In the first edition of the 2010 Ibrahim Index, and in all launch materials, due to a technical issue, one of the 88 indicators used to compile the Ibrahim Index was calculated incorrectly. This issue has now been corrected and the data in this report are accurate. The impact of this error on the overall performance of any individual country, or on the continent-wide trends, is marginal and is minimised by the fact that the error affected only one indicator out of 88.
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We are pleased to present the 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance.

The Ibrahim Index is the product of tireless work and commitment. The Index team at the Foundation, led by Dr Hania Farhan, receive my particular gratitude alongside our special advisors Dr Daniel Kaufmann, co-producer of the Worldwide Governance Indicators and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, and Nicholas Ulanov, founder of the Ulanov Partnership. The Ibrahim Index is made possible by their dedication. Our Technical Committee members are now able to take an increasingly active role in the conception of the Index and I am grateful to them all for their support. Their input has been invaluable. My thanks also go to the Advisory Council whose experience and expertise benefits the Index immensely and brings new perspectives to bear. And finally I would like to thank all the organisations that provided us with data, such as the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, and particularly our institutional partners in Africa: the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa and the African Development Bank.

The process of capacity development, begun in 2009, has continued in 2010. A technical workshop for representatives of our African partner organisations was held in March alongside ongoing collaboration. Moving forward we intend to continue this process until the compilation of the Ibrahim Index takes place in Africa.

We have continued to work towards finding and commissioning data to augment and strengthen our assessment of governance. This year we have included a number of new indicators measuring access to water and sanitation, which the UN has recently declared is a fundamental human right.

We have also strengthened our assessment of governments’ commitment to gender through the addition of two new indicators, one assessing women’s political and economic rights, and another looking at the existence of specific legislation concerning violence against women. Although we would prefer to also take into account the reality experienced by women in this regard, in line with our outcomes-driven approach to governance, these data are not yet available.

We have made an additional improvement by introducing indicators assessing the provision of antiretroviral treatment, both for the general population and specifically for pregnant women. These are in place of our previous assessment of HIV prevalence rates and, importantly, are demonstrative of governments’ actions on the HIV pandemic that continues to challenge our continent.

And finally, in this important year for taking stock of Africa’s progress with a number of fiftieth independence anniversaries and a summit to review progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, we have been able to introduce an indicator assessing statistical capacity. This indicator provides insight into governments’ commitment to outcomes driven policy-making and evaluation.

We remain troubled by the patchiness of data on Africa, both in terms of inadequate country coverage and time series availability and this remains a core priority for us. We will continue to advocate for improvements in this area and intend to bring together key stakeholders to work towards improving data availability in Africa. The lack of robust and comprehensive data obstructs our ability to assess key areas of governance such as poverty levels and health service delivery, including maternal mortality rates. Future inclusion of assessment of these areas is a key aim for the Foundation.

We are also committed to continually increasing the number of African data sources included in the Index, thus entrenching ownership of the Index on the continent and ensuring that it is genuinely reflective of people’s experiences.

The Ibrahim Index is ultimately aimed at engaging governments, parliaments, civil society, and citizens in a meaningful conversation about improving our governance to the benefit of all Africans.

Dr Mo Ibrahim
Founder and Chair of the Mo Ibrahim Foundation

The Ibrahim Index is aimed at engaging governments, parliaments, civil society, and citizens in a meaningful conversation about improving our governance to the benefit of all Africans.”
About the Ibrahim Index of African Governance

“...We are shining a light on governance in Africa, and in so doing we are making a unique contribution to improving the quality of governance. The Ibrahim Index is a tool to hold governments to account and frame the debate about how we are governed. Africans are setting benchmarks not only for their own continent, but for the world.”

Mo Ibrahim

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance is a comprehensive assessment of governance quality in Africa.

The Ibrahim Index
- measures the delivery of public goods and services to citizens by government and non-state actors.
- uses indicators across four main categories as proxies for the quality of the processes and outcomes of governance:
  - Safety and Rule of Law
  - Participation and Human Rights
  - Sustainable Economic Opportunity
  - Human Development.
- is the most comprehensive collection of qualitative and quantitative data that assess governance in Africa.
- is funded and led by an African institution.
- is a progressive and consultative assessment of governance.

The Ibrahim Index aims to
- be Africa’s leading assessment of governance that is a tool for citizens, public authorities and partners to assess progress.
- stimulate constructive debate on governance.
- establish a framework for assessing governance in Africa that is focused on government delivery.

Partnerships
The Foundation is committed to partnerships with institutions on the continent and to developing capacity within them.

The Ibrahim Index is currently compiled in partnership with an Advisory Council and a Technical Committee that include experts from Afrobarometer, Centre for Democratic Development (CDD) in Ghana, American University in Cairo (AUC) in Egypt, Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) in Senegal, and Institut de Recherche Empirique en Economie Politique (IREEP) in Benin.

This is part of the Foundation’s commitment to further entrench the continent’s ownership of governance issues and to improve the quality and availability of data.

New indicators
The 2010 Ibrahim Index* includes new indicators in the following areas: HIV/AIDS governance; water and sanitation provision; statistical capacity; and gender.

Data
The Ibrahim Index is currently compiled using various international and African sources.

Many crucial indicators of governance, such as poverty and health statistics, could not be included as the data are not sufficiently comprehensive. The future provision of robust data, including health and poverty statistics, from African sources is a core priority for the Foundation.

Full datasets and papers are available at www.moibrahimfoundation.org

*The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator; these data are from either 2008 or 2009. Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.
## 2010 Ibrahim Index Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score (out of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Congo, Democratic Rep.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

- The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator; these data are from either 2008 or 2009. Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year. Throughout this report, 2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.

- Changes in a country’s performance over time can be made using rankings (relative movement). Comparisons of scores over time are not recommended without taking margins of error fully into account.

- A decline or improvement is described as significant through the use of standard statistical methodology at a 90% confidence level. However some analysts may also find it instructive to examine movements below the thresholds set above. Individual margins of error for each country and for each year are available on our website: [http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/en/section/the-ibrahim-index](http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/en/section/the-ibrahim-index)

- From 2005, data availability improves substantially and therefore comparison over time in the years prior to 2004/05 is not recommended.

- All figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number for clarity. This means that some countries may appear to have the same score (and therefore the same rank) when rounded but these countries actually have different scores from each other when displayed in full. In these cases countries have been ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here.

- The regional groupings are those used by the African Development Bank ([www.afdb.org](http://www.afdb.org)):

  - **Southern Africa**: Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe
  
  - **North Africa**: Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia
  
  - **East Africa**: Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda
  
  - **West Africa**: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, São Tomé & Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo

  - **Central Africa**: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon
Commentaries on the Ibrahim Index

The following articles are about the importance of good governance in Africa. They explore the relationship between governance as measured by the Ibrahim Index, and three issues: child mortality, infrastructure, and the management of natural resources in Africa.
African Governance and African Children

Professor Paul Collier
Professor of Economics, Oxford University
Director, Centre for the Study of African Economies

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance is an impressively thorough undertaking. Two features strike the eye: difference and change. From a distance ‘Africa’ may seem to suffer from poor governance, but the Index shows just how large are the differences among Africa’s 53 countries. Although all share the same continent, from the perspective of governance, the best (the five countries with scores over 70) are on a different planet from the worst (the 12 countries under 40). There is nothing ‘African’ about poor governance, were the standards of the best to become general Africa would be a well-governed region. And the best can become the general: governance is not frozen.

The Index now ranges back to 2000 and so provides a monitor of change. Over that period there has been considerable movement. Most societies have managed to improve their governance, some very substantially. But good governance is a never-ending struggle: in 13 countries the struggle is being lost with standards deteriorating. By providing a yardstick which enables comparison both with other African countries and with each society’s own past, the Index empowers the many people striving for improvement.

Does governance matter for ordinary people, or is it just an ethical luxury? I have matched the Index against basic indicators of the wellbeing of ordinary citizens. There are very few measures of wellbeing that are available for all African countries, year-by-year. I chose one that is surely fundamental to any family: whether young children live or die.

Across Africa child mortality has been declining, but there are large differences between countries. I decided to investigate whether the rate at which child mortality has declined between 2000 and 2008 (the latest figures) is related to governance as measured by the Ibrahim Index. What I found is that, controlling for the level of child mortality in 2000, its subsequent rate of decline is strongly associated with the level of governance in 2000: in societies that were well-governed there was a significantly faster fall in child mortality. The effect is big: the difference between a governance score of 40 and one of 70 is associated with an extra decline in under-5 child mortality of 23 per 1000 children. Statistical associations of this type cannot ‘prove’ a causal connection, but the sensible working hypothesis is that the struggle for better governance translates into a struggle for children’s lives.
Governance and Infrastructure in Africa

Professor Mthuli Ncube, Hee-Sik Kim and Albert Mafusire
African Development Bank

The African Development Bank has made infrastructure development a cornerstone in its development agenda with regional member countries. The Bank recognizes that lack of adequate social and economic infrastructure is one of the key constraints to short- and medium-term poverty reduction in Africa, and has thus been a major force in private and public sector infrastructure development through the provision of financial and technical resources. At the same time, the Bank recognizes the increasing importance of governance for infrastructure development and has made good governance an imperative in its lending and non-lending operations. Africa’s lack of the basic infrastructure to facilitate sustainable development and trade – both regionally and globally – and to ensure competitiveness is already known. In particular, for the large number of landlocked countries, their access to markets is hampered by weak transport and energy infrastructure. While some countries have been able to implement individual projects to alleviate those difficulties, Africa does not have common strategic targets for infrastructure development.

Good governance is crucial for ensuring the effective and efficient provision of infrastructure. This is largely because, firstly, good governance means that resource allocations will reflect national developmental priorities and thus respond to societal demands. Secondly, good governance promotes accountability, reduces corruption and therefore minimises resource wastage through inefficiency. And finally, good governance ensures stability (economic and political) and reduces the level of risk associated with large and lumpy infrastructure investments. This in turn facilitates the mobilisation of both public and private sector financing resources that are critical for infrastructure development. However, governance is multidimensional, and the question of its definition and measurement is problematic. Against this background, this article examines the relationship between governance – based on the Ibrahim Index – and the quality of infrastructure in Africa.

There have been considerable changes in the delivery of national infrastructure services across Africa. However, performance in terms of infrastructure service delivery and quality continue to vary across countries. A simple analysis of the extent of association (correlation) between specific variables in the Ibrahim Index seems to suggest that not all components of governance, as defined by the Index, are important determinants of infrastructure quality. Rather, it is those aspects of governance that impact on costs, risk levels and efficiency in resource allocations that matter most. For instance, while corruption is a symptom of failed governance, it can also further weaken the governance environment. Corruption not only raises the price of infrastructure, it can also reduce the quality of, and economic returns from, infrastructure investment.

How is the quality of infrastructure related to governance in Africa? By applying some correlation analyses using selected variables from the Ibrahim Index, it was found that positive correlations are observed between the Quality of Physical Infrastructure and the following variables: Judicial Independence; Property Rights; Corruption in Government and Public Officials; Prosecution of Abuse of Office; and Corruption and Bureaucracy.

A further analysis with scatter plots of country averages shows that there exists positive feedback from governance to infrastructure. This may reflect partly the market responses and donor resource allocations that are determined on the basis of the performance of the recipient country.

The implication from this observation is that a positive relationship exists between governance and the Quality of Physical Infrastructure. A country can therefore improve the quality of its infrastructure through improving governance, especially in the areas of property rights, rule of law, and accountability and corruption. Improved governance improves market conditions, attracts resources and ensures efficiency in their application.
Land, forests and water are facing a tight squeeze around the world, as rising values and greater competition pile on the pressure.

On environment and rural development, the Ibrahim Index of African Governance makes for mixed reading, unsurprising given the mosaic of settings. While recognition and reward for farsighted leadership certainly matter, it’s not enough. Key to better on-the-ground governance of natural resources is better access to information. Many governments have signed up to visionary policies and commitments, yet there can be a huge gap between the goals formally espoused and everyday practice.

“Key to better on-the-ground governance of natural resources is better access to information... the Index adds important impetus to the agenda of accessible, clear, transparent information in all sectors.”

Information has a big role in filling that gap. But information posted on a website, or in convoluted legalese is useless to those facing battles over their land today.

Information is power, which is why many of those with power try to keep information hidden. They know its value and don’t want to share it around. This is especially true of information about land and forest deals.

Decisions made in the capital can have huge consequences for local livelihoods, yet such deals are often made behind closed doors. Local people need to know their rights and how to exercise them, without fear of reprisals. Getting legal literacy ‘caravans’ on the move across the country can help bring much needed knowhow to rural communities. Information can also flow two ways, with rural people now able to access mobile phones in far larger numbers. Bottom-up ideas and evidence can now flow back to capitals to challenge how the nation’s natural capital, intended to serve collective ends, is being carved up to benefit private interests.

Mobile phones have the power to make information a key tool in achieving fairer, more sustainable patterns of development.

In this context the Index adds important impetus to the agenda of accessible, clear, transparent information in all sectors. Through this comprehensive assessment of governance, the Index provides citizens and governments with the information they need to assess progress. We can only hope that this will lead to a renewed emphasis on access to information in all areas, particularly environmental issues.
Ibrahim Index Overall
Country Scores (2008/09*)

The Ibrahim Index assesses governance against 88 criteria, making it the most comprehensive collection of qualitative and quantitative measures of governance in Africa.

* For the purposes of graphical illustration, country scores have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Note: Western Sahara is on the United Nations list of non-self-governing territories.
### 2010 Ibrahim Index Country Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Democratic Republic of</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigé</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Principe</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator (either 2008 or 2009). Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.*

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers for clarity; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.

---

**Ibrahim Index overall country scores (2004/05–2008/09)**

**Most changed scores**

Significant change between 2004/05 and 2008/09 (highlighted):

- **Movement up**: Angola, Liberia, Togo.
- **Movement down**: Eritrea, Madagascar.

**Top ten highest overall scores for 2010 Ibrahim Index:**

1. Mauritius
2. Seychelles
3. Botswana
4. Cape Verde
5. South Africa
6. Namibia
7. Ghana
8. Tunisia
9. Egypt
10. Lesotho
The continental average for governance quality is 49. The highest scoring country, Mauritius, has a score of 83. Somalia is at the bottom with a score of 8.

Southern Africa shows the strongest performance overall with a regional average of 57. Central Africa shows a poor performance overall with a regional average of 38.

2010 Ibrahim Index regional averages (2008/09)

Continental average: 49

North Africa 55
West Africa 50
Central Africa 38
East Africa 45
Southern Africa 57

2010 Ibrahim Index

Top ten scores (2008/09)

1. MAURITIUS (83)
2. SEYCHELLES (79)
3. BOTSWANA (76)
4. CAPE VERDE (75)
5. SOUTH AFRICA (71)
6. NAMIBIA (67)
7. GHANA (65)
8. TUNISIA (62)
9. EGYPT (60)
10. LESOTHO (60)

Bottom ten scores (2008/09)

44. Côte d’Ivoire (37)
45. Guinea (36)
46. Equatorial Guinea (35)
47. Sudan (33)
48. Central African Republic (33)
49. Zimbabwe (33)
50. Eritrea (32)
51. Congo, Democratic Rep. (31)
52. Chad (29)
53. Somalia (8)
Key Findings

While this year’s Index shows governance performance stagnating at a continental average score of 49, the most interesting trends are to be found at the category and sub-category levels.

Ibrahim Index: changes in overall category scores (2004/05–2008/09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Declines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>41 countries</td>
<td>35 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>46 countries</td>
<td>30 countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strikingly, in the Sustainable Economic Opportunity and Human Development categories, all significant movements are positive. Of the ten countries that show significant movement in the Sustainable Economic Opportunity category and the three countries that do similarly in Human Development, none showed negative movements.

Additionally, over 40 countries have seen some form of improvement in both Sustainable Economic Opportunity and Human Development, notwithstanding the margin of error. Such sustained, universal progress in these two categories is worthy of note. Generally, African citizens are healthier and have more access to economic opportunities than was the case five years ago.

At the sub-category level, analysis of the performance of countries with regard to Gender issues also shows some progress. However, the nature of some of the indicators used in this sub-category means that – to a degree – this is more a measurement of legislation than of the reality on the ground.

However, the category that Gender sits within, Participation and Human Rights, makes for less encouraging reading. 30 of Africa’s 53 states have declined in Participation and Human Rights performance over the past five years – notwithstanding some improvements around Gender issues.

Meanwhile, 35 African states have declined in the Safety and Rule of Law category; five of these were significant. African citizens are generally less physically secure and politically enfranchised than they were in 2005.

Overall, then, the impressive sustained economic progress and human development on the continent stand in contrast to deterioration in national performance in security, rule of law, participation and rights.
Safety and Rule of Law

Having a firmly embedded judicial system that is just, effective, accessible to all, administered by competent and independent judges who work independently of political influences and in a corruption-free environment and make decisions according to merit, is a major prerequisite for ensuring safety and rule of law. Indeed consideration of safety cannot be separated from an assessment of the entrenchment of the rule of law in a state. This accords citizens the right to safety rather than the mere presence of safety with no guarantees of entitlement. This extends to include the accountability of public officials and prevention, control and elimination of corruption in the country.

Experience has demonstrated that a legal system can easily be subverted if its enforcers are not accountable to those they serve and if they are prone to influence through financial and other considerations. Furthermore, an empowered citizenry conscious of its constitutional and fundamental rights and responsibilities ensures the conditions for the entrenchment of the rule of law and safety in the state.

To ensure maximum progress in the efforts to promote good governance in Africa, it is imperative to see to it that safety in its holistic form and the rule of law exist concomitantly.

Salim Ahmed Salim
Former Secretary-General, Organisation of African Unity and former Prime Minister of Tanzania
**Personal Safety**

People everywhere desire to live safely and have recourse to the law when their rights are violated or they are victims of crime. One of the basic responsibilities of government is to create an environment in which this is possible. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Safety of the Person** – level of criminality in a country (EA).
- **Violent Crime** – prevalence of violent crime, both organised and common (EA).
- **Social Unrest** – prevalence of violent social unrest (EA).
- **Human Trafficking** – government efforts to combat human trafficking (EA).
- **Domestic Political Persecution** – clustered indicator (an average) of the following variables:
  - **Physical Integrity Rights Index** – government respect for citizens’ rights to freedom from torture, extrajudicial killing, political imprisonment, and disappearance (EA).
  - **Political Terror Scale** – levels of state-instigated political violence and terror (EA).

**Rule of Law**

Consideration of safety cannot be separated from an assessment of the entrenchment of the rule of law in a state. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Strength of Judicial Process** – extent to which the judicial process or courts are subject to interference or distortion by interest groups (EA).
- **Judicial Independence** – degree of independence, separation of powers, and a system of checks and balances within the judicial system (EA).
- **Property Rights** – clustered indicator (an average) of the following variables:
  - **Property Rights Protection** – degree to which private property rights are respected and enforced (EA).
  - **Property Rights** – extent to which government ensures a clear process for ownership and acquisition of property (EA).
  - **Property Rights** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the extent to which property and contract rights are guaranteed and protected (EA).
  - **Property Rights Index** – ability of individuals to accumulate private property, secured by clear laws that are fully enforced by the state (EA).
- **Orderly Transfers of Power** – extent of clarity, establishment and acceptance of constitutional mechanisms for the orderly transfer of power from one administration to another (EA).
- **Sanctions** – whether the United Nations Security Council and/or the African Union has imposed sanctions on a state, or governmental or non-governmental actors within a country (EA/OD).

**Accountability and Corruption**

Rule of law also includes the accountability of public officials and the level of corruption in a country. Prevalence, or lack, of corruption reflects a government’s commitment to its citizens. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Transparency and Corruption** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the accountability of public officials (both elected and appointed) to citizens, law-making bodies, and the justice system for:
  - Use of funds and resources
  - Results of their actions (EA).
- **Accountability of Public Officials** – extent to which safeguards/sanctions exist to ensure public officials (both elected and appointed) are accountable and perform competently (EA).
- **Corruption in Government and Public Officials** – level of vested cronyism in, and corruption of, public officials (both elected and appointed) (EA).
- **Prosecution of Abuse of Office** – extent to which there are legal or political penalties for public officials (both elected and appointed) who abuse their positions (EA).
- **Corruption and Bureaucracy** – how obstructive state bureaucracy is. This includes the amount of red tape likely to be encountered, as well as the likelihood of encountering corrupt officials and other groups (EA).
- **Accountability, Transparency and Corruption in Rural Areas** – provisions put in place to:
  - Encourage decentralisation of management of public finances for rural areas
  - Promote accountability and transparency in decision-making and disclosure of information at local level (EA).
National Security
Safety must also be considered in the wider context of the absence of conflict and its consequences. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Domestic Armed Conflict** – level of domestic armed conflict in a country, or the likelihood of conflict developing in the near future (EA).
- **Government Involvement in Armed Conflict** – whether government is the primary or secondary party in armed conflict, in which the use of armed force results in 25 or more battle deaths in a year (EA).
- **Battle Deaths (Civilian and Combatant)** – civilian or combatant battle deaths (greater than 25) resulting from war, minor conflict and non-state violence (EA).
- **Civilian Deaths from Civilian-Targeted Violence** – deaths (greater than 25) that occur from the use of armed force, targeted specifically at civilians, by the government or a formally organised group (EA).
- **Refugees Originating from the Country** – people fleeing the country due to fear of persecution (OD).
- **Internally Displaced People** – estimate of internally displaced people within and outside camps (EA/OD).
- **International Tensions** – potential threat to a country’s economic and political stability due to cross-border tensions (EA).

Safety and Rule of Law country scores (2008/09*)

* For the purposes of graphical illustration, country scores have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Note: Western Sahara is on the United Nations list of non-self-governing territories.
The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator (either 2008 or 2009). Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers for clarity; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.

### Safety and Rule of Law country scores (2004/05–2008/09)*

#### Most changed category scores

Significant change between 2004/05 and 2008/09 (highlighted):
- **Movement up**: Liberia, Togo.
- **Movement down**: Eritrea, Guinea, Madagascar, Mauritania, Somalia.

#### Top ten ‘Safety and Rule of Law’ scores for 2010 Ibrahim Index:

1. Mauritius
2. Botswana
3. Cape Verde
4. Seychelles
5. Namibia
6. Ghana
7. South Africa
8. Lesotho
9. Benin
10. São Tomé and Príncipe

*The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator (either 2008 or 2009). Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers for clarity; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.
Mauritius is the highest performing country in this category. Southern Africa is the best performing region with a score of 66.

Southern Africa has five countries in the top ten, but West African countries also perform well with four in the top ten.

Both East and Central Africa have three countries in the bottom ten.

**Safety and Rule of Law**

**Top ten scores (2008/09)**

- Cape Verde (84)
- Benin (69)
- Ghana (75)
- Sao Tome and Principe (68)
- Mauritania (42)
- Eritrea (40)
- Guinea (39)
- Chad (38)
- Côte d’Ivoire (38)
- Central African Republic (35)

**Bottom ten scores (2008/09)**

- 64 Mauritania (42)
- 65 Eritrea (40)
- 66 Guinea (39)
- 67 Chad (38)
- 68 Côte d’Ivoire (38)
- 69 Central African Republic (35)
- 70 Zimbabwe (35)
- 71 Congo, Democratic Rep. (33)
- 72 Sudan (22)
- 73 Somalia (8)
### Personal Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Averages</th>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>South Africa (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cameroon (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nigeria (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Chad (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rule of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Averages</th>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Liberia (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Zimbabwe (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Comoros (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mauritania (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Madagascar (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accountability and Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Averages</th>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Libya (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Gambia (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Central African Republic (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Congo (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Averages</th>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Angola (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Eritrea (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Chad (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Ethiopia (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Congo, Democratic Rep. (56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).
Participation and Human Rights

In preparing an index illustrating outcomes in the areas of participation and human rights, it is clear that participation is much easier to assess and measure. Of course, participation encompasses and overlaps with areas of human rights, such as the right to vote, the right to a fair election, and freedom to express views on political issues and to hold government accountable for commitments made under national and international law.

When we look back at the development of the international human rights system over the past 60 years there is a significant gap in implementation which poses a problem in developing an index to measure outcomes in a comparable way in 53 countries in Africa.

Despite the present gap, and the weakness in data, I believe the Ibrahim Index is making a significant contribution. It is exerting a healthy pressure on the UN and others to develop more practical ways to compare the human rights record of African countries.

By offering the best measurements and relevant data the index can find at present, it is creating a demand – which civil society in each country should champion – for better performance measurements.

What an innovative way to enhance protection and promotion of human rights in African countries!

Mary Robinson
Former President of Ireland and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
Participation
The ability of citizens to participate in the political process is a vital gauge of the legitimacy of government, although participation is a much wider concept. Elections are the yardstick by which the level of citizen participation in public life can be assessed. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

► Political Participation – extent to which citizens have relevant information and the freedom to participate in the political process (EA).
► Effective Power to Govern – extent to which democratically elected leaders have the effective power to govern, or the extent of veto powers and political enclaves (EA).
► Free and Fair Elections – extent to which leaders are determined by free and fair elections (EA).
► Electoral Self-determination – right of citizens to freely decide their political system and leadership (EA).
► Free and Fair Executive Elections – integrity of executive elections (EA).

Rights
Citizens’ rights and freedoms should be guaranteed by the state, and legal recourse should be available when these rights are violated. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

► Human Rights – likelihood of a state being accused of serious human rights violations (EA).
► Political Rights – legitimacy of policy-making; electoral process including electoral laws; political pluralism; participation; corruption; and accountability (EA).
► Workers’ Rights – laws for internationally-recognised rights in the workplace that govern pay, hours of work, forced labour, child labour, occupational safety, and the right to associate and bargain collectively (EA).
► Freedom of Expression – extent to which citizens, organisations and media can express opinions freely (EA).

► Freedom of Association and Assembly – clustered indicator (an average) of the following variables:
  ► Freedom of Association and Assembly – extent to which independent political and/or civic groups can associate and assemble freely (EA).
  ► Freedom of Assembly and Association – existence and enforcement of laws that allow citizens the right to assemble freely and associate into groups such as political parties and trade unions among others (EA).
  ► Freedom of Association – likelihood that freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining will not be respected (EA).
► Press Freedom – clustered indicator (an average) of the following variables:
  ► Freedom of Speech and Press – extent to which freedoms of speech and press are affected by government censorship and ownership (EA).
  ► Free Press – degree of print, broadcast, and internet freedom, including assessment of events impacting the media environment (EA).
  ► Press Freedom Index – degree of freedom for journalists and news organisations, and efforts made by the authorities to ensure respect for this freedom (EA).
► Civil Liberties – clustered indicator (an average) of the following variables:
  ► Protection of Civil Liberties – the extent to which civil liberties are guaranteed and protected, and citizens can seek redress for violations of these liberties (EA).
  ► Civil Liberties – the extent of various citizens’ freedoms (EA). *
  ► Civil Liberties – the extent of various citizens’ freedoms (EA). *
► Ratification and Initial Reporting of Core International Human Rights Conventions – assessment based on the number of the nine core international human rights treaties a country has ratified and submitted an initial report for (EA/OD).

* Civil liberties include, amongst others, the absence of internet restrictions, no state use of torture, freedom of expression and belief, freedom to unionise, and personal freedoms such as freedom of movement and private property rights.
Gender

The absence of gender discrimination is crucial. Women are often afforded fewer rights while contributing disproportionately to family, community and economic life. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Gender Equality** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the extent to which a state has enacted institutions and programs to enforce laws and policies that:
  - Promote equal access for men and women to education and training
  - Promote equal access for men and women to resources
  - Provide equal legal status to men and women (EA).
- **Primary School Completion Rate, Female** – female students successfully finishing the last year of primary school (OD).
- **Ratio of Girls to Boys in Primary and Secondary Education** – ratio of total enrollment rate of girls to boys in both primary and secondary education (OD).
- **Women’s Participation in the Labour Force** – proportion of women aged 15 and older that are economically active (OD).
- **Women in Parliament** – parliamentary seats held by women (OD).
- **Women’s Rights** – existence and enforcement of laws that accord women internationally recognised economic rights (rights concerning employment); and political rights (including the right to vote and hold political office).
- **Legislation on Violence against Women** – existence or planned existence, and specificity, of laws against domestic violence; sexual assault or rape; and sexual harassment (EA).

The Ibrahim Index is compiled using indicators based on either Expert Assessment (EA) or Official Data (OD).

Participation and Human Rights country scores (2008/09*)

* For the purposes of graphical illustration, country scores have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Note: Western Sahara is on the United Nations list of non-self-governing territories.
### Participation and Human Rights country scores (2004/05–2008/09)*

**Most changed category scores**

Significant change between 2004/05 and 2008/09 (highlighted):  
- **Movement up:** Angola, Central African Republic, Liberia, Togo.  
- **Movement down:** Eritrea, Madagascar, Senegal.

**Top ten ‘Participation and Human Rights’ scores for 2010 Ibrahim Index:**  
1. Cape Verde  
2. Mauritius  
3. South Africa  
4. Botswana  
5. Seychelles  
6. Ghana  
7. Lesotho  
8. Namibia  
9. São Tomé and Príncipe  
10. Benin

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Democratic Republic of</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator (either 2008 or 2009). Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers for clarity; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.
Cape Verde is the highest performing country in this category.

Southern Africa is the best performing region with a score of 56, and five countries in the top ten.

East Africa and Central Africa both have three countries in the bottom ten.

**Participation and Human Rights regional averages (2008/09)**

- **North Africa**: 35
- **West Africa**: 52
- **Central Africa**: 33
- **East Africa**: 41
- **Southern Africa**: 56

Continental average: 42

**Participation and Human Rights**

**Top ten scores (2008/09)**

1. Cape Verde (80)
2. Seychelles (69)
3. South Africa (73)
4. Botswana (69)
5. Ghana (68)
6. São Tomé and Príncipe (65)
7. Lesotho (68)
8. Namibia (66)
9. Benin (62)
10. Benin (62)

**Bottom ten scores (2008/09)**

44. Zimbabwe (31)
45. Congo, Democratic Rep. (30)
46. Côte d’Ivoire (29)
47. Swaziland (27)
48. Sudan (23)
49. Chad (23)
50. Eritrea (20)
51. Libya (19)
52. Equatorial Guinea (19)
53. Somalia (12)

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5). 2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.
Participation and Human Rights sub-categories

### Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mauritius (87)</td>
<td>44 Equatorial Guinea (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cape Verde (85)</td>
<td>45 Morocco (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Comoros (79)</td>
<td>46 Côte d’Ivoire (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Benin (77)</td>
<td>47 Sudan (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 South Africa (77)</td>
<td>48 Swaziland (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Botswana (74)</td>
<td>49 Guinea (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 São Tomé and Príncipe (74)</td>
<td>50 Chad (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Seychelles (72)</td>
<td>51 Somalia (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ghana (71)</td>
<td>52 Eritrea (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mali (71)</td>
<td>52 Libya (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cape Verde (86)</td>
<td>44 Chad (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mauritius (82)</td>
<td>45 Tunisia (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ghana (73)</td>
<td>46 Djibouti (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Namibia (70)</td>
<td>47 Congo, Democratic Rep. (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 South Africa (69)</td>
<td>48 Zimbabwe (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mali (68)</td>
<td>49 Sudan (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Benin (66)</td>
<td>50 Libya (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 São Tomé and Príncipe (65)</td>
<td>51 Equatorial Guinea (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Senegal (64)</td>
<td>52 Somalia (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Burkina Faso (64)</td>
<td>53 Eritrea (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Seychelles (81)</td>
<td>44 Libya (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lesotho (77)</td>
<td>45 Nigeria (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Botswana (75)</td>
<td>46 Sudan (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 South Africa (74)</td>
<td>47 Mali (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Namibia (69)</td>
<td>48 Congo, Democratic Rep. (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rwanda (68)</td>
<td>49 Chad (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cape Verde (68)</td>
<td>50 Equatorial Guinea (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tanzania (67)</td>
<td>51 Niger (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Tunisia (67)</td>
<td>52 Guinea-Bissau (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kenya (65)</td>
<td>53 Somalia (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).
Sustainable Economic Opportunity is one of the four pillars under which governance is measured in the Ibrahim Index. Freedom to participate in the creation of economic wealth is a key right for all citizens and governments have an overwhelming duty to develop an enabling framework.

This pillar seeks to measure, first, governments’ abilities to manage the macro economy along sound lines to ensure broad economic development. It also seeks to measure the regulatory framework, which allows, inter alia, the wealth-creating private sector to grow within the constraints and interest of society as a whole. A third category of variables covers the availability of basic infrastructure, which in some cases is provided by the State, whilst in others by the private sector, within a system determined by governments.

The final group of indicators cover aspects of rural and environmental issues. These are of particular significance, given the large rural populations of most countries, the importance of subsistence goods together with concerns associated with environmental degradation and climate change, which may become even more acute.

Lord Cairns
Former Chief Executive Officer, SG Warburg and Former Chairman, Actis Capital LLP
Public Management
At the macro-economic level, a government needs to provide its citizens with an enabling, stable policy environment that fosters enterprise. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Quality of Public Administration** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the extent to which the civil service is structured to effectively and ethnically design policy and deliver services (EA).
- **Quality of Budget Management** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the extent to which there is a comprehensive and credible budget, linked to policy priorities, with mechanisms to ensure implementation and reporting (EA).
- **Currency Inside Banks** – total stock of currency held within banks as a proportion of the money supply in an economy (OD).
- **Ratio of Total Revenue to Total Expenditure** – total budget revenue as a proportion of total budget expenditure (OD).
- **Ratio of Budget Deficit or Surplus to GDP** – budget deficit or budget surplus as a proportion of Gross Domestic Product (OD).
- **Inflation** – annual average change in the consumer price index (OD).
- **Ratio of External Debt Service to Exports** – total external debt service due, expressed as a proportion of exports of goods, non-factor services, income and workers’ remittances (OD).
- **Imports Covered by Reserves** – period of time that imports could be paid for by foreign exchange reserves (OD).
- **Statistical Capacity** – national statistical systems and their adherence to international norms in the areas of:
  - Methodology (of compiling statistics and indicators)
  - Regularity and coverage of censuses and surveys
  - Regularity, timeliness and accessibility of key socioeconomic indicators (EA).

Private Sector
The formulation and implementation of policies and institutions that are supportive of and conducive to a flourishing private sector is an important part of a government’s efforts to foster growth and prosperity. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Competitive Environment** – clustered indicator (an average) of the following variables:
  - Competitive Environment – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the extent to which the legal, regulatory, and policy environment helps or hinders private enterprise (EA).
  - **Competition** – extent to which the fundamentals of market based competition have developed and safeguards exist to prevent monopolies and cartels (EA).
  - **Unfair Competitive Practices** – quality of the competitive framework in place including the likelihood that domestic or foreign corporations are subject to discriminatory prices, taxes and tariffs (EA).
- **Investment Climate for Rural Businesses** – extent to which the government has adopted a framework that supports the emergence and development of an efficient private rural business sector (EA).
- **Investment Climate** – extent to which a state’s policies are conducive to free flows of investment capital (EA).
- **Bureaucracy and Red Tape** – extent of bureaucratic delay and complexity in obtaining the appropriate documentation or authorisation to engage in business activities (EA).

Infrastructure
Infrastructure is pivotal to an efficient and prosperous society. Governments which facilitate the development and maintenance of the infrastructural base of the economy stimulate growth and wealth creation, and ensure improved delivery of public goods and services. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Quality of Physical Infrastructure** – risk that deficiencies in physical infrastructure may cause a loss of income to a country (EA).
- **Reliability of Electricity Supply** – risk that power shortages could disrupt business activities (EA).
- **Mobile Phone Subscribers** – users of portable telephones (OD).
- **Computer Usage** – personal computers installed (OD).
- **Internet Subscribers** – subscriptions to the internet, for example businesses or households (OD).

Environment and the Rural Sector
In order to ensure long term sustainability of a state and its economy, the extent to which governments value and prioritise environment is key. In Africa, where 65% of the population lives in rural areas, the close links between environment and rural development necessitate sound environmental policy. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Environmental Sustainability** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring the extent to which environmental policies foster protection and sustainable use of natural resources, and management of pollution (EA).
Role of Environment in Policy Formulation – extent to which environmental concerns are taken into account in both macro- and micro-economic policies (EA).

Land and Water for Agriculture – institutional, legal and market framework for the rural poor to have
- Secure and accessible land ownership
- Equitable user-rights and management opportunities over agricultural water resources (EA).

Agricultural Input and Produce Markets – extent to which the policy, legal and institutional framework supports development and liberalisation of commercially-based, efficient and equitable agricultural markets that are accessible to small farmers (EA).

Rural Financial Services Development – extent to which the policy, legal and institutional framework supports development of a commercial rural finance sector, that is efficient, equitable and accessible to low-income populations (EA).

Policy and Legal Framework for Rural Organisations – extent to which the policy and legal environment enables the rural poor to organise into autonomous groups/associations or to engage in other forms of collective action (EA).

Public Resources for Rural Development – extent to which government emphasises development of the agricultural and rural sector in its planning, policy-making and investment programmes (EA).

Dialogue Between Government and Rural Organisations – extent to which the rural poor can express their concerns and priorities to government through dialogue or lobbying (EA).

Sustainable Economic Opportunity country scores (2008/09*)

* For the purposes of graphical illustration, country scores have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Note: Western Sahara is on the United Nations list of non-self-governing territories.
### Sustainable Economic Opportunity country scores (2004/05–2008/09)*

#### Most changed category scores
Significant change between 2004/05 and 2008/09 (highlighted):
- **Movement up**: Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Egypt, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland.

#### Top ten ‘Sustainable Economic Opportunity’ scores for 2010 Ibrahim Index:
1. Mauritius
2. Botswana
3. Cape Verde
4. Seychelles
5. Tunisia
6. Egypt
7. South Africa
8. Namibia
9. Morocco
10. Rwanda

---

*S The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator (either 2008 or 2009). Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers for clarity; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.
Mauritius is the highest performing country in this category. North Africa is the highest performing region with a score of 58.

Southern Africa has four countries in the top ten.

Central Africa, East Africa and West Africa all have three countries in the bottom ten.

Sustainable Economic Opportunity regional averages (2008/09)

North Africa 58
West Africa 45
Central Africa 36
East Africa 42
Southern Africa 53

Continental average: 46

Sustainable Economic Opportunity

Top ten scores (2008/09)
1. Mauritius (84)
2. Botswana (70)
3. Namibia (63)
4. Seychelles (66)
5. Tunisia (66)
6. Egypt (66)
7. South Africa (65)
8. Rwanda (55)
9. Morocco (62)
10. Cape Verde (67)

Bottom ten scores (2008/09)
44. Togo (34)
45. Guinea-Bissau (33)
46. Chad (32)
47. Comoros (29)
48. Liberia (29)
49. Central African Republic (28)
50. Congo, Democratic Rep. (26)
51. Eritrea (25)
52. Zimbabwe (19)
53. Somalia (4)

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index.
2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.
### Public Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 South Africa (77)</td>
<td>44 Comoros (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Botswana (77)</td>
<td>45 Angola (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Morocco (74)</td>
<td>46 Guinea (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mauritius (73)</td>
<td>47 Central African Republic (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tunisia (71)</td>
<td>48 Chad (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Namibia (70)</td>
<td>49 Sudan (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Algeria (70)</td>
<td>50 Congo, Democratic Rep. (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Burkina Faso (68)</td>
<td>51 Eritrea (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Libya (68)</td>
<td>52 Zimbabwe (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rwanda (68)</td>
<td>53 Somalia (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mauritius (97)</td>
<td>44 Libya (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cape Verde (88)</td>
<td>45 Togo (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Egypt (74)</td>
<td>46 Liberia (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 South Africa (72)</td>
<td>47 Equatorial Guinea (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Seychelles (67)</td>
<td>48 Congo (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cape Verde (63)</td>
<td>49 Comoros (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Namibia (63)</td>
<td>50 Congo, Democratic Rep. (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rwanda (63)</td>
<td>51 Eritrea (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Morocco (63)</td>
<td>52 Zimbabwe (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Tanzania (62)</td>
<td>53 Somalia (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Seychelles (78)</td>
<td>44 Burkina Faso (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mauritius (78)</td>
<td>45 Sierra Leone (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tunisia (60)</td>
<td>46 Guinea (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Namibia (58)</td>
<td>47 Liberia (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Libya (53)</td>
<td>48 Burundi (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Botswana (50)</td>
<td>49 Comoros (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cape Verde (48)</td>
<td>50 Niger (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Egypt (45)</td>
<td>51 Central African Republic (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 South Africa (44)</td>
<td>52 Somalia (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Morocco (41)</td>
<td>53 Congo, Democratic Rep. (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment and the Rural Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mauritius (89)</td>
<td>44 Angola (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cape Verde (88)</td>
<td>45 Côte d’Ivoire (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Egypt (78)</td>
<td>46 Chad (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rwanda (72)</td>
<td>47 Guinea-Bissau (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tunisia (71)</td>
<td>48 Equatorial Guinea (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ghana (70)</td>
<td>49 Togo (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Burkina Faso (70)</td>
<td>50 Central African Republic (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Morocco (70)</td>
<td>51 Liberia (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Botswana (69)</td>
<td>52 Zimbabwe (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 South Africa (69)</td>
<td>53 Somalia (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All figures have been rounded to whole numbers; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).
Human Development

Human Development reflects the outcomes of investments made in the talents of a country, with a particular focus on education, health and social safety nets.

Human Development indicators measure the efforts contributed by the individual, family, community and society as a whole. Government’s commitment to making the appropriate investment to provide equitable access to, and quality outcomes of education, training and health care systems is key to success.

In addition government has a role in creating an appropriate investment climate for innovative partnerships between public sector/private sector/civil society to ensure good and shared outcomes.

Human Development indicators provide a profile of the quality of a country’s human capital base and its ability to participate in the global knowledge economy.

Although the trend in most African countries is encouraging with respect to greater focus on investments in Human Development, more effort needs to go into data collection about monitoring and evaluating outcomes of those investments. Access to education and health care facilities does not necessarily translate into higher quality of outcome in the form of well-educated and trained people nor healthier populations. Africa needs to ensure that it invests effectively and efficiently in its youthful population for it to compete in the market place for industrial and service sector investment.

Dr Mamphela Ramphele
Former Managing Director, World Bank and former Vice-Chancellor, University of Cape Town
Health and Welfare

Citizens everywhere desire to live long, healthy lives free from poverty. Even if government does not directly provide these services to citizens, ultimate accountability for their delivery rests with government. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Incidence of TB** – incidence of new cases of Tuberculosis (OD).
- **Child Mortality** – likelihood that a newborn baby will die before the age of five, assuming that he/she is subject to current, age-specific mortality rates (OD).
- **Immunisation against Measles** – proportion of one year olds (children aged 12–23 months) who have received one dose of measles vaccine (OD).
- **Immunisation against DTP** – proportion of one year olds (children aged 12–23 months) who have received three doses of DTP vaccine (OD).
- **Welfare Regime** – equality of access to social safety nets that compensate for poverty and other risks (EA).
- **Social Protection and Labour** – clustered indicator (average) of variables from the African Development Bank and the World Bank measuring government policies and regulations to ensure a minimum level of welfare to all people (EA).
- **Social Exclusion** – extent to which significant parts of society are isolated due to poverty and inequality (EA).
- **Antiretroviral Treatment Provision** – people with advanced HIV infection who are receiving antiretroviral treatment (ART) according to nationally approved or international standards (OD).
- **Antiretroviral Treatment Provision for Pregnant Women** – HIV positive pregnant women who received antiretroviral treatment (ART) to reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission (OD).
- **Access to Piped Water** – proportion of the population with access to water piped into their dwelling or just outside it (OD).
- **Access to Improved Water** – proportion of the population with access to a water source protected from outside contamination (OD).
- **Access to Improved Sanitation** – proportion of the population served with a sanitation facility that hygienically separates human excreta from human contact (OD).
- **Open Defecation Sanitation** – proportion of the population forced to dispose of human faeces in open bodies of water or outdoor open spaces (OD).

Education

Education is another key service for citizens due to its importance in facilitating personal growth and access to opportunity. Within this sub-category the Ibrahim Index measures:

- **Education Provision and Quality** – existence of solid institutions for basic, secondary and tertiary education, as well as for research and development (EA).
- **Ratio of Pupils to Teachers in Primary School** – pupils enrolled in primary school in relation to primary school teachers (OD).
- **Primary School Completion Rate** – students successfully completing the last year of primary school (OD).
- **Progression to Secondary School** – pupils admitted to the first grade of secondary school in a given year in relation to pupils enrolled in the final grade of primary school in the previous year (OD).
- **Tertiary Enrolment Rate** – total enrolment in higher education, regardless of age (OD).

The Ibrahim Index is compiled using indicators based on either Expert Assessment (EA) or Official Data (OD).
"Human Development reflects the outcomes of investments made in the talents of the country, with a particular focus on education, health and social safety nets."

Dr Mamphela Ramphele

Human Development country scores (2008/09*)

* For the purposes of graphical illustration, country scores have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Note: Western Sahara is on the United Nations list of non-self-governing territories.
Human Development country scores (2004/05–2008/09)*

Most changed category scores

Significant change between 2004/05 and 2008/09 (highlighted):
- Movement up: Angola, Uganda and Zambia.

Top ten ‘Human Development’ scores for 2010 Ibrahim Index:
1. Seychelles
2. Libya
3. Tunisia
4. Mauritius
5. Botswana
6. South Africa
7. Algeria
8. Egypt
9. Cape Verde
10. Morocco

* The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is based on the latest available data for each indicator (either 2008 or 2009). Previous years’ indices are calculated using the latest data that would have been available that year.

All figures have been rounded to whole numbers for clarity; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).

2010 refers to the publication year of the Ibrahim Index. 2008/09 refers to the latest available data year.
Seychelles is the highest performing country in this category. North Africa is the highest performing region with a score of 70.

North Africa has five countries in the top ten. Mauritania is the only North African country not to be ranked in the top ten in this category.

West Africa has four countries in the bottom ten.

Human Development

Human Development regional averages (2008/09)

North Africa 70
West Africa 46
Central Africa 39
East Africa 49
Southern Africa 55

Continental average: 50

Seychelles is the highest performing country in this category. North Africa is the highest performing region with a score of 70.

North Africa has five countries in the top ten. Mauritania is the only North African country not to be ranked in the top ten in this category.

West Africa has four countries in the bottom ten.

Human Development

Top ten scores (2008/09)

1. EGYPT (73)
2. ALGERIA (75)
3. TUNISIA (81)
4. CAPE VERDE (72)
5. BOTSWANA (77)
6. LIBYA (85)
7. SEYCHELLES (99)
8. SOUTH AFRICA (75)
9. MOROCCO (65)
10. GUINEA-BISSAU (31)

Bottom ten scores (2008/09)

44. Burundi (39)
45. Guinea (36)
46. Congo, Democratic Rep. (35)
47. Burkina Faso (35)
48. Niger (33)
49. Angola (33)
50. Guinea-Bissau (31)
51. Central African Republic (26)
52. Chad (23)
53. Somalia (8)
### Human Development sub-categories

#### Health and Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Seychelles (100)</td>
<td>44 Togo (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mauritius (90)</td>
<td>45 Ethiopia (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Libya (87)</td>
<td>46 Equatorial Guinea (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tunisia (81)</td>
<td>47 Niger (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Botswana (78)</td>
<td>48 Liberia (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cape Verde (77)</td>
<td>49 Central African Republic (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Egypt (77)</td>
<td>50 Sierra Leone (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Algeria (76)</td>
<td>51 Congo, Democratic Rep. (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 South Africa (70)</td>
<td>52 Chad (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gambia (70)</td>
<td>53 Somalia (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continental average: 54.** North Africa has the most countries in the top ten. Central Africa and West Africa both have four countries in the bottom ten. North Africa has the highest average score.

#### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top ten scores (08/09)</th>
<th>Bottom ten scores (08/09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Seychelles (97)</td>
<td>44 Guinea (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Libya (83)</td>
<td>45 Malawi (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tunisia (81)</td>
<td>46 Burkina Faso (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 South Africa (81)</td>
<td>47 Burundi (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Botswana (75)</td>
<td>48 Chad (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Algeria (73)</td>
<td>49 Guinea-Bissau (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mauritius (71)</td>
<td>50 Angola (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Egypt (70)</td>
<td>51 Central African Republic (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cape Verde (66)</td>
<td>52 Somalia (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continental average: 46.** North Africa has four countries in the top ten. Central Africa is also represented in the top ten by Gabon. This is one of only two sub-categories in which a Central African country is in the top ten. The other is National Security. West Africa has four countries in the bottom ten. North Africa has the highest average score.

*All figures have been rounded to whole numbers; countries are ranked based on their scores in full, not on the rounded figures displayed here (see note on page 5).*
Methodology

The 2010 Ibrahim Index of African Governance is a work in progress, and also builds on the work of the first three years. Statistically, our challenges in compiling and constructing the Ibrahim Index were many, including choosing the most appropriate statistical method to aggregate the data into one composite index, and, at a more basic level, finding the most ‘suitable’ set of official data and expert assessment indicators that appropriately reflect governance as defined by the Board of the Foundation, its founder, and its Advisory Council and Technical Committee members. Essentially, the Ibrahim Index considers governance from the point of view of the citizen. It measures the extent of delivery to the citizen of a large number of economic, social and political goods and services by governments and non-state actors. The Index groups indicators into four main categories: Safety and Rule of Law, Participation and Human Rights, Sustainable Economic Opportunity, and Human Development.

At the practical level, we found that many official data indicators that we would have liked to include did not have sufficient data coverage and were not released or updated periodically enough to warrant inclusion. This factor led us to exclude what could arguably be considered the most important indicators on governance: income poverty indicators.

On another front, and similar to what was done previously, for many indicators that we include the data were missing for many periods during 2000–2009, particularly in the earlier years. This meant that the missing values had to be estimated. In most cases, we substituted using the country means (or extrapolation) for that variable where appropriate.

The Ibrahim Index is a composite, and as such, it could be seen as a ‘poll of polls’, utilising data from 23 external institutions. Following the gathering of the raw data on all the indicators, a method was chosen to put the raw data on a common scale, that is to say, to re-scale the raw data, so that it can be usefully combined to produce an overall score for each country. There are a number of statistical methods and data aggregation techniques to choose from. The methods used to compile the Index and the nature of the data mean that, for cross country comparisons and comparisons over time, it is more instructive to look at scores and ranks in more recent years, rather than in the early years. A key reason for this is that data in the early years are patchy but data availability improves substantially over time. Comparisons of scores across sub-categories and categories are misleading and so should be avoided. Moreover, comparisons across countries (for the same period) should be governed by the non-trivial and considerable margins of error, which are present in any governance index or indicator.

The main sources of uncertainty in the computation of the Index arise from measurement errors and missing data.** Standard errors and confidence intervals that capture that uncertainty were computed. Those margins of error mean that score or rank comparisons when differences across countries are small should be avoided, since they would reflect a statistical ‘tie’. On average, we found that the margin of error for the overall Index scores was around +/-8 points.

Finally, in order to render the 2010 Index more reflective of recent performance, we used the latest available data for every indicator. This means that for the year marked 2008/2009, for example, 2009 data were used if available, and 2008 if not.

Fundamentally, the Min–Max method involves re-scaling the raw data values to a scale of 0–100, for every indicator, for every country, and for every year. This is done using the formula:

\[ \frac{(x_t - \text{Min}(X))}{(\text{Max}(X) - \text{Min}(X))} \times 100 \]

where \( x_t \) is the raw value for that indicator for a particular country in year \( t \), and the Min(X) and Max(X) are the minimum and maximum values for that indicator over the whole period and for all countries. The final result was subtracted from 100 where necessary, so that a higher number always indicated a better performance.

Some indicators are composed of clusters of variables. This clustering was done when it was found that several sources appear to be measuring very similar dimensions. To avoid double counting and confusion, once the raw values of the component variables were re-scaled, we averaged the scores of the component variables to arrive at the overall score for that clustered indicator.

The sub-category scores were calculated by averaging the scores of all the component indicators. Category scores were calculated by averaging the scores of the sub-categories, and finally, the overall Index scores were obtained by averaging the scores of the four categories.*

The methods used to compile the Index and the nature of the data mean that, for cross country comparisons and comparisons over time, it is more instructive to look at scores and ranks in more recent years, rather than in the early years. A key reason for this is that data in the early years are patchy but data availability improves substantially over time. Comparisons of scores across sub-categories and categories are misleading and so should be avoided. Moreover, comparisons across countries (for the same period) should be governed by the non-trivial and considerable margins of error, which are present in any governance index or indicator.

*While this process of compiling the Index may be done adequately using standard spreadsheet software, for the sake of accuracy and precision we used statistical software called Stata (www.stata.com).

**It could also be argued that the weights applied to each category – all being equally weighted – also generate a degree of uncertainty in the scores.

Dr Hania Farhan
Director of the Ibrahim Index of African Governance
Ibrahim Index: from raw data to final scores

1. The data gathered comes in all shapes and sizes. Before they can be used in the Ibrahim Index, they must be transformed to a common scale. As the data are all in different units and scales, these varying numbers need to be translated onto a scale on which they can be meaningfully compared and averaged.

2. Once the 88 indicators have been transformed to a common scale, each one is grouped with similar indicators to form sub-categories. The sub-category score is simply the average of all the indicator scores.

3. Sub-categories are then grouped into categories; sub-category scores are averaged to produce the category score.

4. The category scores are then averaged to produce the final Ibrahim Index score.

*Outliers:* eight variables have extreme values which had to be statistically treated so as not to skew the entire dataset. For more information please see: http://www.moibrahimfoundation.org/en/section/the-ibrahim-index/methodology

*Clustered indicators:* thirteen indicators were formed by clustering a number of variables that measure the same concept from different sources. A cluster is formed by averaging the underlying variables (post normalisation).
Margins of Error

Governance indicators are subject to margins of error. These errors are largely attributable to missingness of data (data might be missing for a number of reasons, including because a source does not produce data on a particular country, or because data were not collected in a particular year) and to errors that may arise in measurement.

The margins of error must be taken seriously as they indicate the extent of the imprecision in measurement. In other words, if Country A has a score of, say 53, and the margin of error is +/–8, that means the score could be anywhere in the range of 45 and 61. If another country – Country B – has a score of 55, then that country’s own score could be anywhere in the range of 47 and 63. What this implies is that we cannot confidently say that Country B’s score is better than Country A’s score, or vice-versa. They are, statistically, a ‘tie’, because of the possible errors introduced to the score owing to measurement and missingness of data.

Therefore, cross-country comparisons and comparisons over time must be made with caution. Score or rank comparisons when differences between countries are small should be avoided.

Margins of error for 2008/09

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance is transparent about publishing these margins of error, and the graph on the left shows the margins of error associated with the score for each country.

The bars associated with each value in the graph represent the range of possible values which each country’s score could take at the 90% confidence level.

A confidence interval gives the range of values within which the true value is likely to be. It gives an estimate of how much uncertainty there is in the estimate of the true value. The smaller the interval, the more precise the estimate. A 90% confidence interval implies that there is a 90% probability that the interval contains the true value.
Project Team

Foundation Research Team

- Dr Hania Farhan
  *Director of the Ibrahim Index*
- Elizabeth McGrath
  *Senior Analyst*
- Salmana Ahmed
  *Analyst*
- Kenza Ziar
  *Analyst*
- Nathalie Delapalme
  *Director of Research and Policy*
- Dr Daniel Kaufmann (Brookings Institution, USA)
  *Special Advisor*
- Nicholas Ulanov (The Ulanov Partnership, USA)
  *Special Advisor*

Advisory Council

The Ibrahim Index Advisory Council consists of 27 members who meet twice a year to review and discuss the Ibrahim Index. Eleven members of this council form the Technical Committee which meets more frequently and reviews the Index, its components and methodology in much greater depth.

- Karin Alexander
  *Institute of Democracy (Idasa), South Africa*
- Meaza Ashenafi
  *Ethiopian Women’s Lawyers Association, Ethiopia*
- Dr Mwesiga Baregu
  *St Augustine University, Tanzania*
- Dr Richard Calland
  *University of Cape Town, South Africa*
- Dr Chris Cramer
  *School of Oriental and African Studies, UK*
- Keli Gadzekpo
  *Databank, Ghana*
- Dr Abdalla Hamdok
  *United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), Ethiopia*
- Dr Samba Ka
  *formerly African Capacity Building Foundation, Zimbabwe*
- Michael Keating
  *Africa Progress Panel, Switzerland*
- Dr Georges Nzongola-Ntalaja
  *Africa Governance Institute, Senegal*
- Dr ‘Funmi Olonisakin
  *King’s College London, UK*
- Dr Okey Onyekewu
  *Center for Sustainable Governance, Nigeria*
- Julie Oyegun
  *World Bank Group, USA*
- Dr Irene Pogoson
  *University of Ibadan, Nigeria*
- Dr Zene Tadesse
  *Association of African Women Researchers for Development (AAWORD), Ethiopia*
- Dr Peter Wanyande
  *University of Nairobi, Kenya*

Technical Committee

Members of the Technical Committee are also members of the Advisory Council.

- Nathalie Delapalme
  *Mo Ibrahim Foundation*
- Dr Hania Farhan
  *Mo Ibrahim Foundation*
- Dr E. Gyimah-Boadi
  *Afrobarometer, and Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana), Ghana*
- Dr Ali Hadi
  *The American University in Cairo, Egypt*
- Hadeel Ibrahim
  *Mo Ibrahim Foundation*
- Dr Daniel Kaufmann
  *Brookings Institution, USA*
- Dr Ebrima Sall
  *Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA), Senegal*
- Dr Akilagpa Sawyerr
  *formerly Association of African Universities, Ghana*
- Dr Piero Stanig
  *London School of Economics and Political Science, UK*
- Nicholas Ulanov
  *The Ulanov Partnership, USA*
- Dr Leonard Wantchekon
  *Institute for Empirical Research in Political Economy (IREEP), Benin*
  *New York University, USA*

Sub-committee of the Board of the Mo Ibrahim Foundation responsible for the Ibrahim Index

- Lord Cairns
- Nathalie Delapalme
- Hadeel Ibrahim
- Dr Mamphela Ramphele
- Dr Mary Robinson
Data Sources

The African Development Bank (AfDB) – Country Performance Assessment (CPA)
The African Development Bank (AfDB) Country Performance Assessment (CPA) data consist of Country Policy and Institutional Assessment Ratings (CPIA) and Governance Ratings (CR). CPA is a system designed to assess the quality of a country’s present policy and institutional framework.
Data provider: African Development Bank (AfDB)
Description of data provider: Multilateral development bank
Data source: Country Performance Assessment (CPA)
Number of variables from source: 9 (all in clustered indicators)

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
► Safety and Rule of Law
► Accountability and Corruption
► Participation and Human Rights
► Sustainable Economic Opportunity
► Sustainable Economic Opportunity
► Human Development

Bertelsmann Foundation – Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI)
The Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI) is an international ranking of 125 developing and transition countries. It considers the political and economic status of each country and the political management performance by the relevant actors, through the publication of two rankings, the Status Index and the Management Index. Assessment is based on the three dimensions of democracy, market economy and economic management, across 17 criteria that are subdivided into 52 questions.
Data provider: Bertelsmann Foundation
Description of data provider: Private non-profit foundation
Data source: Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI)
Number of variables from source: 13 (4 in clustered indicators)
Data type: Expert Assessment
Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/en/bti/

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
► Safety and Rule of Law
► Personal Safety
► Electoral Self-Determination
► Participation and Human Rights
► Women’s Rights

Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Data Project
Data provider: The Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Data Project
Description of data provider: Non-profit organisation
Data source: Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Dataset
Number of variables from source: 6 (3 in clustered indicators)
Data type: Expert Assessment
Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://www.humanrightsdata.org

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
► Safety and Rule of Law
► Personal Safety
► Electoral Self-Determination
► Participation and Human Rights
► Women’s Rights

Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana)
The Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana) is an independent, non-partisan and non-profit research-based and policy-oriented think tank in Accra, Ghana. Founded in 1998, it promotes democracy, good governance and the development of a liberal political and economic environment in Ghana in particular, and Africa in general. The Mo Ibrahim Foundation commissioned CDD-Ghana to conduct an independent analysis of the imposition of sanctions in Africa by various international and regional organisations.
Data provider: Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana)
Description of data provider: Non-profit think tank
Data source: Sanctions in Africa 2000–2009 (work commissioned by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation)
Number of variables from source: 1
Data type: Expert Assessment based on Official Data
Frequency: Annual
Public Access: Commercially available
Website: http://www.cddghana.org/index.aspx

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
► Safety and Rule of Law
► Personal Safety
► Electoral Self-Determination
► Participation and Human Rights
► Women’s Rights

Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) – EIU Democracy Index; EIU CountryData and Commissioned Expert Assessments
The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) provides analysis and forecasts on more than 200 countries and six key industries. The Ibrahim Index of African Governance uses three types of EIU data:
► The EIU’s Democracy Index provides a snapshot of the current state of democracy for 165 countries. It is based on five interrelated categories: electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture.
► EIU CountryData is a database covering 317 economic indicators and forecasts for 201 countries, running from 1980 and forecasting out five years.
► The EIU was also commissioned by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation to construct a range of independent Expert Assessments across the Ibrahim Index categories.

Data provider: Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU)
Description of data provider: Research and advisory organisation
Data sources: Democracy Index; CountryData; and Commissioned Expert Assessments
Number of variables from source: 24 (4 in clustered indicators)
Data type: Expert Assessment and Official data
Frequency: Democracy Index: every two years; CountryData: updated regularly; Commissioned Expert Assessments: annually from 2006.
Public access: Commercially available
Website: http://www.eiu.com

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Safety and Rule of Law > Personal Safety > Safety of the Person; Violent Crime; Social Unrest
- Safety and Rule of Law > Rule of Law > Strength of Judicial Process; Property Rights (clustered); Ordery Transfers of Power
- Safety and Rule of Law > Accountability and Corruption > Accountability of Public Officials; Corruption in Government and Public Officials
- Safety and Rule of Law > National Security > Domestic Armed Conflict; International Tensions
- Participation and Human Rights > Participation > Political Participation
- Participation and Human Rights > Rights > Human Rights; Freedom of Association and Assembly (clustered); Civil Liberties (clustered)
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Public Management > Currency Inside Banks; Ratio of Total Revenue to Total Expenditure; Ratio of Budget Deficit or Surplus to GDP; Inflation; Ratio of External Debt Service to Exports; Imports Covered by Reserves
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Private Sector > Competitive Environment (clustered); Bureaucracy and Red Tape
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Infrastructure > Quality of Physical Infrastructure; Reliability of Electricity Supply

Freedom House (FH) – Freedom in the World Survey and Freedom of the Press Index

Freedom House (FH) is an independent non-governmental organisation that supports non-violent civic initiatives in societies where freedom is denied or under threat.

The Ibrahim Index of African Governance uses two sources of Freedom House data:
- The Freedom in the World Survey is a comparative assessment of global political rights and civil liberties. Published annually since 1972, it reports on 193 countries and 15 related and disputed territories.
- The Freedom of the Press Index is an annual survey of media independence in 195 countries and territories. The annual index contains data on media freedom, assessing the degree of print, broadcast, and internet freedom in every country in the world, and analysing the events of each calendar year.

Data provider: Freedom House
Description of data provider: Non-governmental organisation
Data sources: Freedom in the World Survey and Freedom of the Press Index
Number of variables from source: 2 (1 in a clustered indicator)
Data type: Expert Assessment Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://www.freedomhouse.org/fhp/index/

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Safety and Rule of Law > Rule of Law > Property Rights (clustered)
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Private Sector > Investment Climate

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC)
The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) monitors internal displacement caused by armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters in some 50 countries worldwide, and maintains an online database on conflict and violence-related internal displacement. IDMC seeks and compiles data from national governments, the United Nations and other international organisations, national and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), human rights organisations and the media.

Data provider: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre Description of data provider: Non-governmental organisation
Data source: ‘Internal Displacement: Global Overview of Trends and Developments’ 2003–2009 and country specific internally displaced profile reports
Number of variables from source: 1
Data type: Expert Assessment and Official Data Frequency: Annual
Public access: Yes
Website: http://www.internal-displacement.org

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Participation and Human Rights > Rights > Political Rights; Press Freedom (clustered); Civil Liberties (clustered)

The Heritage Foundation and The Wall Street Journal – Index of Economic Freedom
The Heritage Foundation and The Wall Street Journal produce the Index of Economic Freedom. The Index tracks economic freedom around the world through 10 benchmarks: Business Freedom; Trade Freedom; Fiscal Freedom; Government Spending; Monetary Freedom; Investment Freedom; Financial Freedom; Property Rights; Freedom from Corruption and Labour Freedom.

Data providers: The Heritage Foundation and The Wall Street Journal
Description of data providers: Think tank (Heritage Foundation) and business publication (The Wall Street Journal)

Data source: Index of Economic Freedom
Number of variables from source: 2 (1 in a clustered indicator)
Data type: Expert Assessment Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://www.heritage.org/index/

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Safety and Rule of Law > Rule of Law > Property Rights (clustered)

Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (IGME) – Child Mortality Estimates Info (CME)
Experts at the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), The World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Population Division (UNPD) and members of the academic community joined together in 2004 to form the Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (IGME), in order to agree on the best way to calculate infant and child mortality levels and trends. Child Mortality Estimates Info (CME) is a web-based database management application to create estimate-based charts on child mortality indicators and manage underlying data.

Data provider: Inter-Agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (IGME)
Description of data provider: Inter-agency group of international organisations and members of the academic community
Data source: Child Mortality Estimates Info (CME)
Number of variables from source: 1
Data type: Official Data Frequency: Updated regularly
Public access: Freely available
Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Human Development > Health and Welfare > Child Mortality

The Bulletin Board on Statistical Capacity (BBSC) was developed by the Development Data Group (DECDG) at the World Bank to improve understanding of the state of statistical systems in International Development Association (IDA) countries, by facilitating measuring and monitoring of statistical capacity, with close collaboration with countries and users. The database contains information encompassing various aspects of national statistical systems.

Data provider: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank (WB)
Description of data provider: Multilateral development bank
Data source: Bulletin Board on Statistical Capacity (BBSC)
Number of variables from source: 1
Data type: Expert Assessment
Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://go.worldbank.org/SZTHWITX60

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Safety and Rule of Law > Rule of Law > Property Rights (clustered)
- Safety and Rule of Law > Accountability and Corruption > Transparency and Corruption (clustered)
- Participation and Human Rights > Gender > Gender Equality (clustered)
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Public Management > Quality of Public Administration (clustered); Quality of Budget Management (clustered); Management of Public Debt (clustered)
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Private Sector > Competitive Environment (clustered)
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Environment and the Rural Sector > Environmental Sustainability (clustered)
- Human Development > Health and Welfare > Social Protection and Labour (clustered)

The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) report aggregate and individual governance indicators for 212 countries and territories over the period 1996–2008, for six dimensions of governance: (a) voice and accountability; (b) political stability and absence of violence; (c) government effectiveness; (d) regulatory quality; (e) rule of law; and (f) control of corruption. In the ‘control of corruption’ dimension, WGI includes a corruption variable provided by IHS Global Insight’s World Markets Online (WMO) – a commercial data provider.

Data provider: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank (WB)
Description of data provider: Multilateral development bank
Data source: Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)
Number of variables from source: 9
Data type: Expert Assessment
Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Safety and Rule of Law > Accountability and Corruption > Transparency and Corruption in Rural Areas
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Private Sector > Investment Climate for Rural Businesses
Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Environment and the Rural Sector > Land and Water for Agriculture
[This indicator consists of the sum of the scores from two variables from the IFAD PBAS-RSPA > ‘Access to Land for Agriculture’ and ‘Access to Water for Agriculture’]; Agricultural Input and Produce Markets; Rural Financial Services Development; Policy and Legal Framework for Rural Organisations; Public Resources for Rural Development; Dialogue between Government and Rural Organisations

International Monetary Fund (IMF) – International Financial Statistics (IFS) and Article IV Consultations – Staff Reports

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) is an international organisation that provides technical support and produces information and data on all of its member countries. The Ibrahim Index utilises two types of IMF data:
- International Financial Statistics (IFS) provides continuously updated international statistics on all aspects of international and domestic economies and finance. It reports current data needed for the analysis of economies, payments and monetary and financial statistics.
- IMF Article IV Consultations – Staff Reports are based on consultations by IMF economists who visit member countries to gather information and hold discussions with government and central bank officials, and often with other stakeholders such as private investors, labour representatives and members of parliament.

Data provider: International Monetary Fund (IMF)
Description of data provider: International organisation
Data source: International Financial Statistics (IFS) and Article IV Consultations – Staff Reports
Number of variables from source: 2 (1 as a component)
Data type: Official Data
Frequency: Updated regularly; IMF Article IV Consultations – Staff Reports: annual
Public access: IFS: commercially available; IMF Article IV Consultations – Staff Reports: freely available

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Sustainable Economic Opportunity > Public Management > Currency Inside Banks (component) [there are two components of the ‘Currency Inside Banks’ indicator; one of these components – ‘Currency Outside Deposit Money Banks’ – is taken from the IFS]. Inflation [The primary source of data for the ‘Inflation’ indicator (EIU) does not cover all African countries. Where data is missing, we have sourced this indicator from the IMF Article IV Consultations – Staff Reports]

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/ AIDS (UNAIDS) – UNAIDS Knowledge Centre

The UNAIDS Knowledge Centre provides a range of resources and data, developed either by the UNAIDS Secretariat and/or one of their co-sponsors, that include HIV data, information on data collection methodologies and tools, publications including reports, evaluations, reflections and Best Practices, media information, multimedia products and Q&A and fact sheets on UNAIDS and AIDS issues.

Data provider: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/ AIDS (UNAIDS)
Description of data provider: United Nations agency
Data source: UNAIDS Knowledge Centre
Number of variables from source: 2
Data type: Official Data
Frequency: Updated regularly
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://www.unaids.org/en/KnowledgeCentre/HIVData/mapping_progress.asp

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Human Development > Health and Welfare > Antiretroviral Treatment Provision; Antiretroviral Treatment Provision for Pregnant Women
- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary General (MTDSG) and Treaty Body Document databases

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is a United Nations agency that works to promote and protect the human rights that are guaranteed under international law and stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.
- The Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary General (MTDSG) database provides information on the status of over 500 multilateral instruments deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations (including the texts of reservations, declarations and objections). This database reflects the status of these instruments, as Member States sign, ratify, accede or lodge declarations, reservations or objections.
- The Treaty Body Document database provides access to documents concerning the different monitoring mechanisms for the core international human rights treaties, including the Core Documents, State Reports, and other treaty related information.

Data provider: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
Description of data provider: United Nations agency
Number of variables from source: 7
Data type: Official Data
Frequency: Annual
Public access: Freely available
Website: http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a013eb06.html

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:
- Safety and Rule of Law > National Security > Refugees Originating from the Country

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) – Gender, Institutions and Development Database (GID-DB)

The OECD Gender, Institutions and Development Database (GID-DB) is a tool for the analysis of obstacles to women’s economic development. It covers a total of 160 countries and comprises an array of 60 indicators on gender discrimination. The database has been compiled from various sources and includes institutional variables that range from intra-household behaviour to social norms.
Data provider: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Description of data provider:
Multilateral organisation


Number of variables from source: 1

Data type: Expert Assessment

Frequency: Published in 2006 and 2009

Public access: Freely available

Website: http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_33935_39323280_1_1_1_1,00.html

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:

- Participation and Human Rights
- Gender
- Legislation on Violence against Women

Political Terror Scale (PTS)
The Political Terror Scale (PTS) is computed by Professor Mark Gibney, Mr Reed Wood and a group of volunteers. It was first developed in the early 1980s, well before ‘terrorism’ took on much of its present meaning. The ‘terror’ in the PTS refers to state-sanctioned killings, torture, disappearances and political imprisonment that the Political Terror Scale measures. The data used in compiling PTS come from two different sources: the yearly country reports of Amnesty International and the US Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

Data provider: Political Terror Scale (PTS)

Description of data provider: Academic project

Data source: Political Terror Scale (PTS)

Number of variables from source: 1 (in a clustered indicator)

Data type: Expert Assessment

Frequency: Annual

Public access: Freely available

Website: http://www.poltor Россії.org

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:

- Participation and Human Rights
- Gender

United Nations International Telecommunication Union (ITU) – World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database
The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) is a United Nations agency working on information and communication technology issues. The World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database contains time series data for around 100 datasets of telecommunication and Information Technology statistics.

Data provider: United Nations International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

Description of data provider: United Nations agency

Data source: World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database

Number of variables from source: 4

Data type: Official Data

Frequency: Updated when relevant

Public access: Freely available

Website: http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/publications/world/world.html

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:

- Human Development
- Health and Welfare

Uppsala University, Department of Peace and Conflict Research – Uppsala Conflict Data Programme (UCDP): UCDP Database and UCDP Datasets

The UCDP Database and UCDP Datasets provide information on a large number of aspects of armed violence and conflict since 1946. The definitions of conflict are designed so as to pick up the same phenomenon across time as well as across space, in order to make the data useful for systematic studies of the origins and dynamics of conflict.

Data provider: Uppsala University, Department of Peace and Conflict Research – Uppsala Conflict Data Programme (UCDP)

Description of data provider: Academic institution

Data sources: UCDP Database and UCDP Datasets

Number of variables from source: 3

Data type: Expert Assessment

Frequency: Annual

Public access: Freely available

Website: http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP/index.html

Ibrahim Index Indicators from this source:

- Human Development
- Health and Welfare

WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation

The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation is the official United Nations mechanism tasked with monitoring progress towards the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) relating to drinking-water and sanitation (MDG 7, Target 7c), which is to: ‘Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking-water and basic sanitation’.

Data provider: WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation

Description of data provider: United Nations agency

Data source: WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation

Number of variables from source: 4

Data type: Official Data

Frequency: Updated when relevant

Public access: Freely available

Website: http://www.wssinfo.org/
Africa is blessed with an abundance of resources, both natural and human. Harnessing these resources to transform the living standards of people across the continent requires good governance. While there have recently been significant improvements in many African countries, weaknesses in governance and capacity are central to the challenges facing Africa.

Established in 2006 by Mo Ibrahim, the Mo Ibrahim Foundation aims to support great African leadership. The Foundation works to:

- stimulate debate on good governance;
- provide criteria by which citizens, civil society, parliaments and governments can measure progress;
- recognise achievement in African leadership and provide a practical way in which leaders can build positive legacies on the continent when they have left office;
- support aspiring leaders for the African continent.

These aims are achieved through the Foundation’s five core initiatives:

- **The Ibrahim Prize for Achievement in African Leadership** is an annual prize which celebrates excellence in African leadership. The prize is awarded to a former Executive Head of State or Government by a Prize Committee composed of eminent African and international figures, including three Nobel Laureates. Previous laureates include President Joaquim Chissano (2007), President Festus Mogae (2008) and President Nelson Mandela (Honorary). In 2009 and 2010, the Ibrahim Prize was not awarded by the Prize Committee.

- **The Ibrahim Index of African Governance** is a comprehensive assessment of African countries according to the quality of their governance. Compiled in partnership with experts from a number of African institutions, the Ibrahim Index aims to be Africa’s leading assessment of governance that informs and empowers citizens and governments to measure progress.

- **The Ibrahim Scholarship Programmes** are a range of scholarships to support aspiring African leaders at a number of distinguished academic institutions, including Ahfad University in Khartoum, the American University in Cairo, London Business School and the University of London’s School of Oriental and African Studies.

- **The Ibrahim Discussion Forum** is a high-level discussion forum facilitated by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation. Participants discuss and debate the African agenda articulated by the Foundation in collaboration with key members of African civil society.

- **The Ibrahim Leadership Fellowships** is a selective programme designed to identify and prepare the next generation of outstanding African leaders by providing them with mentoring opportunities in key multilateral institutions.

The Foundation is governed by a Board of Directors comprised of:

- Mo Ibrahim, (Founder and Chair), Founder, Celtel International
- Lord Cairns, Former Chairman, Actis Capital LLP and former Chief Executive Officer, SG Warburg
- Nathalie Delapalme, Director of Research and Policy at the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, and former Advisor on Africa and Development issues to various French Foreign Ministers
- Hadeel Ibrahim, Director of Strategy and External Relations, the Mo Ibrahim Foundation
- Sir Ketumile Masire, Co-Chairperson of the Global Coalition for Africa and former President of Botswana
- Dr Mamphela Ramphele, Former Managing Director, World Bank and former Vice-Chancellor, University of Cape Town
- Mary Robinson, Former President of Ireland and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
- Salim Ahmed Salim, Former Secretary-General, Organisation of African Unity and former Prime Minister of Tanzania.

---

About the Foundation

“There’s nothing wrong with Africa’s people. There’s nothing wrong with our continent. But good people and good land do not necessarily make successful countries. There is another necessary ingredient – good governance and proper leadership – and that is what we need to focus on.”

Mo Ibrahim
Without good governance in Africa, natural resources will continue to be squandered, investors will continue to be deterred, and citizens will lack the physical and financial security due to them. But if governments across the continent rise to the challenge, Africa will finally be able to realise its great potential.

Mo Ibrahim