland	0.92	0.90	1.00	0.85
France	0.84	0.87	1.00	0.65
Georgia	0.84	0.98	0.83	0.70
Germany	0.86	0.88	1.00	0.70
Ghana	0.68	0.77	1.00	0.27
Greece	0.73	0.79	1.00	0.41
Guatemala	0.59	0.43	1.00	0.33
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.93	0.98	1.00	0.80
Hungary	0.83	0.80	1.00	0.69
India	0.39	0.54	0.33	0.31
Indonesia	0.72	0.95	1.00	0.20
Iran	0.68	0.69	0.66	0.67
Italy	0.76	0.83	1.00	0.47
Jamaica	0.60	0.69	1.00	0.11
Japan	0.89	0.92	1.00	0.74
Jordan	0.75	0.94	1.00	0.31
Kazakhstan	0.74	0.79	1.00	0.43
Kenya	0.62	0.66	1.00	0.20
Kyrgyzstan	0.74	0.78	1.00	0.43
Lebanon	0.68	0.88	0.75	0.41

FACTOR 3: ORDER AND SECURITY

Country	Factor 3: Order and Security	3.1 Crime is effectively controlled	3.2 Civil conflict is effectively limited	3.3 People do not resort to violence to redress personal grievances
Liberia	0.56	0.52	1.00	0.16
Macedonia	0.75	0.78	1.00	0.47
Madagascar	0.76	0.73	0.92	0.64
Malawi	0.69	0.63	1.00	0.44
Malaysia	0.86	0.78	1.00	0.79
Mexico	0.50	0.44	0.75	0.30
Moldova	0.77	0.77	1.00	0.53
Mongolia	0.75	0.71	1.00	0.52
Morocco	0.72	0.83	0.92	0.42
Nepal	0.69	0.82	0.75	0.49
Netherlands	0.86	0.91	1.00	0.67
New Zealand	0.87	0.86	1.00	0.76
Nicaragua	0.64	0.63	1.00	0.28
Nigeria	0.47	0.49	0.58	0.35
Norway	0.87	0.91	0.92	0.80
Pakistan	0.29	0.47	0.04	0.37
Panama	0.68	0.64	1.00	0.41
Peru	0.62	0.50	0.92	0.44
Philippines	0.60	0.66	0.67	0.49
Poland	0.81	0.85	1.00	0.58
Portugal	0.74	0.82	1.00	0.42
Republic of Korea	0.82	0.86	1.00	0.59
Romania	0.80	0.82	1.00	0.59
Russia	0.49	0.57	0.50	0.41
Senegal	0.65	0.74	0.92	0.31
Serbia	0.75	0.86	1.00	0.39
Sierra Leone	0.64	0.46	1.00	0.47
Singapore	0.93	0.96	1.00	0.82
Slovenia	0.80	0.92	1.00	0.48
South Africa	0.56	0.33	1.00	0.34
Spain	0.79	0.90	1.00	0.46
Sri Lanka	0.54	0.91	0.37	0.32
Sweden	0.89	0.91	1.00	0.76
Tanzania	0.61	0.56	1.00	0.26
Thailand	0.63	0.89	0.58	0.42
Tunisia	0.79	0.84	1.00	0.52
Turkey	0.63	0.77	0.67	0.46
UAE	0.91	0.98	1.00	0.75
Uganda	0.48	0.53	0.66	0.25
Ukraine	0.74	0.78	1.00	0.45
United Kingdom	0.84	0.88	1.00	0.65
United States	0.83	0.86	1.00	0.62
Uruguay	0.70	0.72	1.00	0.37
Uzbekistan	0.89	0.94	1.00	0.72
Venezuela	0.51	0.31	1.00	0.22
Vietnam	0.82	0.90	0.92	0.65
Zambia	0.67	0.63	1.00	0.39
Zimbabwe	0.59	0.63	0.75	0.38

FACTOR 4: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Country	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	4.1 Equal treatment and absence of discrimination are effectively guaranteed	4.2 The right to life and security of the person is effectively guaranteed	4.3 Due process of law and rights of the accused are effectively guaranteed	4.4 Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed	4.5 Freedom of belief and religion is effectively guaranteed	4.6 The right to privacy is effectively guaranteed	4.7 Freedom of assembly and association is effectively guaranteed	4.8 Fundamental labor rights are effectively guaranteed
Albania	0.63	0.65	0.67	0.51	0.62	0.77	0.52	0.72	0.58
Argentina	0.63	0.65	0.74	0.58	0.54	0.72	0.58	0.69	0.55
Australia	0.84	0.61	0.90	0.81	0.89	0.84	0.93	0.97	0.79
Austria	0.82	0.69	0.85	0.80	0.90	0.87	0.78	0.95	0.77
Bangladesh	0.43	0.51	0.27	0.33	0.43	0.45	0.42	0.55	0.53
Belarus	0.45	0.71	0.50	0.55	0.26	0.66	0.04	0.35	0.55
Belgium	0.81	0.78	0.89	0.76	0.77	0.80	0.88	0.80	0.84
Bolivia	0.49	0.44	0.49	0.39	0.42	0.66	0.45	0.52	0.55
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.67	0.64	0.72	0.70	0.56	0.72	0.68	0.65	0.69
Botswana	0.59	0.50	0.58	0.66	0.76	0.68	0.21	0.74	0.61
Brazil	0.69	0.69	0.66	0.44	0.73	0.83	0.73	0.76	0.73
Bulgaria	0.68	0.61	0.74	0.69	0.69	0.76	0.64	0.84	0.64
Burkina Faso	0.59	0.70	0.49	0.38	0.51	0.80	0.40	0.71	0.70
Cambodia	0.43	0.49	0.42	0.34	0.36	0.41	0.38	0.47	0.60
Cameroon	0.42	0.40	0.43	0.28	0.36	0.63	0.35	0.52	0.39
Canada	0.78	0.62	0.88	0.76	0.76	0.87	0.85	0.82	0.67
Chile	0.73	0.57	0.84	0.61	0.74	0.79	0.82	0.77	0.69
China	0.35	0.60	0.46	0.49	0.10	0.16	0.34	0.13	0.55
Colombia	0.55	0.54	0.47	0.43	0.61	0.65	0.48	0.64	0.56
Cote d'Ivoire	0.50	0.65	0.28	0.29	0.46	0.77	0.25	0.64	0.67
Croatia	0.67	0.66	0.73	0.66	0.69	0.67	0.50	0.74	0.71
Czech Republic	0.79	0.72	0.90	0.77	0.74	0.80	0.83	0.81	0.71
Denmark	0.91	0.80	0.96	0.91	0.95	0.86	0.94	0.94	0.92
Dominican Republic	0.67	0.66	0.57	0.55	0.73	0.77	0.56	0.82	0.71
Ecuador	0.56	0.57	0.66	0.45	0.51	0.61	0.47	0.60	0.61
Egypt	0.43	0.47	0.36	0.31	0.61	0.32	0.32	0.64	0.44
El Salvador	0.58	0.54	0.55	0.27	0.64	0.80	0.50	0.72	0.61
Estonia	0.79	0.80	0.88	0.75	0.77	0.83	0.78	0.78	0.71
Ethiopia	0.41	0.48	0.46	0.41	0.25	0.67	0.33	0.30	0.35
Finland	0.90	0.86	0.99	0.91	0.88	0.81	1.00	0.90	0.86
France	0.79	0.69	0.79	0.74	0.83	0.83	0.68	0.97	0.76
Georgia	0.61	0.77	0.66	0.56	0.58	0.68	0.38	0.60	0.63
Germany	0.80	0.77	0.89	0.77	0.80	0.81	0.78	0.81	0.79
Ghana	0.72	0.72	0.63	0.48	0.85	0.82	0.63	0.95	0.67
Greece	0.72	0.66	0.80	0.53	0.74	0.75	0.82	0.79	0.66
Guatemala	0.59	0.43	0.59	0.47	0.67	0.72	0.70	0.69	0.47
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.71	0.72	0.83	0.78	0.51	0.69	0.77	0.56	0.79
Hungary	0.72	0.61	0.83	0.61	0.72	0.59	0.79	0.76	0.82
India	0.56	0.45	0.36	0.39	0.73	0.72	0.49	0.75	0.56
Indonesia	0.56	0.47	0.48	0.39	0.74	0.51	0.47	0.83	0.61
Iran	0.27	0.46	0.19	0.39	0.31	0.15	0.08	0.28	0.33
Italy	0.72	0.60	0.85	0.69	0.70	0.74	0.80	0.78	0.63
Jamaica	0.59	0.59	0.42	0.40	0.63	0.81	0.51	0.70	0.61
Japan	0.78	0.81	0.79	0.69	0.84	0.78	0.71	0.84	0.80
Jordan	0.50	0.56	0.44	0.50	0.49	0.62	0.33	0.61	0.42
Kazakhstan	0.50	0.61	0.50	0.44	0.35	0.67	0.33	0.44	0.63
Kenya	0.54	0.43	0.43	0.41	0.61	0.74	0.39	0.78	0.49
Kyrgyzstan	0.51	0.41	0.46	0.32	0.58	0.62	0.38	0.71	0.62
Lebanon	0.65	0.49	0.74	0.44	0.77	0.50	0.75	0.80	0.68

FACTOR 4: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Country	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	4.1 Equal treatment and absence of discrimination are effectively guaranteed	4.2 The right to life and security of the person is effectively guaranteed	4.3 Due process of law and rights of the accused are effectively guaranteed	4.4 Freedom of opinion and expression is effectively guaranteed	4.5 Freedom of belief and religion is effectively guaranteed	4.6 The right to privacy is effectively guaranteed	4.7 Freedom of assembly and association is effectively guaranteed	4.8 Fundamental labor rights are effectively guaranteed
Liberia	0.52	0.40	0.37	0.70	0.73	0.47	0.73	0.35	
Macedonia	0.64	0.68	0.54	0.53	0.77	0.58	0.71	0.61	
Madagascar	0.58	0.66	0.45	0.47	0.85	0.33	0.60	0.74	
Malawi	0.47	0.56	0.32	0.50	0.54	0.39	0.58	0.41	
Malaysia	0.50	0.69	0.59	0.40	0.27	0.51	0.34	0.63	
Mexico	0.56	0.39	0.37	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.71	0.65	
Moldova	0.54	0.63	0.36	0.50	0.59	0.46	0.65	0.59	
Mongolia	0.62	0.67	0.46	0.62	0.72	0.46	0.72	0.88	
Morocco	0.48	0.53	0.32	0.55	0.46	0.21	0.75	0.64	
Nepal	0.59	0.68	0.48	0.61	0.61	0.54	0.60	0.56	
Netherlands	0.84	0.70	0.89	0.90	0.88	0.98	0.98	0.55	
New Zealand	0.86	0.83	0.84	0.88	0.88	0.86	0.82	0.85	
Nicaragua	0.54	0.48	0.39	0.50	0.74	0.46	0.54	0.68	
Nigeria	0.45	0.48	0.21	0.56	0.50	0.35	0.74	0.46	
Norway	0.90	0.84	0.92	0.90	0.84	0.94	0.90	0.93	
Pakistan	0.40	0.43	0.28	0.59	0.41	0.24	0.56	0.40	
Panama	0.63	0.68	0.44	0.57	0.68	0.58	0.63	0.72	
Peru	0.70	0.48	0.61	0.77	0.82	0.77	0.82	0.49	
Philippines	0.57	0.57	0.40	0.69	0.64	0.45	0.77	0.64	
Poland	0.85	0.78	0.86	0.85	0.76	0.83	0.91	0.80	
Portugal	0.75	0.63	0.66	0.75	0.88	0.71	0.83	0.70	
Republic of Korea	0.76	0.75	0.80	0.72	0.75	0.69	0.81	0.73	
Romania	0.73	0.74	0.65	0.70	0.82	0.62	0.73	0.74	
Russia	0.47	0.62	0.32	0.33	0.53	0.39	0.38	0.68	
Senegal	0.62	0.65	0.41	0.66	0.82	0.46	0.73	0.67	
Serbia	0.61	0.59	0.50	0.58	0.78	0.42	0.72	0.72	
Sierra Leone	0.63	0.55	0.40	0.67	0.80	0.58	0.66	0.76	
Singapore	0.73	0.82	0.85	0.52	0.79	0.77	0.50	0.69	
Slovenia	0.78	0.62	0.72	0.69	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.81	
South Africa	0.64	0.49	0.52	0.70	0.78	0.60	0.78	0.62	
Spain	0.86	0.77	0.82	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.97	0.89	
Sri Lanka	0.60	0.64	0.42	0.63	0.78	0.46	0.68	0.83	
Sweden	0.93	0.83	0.93	0.94	0.93	0.95	0.98	0.90	
Tanzania	0.53	0.54	0.38	0.59	0.64	0.46	0.60	0.53	
Thailand	0.66	0.61	0.58	0.66	0.68	0.75	0.73	0.66	
Tunisia	0.56	0.62	0.44	0.61	0.61	0.50	0.60	0.56	
Turkey	0.49	0.58	0.54	0.44	0.59	0.36	0.52	0.38	
UAE	0.47	0.48	0.66	0.31	0.32	0.51	0.25	0.59	
Uganda	0.43	0.49	0.29	0.47	0.67	0.20	0.58	0.43	
Ukraine	0.58	0.62	0.43	0.52	0.65	0.54	0.67	0.67	
United Kingdom	0.78	0.69	0.82	0.77	0.83	0.81	0.79	0.69	
United States	0.73	0.52	0.62	0.80	0.82	0.80	0.85	0.63	
Uruguay	0.75	0.69	0.63	0.74	0.87	0.77	0.82	0.75	
Uzbekistan	0.34	0.64	0.25	0.13	0.55	0.17	0.24	0.42	
Venezuela	0.48	0.50	0.25	0.40	0.81	0.33	0.60	0.65	
Vietnam	0.48	0.60	0.59	0.27	0.29	0.67	0.18	0.51	
Zambia	0.41	0.45	0.35	0.37	0.35	0.58	0.34	0.31	
Zimbabwe	0.31	0.36	0.30	0.14	0.61	0.19	0.18	0.40	

FACTOR 5: OPEN GOVERNMENT

Country	Factor 5: Open Government				
	5.1 The laws are comprehensible to the public	5.2 The laws are publicized and widely accessible	5.3 The laws are stable	5.4 The right to petition the government and public participation is effectively guaranteed	
Albania	0.44	0.54	0.56	0.25	0.44
Argentina	0.48	0.56	0.47	0.48	0.41
Australia	0.84	0.87	0.88	0.81	0.81
Austria	0.80	0.85	1.00	0.83	0.52
Bangladesh	0.35	0.44	0.16	0.44	0.38
Belarus	0.36	0.46	0.33	0.33	0.31
Belgium	0.67	0.66	0.76	0.65	0.60
Bolivia	0.41	0.42	0.48	0.39	0.35
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.49	0.56	0.51	0.43	0.47
Botswana	0.67	0.67	0.70	0.86	0.46
Brazil	0.54	0.47	0.57	0.52	0.62
Bulgaria	0.53	0.54	0.48	0.58	0.52
Burkina Faso	0.41	0.32	0.48	0.44	0.40
Cambodia	0.37	0.45	0.31	0.45	0.25
Cameroon	0.27	0.34	0.25	0.27	0.21
Canada	0.84	0.82	0.88	0.82	0.84
Chile	0.68	0.54	0.89	0.52	0.78
China	0.42	0.69	0.50	0.23	0.27
Colombia	0.51	0.54	0.38	0.55	0.59
Cote d'Ivoire	0.37	0.25	0.33	0.51	0.40
Croatia	0.53	0.60	0.56	0.43	0.52
Czech Republic	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.49	0.45
Denmark	0.82	0.71	0.93	0.82	0.84
Dominican Republic	0.52	0.65	0.64	0.36	0.45
Ecuador	0.38	0.45	0.24	0.44	0.38
Egypt	0.48	0.55	0.52	0.53	0.32
El Salvador	0.37	0.49	0.42	0.39	0.21
Estonia	0.71	0.65	0.82	0.66	0.72
Ethiopia	0.29	0.50	0.14	0.34	0.20
Finland	0.84	0.72	0.97	0.77	0.89
France	0.75	0.74	0.65	0.87	0.75
Georgia	0.47	0.57	0.45	0.35	0.49
Germany	0.73	0.65	0.88	0.72	0.66
Ghana	0.55	0.44	0.62	0.70	0.45
Greece	0.51	0.39	0.54	0.41	0.70
Guatemala	0.46	0.40	0.55	0.47	0.41
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.82	0.85	0.93	0.57	0.91
Hungary	0.52	0.63	0.46	0.54	0.45
India	0.48	0.43	0.47	0.55	0.47
Indonesia	0.53	0.44	0.72	0.51	0.43
Iran	0.38	0.59	0.40	0.39	0.16
Italy	0.49	0.45	0.47	0.47	0.56
Jamaica	0.41	0.37	0.41	0.43	0.44
Japan	0.82	0.84	0.88	0.73	0.83
Jordan	0.46	0.65	0.51	0.31	0.38
Kazakhstan	0.36	0.57	0.20	0.37	0.29
Kenya	0.44	0.39	0.48	0.49	0.38
Kyrgyzstan	0.44	0.49	0.45	0.44	0.38
Lebanon	0.47	0.45	0.57	0.43	0.43

FACTOR 5: OPEN GOVERNMENT

Country	Factor 5 Open Government	5.1 The laws are comprehensible to the public	5.2 The laws are published and widely accessible	5.3 The laws are stable	5.4 The right to petition the government and public participation is effectively guaranteed
Liberia	0.39	0.30	0.33	0.54	0.38
Macedonia	0.62	0.71	0.73	0.56	0.49
Madagascar	0.50	0.51	0.86	0.37	0.26
Malawi	0.43	0.40	0.42	0.61	0.29
Malaysia	0.48	0.65	0.61	0.45	0.23
Mexico	0.53	0.53	0.65	0.47	0.48
Moldova	0.43	0.54	0.29	0.38	0.51
Mongolia	0.35	0.38	0.48	0.25	0.28
Morocco	0.51	0.58	0.54	0.48	0.44
Nepal	0.38	0.42	0.20	0.49	0.41
Netherlands	0.90	0.87	0.93	1.00	0.81
New Zealand	0.84	0.82	0.91	0.78	0.85
Nicaragua	0.48	0.54	0.56	0.50	0.31
Nigeria	0.35	0.33	0.39	0.40	0.28
Norway	0.84	0.74	0.95	0.76	0.93
Pakistan	0.35	0.30	0.37	0.43	0.29
Panama	0.60	0.52	0.72	0.59	0.58
Peru	0.43	0.38	0.36	0.48	0.50
Philippines	0.46	0.52	0.51	0.48	0.31
Poland	0.59	0.67	0.56	0.57	0.57
Portugal	0.62	0.53	0.49	0.77	0.67
Republic of Korea	0.74	0.82	0.79	0.66	0.67
Romania	0.51	0.48	0.53	0.46	0.57
Russia	0.41	0.46	0.50	0.33	0.35
Senegal	0.41	0.22	0.64	0.43	0.33
Serbia	0.44	0.51	0.39	0.42	0.42
Sierra Leone	0.26	0.36	0.00	0.46	0.20
Singapore	0.67	0.79	0.89	0.60	0.41
Slovenia	0.63	0.66	0.64	0.55	0.69
South Africa	0.61	0.61	0.71	0.62	0.50
Spain	0.61	0.74	0.62	0.57	0.52
Sri Lanka	0.50	0.53	0.64	0.60	0.22
Sweden	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.89
Tanzania	0.41	0.41	0.29	0.57	0.37
Thailand	0.50	0.49	0.49	0.61	0.43
Tunisia	0.46	0.50	0.59	0.43	0.34
Turkey	0.46	0.56	0.64	0.28	0.37
UAE	0.44	0.58	0.55	0.42	0.20
Uganda	0.36	0.32	0.29	0.50	0.32
Ukraine	0.44	0.41	0.49	0.27	0.57
United Kingdom	0.78	0.75	0.78	0.78	0.83
United States	0.77	0.77	0.79	0.78	0.73
Uruguay	0.62	0.59	0.64	0.65	0.60
Uzbekistan	0.36	0.37	0.46	0.33	0.26
Venezuela	0.36	0.53	0.31	0.38	0.22
Vietnam	0.35	0.43	0.47	0.33	0.16
Zambia	0.39	0.45	0.46	0.44	0.20
Zimbabwe	0.24	0.24	0.28	0.21	0.24

FACTOR 6: REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT

Country	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	6.1 Government regulations are effectively enforced	6.2 Government regulations are applied and enforced without improper influence	6.3 Administrative proceedings are conducted without unreasonable delay	6.4 Due process is respected in administrative proceedings	6.5 The Government does not expropriate without adequate compensation
Albania	0.43	0.42	0.38	0.44	0.35	0.54
Argentina	0.43	0.42	0.48	0.36	0.46	0.43
Australia	0.83	0.78	0.89	0.81	0.87	0.80
Austria	0.84	0.82	0.88	0.85	0.81	0.86
Bangladesh	0.36	0.35	0.22	0.46	0.26	0.48
Belarus	0.56	0.58	0.58	0.71	0.44	0.47
Belgium	0.70	0.69	0.82	0.54	0.68	0.76
Bolivia	0.37	0.31	0.38	0.46	0.33	0.39
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.53	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.65	0.59
Botswana	0.71	0.74	0.79	0.61	0.65	0.76
Brazil	0.56	0.57	0.64	0.48	0.52	0.57
Bulgaria	0.50	0.50	0.45	0.55	0.42	0.57
Burkina Faso	0.56	0.50	0.63	0.53	0.48	0.68
Cambodia	0.33	0.32	0.30	0.54	0.15	0.33
Cameroon	0.28	0.35	0.29	0.18	0.25	0.35
Canada	0.79	0.70	0.83	0.72	0.85	0.83
Chile	0.66	0.57	0.70	0.74	0.49	0.77
China	0.41	0.41	0.46	0.54	0.35	0.27
Colombia	0.52	0.44	0.60	0.32	0.53	0.70
Cote d'Ivoire	0.48	0.36	0.47	0.52	0.42	0.65
Croatia	0.48	0.55	0.52	0.34	0.43	0.59
Czech Republic	0.59	0.63	0.67	0.51	0.45	0.70
Denmark	0.85	0.82	0.91	0.84	0.82	0.84
Dominican Republic	0.45	0.42	0.55	0.41	0.39	0.47
Ecuador	0.46	0.45	0.54	0.48	0.41	0.44
Egypt	0.42	0.41	0.43	0.28	0.36	0.62
El Salvador	0.52	0.42	0.61	0.56	0.50	0.49
Estonia	0.73	0.77	0.85	0.70	0.60	0.71
Ethiopia	0.36	0.37	0.51	0.35	0.15	0.43
Finland	0.82	0.75	0.88	0.86	0.84	0.76
France	0.76	0.72	0.83	0.76	0.75	0.75
Georgia	0.63	0.61	0.88	0.66	0.59	0.42
Germany	0.73	0.69	0.77	0.59	0.81	0.80
Ghana	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.38	0.67
Greece	0.54	0.52	0.41	0.55	0.58	0.64
Guatemala	0.43	0.41	0.48	0.35	0.46	0.48
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.75	0.55	0.81	0.89	0.85	0.65
Hungary	0.60	0.70	0.73	0.42	0.56	0.57
India	0.41	0.31	0.35	0.29	0.49	0.60
Indonesia	0.50	0.36	0.41	0.57	0.59	0.58
Iran	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.58	0.44	0.61
Italy	0.56	0.58	0.64	0.39	0.56	0.61
Jamaica	0.55	0.50	0.69	0.42	0.53	0.59
Japan	0.87	0.83	0.91	0.77	0.87	0.94
Jordan	0.59	0.57	0.67	0.48	0.50	0.72
Kazakhstan	0.44	0.55	0.46	0.49	0.16	0.52
Kenya	0.39	0.37	0.36	0.35	0.41	0.47
Kyrgyzstan	0.43	0.51	0.41	0.47	0.39	0.38
Lebanon	0.38	0.41	0.26	0.37	0.38	0.50

FACTOR 6: REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT

Country	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	6.1 Government regulations are effectively enforced	6.2 Government regulations are applied and enforced without improper influence	6.3 Administrative proceedings are conducted without unreasonable delay	6.4 Due process is respected in administrative proceedings	6.5 The Government does not expropriate without adequate compensation
Liberia	0.23	0.26	0.27	0.13	0.13	0.35
Macedonia	0.54	0.47	0.54	0.61	0.53	0.66
Madagascar	0.46	0.49	0.48	0.37	0.46	0.51
Malawi	0.45	0.36	0.40	0.56	0.39	0.54
Malaysia	0.52	0.45	0.60	0.57	0.60	0.39
Mexico	0.49	0.43	0.48	0.52	0.47	0.54
Moldova	0.39	0.49	0.46	0.36	0.21	0.43
Mongolia	0.48	0.49	0.47	0.56	0.39	0.46
Morocco	0.47	0.39	0.40	0.45	0.45	0.70
Nepal	0.44	0.42	0.45	0.27	0.53	0.53
Netherlands	0.83	0.77	0.88	0.81	0.76	0.92
New Zealand	0.82	0.79	0.82	0.82	0.83	0.76
Nicaragua	0.45	0.52	0.54	0.39	0.37	0.42
Nigeria	0.42	0.36	0.44	0.38	0.37	0.52
Norway	0.83	0.80	0.82	0.74	0.82	0.86
Pakistan	0.36	0.22	0.30	0.38	0.45	0.46
Panama	0.52	0.45	0.57	0.47	0.51	0.59
Peru	0.48	0.39	0.58	0.37	0.47	0.60
Philippines	0.51	0.47	0.66	0.51	0.42	0.48
Poland	0.61	0.59	0.71	0.51	0.59	0.66
Portugal	0.57	0.60	0.71	0.60	0.41	0.64
Republic of Korea	0.67	0.47	0.74	0.84	0.63	0.69
Romania	0.54	0.49	0.47	0.61	0.47	0.65
Russia	0.45	0.54	0.48	0.52	0.30	0.39
Senegal	0.58	0.42	0.56	0.64	0.54	0.74
Serbia	0.43	0.43	0.38	0.42	0.36	0.49
Sierra Leone	0.33	0.40	0.42	0.00	0.34	0.50
Singapore	0.80	0.82	0.95	0.83	0.77	0.66
Slovenia	0.59	0.50	0.56	0.63	0.54	0.71
South Africa	0.54	0.51	0.59	0.43	0.52	0.66
Spain	0.67	0.70	0.82	0.56	0.64	0.65
Sri Lanka	0.52	0.54	0.52	0.57	0.41	0.56
Sweden	0.89	0.88	0.91	0.91	0.90	0.86
Tanzania	0.44	0.34	0.33	0.39	0.59	0.56
Thailand	0.51	0.43	0.62	0.37	0.61	0.50
Tunisia	0.55	0.60	0.55	0.48	0.42	0.68
Turkey	0.55	0.43	0.47	0.66	0.54	0.63
UAE	0.65	0.69	0.76	0.64	0.58	0.57
Uganda	0.38	0.34	0.28	0.26	0.51	0.54
Ukraine	0.35	0.36	0.25	0.52	0.28	0.37
United Kingdom	0.79	0.74	0.84	0.74	0.84	0.78
United States	0.70	0.65	0.85	0.63	0.75	0.64
Uruguay	0.71	0.69	0.82	0.55	0.64	0.85
Uzbekistan	0.46	0.67	0.50	0.49	0.37	0.26
Venezuela	0.33	0.45	0.45	0.27	0.18	0.28
Vietnam	0.39	0.49	0.34	0.44	0.35	0.34
Zambia	0.41	0.43	0.44	0.13	0.62	0.42
Zimbabwe	0.35	0.42	0.34	0.34	0.48	0.17

FACTOR 7: CIVIL JUSTICE

Country	Factor 7: Civil Justice	7.1 People are aware of available remedies	7.2 People can access and afford legal advice and representation	7.3 People can access and afford civil courts	7.4 Civil Justice is free of discrimination	7.5 Civil Justice is free of corruption	7.6 Civil Justice is free of improper government influence	7.7 Civil Justice is not subject to unreasonable delays
Albania	0.51	0.61	0.60	0.22	0.48	0.38	0.58	0.69
Argentina	0.54	0.63	0.72	0.62	0.45	0.30	0.70	0.70
Australia	0.72	0.60	0.56	0.92	0.86	0.51	0.77	0.85
Austria	0.74	0.66	0.59	0.90	0.76	0.58	0.79	0.94
Bangladesh	0.32	0.39	0.30	0.26	0.46	0.17	0.40	0.27
Belarus	0.63	0.60	0.73	0.54	0.38	0.72	0.68	0.77
Belgium	0.68	0.65	0.74	0.81	0.73	0.41	0.65	0.77
Bolivia	0.38	0.47	0.40	0.25	0.36	0.20	0.40	0.58
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.50	0.54	0.60	0.50	0.56	0.25	0.38	0.66
Botswana	0.65	0.59	0.46	0.83	0.83	0.50	0.69	0.67
Brazil	0.55	0.64	0.69	0.66	0.69	0.26	0.36	0.58
Bulgaria	0.57	0.58	0.71	0.58	0.60	0.49	0.38	0.72
Burkina Faso	0.59	0.46	0.68	0.56	0.56	0.54	0.61	0.72
Cambodia	0.37	0.39	0.25	0.18	0.46	0.41	0.38	0.56
Cameroon	0.35	0.43	0.44	0.26	0.36	0.18	0.21	0.54
Canada	0.72	0.64	0.65	0.84	0.83	0.47	0.79	0.84
Chile	0.66	0.77	0.65	0.69	0.74	0.38	0.60	0.80
China	0.43	0.58	0.45	0.37	0.10	0.64	0.35	0.52
Colombia	0.53	0.64	0.57	0.49	0.61	0.26	0.44	0.74
Cote d'Ivoire	0.51	0.48	0.54	0.42	0.51	0.39	0.49	0.74
Croatia	0.51	0.65	0.65	0.56	0.50	0.31	0.31	0.71
Czech Republic	0.65	0.67	0.71	0.71	0.75	0.26	0.64	0.79
Denmark	0.79	0.76	0.83	0.94	0.90	0.51	0.77	0.79
Dominican Republic	0.51	0.57	0.63	0.44	0.43	0.42	0.40	0.64
Ecuador	0.42	0.57	0.47	0.34	0.48	0.18	0.28	0.70
Egypt	0.47	0.52	0.32	0.60	0.64	0.31	0.28	0.60
El Salvador	0.49	0.54	0.56	0.46	0.51	0.37	0.42	0.58
Estonia	0.71	0.63	0.80	0.87	0.82	0.44	0.64	0.75
Ethiopia	0.46	0.45	0.47	0.35	0.38	0.41	0.44	0.68
Finland	0.79	0.69	0.96	0.92	0.82	0.60	0.82	0.71
France	0.68	0.66	0.68	0.79	0.71	0.57	0.65	0.73
Georgia	0.61	0.74	0.58	0.61	0.40	0.61	0.65	0.71
Germany	0.80	0.80	0.87	0.85	0.83	0.68	0.87	0.78
Ghana	0.61	0.61	0.70	0.63	0.69	0.36	0.47	0.77
Greece	0.61	0.70	0.78	0.69	0.67	0.22	0.47	0.78
Guatemala	0.41	0.41	0.51	0.30	0.53	0.21	0.25	0.64
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.71	0.73	0.76	0.88	0.53	0.62	0.66	0.76
Hungary	0.55	0.56	0.44	0.87	0.67	0.30	0.32	0.68
India	0.45	0.46	0.50	0.47	0.68	0.20	0.26	0.55
Indonesia	0.49	0.62	0.58	0.33	0.67	0.45	0.34	0.47
Iran	0.62	0.63	0.62	0.57	0.57	0.53	0.69	0.76
Italy	0.56	0.62	0.50	0.73	0.70	0.29	0.33	0.74
Jamaica	0.51	0.55	0.44	0.68	0.67	0.29	0.34	0.58
Japan	0.77	0.64	0.83	0.85	0.79	0.65	0.79	0.83
Jordan	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.73	0.68	0.36	0.67	0.68
Kazakhstan	0.49	0.48	0.41	0.34	0.49	0.62	0.51	0.54
Kenya	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.36	0.51	0.35	0.48	0.64
Kyrgyzstan	0.46	0.64	0.54	0.19	0.44	0.42	0.49	0.64
Lebanon	0.45	0.60	0.42	0.44	0.55	0.20	0.52	0.44

FACTOR 7: CIVIL JUSTICE

Country	Factor 7: Civil Justice	7.1 People are aware of available remedies	7.2 People can access and afford legal advice and representation	7.3 People can access and afford civil courts	7.4 Civil Justice is free of discrimination	7.5 Civil Justice is free of corruption	7.6 Civil Justice is free of improper government influence	7.7 Civil Justice is not subject to unreasonable delays
Liberia	0.33	0.49	0.21	0.41	0.40	0.27	0.29	0.22
Macedonia	0.53	0.67	0.54	0.36	0.62	0.37	0.55	0.61
Madagascar	0.53	0.50	0.88	0.41	0.54	0.25	0.42	0.75
Malawi	0.59	0.56	0.75	0.61	0.60	0.41	0.50	0.74
Malaysia	0.57	0.61	0.60	0.71	0.37	0.53	0.48	0.71
Mexico	0.40	0.48	0.29	0.37	0.54	0.30	0.28	0.54
Moldova	0.42	0.59	0.58	0.20	0.40	0.32	0.41	0.43
Mongolia	0.53	0.55	0.60	0.47	0.53	0.60	0.51	0.42
Morocco	0.54	0.49	0.76	0.39	0.58	0.52	0.45	0.59
Nepal	0.43	0.31	0.60	0.27	0.62	0.33	0.31	0.56
Netherlands	0.80	0.73	0.84	0.92	0.84	0.61	0.86	0.81
New Zealand	0.76	0.74	0.72	0.97	0.80	0.63	0.69	0.76
Nicaragua	0.42	0.52	0.52	0.24	0.37	0.29	0.34	0.69
Nigeria	0.53	0.55	0.56	0.51	0.56	0.35	0.50	0.66
Norway	0.82	0.73	0.81	0.93	0.89	0.69	0.74	0.92
Pakistan	0.39	0.55	0.22	0.38	0.61	0.26	0.23	0.52
Panama	0.51	0.57	0.62	0.40	0.47	0.30	0.50	0.67
Peru	0.43	0.49	0.39	0.36	0.52	0.29	0.32	0.65
Philippines	0.43	0.51	0.38	0.44	0.50	0.26	0.32	0.58
Poland	0.63	0.62	0.74	0.77	0.70	0.32	0.50	0.76
Portugal	0.62	0.68	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.27	0.40	0.73
Republic of Korea	0.72	0.61	0.70	0.78	0.65	0.60	0.75	0.94
Romania	0.59	0.61	0.72	0.57	0.58	0.34	0.50	0.77
Russia	0.50	0.54	0.56	0.43	0.42	0.52	0.40	0.60
Senegal	0.58	0.55	0.77	0.45	0.54	0.47	0.56	0.70
Serbia	0.47	0.48	0.75	0.39	0.44	0.28	0.38	0.58
Sierra Leone	0.54	0.70	0.71	0.35	0.56	0.37	0.48	0.63
Singapore	0.79	0.61	0.90	0.88	0.69	0.82	0.85	0.76
Slovenia	0.60	0.68	0.69	0.64	0.66	0.28	0.41	0.81
South Africa	0.55	0.49	0.47	0.62	0.62	0.41	0.52	0.67
Spain	0.65	0.72	0.78	0.77	0.68	0.40	0.46	0.71
Sri Lanka	0.52	0.45	0.42	0.56	0.67	0.28	0.58	0.70
Sweden	0.78	0.77	0.80	0.92	0.85	0.55	0.83	0.72
Tanzania	0.48	0.47	0.50	0.34	0.56	0.37	0.53	0.63
Thailand	0.43	0.50	0.35	0.58	0.50	0.32	0.36	0.42
Tunisia	0.56	0.61	0.71	0.48	0.69	0.41	0.36	0.63
Turkey	0.55	0.54	0.65	0.60	0.54	0.44	0.43	0.67
UAE	0.60	0.50	0.44	0.74	0.70	0.57	0.61	0.66
Uganda	0.51	0.53	0.53	0.42	0.56	0.29	0.54	0.72
Ukraine	0.52	0.58	0.78	0.35	0.29	0.51	0.46	0.66
United Kingdom	0.72	0.66	0.73	0.84	0.78	0.58	0.64	0.82
United States	0.65	0.53	0.53	0.86	0.75	0.44	0.63	0.83
Uruguay	0.71	0.79	0.78	0.78	0.72	0.49	0.72	0.72
Uzbekistan	0.49	0.59	0.58	0.28	0.21	0.61	0.51	0.66
Venezuela	0.38	0.55	0.61	0.31	0.27	0.14	0.20	0.57
Vietnam	0.43	0.48	0.57	0.24	0.23	0.49	0.39	0.64
Zambia	0.46	0.36	0.51	0.42	0.34	0.34	0.47	0.77
Zimbabwe	0.40	0.40	0.23	0.42	0.38	0.34	0.48	0.54

FACTOR 8: CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Country	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	8.1 Crimes are effectively investigated	8.2 Crimes are effectively and timely adjudicated	8.3 The correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior	8.4 The criminal justice system is impartial	8.5 The criminal justice system is free of improper influence	8.6 The criminal justice system is free of improper government influence	8.7 The criminal justice system accords the accused due process of law
Albania	0.41	0.33	0.42	0.39	0.49	0.32	0.41	0.51
Argentina	0.43	0.30	0.32	0.32	0.59	0.47	0.46	0.58
Australia	0.72	0.56	0.62	0.65	0.60	0.89	0.94	0.81
Austria	0.75	0.64	0.75	0.70	0.64	0.86	0.85	0.80
Bangladesh	0.38	0.47	0.42	0.29	0.45	0.32	0.40	0.33
Belarus	0.59	0.69	0.68	0.55	0.69	0.66	0.34	0.55
Belgium	0.72	0.75	0.66	0.48	0.71	0.80	0.84	0.76
Bolivia	0.28	0.20	0.14	0.24	0.39	0.23	0.38	0.39
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.62	0.75	0.68	0.43	0.64	0.60	0.51	0.70
Botswana	0.72	0.75	0.74	0.50	0.70	0.85	0.82	0.66
Brazil	0.49	0.49	0.42	0.23	0.37	0.61	0.84	0.44
Bulgaria	0.39	0.23	0.39	0.29	0.40	0.24	0.64	0.51
Burkina Faso	0.45	0.56	0.47	0.26	0.60	0.45	0.41	0.38
Cambodia	0.40	0.53	0.51	0.26	0.39	0.20	0.54	0.34
Cameroon	0.32	0.42	0.33	0.06	0.40	0.22	0.51	0.28
Canada	0.75	0.82	0.74	0.69	0.56	0.80	0.86	0.76
Chile	0.60	0.61	0.68	0.26	0.56	0.73	0.77	0.61
China	0.54	0.77	0.59	0.63	0.65	0.59	0.09	0.49
Colombia	0.43	0.49	0.39	0.21	0.43	0.44	0.63	0.43
Cote d'Ivoire	0.37	0.43	0.49	0.11	0.38	0.37	0.54	0.29
Croatia	0.53	0.51	0.53	0.37	0.43	0.58	0.60	0.66
Czech Republic	0.70	0.61	0.63	0.57	0.75	0.69	0.85	0.77
Denmark	0.87	0.91	0.84	0.77	0.76	0.96	0.95	0.91
Dominican Republic	0.47	0.50	0.49	0.16	0.61	0.44	0.55	0.55
Ecuador	0.44	0.50	0.49	0.19	0.39	0.49	0.53	0.45
Egypt	0.45	0.55	0.50	0.28	0.47	0.53	0.53	0.31
El Salvador	0.25	0.19	0.26	0.05	0.05	0.47	0.45	0.27
Estonia	0.75	0.67	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.81	0.93	0.75
Ethiopia	0.49	0.67	0.53	0.37	0.58	0.47	0.43	0.41
Finland	0.87	0.90	0.81	0.78	0.80	0.92	0.94	0.91
France	0.69	0.54	0.65	0.49	0.77	0.84	0.78	0.74
Georgia	0.66	0.79	0.67	0.56	0.90	0.82	0.30	0.56
Germany	0.76	0.76	0.73	0.69	0.69	0.83	0.85	0.77
Ghana	0.45	0.36	0.31	0.35	0.50	0.43	0.70	0.48
Greece	0.50	0.56	0.46	0.22	0.37	0.65	0.74	0.53
Guatemala	0.37	0.37	0.30	0.15	0.44	0.28	0.61	0.47
Hong Kong SAR, China	0.76	0.88	0.81	0.71	0.75	0.85	0.55	0.78
Hungary	0.64	0.76	0.58	0.46	0.48	0.84	0.75	0.61
India	0.44	0.45	0.40	0.39	0.35	0.43	0.67	0.39
Indonesia	0.45	0.48	0.51	0.26	0.42	0.40	0.66	0.39
Iran	0.45	0.59	0.50	0.49	0.32	0.49	0.38	0.39
Italy	0.67	0.71	0.59	0.43	0.66	0.76	0.87	0.69
Jamaica	0.42	0.41	0.31	0.16	0.33	0.60	0.71	0.40
Japan	0.68	0.63	0.58	0.60	0.65	0.84	0.77	0.69
Jordan	0.52	0.42	0.58	0.49	0.44	0.57	0.62	0.50
Kazakhstan	0.46	0.49	0.63	0.44	0.37	0.41	0.42	0.44
Kenya	0.40	0.44	0.30	0.29	0.33	0.34	0.66	0.41
Kyrgyzstan	0.35	0.39	0.48	0.24	0.30	0.24	0.49	0.32
Lebanon	0.49	0.56	0.47	0.12	0.50	0.60	0.72	0.44

FACTOR 8: CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Country	Factor 8: Criminal Justice	8.1 Crimes are effectively investigated	8.2 Crimes are effectively and timely adjudicated	8.3 The correctional system is effective in reducing criminal behavior	8.4 The criminal justice system is impartial	8.5 The criminal justice system is free of improper influence	8.6 The criminal justice system is free of improper government influence	8.7 The criminal justice system accords the accused due process of law
Liberia	0.35	0.38	0.43	0.19	0.14	0.38	0.56	0.37
Macedonia	0.53	0.56	0.44	0.42	0.66	0.58	0.54	0.54
Madagascar	0.49	0.54	0.61	0.45	0.49	0.34	0.58	0.45
Malawi	0.45	0.55	0.57	0.18	0.48	0.42	0.65	0.32
Malaysia	0.61	0.72	0.54	0.44	0.54	0.72	0.50	0.59
Mexico	0.35	0.43	0.34	0.16	0.31	0.29	0.55	0.37
Moldova	0.40	0.57	0.54	0.22	0.52	0.29	0.33	0.36
Mongolia	0.54	0.47	0.58	0.53	0.64	0.50	0.63	0.46
Morocco	0.35	0.60	0.48	0.17	0.20	0.32	0.39	0.32
Nepal	0.54	0.50	0.54	0.35	0.63	0.60	0.87	0.48
Netherlands	0.80	0.60	0.70	0.79	0.85	0.90	0.87	0.89
New Zealand	0.79	0.79	0.72	0.63	0.71	0.94	0.91	0.84
Nicaragua	0.42	0.53	0.52	0.20	0.52	0.39	0.41	0.39
Nigeria	0.28	0.26	0.27	0.14	0.23	0.32	0.55	0.21
Norway	0.85	0.79	0.79	0.76	0.83	0.93	0.90	0.92
Pakistan	0.39	0.28	0.36	0.33	0.41	0.34	0.71	0.28
Panama	0.38	0.41	0.34	0.08	0.38	0.47	0.56	0.44
Peru	0.45	0.31	0.25	0.32	0.68	0.34	0.65	0.61
Philippines	0.42	0.49	0.42	0.38	0.35	0.55	0.52	0.40
Poland	0.73	0.60	0.56	0.56	0.94	0.78	0.83	0.86
Portugal	0.62	0.65	0.49	0.65	0.49	0.72	0.88	0.66
Republic of Korea	0.76	0.57	0.80	0.80	0.78	0.79	0.74	0.80
Romania	0.60	0.72	0.55	0.42	0.55	0.55	0.58	0.65
Russia	0.40	0.57	0.42	0.29	0.37	0.39	0.41	0.32
Senegal	0.46	0.71	0.52	0.21	0.40	0.50	0.51	0.41
Serbia	0.45	0.30	0.39	0.43	0.59	0.47	0.47	0.50
Sierra Leone	0.36	0.53	0.36	0.11	0.28	0.29	0.54	0.40
Singapore	0.87	0.93	0.90	0.95	0.82	0.88	0.72	0.85
Slovenia	0.59	0.69	0.56	0.44	0.61	0.62	0.52	0.72
South Africa	0.49	0.44	0.46	0.26	0.51	0.62	0.64	0.52
Spain	0.69	0.61	0.55	0.66	0.68	0.82	0.71	0.82
Sri Lanka	0.62	0.68	0.52	0.44	0.78	0.72	0.75	0.42
Sweden	0.82	0.63	0.73	0.77	0.89	0.93	0.88	0.93
Tanzania	0.49	0.54	0.55	0.24	0.52	0.47	0.71	0.38
Thailand	0.59	0.60	0.55	0.62	0.53	0.66	0.60	0.58
Tunisia	0.52	0.60	0.58	0.39	0.52	0.50	0.64	0.44
Turkey	0.42	0.43	0.26	0.40	0.41	0.51	0.39	0.54
UAE	0.75	0.88	0.73	0.72	0.80	0.73	0.72	0.66
Uganda	0.43	0.54	0.41	0.39	0.42	0.36	0.60	0.29
Ukraine	0.39	0.48	0.44	0.38	0.51	0.26	0.26	0.43
United Kingdom	0.75	0.78	0.79	0.60	0.67	0.80	0.82	0.82
United States	0.65	0.78	0.78	0.46	0.38	0.77	0.80	0.62
Uruguay	0.50	0.49	0.40	0.23	0.45	0.73	0.69	0.53
Uzbekistan	0.36	0.58	0.51	0.35	0.37	0.29	0.15	0.25
Venezuela	0.24	0.36	0.20	0.05	0.27	0.30	0.23	0.25
Vietnam	0.57	0.60	0.65	0.57	0.70	0.52	0.36	0.59
Zambia	0.37	0.51	0.41	0.15	0.42	0.39	0.34	0.35
Zimbabwe	0.43	0.58	0.49	0.36	0.57	0.29	0.44	0.30

Rankings by Income

The following tables include countries and their ranking for their specific income group.

High Income

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Australia	5	8	14	8	5	5	12	17
Austria	8	19	8	10	11	4	10	15
Belgium	16	16	17	11	19	18	18	18
Canada	15	12	9	18	6	12	13	13
Croatia	28	29	26	28	24	29	29	28
Czech Republic	22	27	22	15	27	24	20	19
Denmark	1	2	4	2	8	3	6	1
Estonia	12	18	20	13	17	16	15	14
Finland	4	4	3	4	7	8	5	2
France	11	13	16	14	14	13	17	21
Germany	9	11	12	12	16	15	3	9
Greece	26	28	29	25	26	28	24	29
Hong Kong SAR, China	20	9	2	27	10	14	16	8
Hungary	27	22	18	26	25	23	28	25
Italy	23	25	27	24	28	27	27	23
Japan	10	10	7	17	9	2	8	22
Netherlands	7	5	13	9	2	7	2	6
New Zealand	6	6	11	5	4	9	9	7
Norway	3	3	10	3	3	6	1	4
Poland	14	23	23	7	23	22	22	16
Portugal	21	24	28	21	21	26	23	26
Republic of Korea	24	21	21	20	15	19	14	10
Singapore	19	7	1	23	18	10	4	3
Slovenia	25	26	24	19	20	25	26	27
Spain	18	14	25	6	22	20	21	20
Sweden	2	1	6	1	1	1	7	5
UAE	29	20	5	29	29	21	25	12
United Kingdom	13	15	15	16	12	11	11	11
United States	17	17	19	22	13	17	19	24

Upper Middle Income

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Argentina	22	16	24	13	16	27	14	22
Belarus	28	12	5	28	30	6	5	6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	15	17	7	7	14	14	20	2
Botswana	2	2	6	16	2	1	3	1
Brazil	6	8	18	5	7	7	11	15
Bulgaria	19	19	12	6	9	19	9	27
Chile	1	3	13	3	1	3	2	4
China	26	10	4	29	23	28	27	8
Colombia	14	20	30	21	11	16	15	23
Dominican Republic	17	29	22	8	10	23	17	16
Ecuador	24	18	25	19	27	22	28	21
Iran	25	15	17	30	26	11	6	19
Jamaica	7	11	23	17	24	10	18	25
Jordan	13	5	10	24	19	4	4	11
Kazakhstan	27	26	11	23	29	25	22	17
Lebanon	10	22	16	10	17	29	24	14
Macedonia	18	7	9	12	3	5	16	9
Malaysia	11	4	1	22	15	15	8	3
Mexico	12	27	28	18	8	20	29	29
Panama	23	23	15	14	6	17	19	28
Peru	4	28	21	4	22	21	26	18
Romania	8	13	2	2	12	13	7	5
Russia	29	25	29	27	25	24	21	26
Serbia	20	21	8	15	21	26	23	20
South Africa	5	14	26	11	5	12	13	13
Thailand	16	24	20	9	13	18	25	7
Tunisia	9	9	3	20	18	8	10	10
Turkey	21	6	19	25	20	9	12	24
Uruguay	3	1	14	1	4	2	1	12
Venezuela	30	30	27	26	28	30	30	30

Lower Middle Income

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Albania	14	15	7	1	10	13	9	11
Bolivia	19	22	10	15	13	20	22	22
Cameroon	22	23	15	20	23	23	23	20
Cote d'Ivoire	17	11	19	14	16	7	8	16
Egypt	3	2	12	19	5	14	13	6
El Salvador	11	5	18	8	17	4	11	23
Georgia	12	1	2	4	7	1	1	1
Guatemala	8	18	17	6	8	12	20	15
India	2	14	22	11	4	16	15	8
Indonesia	1	16	9	10	1	6	10	7
Moldova	16	12	4	12	12	19	19	12
Mongolia	10	9	5	2	22	8	5	4
Morocco	5	13	8	17	2	9	3	19
Nicaragua	21	10	14	13	6	11	18	9
Nigeria	15	21	21	18	19	15	4	21
Pakistan	13	19	23	22	21	21	21	14
Philippines	6	8	16	9	9	5	17	10
Senegal	4	4	13	3	14	2	2	5
Sri Lanka	7	3	20	5	3	3	6	2
Ukraine	20	20	6	7	11	22	7	13
Uzbekistan	23	17	1	23	18	10	12	18
Vietnam	18	7	3	16	20	18	16	3
Zambia	9	6	11	21	15	17	14	17

Low Income

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Bangladesh	12	12	9	12	12	11	15	12
Burkina Faso	11	1	4	4	7	1	3	7
Cambodia	14	11	3	13	10	14	13	11
Ethiopia	13	4	13	14	13	10	10	3
Ghana	1	2	7	1	1	2	1	6
Kenya	8	13	10	6	4	8	8	10
Kyrgyzstan	9	15	2	9	3	7	9	14
Liberia	4	9	14	8	8	15	14	15
Madagascar	7	7	1	5	2	3	5	2
Malawi	6	3	5	10	5	4	2	5
Nepal	5	6	6	3	9	6	11	1
Sierra Leone	2	8	8	2	14	13	4	13
Tanzania	3	5	11	7	6	5	7	4
Uganda	10	10	15	11	11	9	6	9
Zimbabwe	15	14	12	15	15	12	12	8

Rankings by Region

The following tables include countries and their ranking for their specific region.

Western Europe & North America

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Austria	6	13	4	7	7	3	7	9
Belgium	11	11	11	8	12	12	11	10
Canada	10	7	5	12	4	8	9	8
Denmark	1	2	2	2	6	2	5	1
Finland	4	4	1	4	5	6	4	2
France	8	8	10	10	10	9	10	12
Germany	7	6	7	9	11	10	3	6
Greece	16	16	16	16	15	16	15	16
Italy	15	15	14	15	16	15	16	13
Netherlands	5	5	8	6	2	5	2	5
Norway	3	3	6	3	3	4	1	3
Portugal	14	14	15	13	13	14	14	15
Spain	13	9	13	5	14	13	13	11
Sweden	2	1	3	1	1	1	6	4
United Kingdom	9	10	9	11	8	7	8	7
United States	12	12	12	14	9	11	12	14

East Asia & Pacific

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Australia	1	3	5	2	2	2	4	5
Cambodia	14	13	12	13	12	14	14	14
China	13	8	9	14	11	12	12	11
Hong Kong SAR, China	5	4	2	6	4	5	6	3
Indonesia	7	14	11	10	7	10	9	12
Japan	3	5	3	3	3	1	2	6
Malaysia	8	7	6	11	9	7	7	7
Mongolia	11	12	10	8	14	11	8	10
New Zealand	2	1	4	1	1	3	3	2
Philippines	9	10	14	9	10	8	13	13
Republic of Korea	6	6	8	4	5	6	5	4
Singapore	4	2	1	5	6	4	1	1
Thailand	10	11	13	7	8	9	11	8
Vietnam	12	9	7	12	13	13	10	9

Eastern Europe & Central Asia

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Albania	14	18	19	11	13	19	14	15
Belarus	19	10	9	20	20	8	3	8
Bosnia and Herzegovina	8	12	12	9	9	11	15	6
Bulgaria	10	13	17	7	5	12	8	19
Croatia	6	9	10	8	6	13	13	11
Czech Republic	3	6	5	3	10	5	2	3
Estonia	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	1
Georgia	11	2	2	13	11	2	5	4
Hungary	5	3	3	6	7	4	10	5
Kazakhstan	18	16	16	17	19	16	18	12
Kyrgyzstan	15	20	18	16	14	17	20	21
Macedonia	9	8	14	10	3	7	11	10
Moldova	16	17	11	15	17	20	21	16
Poland	2	4	6	1	4	3	4	2
Romania	7	11	7	5	8	10	7	7
Russia	20	15	21	19	18	15	16	17
Serbia	12	14	13	12	16	18	19	13
Slovenia	4	5	8	4	2	6	6	9
Turkey	13	7	20	18	12	9	9	14
Ukraine	17	21	15	14	15	21	12	18
Uzbekistan	21	19	1	21	21	14	17	20

Middle East & North Africa

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Egypt	1	4	7	6	2	6	6	5
Iran	7	5	6	7	7	4	2	6
Jordan	6	2	3	3	5	2	1	3
Lebanon	4	6	5	1	3	7	7	4
Morocco	3	7	4	4	1	5	5	7
Tunisia	2	3	2	2	4	3	4	2
UAE	5	1	1	5	6	1	3	1

Latin America & the Caribbean

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Argentina	11	5	10	6	8	14	4	7
Bolivia	14	16	4	15	13	15	15	14
Brazil	4	3	6	4	4	3	3	3
Chile	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1
Colombia	7	8	16	13	7	5	5	8
Dominican Republic	8	13	8	5	6	11	6	4
Ecuador	13	6	13	12	14	10	11	6
El Salvador	10	7	12	10	15	6	9	15
Guatemala	9	15	11	8	10	13	13	12
Jamaica	5	4	9	9	12	4	7	10
Mexico	6	11	15	11	5	8	14	13
Nicaragua	15	10	5	14	9	12	12	9
Panama	12	9	3	7	3	7	8	11
Peru	3	12	7	3	11	9	10	5
Uruguay	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Venezuela	16	14	14	16	16	16	16	16

Sub-Saharan Africa

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Botswana	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1
Burkina Faso	14	3	3	6	8	3	4	9
Cameroon	17	18	10	15	16	17	17	17
Cote d'Ivoire	15	10	13	11	12	6	11	13
Ethiopia	16	8	14	17	15	14	15	4
Ghana	2	5	5	1	3	5	2	8
Kenya	12	15	9	8	5	12	13	12
Liberia	7	13	15	10	10	18	18	16
Madagascar	10	11	2	7	4	7	8	2
Malawi	9	7	4	12	6	8	3	7
Nigeria	11	17	18	13	14	10	9	18
Senegal	4	4	7	4	9	2	5	6
Sierra Leone	5	12	8	3	17	16	7	15
South Africa	3	2	16	2	2	4	6	3
Tanzania	6	9	11	9	7	9	12	5
Uganda	13	14	17	14	13	13	10	11
Zambia	8	6	6	16	11	11	14	14
Zimbabwe	18	16	12	18	18	15	16	10

South Asia

Country	Factor 1: Limited Government Powers	Factor 2: Absence of Corruption	Factor 3: Order and Security	Factor 4: Fundamental Rights	Factor 5: Open Government	Factor 6: Regulatory Enforcement	Factor 7: Civil Justice	Factor 8: Criminal Justice
Bangladesh	5	4	2	4	4	5	5	5
India	1	3	4	3	2	3	2	3
Nepal	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	2
Pakistan	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4
Sri Lanka	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1

Data Notes



Data Notes

The WJP Rule of Law Index provides new indicators on nine factors and 48 sub-factors. These factors and sub-factors correspond to goals or outcomes that rule of law societies seek to achieve and that policy makers might want to influence. The WJP Rule of Law Index is a first attempt to systematically and comprehensively quantify these outcomes through operationalization of the rule of law dimensions into concrete questions. These questions are administered to a representative sample of the general public, and to local experts, and then are analyzed and cross-checked pursuant to a rigorous triangulation methodology. The outcome of this exercise is one of the world's most comprehensive data sets of the extent to which countries adhere to the rule of law in practice.

The WJP Rule of Law Index 2012 builds on more than 400 variables drawn from the assessments of more than 97,000 people and 2,500 local experts in 97 countries and jurisdictions.

OUTCOMES VS. INPUTS

The WJP Rule of Law Index 2012 measures outcomes rather than inputs. More specifically, our aim is to provide a picture of where countries stand with regard to a number of widely accepted outcomes that rule of law societies

seek to achieve, as opposed to the institutional means, such as the legal and regulatory frameworks, to attain them. Some examples of outcomes measured by the Index include respect for fundamental rights, absence of corruption, and access to justice. Examples of inputs include a country's number of courts, number of police officers, and judicial budget.

Measuring outcomes improves accuracy while reducing the risk of misdiagnosing the causes of problems and bottlenecks. For instance, police resources are just one of the many inputs of effective policing (an outcome), and it may or may not be the driving reason behind crime rates. Since the Index does not contain all the elements to diagnose the root causes of the country's rule of law weaknesses, we focus on outcomes which, in the end, are the goals policy makers want to address. Relevant inputs will continue to be captured by the methodology, as they are essential for policy analysis, and will be incorporated in the Index's spin-off products which will complement the Index framework and provide a solid basis for policy analysis and discussion.

LAW IN PRACTICE VS. LAW ON THE BOOKS

In order to evaluate the rule of law in a given country, it is necessary to look not only at the laws as written (*de jure*), but also at how they are actually implemented in practice and experienced by those who are subject to them (*de facto*). Unlike other indices, the WJP Rule of Law Index methodology focuses entirely on adherence to the rule of law in practice.

A NEW DATA SET

The WJP's Rule of Law Index is based on the premise that it is necessary to use different but complementary data sources to best approximate the concept of the rule of law. Currently, there is no comparable data that fully covers all dimensions of the rule of law. The WJP Rule of Law Index addresses this gap by constructing a new set of indicators drawn from two novel data sources:

- » A general population poll (GPP) conducted by leading local polling companies using a probability sample of 1,000 respondents in the three largest cities of each country.
- » Qualified respondents' questionnaires (QRQ) completed by in-country experts in civil and commercial law, criminal justice, labor law, and public health.

The general population poll (GPP) is a key component of the Index as it provides information on how the rule of law is experienced by the people, including marginalized segments of

the society. The GPP questionnaire was designed to provide information on the experiences and the perceptions of ordinary people about their dealings with the government, the police, and the courts; the openness and accountability of the State; the extent of corruption; and the magnitude of common crimes to which the general public is exposed. The latest questionnaire includes 91 perception-based questions and 58 experience-based questions. In addition, socio-demographic information was also collected. In all countries, the questionnaire was translated into local languages and adapted to common expressions. The poll was carried out on a probability sample of 1,000 respondents drawn from the three largest cities in each country, and was conducted by leading local polling companies on behalf of the World Justice Project. Depending on the particular situation of each country, three different polling methodologies were used: CATI, Online, or F2F. The cities covered, the polling company, and the polling methodology employed in all 97 countries are presented in Table 4. For the first wave of countries, data were gathered in September 2009. For the second wave, they were collected in April 2011. For the third wave of countries, data were collected in July 2012.

The Qualified Respondents' Questionnaire (QRQ) is designed to complement polling data with expert opinion on a variety of dimensions relevant to the rule of law. The expert questionnaires were tailored to four areas of expertise: civil and commercial law, criminal justice (*due process*); labor law, and public health. The questionnaires cover different

Table 3: City Coverage and polling methodology in the 97 indexed countries

Country	Cities Covered	Polling Company	Methodology	Sample	Year
Albania	Tirana, Durres, Elbasan	Strategic Puls Group	F2F	1096	2009
Argentina	Buenos Aires, Cordoba, Rosario	Navarro Mkt Research	CATI	1000	2009
Australia	Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane	IPSOS Public Affairs Pty Ltd.	ONLINE	1030	2009
Austria	Vienna, Graz, Linz	Market Institut	ONLINE	1000	2009
Bangladesh	Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna	Org-Quest Research Limited	F2F	1000	2011
Belarus	Minsk, Gomel, Mogilev	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA	F2F	1000	2012
Belgium	Brussels, Antwerpen, Gent	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2011
Bolivia	La Paz, Santa Cruz, Cochabamba	Encuestas y Estudios	F2F	1003	2009
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Tuzla	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA	F2F	1000	2012
Botswana	Gaborone, Francistown, Molepolole	SIS International Research	F2F	1045	2012
Brazil	São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte	Fine Research	CATI & F2F	850	2011
Bulgaria	Sofia, Plovdiv, Varna	Alpha Research	F2F	1024	2009
Burkina Faso	Ouagadougou, Bobo-Dioulasso, Dedougou	TNS-RMS Cameroun Ltd.	F2F	1007	2012
Cambodia	Phnom Penh, Battambang, Kampong Cham	Indochina Research Ltd	F2F	1006	2011
Cameroun	Douala, Yaoundé, Bamenda	CIBLE	F2F	1000	2011
Canada	Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2012
Chile	Santiago, Valparaíso, Concepcion	Fine Research	CATI	850	2011
China	Shanghai, Beijing, Guangzhou	WJP in collaboration with local partner	F2F	1006	2011
Colombia	Bogota, Medellín, Cali	Statmark Group S.A.	F2F	1000	2012
Cote d'Ivoire	Abidjan, Bouake, San Pedro	TNS-RMS Cameroun Ltd.	F2F	1013	2012
Croatia	Zagreb, Split, Rijeka	Puls - Marketing, Media and Public Opinion	CATI	1006	2009
Czech Republic	Prague, Brno, Ostrava	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1001	2011
Denmark	Copenhagen, Aarhus, Odense	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2012
Dominican Republic	Gran Santo Domingo, Santiago de los Caballeros, San Cristobal	Asisa Research Group Inc.	F2F	1000	2009
Ecuador	Quinto, Guayaquil, Cuenca	Prime Consulting	F2F	1152	2012
Egypt	Cairo, Alexandria, Giza	FeedBack Market Research	F2F	1000	2012
El Salvador	San Salvador, Soyapango, Santa Ana	Borge y Asociados	F2F	1020	2009
Estonia	Tallinn, Tartu, Narva	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2011
Ethiopia	Addis Ababa, Dire Dawa, Mek'ele	Research Solutions Limited	F2F	1019	2011
Finland	Helsinki, Tampere, Turku	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2012
France	Paris, Marseille, Lyon	Leger Marketing with local partner	ONLINE	1000	2009
Georgia	Tbilisi, Kutaisi, Batumi	ACT Marketing Research & Consulting	F2F	1000	2012
Germany	Berlin, Hamburg, Munich	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1002	2011
Ghana	Accra, Kumasi, Tamale	The Steadman Group (Synovate)	F2F	1006	2009
Greece	Athens, Salonica, Patras	Centrum S.A.	CATI	1000	2012
Guatemala	Guatemala City, Villa Nueva, Mixco	TNS DATA, S.A.	F2F	1000	2011
Hong Kong SAR, China	Hong Kong	IBI Partners	F2F	1006	2011
Hungary	Budapest, Debrecen, Miskolc	SIS International Research	F2F	1000	2012
India	Mumbai, Delhi, Kolkata	Hindustan Thompson Assoc. Pvt Ltd Division IMRB Int.	F2F	1004	2009
Indonesia	Jakarta, Bandung, Surabaya	Synovate Indonesia	F2F	1067	2009
Iran	Teheran, Mashad, Isfahan	FeedBack Market Research	F2F	1097	2011
Italy	Rome, Milan, Naples	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2011
Jamaica	Kingston, Portmore, Spanish Town	StatMark Group S.A.	F2F	1000	2011
Japan	Tokyo, Yokohama, Osaka	IBI Partners	CATI	1000	2009
Jordan	Amman, Irbid, Zarqa	WJP in collaboration with local partner	F2F	1011	2009
Kazakhstan	Almaty, Astana, Shymkent	ROMIR Holding Research LTD	F2F	1000	2011
Kenya	Nairobi, Mombasa, Nakuru	Synovate Kenya	F2F	1012	2009
Kyrgyzstan	Bishkek, Osh, Jalalabd	ROMIR Holding Research LTD	F2F	1000	2011
Lebanon	Beirut, Tripoli, Sidon	FeedBack Market Research	F2F	1001	2011
Liberia	Monrovia	WJP in collaboration with local partner	F2F	1000	2009
Macedonia	Skopje, Bitola, Kumanovo	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA	F2F	1000	2012
Madagascar	Antananarivo, Antsirabe, Toamasina	DCDM Research	F2F	1002	2012
Malawi	Lilongwe, Blantyre, Mzuzu	SIS International Research	F2F	1001	2012
Malaysia	Kuala Lumpur, Ipoh, Johor Bahru	IBI Partners	F2F	1006	2011
Mexico	Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey	On Target	CATI	1000	2012
Moldova	Chisinau, Balti, Cahul	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA	F2F	1000	2012
Mongolia	Ulaanbaatar, Erdenet, Darkhan	Sant Maral	F2F	1000	2012
Morocco	Casablanca, Rabat, Fes	WJP in collaboration with local partner	F2F	1000	2009
Nepal	Kathmandu, Morang, Rupandehi	Ipsos	F2F	1015	2012
Netherlands	Amsterdam, s'Gravenhage, Rotterdam	RenMMatrix	ONLINE	1004	2009
New Zealand	Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch	IBI Partners	CATI	1006	2011
Nicaragua	Managua, León, Esteli	Statmark Group S.A.	F2F	1000	2012
Nigeria	Lagos, Kano, Ibadan	The Steadman Group (Synovate)	F2F	1001	2009
Norway	Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1005	2011
Pakistan	Karachi, Lahore, Faisalabad	Ipsos	F2F	1000	2012
Panama	Panama City, Colón, David Chiriquí	Statmark Group S.A.	F2F	1000	2012
Peru	Lima, Trujillo, Arequipa	IPSOS APOYO Opinion y Mercado S.A.	F2F	1009	2009
Philippines	Manila, Davao, Cebu	IBI Partners	F2F	1000	2009
Poland	Warsaw, Lodz, Cracow	Synovate Poland	F2F	1000	2009
Portugal	Lisbon, Porto, Braga	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2012
Republic of Korea	Seoul, Busan, Incheon	Nice Research and Consulting, Inc.	ONLINE	1000	2009
Romania	Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, Iasi	Synovate SRL	F2F	1000	2011
Russia	Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Novosibirsk	ROMIR Holding Research LTD	F2F	1000	2011
Senegal	Dakar, Thies, Diourbel	TNS RMS Senegal	F2F	1024	2011
Serbia	Belgrade, Novi Sad, Nis	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA	F2F	1000	2012
Sierra Leone	Freetown, Kenema, Makeni	TNS-RMS Cameroun Ltd.	F2F	1005	2012
Singapore	Singapore	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2012
Slovenia	Ljubljana, Maribor, Celje	SIS International Research	F2F	1000	2012
South Africa	Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban	Quest Research Services	F2F	1000	2009
Spain	Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia	Leger Marketing with local partner	ONLINE	1018	2009
Sri Lanka	Colombo, Negombo, Kandy	Ipsos	F2F	1020	2012
Sweden	Stockholm, Goteborg, Malmo	NORSTAT	ONLINE	1003	2009
Tanzania	Dar es Salaam, Mwanza, Shinyanga	Consumer Options Ltd.	F2F	1000	2012
Thailand	Bangkok, Nonthaburi, Pak Kret	IBI Partners Thailand	F2F	1000	2009
Tunisia	Tunis, Sfax, Sousse	WJP in collaboration with local partner	F2F	1000	2012
Turkey	Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir	Yontem Research Consultancy Ltd.	F2F	1000	2009
Uganda	Kampala, Mukono, Wakiso	Synovate Limited	F2F	1000	2011
Ukraine	Kiev, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk	Kiev International Institute of Sociology, Ltd	F2F	1010	2011
United Arab Emirates	Dubai, Sharjah, Abu-Dhabi	FeedBack Market Research	F2F	1011	2011
United Kingdom	London, Birmingham, Glasgow	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1001	2011
United States	New York, Los Angeles, Chicago	Survey Sampling International, LLC	ONLINE	1000	2012
Uruguay	Montevideo, Salto, Paysandu	Statmark Group S.A.	CATI	1000	2012
Uzbekistan	Fergana, Samarkand, Tashkent	Market Research & Polls - EURASIA	F2F	1000	2012
Venezuela	Caracas, Maracaibo, Barquisimeto	WJP in collaboration with local partner	F2F	1000	2011
Vietnam	Ho Chi Minh City, Ha Noi, Hai Phong	Indochina Research Ltd	F2F	1000	2011
Zambia	Lusaka, Kitwe, Ndola	SIS International Research	F2F	1004	2012
Zimbabwe	Harare, Bulawayo, Chitungwiza	SIS International Research	F2F	1005	2012

aspects of the majority of factors, but are tailored to suit the knowledge and expertise of each type of respondent. The questionnaires include close-ended perception questions and several hypothetical scenarios with highly detailed factual assumptions aimed at ensuring comparability across countries. Qualified respondents are selected based solely on their professional expertise by using two methods. The first method involves a two-stage procedure. In the first stage, a large number of organizations are selected from a set of directories of law firms, universities/colleges, research organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In the second stage, a random sample of experts is drawn from within the selected organizations. Once a sufficient number of potential respondents are identified, questionnaires are sent to the selected individuals. The second method builds on the WJP network of practitioners and academics- people who have provided significant input to the development of the Index. Data collection was conducted from May 2012 through October 2012.

The Index is thus based on data from experts and data from the general public. The intent in using these two data sources is twofold - the first is to complement the information provided by the experts' assessments (specialized knowledge of certain processes, actors, and circumstances) with that of the general public (different rule of law problems as experienced by the people). The underlying concept is that experts and lay people are knowledgeable about different rule of law situations. For instance, while experts are familiar with the duration of cases in courts,

they might not comprehend factors such as crime in different neighborhoods, which is a problem experienced on a daily basis by the general public. The second goal is to validate our findings by providing different perspectives on the same issue (see Data validation and cross-checks section below). In this way, the Index anchors expert opinion on rigorous polling of the general public to ensure that the findings reflect the conditions experienced by the population, including marginalized sectors of society.

COMBINING SEVERAL QUESTIONS TO MEASURE A COMPLEX CONCEPT

No single question can cover all of the dimensions of the concepts described by the different factors and sub-factors, therefore, the WJP's Rule of Law Index measures each of the concepts with several variables. By combining a series of questions, with each reflecting different aspects of a particular concept, it is possible to create composite indicators that better capture the reality of a complex concept, such as the rule of law. For instance, sub-factor 6.2 measures whether government regulations are applied and enforced without the exercise of bribery or improper influence. Given the large number of regulations emerging from different governmental bodies in each country, it is clear that no single question can adequately encompass this concept. The Index thus incorporates a series of 33 questions falling under

different regulatory areas, such as labor, environment, public health, education, public registries, and procurement. With all this information, we create a composite measure that conveys more precisely the extent of bribery and corruption in regulatory implementation. Overall, the Index combines more than 400 detailed questions to measure the concepts represented in the different sub-factors of the WJP's Rule of Law Index.

BUILDING INDICATORS

All variables included in the Rule of Law Index were normalized using the Min-Max method, so that all variables are expressed in a scale from 0 (low rule of law) to 1 (high rule of law). Individual variables covering the same concept were averaged and then aggregated into sub-factors and factors using simple averages. These scores are the basis of the final rankings. In all cases, the base level of aggregation for each sub-factor is calculated with a weight of 50% for the QRQ variables, and 50% for the GPP variables.¹

DATA VALIDATION AND CROSS-CHECKS

Another distinguishing feature of the WJP's Rule of Law Index is that it approaches the measurement of rule

of law from various angles so as to improve the validity and reliability of the resultant scores – a method known as triangulation. The Rule of Law Index triangulates information across data sources and also across types of questions. This approach not only enables accounting for different perspectives on the rule of law, but it also helps to reduce possible bias that might be introduced by any one particular data collection method. In addition, the Index employs both a qualitative and quantitative methodology for cross-checking its findings in order to identify discrepancies between the Index and other data sources.

LIMITATIONS

With the aforementioned methodological strengths come a number of limitations. First, the data will shed light on rule of law dimensions that appear comparatively strong or weak, but will not be specific enough to establish causation. Thus, it will be necessary to use the Index in combination with other analytical tools to provide a full picture of causes and possible solutions.

Second, the methodology has been applied only in three major urban areas in each of the indexed countries. As the project evolves, the WJP intends to extend the application of the methodology to other urban areas, and eventually to rural areas as well.

¹ Composite indicators are subject to several sources of uncertainty, including sampling error, missing data, weighting, normalization, or aggregation rules, to mention just a few. To assess the impact of such uncertainties on our estimates, we asked the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission to perform a sensitivity analysis based a combination of Monte Carlo experiments, bootstrapping, and multi-modeling approaches [Saisana, M and Saltelli, A. (2012)]. Their analysis has demonstrated the robustness of our findings, i.e., that 90 percent of the countries show a shift of less than ± 1 position.

OTHER METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A detailed presentation of the methodology, including a description of the more than 400 variables used to construct the Index scores, are available in Botero, J and Ponce, A. (2012) “Measuring the Rule of Law 2012 Update ”. WJP Working Paper No. 2, available online at www.worldjusticeproject.org.

Part III: JRC audit on the 2012 WJP Rule of Law Index



Statistical Audit

MICHAELA SAISANA AND ANDREA SALTELLI

European Commission Joint Research Centre (Ispra, Italy)

SUMMARY

The JRC analysis suggests that the conceptualized multi-level structure of the 2012 WJP Rule of Law Index is statistically coherent and balanced (i.e., none of the eight dimensions is dominated by an underlying component). Furthermore, the analysis has offered statistical justification for the equal weights and the use of arithmetic averaging at the various levels of aggregation. Country ranks across the eight dimensions are also fairly robust to methodological changes related to the estimation of missing data, weighting or aggregation rule (less than ± 3 positions shift in 90% of the cases).

The assessment of conceptual and statistical coherence of the World Justice Project (WJP) Rule of Law Index and the estimation of the impact of modeling choices on a country's performance are useful steps: they add to the transparency and reliability of the Index and to build confidence in the narratives supported by the measure. Modelling the cultural and subjective concepts underlying rule of law at a national scale around the globe raises practical challenges related to the combination of these concepts into a single set of numbers.

The Econometrics and Applied Statistics Unit at the European Commission Joint Research Centre in

Ispra (Italy) has undertaken for a third consecutive year, upon invitation of the WJP, a thorough statistical assessment of the *Index*¹. Fine-tuning suggestions made by the JRC for the previous two releases of the *Index* were already taken on board by the WJP. However, due to some re-structuring of the framework from 46 to 44² sub-factors and from 479 to 516 survey questions, the WJP requested an audit of the Index for a third time. The WJP Rule of Law Index was assessed along two main avenues: the conceptual and statistical coherence of the structure, and the impact of key modeling choices on its 2012 WJP Rule of Law scores and ranks.

CONCEPTUAL AND STATISTICAL COHERENCE IN THE WJP RULE OF LAW FRAMEWORK

Country data delivered to the JRC were average scores across academics or individuals along 516 survey questions (henceforth variables) for 97 countries. These variables are not affected by outliers or skewed

¹ The JRC analysis was based on the recommendations of the OECD (2008) Handbook on Composite Indicators, and on more recent research from the JRC. The JRC auditing studies of composite indicators are available at <http://composite-indicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

² A total of only 44 sub-factors accounts for the fact that neither sub-factor 1.1, 9.1, 9.2 nor 9.3 are covered in the 2012 Index.

distributions³, except for 13 variables spread across five dimensions in the WJP Rule of Law Index⁴. Given the high number of variables combined in building a dimension, the skewed distributions of those variables do not bias the results. The 2012 dataset is characterized by excellent data coverage (96% in a matrix of 516 variables × 97 countries). Data coverage per dimension and country is also very good or excellent. A further data quality issue relates to the treatment of missing values. The WJP, for reasons of transparency and simplicity, calculated sub-factor scores using only available information for each country. This choice, which is common in relevant contexts, might discourage countries from reporting low data values. We tested the implications of ‘no imputation’ versus the use of the expectation-maximization method for the estimation of missing data and discuss this in the second part of the assessment together with other modeling choices.

Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to assess to which extent the conceptual framework is confirmed by statistical approaches and to identify eventual pitfalls. The analysis confirms the 2012 WJP Rule of Law Index structure, as within each of the eight dimensions the first latent factor captures between 58% up to 87% of the variance (best result for the dimension on *Absence of Corruption*). A more detailed analysis of the correlation structure confirms

the expectation that the sub-factors are more correlated to their own dimension than to any other dimension and all correlations are strong and positive. Hence, the conceptual grouping of sub-factors into dimensions is statistically supported by the data. Finally, the eight dimensions share a single latent factor that captures 81% of the total variance. This latter result could be used as a statistical justification for aggregating further the eight dimensions into a single index by using a weighted arithmetic average. This is not currently done, as the WJP team aims to shed more light to the dimensions of the rule of law as opposed to an overall index.

Next, tests focused on identifying whether the eight dimensions of the WJP Rule of Law Index are statistically well-balanced in the underlying sub-factors. In the present context given that all dimensions are built as simple arithmetic averages (*i.e.* equal weights for the relative sub-factors), our analysis answers the question: ‘*are the sub-factors really equally important?*’ We used an ‘importance measure’ (henceforth S_i), known as correlation ratio or first order sensitivity measure (Saltelli *et al.*, 2008). The S_i describes ‘the expected reduction in the variance of the eight dimension scores that would be obtained if a given sub-factor could be fixed’. As discussed in Paruolo *et al.*, 2012, we can take this as a measure of importance⁵; thus if sub-factors are

3 Groeneveld and Meeden (1984) set the criteria for absolute skewness above 1 and kurtosis above 3.5. The skewness criterion was relaxed to ‘above 2’ to account for the small sample (97 countries).

4 In the WJP Rule of Law Index ‘sub-factors’ are equivalent to sub-dimensions.

5 The Pearson correlation ratio or first order sensitivity measure offers a precise definition of importance, that is ‘the expected reduction in variance of the CI that would be obtained if a variable could be fixed’; it can be used regardless of the degree of correlation between variables; it is model-free, in that it can be applied also in non-linear aggregations; it is not invasive, in that no changes are made to the index or to the correlation structure of the indicators.

Table 4: Importance measures (variance-based) for the 44 sub-factors in the eight dimensions of the 2012 WJP Rule of Law Index

Sub-factor	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8
#.1		0.95 [0.93, 0.96]	0.64 [0.63, 0.72]	0.51* [0.51, 0.56]	0.76 [0.73, 0.80]	0.81 [0.80, 0.84]	0.58 [0.56, 0.60]	0.69 [0.62, 0.74]
#.2	0.87 [0.83, 0.90]	0.90 [0.85, 0.91]	0.42* [0.42, 0.44]	0.84 [0.82, 0.89]	0.81 [0.80, 0.87]	0.91 [0.88, 0.91]	0.55 [0.55, 0.66]	0.76 [0.76, 0.82]
#.3	0.92 [0.89, 0.92]	0.91 [0.88, 0.93]	0.62 [0.62, 0.71]	0.72 [0.72, 0.78]	0.73 [0.72, 0.83]	0.74 [0.71, 0.8]	0.82 [0.79, 0.84]	0.80 [0.78, 0.86]
#.4	0.81 [0.80, 0.84]	0.84 [0.81, 0.87]		0.79 [0.75, 0.84]	0.81 [0.79, 0.86]	0.82 [0.80, 0.85]	0.64 [0.58, 0.71]	0.69 [0.69, 0.78]
#.5	0.72 [0.71, 0.77]					0.74 [0.71, 0.82]	0.43* [0.43, 0.52]	0.87 [0.86, 0.90]
#.6	0.80 [0.75, 0.85]						0.80 [0.77, 0.82]	0.60 [0.47, 0.69]
#.7	0.83 [0.80, 0.86]						0.60 [0.59, 0.68]	0.86 [0.85, 0.87]
#.8				0.65 [0.65, 0.69]				

Source: Saisana and Saltelli, European Commission Joint Research Centre; WJP Rule of Law 2012
Notes: (1) Numbers represent the kernel estimates of the Pearson correlation ratio (η^2), as in Paruolo et al., 2012. Min-max estimates for the η^2 derive from the choice of the smoothing parameter. (2) Sub-factors that have much lower contribution to the variance of the relevant Dimension scores than the equal weighting expectation are marked with an asterisk. (3) D1: Limited Government Powers, D2: Absence of Corruption, D3 Order and Security, D4: Fundamental Rights, D5: Open Government, D6: Regulatory Enforcement, D7: Civil Justice, D8: Criminal Justice.

supposed to be equally important their S_i values should not differ too much. Results are reassuring: all sub-factors are important in classifying countries within each dimension, though some sub-factors are slightly more important than others (see Table 4 “Table 4: Importance measures (variance-based) for the 44 sub-factors in the eight dimensions of the 2012 WJP Rule of Law Index” on page 11). Although still acceptable, the worst results for this kind of coherence analysis are: under *Fundamental Rights* dimension (D4), the contribution of the sub-factor 4.1 (*equal treatment and absence of discrimination*) compared to the remaining sub-factors on the basis of the lower effective weight. Similarly, sub-factors 3.2 (*civil conflict is effectively limited*) and sub-factor 7.5 (*civil justice is not subject to unreasonable delays*) have a lower contribution to the variance of the respective dimension compared to the other sub-factors in those dimensions. All together the degree of coherence of this version of the index is remarkable, i.e. all dimensions look balanced and coherent.

IMPACT OF MODELING ASSUMPTIONS ON THE WJP RULE OF LAW INDEX RESULTS

Every dimension in the WJP Rule of Law Index is the outcome of choices: the framework (driven by theoretical models and expert opinion), the variables included, the estimation or not of missing values, the normalization of the variables, the weights assigned to the variables and sub-factors, and the aggregation method, among other elements. Some of these choices are based on expert opinion, or common practice, driven by statistical analysis or the need for ease of communication. The aim of the uncertainty analysis is to assess to what extent these choices might affect country classification. We have dealt with these uncertainties simultaneously in order to assess their joint influence and fully acknowledge their implications. Data are considered to be error-free since the WJP team already undertook a double-check

Table 5: Uncertainty parameters (missing values, weights and aggregation function)

	Reference	Alternative
I. Uncertainty in the treatment of missing data	No estimation of missing data	Expectation Maximization (EM)
II. Uncertainty in the aggregation function	Arithmetic average	Geometric average
III. Uncertainty intervals for the sub-factor weights	Reference value for the weight	Distribution assigned for uncertainty analysis
1: Limited Government Powers (# 6 sub-factors)	0.167	U[0.125, 0.208]
2: Absence of Corruption (#4 sub-factors)	0.250	U[0.187, 0.312]
3: Order and Security (#3 sub-factors)	0.333	U[0.250, 0.417]
4: Fundamental Rights (#8 sub-factors)	0.125	U[0.094, 0.156]
5: Open Government (#4 sub-factors)	0.250	U[0.187, 0.312]
6: Regulatory Enforcement (#5 sub-factors)	0.200	U[0.150, 0.250]
7: Civil Justice (#7 sub-factors)	0.143	U[0.107, 0.179]
8: Criminal Justice (#7 sub-factors)	0.143	U[0.107, 0.179]

Source: Saisana and Saltelli, European Commission Joint Research Centre; WJP Rule of Law 2012

control of potential outliers and eventual errors and typos were corrected during this phase.

The robustness assessment of the WJP Rule of Law Index was based on a combination of a Monte Carlo experiment and a multi-modelling approach. This type of assessment aims to respond to eventual criticism that the country scores associated with aggregate measures are generally not calculated under conditions of certainty, even if they are frequently presented as such (Saisana *et al.*, 2005, 2011). The Monte Carlo simulation related to the weights and comprised 1,000 runs, each corresponding to a different set of weights of the sub-factors underlying each dimension, randomly sampled from uniform continuous distributions centered in the reference values. The choice of the range for the weights' variation was driven by two opposite needs: on the one hand, the need to ensure a wide enough interval to have meaningful robustness checks; on the other hand, the need to respect the rationale of the WJP that the sub-factors and equally important when calculating a dimension. Given

these considerations, limit values of uncertainty intervals have been defined as shown in Table 5.

The multi-modelling approach involved combinations of the remaining two key assumptions on the 'no imputation' of missing data and the aggregation formula within a dimension. The WJP calculated sub-factor scores using only available information for each country⁶. This choice (often termed as 'no imputation') was confronted with the application of the expectation-maximization method for the estimation of the missing data⁷. Regarding the WJP assumption on the aggregation function (arithmetic average), and despite the fact that it received statistical support (see principal component analysis results in the previous section), decision-theory practitioners have challenged this type


⁶ Note that here 'no imputation' is equivalent to replacing missing values with the average of the available data within each sub-factor.

⁷ The Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm (Little and Rubin, 2002) is an iterative procedure that finds the maximum likelihood estimates of the parameter vector by repeating two steps: (1) The expectation E-step: Given a set of parameter estimates, such as a mean vector and covariance matrix for a multivariate normal distribution, the E-step calculates the conditional expectation of the complete-data log likelihood given the observed data and the parameter estimates. (2) The maximization M-step: Given a complete-data log likelihood, the M-step finds the parameter estimates to maximize the complete-data log likelihood from the E-step. The two steps are iterated until the iterations converge.

of aggregation because of inherent theoretical inconsistencies lined to their fully compensatory nature, in which a comparative advantage of a few variables can compensate a comparative disadvantage of many variables. This offsetting might not be always desirable when dealing with fundamental aspects of a concept such as rule of law. Hence, we considered the geometric average instead, which is a partially compensatory approach⁸. Consequently, we tested four models based on the combination of no imputation versus expectation-maximization and arithmetic versus geometric average. Combined with the 1,000 simulations per model to account for the uncertainty in the weights across the sub-factors, we carried out altogether 4,000 simulations.

The main results of the uncertainty analysis are provided in Figure 1, which shows median ranks and 90% intervals computed across the 4,000 Monte Carlo simulations for *Absence of Corruption* (D2, one of the most robust dimensions) and for *Order and Security* (D3, one of the least robust dimensions). Countries are ordered from best to worst according to their reference rank in the WJP (black line), the dot being the simulated median rank. Error bars represent, for each country, the 90% interval across all simulations. Ranks in all eight dimensions are very robust to the modeling assumptions: 90 percent of the countries shift with respect to the simulated median less than ± 2 positions in *Limited Government Powers* (D1) and *Absence of Corruption* (D2); less than ± 3 positions in *Regulatory Enforcement*

⁸ In the geometric average, sub-factors are multiplied as opposed to summed in the arithmetic average. Sub-factor weights appear as exponents in the multiplication. To avoid close to zero values biasing the geometric average, we re-scaled linearly the sub-factors scores to a minimum of 0.1.



(D6), *Civil Justice* (D7) and *Criminal Justice* (D8); less than ± 4 positions in *Fundamental Rights* (D4); less than ± 5 positions in *Open Government* (D5); less than ± 6 positions in *Order and Security* (D3).

The fact that the dimension on *Absence of Corruption* (D2) is one of the most robust in the WJP Rule of Law Index with respect to modeling assumptions and also very coherent (as discussed in the previous section, see Table 4)

is all the more noteworthy given its inclusion in the Corruption Perception Index of Transparency International (as one of the thirteen measures describing perception of corruption in the public sector and among politicians).

Overall across all 97 countries and eight dimensions of the rule of law, there is an absolute shift of less than 3 positions with respect to the simulated median rank in 90% of the cases. Note that in the 2011 release of the index (66 countries) the respective shift was merely 1 position for 90% of the cases. This should not be interpreted as the 2012 being less robust given the higher number of countries included this year (97 in 2012, over 66 in 2011).

Simulated 90% intervals across 4,000 Monte Carlo runs are narrow enough for most countries (less than 6 positions in 75% of the cases) to allow for meaningful inferences to be drawn. Few countries have relatively wide intervals (more than 15 positions): none on D1; Thailand on D2; Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Philippines and Sri Lanka on D3; none on D4; Albania, China, Iran, Madagascar, Malaysia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, and UAE on D5; none on D6; Croatia and Madagascar on D7; Peru on D8. These relatively wide intervals are due to compensation of low performance on some sub-factors with a very good performance on other sub-factors in a given dimension (see country profiles in the main part of the report). These cases have been flagged herein as part of the uncertainty analysis in order to give more transparency in the entire process and to help appreciate the WJP Rule of Law Index results with respect to the choices made during the development phase.

CONCLUSION

The JRC analysis suggests that the conceptualized multi-level structure of the 2012 WJP Rule of Law Index is statistically coherent and balanced (i.e., none of the eight dimensions is dominated by an underlying component). Furthermore, the analysis has offered statistical justification for the equal weights and the use of arithmetic averaging at the various levels of aggregation – which should not be taken for granted when linear aggregation is concerned. Country ranks across the eight dimensions are also fairly robust to methodological changes related to the estimation of missing data, weighting or aggregation rule (less than ± 3 positions shift in 90% of the cases). A hypothetical aggregated Rule of Law Index would also appear statistically justified given the data. Finally, the fact that the dimension on Absence of Corruption is especially coherent and robust in the WJP Rule of Law Index is noteworthy given its inclusion in the Corruption Perception Index of Transparency International.

REFERENCES

- Groeneveld, R. A., Meeden, G. 1984. Measuring skewness and kurtosis. *The Statistician* 33: 391–99.
- Little, R. J. A., Rubin, D. B. 2002. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*, 2nd edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Munda, G. 2008. *Social Multi-Criteria Evaluation for a Sustainable Economy*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- OECD/EC JRC, 2008. *Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide*. Paris: OECD.

Paruolo, P., Saltelli, A., Saisana, M. 2012. Ratings and rankings: Voodoo or Science? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, 176 (2), 1-26.

Saisana, M., Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S. 2005. Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis Techniques as Tools for the Analysis and Validation of Composite Indicators. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A* 168 (2):307–323.

Saisana, M., D’Hombres, B., Saltelli, A. 2011. Rickety Numbers: Volatility of University Rankings and Policy Implications. *Research Policy* 40: 165–77.

Saltelli, A., Ratto, M., Andres, T., Campolongo, F., Cariboni, J., Gatelli, D., Saisana, M., Tarantola, S. 2008. *Global Sensitivity Analysis: The Primer*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Part IV: Contributing Experts |

Contributing Experts

The WJP Rule of Law Index 2012 was made possible by generous pro-bono contribution of academics and practitioners who contributed their time and expertise. The names of those experts wishing to be acknowledged individually listed in the following pages.

This report was also made possible by the work of the polling companies who conducted fieldwork, and the thousands of individuals who have responded to the general population poll (GPP) around the world.

ALBANIA

Ervin Bano
Tonucci @ Partners

Jona Bica
Kalo @ Associates

Raimonda Bozo
Tirana Legal Aid Society (TLAS)

Jonida Braja
WolfTheiss

Dorant Ekmekaj
Hoxha, Memi @ Hoxha

Sokol Elmazaj
Boga @ Associates

Valbona Gjoncari
Boga @ Associates

Shirli Gorenca Gorenca
Kalo @ Associates

Emel Haxhillari
Kalo @ Associates

Eris Hoxha
Hoxha, Memi @ Hoxha

Ilir Johollari
Hoxha, Memi @ Hoxha

Andi Memi
Hoxha, Memi @ Hoxha

Blerta Nesho
WolfTheiss

Anteo Papa
Optima Legal @ Financial

Artila Rama
Boga @ Associates

Klodian Rjepaj
Ministry of Health

Genci Terpo

Gerhard Velaj
Boga @ Associates

Anonymous Contributors

ARGENTINA

Valeria Amelong
Sanatorio de Niños

Alejo Baca Castex
G. Breuer

Fernando Basch
Guillermo Jorge @ Asociados

Paola Bergallo
Universidad de San Andrés

Marcelo Bombau

Federico A. Borzi Cirilli
Defensas Penales

Diego Carbone
*Alesina Gatti Taubas Bellani Carbone
Vibes Abogados*

Hernán Jorge Danzi
Estudio Jurídico Penal Danzi

Roberto Durrieu
Estudio Durrieu Abogados

Alberto Justo Giles
*Colegio de Abogados de la Provincia de
Buenos Aires*

Adrián Goldin
*Sociedad Internacional de Derecho del
Trabajo y de la Seguridad Social*

Gonzalo Hernández
M. @ M. Bomchil

Santiago Legarre
*Pontificia Universidad Católica
Argentina*

Jorge Luis Leguiza
Universidad ISALUD

Monica Lupi
Sanchez Lupi @ Assoc.

Gabriel Alejandro Martoglio

Pablo Mazza
Ministerio de Salud de la Nacion

Rosa María Oller
Estudio Jurídico Oller López @ Asoc.

Claudio J. Santagati
*Pontificia Universidad Católica
Argentina*

Diego Silva Ortiz
Silva Ortiz, Alfonso, Pavic @ Louge

Santiago Gerardo Spadafora
Universidad ISALUD

Adrián R. Tellas

Maria Paola Trigiani
Alfaro Abogados

Mariano Vaquero

Anonymous Contributors

AUSTRALIA

Lee Ann Bassar
La Trobe University

Peter Cashman
University of Sydney

Joseph Catanzariti
Clayton Utz

Sean Cooney
*Melbourne Law School, University of
Melbourne*

Nicholas Cowdery AM QC
*Sydney Institute of Criminology,
University of Sydney*

Breen Creighton
RMIT University

Carol Dalglish
Queensland University of Technology

Evelyne de Leeuw
Deakin University

Michael Dodson
*National Centre for Indigenous Studies,
Australian National University*

Shelley Dunstone
Legal Circles

Patrick Emerton
Faculty of Law, Monash University

Thomas Faunce
Australian National University

James Fitz Simmons
Clayton Utz

Andrew Frazer
University of Wollongong

Jeffrey Fuller
*School of Nursing @ Midwifery, Flinders
University*

Chunchai Giugni
Royal Thai Government

Paghona Peggy Kerdo
La Trobe University

Vivian Lin
La Trobe University

Fiona McDonald
*School of Law, Queensland University of
Technology*

Mary Anne Noone
School of Law, La Trobe University

Simon Rice
Australian National University

Esther Stern
Flinders University of South Australia

Greg Taylor
Monash University

Penelope Weller
Monash University

Daniel Williams
Minter Ellison

Anonymous Contributors

AUSTRIA

Franz Amler

Julian Feichtinger
CHSH Partnerschaft von Rechtsanwälten

Arpad Gered
*Maybach Görg Lenneis Gered Zacherl
Rechtsanwälte GmbH*

C. Hahl
Austrian Health Institute ÖBIG

Thomas Hofmann
PALLAS Rechtsanwalte Partnerschaft

Robert Kert
*Criminal Law Department, University
of Vienna*

Manfred Ketzer
*Hausmaninger Kletter Rechtsanwälte
GmbH*

Andreas Lehner
Constitutional Court of Austria

ÖGB

Isabelle Pellech
*Mag. Isabelle Pellech LL.M.
Rechtsanwältin*

Martin Reinisch
*Brauneis Klauser Prändl Attorneys-at-
Law*

Martin Risak
*Department of Labour Law and Law of
Social Security, University of Vienna*

David Schnaiter

Jernej Sekolec
*London Court of International
Arbitration*

Karl Stoeger
University of Graz

Doris Wydra
*Salzburg Centre of European Union
Studies*

Stefan Zleptnig
University of Vienna

Anonymous Contributors

BANGLADESH

ASM Alamgir
World Health Organisation (WHO)

Bilqis Amin Hoque
*Environment and Population Research
Centre (EPRC)*

Abdul Awal
NRDS

M. R. I. Chowdhury
M. R. I. Chowdhury @ Associates

Mirza Farzana Iqbal Chowdhury
Daffodil International University

A.B.M. Nasirud Doulah
Doulah @ Doulah

Debra Efroymsom
HealthBridge

S M Shajedul Haque
Eminence

Arif Imtiaz
Fox Mandal

Saira Rahman Khan
BRAC University

Shusmita Khan
Eminence

Ashiquddin Mohammad Maruf
Northern University Bangladesh

Mahbub Parvez
Daffodil International University

Sheikh Abdur Rahim
Daffodil International University

Abu Sayeed M. M. Rahman
United Hospital Limited

Mir Shamsur Rahman
*Department of Law and Human Rights,
University of Asia Pacific*

Mohammad Mostafizur Rahman
HeidelbergCement Bangladesh Limited

S. A. Razzak
AMDA Bangladesh

K.A.R. Sayeed
United Hospital Limited

Anonymous Contributors

BELARUS

Alexandr Bondar
Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski Law Firm

Antonina Ivanova
DICSA Law Firm

Vitaly Kachelya
GLIMSTEDT Law Firm

Sergey Kalinin
Belarussian State University

Nina Knyazeva
Businessconsult Law Firm

Anastasiya Malakhova
Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski Law Firm

Valentina Ogarkova
Stepanovski, Papakul @ Partners LLC

Elena Selivanova
Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski Law Firm

Artsemyeu Siarhei
Belarussian State University

Olga Zdobnova
Vlasova Mikhel and Partners Law Firm

Anonymous Contributors

BELGIUM

Jean-Pascal Abayo
Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Liège

J. Acolty
Philippe @ Partners

Alexia Autenne
Université Catholique de Louvain

A. Claes
De Broeck Van Laere @ Partners

Michel Cornette
Elegis Advocaten

Daniël Cuypers
Université d'Anvers

Jan De Greef

Olivier De Witte
Université Libre de Bruxelles

Michel De Wolf
Université Catholique de Louvain

Elise Dermine
Université Catholique de Louvain

Ledoux Didier
Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Liège

Jean-François Gerkens
Université de Liège

Séverine Lauwick
Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Liège

Jacques Libouton
Gérard @ Associés

Etienne Montero
Université de Namur

Karel Mul
Mul Law Offices

Sakalihan Natzli
Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Liège

Emmanuel Plasschaert

Pieter Vandekerckhove

Patrick Wautelet
Faculté de droit - Université de Liège

Christian Willems
Loyens @ Loeff

Anonymous Contributors

BOLIVIA

Maria Eugenia Antezana
Criales, Urcullo @ Antezana - Abogados

Pedro Barrientos
Cayo Salinas @ Asociados

Cesar Burgoa Rodriguez
Bufete Burgoa

Cristian Bustos
Ferrere Abogados

Rosario Baptista Canedo
*Comisión Andina de Juristas - Asociación
Americana de Juristas, rama Bolivia*

Carlos Derpic Salazar
Garrón Bozo Abogados

Arturo Gerente
Alpha SG.Consultores Legales

Carlos L. Gerke
Estudio Jurídico Gerke, Soc. Civ.

Primitivo Gutiérrez Sanchez
Guevara @ Gutiérrez S.C.

Carlos Ibañez Guzman
CNS - UMSA

Jorge Luis Inchauste
Guevara @ Gutierrez S.C.

Ricardo Indacochea
Indacochea @ Asociados, Abogados

Ivan Lima Magne
CEJIP INECIP

Ernesto Marcelo Malaga Vasquez
ONG Kurt Godel

Javier Mir Peña
Mir @ Asoc.

Ariel Morales Vasquez
CRF Rojas Abogados

Josè Marcelo Ortuste Gonzales
Estudio Jurídico Ortuste @ Asociados

Sergio Reynolds
Bufete Reynolds Legal Advice

Hugo Rivera
OPS/OMS

Jose Luis Rosas Salazar
Fiscalía Departamental la Paz - Bolivia

Maria Saleté Tejerina
Clínica del Sur

Cayo Salinas
Cayo Salinas @ Asociados

Miguel Ángel Sandoval Parada
Indacochea @ Asociados, Abogados

Carola Serrate
Serrate Paz @ Asociados

Rene Soria Saucedo
Boston University

Magdalena Vilte Fernandez
Hospital Regional "San Juan de Dios"

Anonymous Contributors

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Adis Arapovic
CCI

Adisa Omerbegovic Arapovic
Sarajevo School of Science and Technology

Alisa Bergovic

Darko Brkan
UG Zasto ne / CA Why not

Zoran Dakic
Health Center Bijeljina

Vjekoslav Domljan
Centre for Regional Economic Studies (CRES)

Adnan Durakovic
Faculty of Law, University of Zenica

Mehmed Ganic
International University of Sarajevo

Adis Gazibegovic
CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz

Hana Koraa
University of Travnik

Esad Oruc
International Burch University

Danijela Saller Osenk

Denis Pajic

Lejla Sijercic
Lejla Sijercic Law Firm

Osman Sinanovic
Department of Neurology, University Clinical Center Tuzla

Nedžad Smailagic
University of Sarajevo

Mehmed Spaho
Law Office Spaho

Boris Stojanovic
Boris Stojanovic Law Office

Milos Trifkovic
University Vitez

Meškic Zlatan

Anonymous Contributors

BOTSWANA

M. Buhle

Tatenda Dumba
Armstrongs Attorneys

Lethogonolo Innocent Makgane
YS Moncho Attorneys

Doreen Khama
Doreen Khama Attorneys

Rekha A. Kumar
University of Botswana

Motsomi Ndala Marobela
University of Botswana

John McAllister
University of Botswana

Kiven Mvududu
Armstrongs Attorneys

Abdoul Rahim
Rahim Khan @ Company

Joanne Robinson
Rahim Khan @ Company

Naomi Seboni
School of Nursing, University of Botswana

Dorothy Tafadzwa Matiza
Rahim Khan @ Company

Marvin T. Torto
Salbany @ Torto Attorneys

Anonymous Contributors

BRAZIL

Gabriel Alves da Costa
Shell Brasil Petróleo Ltda.

Abel S. Amaro
Veirano Advogados

Sergio C. Arenhart
Ministério Público Federal

Ordélio Azevedo Sette
Azevedo Sette Advogados

Rogério Carmona Bianco
Lilla Huck Otranto Camargo Advogados

Maria Celina Bodin de Moraes
UERJ @ PUC-Rio

Thiago Bottino
Fundação Getúlio Vargas - Direito GV

Nancy Cardia
Center for the Study of Violence - University of São Paulo

Rodrigo Castro
Peixoto e Cury Advogados

Carlos Henrique da Silva Ayres
Trench, Rossi e Watanabe Advogados

Elival da Silva Ramos
São Paulo University

João Carlos A.C. de Mendonça
Veirano Advogados

Rodrigo de Souza Costa
Universidade Federal Fluminense

Mario B. Duarte Garcia
Duarte Garcia, Caselli Guimaraes e Terra Advogados

Heloisa Estellita
Fundação Getúlio Vargas - Direito GV

Fernando Smith Fabris
Advocacia Smith Fabris

Joaquim Falcão
Fundação Getúlio Vargas - Direito GV

Maurício Faragone
Faragone Advogados

Luciano Feldens
Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul

Boriska Ferreira Rocha
CFA Advogados

Tiago Figueiro
Veirano Advogados

Alexandre Fragoso Silvestre
Miguel Neto Advogados

Isabel Franco
KLA - Koury Lopes Advogados

Pedro Freitas
Veirano Advogados

Werner Grau
Pinheiro Neto Advogados

Ludmila Groch
IDDD - Instituto de Defesa do Direito de Defesa

HP Legal

Maria-Valeria Junho Penna
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

Carolina Korbage

Rosa Lima
2nd Judicial District Attorney's Office

Adelmo Machado
Veirano Advogados

Jorge Magalhães
FIOCRUZ

Estêvão Mallet
University of São Paulo

Sergio Mannheimer
Andrade @ Fichtner Advogados

Luiz Guilherme Marinoni
Marinoni Advocacia

Daniela Muradas Reis
Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG)

Fabio Martins Di Jorge
Peixoto e Cury Advogados

Anna Thereza Monteiro de Barros
Pinheiro Neto Advogados

Adriano A.S. Pedrosa
Universidade Federal de Alagoas (UFAL)

Luiz Paulo Pieruccetti Marques
Vieira, Rezende, Barbosa e Guerreiro Advogados

João Otavio Pinheiro Oliverio
Campos Mello Advogados

Claudio A. Pinho
Instituto Belo Horizonte de Ensino Superior

Angela Pires Pinto
University of Brasilia

Victor Polizelli
KLA - Koury Lopes Advogados

Luiz Guilherme Primos
Primos e Primos Advocacia

Jose Ricardo dos Santos Luz Júnior
Duarte Garcia, Caselli Guimaraes e Terra Advogados

Eduardo Soto
Veirano Advogados

Mariana Tavares de Araujo
Levy @ Salomão Advogados

Mauricio Vedovato
Lilla Huck Otranto Camargo Advogados

Oscar Vilhena Vieira
Fundação Getúlio Vargas - Direito GV

Rafael Villac Vicente de Carvalho
Peixoto e Cury Advogados

Teresa Wambier
PUC/SP

Anonymous Contributors

BULGARIA

J. Crombois
American University in Bulgaria

Nikolai Hristov
Medical University - Sofia

Stanislav Hristov
Legal Office Slavi Slavov

Gergana Ilieva
Novel Consult Law Firm

Dimitar Ivanov
Dimitrov Ivanov @ Partners, Attorneys-at-Law

Vladimir Natchev
Arsov Natchev Ganeva Attorneys and Counsellors at Law

Marina Nenova-Popova
Department of Infectious Diseases, University Hospital

Lachezar Raichev
Penkov, Markov @ Partners

Jenia Rusanova
CMS Cameron McKenna LLP

Elina Ruseva
Tsvetkova, Bebov @ Partners Attorneys-at-Law

Petko Salchev
National Center of Public Health and Analyses

Christian Schrobsdorff, Esq.
NBLO Law

Atanas Slavov
University of Sofia

Anonymous Contributors

BURKINA FASO

Norbert Enoch Dabire
Barreau du Burkina Faso

Julien Lalogo
Etude de Maitre Julien Lalogo Avocat a la Cour

Ali Neya
Cabinet d'Avocats Ali Neya

Amadou Sagnon

Paulin Salambere
SCPA Ouattara-Sory @ Salambere

Moussa Sogodogo

Georges Some
Cabinet d'avocats Abdoul Ouedraogo

Marcellin Some
Barreau du Burkina-Faso

Richard Traore

Amado Yoni
SCPA Legalis

Sosthene Adrien M. Zongo
Cabinet d'Avocats Sostene A.M. Zongo

Anonymous Contributors

CAMBODIA

Narin Chum
Community Legal Education Center

Nhim Dalen
Advanced Research Consultant Team (ART)

Antoine Fontaine
Bun @ Associates

Teilee Kuong
Nagoya University

Kem Ley
Advanced Research Consultant Team (ART)

Sia Phearum
Housing Rights Task Force

Fil B. Tabayoyong, Jr.
BMAP

Anonymous Contributors

CAMEROON

Roland Abeng
The ABENG Law Firm

Tazoacha Asonganyi
Université de Yaounde I

Charles-Olivier Boum-Bissaï

Epee Emiliene
CHU

José Essi
Faculté de Médecine et de Sciences Biomédicales - UYI

Marie-José Essi
Faculté de Médecine et de Sciences Biomédicales - UYI

Philip Forsnang Ndikum
Ndikum Law Offices

Benjamin Fomba Kamga
Université de Yaoundé II-SOA

Cecile H. Nantchouang
Nantch @ Associates, LLP.

Fansi Ngamou
SCP Ngassam Njike @ Associés

Ngassam Njike Virgile
SCP Ngassam Njike @ Associés

Nana Philip Njotang
Maternité Principale, Hopital Central Yaounde

Samuel Nko'o Amvene
CHU

Samuel Takongmo
CHU

I. Takougang
Université de Yaounde I

Nzectchie Alain Bruno Woumbou
Cabinet d'avocats Josette Kadji

Njoumemei Zakariaou
*Faculté de Médecine et de Sciences
Biomédicales - UYI*

Anonymous Contributors

CANADA

Zayid Al-Baghdadi
Zayid Al-Baghdadi, Avocat - Lawyer

Bruce P. Archibald
Dalhousie University

Carol Aylward
*Schulich School of Law, Dalhousie
University*

Charlyn Black
University of British Columbia

Sarah P. Bradley
*Schulich School of Law, Dalhousie
University*

Karen Busby
Faculty of Law, University of Manitoba

Karen A. Campbell
Cox @ Palmer

Daniel M. Campbell QC
Cox @ Palmer

Christian Drolet
Heenan Blaikie

Brenda Elias
University of Manitoba

Patrick Essiminy
Strikeman Elliott LLP

Jabeur Fathally
University of Ottawa

Fabien Gelinas
Faculty of Law, McGill University

H. Patrick Glenn
Faculty of Law, McGill University

Sonny Goldstein
Goldstein Financial Consultants

Elise Groulx Diggs
*International Criminal Defence
Attorneys Association*

Charles G. Harrison
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP

Clyde Hertzman
University of British Columbia

Elizabeth Hughes
*Schulich School of Law, Dalhousie
University*

Jula Hughes
University of New Brunswick

Michelle Kelly
Cox @ Palmer

Brian Langille
University of Toronto

Katherine Lippel
University of Ottawa

Vanessa MacDonnell
Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa

Constance MacIntosh
Dalhousie Health Law Institute

Finn Makela
Faculty of Law, University of Sherbrooke

Anne McGillivray
Faculty of Law, University of Manitoba

Bradley Mitchell
McDougall Gauley LLP

Rick Molz
Concordia University

Ronalda M. Murphy
Schulich School of Law

Orie Niedzwiecki
Elyn Law LLP

Darrel Pink
Noava Scotia Barristers' Society

Nicolas Plourde
Barreau du Québec

Heather Raven
Faculty of Law, University of Victoria

Graham Reynolds
*Schulich School of Law, Dalhousie
University*

George S. Rigakos
Carlton University

Colin L. Soskolne
University of Alberta

Maxime St-Hilaire
University of Sherbrooke's Law Faculty

France M. Tenaille
Cassels Brock @ Blackwell LLP

Barbara Von Tigerstrom
University of Saskatchewan

Anonymous Contributors

CHILE

Alberto Alcalde
Puga Ortiz Abogados

Luis Alberto Aninat
Aninat Schwencke y Cia

Gustavo Balmaceda Hoyos
Universidad de los Andes

Jorge Baraona Gonzalez
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de los
Andes*

Jorge Bofill
Bofill Mir @ Alvarez Jana Abogados

Miguel Ángel Chaves Pérez
*Chaves Awad Contreras Schürmann
Abogados*

Alexandra de Grenade Errázuriz
Eyzaguirre @ Cía

Gabriel del Río
Aninat Schwencke y Cia

Cristián Fabres
Guerrero, Olivos, Novoa y Errázuriz

Ruth Gabriela Lanata Fuenzalida
Universidad de Concepcion

Sergio Gamonal Contreras
Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez

Davor Harasic
Universidad de Chile

Manuel Jimenez Pflingsthor
Jara Del Favero

Beatriz Larrain
Universidad de Concepcion

Juan Pablo Cox Leixelard
Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez

Fernando Lolas Stepke
Universidad de Chile

José Ignacio Martínez
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de los
Andes*

Omar Morales
Montt @ Cía. S.A.

Carlos Ossandon
Eluchans @ Cía.

Germán Ovalle
Universidad de Chile

Gonzalo Pantoja Ackermann
Biomer

Luis Parada
Bahamondez, Álvarez @ Zegers

Pablo Paredes
Albagli Zaliasnik

Daniela Pérez

Carmenmaría Poblete
Carey y Cía Ltda.

Jaime Portales Y.
Universidad de Concepción

Carla Robledo M.

Juan Manuel Rodríguez

Pablo Ruiz-Tagle
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de
Chile*

Marcelo Sanfeliu
Carey y Cía Ltda.

Luis A. Silva
Universidad de los Andes

Cristóbal Silva Bengolea
Bahamondez, Alvarez @ Zegers Ltda.

Cristóbal Smythe
Bahamondez, Alvarez @ Zegers Ltda.

Carlos Stevenson

Luis Eugenio Ubilla Grandi
*Universidad Católica de la Sma
Concepción*

Oscar Gajardo Uribe
Eyzaguirre @ Cía

Juan Enrique Vargas
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad Diego
Portales*

Jorge S. Wahl
Larrain @ Asociados

Anonymous Contributors

CHINA

David C. Buxbaum
Anderson @ Anderson LLP

Ming Dong
Junhe Law Offices

Yu Du
MMLC Group

Xiao Gong

Liu Kaiming
*The Institute of Contemporary
Observation*

Jia Ping
China Global Fund Watch

Wei Shen
*Law School, Shanghai Jiao Tong
University*

Anonymous Contributors

COLOMBIA

Felipe Aristizabal
Nieto @ Chalela Abogados

Guillermo Hernando Bayona
Combariza

Mauricio A. Bello Galindo
Baker @ McKenzie Colombia

Eduardo Cardenas
Cardenas y Cardenas Abogados

Marcela Castro
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de
Los Andes*

Camilo Cortes
Cardenas y Cardenas Abogados

Jorge Diaz-Cardenas
Diaz Cardenas Abogados

Lucas Fajardo Gutierrez
Brigard @ Urrutia Abogados S.A.

Carlos Andreas Gomez Gonzalez
Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano

Nancy Gore Saravia
CIDEIM

Mildred Hartmann
Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano

Fredy Andrei Herrera Osorio
Universidad Nacional de Colombia

Isabel Cristina Jaramillo Sierra
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de los
Andes*

Monica Lombana
Baker @ McKenzie Colombia

Gloria Patricia Lopera Mesa
Universidad Eafit

Blanca Patricia Mantilla Uribe
Universidad Industrial de Santander

Santiago Martínez Méndez
Godoy Córdoba

Manuel Mejia

Juan Mendoza

Tatiana Molina Velasquez
Universidad CES

Carlos Molina-Arrubla
Molina Diaz y Cía

Patricia Moncada Roa
*Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de los
Andes*

Maria Fernanda Navas-Herrera
*Navasherrera @ Associated Legal
Consultants*

Luis Nieto
Nieto @ Chalela Abogados

Julian Osorio
Universidad CES

Martha Peñuela
Universidad del Norte

Carolina Posada
Posse Herrera @ Ruiz

Ricardo Posada Maya
Universidad de los Andes

Gustavo Quintero Navas

Luis Fernando Ramirez Contreras
Rama Judicial

Gabriel Sanchez
Posse Herrera @ Ruiz

Fredy A. Sandoval
Fredy A. Sandoval Abogados

Juan Oberto Sotomayor Acosta
Universidad Eafit

Raúl Alberto Suárez Arcila
Suárez Arcila @ Abogados Asociados

Carlos Arturo Toro Lopez

Rafael Tuesca Molina
Universidad del Norte

Carlos Umaña
Brigard @ Urrutia Abogados S.A.

Jorge Lara Urbaneja
Lara Consultores

Diego Felipe Valdivieso Rueda

Universidad de los Andes

Anonymous Contributors

COTE D'IVOIRE

Raphaël Abauleth

Alexandre Bairo
KSK Société d'Avocats

Vanie Bi Ta
Cabinet Medical Le Belier

Arsene Dable
SCPA Dogue Abbe Yao et Associes

M. Fadika Delafosse
Cabinet FDKA

K. Fadika
Cabinet FDKA

C. Kacoutié
Cabinet FDKA

Hermann Kouao
IKT Law Firm

Mohamed Lamine Faye
Cabinet Faye

M. Soro
Université Montesquieu Bordeaux IV

Adama Yeo
Université de Bouaké

Anonymous Contributors

CROATIA

Bruno Barsic

Bojan Biocina
*School of Medicine, University of Zagreb,
Clinical Hospital Center*

Bozidar Feldman
Law Firm Matic @ Feldman

Marijana Jelic
Law Office Jelic

Darko Jurisic
County Hospital "Dr.J.Bencevic"

Ivan Kos
PETOŠEVIC

Luka Kovacic
*Andrija Stampar School of Public Health,
Medical School, University of Zagreb*

Boris Kozjak
Law Office Kozjak

Anita Krizmanic
Law Offices Macesc @ Partners

Natasa Novakovic
Croatian Employer Association

Matko Pajcic
Faculty of Law, Split

Aleksandra Pirjavec
University Hospital Center Rijeka

Dalida Rittossa
Faculty of Law, University of Rijeka

Boris Savoric
Savoric @ Partners

Alan Soric
Attorneys Soric @ Tomekovic Dunda

Zvonko Sosic
*Andrija Stampar School of Public Health,
Medical School, University of Zagreb*

Ana Stavljenic-Rukavina

Jelena Zjadic
Macesic @ Partners Law Firm

Anonymous Contributors

CZECH REPUBLIC

Tomas Cihula
Kinstellar

Jan Filip
Faculty of Law, Masaryk University

Pavel Holec
*Holec, Zuska @ Partners, Attorneys-
at-Law*

Marie Janšová
Glatzova @ Co., s.r.o.

Tomas Matejovsky
CMS Cameron McKenna LLP

Radek Matous
Balcar Polansky Eversheds

Robert Neruda
Havel, Holásek @ Partners

Lukáš Prudil

Nataša Randlová
Randl Partners

Nadezda Rozehnalova
Faculty of Law, Masaryk University

Ladislav Smejkal
White @ Case (Europe) LLP

Simona Stocesova
*Faculty of Law, University of West
Bohemia*

Martin Strnad
Havel, Holásek @ Partners

Pavel Urban
National Institute of Public Health

Zilvarová Ctibor Hladký v.o.s.

Anonymous Contributors

DENMARK

Per Andersen
Department of Law, Aarhus University

Lars Bracht Andersen
Aarhus University

Morten Broberg
Faculty of Law, University of Copenhagen

Ole Hammerslev
*Department of Law, University of
Southern Denmark*

Rena Franz Henschel
*Department of Law, Business and Social
Sciences, Aarhus University*

Poul Hvilsted
Horten Law Firm

Paul Kruger Andersen
Aarhus University

Lars Lindencrone Petersen
Bech-Bruun Law Firm

Thomas Neumann
Department of Law, Aarhus University

Jesper Noergaard
Dahl Lawfirm Copenhagen

Dr. Ole
Aarhus University

Henrik Aasted Paulsen
Clemens Advokater

Arja R.
University of Southern Denmark

Jens Rye-Andersen
Jens Rye Andersen

Jacob Sand
Gorrissen Federspiel

Klaus Sogaard
Gorrissen Federspiel

Henning Fuglsang Sorensen
Aarhus University

Anette Storgaard
Aarhus University

Tina Svanberg
Delacourdanía

Kim Transkow
Kromann Reumert

Jørn Vestergaard
Faculty of Law, University of Copenhagen

Anonymous Contributors

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Jesus R. Almanzar
DMK - Central Law

Carla Alsina
Biaggi @ Messina

Ana Isabel Caceres
Troncoso y Caceres

Dalia Castillo Sanchez
Organización Panamericana de la Salud

Ismael Comprés
Ortiz @ Comprés

Alberto E. S. Fiallo
Fiallo-Billini Scanlon Associates

Virgilio Bello González
Bello Rosa @ Bello González, Abogados

Nestor Julio Victorino
NJ Victorino @ Associates

Virgilio A. Méndez Amaro
*Mendez @ Asociados, Abogados y
Consultores*

Enmanuel Montas
MS Consultores

Maria Elena Moreno Grateraux
Grateraux Delva @ Asoc.

Jose ML. G. Paez
Bufete Paez-Mueses-Castillo

Rafael Antonio Santana Goico
Headrick, Rizik, Alvarez @ Fernandez

Georges Santoni Recio
Russin, Vecchi @ Heredia Bonetti

Angeanette Tejada Garcia
OMG

Pedro Troncoso
Troncoso y Caceres

Anonymous Contributors

ECUADOR

Vanesa Aguirre Guzmán
Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar

Xavier Andrade
Abogado Profesor Juez

Rommel M. Artieda
INSCORA S. A.

Rodrigo Bermeo-Andrade
Bermeo @ Bermeo Law Firm

Jorge Cevallos-Jacome
Perez Bustamente Y Ponce Abogados

Maria Rosa Fabara Vera
Fabara @ Compañía Abogados

Juan Carlos Gallegos
Gallegos, Valarezo @ Neira

Caesar Molina Novillo
Molina @ Compañía Abogados S.A.

Ximena Moreno Echeverria
*Pontificia Universidad Católica del
Ecuador*

Jorge Vicente Paladines
*Centro de Política Criminal y Estudios
Socio-jurídicos*

Patricio Peña Romero
*Estudio Noboa, Peña, Larrea @ Torres
Abogados*

Marcelo Proaño
Romero Arteta Ponce Abogados

Gladis Proaño Reyes
Comandancia General de Policía

Verónica Regalado
Estudio Jurídico Vivanco @ Vivanco

Juan Carlos Riofrío
Coronel y Pérez Abogados

Raul Riquelme Cardenas
Herrera, Olalla @ Riquelme Abogados

Leonardo Sempértégui Vallejo
Sempértégui Ontaneda Abogados

Rafael Serrano
Serrano Puig Abogados

Farith Simon
Universidad San Francisco de Quito

Anonymous Contributors

EGYPT

Mohamed Abdelaal
Faculty of Law, Alexandria University

Haytham Ali
Hafez

Ibrahim Awad
School of Global Affairs and Public Policy (GAPP), American University in Cairo (AUC)

Kilian Baelz
Amereller - Mena Associates

Ghada Barsoum
American University in Cairo

Khaled El Shalakany
Shalakany Law Office

Habiba Hassan Hassan-Wassef
World Health Organization

Somaya Hosny
Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University

Ibrahim Kharboush
High Institute of Public Health, Alexandria University

Mohamed Hanafi Mahmoud
Egyptian Ministry of Justice

Ibrahim Saleh
University of Cape Town

Ahmed Tawfik
El Gamal @ Tawfik International Law Firm

Bassem S. Wadie
Urology and Nephrology Center

Hossam Younes
Egyptian International Trade Point

Ayman Zohry
Egyptian Society for Migration Studies

Anonymous Contributors

EL SALVADOR

Rebecca Atanacio de Basagoitia
Asesores Legales

Ana Yesenia Granillo de Tobar
Escuela Superior de Economía y Negocios

David Gruter
Arias @ Muñoz - El Salvador

Roberto Enrique Hernández Valencia
Latinalliance

Yudy Aracely Jiménez de Guerrero
Gold Service S.A.

Diego Martín-Menjivar
Consortium Centro América Abogados

Juan Jose Planas Carias
Banco Agrícola

Juan Jose Rodriguez Flores
Universidad Católica de El Salvador

Rommell Ismael Sandoval Rosales
SBA Legal Firm @ Consulting

José Freddy Zometa Segovia

Anonymous Contributors

ESTONIA

Urmas Arumäe
Estonian Business School

Tiit Elenurm
Estonian Business School

Carri Ginter
University of Tartu

Maksim Greinoman
Advokaadibüroo Greinoman @ Co.

Helen Hääl
Concordia Attorneys at Law

Pirkko-Liis Harkmaa
LAWIN Attorneys at Law

Triinu Hiob
LAWIN Attorneys at Law

Kari Kasper
Tallinn University of Technology

Tanel Kerikmäe
Tallinn University of Technology

Liisa Linna
Hedman Partners

Valdo Lips
Borenus Attorneys at Law

Aare Martson
Tartu University Hospital, University of Tartu

Marianne Meiorg
Estonian Human Rights Centre

Merle Muda
University of Tartu

Senny Pello
Advokaadibüroo Concordia

Mari Ann Simovart
Institute of Private Law, University of Tartu

Gabriel Tavits
University of Tartu

Paul Varul
University of Tartu

Andres Vutt
University of Tartu

Anonymous Contributors

ETHIOPIA

Tameru Wondm Agegnehu
Tameru Wondm Agegnehu, Law Offices

M. Aman
Haramaya University

Sileshi Bedasie
Haramaya University

Aberra Degefa
Addis Ababa University

Tilahun Esmael
College of Law, Haramaya University

Abraham Yohannes Hailu
Abraham Law Office

Wondwossen Kassa

Lubo Teferi Kerorsa
Adama Science and Technology University

Alemu Meheretu
Jimma University

Eyoel Berhan Mekonen
Mekelle University

Mehari Redae
Addis Ababa University

Yordanos Seifu
Addis Ababa University

Seyoum Y. Tesfay
Addis Ababa University

Wondimu Shanko Yirga
College of Health Sciences, Haramaya University

Anonymous Contributors

FINLAND

HP Legal

Nina Isokorpi
Roschier, Attorneys Ltd.

Jussi Järvensivu
Justeria Attorneys Ltd

Mike J. Lehtimäki
Attorneys-at-Law TRUST

Ari Miettinen
Fimlab Laboratories Ltd.

Johanna Niemi
University of Helsinki

Jukka Peltonen
Peltonen LMR Attorneys Ltd.

Ikka Sainio
Attorneys-at-Law Juridia Ltd.

Matti Tolvanen
University of Eastern Finland

Anonymous Contributors

FRANCE

M. Augier

M. Berland
SCP Berland/Sevin

M. Boiche
CBBC

M. Castets
Hospices Civils de Lyon

Catherine Cathiard
Jeanet et Associés

M. Cesarini
Ass. Sécurité Solaire

M. Chassang
*Institut National de la Santé et de la
Recherche Médicale*

Veronique Chauveau
CBBC

Marie-Christine Cimadevilla
Cimadevilla Avocats

Olivier de Boutiny
BBG Associés

Francois-Paul Debionne
Communaute Urbaine de Strasbourg

Jacques Delga
ESSEC

Halley des Fontaines
*Faculta de Medecine Pierre et Marie
Curie*

Yann Dubois
CHRU Brest

S. Ducamp
Winston @ Strawn Selarl

Patrick Dunaud
Winston @ Strawn Selarl

Nataline Fleury
Ashurst

Elisabeth Grabli
Elisabeth Grabli

J. Herbet
Winston @ Strawn Selarl

Dr. Herrera
Université de Cergy-Pontoise

M. Kempf
Hospices Civils de Lyon

Mathieu Nicolas
*Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher @ Flom
LLP*

Jacques-Antoine Robert
Simmons @ Simmons LLP

M. Roos
Proskauer Rose LLP

M. Samson
Hospices Civils de Lyon

Nicole Stolowy
HEC Paris

M. Tartour

Pr. Valette
Hospices Civils de Lyon

Anicee Van Engeland
SOAS - University of London

Anonymous Contributors

GEORGIA

Revaz Beridze
Eristavi Law Group

Ketevan Chkhatrashvili
Curatio International Foundation

Ketevan Dadiani
Iv. Javakishvili Tbilisi State University

George Gotsadze
Curatio International Foundation

David Imnadze
Caucasus School of Law

Ted Jonas
DLA Piper Georgia

Nata Kazakhashvili
Iv. Javakishvili Tbilisi State University

Mr. Ketevan
EPEC

Julieta Mukhadze
Universiti Iveria

Giorgi Nanobashvili
UNDP

Mikheil Vashakidze
VBAT Law Firm

Akaki Zoidze
Consulting Group Curatio

Anonymous Contributors

GERMANY

Cornelius Antor
BridgehouseLaw

Alexander Baron von Engelhardt

Oliver Bolthausen
BridgehouseLaw

Thomas F. Feltes
Ruhr-University Bochum

Wolfgang Hau
University of Passau

Burkhard Hess
University Heidelberg

HP Legal

Jessica Jacobi
Kliemt @ Vollstaedt

Christof Kerwer
Würzburg University

Thomas Melletat
Melletat - Rechtsanwälte

Andreas Meyer-Lindenberg
Zentralinstitut für seelische Gesundheit

Andreas Michaeli
BORN Rechtsanwaltssozietät

Carsten Momsen
Leibniz Universitaet Hannover

Dr. Oppermann
Leibniz Universität Hannover

Stefanie Prehm
Luther Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH

Martin Reufels
Heuking Kühn Lüer Wojtek

Henning Rosenau
Law Faculty, University of Augsburg

Stephan Sander
Terhedebrügge Heyn Sander

Stefan Sasse
Göhmman Rechtsanwälte

Michael Staudenmayer
*Staudenmayer Fachanwalts- u.
Steuerkanzlei*

Ms. Sachsenberg

M. Traber
Ahlers @ Vogel

Manfred Weiss
Goethe University

Bernd Weller
Heuking Kühn Lüer Wojtek

Peter Zuriel
Strafrechtskanzlei

Anonymous Contributors

GHANA

Azanne Kofi Akainyah
A @ A Law Consult

Franklin Cudjoe
IMANI Center for Policy @ Education

Nii Nortey Hanson-Nortey
Ghana Health Service

Constant K. Hometowu
UN - International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

Sam Poku
Business Council for Africa (GH)

Araba Sefa-Dedeh
University of Ghana Medical School

Anonymous Contributors

GREECE

Ilias Anagnostopoulos
Anagnostopoulos

Ioanna Chryssiis Argyraki
I.K. Rokas @ Partners Law Firm

Costas Bakouris
Transparency International Greece

Antonis Bavas
Stephenson Harwood

Nigel Bowen-Morris
Stephenson Harwood

Andreas Delopoulos
DNP Law

Stephanos Diamandis
Forest Research Institute

Passas Dimitris
Moratis-Passas

Panagiotis Gioulakos

HP Legal

Konstantinos Kanellakis

Athanasios Kikis
Kikis @ Partners Law Office

Nikolaos Kondylis
N.M. Kondylis @ Partners Law Office

Stratos Konstandinidis
Konstandinidis @ Associates

Apostolopoulos Konstantinos
ApostolopoulosPatrasLaw

Pandora Manolidi

Anthony Mavrides
Ballas, Pelecanos @ Associates

Victoria Moutzouridou
Moutzouridou - Sakellariou @ Associates Law Firm

Kanakis Nikitas
Doctors of the World

Christina Papadopoulou
Greek National Human Rights Commission

Fotini N. Skopouli
Harokopio University

Anastasia Tsakatoura
KTlegal Law Office

E. Tsangalidou
E.Tsangalidou @ Co Law Company

Anonymous Contributors

GUATEMALA

Mario Augusto Alcántara Velásquez
Carrillo @ Associates

Mario Archila
Consortium Centro America Abogados

Elias José Arriaza Sáenz
Consortium Centro America Abogados

Emanuel Callejas

Alvaro Cordon
Cordón, Ovalle y Asociados

Angel Estuardo de Leon Monroy
ADSS

David Erasles Jop
Consortium Centro America Abogados

Julio Roberto Garia Merlos
Universidad Francisco Marroquin

Liz Gordillo
Arias @ Muñoz

Kristine Klanderud
Universidad Francisco Marroquín

Guillermo Lopez Davis
Bufete Lopez Cordero

Jose E. Quiñones
Quiñones, Ibarquien, Lujan @ Mata, S.C.

Evelyn Rebuli
Quiñones, Ibarquien, Lujan @ Mata, S.C.

Mario Roberto Guadran Rouanet
Palomo @ Porras

Saravia y Muñoz

Erick Wong
Cordón, Ovalle y Asociados

Fernando Zelada
Arias @ Muñoz

Anonymous Contributors

HONG KONG SAR, CHINA

Shahla F. Ali
Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong

Patricia E. Alva
Hong Kong Bar Association

Ruy Barretto

Danny Chan
Century Chambers

Jessica W. Y. Chan
Bernacchi Chambers

Kay K.W. Chan
Admiralty Chambers

Anne S.Y. Cheung
The University of Hong Kong

Diana Cheung

Rick Glofcheski
Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong

Lok Sang Ho
Lingnan University

Christopher Hooley
Odham, Li @ Nie

A. K. C. Koo
Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong

Yue Ma
Department of Economics, Lingnan University

Rebecca Ong
City University of Hong Kong

John Kong Shan
School of Law, City University of Hong Kong

Benny Y. T. Tai
Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong

Yun Zhao
University of Hong Kong

Anonymous Contributors

HUNGARY

Katalin Barta

Gábor Baruch
Baruch Law Office

Barnabas Buzasi
Wolf Theiss

Laszlo Hajdu
Hajdu and Pázsitka Law Office

Judit Kapas
University of Debrecen

Verónika Mora
Hungarian Environmental Partnership Foundation

Tamas L. Paal
Institute of Drug Regulatory Affairs, University of Szeged

Anonymous Contributors

INDIA

B.V. Babu
ICMR

Shivani Bhardwaj
Sathi All for Partnerships

Lalit Bhasin
Bhasin @ Co., Advocates

Subhash Bhatnagar
Indian Institute of Management

N.K. Chakrabarti
KIIT University

Jhelum Chowdhury
Crystal Research and Consulting Pvt. Ltd.

S.M.S. Devadoss
Kochhar @ Co., Advocates and Legal Consultants

E.N. Thambi Durai
Durai Group Companies

Yashomati Ghosh
National Law School of India University

Arundhuti Gupta
Mentor Together

Pankaj Jain

Srilatha Juvva
Tata Institute of Social Sciences

Sachidananda Kannarnuji
LEXPROFICIENCY

Rajas Kasbekar
Little @ Co., Advocates and Solicitors

Shomona Khanna
Supreme Court of India

Uday Khare

P.R. Krishnan

Yadlapalli S. Kusuma
All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS)

Vipender Mann
KNM @ Partners, Law Offices

Puneet Misra
All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS)

Saurabh Misra
Saurabh Misra @ Associates, Advocates @ International Legal Consultants

Shantanu Mohan Puri
SMA Legal

J. L. N. Murthy
Jonnalagadda LLP

A. Nagarathna
National Law School of India University

PM Nair
Government of India

Anil Paleri

Eugene Pereira
Migrant Forum

Sushil Raj

Sankaran Ramakrishnan

Jegan Rupa Subramanian

Prakash Singh

Ruchi Sinha
Tata Institute of Social Sciences

Suhas Srinivasiah
Kochhar @ Co., Advocates and Legal Consultants

S.R. Subramanian
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur

Anonymous Contributors

INDONESIA

Karen Mills
KarimSyah Law Firm

Rahayu Ningsih Hoed
Makarim @ Taira S. Counsellors at Law

Mardjono Reksodiputro
University of Indonesia

Rully Sandra
HRRC

M. Sartono
Law Firm Hanafiah Ponggawa @ Partners

Frans H. Winarta
Frans Winarta @ Partners

Anonymous Contributors

IRAN

Ardeshir Atai
Atai @ Associates Law Firm

Mohammad Badamchi
HAMI Legal Services

Amir Karbasi Milani
Milani Law Firm

Seyed Mahmoud Kashani
Shahid Beheshty University

Dr. Majid
National Nutrition @ Food Technology Research Institute of Iran (NNFTRI)

Yahya Rayegani
Farjam Law Office

M. Ebrahim Tavakoli

Anonymous Contributors

ITALY

Antonella Antonucci
University of Bari

Monica Barbieri
Pirola Pennuto Zei @ Association

Gianantonio Barelli
Caffi Maroncelli Law Firm

Paola Bilancia
University of Milano

Roberto Bin
University of Ferrara

Sabrina Bruno
University of Calabria

Carlo Casonato
University of Trento

Antonio Cassatella
University of Trento

Mariano Cingolani
University of Macerata

Emanuele Cortesi
Caffi Maroncelli e Associati

Corrado De Martini
Union Internationale des Avocats

Alessio Di Amato
University of Salerno

Astolfo Di Amato
University of Naples

Serena Forlati
University of Ferrara

Mitja Gialuz
University of Trieste

Ajani Gianmaria
Department of Law, University of Turin

Francesco Gongolo
Direzione Centrale Salute Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia

Paolo Greco
University of Salerno

Alberto Lama
Ancarani Studio Legale

Giuseppe Lorenzo Rosa
Giuseppe L. Rosa, Esq. @ Associated Counsels

Paola Lucarelli
University of Florence

Pierpaolo Martucci
University of Trieste

Marco Orofino
University of Milan

Fulvio Maria Palombino
Faculty of Law, University of Naples

Roberto Rosapepe
University of Salerno

Riccardo Salomone
University of Trento

Emanuele Scafato
Societa' Italiana di Alcologia SIA

M. Scarponi
University of Trento

Giuseppe Scassellati-Sforzolini
Cleary Gottlieb Steen @ Hamilton LLP

Annita Larissa Sciacovelli
University of Bari

Anna Simonati
University of Trento

Roberto Toniatti
Law School, University of Trento

Francesca Valent
Direzione Centrale Salute Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia

Domenico Vitale
Studio Associato Paulli-Pironti-Laratro

Alberto Zucconi
Istituto dell'Approccio Centrato sulla Persona

Anonymous Contributors

JAMAICA

Sylvia Adjoa Mitchell
University of the West Indies

Anthony Clayton
University of the West Indies

Colette Cunningham-Myrie
University of the West Indies

Pauline E. Dawkins
University of the West Indies

Paula Dawson
University of the West Indies

J. Peter Figueroa
University of the West Indies

Horace Fletcher
University of the West Indies

Damian K. Francis
University of the West Indies

Marie Freckleton
University of the West Indies

Carron Gordon
University of the West Indies

Linton Gordon
Frater Ennis @ Gordon

Verona Henry-Ferguson
University of the West Indies

Rachael Irving
University of the West Indies

Shelly McFarlane
University of the West Indies

Donovan McGrowder
University of the West Indies

Aisha Mulendwe

Cynthia Pitter
University of the West Indies

Dalip Ragoobirsingh
University of the West Indies

Tana Ricketts-Roomes
University of the West Indies

Eris Schoburgh
University of the West Indies

Lester Shields
University of the West Indies Health Centre

Norman Waldron
University of the West Indies

Lloyd Waller
University of the West Indies

Steve Weaver
University of the West Indies

Sharon White
University of the West Indies

Allan S. Wood

Anonymous Contributors

JAPAN

Yasuhiro Fujii
Baker @ McKenzie

Kaoru Haraguchi
Haraguchi International Law Office

Yasushi Higashizawa
Kasumigaseki Sogo Law Offices

HP Legal

Shigetoshi (Toshi) Hirano
Oh-Ebashi LPC @ Partners

Shigeji Ishiguro
Oguri @ Ishiguro Law Offices

Masakazu Iwakura
Nishimura @ Asahi

Nobuo Koinuma
Tohoku University

Mark Nakamura
Int'l Education Information Centre

Hiroshi Nishihara
Waseda-University

Anonymous Contributors

JORDAN

Hazar Saleh Al Khasawneh
Institute for Leadership Excellence (ILE)

Tarik Arida
Arida Law Firm

Abatah D. Daher
Jordan University

Ms. Ihssan
Judiciary Court of Appeals

Firas Yosef Kasassbeh
Yarmouk University

Nisreen Mahasneh
Yarmouk University

Dr. Mushasha
Al-Albyte University

Mahmoud N. Quteishat

Dima Yousef

Anonymous Contributors

KAZAKHSTAN

Valery Chechulin
Michael Wilson @ Partners Ltd.

Roman Nurpeissov
KIMEP University

Alida Tuyebekova
Michael Wilson and Partners, Ltd.

Timur Yerjanov
Kazakh National University

Arlan Yerzhanov
GRATA Law Firm

Anonymous Contributors

KENYA

Yaw Afrane
Kenya Medical Research Institute

L. Obura Aloo
Mwaura @ Wachira Advocates

Peter Gachuhi
Kaplan and Stratton Advocates

Anthony Gross
A. F. Gross Advocate

Nigel V. Jeremy
Daly @ Figgis Advocates

Jacqueline Kamau
Laibuta, Kamau @ Co Advocates

Mugambi Laibuta
ES-EA

Thomas N. Maosa
Maosa @ Company Advocates

Aisha Maulana

John Mudegu Vulule
KEMRI

Dennis Mung'ata
Gichimu Mung'ata @ Co Advocates

Martin Munyu
Iseme Kamau @ Maema Advocates

Rachel Muthoga
Physicians for Human Rights

Kiingati Ndirangu
Kairu Mbuthia @ Kiingati Advocates

Anthony Njogu
Daly @ Figgis Advocates

Angela Ochumba
New York University School of Law

Leonard Samson Opundo
Opundo @ Associates Advocates

James Otieno Odek
School of Law, University of Nairobi

Sonal Sejjal
Anjarwalla @ Khanna Advocates

Anonymous Contributors

KYRGYZSTAN

Albanova Aizhan

Valentin Chernyshev

Asel Dzhamankulova
ABA Rule of Law Initiative

Guljan Esenalieva
American University in Central Asia

Begaiym Esenkulova
American University of Central Asia

Azamat Kerimbaev
ABA Rule of Law Initiative

Saltanat Moldoisaeva
NGO "For Rational and Safety Use of Medicines"

Gulnaz Naamatova
American University in Central Asia

Nazik Satkeyeva
ARTE Law Firm

Akbar Suvanbekov
Republican Center for Health System Development and IT

Anonymous Contributors

LEBANON

Charbel Dagher
Baroudi @ Associates Law Firm

Khatoun Haidar
Synergy-Takamol

Joelle Khater
Badri and Salim El Meouchi Law Firm

Souraya Machnouk
Abou Jaoude @ Associates

Elias Mattar
AJA Law Firm

Hikmat Rizk
Lebanese American University

Georges Saad
Faculty of Law, Lebanese University

Joseph Saaiby
HMB @ Partners Law Firm

Rany Sader
SADER @ Associates (Advocates @ Legal Consultants)

Ramy Torbey
Aziz Torbey Law Firm

Hafez Zakhour
Zakhour Ali @ Partner

Tony Zreik
Lebanese American University

Anonymous Contributors

LIBERIA

Sam M. Adorowa
ChildFund - Liberia

Luke L. Bawo
Ministry of Health and Social Welfare

F. Augustus Caesar
Caesar Architects Inc.

Mohamedu F. Jones
Mohamedu F. Jones, Esq

Hannan Karnley-Bestman
IMaD/MCDI - Liberia

Anonymous Contributors

MACEDONIA

Besa Arifi
Faculty of Law, South East European University

Aleksandra Baleva
Advokatsko drustvo Godzo, Kiceec i Novakovski Ohrid

Doncho Donev
Faculty of Medicine, Ss Cyril and Methodius University

Dennis Farrington
SEE University

Shterjovski Goce
Shterjovski

Aleksandar Godzo
Godzo, Kiceec @ Novakovski

Marija Gulija
AD Dr. Panovski

Dr. Jadranka
University "Goce Delcev" Stip

Maja Jakimovska
CAKMAKOVA Advocates

Adnan Jashari
South East European University

Deljo Kadiev
Kadiev Law Office

Trajce Kitanovski
Law Firm Kitanovski

Sami Mehmeti
South East European University

Neda Milevska-Kostova
Centre for Regional Policy Research and Cooperation 'Studiorum'

Svetlana Neceva
Law Office Pepeljugoski

Ilija Nedelkoski
CAKMAKOVA Advocates

Aleksandar Pulejkov
Aleksandar Pulejkov Judgments Law Enforcement Office

Dr. Starsko
University "Goce Delcev" Stip

Aleksandar Trajkovski
Law Office Pepeljugoski

Leonid Trpenoski
Law Firm Trpenoski

Svetlana Veljanovska
Faculty of Law UKLO Bitola, Kichevo

Anonymous Contributors

MADAGASCAR

Andrianjaka Adriamanalina
Office Notarial de Tamatave

M. Andriamadison

Jacques Rakotomalala
Cabinet d'Avocats Rakotomalala

Rija Rakotomalala
Cabinet d'Avocats Rakotomalala

Mamison Rakotondramanana
JurisConsult Madagascar Law Firm

M. Razaiarisolo
Cabinet d'Avocats Razaiarisolo Rakotomalala

Anonymous Contributors

MALAWI

Justin Goodwin Kusamba Dzonzi
Kainja @ Dzonzi

Victor Makhubalo Jere
Churchill, Norris @ Foster

Gabriel Kambale
GK Associates

Andrews Dowell Katuya
Dowell @ Jones, Attorneys-at-Law

Kenneth Mphatso Maleta
University of Malawi, College of Medicine

Charles Mhango
Malawi Human Rights Commission

Allan Hans Muhome
Malawi Law Society

Adamson S. Muula
University of Malawi, College of Medicine

Jack Nriwa
Malawi Judiciary

Anonymous Contributors

Teresa Carmona Arcos
Consultores Jurídicos

Bernardo Rodriguez

Enkhbat Batsukh
Khan Lex Partners

MALAYSIA

Azmi Mohd Ali
Azmi @ Associates

Daniel Carranca de la Mora
Carranca, Araujo, Acosta y Riquelme Abogados

César Rojas
Basham, Ringe y Correa, S.C.

Volodya Bolormaa
GRATA Law Firm

Ashgar Ali bin Ali Mohamed
International Islamic University Malaysia

Jorge A. de Regil
Baker @ McKenzie

Ivonne M. Rojas
PMC LAW, S.C.

Bayar Budragchaa
ELC

Aishah Bidin
National University of Malaysia

Aldo González Melo
Carranca, Araujo, Acosta y Riquelme Abogados

Fabian Sanchez Matus
i(dh) eas, Litigio Estratégico en Derechos Humanos, A.C.

M. Gankhuyag
GN @ Co., Ltd.

HP Legal

Alonso Gonzalez-Villalobos

Pietro Straulino
Sanchez DeVanny Eserverri, S.C

Darin Hoffman
MahoneyLiotta

Ashran bin Haji Idris
Universiti Teknologi Mara Malaysia

Yves Hayaux-du-Tilly
Nader, Hayaux @ Goebel

Juan Francisco Torres Landa R.
Barrera, Siqueiros y Torres Landa, S.C.

Luke Lkhaasuren
Logos Avocates

S.B. Cheah
S.B.Cheah @ Associates

Michel Hernández

Anonymous Contributors

Erdenejargal Perenlei
Open Society Forum

Sharon Kaur
Faculty of Law, University of Malaysia

Julio Hernández Barros
Bufete Hernández Pliego Abogados A.C.

MOLDOVA

Badamragchaa Purevdorj
Open Society Forum

Rooshida Merican

Julio Hernández Pliego
Bufete Hernández Pliego Abogados A.C.

Octavian Cazac
Turcan Cazac Law Firm

Batragchaa Ragchaa
A @ A Global Law Firm

Chew Phye Keat
Raja, Darryl @ Loh

Hugo Hernández-Ojeda Álvarez
Barrera, Siqueiros y Torres Landa, S.C.

Alexei Croitor
Alexei Croitor Law Firm

Gerelmaa Sandui
Umug Kholch LLC

Rizal Rahman
National University of Malaysia

HP Legal

Marica Dumitrasco
Acadamy of Sciencies of Moldova

Anonymous Contributors

Anonymous Contributors

Juan Manuel Juarez Meza
R@N Abogados

Victor Durllesteanu
Durllesteanu @ Partners

MOROCCO

Sion Assidon
Transparency MAROC

MEXICO

Ma Guadalupe Alvear-Galindo
Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Angel M. Junquera
Junqueray Forcada

Iulia Fortuna
Turcan Cazac Law Firm

M. Boukasri

Iker Arriola
White @ Case LLP

David Gustavo Lamoyi
Aeromexico

Ana Galus
Turcan Cazac Law Firm

M. Briou

L. Alberto Balderas
Jauregui y Navarrete, S.C.

Olivia Lopez-Arellano
Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Xochimilco

HP Legal

Richard D. Cantin
Juristructures LLP

Esteban Maqueo Barnetche
Maqueo Abogados, S.C.

Luciano Mendoza Cruz
Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Cristina Martin
ACI Partner

Mimoun Charqi
JURISPOL

Jose Alberto Campos Vargas
Sánchez de Vanny Eserverri, S.C.

Sergio Lopez Moreno
Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Xochimilco

Daniel Martin
BAA Avornic @ Partners

Kenza Cherif
Cabinet D'Avocats Cherif

Maria Teresa Cantú Reus
CantúReus Abogados, S.C.

Guillermo Piecarchic Cohen
PMC LAW, S.C.

Alexandru Savva
Turcan Cazac Law Firm

Amin Hajji
Hajji @ Associés

Anonymous Contributors

Carlos Riquelme
Carranca, Araujo, Acosta y Riquelme Abogados

Anonymous Contributors

Zineb Idrissia Hamzi
Hamzi Law Firm

MONGOLIA

Nassri Ilham
Institut National de Santé Publique

Mehdi Kettani
Kettani Associés

Anis Mahfoud
AB Avocats @ Associés

Tarik Mossadek
Université Hassan I

Saâd Moummi

Driss Moussaoui
Centre Psychiatrique Universitaire Ibn Rochd

Mohamed Nakhli
Cabinet Maitre Nakhli

Adbdelaziz Nouyadi
Adala Association

Soulaymani Rachida
Centre Anti Poison et de Pharmacovigilance du Maroc

Houcine Sefrioui
Etude de Notariat Moderne

Fenjiro Soulaïmane, Esq

Anonymous Contributors

NEPAL

Sangha R. Bajracharya
National Centre for Health Professions' Education

Damodar Gajurel
Nepal Medical Council

Bishwa Nath Khanal
Shrestha Legal Service Center

Gourish K. Kharel
Kto Inc.

Bishnu Luitel
BG Law Foundation

Bijaya Prasad Mishra
Nepal Bar Association

Balkrishna Neupane
Neupane Law Associates

Paras K. Pokharel
BP Koirala Institute of Health Sciences

Rudra Prasad Pokhrel
R.P. Pokhrel @ Associates

Rudra Sharma
Pradhan @ Associates

Narayan Shrestha
Shrestha Legal Service Center

Nil Mani Upadhyay
Nepal Medical Council

Anonymous Contributors

NETHERLANDS

W.H.E. Buntinx
Buntinx Training @ Consultancy

Duco de Boer
Stibbe

Daan de Lange
Brinkhof

Mark Govers
Maastricht University

HP Legal

Hans J. Hoegen Dijkhof
Hoegen Dijkhof Attorneys @ Tax Counsellors

Joost Italianer
NautaDutilh

Frans Sijbers
Wladimiroff

Carel Stolker
Leiden University

Sjef van Erp
Maastricht University

Anton van Kalmthout
Tilburg University

Lars van Vliet
Maastricht University

Arnold Versteeg
Brinkhof

Anonymous Contributors

NEW ZEALAND

Philip Ahern
Morrison Kent

William Akel
Simpson Grierson

Gordon Anderson
Victoria University

Denise Arnold
Lyon O'Neale Arnold

Sylvia Bell
Human Rights Commission

Mark Bennett
Victoria University of Wellington, Faculty of Law

Matthew Berkahn
Massey University

Michael Bott
Michael Bott Barrister

David Bromell
Institute for Governance and Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

WJ Brookbanks
University of Auckland

Sonja Cooper
Cooper Legal, Barristers and Solicitors

Alberto Costi
Victoria University of Wellington

Nicholas Crang
Buddle Findlay

Francisc Deliu
Amicus Barristers Chambers

Tony Ellis

James Gardner-Hopkins
Russell McVeagh

D J Gates
DJ Gates

Andrew Geddis
Faculty of Law, University of Otago

Kris Gledhill
Faculty of Law, University of Auckland

Paul Gooby
Cavell-Leitch Law

Earl Gray
Simpson Grierson

Kathryn Guise
Hesketh Henry

Geoff Hall
University of Otago

Nigel Hampton Q C
Nigel Hampton Q C

Christopher Hare
Faculty of Law, University of Auckland

Dan Harrison

Donald Harrison
Haigh Lyon

Colin Henry
C.S. Henry, Barrister, and Associates

Robert Hesketh
Office of Human Rights Proceedings

Brian Keene
Brian Keene Queens Counsel

Dean Kilpatrick
Anthon Harper

Alan Knowsley
Rainey Collins Lawyers

Simon Ladd
Bell Gully

Paul Michalik

Simon Moore QC
Meredith Connell

Joanna Mossop
Victoria University of Wellington

Pam Nuttall
AUT University Law School

Evgeny Orlov
Equity Law

Michael Quigg
Quigg Partners

Kevin Riordan
New Zealand Defence Force

Paul Roth
University of Otago

Mary-Rose Russell
Law School, Auckland University of Technology

Feona Sayles
Massey University

Stephen Eliot Smith
University of Otago

W. Murray Thomson
University of Otago

Rob Towner
Bell Gully

David Underwood

Peter Watts
Faculty of Law, University of Auckland

Nicola Wheen
University of Otago

David V. Williams
University of Auckland

Kim Workman
Robson Hanan Trust

Steven Zindel
Zindels

Anonymous Contributors

NICARAGUA

Marco Antonio Benavente Gómez
García @ Bodán

Luis Manuel Canales Perez
Jarquín García

Gerardo Martín Hernández
Consortium Centro America Abogados

Andre Herrera Rodriguez
CIDS, UNAN-Leon

Roberto Jose
Arias @ Muñoz

Angelica Maria Toruno Garcia
*Universidad Evangelica Nicaraguense
Martin Luther King Jr.*

Edgard Torres Mendieta
Arias @ Muñoz

Soraya Montoya Herrera
Molina @ Asociados, S.A.

Luis Manuel Perezalonso Lanzas
Oficina de Leyes

Ramiro Rodriguez
García @ Bodán

Christian Alemán Sotomayor
Alemán Abogados y Notarios

Anonymous Contributors

NIGERIA

Abdulhamid Abdullahi Bagara
Community Health and Research Initiative

Joseph E.O. Abugu
Abugu @ Co., Solicitors

Wale-Adewale Adeleke
Ondo State Government

Onjefu Adoga
Brooke Chambers

Chioma Kanu Agomo
Department of Commercial and Industrial Law, University of Lagos

Olumide O. Aju
F.O.Akinrele @ Co.

Seyi Akinwunmi
Akinwunmi @ Busari, Legal Practitioners

Yomi Alliyu
Chief Yomi Alliyu @ Co.

Nonye Aniebue
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Ige Asemudara
PUNUKA Attorneys @ Solicitors

Yomi Dare
Yomi Dare and Company

Idowu Durosini-Etti
Adepetun Caxton-Martins Agbor @ Segun

Efena Efetie
National Hospital

Olumide Ekisola
Adejumo Ekisola @ Ezeani

Godwin Etim
AELEX Legal Practitioners @ Arbitrators

Joy Ngozi Ezeilo
WomenAid Collective (WACOL)

Anse Agu Ezetah
Law Agu Ezetah @ Co.

Vitalis Chukwunalu Ihedigbo
PUNUKA Attorneys @ Solicitors

Ayo Kusamotu
Kusamotu @ Kusamotu

Emmanuel Amaechi Nwobi
University of Nigeria

Chinyere Nwokoro
Legal Luminaries Solicitors

Godwin Obla
Obla and Co, Barristers and Solicitors

Gbenga Odusola
Gbenga Odusola @ Co., LP

Nelson Ogbuanya
Nocs Consults

Chudi Nelson Ojukwu
Nigerian Law School

Patrick Okonjo
Okonjo, Odiawa @ Ebie

Ndubuisi Okonta
Punuka Attorneys @ Solicitors

Olasupo Olaibi
Supo Olaibi @ Company

Bolaji Olaniran
Justice Group of Nigeria

Ayotunde Ologe
SYNERGY Legal Practitioners and Consultants

Ehijeagbon Oserogho
Oserogho @ Associates

Akin Osinbajo
Abdulai, Taiwo @ Co., Solicitors

Gbenga Oyebode
Aluko @ Oyebode

Festus Okechukwu Ukwueze
Faculty of Law, University of Nigeria

Anonymous Contributors

NORWAY

Carl A. Christiansen
Raeder DA

Terje Einarsen
Gulating High Court

Birthe Eriksen
Faculty of Law, University of Bergen

Jan Fridthjof Bernt
Faculty of Law, University of Bergen

Eirik Holmøyvik
Faculty of Law, University of Bergen

Erling Johannes Husabø
University of Bergen

Erling Lind
Wiersholm

Eivind Smith
University of Oslo

Tina Søreide
Faculty of Law, University of Bergen

Karl Harald Sovig
Faculty of Law, University of Bergen

Ulf Stridbeck
Faculty of Law, University of Oslo

Stella Tuft
Microsoft

Arild Vaktkskjold
IHA, Universitetet for miljø- og biovitenskap

Tor Vale
Advokatfirmaet Hartsang DA

Anonymous Contributors

PAKISTAN

Mohammad Akram Sheikh
Supreme Court of Pakistan

Zia Ahmed Awan
Lawyers for Human Rights @ Legal Aid

Rai Muhammad Saleh Azam
Azam @ Rai Advocates @ Legal Consultants

Shahbaz Ahmad Cheema
University of the Punjab

Umer Farooq
Ayub Medical College

Shams ul Haque Joiya
Right Law Company

Parvez Hassan
Hassan and Hassan Advocates

Muzaffar Islam
Lahore Waste Management Company

Anees Jillani
Jillani @ Hassan

Muhammad Khan
Lahore General Hospital

Shereen Masoud
Masud Law Associates

Nasir Ul Mulk
Supreme Court of Pakistan

Muhammad Munir
International Islamic University, Islamabad

Faiza Muzaffar
Legis Inn Attorneys @ Corporate Consultants

Adnan Aslam Qureshi
Qureshi Law Associates

Tariq Rahim
Tariq Rahim Law Associates

Salman Safdar
Chamber of Barrister Salman Safdar

Fatima Sajjad

Shahzadi Samreen Tariq
Society for Enforcement of Rule of Law

Muhammad Irfanullah Siddiqui
Umm Al-Qura University

Iftikhar Ahmad Tarar
Punjab University

S.M.Farhad Tirmazi
Tirmazi @ Associates

Mohammad Zakaria

Anonymous Contributors

PANAMA

Víctor Delgado
Universidad Católica Santa María La Antigua

Carlos Ernesto González Ramírez
Fundación Libertad

Gisela Juliao
Legal Invest Solutions

Ivette Martinez
Patton Moreno @ Asvat

Mario Rognoni
Arosemena, Noriega @ Contreras

Raul Soto
ANORCO

Anonymous Contributors

PERU

Marco Alarcon
Estudio Ehecopar

Eduardo Benavides
Berninzon @ Benavides

Raquel Cancino
Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia

Cecilia Melba Ma Cardenas
Consult Salud

Shirley Cárdenas
García Sayán Abogados

Dino Carlos Caro Coria
Caro @ Asociados, Especialistas en Derecho Penal Económico y de la Empresa

Maria Sofia Cuba Fuentes
Sociedad Peruana de Medicina Familiar y Comunitaria

Jaime Durand
García Sayán Abogados

Martin Gavidia

Carmen Heck Franco
Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental

David Lira
Clinica Internacional

Rossana Maccera

Elfren Morales
Hospital Nacional Hipólito Unanue

Evan E. Morgan
Evan Morgan @ Asociados Abogados

Yesenia Nuñez
Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Neurológicas (INCN)

Gabriel Ortiz de Zevallos
APOYO Comunicación Corporativa S.A.

Jorge Martín Paredes Pérez
Paredes @ Asociados

Ricardo M. Pauli

Miguel Angel Porras Carrión
Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Neurológicas (INCN)

César Puntriano
Estudio Muñiz

Marcos Ricardo Revatta Salas
Unica Universidad Nacional San Lus Gonzaga De Ica Peru

Miguel Rubio Ayllon
Muñiz, Ramirez, Perez - Taiman @ Olaya

Alberto Varillas
García Sayán Abogados

Jose Luis Velarde Lazarte
Estudio Olaechea

Anonymous Contributors

PHILIPPINES

Luther Z. Calderon
Kabalikat ng Migranteng Pilipino Inc. (KAMPI)

Hilario G. Davide, Jr.

Jelson Garcia
Bank Information Center

Karen S. Gomez Dumpit
Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines

Nancy Joan M. Javier
Integrated Bar of the Philippines

Carmelita G. Nuqui
Development Action for Women Network (DAWN)

Olivier L. Pantaleon

Jeanie S. Pulido
Law Office of Jeanie S. Pulido

Mary Grace R. Quintana
Department of Justice

Ramon G. Samson

Isagani R. Serrano
Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM)

Reginald A. Tongol

Ma. Louisa M. Viloría-Yap
Law Firm of Garcia Inigo @ Partners

Anonymous Contributors

POLAND

Katarzyna Batko-Toluc
The Association of Leaders of Local Civic Groups

Andrzej Brodziak
Institute of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health

Joanna Kobza
Silesian Medical University

Agnieszka Lisiecka
Wardynski and Partners sp. k.

Piotr Majer
Aaszczuk @ Partners Sp.k.

Andrzej Michalowski
Michalowski Stefanski Adwokaci Spółka Komandytowa

Malgorzata Muc-Wierzgon
Silesian Medical University

Jerzy Naumann

Michal Raczkowski
Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Warsaw

Krzysztof Rastawicki
RMS Rastawicki Sawicki Sp.K.

Lechoslaw Stepniak
Domanski Zakrzewski Palinka sp.k.

Tomasz Trojanowski
IFMSA

Jerzy Wolinski
Law Office JW

Anonymous Contributors

PORTUGAL

Luis Miguel Amaral
Luis Miguel Amaral - Advogados

Fernando Antas da Cunha
ACFA

Joana Barrilaro Ruas

Anja Bothe
Universidade Atlântica

Eduardo J. Buisson VB Loureiro
Legal Affairs Bureau (Macau)

Octavio Castelo Paulo
SRS Advogados

Pedro Rodrigues de Mata
PRM @ Associados

Henrique Doroteia
Henrique Doroteia Advogados

Andre Lamas Leite
Faculty of Law, University of Porto

Sandrine Bisson Marvaio

Pedro Pinto
PBBR

Goncalo Pinto Ferreira
Albuquerque @ Associates

Teresa Pizarro Belezã
Law School, Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Carlos Lopes Ribeiro

Isabel Rocha
RMV @ Associates Law Firm

Libertário Teixeira
LTCF Sociedade de Advogados RL

Anonymous Contributors

ROMANIA

Cristina Alexe
Popovici Nitu @ Asociatii Attorneys at Law

Marius-Nicolae Balan
The Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi

Cristian Bogaru
Hammond, Bogaru @ Associates

Anca Lulia Cimpeanu
Rubin Meyer Doru @ Trandafir LPC

Miloiu Ciprian
Miloiu Ciprian Private Law Office

Valeriu Ciuca
The Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi

Madalina Constantin
Voicu @ Filipescu SCA

Dariescu Cosmin
The Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi

Cosmin Flavius Costas
Faculty of Law, Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Andrei Danciu
SCA Cataniciu @ Asociatii

Daghie Dragos
Daghie @ Asociatii

Ioana Dumitru
SCA Popovici Nitu @ Asociatii

Diana Maria Ionescu
Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

HP Legal

Ioan Lazar
Alba County Bar Association

Raul Miha
Voicu @ Filipescu SCA

Flaviu Nanu
White @ Case

Vlad Neacsu
SCA Popovici Nitu @ Asociatii

George Nedelcu
Nedelcu George - Law Office

Daniel Nitu
Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Dan Oancea

Septimiu Panainte
Law Faculty, The Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi

Gavrila Simona Petrina
University Dunarea de Jos Galati

Radu Rizoiu
Rizoiu @ Asociatii

Mihail Romeo Nicolescu
Romeo Nicolescu Law Office

Felicia Rosioru
Faculty of Law, Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Bogdan Sergiu

Florin Stretanu
Faculty of Law, Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Simina Tanasescu
University of Bucharest

Andrei Zamfirescu
Gilescu @ Partenerii CHSH

Anonymous Contributors

RUSSIA

Sergey Alexeev
Institute of Private Law

HP Legal

Nikolai Kostenko
Moscow Helsinki Group

Eduard Margulyan
Margulyan @ Kovalev

Andrey Neznamov
The Ural State Law Academy

Alexander Romanov
The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration

Elena Sapegina
Beiten Burkhardt

Vladimir Shoukhov
Moscow State Medico-Stomatological University

Anonymous Contributors

SENEGAL

Mbaye Diene
Consortium pour la Recherche Economique et Sociale(CRES)

Diene Ousseynou Diouf
Université de Ziguinchor

Elhadji Mame Gning

Serigne Magueye Gueye
Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar

Mamadou Mbaya
SCP Mame Adama Gueye @ Associés

Moustapha Ndoye

Moustapha Ngaido
Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar

Dr. Sarr
Ministere de la Santé

El Hadji Omar Youm
SCP Mame Adama Gueye @ Associés

Anonymous Contributors

SERBIA

Vera Bajic

Dusan S. Dimitrijevic

Djordje Djurisc
Law Office of Djordje Djurisc

Veljko Guberina
Guberina-Marinkov Law Office

Valentina Krkovic
Law office Valentina Krkovic

Zach Kuvizic
Kuvizic @ Tadic Law Office

Jane Paunkovic
Faculty of Management Zajecar

Vladan Simeunovic
Law Office Simeunovic-Ikonovic-Isailovic

Petar Stojanovic
*Joksovic, Stojanovic @ Partners,
Attorneys at Law*

Nenad Vujic
Vujic Law Office

Anonymous Contributors

SIERRA LEONE

Anthony Brewah
Brewah and Co.

Michael Imran Kanu
Streamline Consultancy

Simeon Koroma
TIMAP for Justice

Ady Macauley
Anti-Corruption Commission

Editayo Pabs-Garnon
Renner-Thomas @ Co.

Nancy Sesay
Open Society Initiative for West Africa

Rowland Wright
Wright@ Co.

Anonymous Contributors

SINGAPORE

Simon Chesterman
*Faculty of Law, National University of
Singapore*

Kelvin Chia
Kelvin Chia Partnership

Harry Elias
Harry Elias Partnership LLP

HP Legal

Tan Cheng Han
National University of Singapore

Koon-Hou Mak

Dan W. Puchniak
*Faculty of Law, National University of
Singapore*

Elizabeth Siew-Kuan Ng
*Faculty of Law, National University of
Singapore*

Josephus Tan
Patrick Tan LLC

Patrick Tan
Patrick Tan LLC

Chia Boon Teck
Chia Wong LLP

Jack Tsen-Ta Lee
*School of Law, Singapore Management
University*

Stanley Yeo
National University of Singapore

Anonymous Contributors

SLOVENIA

Bojko Bucar
University of Ljubljana

Ales Galic
University of Ljubljana

Erik Kersevan
University of Ljubljana

Andrej Kirm
Avbreht, Zajc @ Partners, Ltd.

Rajko Knez
Faculty of Law, University of Maribor

Suzana Kraljic
Faculty of Law, University of Maribor

Matija Repolusk
Repolusk Law Firm

Primoz Rozman
Blood Transfusion Centre of Slovenia

Josip Sever

Peter Stanovnik
Institute for Economic Research

Grega Strban
Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana

Luka Ticar
Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana

Anonymous Contributors

SOUTH AFRICA

Johan Beukes

Victoria Bronstein
*School of Law, University of the
Witwatersrand*

Fawzia Cassim
University of South Africa

Tamara Cohen
University of KwaZulu Natal

Daphney Nozizwe Conco
DENOSA Professional Institute

Hugh Corder
University of Cape Town

Pieter du Toit
North-West University

Sieg Eiselen
University of South Africa

Chantelle Feldhaus
North-West University

Henri Fouche
University of South Africa

Wilhelmina Germishuys
University of South Africa

Susan Goldstein
Soul City

James Grant
*School of Law, University of the
Witwatersrand*

Jacqueline Heaton
University of South Africa

Derek Hellenberg
University of Cape Town

Paul Hoffman
*The Institute for Accountability in
Southern Africa*

Rene Koraan
North-West University, Potchefstroom

Johann Krieger
Freedom Under Law

Johan Kruger
Centre for Constitutional Rights

Peter Leon
Webber Wentzel

A. Leonard
University of South Africa

Leon Louw
*Law Review Project
Witwatersrand*

J. Mahler-Coetzee
Nelson Mandela School of Law

Vuyokazi Matshaya
African Medical @ Research Foundation

Stephen Monye
University of South Africa

Kasturi Moodaliyar
University of Witwatersrand

Budeli Mpariseni
University of South Africa

Dejo Olowu
North-West University

Matome M. Ratiba
University of South Africa

Altair Richards
Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc.

Milton Seligson
South African Bar

Sandhiya Singh
University of KwaZulu Natal

Elizabeth Snyman-Van Deventer
University of the Free State

Philip Stoop
University of South Africa

Clarence I. Tshoose
University of South Africa

Andreas van Wyk
Stellenbosch University

Jeannie van Wyk
University of South Africa

Francois Venter
*Faculty of Law, North-West University,
Potchefstroom*

Tania Vergnani
University of the Western Cape

R. Zinn
University of South Africa

Anonymous Contributors

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Woo Young Choi
Hwang Mok Park

HP Legal

Haksoo Ko
School of Law, Seoul National University

Hwang Lee
Korea University School of Law

Sang Won Lee
School of Law, Seoul National University

YangHee Lee
Sungyunkwan University

Jaeseop Song
Shin @ Kim

Junsok Yang
Catholic University of Korea

Michael Yu
Kim @ Chang

Sung Whan Lee
Ahnse Law Offices

Anonymous Contributors

SPAIN

María Acale Sanchez
Universidad de Cádiz

Caesar Aguado Renedo
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Juan Francisco Aguiar Rodríguez
Servicio Canario de Salud - Gobierno de Canarias

Maraa Jose Aguilar Idañez
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

Carlos Alvarez-Dardet
Universidad de Alicante

Josefa Cantero Martínez
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

Montserrat Casamitjana
*Sociedad Salud Pública de Catalunya i
Balears*

Xavier Castells Oliveres
Hospital del Mar

Charles C. Coward Bates
Uria Menéndez

Paz M. de la Cuesta
Universidad de Cantabria

Francisco Javier Dávila González
Universidad de Cantabria

HP Legal

Gustavo de las Heras
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

Manuel Angel de las Heras Garcia
Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de Alicante

Federico Durán López
Garrigues Abogados

Santiago Fernández Redondo
Hospital Universitario La Princesa

Antonio Fernández Rodríguez
Garrigues Abogados

Jose Fernandez-Ranada
Garrigues Abogados

Luis Gaité
Hospital Universitario Marques de Valdecilla

Roman Gil Alburquerque
Junta de Gobierno del Ilustre Colegio de Abogados de Madrid

Martin Godino Reyes
Sagardoy Abogados

Carlos Gómez-Jara
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Pablo Guárez Tricarico
*Departamento de Derecho Penal,
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*

Ana Gutiérrez
Universidad de Cantabria

María Gutiérrez Rodríguez
Universidad Carlos III

Juan Antonio Lascaraín Sánchez
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Josep Lluís de Peray
Departament de Salut

María del Mar Carrasco Andrino
Universidad de Alicante

Jose Martí Boscà
Universitat de Valencia

Juan Oliva-Morena
Asociación de Economía de la Salud

José María Ordóñez Iriarte
Comunidad de Madrid

Rafael Ortiz Cervello
Garrigues Abogados

Rocio Ortiz Moncada
Universidad de Alicante

Jesús Padilla Gálvez
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

Vicente Pastor y Aldeguer
Hospital Universitario La Princesa

Manuel Portero
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

Felipe Renart Garcia
Universidad de Alicante

Jose Ignacio Rodriguez
Universidad de Alcala

Federico Rodríguez Morata
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

August Torà Barnadas

Yolanda Valdeolivas
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Rosario Vicente Martínez
Universidad Castilla-La Mancha

Anonymous Contributors

SRI LANKA

Chrishantha Abeyseena
University of Kelaniya

A. Pathmeswaran
University of Kelaniya

Gamini Perera
Supreme Court of Sri Lanka

Dr. Rajendira
Faculty of Medicine Jaffna

Asoka Silva
Department of Legal Studies, The Open University of Sri Lanka

Manuj Weerasinghe
Faculty of Medicine, University of Colombo

Anusha Wickramasinghe
The Open University of Sri Lanka

Anonymous Contributors

SWEDEN

Jack Ågren
Stockholm University

Bengt Ahgren
Nordic School of Public Health

Carl-Olof Bouveng
Advokatfirman Lindahl

Laura Carlson
Faculty of Law, Stockholm University

Daniel Drott
Advokatfirman Delphi

Reinhold Fahlbeck
Lund University

Boel Flodgren
Lund University

Peder Grandinson
Hammarstiöld & Co.

HP Legal

Peder Hammarstiöld
Hammarstiöld & Co.

Petter Holm
Gärde Wesslau Advokatbyrå

Mikael Johansson
Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

Lennart Kahler
Nordic School of Public Health

Gunilla Lindmark
Uppsala University

Bengt Lundell
Lund University

Olov Marsater
Faculty of Law, Uppsala University

Ulf Maunsbach
Faculty of Law, Lund University

Christoffer Monell
Mannheimer Swartling Advokatbyrå

Karol Nowak
Faculty of Law, Lund University

Birgitta Nyström
Faculty of Law, Lund University

Bjorn Ohde
Advokataktiebolaget Roslagen

Karl-Arne Olsson
Gärde Wesslau Advokatbyrå

Johan Sangborn
The Swedish Bar Association

Gustaf Sjöberg
Stockholm University

Dennis Töllborg
University of Gothenburg

Mauro Zamboni
Faculty of Law, Stockholm University

Ola Zetterquist
Gothenburg University

Anonymous Contributors

TANZANIA

Salim Abubakar
BLC Advocates

Grace Kazoba
IFM

Francis Kiwanga
Matrix Consulting Advocates

Melkizedeck Leshabari
University of Health and Allied Sciences

Florens Luoga
FK Law Chambers

Fadhili Nathan Lwendo
Zenith Attorneys

Samwel Gard Madulanga
Mrosso & Associates Advocate

Annmarie Mavenjina Nkelame
ActionAid Tanzania

Cheggy C. Mziray
BrickHouse Law Associates

Eustard Athanace Ngatale
Prime Ministers Office Regional Administration and Local Government

Juvenalis Ngowi
East African Law Chambers

Eliud Wandwalo
Management Sciences for Health

Anonymous Contributors

THAILAND

Paul Connelly
International Legal Counsellors Thailand Limited

Wonpen Keawpan
Faculty of Public Health

Jeeranun Klaewkla
Faculty of Public Health, Mahidol University

Usa Lek-Uthai
Mahidol University

Siriporn Skrobanek
Foundation for Women

Chanvit Tharathep
Ministry of Public Health

Anonymous Contributors

TUNISIA

Hamdi Amine
Zaanouni Law Firm

Ben Ammar
Ben Ammar Law Firm

Amel Bchini
Bchini Avocat Conseil

Nadhir Ben Ammu
Cabinet Nadhir Ben Ammu

Kais Ben Brahim
Tunisia Legal

Elies Ben Letaifa
Juris International Lawyers

Bessem Ben Salem
BSLF

Elyes Chafter
Chafter Raoudi Law Firm

Mohammed Ennaceur
Association Tunisienne de Droit Social

Zied Gallala
Gallala Law Firm

Zouhaier Ghedira
Ordre National des Avocats de Tunisie

Amel Gorbej

Donia Hedda Ellouze
Cabinet Maitre Donia Hedda Ellouze

Hedio Kedadi
Hedio Kedadi Legal

Kouki Khaled
KBN Avocats

Brahim Latrech
Dr. Brahim Latrech Law Office

Hechmi Louzir
Institut Pasteur de Tunisie

Amin Mahfoudh
Barreau de Tunisie

Ridha Mezghani

Asma Nouira
Faculté de Droit et de Sciences Politiques

Nizar Sdiri
Nizar Sdiri Law Firm

Anonymous Contributors

TURKEY

Ufuk Aydin
Faculty of Law, Anadolu University

Cem Behar
Bogaziçi University

Bahir Bozcali
Bozcali Law Offices

Gökçe Çelen
Çelen Law Office

Murat Volkan Dülger
Dulger Law Firm

Ece Göztepe
Bilkent University

HP Legal

Osman Hayran
Yeditepe University

Nuray Galkasek Karaca
Anadolu University

Orhan Yavuz
ADMD Law Firm

Anonymous Contributors

UGANDA

Patrick A. Alunga
Barugahare @ Co. Advocates

D.J. Bakibinga
Makerere University

Eva Berinda
FIDA Uganda

Jude Byamukama
Twesigye, Namanya @ Co. Advocates

Brigitte Byarugaba Kusiima
Shonubi, Musoke @ Co. Advocates

Ahumuza Charity
Refugee Law Project, School of Law, Makerere University

Adrian Jjuuko
Human Rights Awareness and Promotion Forum (HRAPP)

Peter Kabatsi
Kampala Associated Advocates

David Kaggwa
Kaggwa @ Kaggwa Advocates

Brian Kalule
Nsubuga @ Co. Advocates

Kakembo Katende
JN Kirkland @ Associates

Regina Kawooya-Junju
Kawwoya Junju @ Co. Avocate

Emmanuel Meta Aloro
Lex Uganda Advocates @ Solicitors

Damalie Naggita-Musoke
Makerere University

Salima Namusoby
Refugee Law Project, School of Law, Makerere University

Laura Nyirinkindi
Uganda Association of Women Lawyers (FIDA Uganda)

George Omunyokol
Omunyokol And Company Advocates

Arthur K. Ssempebwa
Katende, Ssempebwa and Company Advocates

Mpiima Jamir Ssenoga
Kiwanuka, Lubega, Mpiima @ Co. Advocates

Winifred Tarinyeba Kiryabwire
School of Law, Makerere University

Ronald Tusingwire
M/S Synergy Solicitors and Advocates

Anonymous Contributors

UKRAINE

Alexander Bodnaruk
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

Timur Bondaryev
Arzinger Law Firm

Zoryana Chernenko

HP Legal

Nick V. Karchevskiy
Lugansk State University

Julia Kondratska
Moskalenko @ Partners Law Firm

Oleksandr Kostenko
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Andrey Kubko
Salkom Law Firm

Pavlo Lukomskyi
Salkom Law Firm

Andrii Misiats
NGO "Podilska Legal League"

Yaroslav Ognevyyuk
Doubinsky @ Osharova Law Firm

Alexandr Subbotin
Tarasov @ Partners

Anna Tyshchenko
Integrites

Vladimir N. Zakhvataev
Salans

Anonymous Contributors

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Camille Chamoun
BSA LLP

Ibrahim Elsadig
SNR Denton

Oliver Harrison
Health Authority Abu Dhabi

Abhimanyu Jalan
Clyde and Co.

Jennifer Page
Al Tamimi @ Company

Kavitha S. Panicker
Panicker Partners

Abdul Karim Pharaon
Court of Cassation

Amer Saadeddin
Dubai Community Health Center

Mohammed Zaheeruddin
United Arab Emirates University

Anonymous Contributors

UNITED KINGDOM

Khadija Ali
Tooks Chambers

Richard E. Ashcroft
Queen Mary, University of London

James Bell
Slater and Gordon UK LLP

David Cabrelli
School of Law, University of Edinburgh

Nigel Duncan
City University London

Julio Faundez
University of Warwick

Sara Fovargue
Lancaster University

Jeffrey Golden
London School of Economics and Political Science

Richard Griffith
Swansea University

Samantha Halliday
University of Liverpool

Simon Honeyball
University of Exeter

Peter Hungerford-Welch
City Law School, City University London

Alan J. Masson
Anderson Strathern LLP

Gerard McCormack
University of Leeds

Peter McTigue
Nottingham Trent University

Tonia Novitz
University of Bristol

Hannah Quirk
University of Manchester

Kiron Reid
University of Liverpool

Katja Samuel
Human Rights Law Centre, Nottingham University

Keith Syrett
Cardiff University

Cassam Tegnah
Swansea University

Steve Uglow
Kent Law School, University of Kent

Samantha Velluti
School of Law, University of Lincoln

Tony Ward
University of Hull

Richard Whitecross
Edinburgh Napier University

Anonymous Contributors

UNITED STATES

Jane Aiken <i>Georgetown Law</i>	Frederick Krimgold <i>Virginia Tech</i>	Haroldo Espalter <i>Hughes & Hughes</i>	Dorelys Coraspe <i>DLA Interjuris</i>
David E. Birenbaum <i>Fried Frank Harris Shriver & Jacobson</i>	Sherman L. Cohn <i>Georgetown University</i>	Horacio Fernández <i>Bado, Kuster, Zerbino & Rachetti</i>	Ricardo J. Cruz Rincón <i>Escritorio Chumaceiro-Gonzalez Rubio</i>
Robert A. Burt <i>Yale University</i>	John R. LaBar <i>Henry, McCord, Bean, Miller, Gabriel & LaBar, P.L.L.C.</i>	Martín Fridman <i>Ferrere Abogados</i>	Rafael de Lemos <i>Raffalli de Lemos Halvorsen Ortega y Ortiz</i>
Sara Elizabeth Dill <i>Law Offices of Sara Elizabeth Dill</i>	Renee M. Landers <i>Suffolk University Law School</i>	Juan Andrés Fuentes <i>Arcia Storace Fuentes Medina Abogados</i>	Jesus E. Escudero <i>Torrez, Plaz & Araujo</i>
Timothy Dolan <i>American University in Cairo</i>	M. Levine <i>Attorney Johnson-Reynolds-Fitzgerald</i>	Diego Gamarra <i>Posadas, Posadas & Vecino</i>	Juan C. Garanton <i>Universidad Católica Andrés Bello</i>
Anjali Bajaj Dooley <i>Law Office of Anjali B. Dooley, LLC</i>	Michael W. McConnell <i>Stanford University</i>	Gabriel Gari <i>Queen Mary University of London</i>	Andrés L. Halvorsen <i>RDHOO</i>
Addisu Dubale <i>University of Washington School of Law</i>	Frank Michelman <i>Harvard University</i>	Andrés Hessdörfer <i>Arcia Storace Fuentes Medina Abogados</i>	Andrés Hernández Lossada
Steven Eckhaus <i>Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP</i>	Elizabeth Pendo <i>Saint Louis University School of Law</i>	Camilo Martínez <i>Universidad de Montevideo</i>	Luis Eduardo López Durán <i>Hoet Peláez Castillo & Duque</i>
Barbara J. Fick <i>University of Notre Dame Law School</i>	Li Qiang <i>China Labor Watch</i>	Ricardo Mezzera <i>Estudio Dr. Mezzera</i>	Jaime Martínez Estévez <i>Rodner, Martínez & Asociados</i>
M. Fitzgerald <i>Attorney Johnson-Reynolds-Fitzgerald</i>	David Ranney <i>Vitalize Consulting Solutions</i>	Cristina Muñoz <i>Ferrere Abogados</i>	Mark A. Melilli S. <i>Mangieri Benavente & Asociados</i>
Michele Forzley <i>Georgetown Law</i>	Maryellen Reynolds <i>Attorney Johnson-Reynolds-Fitzgerald</i>	Santiago Pereira Campos <i>Rueda Abadi Pereira</i>	Gregory Odreman Ordozgoitty <i>Odreman & Associates</i>
Ricks Frazier	Christopher David Ruiz Cameron <i>Southwestern Law School</i>	Martin Thomasset <i>Galante & Martins</i>	Irene Rivas Gómez
Norman M. Gleichman <i>Service Employees International Union</i>	Lois Shepherd <i>University of Virginia</i>	Anonymous Contributors	Anonymous Contributors
Thomas L. Hafemeister <i>University of Virginia School of Law</i>	Toan Foeng Tham <i>Global Oral, Legal and Dental(GOLD) Foundation</i>	Uzbekistan	Vietnam
Charles Harrell <i>Duane Morris LLP</i>	David Udell <i>National Center for Access to Justice</i>	Shukhrat Khudayshukurov <i>Advokat-Himoya Law Firm</i>	Nguyen Gia Huy Chuong <i>Phuoc & Partners Law Firm</i>
Alan W. Houseman <i>Center for Law & Social Policy</i>	John L. Wilkerson <i>Arkansas Municipal League</i>	Akmaljon A. Umirzakov <i>Westminster International University in Tashkent</i>	Kevin Hawkins <i>Mayer Brown JSM</i>
Arthur Hunter Jr. <i>Orleans Parish Criminal District Court</i>	Anonymous Contributors	Anonymous Contributors	Nguyen Thanh Huong <i>Hanoi School of Public Health</i>
Earl Johnson Jr. <i>California Court of Appeal</i>	Uruguay	Venezuela	Ngo Huu Nhi <i>Thienan Law Office</i>
Theodore A. Kittila <i>Elliott Greenleaf</i>	Maria Durán <i>Hughes & Hughes</i>	Jorge Acedo	Loc Le <i>YKVN Lawyers</i>
	Escandor El Ters	Pablo Benavente <i>Escritorio Jurídico Mangieri Benavente & Asociados</i>	Tung Ngo <i>VILAF - Hong Duc</i>

Pham Van Phat
Anphat Pham Law Firm

John Tawanda Burombo
International Bridges to Justice

Nguyen Huu Phuoc
Phuoc @ Partners Law Firm

Anonymous Contributors

Ngoc Tran
Indochine Counsel

Anonymous Contributors

ZAMBIA

Chifumu K. Banda S.C.
Chifumu Banda and Associates

Lizzy Nkole Chanda
Afya Mzuri

Ernest Kakoma
Ministry of Health

Masaiti Katebe
Community Markets for Conservation Limited

Michael Munalula Liweleya
MML Legal Practitioners

Anonymous Contributors

ZIMBABWE

Simplicio Bhebhe
Kantor and Immerman

Reginald Chidawanyika
Messrs Chitere Chidawanyika @ Partners

Paul Fraser
Lofty @ Fraser

Adam Kara

Andrew Makoni
Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights

Christopher Mhike
Atherstone @ Cook Legal Practitioners

Tarisai Mutangi
Donsa-Nkomo @ Mutangi Attorneys

Archford Rutanhira
Scanlen @ Holderness

Part V: Acknowledgments |

Acknowledgments

The World Justice Project's Founder, President and CEO, William H. Neukom.

The WJP's Directors and Officers: Sheikha Abdulla Al-Misnad, Emil Constantinescu, Ashraf Ghani, William C. Hubbard, Suet-Fern Lee, Mondli Makhanya, William H. Neukom, Ellen Gracie Northfleet, James R. Silkenat, Deborah Enix-Ross, Suzanne E. Gilbert, Lawrence B. Bailey, and Gerold W. Libby.

WJP Executive Director, Juan Carlos Botero, and staff: April Baskin, Ted Carroll, Nabiha Chowdhury, Ana Victoria Cruz, Eric Florenz, Radha Friedman, Dorothy Garcia, Sophie Gebreselassie, Dwight Gee, Margaret Halpin, Bethany McGann, Aisha Minhas, Doreen Ndishabandi, Liz Ross, Steve Ross, and Nancy Ward.

Academic advisors: Harris Pastides, University of South Carolina; Andrei Shleifer, Harvard University; Angela Pinzon, Universidad del Rosario; Robert Nelson, American Bar Foundation and Northwestern University; Claudia J. Dumas; Margaret Levi, University of Washington; Jack Knight, Duke University; Beatriz Magaloni, Stanford University; Tom Ginsburg, University of Chicago; Christopher Stone, Harvard University; Gordon Smith, University of South Carolina; Sam Muller, HiiL; Andrea Saltelli, EU-JRC; Michaela Saisana, EU-JRC; Jorge Zapp Glauser; Julio Faundez, Warwick University; Randal Peerenboom, La Trobe University and Oxford University; William T. Loris, Loyola University; Ronald Janse, HiiL and Utrecht University; Jose Caballero, University of the West of England; Lutforahman Saeed, Kabul University; Jorge Luis Silva, ITAM; Audrey Sacks, The World Bank; Maurits Barendrecht, Tilburg University; Martin Gramatikov, Tilburg University; Ghada Moussa, Cairo University; Wassim Harb, Arab Center for the Development of Rule of Law and Integrity (ACRLI); Eduardo Barajas, Universidad del Rosario; Angela Ruiz, Universidad del Rosario; Sherman Cohn, Georgetown University; Jon Gould, American University; Shannon Portillo, George Mason University; Susan Hirsch, George Mason University; Eduardo Cifuentes, Universidad de los Andes; Diego Lopez, Universidad de los Andes; Marcela Castro, Universidad de los Andes; Rene Uruena, Universidad de los Andes; Jorge Gonzalez, Universidad Javeriana; Clare Lockhart, The Institute for State Effectiveness.

William H. Gates, Sr.; Arthur Chaskalson; Hans Corell; Kunio Hamada; Richard Randerson; Hassan Bubacar Jallow; Paul Brest; Larry D. Kramer; Brad Smith; Michael Holston; Anne Kelley; Brackett B. Denniston, III; Bruce Sewell; Russell C. Deyo; Michael S. Greco; Rolf Alter; Iris Litt; Adam Gerstenmier; Laurence Tribe;

Christina Biebesheimer; Murtaza Jaffer; Elisa Massimino; Stephen Zack; Laurel Bellows; R. William Ide, III; Liliana Moreno; Karan K. Bhatia; Frank Mantero; Cynthia Powell; Zsuzsanna Lonti; Sarah Alexander; Barbara Cooperman; Nigel H. Roberts; Claudia Rast; Sheila Hollis; Roger Martella; Irma Russell; Howard Kenison; Linn Hammergren; Roy L. Prosterman; Thomas M. Susman; Rob Boone; Michael Maya; Alvaro Herrero; Sandra Elena; Lina Alameddine; David Bruscano; Anna Gardner; Javier Ramirez; Carolina Cabrera; Sujith George; Marie-Therese Julita; John Pollock; Abderrahim Foukara; Ludmila Mendonça Lopes Ribeiro; Javier Castro De León; Hamud M. Balfas; Gustavo Alanis Ortega; Junaid Khalid; Adrian F. Revilla; Jose Cochingyan, III; Humberto Prado Sifontes; Lukman Abdul-Rahim; Roland Abeng; Jassim Alshamsi; Evelyn Ankumah; Ekaterina Baksanova; Rindala Beydoun; Fahima Charaffeddine; Christine Cole; Sonkita Conteh; Surya Dhungel; Roger El Khoury; Todd Foglesong; Viorel Furdui; Jacqueline Gichinga; Deweh Gray; Elise Groulx; Arkady Gutnikov; Sana Hawamdeh; Raúl Izurieta Mora Bowen; Rose KarikariAnang; Simeon Koroma; Sunil Kumar Joshi; Deborah Lindholm; Ahna B. Machan; Biawakant Mainali; Andrew Makoni; Hiroshi Matsuo; Sindi Medar-Gould; Junichi Morioka; Norhayati Mustapha; Reinford Mwangonde; Bolaji Olaniran; Mohamed Olwan; Bolaji Owasanoye; Nathalie Rakotomalia; Daniela Rampani; Lumba Siyanga; Elizabeth Thomas-Hope; Patricia van Nispen; Lianne Labossiere; Minoru Furuyama; Rose Murray; Susanna Brown; Peggy Ochanderena; Jack Krumholtz; Ellen Mignoni; Se Hwan Kim; Katrina Moore; Kate Coffey; Justin Nyekan; and Ivan Batishchev.

The American Bar Association; The Hague Institute for the Internationalisation of Law; The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University; Rule of Law Collaborative, University of South Carolina; The Whitney and Betty MacMillan Center for International and Area Studies, Yale University; The Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University; The Legal Department of Hewlett-Packard Limited; The Legal Department of Microsoft Corporation; American Bar Association Section of Environment, Energy, and Resources; American Bar Association Section of Health Law; American Bar Association Section of Intellectual Property Law; American Bar Association Section of International Law; Vera Institute of Justice; Altus Global Alliance; APCO Worldwide; and Fleishman-Hillard.

WJP Rule of Law Index 2012 main financial supporters: The William H. Neukom and the Neukom Family Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and LexisNexis.

WJP Honorary Chairs, Financial Supporters, and Sponsoring Organizations listed in the last section of this report.

The polling companies and research organizations listed on *page 187*, and the contributing experts listed in the previous section.

About the WJP |

About The World Justice Project

The World Justice Project, an independent, non-profit organization, develops communities of opportunity and equity by advancing the rule of law worldwide.

The rule of law helps people and communities thrive. Effective rule of law helps reduce corruption, improve public health, enhance education, lift people from poverty and protect them from injustices and dangers large and small. The World Justice Project is one of the world's foremost resources on the importance of the rule of law.

The World Justice Project engages leaders in countries across the globe and from all work disciplines to advance the rule of law. Our work spurs government reforms, it develops practical on-the-ground programs that support the rule of law and it increases understanding of how the rule of law is important to people and the communities where they live.

Founded by William H. Neukom in 2006 as a presidential initiative of the American Bar Association (ABA), and with the initial support of 21 other strategic partners, The World Justice Project transitioned into an independent 501(c)(3) non-profit organization in 2010. Its offices are located in Washington, DC, and Seattle, WA USA.

GOALS AND PROGRAM AREAS

Advancing the rule of law around the world is the central goal of the World Justice Project. Establishing the rule of law is fundamental to achieving communities of opportunity and equity - communities that offer sustainable economic development, accountable government, and respect for fundamental rights. Without the rule of law, medicines do not reach health facilities due to corruption; women in rural areas remain unaware of their rights; people are killed in criminal violence; corrupt governments divert public resources needed for public works; and businesses' costs increase because of expropriation risk. The rule of law is the foundation to improving public health, safeguarding fundamental human rights, ensuring security, and fighting poverty.

The WJP's definition of the rule of law is organized under four universal principles and is derived from established international standards and norms:

- » The government and its officials and agents are accountable under the law;
- » The laws are clear, publicized, stable and fair, and protect fundamental

rights, including security of persons and property;

- » The process by which the laws are enacted, administered, and enforced is accessible, fair, and efficient; and
- » Justice is provided by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are of sufficient number, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.

This definition has been tested and refined through extensive consultations with experts from around the world.

The work of the World Justice Project is founded on two premises: the rule of law is the foundation of communities of opportunity and equity and multidisciplinary collaboration is the most effective way to advance the rule of law. Everyone is a stakeholder in advancing justice.

The Project has three complementary programs: Research and Scholarship, The World Justice Project Rule of Law Index, and Mainstreaming practical on-the-ground programs to extend the rule of law.

- » The WJP's Mainstreaming initiatives strive to make rule of law advancement as fundamental to the thinking and work of other professionals as it is to lawyers and judges. One of the ways the WJP achieves reforms in rule of law is through on-the-ground programs conducted with leaders of government, businesses, civil society and individuals across work disciplines in countries throughout the world. The WJP convenes these leaders to find common ground, to examine how the fundamental importance of the rule of law matters in the everyday lives of people

in their own communities and to incubate rule of law reforms. Since 2006, the WJP has held three World Justice Forums and nine regional outreach meetings on five continents, attracting hundreds of leaders from more than one hundred countries.

- » The WJP Rule of Law Index is an innovative assessment tool designed to provide a detailed and comprehensive picture of the extent to which countries adhere to the rule of law in practice. The Index provides detailed information and original data regarding a variety of dimensions of the rule of law, which enables stakeholders to assess a nation's adherence to the rule of law in practice, identify a nation's strengths and weaknesses in comparison to similarly situated countries, and track changes over time.
- » Research and Scholarship program: The WJP supports rigorous research that examines the contributions of the rule of law to various aspects of economic, political, and social development and sheds new light on how to strengthen the rule of law. The WJP scholarship program is co-chaired by Robert L. Nelson, the MacCrate Research Chair in the Legal Profession at the American Bar Foundation, and Margaret Levi, the Jere L. Bacharach Professor of International Studies at the University of Washington. The Scholarship program is currently pursuing an ambitious research agenda studying the effectiveness of the rule of law in various domains of social life, the interdependencies among the institutional components of the rule of law, and the causal mechanisms by which the rule of law affects economic and political life.

Honorary Chairs

The World Justice Project has the support of outstanding leaders representing a range of disciplines around the world. The Honorary Chairs of the World Justice Project are:

Madeleine Albright, Giuliano Amato, Robert Badinter, James A. Baker III, Cherie Blair, Stephen G. Breyer, Sharan Burrow, David Byrne, Jimmy Carter, Arthur Chaskalson, Hans Corell, Hilario G. Davide, Jr., Hernando de Soto, Adama Dieng, William H. Gates, Sr., Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Richard J. Goldstone, Kunio Hamada, Lee H. Hamilton, Mohamed Ibrahim, Hassan Bubacar Jallow, Tassaduq Hussain Jillani, Anthony M. Kennedy, Maria Livanos Cattau, Beverley McLachlin, George J. Mitchell, John Edwin Mroz, Indra Nooyi, Sandra Day O'Connor, Ana Palacio, Colin L. Powell, Roy L. Prosterman, Richard W. Riley, Mary Robinson, Petar Stoyanov, Richard Trumka, Desmond Tutu, Antonio Vitorino, Paul A. Volcker, Harold Woolf, Andrew Young, Zhelyu Zhelev.

Board of Directors

Sheikha Abdulla Al-Misnad, Emil Constantinescu, Ashraf Ghani, William C. Hubbard, Suet-Fern Lee, Mondli Makhanya, William H. Neukom, Ellen Gracie Northfleet, James R. Silkenat.

Officers and Staff

William C. Hubbard, *Chairman of the Board*; William H. Neukom, *Founder, President & CEO*; Deborah Enix-Ross, *Vice President*; Suzanne E. Gilbert, *Vice President*; James R. Silkenat, *Director*

& *Vice President*; Lawrence B. Bailey, *Secretary and Treasurer*; Gerold W. Libby, *General Counsel*.

Staff: Juan Carlos Botero, *Executive Director*; Sophie Barral, April Baskin, Eric Black, Ted Carroll, Nabiha Chowdhury, Ana Victoria Cruz, Alex Davis, Eric Florenz, Radha Friedman, Dorothy Garcia, Sophie Gebreselassie, Dwight Gee, Sharan Grewal, Paula Guevara, Margaret Halpin, Sarah Long, Joel Martinez, Bethany McGann, Angeles Melano Paz, Aisha Minhas, Doreen Ndishabandi, Alejandro Ponce, Christine Pratt, Kelly Roberts, Liz Ross, Steve Ross, Joshua Steele, Nancy Ward, and Jennifer Wilmore.

Financial Supporters

Foundations: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; William H. Neukom & Neukom Family Foundation; Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation; Ford Foundation; GE Foundation; Oak Foundation; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; Carnegie Corporation of New York; National Endowment for Democracy; Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation; The Edward John and Patricia Rosenwald Foundation; Allen & Overy Foundation; Judson Family Fund at The Seattle Foundation; Chase Family Philanthropic Fund.

Corporations: Microsoft Corporation; Hewlett-Packard Company; LexisNexis; Anonymous; Google, Inc.; Intel Corporation; Johnson & Johnson; Merck & Co., Inc.; The Boeing Company; Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.; General Electric Company; McKinsey & Company, Inc.; Texas Instruments, Inc.; Viacom International Inc.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company; PepsiCo.

Law Firms: K&L Gates; Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP; Boies, Schiller & Flexner, LLP; Winston & Strawn LLP; Allen & Overy LLP; Fulbright & Jaworski LLP; Hunton & Williams; Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP; Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; White & Case LLP; Garrigues LLP; Haynes and Boone, LLP; Mason, Hayes+Curran; Cochingyan & Peralta Law Offices; Gómez-Acebo & Pombo; Holland & Knight LLP; Roca Junyent; SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan; Troutman Sanders LLP; Turner Freeman Lawyers; Uría Menéndez.

Governments: Irish Aid.

Professional Firms and Trade Associations: American Bar Association; American Bar Association Business Law Section; American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section; American Bar Association Health Law Section; American Bar Association Judicial Division; American Bar Association Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice; American Bar Association Section of Antitrust Law; American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution; American Bar Association Section of Environment, Energy, and Resources; American Bar Association Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities; American Bar Association Section of Intellectual Property Law; American Bar Association Section of International Law; American Bar Association Section of Labor and Employment Law; American Bar Association Section of Litigation; American Bar Association Section of Real Property, Trust and Estate Law; American Bar Association Section of State and Local Government Law; American Bar Association Section

of Taxation; Major, Lindsey & Africa; U.S. Chamber of Commerce & Related Entities; Welsh, Carson, Anderson & Stowe.

Institutions: Eastminster Presbyterian Church; Society of the Cincinnati.

Individual Donors: H. William Allen; William and Kay Allen; David and Helen Andrews; Anonymous; Keith A. Ashmus; Robert Badinter; Lawrence B. Bailey; Martha Barnett; Richard R. Barnett, Sr.; April Baskin; Juan Carlos Botero; Pamela A. Bresnahan; Toby Bright; Richard D. Catenacci; Valerie Colb; Lee and Joy Cooper; Mark S. Ellis; Deborah Enix-Ross; R. Bradford Evans; William and Janet Falsgraf; Dwight Gee and Barbara Wright; Suzanne E. Gilbert; Lynn T. Gunnoe; Peter E. Halle and Carolyn Lamm; Harry Hardin; Norman E. Harned; Judith Hatcher; Thomas Z. Hayward, Jr.; Benjamin H. Hill, III; Claire Suzanne Holland; R. Thomas Howell, Jr.; William C. and Kappy Hubbard; R. William Ide, III; Marina Jacks; Patricia Jarman; George E. Kapke; Myron and Renee Leskiw; Paul M. Liebenson; Iris Litt; Hongxia Liu; Roderick and Karla Mathews; Lucile and Gerald McCarthy; M. Margaret McKeown; Leslie Miller; Liliana Moreno; Robert Nelson; William H. Neukom; Scott F. Partridge; J. Anthony Patterson, Jr.; Lucian T. Pera; Maury Poscover; Llewelyn G. Pritchard; Michael Reed; Joan and Wm. T. Robinson III; Erik A. Schilbred; James R. Silkenat; Rhonda Singer; Thomas Smegal; Ann and Ted Swett; Joan Phillips Timbers; Nancy Ward; H. Thomas Wells.

Strategic Partners

The World Justice Project is partners with organizations that provide global leadership in a variety of disciplines. The list of partnering organizations continues to expand, increasing in its ability to represent disciplines and world regions. The current strategic partners of the World Justice Project are: American Bar Association; American Public Health Association; American Society of Civil Engineers; Arab Center for the Development of the Rule of Law and Integrity; Avocats Sans Frontières; Canadian Bar Association; Club of Madrid; Hague Institute for the Internationalisation of Law; Human Rights First; Human Rights Watch; Inter-American Bar Association; International Bar Association; International Chamber of Commerce; International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis; International Organization of Employers; International Trade Union Confederation; Inter-Pacific Bar Association; Karamah: Muslim Women Lawyers for Human Rights; Landesa; NAFSA: Association of International Educators; Norwegian Bar Association; People to People International; The World Council of Religious Leaders; Transparency International USA; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Union Internationale des Avocats; World Federation of Engineering Organisations; World Federation of Public Health Associations.

For further details, visit:
www.worldjusticeproject.org.

"Laws of justice which Hammurabi, the wise king, established... That the strong might not injure the weak, in order to protect the widows and orphans..., in order to declare justice in the land, to settle all disputes, and heal all injuries."

CODEX HAMMURABI

"I could adjudicate lawsuits as well as anyone. But I would prefer to make lawsuits unnecessary."

ANALECTS OF CONFUCIUS

"The Law of Nations, however, is common to the entire human race, for all nations have established for themselves certain regulations exacted by custom and human necessity."

CORPUS JURIS CIVILIS

"Treat the people equally in your court and give them equal attention, so that the noble shall not aspire to your partiality, nor the humble despair of your justice."

JUDICIAL GUIDELINES FROM 'UMAR BIN AL-KHATTAB, THE SECOND KHALIFA OF ISLAM

"No freeman is to be taken or imprisoned or disseised of his free tenement or of his liberties or free customs, or outlawed or exiled or in any way ruined, nor will we go against such a man or send against him save by lawful judgement of his peers or by the law of the land. To no-one will we sell or deny or delay right or justice."

MAGNA CARTA

"Good civil laws are the greatest good that men can give and receive. They are the source of morals, the palladium of property, and the guarantee of all public and private peace. If they are not the foundation of government, they are its supports; they moderate power and help ensure respect for it, as though power were justice itself. They affect every individual; they mingle with the primary activities of his life; they follow him everywhere. They are often the sole moral code of a people, and they are always part of its freedom. Finally, good civil laws are the consolation of every citizen for the sacrifices that political law demands of him for the city, protecting, when necessary, his person and his property as though he alone were the whole city."

JEAN-ÉTIENNE-MARIE PORTALIS. DISCOURS PRÉLIMINAIRE DU PREMIER PROJET DE CODE CIVIL

"All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

“The rule of law is the foundation for communities of opportunity and equity—it is the predicate for the eradication of poverty, violence, corruption, pandemics, and other threats to civil society.”

WILLIAM H. NEUKOM, FOUNDER, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE WORLD JUSTICE PROJECT

“The Rule of Law Index provides an unparalleled mechanism to help understand how law functions in countries around the world and assess where there are areas for improvement or praise. It is ripe with original, independent, and interesting data – some surprising and some that finally confirms what societies have known intuitively for a long time. In all cases, I am optimistic that the Index will advance necessary debates to improve the policies, procedures, and practices that shape rule of law around the world.”

BILL GATES SR., CO-CHAIR, BILL & MELINDA GATES FOUNDATION

“As the most comprehensive measurement tool currently available to legal and judicial reformers, the Rule of Law Index highlights the strengths and weaknesses of national systems, thereby enabling comparisons among countries within a region or of similar GDP and, hopefully, will be widely accepted as a means of improving judicial services.”

ELLEN GRACIE NORTHFLEET, FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE OF BRAZIL

“When we talk about the rule of law, we mean more than adherence to the laws of the country whatever they may be. There has to be a substantial content to the law itself. If the rule of law is to have any meaning at all, as a constitutional principle, it must have a substantial element of protection of fundamental rights. And that is one of the great values, I believe, of the WJP Rule of Law Index. Where there’s a culture of respect for the rule of law, it is a bulwark against injustice.”

ARTHUR CHASKALSON, FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE OF SOUTH AFRICA

“As an educator, I’m convinced that access and equity in higher education isn’t possible in regions where a cogent Rule of Law is absent; as an epidemiologist, I have been most sensitive to the Index’s development as a statistical tool which will have a wide ranging impact.”

HARRIS PASTIDES, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA



The World Justice Project

ISBN (print): 978-0-9882846-2-3