

Fiscal Year 2012 (FY12) Data Notes

I. Indicators

Political Rights

Source: Freedom House

Freedom House publishes a 1-7 scale (where 7 is “least free” and 1 is “most free”) for Political Rights. Since its *Freedom in the World 2006* report, Freedom House has also released data using a 0-40 scale for Political Rights (where 0 is “least free” and 40 is “most free”). The Political Rights indicator is based on a 10 question checklist grouped into the three subcategories: Electoral Process (3 questions), Political Pluralism and Participation (4 questions), and Functioning of Government (3 questions). Points are awarded to each question on a scale of 0 to 4, where 0 points represents the fewest rights and 4 represents the most rights. The only exception to the addition of 0 to 4 points per checklist item is Additional Discretionary Question B in the Political Rights Checklist, for which 1 to 4 points are *subtracted* depending on the severity of the situation. The highest number of points that can be awarded to the Political Rights checklist is 40 (or a total of up to 4 points for each of the 10 questions). Freedom House has released these aggregated sub-category data for the period 2002-2010. Table 1 illustrates how the 1-7 scale used prior to Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07) corresponds to the new 0-40 scale.

Table 1: Political Rights

New Scale	Old Scale
36-40	1
30-35	2
24-29	3
18-23	4
12-17	5
6-11	6
0-5	7

Before FY07, the years displayed on the x-axis of the MCA Country Scorecards corresponded to the year of the Freedom House publication. For example, data from the *Freedom in the World 2005* publication was treated as “2005” data. This led to a significant amount of confusion since the *Freedom in the World* publications evaluate country performance in the previous year. To address this issue, MCC has adjusted the years on the x-axis of the MCA Country Scorecards to correspond to the period of time covered by the *Freedom in the World* publication. For instance, FY12 Political Rights data come from *Freedom in the World 2011* and are labeled as 2010 data on the scorecard.

Civil Liberties

Source: Freedom House

Freedom House publishes a 1-7 scale (where 7 is “least free” and 1 is “most free”) for Civil Liberties. Since its *Freedom in the World 2006* report, Freedom House has also released data using a 0-60 scale (where 0 is “least free” and 60 is “most free”) for Civil Liberties. The Civil Liberties indicator is based on a 15 question checklist grouped into four subcategories: Freedom of Expression and Belief (4 questions), Associational and Organizational Rights (3 questions),

Rule of Law (4 questions), and Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights (4 questions). Points are awarded to each question on a scale of 0 to 4, where 0 points represents the fewest liberties and 4 represents the most liberties. The highest number of points that can be awarded to the Civil Liberties checklist is 60 (or a total of up to 4 points for each of the 15 questions). Freedom House has released these aggregated sub-category data for the period 2002-2010. Table 2 illustrates how the 1-7 scale used prior to FY07 corresponds to the new 0-60 scale.

Table 2: Civil Liberties

New Scale	Old Scale
53-60	1
44-52	2
35-43	3
26-34	4
17-25	5
8-16	6
0-7	7

Before FY07, the years displayed on the x-axis of the MCA Country Scorecards corresponded to the year of the Freedom House publication. For example, data from the *Freedom in the World 2005* publication was treated as “2005” data. This led to a significant amount of confusion since the *Freedom in the World* publications evaluate country performance in the previous year. To address this issue, MCC has adjusted the years on the x-axis of the MCA Country Scorecards to correspond to the period of time covered by the *Freedom in the World* publication. For instance, FY12 Civil Liberties data come from *Freedom in the World 2011* and are labeled as 2010 data on the scorecard.

Control of Corruption, Government Effectiveness, Rule of Law, Regulatory Quality, and Voice & Accountability¹

Source: World Bank/Brookings Institution

For ease of interpretation, MCC has adjusted the median for low income countries (LICs) and lower-middle income countries (LMICs) to zero for all of the Worldwide Governance Indicators. Country scores are calculated by taking the difference between actual scores and the median. For example, the unadjusted median for LICs on Voice and Accountability is -0.81. In order to set the median at zero, we simply add 0.81 to each country’s score. Therefore, Mali’s Voice and Accountability score, which was originally 0.15, has been adjusted to 0.96.

The FY12 scores come from the 2011 update of the Worldwide Governance Indicators dataset and largely reflect performance in calendar year 2010. Since the release of the 2006 update of the Worldwide Governance Indicators, the indicators are updated annually.² Each year, the World Bank and Brookings Institution also make minor backward revisions to the historical data.

¹ In FY12 MCC will use two scorecards to assess countries’ policy performance. This includes the traditional scorecard used in FY11 and a newly revised scorecard. Voice & Accountability is featured in the traditional scorecard but not the revised scorecard.

² Prior to 2006, the World Bank released data every two years (1996, 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004). With the 2006 release, the World Bank moved to an annual reporting cycle and provided additional historical data for 2003 and 2005.

Freedom of Information³

Source: Freedom House, Open Net Initiative, FRINGE Special

This indicator uses a country's score on Freedom House's Freedom of the Press index (Press) as the base. Countries base scores may improve based on data from the Overview of all Freedom of Information Laws (FOIA.) A country's score is improved by 2 points if they have a Freedom of Information law in process and by 4 points if they have Freedom of Information laws or regulations already enacted. Data from the Open Net Initiative (Net) is used to penalize some countries base scores. A country's score is penalized 2 points for selective filtering of either political content or internet tools; 3 points for substantial filtering of either category; or 4 points for pervasive filtering of either category. This means a country that pervasively filters both political content and internet tools would receive a penalty of 8 points.

On this index, lower is better. Overall index scores are calculated as follows:

$$\text{Press} - \text{FOIA} + \text{Net} = \text{index score}$$

For example, India's Freedom in the Press score is 35. It has a Freedom of Information law enacted so 4 points are subtracted from its score. However, ONI data indicates there is selective filtering of both political content and internet tools, so 2 points are added for each category. India's Freedom of Information score is $35 - 4 + 2 + 2 = 35$.

Health Expenditures

Source: WHO

This indicator measures public expenditure on health as a percent of gross domestic product (GDP). MCC relies on the World Health Organization (WHO) for data on public health expenditure. The WHO estimates general government health expenditure (GGHE) – the sum of outlays by government entities to purchase health care services and goods – in million national currency units (million NCU) and in current prices. GDP data are primarily drawn from the United Nations National Accounts statistics. Countries receive an FY12 score only if 2009 or 2010 expenditure data were available to the WHO. As better data become available, the WHO makes backward revisions to its historical data.

Primary Education Expenditures

Source: UNESCO Institute of Statistics and national sources

This indicator measures public expenditure on primary education as a percent of GDP. MCC relies on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Institute of Statistics as its primary source and self-reported data from national governments as its secondary source. UNESCO data are always treated as the preferred source of information. For FY12, MCC first determined if a country has a value reported by UNESCO for 2011, 2010, 2009, or 2008. If so, the most recent data available within those four years were used. If a country did not have a value from UNESCO within those four years, MCC used the most recent available data from national sources for 2011, 2010, 2009, or 2008. If a country had neither UNESCO data nor nationally reported data for 2008-2011 it did not receive an FY12 score.

³ Freedom of Information is included in the updated scorecard but not the traditional scorecard in FY12.

For UNESCO data, the GDP estimates used in the denominator are provided to UNESCO by the World Bank. For self-reported data, MCC also requests self-reported GDP estimates, which are cross checked with GDP estimates from the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In its data request to Candidate Countries, MCC requests inclusion of all government expenditures, including sub-national expenditures (both current and capital) and the consolidated public sector (i.e. state-owned enterprises and semi-autonomous institutions), but exclusion of donor funds unless it is not possible to disaggregate them. All data are requested in current local currency (not a constant base year, nor US dollars). As better data become available, UNESCO and MCC make backward revisions to historical data.

Immunization Rates

Source: WHO/UNICEF

MCC relies on official WHO/United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) estimates for all immunization data. MCC uses the simple average of the 2010 DPT3 coverage rate and the 2010 measles (MCV) coverage rate to calculate FY12 country scores. If a country is missing data for either DPT3 or Measles, it does not receive an index value. The same rule is applied to historical data. As better data become available, WHO/UNICEF make backward revisions to the historical data.

Girls' Primary Education Completion⁴

Source: UNESCO

MCC draws upon data from UNESCO's Institute of Statistics as its exclusive source of data. To receive an FY12 score, countries must have either a 2011, 2010, 2009, or 2008 UNESCO value. MCC uses the most recent year available. As better data become available, UNESCO makes backward revisions to its historical data.

Girls' Primary Education Completion is measured as the gross intake ratio in the last grade of primary, which is the total number of female students enrolled in the last grade of primary (regardless of age), minus the number of female students repeating the last grade of primary, divided by the total female population of the entrance age of the last grade of primary. This indicator was selected since data limitations preclude adjusting the girls' primary education completion rate for students who drop out during the final year of primary school. Therefore, UNESCO's estimates should be taken as an upper-bound estimate of the actual female primary completion rate. Because the numerator may include late entrants and over-age children who have repeated one or more grades of primary school but are now graduating, as well as children who entered school early, it is possible for the primary completion rate to exceed 100 percent.

Girls' Secondary Education Enrolment⁵

Source: UNESCO

MCC draws upon data from UNESCO's Institute of Statistics as its exclusive source of data. To receive an FY12 score, countries must have either a 2011, 2010, 2009, or 2008 UNESCO value.

⁴ Girls Primary Education Enrolment is included in the traditional scorecard for LICs and LMICs. It is included in the updated scorecard for LICs only in FY12.

⁵ Girls Secondary Education Enrolment is included in the updated scorecard for LMICs only in FY12. It is not included in the traditional scorecard.

MCC uses the most recent year available. As better data become available, UNESCO makes backward revisions to its historical data.

The Girls' Secondary Education Enrolment Ratio indicator measures the number of female pupils enrolled in lower secondary school (regardless of age), expressed as a percentage of the total female population of the standard age of enrolment for lower secondary education. Lower secondary school is defined as a program typically designed to complete the development of basic skills and knowledge which began at the primary level. Because the numerator may include late entrants and over-age children, as well as children who entered school early, it is possible for the primary completion rate to exceed 100 percent.

Natural Resource Management⁶

Source: CIESIN/YCELP

In creating the index used for the FY12 data, Columbia University's Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN) and the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy (YCELP) relied on 2011 eco-region protection data, 2008 water access data, 2008 sanitation access data, and 2010 child (ages 1-4) mortality data. If no 2008 water and sanitation updates were available, 2006 data were applied.⁷ Each of the four components (eco-region protection, child mortality, access to water, and access to sanitation) is equally weighted (25%) in the overall index. Country scores are reported on the MCA Country Scorecards as 2011 data. As better data become available, CIESIN and YCELP make backward revisions to historical data.

Natural Resource Protection⁸

Source: CIESIN/YCELP

In creating the indicator used for the FY12 data, Columbia University's Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN) and the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy (YCELP) relied on 2011 eco-region protection data from United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Center. As better data become available, CIESIN and YCELP make backward revisions to historical data.

Child Health⁹

Source: CIESIN/YCELP

In creating the index used for the FY12 data, Columbia University's Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN) and the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy (YCELP) relied on 2010 child (ages 1-4) mortality data, 2008 water access data, and 2008 sanitation access data. If no 2008 water and sanitation updates were available, 2006 data were applied.¹⁰ Each of the three components (child mortality, access to water, and access to sanitation) is equally weighted (33.3%) in the overall index. Country scores are reported on the

⁶ Natural Resource Management is included in the traditional scorecard but not the updated scorecard for FY12. In the updated scorecard, the data for Natural Resource Management is disaggregated into two indicators called Natural Resource Protection and Child Health.

⁷ 2006 is the next most recent estimate before 2008.

⁸ Natural Resource Protection is included in the updated scorecard but not the traditional scorecard in FY12.

⁹ Child Health is included in the updated scorecard but not the traditional scorecard in FY12.

¹⁰ 2006 is the next most recent estimate before 2008.

MCA Country Scorecards as 2011 data. As better data become available, CIESIN and YCELP make backward revisions to historical data.

Fiscal Policy

Source: IMF

MCC relies exclusively on the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) World Economic Outlook (WEO) database for Fiscal Policy data. The fiscal policy indicator measures general government net lending/borrowing as a percent of GDP, averaged over a three year period. Net lending / borrowing is calculated as revenue minus total expenditure. The FY12 score averages the annual data of 2008, 2009, and 2010. As better data become available, the IMF makes backward revisions to its historical data.

The IMF published the net lending/borrowing series for the first time in the 2010 WEO database.

Inflation

Source: IMF

MCC relies exclusively on the IMF's WEO database for inflation data. WEO inflation data reflect annual percentage change averages for the year, not end-of-period data. FY12 data refer to the 2010 inflation rate. As better data become available, the IMF makes backward revisions to its historical data.

Trade Policy

Source: Heritage Foundation

MCC relies on the Trade Freedom component of the Heritage Foundation's annual *Index of Economic Freedom* for its Trade Policy indicator. In 2006, the Heritage Foundation re-scaled the Trade Freedom component to provide greater differentiation among countries. The new scale ranges from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the highest level of protectionism and 100 represents the lowest level of protectionism. FY12 data come from the *2012 Index of Economic Freedom* and are treated as 2011 values on the scorecard.¹¹ As better data become available, the Heritage Foundation makes backward revisions to its historical data.

The equation used to convert tariff rates and non-tariff barriers (NTB) into the 0-100 scale is presented below:

$$\text{Trade Policy}_i = \{[(\text{Tariff}_{\max} - \text{Tariff}_i) / (\text{Tariff}_{\max} - \text{Tariff}_{\min})] \times 100\} - \text{NTB}_i$$

Trade Policy_{*i*} represents the trade freedom in country *i*, Tariff_{max} and Tariff_{min} represent the upper and lower bounds (50 and 0 percent respectively), and Tariff_{*i*} represents the weighted average tariff rate in country *i*. The result is multiplied by 100 to convert it to a percentage. If applicable to country *i*, an NTB penalty of 5, 10, 15, or 20 points is then subtracted from the base score, depending on the pervasiveness of NTBs.

¹¹ The *Index of Economic Freedom* is typically released in January, and before FY09, MCC had relied on the most recent of these data for its Trade Policy indicator. However, beginning in September of 2008, the Heritage Foundation has released a preview of the Trade Freedom scores for the upcoming *Index of Economic Freedom*. On October 7, 2011, the Heritage Foundation published its preview of the Trade Freedom scores for the *2012 Index of Economic Freedom* in a paper entitled "Global Trade Freedom Needs a Boost" by Bryan Riley and Ambassador Terry Miller. The FY12 Trade Policy scores come from this document. The historical time series for Trade Policy comes from previous editions of the *Index of Economic Freedom* through the 2011 edition.

Business Start-Up

The Business Start-Up index is calculated as the average of two indicators from the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) *Doing Business* survey:

- **Days to Start a Business:** This component measures the number of calendar days it takes to comply with all procedures that are officially required for an entrepreneur to start up and formally operate an industrial or commercial business. These include obtaining all necessary licenses and permits and completing any required notifications, verifications or inscriptions for the company and employees with relevant authorities.
- **Cost of Starting a Business:** This component measures the cost of starting a business as a percentage of country's per capita income. The IFC records all procedures that are officially required for an entrepreneur to start up and formally operate an industrial or commercial business. These include obtaining all necessary licenses and permits and completing any required notifications, verifications or inscriptions for the company and employees with relevant authorities.

Since the two sub-components of the Business Start-Up index have different scales, MCC normalizes the indicators to create a common scale for each of the. Each indicator is transformed using a simple formula:

$$\text{Country X's Normalized score} = \frac{\text{Maximum observed value} - \text{Country X's raw score}}{\text{Maximum observed value} - \text{Minimum observed value}}$$

For example, to calculate Mozambique's normalized score on the Days to Start a Business indicator, we would first subtract Mozambique's raw score (13) from the maximum observed value (694)¹². We would then divide the difference between those two numbers (681) by the difference between the maximum observed value (694) and the minimum observed value (1). This yields a normalized "days to start a business" score of 0.9826. After both of the two sub-components were transformed into a common scale, MCC calculated the Business Start-Up Index using the following formula:

$$\text{Business Start-Up} = .5(\text{IFC Days to Start a Business}) + .5(\text{IFC Cost of Starting a Business})$$

In Mozambique's case, its normalized Days to Start a Business score (0.9826) is given a 50% weight and its Cost of Starting a Business score (0.9787) is given a 50% weight. This yields a Business Start-Up index value of 0.9807.

FY12 data refer to the 2012 values reported in the IFC's *Doing Business 2012* report and are labeled as 2011 on the scorecard. As better data become available, the IFC makes backward revisions to its historical data.

¹² The minimum and maximum observed values are the minimum and maximum of all 183 countries covered by the *Doing Business 2012* report.

Access to Credit¹³

Source: IFC

This indicator measures the depth of available credit information and the effectiveness of collateral and bankruptcy laws in facilitating lending. It is a composite indicator made up of two indicators from the *Doing Business* report: *Depth of Credit Information* and *Strength of Legal Rights*. The depth of credit information index measures rules and practices affecting the coverage, scope and accessibility of credit information available through either a public credit registry or a private credit bureau. A score of 1 is assigned for each of 6 features of the public credit registry or private credit bureau (or both) and the total is summed for the final score. The strength of legal rights index measures the extent to which bankruptcy and collateral laws protect the rights of borrowers and lenders to facilitate lending. It contains 10 aspects related to legal rights in collateral law and two aspects in bankruptcy law. A score of 1 is assigned for each of the 10 features of the laws and the total is summed for the final score.

In order to give equal weight to each index, MCC multiplies the *Depth of Credit Information* score by 10 and the *Strength of Legal Rights* score by 6 and then takes the average. For example, Honduras has a score of 6 on the *Depth of Credit Information* indicator and a score of 8 on the *Strength of Legal Rights*. So Honduras' Access to Credit score is $(6*10) + (8*6) / 2 = 54$.

Gender in the Economy¹⁴

Source: IFC

This indicator measures the government's commitment to promoting gender equality by providing women and men with the same legal ability to interact with the private and public sector.

This indicator combines 20 different assessments comparing women's legal capacity to that of men. When conducting the assessments it is assumed that women have reached the legal age of majority; are sane, competent, in good health, and without a criminal record; and where married, are involved in a monogamous relationship. The legal capacity to execute 10 economic activities is examined: get a job, register a business, sign a contract, open a bank account, choose where to live, get passports, travel domestically and abroad, pass on citizenship to their children, and become heads of households. For the purposes of this indicator, women have the same capacity as men if they are legally able to perform these activities in the same way as men. Women are considered to have less capacity to act if they have fewer rights than men in the areas examined.

MCC sums the total number of restrictions, which then represents a country's score in the scorecard. For LICs, the median is 'one' in FY12. Countries must score above the median to pass this indicator. Therefore, LICs must have no restrictions to pass this indicator in FY12. The median for LMICs is 'zero' in FY12. Since it is not possible to have fewer than zero restrictions on women, LMICs who score on the median are considered passing on this indicator in FY12.

Land Rights and Access

¹³ Access to Credit is included in the updated scorecard but not the traditional scorecard for FY12.

¹⁴ Gender in the Economy is included in the updated scorecard but not the traditional scorecard for FY12.

This index draws on 2004-2010 “Access to Land” data from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and 2004-2011 data from the IFC on the time and cost of property registration. Country scores are reported on the Scorecards as 2011 data.

Countries that received a “no practice” score on the IFC’s Time to Register Property indicator were assigned the maximum observed value (i.e. the worst possible score) plus one additional day. Countries that received a “no practice” score on the Cost of Registering Property indicator were assigned the maximum observed value (i.e. the worst possible score) plus one additional percentage point of the property value.¹⁵

Since each of the three sub-components of this index have different scales, MCC created a common scale for each of the indicators by normalizing them. Each indicator was transformed using a simple formula:¹⁶

$$\text{Country X's Normalized score} = \frac{\text{Maximum observed value} - \text{Country X's raw score}}{\text{Maximum observed value} - \text{Minimum observed value}}$$

For example, to calculate Morocco’s normalized score on the IFC Days to Register Property indicator, we would first subtract the maximum observed value (513)¹⁷ from Morocco’s raw score (75). We would then divide the difference between those two numbers (438) by the difference between the maximum observed value (513) and the minimum observed value (1). This yields a normalized “days to register property” score of 0.8555. After each of the three sub-components was transformed into a common scale, MCC calculated the Land Rights and Access Index using the following formula:

$$\text{Land Rights and Access} = .5(\text{IFAD}) + .25(\text{IFC Time to Register Property}) + .25(\text{IFC Cost of Registering Property})$$

In Morocco’s case, its normalized IFAD score (0.7013) is given a 50% weight, its IFC Time to Register Property score is given a 25% weight (0.8555), and its IFC Cost of Registering Property score (0.8254) is given a 25% weight. This yields a Land Rights and Access index value of 0.7717.

FY12 data on the time and cost of registering property are drawn from the 2012 data in the IFC’s *Doing Business 2012* Report. FY12 index values also rely upon the most recent year available from IFAD’s 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 “Access to Land” data. Historical time series data was constructed using a lag structure that assigns an index value to a country

¹⁵ As described in the *Doing Business in 2007* report, “[w]hen an economy has no laws or regulations covering a specific area – for example bankruptcy – it receives a ‘no practice’ mark. Similarly, if regulation exists but is never used in practice, or if a competing regulation prohibits such practice, the economy receives a ‘no practice’ mark. This puts it at the bottom of the ranking” (World Bank 2006: 74).

¹⁶ Due to the fact that high scores on the IFC indicators represent *low* levels of performance and high scores on the IFAD indicator represents *high* levels of performance, it was also necessary to invert either the IFAD normalized scale or the IFC normalized scales. MCC chose to invert the IFAD scale by subtracting each country’s normalized value from 1.

¹⁷ The minimum observed values is the minimum of all 183 countries covered by the *Doing Business 2012* report. The maximum observed value is the maximum of all 183 countries covered by the *Doing Business 2012* report plus one (day or percentage point) to account for the “no practice” values.

only if that country has data from both IFAD and IFC for the year of interest or the most recent prior year if no data were available for the year of interest.¹⁸ No index value is assigned if data from one source exists for a given year, but data from the other source exists only for years after the year of interest. For instance, if a country has data availability according to Table 3, that country would receive index values for 2010, 2009 and 2008. However, it would not receive an index value for 2005, 2006 or 2007 since no “Access to Land” score exists for 2007 or any prior years.

II. Data Collection Cutoff

Many of the indicator institutions make revisions to their data over time. The data on the FY12 country scorecards were current as of October 10, 2011, when MCC completed its data collection process.

Note: In November, MCC received corrected data points for 5 countries from the Open Net Initiative, for inclusion in the *Freedom of Information* indicator. Although it was too late to include this new data in the FY12 scorecards, we have included the corrections in our published data set, on tab 3. Only one country’s pass/fail status on the Freedom of Information Indicator would be affected by this corrected data: Moldova. Because MCC had already closed the data system, Moldova’s scorecard is clearly marked to show that with the correct data included, Moldova would have passed the overall FOI indicator.

¹⁸ As better data become available, the IFC makes backward revisions to its historical data.