Executive Summary

ROBERT Z. LAWRENCE, Harvard University

SEAN DOHERTY, MARGARETA DRZENIEK HANOUZ and **QIN HE,** World Economic Forum

Launched in the midst of a dramatic slump in world trade that has been driven by declines in overall economic activity, lowered sales, and unwanted inventories, *The Global Enabling Trade Report*'s assessment of obstacles to trade may seem less acute than before. However, as businesses take on fewer trading risks, as the psychological barriers to serving new markets mount, and as the trade financing to bridge the time between production and delivery has become harder to obtain, the continued importance of smoothing the path between buyers and sellers and reducing the cost of the transaction itself is evident.

As trade volumes fall and public authorities adopt countercyclical stimulus policies and institutional reform, it is worth remembering the fundamental attributes that govern nations' ability to benefit from trade, be they market access, border administration, infrastructure, or the business environment. This reminder is particularly timely, as measures of some countries overtly favor domestic industries while other countries impose barriers to trade to protect companies and jobs at home.

Although these measures are not the main driver of the present slump in world trade, the risk of protectionism is still present. By ranking countries according to the barriers to trade they have in place, the *Report* serves as a reminder both of the risks of protectionism demonstrated in previous downturns and of the widespread prosperity and poverty reduction associated with the expansion of international trade in the years leading up to 2008.

The *Report* is intended to be a motivator and a foundation for dialogue, providing a yardstick of the extent to which countries enjoy the factors facilitating the free flow of goods, and identifying areas of the Index where improvements are most needed. The contributions from industry and leading international trade organizations highlight current priorities and tools to manage the rapidly changing situation.

The Enabling Trade Index

A key purpose of this *Report* is to assess the extent to which countries around the globe have in place the institutions and policies for enabling trade. To this end, Chapter 1.1 features the Enabling Trade Index (ETI), which was introduced in the last edition. The ETI measures the institutions, policies, and services facilitating the free flow of goods over borders and to final destinations.

The ETI was developed within the context of the World Economic Forum's Industry Partnership Programme for the Logistics and Transport sector. A number of Data Partners have collaborated in this endeavor: the Global Express Association (GEA), the International Air Transport Association (IATA), the International Trade Centre (ITC), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), The World Bank, the World Customs Organization (WCO), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). We have also received important feedback from companies that are Industry Partners in the effort, namely Agility, Deutsche Post DHL, DP World, FedEx Corporation, GeoPost Intercontinental, Stena, TNT N.V., Transnet, and UPS.

The Index mirrors the main enablers of trade, breaking them into four overall issue areas, called *subindexes:* (1) market access, (2) border administration, (3) transport and communications infrastructure, and (4) the business environment. The first subindex measures the extent to which the policy framework welcomes foreign goods into the country and enables access to foreign markets for domestic exporters. The second subindex assesses the extent to which the administration at the border facilitates the entry and exit of goods. The third subindex takes into account whether the country has in place the transport and communications infrastructure necessary to facilitate the movement of goods within the country and across the border. Finally, the fourth subindex looks at the quality of governance as well as the overarching regulatory and security environment impacting the business of importers and exporters active in the country.

Each of these four subindexes is composed in turn of a number of pillars of enabling trade, of which there are nine in all. These are:

1. ***Domestic and foreign market access***
2. ***Efficiency of customs administration***
3. ***Efficiency of import-export procedures***
4. ***Transparency of border administration***
5. ***Availability and quality of transport infrastructure***
6. ***Availability and quality of transport services***
7. ***Availability and use of ICTs***
8. ***Regulatory environment***
9. ***Physical security***

Each of these pillars is in turn composed of a number of individual variables that are obtained from both hard data and the World Economic Forum's Executive Opinion Survey (Survey). The hard data were taken from publicly available sources and international organizations active in the area of trade (for example the World Bank, the ITC, UNCTAD, the ITU, and IATA). The Survey is carried out annually by the World Economic Forum among top business leaders in all economies covered by this study. It captures their perceptions on qualitative aspects of the business environment in which they operate, including a number of specific aspects of international trade.

The Index instrument has been revised following feedback received from academics and users of the methodology. The main changes concern the explicit inclusion of exports into the market access and border administration subindexes. Further, an assessment of overall governance conditions has been added to the business environment subindex.

Additional analysis using a gravity model shows that the revised ETI has notable explanatory power with respect to a country's trade performance. In fact, a 1 percent increase in a country's ETI score is associated with 1.7 percent more exports and 2.3 percent more imports.

The Enabling Trade Index 2009 rankings

The rankings of the 121 economies included are shown in Tables 1 through 5, including the overall ETI as well as the results on the four subindexes and the individual pillars. Since the previous edition of this *Report,* four new countries have been added to the study: Côte d'Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, and Malawi; one country covered last year, Uzbekistan, could not be included this year because of a lack of data.

The top 10

Two Asian economies, Singapore and Hong Kong, take up the top two positions in the ETI ranking. The results mirror the openness of these countries to international trade and investment as part of their successful economic development strategy.

Singapore's positive results reflect high rankings in all four subindexes. The country's very open market, as well as a highly efficient and transparent border administration, a well-developed transport and communications infrastructure, and an open business environment all contribute to this result. Customs procedures are assessed as the least burdensome in the world, and time and cost for both import and export are among the lowest for all countries covered. Singapore's exporters also face relatively low tariffs in target markets (13th). However, less congested roads and improvements to the ICT infrastructure could further increase the ease of getting goods across borders in Singapore. The country's excellent regulatory environment facilitates operations of traders through openness to foreign participation, fair domestic competition, and a highly transparent and efficient government.

Hong Kong SAR's open domestic market mirrors the economy's high dependence on exports and imports. Hong Kong does not apply tariffs on imported products, yet its exported products face more barriers than Singapore's, as reflected in tariffs faced (119th) combined with a low margin of preference in target markets (112th). Hong Kong's strong ranking also rests on its efficient customs procedures, well-developed transport and communications infrastructure, and a regulatory environment that promotes and facilitates an open and secure business environment. The economy's openness to foreign participation is attested to by the prevalence of foreign ownership and relative absence of capital controls (1st). Traders could, however, further benefit from improvements to the very congested roads (89th) and more commitments to open up the transport sector under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) framework (55th).

Switzerland places 3rd overall, scoring very high in three of the four main components of the Index. It ranks 10th for the quality of border administration, despite the country's very high costs to import (84th) and export (92nd). The ETI also reveals the very high quality of the transport infrastructure (9th) and of the associated services (12th), and when it comes to the availability and use of information and communications technologies (ICTs), Switzerland is second to none. Finally, the environment offered to business is particularly friendly (6th) thanks to its excellent institutions, fierce competition, openness to foreign participation, and low prevalence of crime. Switzerland's major weakness resides in the market access component, in which it ranks 38th because of the high level of complexity of the import tariff structure and fairly high protection of agricultural markets.

Denmark (4th) ranks among the top five countries in seven out of the nine pillars of the Index. In particular, it ranks 2nd both for the efficiency and the transparency of border administration, notably thanks to the low level of overall corruption. This, along with several other factors such as the government's efficiency (4th), the intensity of local competition (4th), and the high level of security (4th) contributes to creating an extremely conducive business environment in Denmark, where the only drawback remains the relative difficulty of hiring foreign labor (36th). The data also reveal high levels of quality and availability of transport (5th) and ICT (4th) infrastructure. Such strong results contrast with Denmark's 86th rank in the market access component, which mainly reflects European Union (EU) policies in the area of agriculture as well as the complex tariff structure applied by the European Union.

Ranked just behind Denmark at 5th place overall, **Sweden,** like its neighbor, possesses a world-class infrastructure, very transparent and efficient border administration, and a highly favorable business environment. Yet crime and violence seem to be more of a problem (22nd), and so are the difficulties of hiring foreign workers (50th). With respect to market access, Sweden (88th) posts a comparable performance to Denmark, the only difference coming from the slightly lower score on the Index of non-tariff measures.

Coming in at 6th, **Canada** is one of the three non-European countries within the top 10. It posts a strong and remarkably consistent performance across the board. In particular, it is second only to France for the availability and quality of transport infrastructure, which is excellent across all modes of transportation. Border administration (12th) is characterized by efficient customs services (15th), speedy and hassle-free clearance procedures, and low levels of corruption, with the only dent being the cost to import (95th) and export (96th). Canada ranks a high 13th in the market access pillar. The import-weighted tariffs average is just 2.4 percent, and nearly 90 percent of imports enter the country free of duty. Finally, Canada makes little use of non-tariff barriers (21st) in international comparison, although the tariff structure in place is highly complex (79th).

At 7th place overall, and third among the Nordic countries, **Norway** owes its rank to a consistent performance across all the pillars. The business environment is particularly supportive of trade (5th), thanks to favorable regulation, the efficiency of government operations, its low prevalence of crime and violence (3rd), and—despite a certain reluctance—foreign participation (44th). Another strength is Norway's efficient import and export procedures (6th). In the market access pillar, Norway, at 21st, displays much better results than the Nordic members of the European Union, yet high agricultural tariffs and a complex tariff structure remain a challenge.

In 8th position, **Finland** is the last-ranked Nordic country. Its performance is very much in line with its fellow EU members, with the major exception of the customs service index, on which Finland ranks a low 55—far behind Sweden (2nd) and Denmark (10th). On the other hand, the country ranks slightly higher on the market access pillar, thanks to its less frequent recourse to non-tariff measures.

Austria comes in at 9th position and if it was not for its low 84th rank in the market access component, it would feature even higher in the ETI ranking. The country ranks no lower than 8th in the three other components of the Index and no worse than 18th in each of the associated pillars. Customs are rated as being among the most efficient in the world (3rd) and, overall, border administration is deemed efficient, transparent, and rapid, although not cheap.

The **Netherlands** (10th) completes the top 10 of the ETI. One of the world's main hubs for trade, the country receives outstanding marks for the quality of its transport infrastructure (ranking 2nd, behind only Germany), and the associated services (ranking 2nd, behind Singapore). In particular, the quality of the country's seaports and its connectivity to the rest of the world come as no surprise, given that Rotterdam has one of the world's largest and busiest maritime ports. This, combined with an efficient and speedy border administration (4th), makes the movement of goods to and from the Netherlands almost seamless.

Asia and the Pacific

Outside the top 10, in the Asia and Pacific region, **New Zealand** comes in 11th. Its highly efficient and transparent border administration contributes to this ranking, as do the country's very low tariffs for agricultural products and transparent border administration. Exports, however, face high barriers. The country's regulatory environment is characterized by fairly good ratings on ethics and a low level of corruption, as well as an effective domestic competition policy, though obstacles still persist in hiring foreign labor and regulation of FDI. Upgrading the quality of infrastructure, especially roads and railroads, would be beneficial to further facilitate a smooth flow of goods both across borders and to destinations inside the country.

Australia occupies the 14th position overall. The rating reflects many aspects that the country does particularly well in facilitating the flow of goods across borders and to destination, including its strong performances with respect to transparent border administration, the quality of transport services, and its high level of commitment in the sector under GATS, as well as its regulatory environment, which promotes intense domestic competition. The results are, however, somewhat offset by high domestic and foreign market barriers. Australia applies very high tariffs for non-agricultural products in comparison with economies at a similar level of development, placing the country 96th on this indicator. Lowering these tariffs would further boost the country's openness to trade.

Japan takes up the 23rd position in the ETI ranking. The country's highly efficient and transparent border administration and its well-developed infrastructure, together with its excellent transport services, all contribute to this rating. The ranking is, however, severely offset by Japan's high barriers to market access in domestic and foreign markets (115th), as reflected in the high tariffs on agricultural products and the complexity of tariffs, as well as barriers faced when exporting. In addition, the country's costly import and export procedures and limited openness to foreign participation are not conductive to facilitating trade flows. Japan could also benefit from improving its somewhat burdensome customs procedures (43rd).

Table 1: The Enabling Trade Index 2009

	OVERALL INDEX		SUBINDEXES: Market access		Border administration		Transport and communi-cations infrastructure		Business environment	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Singapore	1	5.97	2	5.63	1	6.49	3	5.64	3	6.13
Hong Kong SAR	2	5.57	20	4.75	7	5.89	5	5.57	4	6.08
Switzerland	3	5.44	38	4.48	10	5.80	9	5.49	6	6.01
Denmark	4	5.44	86	3.81	3	6.31	8	5.50	2	6.15
Sweden	5	5.44	88	3.81	2	6.41	4	5.63	7	5.90
Canada	6	5.35	13	4.96	12	5.64	17	5.27	17	5.52
Norway	7	5.33	21	4.72	18	5.47	20	5.11	5	6.02
Finland	8	5.33	78	3.84	9	5.80	16	5.37	1	6.29
Austria	9	5.29	84	3.81	6	5.92	6	5.55	8	5.89
Netherlands	10	5.27	87	3.81	4	6.04	2	5.64	15	5.59
New Zealand	11	5.27	39	4.39	5	5.95	22	4.97	11	5.75
Germany	12	5.24	90	3.79	11	5.65	1	5.77	10	5.75
Luxembourg	13	5.12	58	4.00	24	5.19	13	5.41	9	5.89
Australia	14	5.07	97	3.72	17	5.54	14	5.39	14	5.62
Ireland	15	5.02	96	3.73	8	5.82	23	4.94	16	5.59
United States	16	5.02	49	4.16	15	5.58	10	5.48	36	4.85
France	17	5.02	89	3.81	19	5.46	7	5.54	23	5.26
United Arab Emirates	18	4.97	65	3.95	20	5.34	24	4.91	13	5.68
Chile	19	4.96	3	5.58	21	5.31	43	3.87	29	5.09
United Kingdom	20	4.93	79	3.84	14	5.62	11	5.47	39	4.81
Belgium	21	4.92	80	3.82	29	5.02	12	5.45	20	5.40
Estonia	22	4.84	71	3.91	16	5.58	27	4.64	24	5.25
Japan	23	4.78	115	3.10	13	5.63	15	5.38	31	5.02
Bahrain	24	4.76	26	4.65	25	5.17	41	4.07	27	5.14
Taiwan, China	25	4.75	99	3.70	27	5.15	19	5.12	30	5.03
Korea, Rep.	26	4.73	106	3.47	22	5.28	21	4.99	26	5.16
Spain	27	4.72	75	3.86	28	5.07	18	5.13	38	4.82
Malaysia	28	4.70	32	4.60	33	4.66	29	4.59	33	4.96
Israel	29	4.66	35	4.54	23	5.25	32	4.37	56	4.46
Portugal	30	4.63	63	3.96	35	4.63	26	4.74	25	5.21
Slovenia	31	4.61	82	3.82	26	5.16	31	4.55	35	4.89
Cyprus	32	4.56	74	3.88	47	4.31	28	4.60	18	5.45
Mauritius	33	4.54	10	4.99	37	4.62	55	3.55	32	5.00
Oman	34	4.52	23	4.69	49	4.23	45	3.74	19	5.43
Qatar	35	4.50	102	3.62	34	4.63	42	4.04	12	5.70
Czech Republic	36	4.39	94	3.76	30	4.92	35	4.32	50	4.58
Jordan	37	4.39	61	3.97	36	4.62	52	3.61	22	5.36
Hungary	38	4.39	81	3.82	31	4.69	34	4.34	45	4.70
Croatia	39	4.36	28	4.63	52	4.16	37	4.18	55	4.49
Lithuania	40	4.36	60	3.97	42	4.46	36	4.28	41	4.75
Tunisia	41	4.36	70	3.91	32	4.67	59	3.46	21	5.40
Saudi Arabia	42	4.36	40	4.39	38	4.61	47	3.70	42	4.73
Costa Rica	43	4.36	5	5.44	46	4.31	70	3.24	58	4.44
Latvia	44	4.33	73	3.90	39	4.60	39	4.09	43	4.72
Italy	45	4.30	66	3.94	48	4.25	25	4.75	66	4.27
Slovak Republic	46	4.30	93	3.77	40	4.52	33	4.36	51	4.56
Greece	47	4.30	59	3.98	57	3.99	30	4.58	47	4.65
Turkey	48	4.19	14	4.93	56	4.05	49	3.65	75	4.15
China	49	4.19	103	3.60	43	4.43	38	4.16	49	4.58
Thailand	50	4.18	98	3.72	41	4.48	40	4.07	59	4.44
Uruguay	51	4.18	22	4.71	53	4.15	78	3.09	40	4.76
Moldova	52	4.15	6	5.38	72	3.59	58	3.46	73	4.16
Panama	53	4.06	54	4.06	50	4.22	44	3.75	71	4.21
Romania	54	4.05	72	3.90	44	4.39	51	3.62	65	4.28
Morocco	55	4.01	51	4.09	51	4.21	65	3.36	63	4.38
El Salvador	56	4.00	1	5.64	61	3.90	91	2.90	104	3.58
Poland	57	3.98	77	3.85	45	4.37	46	3.71	80	3.99
Guatemala	58	3.97	8	5.08	55	4.07	72	3.22	109	3.50
Kuwait	59	3.96	76	3.86	78	3.52	54	3.55	34	4.90
Namibia	60	3.93	33	4.60	79	3.47	75	3.16	54	4.51
South Africa	61	3.92	92	3.78	54	4.12	50	3.62	76	4.14
Indonesia	62	3.82	53	4.07	66	3.75	79	3.04	60	4.43
Albania	63	3.82	30	4.63	60	3.91	94	2.82	83	3.91
Armenia	64	3.81	42	4.25	87	3.25	61	3.42	64	4.33
Peru	65	3.81	25	4.65	59	3.93	89	2.94	95	3.70

(Cont'd.)

Table 1: The Enabling Trade Index 2009 *(cont'd.)*

	OVERALL INDEX		SUBINDEXES: Market access		Border administration		Transport and communications infrastructure		Business environment	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Honduras	66	3.80	16	4.87	82	3.42	82	3.01	84	3.91
Gambia, The	67	3.78	108	3.37	70	3.63	84	3.00	28	5.13
Macedonia, FYR	68	3.78	62	3.97	71	3.60	57	3.46	78	4.09
Malawi	69	3.77	12	4.97	97	3.06	112	2.44	48	4.60
Azerbaijan	70	3.77	52	4.07	103	2.91	62	3.40	46	4.68
Ukraine	71	3.76	24	4.68	95	3.07	60	3.43	85	3.87
Bulgaria	72	3.76	55	4.02	69	3.64	48	3.68	97	3.68
Madagascar	73	3.75	4	5.45	86	3.26	115	2.37	82	3.93
Mexico	74	3.74	43	4.25	62	3.87	74	3.20	98	3.67
Egypt	75	3.72	117	3.05	65	3.78	66	3.35	44	4.71
India	76	3.72	116	3.06	58	3.94	64	3.36	53	4.51
Nicaragua	77	3.71	15	4.91	83	3.38	105	2.54	79	4.01
Sri Lanka	78	3.70	64	3.95	67	3.75	69	3.29	90	3.82
Jamaica	79	3.70	85	3.81	73	3.59	53	3.56	89	3.83
Zambia	80	3.64	19	4.76	102	2.96	111	2.45	62	4.39
Dominican Republic	81	3.64	69	3.91	64	3.80	73	3.20	99	3.64
Philippines	82	3.62	56	4.02	68	3.72	77	3.09	100	3.63
Senegal	83	3.62	109	3.36	76	3.54	81	3.01	52	4.55
Colombia	84	3.61	48	4.16	74	3.55	76	3.13	103	3.58
Uganda	85	3.60	9	5.06	99	2.99	98	2.61	94	3.76
Ghana	86	3.60	67	3.94	80	3.45	102	2.56	57	4.44
Brazil	87	3.58	100	3.67	77	3.53	68	3.33	93	3.79
Bolivia	88	3.55	11	4.98	75	3.55	106	2.53	118	3.16
Vietnam	89	3.54	112	3.24	85	3.28	71	3.24	61	4.40
Lesotho	90	3.51	7	5.25	105	2.84	118	2.33	101	3.63
Cambodia	91	3.50	27	4.65	98	3.00	109	2.50	87	3.85
Tanzania	92	3.50	41	4.33	92	3.17	119	2.25	67	4.24
Kazakhstan	93	3.49	45	4.20	119	2.27	63	3.39	77	4.10
Mozambique	94	3.49	17	4.84	90	3.21	117	2.36	107	3.56
Ethiopia	95	3.48	91	3.79	89	3.22	96	2.71	72	4.20
Benin	96	3.47	47	4.17	101	2.97	99	2.60	74	4.16
Argentina	97	3.46	95	3.75	84	3.35	67	3.33	111	3.42
Kenya	98	3.45	34	4.59	108	2.77	93	2.88	105	3.58
Mali	99	3.44	37	4.51	111	2.64	113	2.40	68	4.23
Pakistan	100	3.43	111	3.26	63	3.85	80	3.04	102	3.58
Kyrgyz Republic	101	3.43	18	4.77	116	2.46	86	2.98	108	3.53
Bosnia and Herzegovina	102	3.42	107	3.41	81	3.44	85	2.98	86	3.87
Ecuador	103	3.41	36	4.53	107	2.80	87	2.97	112	3.36
Burkina Faso	104	3.41	46	4.20	112	2.64	101	2.58	69	4.22
Paraguay	105	3.39	31	4.62	93	3.16	103	2.56	115	3.22
Cameroon	106	3.35	83	3.82	96	3.07	104	2.55	81	3.97
Mauritania	107	3.31	44	4.24	110	2.67	110	2.47	88	3.84
Syria	108	3.30	121	2.25	91	3.17	88	2.96	37	4.83
Russian Federation	109	3.29	113	3.16	106	2.82	56	3.49	96	3.70
Nepal	110	3.22	29	4.63	113	2.58	107	2.51	117	3.17
Bangladesh	111	3.20	57	4.01	104	2.88	108	2.50	110	3.42
Algeria	112	3.18	118	2.76	88	3.24	90	2.90	92	3.81
Mongolia	113	3.17	110	3.36	109	2.71	95	2.82	91	3.81
Tajikistan	114	3.14	104	3.57	118	2.40	116	2.37	70	4.22
Guyana	115	3.13	114	3.13	94	3.14	92	2.90	113	3.34
Burundi	116	2.99	68	3.92	114	2.57	120	2.16	114	3.30
Nigeria	117	2.97	120	2.72	100	2.98	100	2.60	106	3.57
Zimbabwe	118	2.91	101	3.67	117	2.42	114	2.38	116	3.17
Venezuela	119	2.84	105	3.48	120	2.25	83	3.01	121	2.61
Côte d'Ivoire	120	2.78	119	2.74	115	2.55	97	2.70	119	3.15
Chad	121	2.77	50	4.16	121	2.00	121	1.96	120	2.96

Table 2: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Market access

	MARKET ACCESS		PILLARS: 1. Domestic and foreign market access	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
El Salvador	1	5.64	1	5.64
Singapore	2	5.63	2	5.63
Chile	3	5.58	3	5.58
Madagascar	4	5.45	4	5.45
Costa Rica	5	5.44	5	5.44
Moldova	6	5.38	6	5.38
Lesotho	7	5.25	7	5.25
Guatemala	8	5.08	8	5.08
Uganda	9	5.06	9	5.06
Mauritius	10	4.99	10	4.99
Bolivia	11	4.98	11	4.98
Malawi	12	4.97	12	4.97
Canada	13	4.96	13	4.96
Turkey	14	4.93	14	4.93
Nicaragua	15	4.91	15	4.91
Honduras	16	4.87	16	4.87
Mozambique	17	4.84	17	4.84
Kyrgyz Republic	18	4.77	18	4.77
Zambia	19	4.76	19	4.76
Hong Kong SAR	20	4.75	20	4.75
Norway	21	4.72	21	4.72
Uruguay	22	4.71	22	4.71
Oman	23	4.69	23	4.69
Ukraine	24	4.68	24	4.68
Peru	25	4.65	25	4.65
Bahrain	26	4.65	26	4.65
Cambodia	27	4.65	27	4.65
Croatia	28	4.63	28	4.63
Nepal	29	4.63	29	4.63
Albania	30	4.63	30	4.63
Paraguay	31	4.62	31	4.62
Malaysia	32	4.60	32	4.60
Namibia	33	4.60	33	4.60
Kenya	34	4.59	34	4.59
Israel	35	4.54	35	4.54
Ecuador	36	4.53	36	4.53
Mali	37	4.51	37	4.51
Switzerland	38	4.48	38	4.48
New Zealand	39	4.39	39	4.39
Saudi Arabia	40	4.39	40	4.39
Tanzania	41	4.33	41	4.33
Armenia	42	4.25	42	4.25
Mexico	43	4.25	43	4.25
Mauritania	44	4.24	44	4.24
Kazakhstan	45	4.20	45	4.20
Burkina Faso	46	4.20	46	4.20
Benin	47	4.17	47	4.17
Colombia	48	4.16	48	4.16
United States	49	4.16	49	4.16
Chad	50	4.16	50	4.16
Morocco	51	4.09	51	4.09
Azerbaijan	52	4.07	52	4.07
Indonesia	53	4.07	53	4.07
Panama	54	4.06	54	4.06
Bulgaria	55	4.02	55	4.02
Philippines	56	4.02	56	4.02
Bangladesh	57	4.01	57	4.01
Luxembourg	58	4.00	58	4.00
Greece	59	3.98	59	3.98
Lithuania	60	3.97	60	3.97
Jordan	61	3.97	61	3.97
Macedonia, FYR	62	3.97	62	3.97
Portugal	63	3.96	63	3.96
Sri Lanka	64	3.95	64	3.95
United Arab Emirates	65	3.95	65	3.95
Italy	66	3.94	66	3.94
Ghana	67	3.94	67	3.94

(Cont'd.)

Table 2: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Market access *(cont'd.)*

	MARKET ACCESS		PILLARS: 1. Domestic and foreign market access	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Burundi	68	3.92	68	3.92
Dominican Republic	69	3.91	69	3.91
Tunisia	70	3.91	70	3.91
Estonia	71	3.91	71	3.91
Romania	72	3.90	72	3.90
Latvia	73	3.90	73	3.90
Cyprus	74	3.88	74	3.88
Spain	75	3.86	75	3.86
Kuwait	76	3.86	76	3.86
Poland	77	3.85	77	3.85
Finland	78	3.84	78	3.84
United Kingdom	79	3.84	79	3.84
Belgium	80	3.82	80	3.82
Hungary	81	3.82	81	3.82
Slovenia	82	3.82	82	3.82
Cameroon	83	3.82	83	3.82
Austria	84	3.81	84	3.81
Jamaica	85	3.81	85	3.81
Denmark	86	3.81	86	3.81
Netherlands	87	3.81	87	3.81
Sweden	88	3.81	88	3.81
France	89	3.81	89	3.81
Germany	90	3.79	90	3.79
Ethiopia	91	3.79	91	3.79
South Africa	92	3.78	92	3.78
Slovak Republic	93	3.77	93	3.77
Czech Republic	94	3.76	94	3.76
Argentina	95	3.75	95	3.75
Ireland	96	3.73	96	3.73
Australia	97	3.72	97	3.72
Thailand	98	3.72	98	3.72
Taiwan, China	99	3.70	99	3.70
Brazil	100	3.67	100	3.67
Zimbabwe	101	3.67	101	3.67
Qatar	102	3.62	102	3.62
China	103	3.60	103	3.60
Tajikistan	104	3.57	104	3.57
Venezuela	105	3.48	105	3.48
Korea, Rep.	106	3.47	106	3.47
Bosnia and Herzegovina	107	3.41	107	3.41
Gambia, The	108	3.37	108	3.37
Senegal	109	3.36	109	3.36
Mongolia	110	3.36	110	3.36
Pakistan	111	3.26	111	3.26
Vietnam	112	3.24	112	3.24
Russian Federation	113	3.16	113	3.16
Guyana	114	3.13	114	3.13
Japan	115	3.10	115	3.10
India	116	3.06	116	3.06
Egypt	117	3.05	117	3.05
Algeria	118	2.76	118	2.76
Côte d'Ivoire	119	2.74	119	2.74
Nigeria	120	2.72	120	2.72
Syria	121	2.25	121	2.25

Table 3: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Border administration

	BORDER ADMINISTRATION		PILLARS					
			2. Efficiency of customs administration		3 Efficiency of import-export procedures		4. Transparency of border administration	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Singapore	1	6.49	1	6.43	1	6.46	4	6.57
Sweden	2	6.41	2	6.41	4	6.21	1	6.61
Denmark	3	6.31	4	6.00	2	6.33	2	6.59
Netherlands	4	6.04	5	5.94	9	5.94	7	6.22
New Zealand	5	5.95	8	5.71	20	5.58	3	6.57
Austria	6	5.92	3	6.04	18	5.72	11	6.00
Hong Kong SAR	7	5.89	14	5.42	3	6.26	12	5.98
Ireland	8	5.82	6	5.86	15	5.74	14	5.84
Finland	9	5.80	29	4.75	5	6.16	5	6.50
Switzerland	10	5.80	9	5.70	26	5.36	6	6.33
Germany	11	5.65	21	5.17	8	5.97	15	5.81
Canada	12	5.64	15	5.39	28	5.34	9	6.17
Japan	13	5.63	11	5.52	19	5.71	16	5.66
United Kingdom	14	5.62	7	5.75	21	5.56	18	5.53
United States	15	5.58	10	5.66	16	5.73	21	5.36
Estonia	16	5.58	13	5.44	7	6.03	24	5.27
Australia	17	5.54	24	5.14	32	5.27	8	6.20
Norway	18	5.47	35	4.35	6	6.09	13	5.97
France	19	5.46	25	5.11	10	5.92	22	5.35
United Arab Emirates	20	5.34	19	5.19	14	5.78	26	5.06
Chile	21	5.31	20	5.19	40	5.17	17	5.58
Korea, Rep.	22	5.28	18	5.27	13	5.80	33	4.79
Israel	23	5.25	27	5.04	17	5.73	28	4.99
Luxembourg	24	5.19	49	3.98	24	5.48	10	6.11
Bahrain	25	5.17	16	5.31	23	5.50	35	4.69
Slovenia	26	5.16	12	5.46	59	4.73	23	5.28
Taiwan, China	27	5.15	23	5.15	27	5.35	30	4.93
Spain	28	5.07	26	5.06	41	5.14	27	5.00
Belgium	29	5.02	33	4.38	34	5.24	19	5.43
Czech Republic	30	4.92	17	5.28	44	5.12	36	4.35
Hungary	31	4.69	28	4.90	53	4.85	38	4.32
Tunisia	32	4.67	30	4.49	39	5.18	37	4.35
Malaysia	33	4.66	44	4.17	22	5.51	40	4.31
Qatar	34	4.63	69	3.42	43	5.13	20	5.36
Portugal	35	4.63	59	3.66	31	5.28	29	4.95
Jordan	36	4.62	34	4.35	54	4.81	34	4.69
Mauritius	37	4.62	37	4.30	35	5.23	39	4.32
Saudi Arabia	38	4.61	31	4.46	25	5.45	51	3.94
Latvia	39	4.60	39	4.27	33	5.25	41	4.28
Slovak Republic	40	4.52	22	5.17	80	4.26	44	4.12
Thailand	41	4.48	43	4.19	11	5.85	67	3.41
Lithuania	42	4.46	48	4.03	29	5.29	48	4.06
China	43	4.43	45	4.15	30	5.28	55	3.85
Romania	44	4.39	42	4.22	45	5.05	54	3.88
Poland	45	4.37	55	3.73	36	5.20	43	4.17
Costa Rica	46	4.31	41	4.23	65	4.62	46	4.10
Cyprus	47	4.31	46	4.15	98	3.66	25	5.12
Italy	48	4.25	53	3.79	47	4.98	50	3.99
Oman	49	4.23	62	3.56	74	4.31	32	4.83
Panama	50	4.22	73	3.27	12	5.85	63	3.53
Morocco	51	4.21	40	4.24	56	4.77	62	3.62
Croatia	52	4.16	47	4.14	68	4.52	56	3.82
Uruguay	53	4.15	68	3.42	87	4.10	31	4.92
South Africa	54	4.12	38	4.29	94	3.85	42	4.23
Guatemala	55	4.07	32	4.40	85	4.11	57	3.71
Turkey	56	4.05	72	3.29	46	4.98	53	3.89
Greece	57	3.99	81	3.02	51	4.88	47	4.07
India	58	3.94	51	3.83	62	4.67	70	3.32
Peru	59	3.93	79	3.12	61	4.68	49	4.00
Albania	60	3.91	60	3.63	64	4.65	66	3.44
El Salvador	61	3.90	78	3.12	52	4.87	58	3.70
Mexico	62	3.87	52	3.80	78	4.27	64	3.53
Pakistan	63	3.85	56	3.73	57	4.76	80	3.06
Dominican Republic	64	3.80	76	3.18	42	5.13	77	3.11
Egypt	65	3.78	77	3.17	38	5.18	91	2.97
Indonesia	66	3.75	75	3.18	37	5.18	94	2.89

(Cont'd.)

Table 3: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Border administration *(cont'd.)*

	BORDER ADMINISTRATION		PILLARS					
			2. Efficiency of customs administration		3 Efficiency of import-export procedures		4. Transparency of border administration	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Sri Lanka	67	3.75	71	3.31	55	4.78	75	3.15
Philippines	68	3.72	54	3.77	48	4.92	115	2.48
Bulgaria	69	3.64	61	3.61	79	4.27	82	3.05
Gambia, The	70	3.63	80	3.10	60	4.70	78	3.10
Macedonia, FYR	71	3.60	101	2.51	63	4.66	61	3.64
Moldova	72	3.59	67	3.45	97	3.66	59	3.67
Jamaica	73	3.59	65	3.47	72	4.32	87	2.99
Colombia	74	3.55	89	2.69	75	4.30	60	3.66
Bolivia	75	3.55	63	3.55	89	4.09	85	3.00
Senegal	76	3.54	82	2.97	58	4.75	93	2.91
Brazil	77	3.53	98	2.57	67	4.57	65	3.45
Kuwait	78	3.52	112	2.23	69	4.42	52	3.91
Namibia	79	3.47	84	2.91	101	3.39	45	4.11
Ghana	80	3.45	102	2.49	66	4.59	72	3.28
Bosnia and Herzegovina	81	3.44	96	2.61	50	4.88	97	2.82
Honduras	82	3.42	95	2.63	71	4.36	71	3.28
Nicaragua	83	3.38	92	2.67	70	4.40	81	3.06
Argentina	84	3.35	83	2.93	77	4.29	96	2.83
Vietnam	85	3.28	117	2.17	49	4.90	99	2.78
Madagascar	86	3.26	111	2.23	76	4.29	73	3.25
Armenia	87	3.25	64	3.49	99	3.59	106	2.67
Algeria	88	3.24	105	2.40	88	4.10	74	3.23
Ethiopia	89	3.22	50	3.93	109	2.59	76	3.14
Mozambique	90	3.21	87	2.78	92	3.88	92	2.96
Syria	91	3.17	94	2.63	81	4.25	107	2.63
Tanzania	92	3.17	113	2.21	73	4.32	90	2.98
Paraguay	93	3.16	86	2.88	95	3.85	102	2.76
Guyana	94	3.14	100	2.51	84	4.14	103	2.76
Ukraine	95	3.07	110	2.24	91	3.95	84	3.02
Cameroon	96	3.07	93	2.66	90	4.02	113	2.52
Malawi	97	3.06	66	3.46	111	2.34	68	3.39
Cambodia	98	3.00	91	2.67	86	4.10	118	2.23
Uganda	99	2.99	70	3.41	106	2.94	108	2.61
Nigeria	100	2.98	107	2.36	96	3.76	98	2.81
Benin	101	2.97	118	2.03	93	3.88	86	3.00
Zambia	102	2.96	57	3.68	112	2.21	89	2.99
Azerbaijan	103	2.91	36	4.35	118	1.79	112	2.58
Bangladesh	104	2.88	115	2.20	82	4.24	119	2.20
Lesotho	105	2.84	99	2.53	100	3.41	110	2.58
Russian Federation	106	2.82	74	3.20	107	2.67	109	2.59
Ecuador	107	2.80	121	1.74	83	4.15	114	2.50
Kenya	108	2.77	109	2.30	102	3.33	105	2.67
Mongolia	109	2.71	88	2.75	108	2.60	101	2.76
Mauritania	110	2.67	116	2.19	103	3.14	104	2.68
Mali	111	2.64	108	2.35	110	2.49	79	3.09
Burkina Faso	112	2.64	97	2.60	116	1.95	69	3.37
Nepal	113	2.58	119	2.00	105	2.98	100	2.78
Burundi	114	2.57	85	2.90	117	1.94	95	2.86
Côte d'Ivoire	115	2.55	114	2.21	104	3.05	116	2.40
Kyrgyz Republic	116	2.46	58	3.67	121	1.33	117	2.38
Zimbabwe	117	2.42	90	2.67	115	2.02	111	2.58
Tajikistan	118	2.40	104	2.45	119	1.71	83	3.03
Kazakhstan	119	2.27	106	2.39	120	1.42	88	2.99
Venezuela	120	2.25	103	2.46	114	2.10	120	2.18
Chad	121	2.00	120	1.94	113	2.12	121	1.95

Table 4: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Transport and communications infrastructure

	TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE		PILLARS: 5. Availability and quality of transport infrastructure		PILLARS: 6. Availability and quality of transport services		PILLARS: 7. Availability and use of ICTs	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Germany	1	5.77	8	5.28	3	5.85	3	6.20
Netherlands	2	5.64	14	5.12	2	5.91	10	5.89
Singapore	3	5.64	12	5.14	1	5.96	11	5.83
Sweden	4	5.63	6	5.35	11	5.30	2	6.25
Hong Kong SAR	5	5.57	11	5.15	6	5.55	6	6.00
Austria	6	5.55	9	5.20	5	5.76	15	5.69
France	7	5.54	1	5.83	10	5.33	24	5.47
Denmark	8	5.50	5	5.44	17	4.97	4	6.10
Switzerland	9	5.49	18	5.04	12	5.17	1	6.27
United States	10	5.48	3	5.54	14	5.08	12	5.81
United Kingdom	11	5.47	21	4.96	7	5.50	8	5.95
Belgium	12	5.45	7	5.33	8	5.47	19	5.56
Luxembourg	13	5.41	19	5.02	13	5.16	5	6.04
Australia	14	5.39	17	5.07	9	5.43	17	5.67
Japan	15	5.38	23	4.77	4	5.84	21	5.52
Finland	16	5.37	4	5.50	18	4.89	13	5.72
Canada	17	5.27	2	5.58	25	4.64	18	5.58
Spain	18	5.13	15	5.12	15	5.06	26	5.21
Taiwan, China	19	5.12	26	4.65	22	4.73	7	5.97
Norway	20	5.11	10	5.17	35	4.22	9	5.93
Korea, Rep.	21	4.99	29	4.55	23	4.72	14	5.70
New Zealand	22	4.97	20	4.97	31	4.40	20	5.54
Ireland	23	4.94	31	4.47	20	4.84	22	5.50
United Arab Emirates	24	4.91	13	5.14	30	4.58	27	5.01
Italy	25	4.75	50	3.98	21	4.80	23	5.48
Portugal	26	4.74	28	4.64	24	4.70	29	4.87
Estonia	27	4.64	40	4.20	42	4.03	16	5.68
Cyprus	28	4.60	16	5.08	40	4.07	32	4.66
Malaysia	29	4.59	22	4.95	16	5.00	43	3.82
Greece	30	4.58	24	4.74	29	4.58	35	4.41
Slovenia	31	4.55	34	4.37	33	4.30	28	4.99
Israel	32	4.37	54	3.88	43	3.96	25	5.28
Slovak Republic	33	4.36	41	4.15	28	4.60	37	4.34
Hungary	34	4.34	60	3.73	26	4.64	31	4.66
Czech Republic	35	4.32	46	4.09	34	4.26	33	4.61
Lithuania	36	4.28	35	4.34	55	3.68	30	4.81
Croatia	37	4.18	42	4.12	37	4.16	38	4.26
China	38	4.16	30	4.48	19	4.87	60	3.12
Latvia	39	4.09	37	4.31	45	3.93	40	4.04
Thailand	40	4.07	33	4.39	27	4.62	59	3.19
Bahrain	41	4.07	36	4.31	63	3.50	36	4.38
Qatar	42	4.04	47	4.08	60	3.54	34	4.49
Chile	43	3.87	48	4.05	51	3.82	44	3.73
Panama	44	3.75	27	4.65	70	3.34	57	3.26
Oman	45	3.74	43	4.12	32	4.33	74	2.77
Poland	46	3.71	83	3.16	49	3.85	39	4.12
Saudi Arabia	47	3.70	55	3.86	52	3.81	53	3.42
Bulgaria	48	3.68	77	3.31	53	3.79	41	3.95
Turkey	49	3.65	62	3.66	48	3.86	52	3.42
South Africa	50	3.62	44	4.11	44	3.95	72	2.81
Romania	51	3.62	84	3.15	41	4.06	46	3.63
Jordan	52	3.61	59	3.78	39	4.10	65	2.96
Jamaica	53	3.56	58	3.79	76	3.22	45	3.68
Kuwait	54	3.55	70	3.57	79	3.17	42	3.92
Mauritius	55	3.55	32	4.44	106	2.77	49	3.44
Russian Federation	56	3.49	64	3.63	68	3.41	50	3.43
Macedonia, FYR	57	3.46	65	3.62	59	3.56	58	3.21
Moldova	58	3.46	75	3.39	38	4.15	71	2.83
Tunisia	59	3.46	39	4.21	74	3.24	67	2.92
Ukraine	60	3.43	63	3.65	77	3.22	51	3.43
Armenia	61	3.42	69	3.58	50	3.83	70	2.85
Azerbaijan	62	3.40	45	4.11	62	3.51	80	2.59
Kazakhstan	63	3.39	49	4.05	75	3.23	68	2.88
India	64	3.36	51	3.98	46	3.89	93	2.20
Morocco	65	3.36	52	3.95	67	3.43	76	2.69
Egypt	66	3.35	53	3.90	58	3.62	81	2.52

(Cont'd.)

Table 4: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Transport and communications infrastructure *(cont'd.)*

	TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE		PILLARS: 5. Availability and quality of transport infrastructure		PILLARS: 6. Availability and quality of transport services		PILLARS: 7. Availability and use of ICTs	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Argentina	67	3.33	91	2.99	66	3.44	47	3.57
Brazil	68	3.33	93	2.99	56	3.66	54	3.35
Sri Lanka	69	3.29	38	4.28	81	3.15	84	2.43
Costa Rica	70	3.24	66	3.61	103	2.86	56	3.26
Vietnam	71	3.24	108	2.59	36	4.17	66	2.96
Guatemala	72	3.22	81	3.24	69	3.35	61	3.07
Dominican Republic	73	3.20	73	3.45	64	3.50	78	2.65
Mexico	74	3.20	85	3.12	65	3.48	63	2.99
Namibia	75	3.16	25	4.71	115	2.59	95	2.16
Colombia	76	3.13	76	3.31	84	3.10	64	2.98
Philippines	77	3.09	92	2.99	47	3.88	86	2.41
Uruguay	78	3.09	99	2.83	101	2.95	48	3.48
Indonesia	79	3.04	82	3.24	54	3.69	91	2.21
Pakistan	80	3.04	56	3.84	80	3.15	98	2.14
Senegal	81	3.01	72	3.45	72	3.33	89	2.26
Honduras	82	3.01	71	3.48	104	2.86	77	2.68
Venezuela	83	3.01	96	2.88	86	3.09	62	3.05
Gambia, The	84	3.00	57	3.80	97	3.00	90	2.21
Bosnia and Herzegovina	85	2.98	113	2.45	57	3.63	69	2.87
Kyrgyz Republic	86	2.98	61	3.68	87	3.09	94	2.17
Ecuador	87	2.97	86	3.10	78	3.21	79	2.61
Syria	88	2.96	74	3.44	96	3.00	83	2.44
Peru	89	2.94	90	3.02	90	3.08	75	2.72
Algeria	90	2.90	68	3.58	111	2.70	85	2.42
El Salvador	91	2.90	98	2.87	93	3.03	73	2.79
Guyana	92	2.90	107	2.59	108	2.75	55	3.34
Kenya	93	2.88	78	3.30	73	3.26	99	2.07
Albania	94	2.82	97	2.87	85	3.10	82	2.48
Mongolia	95	2.82	67	3.60	112	2.70	96	2.16
Ethiopia	96	2.71	80	3.25	71	3.33	121	1.54
Côte d'Ivoire	97	2.70	95	2.93	95	3.01	97	2.15
Uganda	98	2.61	87	3.08	89	3.09	118	1.65
Benin	99	2.60	114	2.44	61	3.51	111	1.85
Nigeria	100	2.60	112	2.49	92	3.05	88	2.26
Burkina Faso	101	2.58	89	3.02	98	3.00	116	1.73
Ghana	102	2.56	79	3.26	119	2.49	107	1.92
Paraguay	103	2.56	104	2.72	113	2.62	87	2.33
Cameroon	104	2.55	94	2.95	107	2.77	108	1.92
Nicaragua	105	2.54	100	2.81	102	2.87	103	1.94
Bolivia	106	2.53	88	3.06	116	2.59	106	1.93
Nepal	107	2.51	101	2.81	88	3.09	120	1.63
Bangladesh	108	2.50	102	2.78	105	2.79	102	1.95
Cambodia	109	2.50	105	2.71	91	3.05	115	1.75
Mauritania	110	2.47	117	2.24	82	3.15	100	2.03
Zambia	111	2.45	111	2.53	100	2.98	110	1.86
Malawi	112	2.44	109	2.58	83	3.12	119	1.63
Mali	113	2.40	116	2.29	94	3.02	109	1.87
Zimbabwe	114	2.38	106	2.60	109	2.74	113	1.78
Madagascar	115	2.37	103	2.72	118	2.56	112	1.82
Tajikistan	116	2.37	118	2.18	110	2.71	92	2.21
Mozambique	117	2.36	110	2.54	114	2.60	105	1.93
Lesotho	118	2.33	120	2.02	99	2.98	101	1.99
Tanzania	119	2.25	115	2.36	121	2.44	104	1.94
Burundi	120	2.16	119	2.13	117	2.57	114	1.77
Chad	121	1.96	121	1.70	120	2.47	117	1.70

Table 5: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Business environment

	BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT		PILLARS: 8. Regulatory environment		PILLARS: 9. Physical security	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Finland	1	6.29	3	5.88	1	6.70
Denmark	2	6.15	2	5.92	4	6.38
Singapore	3	6.13	1	6.13	9	6.12
Hong Kong SAR	4	6.08	6	5.67	3	6.48
Norway	5	6.02	10	5.50	2	6.54
Switzerland	6	6.01	5	5.77	6	6.24
Sweden	7	5.90	4	5.79	13	6.01
Austria	8	5.89	13	5.40	5	6.37
Luxembourg	9	5.89	8	5.53	7	6.24
Germany	10	5.75	12	5.42	11	6.07
New Zealand	11	5.75	9	5.52	15	5.97
Qatar	12	5.70	17	5.23	8	6.18
United Arab Emirates	13	5.68	15	5.25	10	6.10
Australia	14	5.62	11	5.49	23	5.75
Netherlands	15	5.59	7	5.66	31	5.52
Ireland	16	5.59	14	5.34	18	5.83
Canada	17	5.52	16	5.25	21	5.79
Cyprus	18	5.45	24	4.89	12	6.02
Oman	19	5.43	21	4.98	16	5.88
Belgium	20	5.40	20	4.98	20	5.82
Tunisia	21	5.40	18	5.00	22	5.79
Jordan	22	5.36	30	4.73	14	5.99
France	23	5.26	22	4.93	29	5.59
Estonia	24	5.25	29	4.77	24	5.72
Portugal	25	5.21	36	4.57	17	5.85
Korea, Rep.	26	5.16	27	4.80	32	5.52
Bahrain	27	5.14	28	4.78	34	5.50
Gambia, The	28	5.13	32	4.65	27	5.60
Chile	29	5.09	37	4.56	26	5.61
Taiwan, China	30	5.03	34	4.59	37	5.47
Japan	31	5.02	26	4.83	44	5.21
Mauritius	32	5.00	33	4.64	40	5.36
Malaysia	33	4.96	25	4.86	49	5.06
Kuwait	34	4.90	43	4.21	28	5.60
Slovenia	35	4.89	44	4.16	25	5.62
United States	36	4.85	23	4.90	63	4.80
Syria	37	4.83	66	3.83	19	5.83
Spain	38	4.82	40	4.44	45	5.19
United Kingdom	39	4.81	19	5.00	73	4.62
Uruguay	40	4.76	38	4.48	50	5.04
Lithuania	41	4.75	54	3.97	33	5.52
Saudi Arabia	42	4.73	31	4.73	68	4.73
Latvia	43	4.72	56	3.96	36	5.48
Egypt	44	4.71	49	4.05	39	5.37
Hungary	45	4.70	58	3.90	35	5.49
Azerbaijan	46	4.68	59	3.90	38	5.45
Greece	47	4.65	53	3.98	41	5.33
Malawi	48	4.60	47	4.10	48	5.11
China	49	4.58	45	4.15	52	5.02
Czech Republic	50	4.58	61	3.90	43	5.27
Slovak Republic	51	4.56	52	3.99	47	5.13
Senegal	52	4.55	87	3.56	30	5.53
India	53	4.51	46	4.13	57	4.88
Namibia	54	4.51	42	4.29	70	4.72
Croatia	55	4.49	77	3.64	42	5.33
Israel	56	4.46	39	4.47	83	4.46
Ghana	57	4.44	63	3.86	51	5.03
Costa Rica	58	4.44	41	4.38	80	4.51
Thailand	59	4.44	48	4.09	64	4.79
Indonesia	60	4.43	55	3.97	56	4.89
Vietnam	61	4.40	64	3.86	54	4.94
Zambia	62	4.39	57	3.92	59	4.87
Morocco	63	4.38	51	4.01	66	4.76
Armenia	64	4.33	91	3.50	46	5.16
Romania	65	4.28	85	3.60	53	4.95
Italy	66	4.27	84	3.60	55	4.93
Tanzania	67	4.24	73	3.67	61	4.80

(Cont'd.)

Table 5: The Enabling Trade Index 2009: Business environment *(cont'd.)*

	BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT		PILLARS: 8. Regulatory environment		PILLARS: 9. Physical security	
Country/Economy	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Mali	68	4.23	72	3.72	69	4.73
Burkina Faso	69	4.22	67	3.83	75	4.61
Tajikistan	70	4.22	80	3.63	62	4.80
Panama	71	4.21	60	3.90	79	4.52
Ethiopia	72	4.20	81	3.62	65	4.78
Moldova	73	4.16	94	3.45	58	4.87
Benin	74	4.16	82	3.62	71	4.70
Turkey	75	4.15	65	3.85	84	4.46
South Africa	76	4.14	35	4.59	105	3.70
Kazakhstan	77	4.10	75	3.66	78	4.55
Macedonia, FYR	78	4.09	86	3.58	77	4.60
Nicaragua	79	4.01	106	3.19	60	4.83
Poland	80	3.99	88	3.52	82	4.46
Cameroon	81	3.97	103	3.25	72	4.69
Madagascar	82	3.93	90	3.51	86	4.34
Albania	83	3.91	105	3.20	74	4.62
Honduras	84	3.91	68	3.81	95	4.01
Ukraine	85	3.87	107	3.14	76	4.61
Bosnia and Herzegovina	86	3.87	113	3.00	67	4.74
Cambodia	87	3.85	89	3.52	89	4.18
Mauritania	88	3.84	102	3.27	85	4.41
Jamaica	89	3.83	62	3.86	102	3.80
Sri Lanka	90	3.82	50	4.02	109	3.63
Mongolia	91	3.81	108	3.14	81	4.48
Algeria	92	3.81	101	3.29	87	4.33
Brazil	93	3.79	95	3.43	90	4.14
Uganda	94	3.76	92	3.50	93	4.02
Peru	95	3.70	79	3.64	103	3.76
Russian Federation	96	3.70	109	3.13	88	4.27
Bulgaria	97	3.68	99	3.31	91	4.04
Mexico	98	3.67	78	3.64	106	3.69
Dominican Republic	99	3.64	97	3.39	99	3.88
Philippines	100	3.63	98	3.32	97	3.94
Lesotho	101	3.63	96	3.40	100	3.85
Pakistan	102	3.58	76	3.65	112	3.52
Colombia	103	3.58	71	3.73	114	3.43
El Salvador	104	3.58	70	3.78	115	3.37
Kenya	105	3.58	83	3.61	111	3.55
Nigeria	106	3.57	74	3.67	113	3.47
Mozambique	107	3.56	100	3.29	101	3.82
Kyrgyz Republic	108	3.53	111	3.09	96	3.96
Guatemala	109	3.50	69	3.81	119	3.20
Bangladesh	110	3.42	110	3.11	104	3.73
Argentina	111	3.42	117	2.80	92	4.04
Ecuador	112	3.36	116	2.80	98	3.91
Guyana	113	3.34	93	3.46	118	3.22
Burundi	114	3.30	114	2.95	108	3.65
Paraguay	115	3.22	115	2.86	110	3.57
Zimbabwe	116	3.17	120	2.33	94	4.02
Nepal	117	3.17	104	3.21	121	3.12
Bolivia	118	3.16	118	2.64	107	3.68
Côte d'Ivoire	119	3.15	112	3.03	117	3.27
Chad	120	2.96	119	2.58	116	3.34
Venezuela	121	2.61	121	2.09	120	3.13

Taiwan, China and **Korea, Rep.** follow at 25th and 26th, respectively, among the countries covered. Both economies boast very good infrastructure. In addition, infrastructure-related services are efficient and widely available, and the use of ICTs is widespread. Traders benefit particularly from efficient customs administration in Korea, while Taiwan is doing especially well on the use of ICTs, which improves the connectivity of companies and the ability to track consignments. Both economies are, however, hampered by restricted access to domestic and foreign markets and a regulatory environment that does not facilitate the entry of foreign investment and labor.

Malaysia occupies the 28th position in the ETI rankings. Efficient import procedures, a low cost of importing and exporting goods, and the quality of transport infrastructure and related transport services all contribute to this good rating, particularly given the country's level of development. Improvements to the transparency of border administration as well as less congested roads would further enhance the country's strengths. The regulatory framework also provides a good trading environment by means of efficient government operations and fair domestic competition policies. Improving the usage of the latest ICTs and lowering business costs of terrorism would allow the country to even further reap the harvest of international trade.

China ranks 49th among the countries covered. This ranking underscores a number of characteristics in China's economy and its trading regime. China relies heavily on its successful export performance, although imports are still significantly inhibited by tariff barriers. The country performs particularly well in its low cost to import and export (3rd). Furthermore, because of large trade volumes, the country is extremely well connected to international markets through its vast port facilities, with the services provided by liner companies being second to none. However, improvement in the overall transport infrastructure—such as airport density and the quality of air transport infrastructure—would further facilitate the flow of goods across borders and to destinations within China, in particular to the inland provinces. In addition, more transparency in border administration and improvements to the regulatory environment that would allow more foreign participation would help enable trade.

Indonesia comes in at 62nd place, reflecting a pretty balanced performance on all four pillars of the Index. The flow of goods in and out of the country benefits from the low cost of import and export procedures, as well as a regulatory environment that is fairly open toward foreign participation, although businesses are concerned about the level of corruption at borders and the high costs incurred to fight terrorism. Improvements in transport infrastructure and wide adoption of ICTs would tremendously help the country to better connect with its trading partners.

India occupies the 76th position, reflecting a mixed performance on the four pillars. Although the country has a fairly good border administration and business environment, domestic and foreign market access continues to be significantly restricted. India ranks 116th on the applicable component, with tariff barriers representing a more serious impediment than non-tariff barriers. India's border administration meets many needs of importers and exporters, although it continues to be affected by corrupt practices. Trade-related transport infrastructure and the relevant services are equally fairly well developed in India, ranking 51st and 46th, respectively. The country is well connected through maritime routes, although it needs more airports and high-quality roads. India could also benefit from improvement in ease of hiring foreign labor as well as reduced business costs of terrorism.

Europe and North America

The world's biggest exporter, **Germany** ranks 12th overall. The country is the world leader on the quality of transport infrastructure, in particular thanks to high levels of maritime connectivity. There exists some room for improvement in terms of customs administration, particularly an upgrading of customs services. As for the regulatory environment (12th), Germany ranks reasonably well on all the indicators, with the exception of the openness to foreign participation where it places 25th because of the difficulty of hiring foreign labor (76th). Market access is Germany's Achilles' heel, where it ranks lower than most EU countries because of the pervasiveness of non-tariff measures.

The **United States** comes in at 16th position overall. Its performance is uneven across the nine pillars of the Index. The country obtains high rankings for the quality of transport infrastructure (3rd) and the associated services (14th), as well as for the availability and use of ICTs (12th). The country also owes much to the extent and availability of customs services (2nd). Also praised are the efficiency of customs administration (10th) and of import and export procedures (16th). On a less positive note, the business environment is less supportive of trade than it could be (36th). Among other issues, businesses voice their concern about the level of security and indicate that the threat of terrorism and crime and violence impose significant costs. Finally, the United States ranks 49th in the market access component. Although only a small share of goods is subjected to duties and agricultural markets are less protected than in other countries, the US tariff structure is complex (89th) and US exporters face some of the highest barriers in the world.

France ranks 17th overall, helped by its strong performance in terms of quality of infrastructure across all modes. In addition, France is very well connected to major maritime trade routes. Efficient border administration (19th) constitutes another of France's relative strengths. France ranks 1st for the number of documents required for import and export—only two signatures need to be obtained. But there is room for improvement, notably in reducing the cost to import and export, and also, to a lesser extent, in making customs procedures more transparent. France's regulatory environment is quite favorable, although the business community voices some concern about the efficiency of government operations (35th), security (29th), and—most importantly—about limited openness toward foreign participation (50th). Finally, in line with its fellow EU members, market access is restricted (89th).

With the exception of the market access pillar where it ranks a low 79th, the **United Kingdom**'s performance (20th) mirrors that of the United States. The efficiency of border administration (14th) and the quality of infrastructure (11th) are the country's two major strengths, while the quality of the business environment is affected by security concerns. The business community shares the same concern as its American counterpart about the costs associated with the threat of terrorism (112th) as well as crime and violence (81st).

The **Russian Federation** ranks a low 109th. There is only one pillar—availability and use of ICTs—where the country appears in the top half of the ranking (50th). In all categories, the need for improvement is huge. The main area of concern is the extremely restricted access to markets (113th). Not yet a WTO member, Russia has import tariffs that average 15 percent (114th) overall, and 26 percent (106th) on agricultural imports. The complexity of the tariff structure is also extremely high (90th). Barriers to market access are likely to diminish in the process of joining the WTO. Russia also does poorly with respect to border administration (106th), as reflected in the results associated with import and export procedures, which are bleak by every measure, and with low levels of transparency. Russia's business environment (96th) is not particularly welcoming to international participation either, especially with respect to investments (the country ranks 119th for the measure of openness to foreign ownership). Furthermore, executives have little trust in the government and doubts about its ability to enforce law and order. On a positive note, Russia does somewhat better on the use of ICTs.

Latin America and the Caribbean

Chile, ranked 19th, leads the rankings in Latin America and the Caribbean by a considerable margin. This excellent showing is not surprising, given Chile's role as Latin America's leading example on how to benefit from global trade and investment linkages. The country has shown commitment to free trade by reducing the complexity of tariffs (2nd) and successfully negotiating access to foreign markets for domestic exporters, who face less tariff burdens than in any other country covered by the Index. Yet, despite these pronounced strengths, border procedures are not among the least costly and rapid (40th), transport infrastructure and the related services are below international standards, and the availability and use of ICTs is not on a par with countries at the same level of development. On a more positive note, the country is very open to foreign participation.

Costa Rica's ranking of 43rd certainly reflects efforts undertaken in the past decades. The country ranks a very high 5th in terms of domestic and foreign market access because of its relatively low tariff and non-tariff barriers, its simple and transparent tariff structure, and the fairly low tariff barriers faced by exporters in target markets. The country's trade performance also benefits from a favorable regulatory environment (41st). Yet, although Costa Rica's trade policy is firmly geared toward openness, streamlining import and export procedures, upgrading the quality of infrastructure and that of related services, and reducing the cost to business resulting from crime and violence could contribute to further boosting the country's trade performance by lowering the transaction costs associated with trade.

Mexico ranks 74th in this year's ETI. The results show that, despite the country's past export success, there remains untapped potential for further enabling trade, which continues to be hampered by a number of barriers related to trade policy, border administration, and physical security. Moreover, trade policy continues to be heavily biased toward protectionism, and although import and export procedures have been streamlined, they remain costly. The most serious challenge to be addressed, however, concerns the government's inability to provide the required level of physical security, a problem that has been affecting the country for a number of years and has been increasingly exacerbated by drug-related conflicts. On a positive note, Mexico's exporters enjoy rather low tariffs for their products in target markets and benefit from high margins of preference. Some aspects of transport infrastructure and the related services are also assessed positively, in particular those related to maritime shipping services and services offered by the logistics industry. Mexico also benefits from its openness to foreign participation. Further enabling market access and restoring physical security would allow Mexico to benefit from these advantages.

Latin America's largest economy, **Brazil**, ranks 87th for enabling trade across borders. This low ranking is a reflection of Brazil's varied performance across the nine pillars of the ETI. The country displays strengths in the quality of transport services and the use and prevalence of the latest technologies. To a somewhat lesser extent, this also holds true for the transparency and efficiency of overall border procedures, although dealing with customs appears to be burdensome. These positive aspects are partially offset by the level of protection in Brazil, which remains relatively high, in particular for agricultural products. Other areas to be addressed include the quality of transport infrastructure (93rd) across all modes of transport as well as making the business environment and the overall security situation more conducive to trade (93rd).

Argentina ranks 97th in the ETI. Its position mirrors a mixed performance across the four pillars. To further enable trade, Argentina will have to address a number of challenges, most importantly those related to the regulatory environment and physical security. Upgrading the country's infrastructure, in particular for transport by air, would further contribute to lowering the transport cost of goods. At the same time, the country can build on a number of important strengths. Here the positive assessments of ICT infrastructure, the quality of transport services, and to a lesser degree also the efficiency of import-export procedures are worth noting. Furthermore, the competitiveness of Argentina's exporters is supported by reasonably low tariffs faced abroad and a considerable margin of preference in key target markets.

Middle East and North Africa

The **United Arab Emirates (UAE)** leads the rankings for the region at 18th position. The country boasts a very efficient and transparent border administration and has one of the lowest costs to import and among the least burdensome customs procedures of all countries covered, ranking 5th and 6th, respectively, on the relevant indicators. Further strengths include an excellent transport infrastructure (13th) and a regulatory environment that is particularly conducive to trade, the result of its strong institutional framework and also of its openness to foreign participation (19th). Last but not least, the country is relatively secure (ranking 10th). Strengthening the country's position on the Index would require further lowering tariff barriers, in particular for agricultural tariff products, although it has the advantage of a very simple tariff structure. Also, further preferential agreements with main markets would help lower the relatively high tariffs faced by the country in its target markets.

Israel enters the ETI rankings at 29th place. Following its gradual liberalization over the past years, Israel presently has a reasonably open trade policy with the exception of agricultural policies, which remain protective of local producers, ranking 102nd in the ETI sample. The country's border procedures are not perceived as burdensome, the cost of importing and exporting is among the lowest among the countries assessed, and the widespread use of ICTs (25th) facilitates communication and customs clearance. Although the regulatory environment is fairly open to foreign ownership, the lack of physical security, and in particular the threat of terrorism, imposes a significant cost on importers and exporters; addressing these issues would assist in enabling trade. Israel's trade could be additionally enabled though investment in infrastructure, as the quality and availability of facilities remains behind standards found in countries at a similar level of development.

Tunisia ranks 41st overall for enabling trade across borders. Weaknesses in trade policy (70th) are partially compensated for by an effective customs administration (30th), fairly efficient import-export procedures (39th), and a propitious regulatory environment (18th). Nevertheless, a number of weaknesses remain. Tunisia imposes high tariffs on imports. It ranks 119th on tariffs for both agricultural and non-agricultural products—in absolute terms, the tariffs on agricultural products amount to 56 percent ad valorem—and subjects a large majority of its imports to tariffs (over 75 percent, ranking 93rd). In addition to the high level of tariffs, businesses face a complex tariff structure. While further reduction in tariffs would be desirable, Tunisia has very successfully improved access to the main target markets for its exporters, mainly through preferential trading agreements with the European Union, currently the destination for about 80 percent of the country's exports. In addition, the country has preferential access to its main markets with a fairly high preference margin (rank 21). Last but not least, importers and exporters alike would benefit from enhanced transport services.

Saudi Arabia ranks 42nd in the ETI, showing solid performance across many indicators in the analysis. Import and export procedures, including customs, are relatively efficient by international comparison, ranking 31st and 25th, respectively. Among other strengths is the country's regulatory environment, which is supportive of trade (31st) because of a transparent and efficient institutional framework, which compensates for the relative lack of openness to foreign participation. However, Index results also indicate that physical security in general and the threat of terrorism in particular impose significant cost on businesses. Enhancing the use of ICTs and the availability and the quality of transport services would also be beneficial. Yet most of all, further enabling trade in Saudi Arabia will require opening domestic markets to trade, in particular in agricultural products, where the country ranks a low 83rd. Tariff reductions are under way as commitments of WTO membership are being implemented over a 10-year period (since 2005).

Egypt ranks 75th for the ease of getting goods across the border and to destination. The country's most notable strengths include a business environment that is fairly conducive to trade. In particular, it is easy to hire foreign labor, and the business cost of threats to security is assessed as low. Despite efforts to liberalize trade over the past years, trade policy in Egypt remains rather protectionist. Egypt applies very high tariff rates (particularly on some agricultural products), and the tariff structure is complex. In terms of border administration, although importing goods into Egypt is neither costly nor time consuming, importers raise concerns about the efficiency of customs and, to an even greater extent, of other border agencies. On a positive note, Egypt boasts fairly well developed transport infrastructure (53rd) including the related services (58th).

Algeria ranks 112th in the overall ETI. The country remains fairly sheltered from international competition, despite its ongoing efforts to join the WTO. Market access remains restricted (118th on the market access component), yet tariffs are likely to be lowered significantly as Algeria advances toward WTO membership. WTO accession is also bound to lower the tariffs faced by Algerian exporters, which are currently among the highest among the countries covered in this study (116th). In addition to the restrictive trade policy, importers and exporters in Algeria are burdened by a fairly inefficient and opaque border administration, and a cumbersome, time-consuming, and costly clearance process that affects customs as well as other border agencies. Trade would also benefit from a more transparent institutional framework, more domestic competition, and greater openness to foreign participation.

Sub-Saharan Africa

At 33rd position, **Mauritius** is, by a large margin, the highest-ranked country in sub-Saharan Africa. The open access to the country's markets, the efficiency of the border administration, and a regulatory environment that is conducive to trade all contribute to this high showing. Access to domestic and foreign markets is among the most open worldwide; a large share of goods is imported duty-free, and tariff and non-tariff barriers are reasonable. And although Mauritian exporters face fairly high barriers abroad, they benefit from a high margin of preference in their main target markets. Against this overall very positive assessment stand weaknesses in the quality of transport services that make tracking and tracing difficult and lead to delays in shipments; addressing these weaknesses would enhance the country's trade. Equally, more could be done to better leverage ICTs for development, where the country ranks 49th.

Namibia is placed at 60th position, the second-best nation in Africa in terms of enabling trade across borders. This good showing mirrors the favorable results obtained by Namibia in terms of market access, in particular its high share of duty-free imports and high preference margins for exporters. Despite the fairly open access to markets, Namibia's trade is burdened by heavy administration at the borders. The country ranks a low 84th and 101st for the efficiency of customs procedures and overall import-export procedures, respectively, although business leaders attest that the lack of transparency is not a major problem. Additional strengths include the country's well-developed transport infrastructure and a regulatory environment that is more efficient and transparent than in most neighboring countries. To further enable trade, Namibia will have to address the poor quality of its transport services and further open the economy to foreign participation.

South Africa enters the ranking at 61st position. The country's relatively good marks on transport and communications infrastructure and border administration are offset by weaknesses in market access and in its security environment. South Africa has pursued a trade liberalization program since 1994, which contributed significantly to opening its economy. Yet, although tariffs apply to relatively few import products, they remain rather high in international comparison and their structure is complex. It is appropriate that a review of the tariff structure to reduce complexity and lower tariffs for strategically important upstream sectors is under way. Other than that, South Africa boasts relatively efficient infrastructure facilities, and the respective services are also assessed as good. The country's solid institutional framework, with an efficient government and well-defined property rights, is beneficial for importers and exporters. The main areas of concern in South Africa relate to the lack of physical security (105th) and insufficient openness to foreign participation, in particular to hiring foreign labor.

Senegal ranks 83rd overall for getting goods across borders and to destination. The country's strengths include a secure and open business environment and relatively simple and fast import and export procedures. Imports benefit from the country's very simple tariff structure (9th) with no tariff peaks and only four different types of tariffs overall, which makes it transparent and easy to navigate. However, the overall level of protection remains high with respect to both tariff and non-tariff barriers, ranking 90th and 94th, respectively. In addition to lowering tariffs, to further benefit from international trade Senegal should upgrade its institutional framework, which is prone to undue influence (105th) and lack of transparency (101st). As a result, border administration is also heavily affected by corrupt practices (93rd). More transparent border administration would improve revenue collection and allow the country to further lower tariffs while maintaining current revenue levels.

Tanzania occupies the 92nd position in the ETI. This result is based on a number of pronounced strengths and weaknesses throughout the nine pillars of the Index. While Tanzania has a relatively transparent and simple tariff structure (40th) and its exporters face very low tariffs in target markets (5th), burdensome customs and border administration represents a significant hindrance for both importers and exporters. An upgraded transport infrastructure as well as improved quality and availability of transport services along with more intense use of ICTs would enable the country to harvest the benefits of international trade.

General findings of the Enabling Trade Index

The results of the ETI show a strong correlation between a country's level of income and its ease of getting goods across borders. Although this does not provide information about the direction of causality, high-income countries on average tend to be more open to trade, have better infrastructure facilities, and boast favorable business environments and efficient border administrations. Low-income countries, on the other hand, tend to show weaknesses particularly with respect to ICT infrastructure, along with a low transparency and efficiency of border administration and, in a number of countries, less open trade policies. At the same time, regulatory environments and physical security are at levels comparable with the high-income group. In this sense, the results of the ETI provide support for the growing focus on trade facilitation observed over recent decades in the activities of a number of international organizations, and they indicate which areas these programs and countries should tackle as a priority.

Chapters summary

This *Report* includes insightful contributions from a number of trade experts that examine different aspects of enabling trade with particular reference to the global financial crisis. These excellent contributions are highly relevant and complement the analysis of the ETI in Chapter 1.1 and the Country/Economy Profiles found in Part 2 of the *Report*.

In Chapter 1.2, "Finance for Trade: Efforts to Restart the Engine," Marc Auboin from the WTO provides an update on the trade finance situation in times following the financial crisis. Trade finance plays a key role in bridging the time between production, shipment, and payment. Some 80–90 percent of world trade relies on some form of trade finance. However, as a by-product of the financial crisis, there has been evidence of tightening market conditions for trade finance since the first half of 2008. The situation worsened in the second half of the year, and even further in the first quarter of 2009. According to expectations revealed in market-based surveys, there is little doubt that the trade finance market will continue to experience difficulties throughout 2009. This situation is likely to contribute to deepening the global economic malaise.

Although public-backed institutions have responded rapidly to the situation over the course of 2008, this has apparently not been enough to bridge the gap between supply and demand of trade finance worldwide. This is why the G-20 Summit in London adopted a wider package for injecting some US$250 billion in support of trade finance. Since then, the market has not returned to normal, as indicated by the high spreads charged for opening new letters of credit in many countries in the world. The author concludes that the market situation needs to be monitored closely in order to avoid any interruption of trade credit and trade itself, as well as to ensure that the solutions proposed by the public sector meet the demand from trade bankers and traders. The WTO will continue to monitor developments with partner institutions and mobilize political energy.

In Chapter 1.3, entitled "Managing Borders in the 21st Century," Kunio Mikuriya from the World Customs Organization (WCO) takes a detailed look at a number of trade facilitation and border management instruments, tools, and measures developed by the WCO for its members. The rapidly changing international trade environment has placed numerous demands on the customs community. Being faced with increasing calls to facilitate legitimate trade and secure the global trade supply chain at the same time has impelled customs to concentrate its efforts on managing national borders more effectively both now and in preparation for the future. Inefficient procedures, outdated information technology systems, and inadequate infrastructure result in high transaction costs and long delays in the clearance of imports, exports, and transit goods; they also present significant opportunities for administrative corruption at borders. To overcome these barriers to trade, customs recognizes that its business model must become more responsive, have greater flexibility, generate even more innovation, and actively champion a beneficial partnership with all legitimate economic operators.

Having developed an armory of trade facilitation and border management instruments and tools, it is now up to the WCO to ensure their widespread implementation while advancing the single window for trade and encouraging coordination and cooperation among customs, other border agencies, and the business sector. This is what smart border management is all about; this is how customs and its stakeholders can meet the demands of the dynamic 21st century global trading system. The author concludes that the future endeavors of the WCO will be aimed at ensuring a more responsive and strengthened customs community, as well as a creative and flexible border management.

In Chapter 1.4, "IATA e-Freight: Taking the Paper Out of Air Cargo," Steve Smith and Michael Moosberger discuss in detail the IATA e-freight project, an initiative that aims at improving the effectiveness and efficiency of international airfreight. International air cargo transportation historically relies on outdated paper-based processes that make it inherently inefficient. In an economic environment that necessitates the air cargo supply chain to deliver faster speed, reduced costs, and increased reliability, IATA e-freight is a supply chain project to remove the paper associated with the transportation of air cargo.

IATA e-freight offers economies a common set of processes and standards for the exchange of electronic messages. The authors suggest that if the air cargo supply chain is to continue to efficiently meet the needs of the consumer through reduced costs, reliability, and improved transit time, economies must adopt a framework based on common processes and standards rather than proprietary ones that would only add cost and complexity to the air cargo supply chain. In a globalized market, as manufacturers look to set themselves up in competitive market places, the project has a formal delivery approach from how to assess a countries legal and technical capability and willingness through to the initial implementation, delivering significant benefits for the air cargo supply chain and increasing the opportunities for increases in international trade.

In Chapter 1.5, entitled "A Tour of the Ongoing Work of the World Trade Organization on Trade Facilitation: The Traders' Perspective," John Simpson from the Global Express Association focuses on frequently encountered trade barriers resulting from inefficient customs procedures from the traders' perspective. The customs problems—including lack of transparency, procedural inefficiency, the absence of due process, and corruption—are well understood. Frameworks for correcting them have been constructed in both the WTO, in the form of the Doha Round's trade facilitation negotiations; and the WCO, in the form of the International Convention on the Simplification and Harmonization of Customs Procedures, commonly known as the revised Kyoto Convention. Funds for nations needing assistance with customs modernization are available from several sources, chiefly the World Bank.

The author discusses in detail the lack of cooperation among customs administrations on trade law compliance and supply chain security. As a consequence, they cannot fully and confidently assess risk. Simply demanding more information, as some customs administrations are doing, will place additional burdens on trade without improving risk assessment. The author suggests that political will is the primary determinant of progress on trade facilitation, and that a WTO agreement on this topic is critical and could contribute to reviving global trade, thereby contributing to a faster recovery from the present global recession.

In Chapter 1.6, "Obstacles to Trade from the Perspective of the Business Sector: A Cross-Country Comparison," Mondher Mimouni, Carolin Averbeck, and Olga Skorobogatova from the International Trade Centre introduce some findings of a survey that assesses the business sector's experiences with obstacles to trade.

Trained local partners conducted more than 1,600 face-to-face interviews with companies to identify the diverse obstacles to trade they experience during the entire exportation process, in both the destination country and the country of origin. The survey methodology allows for the analysis of barriers, including their possible patterns across products, destination countries and regions, as well as potential bottlenecks at the national level. This chapter assess data obtained from five selected countries from those covered in the survey: namely, Chile, the Philippines, Thailand, Tunisia, and Uganda.

The analysis of the survey data suggests that trade barriers vary considerably across countries, sectors, and trading partners. Many obstacles to trade are concentrated on specific sectors and are more prevalent in intraregional trade. Interestingly, the goods affected often enjoy preferential tariff treatment by the destination country. At the same time, obstacles to trade can be associated with a lack of infrastructure and efficient procedures in the country of origin.

Sam Sidiqi and Fouad Alame from Agility, the authors of Chapter 1.7, "Enabling Trade: Relationship to Clusters and Setting an Openness Agenda," consider ways that government and business sectors can use the ETI to facilitate the implementation of trade enablement more effectively. Governments have limitations of both monetary and political capital, which requires that they choose which reforms and advances they can feasibly make, given their constraints. An important area to be explored is how government can make the most strategic decisions to enable trade most effectively. The authors discuss two frameworks linked to the ETI that can allow a policymaker to make more informed decisions about where and how to focus implementation efforts. They first look at theories of clusters and explore the relationship between ETI and cluster development. With this link and a closer look at the pillars of the Index, they describe how one can derive recommendations about where to prioritize focus based on the performance across different elements of an economy's ETI results. Next, the authors put forward a simple heuristic framework that could help an official to decide what would be the best strategy when driving the enabling trade agenda in his or her country.

In Chapter 1.8, "Implementing Trade Facilitation," Jean-François Arvis, Gerard McLinden, and Monica Alina Mustra from The World Bank and Lauri Ojala from Turku School of Economics discuss emerging issues and developments as well as implementation in trade facilitation. They argue that reducing the cost of trading across borders is essential to the development of trade and the competitiveness of developing economies. The importance of trade facilitation and logistics for development has taken center stage in the last two years through an increased demand for initiatives, projects, and assistance in low- and middle-income economies. This implementation agenda is boosted by a number of tools and initiatives promoted by a number of international organizations. The focus areas and the needs for investment and reform have also been changing substantially. While the need for trade-related infrastructure and core reforms in fiscal administration remain high, the authors describe how especially in low-income countries new cross-cutting and potentially complex policy issues are emerging and have become the binding constraints. These issues include the need to upgrade regional facilitation and transit systems, the improvement and regulation of services, and the integration of border clearance and management.

Part 2 of the *Report* is a comprehensive data section that contains detailed profiles for each of the 121 economies covered. It features the main trade indicators as well as the ETI results at the subindex, pillar, and individual indicator level, presented as strengths and weaknesses. Technical notes and sources, included at the end of Part 2, provide details on the characteristics and sources of the variables included in the *Report*.

Further enabling trade across borders will not only enhance trade and boost economic growth in the longer term. In the short term, initiatives aimed at facilitating trade can also contribute to mitigating the effect of the current global crisis, as such measures reduce the transaction cost of trade and therefore partially offset the effects of the demand slump. In fact, because the payoff of most trade facilitation initiatives tends to be high, countries are well advised to use the resources available through stimulus packages to invest in facilitating the movement of goods across borders. In this context, the ETI can provide policymakers with insight on a country's strengths and challenges to be addressed.