

METHODOLOGY

FOR ASSESSING THE DEGREE OF BUSINESS
CLIMATE CONVERGENCE IN EASTERN
PARTNERSHIP COUNTRIES WITH BUSINESS
CLIMATE IN THE EU



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EaP – The Eastern Partnership;

EU – The European Union;

DB – Doing Business 2019;

EFF – Economic Freedom of the World 2018, Annual Report of Fraser Institute;

EFH – 2018 Index of Economic Freedom, Annual Report of Heritage Foundation;

OECD – OECD SME Policy Index 2016 EaP;

TI – Corruption Perceptions Index 2018;

GK – The Global Competitiveness Report 2018;

GEI – The Global Entrepreneurship Index 2018;

NBD – New business density;

AM – Armenia;

AZ – Azerbaijan;

BY – Belarus;

GE – Georgia;

MD – Moldova;

UA – Ukraine

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	4
2. Sequence of steps to assess the degree of convergence	5
3. The results of calculations for assessing the degree of convergence for 2018	7
4. Annexes:	
▪ Doing Business 2019, Annual Report of World Bank	10
▪ Economic Freedom of the World 2018, Annual Report of Fraser Institute (Canada)	14
▪ 2018 Index of Economic Freedom, Annual Report of Heritage Foundation (USA)	16
▪ OECD SME Policy Index 2016 EaP	18
▪ Corruption Perceptions Index 2017, Annual Report of Transparency International	21
▪ The Global Competitiveness Report 2018, Annual Report of World Economic Forum	22
▪ The Global Entrepreneurship Index 2018, Annual Report of The Global Entrepreneurship and Development Institute, Washington, D.C., USA	24
▪ New business density (new registrations per 1,000 people ages 15-64), 2006-2016, World Bank	26

1. INTRODUCTION

This methodology¹ is based on the use of well-known studies (indexes) of assessing the business climate in various countries of the world:

- Doing Business 2019, Annual Report of World Bank ²;
- Economic Freedom of the World 2018, Annual Report of Fraser Institute (Canada)³;
- 2018 Index of Economic Freedom, Annual Report of Heritage Foundation (USA)⁴;
- OECD SME Policy Index 2016 EaP ⁵;
- Corruption Perceptions Index 2017, Annual Report of Transparency International ⁶;
- The Global Competitiveness Report 2018, Annual Report of World Economic Forum ⁷;
- The Global Entrepreneurship Index 2018, Annual Report of The Global Entrepreneurship and Development Institute, Washington, D.C., USA ⁸;
- New business density (new registrations per 1,000 people ages 15-64), 2006-2016, World Bank ⁹.

A brief description of these indexes is provided in Appendices 1-8.

The above mentioned indexes allow making appropriate conclusions about the business climate in various countries of the world, including the Eastern Partnership countries. Such an abundance of various indices, which pursue similar goals, is explained by the different approaches of the authors of the methodologies to the question of which factors are major in terms of a favourable business climate. In addition, there are a number of features that should also be taken into account. One of the features of the indices is that the time parameters (the year of the report and the

¹ The methodology was developed in the framework of studies conducted during the implementation of the project “Convergence of the business climate in the EaP countries with the business climate in the EU”, funded by the EaP Civil Society Forum

² <http://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Annual-Reports/English/DB2018-Full-Report.pdf>

³ <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/economic-freedom-of-the-world-2018.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.heritage.org/index/>

⁵ <http://www.oecd.org/countries/belarus/sme-policy-index-eastern-partner-countries-2016-9789264246249-en.htm>

⁶ https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2017

⁷ <http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2018.pdf>

⁸ https://thegedi.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2017/11/GEI-2018-1.pdf

⁹ <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.NDNS.ZS>

date of publication of the next report) do not coincide. And one of these indices (**OECD SME Policy Index**) was published only twice: in 2012 and 2016.

Another feature of the indices is that only one of them (**OECD SME Policy Index**) focuses on the problems of the EaP countries. And this study focuses on the application of the principles of the Small Business Act for Europe by these countries.

The variety of methodologies puts people who wish to understand the extent to which the business climate in a country is close to the business climate in the EU in a difficult position. Specifically, representatives of civil society, including members of the Civil Society Forum of EaP countries, who wish to monitor the processes of convergence find themselves in a difficult situation of choosing the appropriate index among those described above.

The analysis of the indices described above shows that each of them, of course, can also be used to assess the level of convergence of the business climate in the Eastern Partnership countries with the EU business climate. To do this, it is necessary to compare the value of the indexes in the EaP countries with the averaged values of the indexes for 28 EU countries. This is the easiest way; however, using it, it is impossible to get a unified view of the degree of proximity of the business climate in a particular EaP country to the business climate in the EU. For each index, different results will be obtained for the same EaP countries. Therefore, this methodology is based on a composite use of all 8 indexes or parts of them, if in the current year no research has been conducted for any indexes (for example, the research on OECD SME Policy Index has been conducted only twice: in 2012 and 2016. Last 2016 study was published in 2018).

2. SEQUENCE OF STEPS TO ASSESS THE DEGREE OF CONVERGENCE

The methodology is to implement a sequence of the following steps:

1. Recalculation of the results of the research of the OECD SME Policy Index to 100 point scale. This is done by the formula:

$$R_{OECD-N} = R_{OECD} / R_i \times 100$$

Here: R_{OECD-N} is the converted value of the OECD estimate;

R_i is the ideal OECD assessment value, which is 5.

2. Bringing the results on the Index of Economic Freedom by the Fraser Institute to a 100-point scale. This is done by multiplying by 10;

- Bringing the results on the New Business Density Index to 100-point scale. This is done by the formula:

$$R_{NBD-N} = R_{NBD} / R_{NBD-MAX} \times 100$$

Here: R_{NBD-N} is the converted value of the NBD assessment;

$R_{NBD-MAX}$ is the best NBD index value for EU countries.

Such a recalculation of the NBD values is controversial, but, on the other hand, it also allows the use of this index.

- Calculation of average values of indexes for the EaP countries and the EU;
- Filling Table 1;

Table 1.

	DB	EFF	EFH	OECD	TI	GK	GEI	NBD	S ₁	S ₂
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
AZ										
AM										
BY										
GE										
MD										
UA										
A ₁										
A ₂										
WFEU										
TFEU										

In Table 1:

S₁ – Sum by indexes: DB, EFF, EFH, OECD, TI, GK, GE, NBD;

S₂ – Sum by indexes: DB, EFF, EFH, OECD, TI, NBD. The reason for calculating this amount is that the GL and GP indices for Belarus are not calculated;

A₁ - Average for EaP;

A₂ - Average for EU;

WFEU - Worst for EU;

TFEU - Top for EU

6. Analysis of the results presented in Table 1. The analysis is carried out by comparing the values of S1 and S2 with A1, A2, WFEU and TFEU. This comparing allows:
- 1) make a conclusion about the proximity of the business climate in a particular EaP country to the business climate in the EU;
 - 2) make a conclusion about the proximity of the business climate in 6 EaP countries to the business climate in the EU;
 - 3) the comparison also allows ranking the EaP countries according to the degree of convergence of the business climate in these countries to the business climate in the EU.

3. THE RESULTS OF CALCULATIONS FOR ASSESSING THE DEGREE OF CONVERGENCE FOR 2018

Table 2 presents the results of calculations for 2018. At the same time, reports on all 8 indexes published in 2018 were used.

Table 2.

	DB	EFF	EFH	OECD	TI	GK	GEI	NBD	S ₁	S ₂
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
AZ	78.64	63,8	64,3	55,0	25	60,0	30	4.96	381,70	291,70
AM	75.37	76,0	68,7	64,6	35	59,9	24	8.38	411,95	328,05
BY	75.77	62,3	58,1	56,4	44	-	-	5.25		301,82
GE	83.28	80,1	76,2	68,2	58	60,9	26	40.32	493,00	406,10
MD	73.54	65,6	58,4	60,6	33	55,5	21	8.43	376,07	299,57
UA	68.25	53,8	51,9	50,0	32	57,0	27	7.42	347,37	263,37
A ₁	75.81	66,9	62,9		37,83	58,7	26	12.48		
A ₂	75.91	75,4	70,2		64,68	72,0	54	7,00		
WFEU	65.43 MT	64,9	57.3 GR	50	65.43 MT	60.1 HR	28 BG	2.87	404,96	316,88
TFEU	84.64 DK	80,7	80.4 IE	100,0	84.64 DK	82.8 DE	78 GB	100	691,18	530,38

As can be seen from Table 2, Georgia, according to the results of 7 reports out of the 8, has the best results compared to other EaP countries. The results of Georgia in four reports (Doing Business 2019, Economic Freedom of the World 2018, 2018 Index of Economic Freedom, New business density) are even better than the average European ones. Only in one index - *The Global Entrepreneurship Index*, the situation in Azerbaijan is better than in other EaP countries.

According to Table 2, in the following cases, the indicators for countries turned out to be beyond the minimum and maximum values for EU countries:

- 1) In the Index of Economic Freedom of the Fraser Institute, the points awarded by the foundation to Azerbaijan, Belarus and Ukraine were lower than the worst value in the EU (GR - Greece);
- 2) In the Index of Economic Freedom of the Heritage Foundation, the points awarded by the Foundation to Ukraine were lower than the worst value in the EU (GR - Greece);
- 3) According to the OECD index, it is not possible to conduct a comparison of the business climate in EaP and EU countries, since this study is carried out only in EaP countries. Nevertheless, taking into account the fact that the assessment in EaP countries is carried out on a five-point system, one can note the considerable remoteness of the economic policy in EaP countries from the principles of the Small Business Act for Europe. For the time being, Georgia demonstrates the best proximity to the principles;
- 4) In the Corruption Perceptions Index, only Georgia has an indicator between the lower and upper values for EU countries. The other five countries have indicators below the worst EU values (Malta);
- 5) In the Global Competitiveness Index, only Georgia has an indicator between the lower and upper values for EU countries. The other five countries have indicators lower than the worst EU values (Croatia);
- 6) In the Global Entrepreneurship Index, only Azerbaijan has an indicator between the lower and upper values for EU countries. The other five countries have indicators lower than the worst EU values (Bulgaria);
- 7) In New Business Density, the indicator for all EaP countries is between the lower and upper values for EU countries.

Table 2 presents the minimum and maximum values for EU countries on the OECD index. These assumptions are certainly controversial, but they will allow checking the data for the EAP countries in columns 10 and 11 on presence between the minimum and maximum values for the EU countries.

Thus, keeping in mind some of the assumptions made, we can estimate the degree of convergence of the business climate in EaP countries with the business climate in EU countries, taking into account all eight studies described above. Moreover, this can be

done annually in order to analyze the dynamics of changes in the business climate of EaP countries.

Doing Business 2019, Annual Report of World Bank¹⁰

The **Doing Business** study allows to evaluate business regulation legislation. The **Doing Business 2019** report covered 190 countries, including all Eastern Partnership countries.

This report is perhaps the most popular among governments and business communities.

In the report, each country is assigned a rating of favourable conditions for doing business. The rating is determined on the basis of 11 indicators¹¹:

Indicator set	What is measured
Starting a business	Procedures, time, cost and paid-in minimum capital to start a limited liability company
Dealing with construction permits	Procedures, time and cost to complete all formalities to build a warehouse and the quality control and safety mechanisms in the construction permitting system
Getting electricity	Procedures, time and cost to get connected to the electrical grid, the reliability of the electricity supply and the transparency of tariffs
Registering property	Procedures, time and cost to transfer a property and the quality of the land administration system
Getting credit	Movable collateral laws and credit information systems
Protecting minority investors	Minority shareholders' rights in related-party transactions and in corporate governance
Paying taxes	Payments, time and total tax and contribution rate for a firm to comply with all tax regulations as well as post-filing processes
Trading across borders	Time and cost to export the product of comparative advantage and import auto parts
Enforcing contracts	Time and cost to resolve a commercial dispute and the quality of judicial processes
Resolving insolvency	Time, cost, outcome and recovery rate for a commercial insolvency and the strength of the legal framework for insolvency
Labor market regulation	Flexibility in employment regulation and aspects of job quality

¹⁰ <http://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Annual-Reports/English/DB2018-Full-Report.pdf>

¹¹ <http://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Annual-Reports/English/DB2018-Full-Report.pdf>

According to experts, the disadvantages of this study are the following circumstances¹²:

- The rating forms without using macroeconomic indicators, as well as factors of the quality of infrastructure, qualification of labour force, currency fluctuations, investor opinions and the state of corruption;
- The report does not cover all legal forms of enterprises, but only limited liability companies. There are very deep differences between countries in the degree of enterprises' tendency to incorporation, since this tendency is differentiated between countries depending on the cost and complexity of the registration procedure, tax incentives and even cultural factors.

Table 1 below lists the comparative values of the ranks (places occupied in the table of ranks) of Eastern Partnership countries. Also, this table shows the best and worst ranks in the 28 EU countries.

Table 1¹³

Indicators	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Top Rank for EU	Worst Rank for EU
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ease of doing business rank	41	25	37	6	47	71	3, DK	84, MT
1. Starting a business	8	9	29	2	14	56	10, IE	127, SK
2. Dealing with construction permits	98	61	46	27	172	30	4, DK	159, HR
3. Getting electricity	17	74	20	39	81	135	5, DE	154, RO
4. Registering property	14	17	5	4	22	63	3, LT	153, GR
5. Getting credit	44	22	85	12	44	32	12, LV	175, LU
6. Protecting minority investors	51	2	51	2	33	72	15, IE, GB	122, LU
7. Paying taxes	82	28	99	16	35	54	4, IE	118, IT

¹² Методы анализа развития малого бизнеса. Отчет USAID MEP, http://atameken.kz/uploads/content/files/%D0%9C%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%BE%D0%B4%D1%8B%20%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%B7%D0%B0%20%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B7%D0%B2%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B8%D1%8F%20%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B3%D0%BE%20%D0%B1%D0%B8%D0%B7%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%81%D0%B0_C.pdf

¹³ In Table 1 all countries are represented by a 2-letter country code¹³ based on the International Naming Convention (ISO - International Organization for Standardization 3166), <https://abbreviations.yourdictionary.com/articles/country-abbreviations.html>

8. Trading across borders	46	84	25	43	35	78	1, MT16C¹⁴	52, IE
9. Enforcing contracts	24	40	29	8	69	57	7, LT	138, GR
10. Resolving insolvency	95	45	72	60	68	145	2, FI	121, MT

As can be seen from Table 1, the resultant ranks of EaP countries are between the worst (84 - Malta) and the top (3 - Denmark) resultant ranks of EU countries. Regarding the ranks for individual indicators, the following conclusions can be made:

- 1) In five indicators (Getting electricity, Registering property, Paying taxes, Enforcing contracts, Resolving insolvency), the ranks of EaP countries are between the worst and the best ranks of EU countries by corresponding indicators;
- 2) In the first indicator (Starting a business), three EaP countries (Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan) have ranks better than the highest rank of an EaP country (10 - Ireland);
- 3) In the second indicator (Dealing with construction permits), only one of the EaP countries (Moldova) has a rank lower than the lowest in the EU (159 - Croatia);
- 4) In the sixth indicator (Protecting minority investors), two EaP countries (Azerbaijan and Georgia) have ranks above the ranks of EU countries;
- 5) In the eighth indicator (Trading across borders), only two of the EaP countries (Azerbaijan and Ukraine) have ranks lower than the lowest in the EU (52 - Ireland).

Table 2 presents the resultant estimates of business simplicity in EaP countries and the EU average.

Table 2.

Indicators	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP	Average for EU
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ease of doing business rank	75.37	78.64	75.77	83.28	73.54	68.25	75.81	75.91

As can be seen from this table, in the two EaP countries (Georgia and Azerbaijan) the estimate of business simplicity is even higher than the EU average.

¹⁴ MT16C – more than 16 countries of EU

Thus, based on the **Doing Business** report, the conclusion is that the business climate in EaP countries is very close to the business climate in EU in terms of the simplicity of setting up and running a business. But what does research from other international organizations show?

Economic Freedom of the World 2018, Annual Report of Fraser Institute (Canada)¹⁵

The Economic Freedom rating is an indicator of economic freedom in a country. The study is annual in nature and is carried out by the Canadian Fraser Institute together with the CATO Institute (USA).

The Economic Freedom rating shows the extent to which a country's policies and institutions promote economic freedom. The rating is based on the components of the Index of Economic Freedom. To determine the rating, 38 indicators and subindicators, combined into five main groups, are used:

1. **Size of government.** Indicators: 1) The share of state consumption in total consumption; 2) The share of government transfers and subsidies in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP); 3) The share of state-owned enterprises and government investments in total investments; 4) The extreme tax rate;
2. **Legal structure, legal framework and protection of property rights.** Indicators: 1) Independence of the judiciary; 2) Fair court; 3) Protection of intellectual property rights; 4) Intervention of law enforcement agencies in the administration of justice and the political process; 5) Consistency of legislation;
3. **Availability of sound money.** Indicators: 1) The difference between the average annual growth rate of the money supply over the past 5 years and the average annual growth rate of real GDP over the past 10 years; 2) Standard deviation of annual inflation rates for the last 5 years; 3) Inflation over the past year; 4) Citizens' freedom to have accounts in foreign currency at home and abroad;
4. **Freedom to trade internationally:** 1) Taxes on foreign trade; 2) Regulatory barriers to foreign trade; 3) The actual size of foreign trade in comparison with the expected size; 4) The difference between the official exchange rate and the black market exchange rate; 5) State control over the movement of international capital;
5. **The degree of state regulation: regulation of business, labour, loans:** 1) Regulation of the credit market 2) Regulation of the labour market; 3) Regulation of business.

Many of these indicators have a number of very important subindicators.

In each indicator, countries are rated in points - from 0 to 10. A higher score corresponds to a higher assessment of the level of economic freedom for this indicator

¹⁵ <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/economic-freedom-of-the-world-2018.pdf>

in a country. The final rating of economic freedom is calculated as the arithmetic average of the aforesaid five indicators.

Table 3 below lists the comparative data for Eastern Partnership countries and the values of the economic freedom rating averaged for European countries based on the methodology of the Fraser Institute:

Table 3

Indicators	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP	Average for EU
Summary Ratings	7,6	6,38	6,23	8,01	6,56	5,38	6,69	7,54
1. Size of Government	7,12	5,19	6,76	7,79	6,46	6,53	6,64	5,29
2. Legal System and Property Rights	5,78	5,32	5,53	6,57	4,25	4,32	5,29	6,88
3. Sound Money	9,48	7,31	5,33	8,99	7,79	3,25	7,02	9,56
4. Freedom to Trade Internationally	8,24	7,1	7,18	8,66	7,44	6,51	7,52	8,24
5. Regulation	7,39	6,99	6,38	8,05	6,86	6,29	6,99	7,76

As can be seen from Table 3, the economic freedom rating in Georgia is even higher than the EU average. The greatest gap between EaP and EU countries is observed in the indicator "**Availability of sound money**". Only in one indicator (Size of Government) the situation in EaP countries is better than in the EU, which is very interesting, since two of the six EaP countries are characterized by a tough authoritarian regime, under which the share of the state is usually higher (the exception is Singapore).

2018 Index of Economic Freedom, Annual Report of Heritage Foundation (USA)¹⁶

This index is also an indicator of economic freedom in a country, but is calculated on the basis of the methodology of the **Heritage Foundation**. The study is annual in nature and is carried out by the Heritage Foundation's research centre together with The Wall Street Journal. The study determines the ratings of countries in terms of economic freedom.

The Index of Economic Freedom is calculated as an arithmetic average of points for twelve of the following indicators:

1. Property Rights;
2. Judicial Effectiveness;
3. Government Integrity;
4. Tax Burden;
5. Government Spending;
6. Fiscal Health;
7. Business Freedom;
8. Labor Freedom;
9. Monetary Freedom;
10. Trade Freedom;
11. Investment Freedom;
12. Financial Freedom.

In each indicator, countries are rated in points - from 0 to 100. Higher scores correspond to higher levels of economic freedom in a country. All countries of the world presented in the final report are divided into five groups according to their rating:

- 1) Countries with a free economy (those which scored more than 80 out of the 100 possible points).
- 2) Countries with a predominantly free economy (those which scored from 70 to 80 points).

¹⁶ <https://www.heritage.org/index/>

- 3) Countries with a moderately free economy (those which scored from 60 to 70 points).
- 4) Countries with a predominantly unfree economy (those which scored from 50 to 60 points).
- 5) Countries with a non-free economy (those which scored less than 50 points).

Table 4 below presents comparative data for Eastern Partnership countries and values of economic freedom averaged for European countries based on the methodology of the **Heritage Foundation**:

Table 4

Indicators	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP	Average for EU
ECONOMIC FREEDOM SCORE	68,7	64,3	58,1	76,2	58,4	51,9	62,9	70,2
RULE OF LAW								
Property Rights	55,3	53,6	53,5	62,8	53,5	41	53,3	75,1
Judicial Effectiveness	47,4	36,8	57,3	64,2	26,3	29,5	43,6	67,4
Government Integrity	40,5	39,9	42	61,8	26,6	29	40,0	59,7
GOVERNMENT SIZE								
Tax Burden	84,7	87,5	89,8	87	85,3	80,2	85,7	66,5
Government Spending	80	59,4	47,9	73,3	56,7	45	60,4	38,3
Fiscal Health	67,2	95,5	75,4	91,8	90	75,9	82,6	80,1
REGULATORY EFFICIENCY								
Business Freedom	78,7	72,3	74,1	86,9	66	62,7	73,4	75,5
Labor Freedom	69,9	71,9	73,1	77,3	39,9	52,8	64,1	60,3
Monetary Freedom	75,8	65,6	62,3	79,6	73,2	60,1	69,4	84,9
OPEN MARKETS								
Trade Freedom	80	74,6	81,4	89,4	78,3	81,1	80,8	86,6
Investment Freedom	75	55	30	80	55	35	55	80,9
Financial Freedom	70	60	10	60	50	30	46,7	67,9

As can be seen from this table, Georgia has better results than the average for the EU in this rating too. Ukraine has the worst result.

OECD SME Policy Index 2016 EaP¹⁷

The OECD SME Economic Policy Index is an assessment of compliance with the principles of the Small Business Act for Europe¹⁸, which proclaims the following 10 principles:

I.	Create an environment in which entrepreneurs and family businesses can thrive and entrepreneurship is rewarded
II.	Ensure that honest entrepreneurs who have faced bankruptcy quickly get a second chance
III.	Design rules according to the “Think Small First” principle
IV.	Make public administrations responsive to SMEs’ needs
V.	Adapt public policy tools to SME needs: facilitate SMEs’ participation in public procurement and better use State Aid possibilities for SMEs
VI.	Facilitate SMEs’ access to finance and develop a legal and business environment supportive to timely payments in commercial transactions
VII.	Help SMEs to benefit more from the opportunities offered by the Single Market
VIII.	Promote the upgrading of skills in SMEs and all forms of innovation
IX.	Enable SMEs to turn environmental challenges into opportunities
X.	Encourage and support SMEs to benefit from the growth of markets

The table below shows the comparative values of the Eastern Partnership countries in 12 directions (indicators for each area are evaluated on a five-point scale, where "1" means the lowest level of economic policy reform, and "5" is the highest). For each of these 12 areas, several indicators are evaluated, the total number of which is 124. Therefore, it is fair to say that the OECD SME Economic Policy Index is a fundamental study. However, the cumbersome nature of this study makes it difficult to conduct annual assessments. For this reason, only two studies have been conducted since 2012. The results of the latter are published in 2018 and cover the figures for 2016.

Table 5

¹⁷ <http://www.oecd.org/countries/belarus/sme-policy-index-eastern-partner-countries-2016-9789264246249-en.htm>

¹⁸ https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/small-business-act_en

		Scores						
		AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP
I	Create an environment in which entrepreneurs and family businesses can thrive and entrepreneurship is rewarded							
1	Entrepreneurial learning and women's entrepreneurship	2,63	2,59	2,39	2,70	2,57	2,25	2.52
II	Ensure that honest entrepreneurs who have faced bankruptcy quickly get a second chance							
2	Bankruptcy and second chance for SMEs	3,16	2,87	2,57	2,94	2,68	2,05	2.71
III	Design rules according to the "think small first" principle							
3	Regulatory framework for SME policy making	3,38	2,47	2,41	3,48	3,51	2,45	2.95
IV	Make public administration responsive to SMEs							
4	Operational environment for SMEs	4,05	4,23	4,09	4,33	3,56	3,81	4.01
V	Adapt public policy tools to SME needs							
5a	Support services for SMEs and start-ups	3,93	2,98	2,99	3,69	3,35	1,84	3.13
5b	Public procurement	3,42	2,42	3,21	4,04	2,89	2,73	3.12
VI	Facilitate SME access to finance and develop a legal framework and business environment supportive of timely							
6	Access to finance for SMEs	3,53	2,70	3,08	3,76	3,40	3,22	3.28
VII	Help SMEs to benefit more from the opportunities offered by the Single Market							
7	Standards and technical regulations	3,33	3,32	3,22	4,22	4,12	4,34	3.76
VIII	Promote the upgrading of skills and all forms of innovation							
8a	Enterprise skills	2,67	2,94	2,28	3,00	2,50	2,56	2.66
8b	Innovation	2,91	2,47	2,91	2,70	2,54	1,86	2.56
IX	Enable SMEs to turn environmental changes into opportunities							

9	SMEs in a green economy	2,39	1,54	2,10	2,48	2,19	1,22	1.99
X	Encourage and support SMEs to benefit from growth markets							
10	Internationalisation of SMEs	3,37	2,50	2,59	3,60	3,07	1,63	2.79
	Average rating for 12 indicators	3.23	2.75	2.82	3.41	3.03	2.50	2,95

As we can see from this table, the economic policy of EaP countries is averaged at 2.95 on a five-point scale. This indicates that the governments of EaP countries still have a lot to do to achieve full compliance with the principles of the Small Business Act for Europe.

The economic policy of the government of Georgia most closely complies with the requirements of the Small Business Act for Europe. Armenia is in second place, and Ukraine closes the list.

The main disadvantages of this study are that it uses only opinions of experts (governmental and independent) and businessmen. The objective macroeconomic results of government policies are not analyzed.

Corruption Perceptions Index 2018, Annual Report of Transparency International¹⁹

The Corruption Perceptions Index is a global study assessing the level of corruption in the public sector. It is calculated on the basis of a combination of publicly available statistical data and the results of expert surveys presented in various sources of international organizations. These sources assess the level of perception of corruption by experts, both living in a particular country and foreign experts, and are a collection of surveys of entrepreneurs, analysts on commercial risk assessment and specialists in specific countries from various international organizations.

The index ranks countries and territories on a scale from 0 (the highest level of corruption) to 100 (the lowest level of corruption) based on the perception of the level of corruption in the public sector. In general, the index is a popular study, although it has some drawbacks inherent in expert studies. For example, the degree of reliability of measurements is not the same for all countries.

Table 6 below provides comparative data for Eastern Partnership countries, CPI points and ranks of EaP countries:

Table 6

Indicator	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP	Average for EU
Score	35	25	44	58	33	32	37.83	64.68
Rank	105	152	70	41	117	120		

As we can see from this table, Georgia has the best rank. In general, the situation in terms of corruption in EaP countries is very far from the situation in the EU.

¹⁹ https://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/publication/corruption_perceptions_index_2018

The Global Competitiveness Report 2018, Annual Report of World Economic Forum²⁰.

This report contains the results of a global survey of countries of the world for economic competitiveness. The calculation is carried out according to the methodology of the World Economic Forum, based on the use of publicly available statistical data and the results of a global survey of company executives. The survey questionnaire covers a wide range of factors affecting the business climate. National competitiveness is understood as the ability of a country and its institutions to ensure stable economic growth rates that would be stable in the medium-term.

The list of analyzed indicators includes:

- 1) 20 indicators of the Institutions;
- 2) 12 indicators of the Infrastructure;
- 3) 5 indicators of the ICT adoption;
- 4) 2 indicators of the Macroeconomic Stability;
- 5) 1 indicator of the Health;
- 6) 9 indicators of the Skills;
- 7) 8 indicators of the Product Market;
- 8) 12 indicators of the Labour Market;
- 9) 9 indicators of the Financial system;
- 10) 2 indicators of the Market size;
- 11) 8 indicators of the Business dynamism;
- 12) 10 indicators of the Innovation capability.

Each indicator is rated on a 100-point scale.

The study has been conducted since 2004 and currently covers 140 countries.

The assessment of the values of indicators is carried out by 2/3 of the expert opinion of representatives of business and political circles and public management and by 1/3 of open materials of statistical data, sociological surveys and scientific studies published in the open press and carried out on a regular basis by international organizations²¹.

²⁰ <http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2018/05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2018.pdf>

²¹ <https://gtmarket.ru/ratings/global-competitiveness-index/info>

Table 7 below provides comparative data for Eastern Partnership countries and the competitiveness rating averaged for European countries:

Таблица 7

	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP	Average for EU
Rank	70	69	-	66	88	83		
Score	59.9	60.0	-	60.9	55.5	57.0	58.7	72.0

As we can see, in Belarus, competitiveness is not being assessed yet. And in this indicator, Georgia has the best result among EaP countries.

The Global Entrepreneurship Index 2018, Annual Report of The Global Entrepreneurship and Development Institute, Washington, D.C., USA²²

GEI measures both the quality of entrepreneurship and the scale and effectiveness of the system to support the entrepreneurial ecosystem. The study is based on an analysis of 14 components that play an important role in ensuring the health of the business ecosystem:

Component of the entrepreneurship ecosystem	What does it measure?
Pillar 1: Opportunity Perception	Can the population identify opportunities to start a business and does the institutional environment make it possible to act on those opportunities?
Pillar 2: Startup Skills	Does the population have the skills necessary to start a business based on their own perceptions and the availability of tertiary education?
Pillar 3: Risk Acceptance	Are individuals willing to take the risk of starting a business? Is the environment relatively low risk or do unstable institutions add additional risk to starting a business?
Pillar 4: Networking	Do entrepreneurs know each other and how geographically concentrated are their networks?
Pillar 5: Cultural Support	How does the country view entrepreneurship? Is it easy to choose entrepreneurship or does corruption make entrepreneurship difficult relative to other career paths?
Pillar 6: Opportunity Perception	Are entrepreneurs motivated by opportunity rather than necessity and does governance make the choice to be an entrepreneur easy?
Pillar 7: Technology Absorption	Is the technology sector large and can businesses rapidly absorb new technology?

²² https://thegedi.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2017/11/GEI-2018-1.pdf

Pillar 8: Human Capital	Are entrepreneurs highly educated, well trained in business and able to move freely in the labor market?
Pillar 9: Competition	Are entrepreneurs creating unique products and services and able to enter the market with them?
Pillar 10: Product Innovation	Is the country able to develop new products and integrate new technology?
Pillar 11: Process Innovation	Do businesses use new technology and are they able access high quality human capital in STEM fields?
Pillar 12: High Growth	Do businesses intend to grow and have the strategic capacity to achieve this growth?
Pillar 13: Internationalization	Do entrepreneurs want to enter global markets and is the economy complex enough to produce ideas that are valuable globally?
Pillar 14: Risk Capital	Is capital available from both individual and institutional investors?

The index value ranges from 0 to 100 points and forms by evaluating the 14 above indicators. The closer the score is to zero, the better the situation in the country.

The 2018 report covers 137 countries. Table 8 below gives the comparative data for Eastern Partnership countries and the GEI rating values averaged for European countries:

Table 8

Indicators	AM	AZ	BY	GE	MD	UA	Average for EaP	Average for EU
Rank	88	62	-	77	92	73		
GEI	24	30	-	26	21	27	26	54

As we see, the global index of entrepreneurship is not being estimated in Belarus yet. In general, the average value of the index for EaP countries is significantly lower than the value of the index for EU countries. According to this index, the situation in Azerbaijan is the best.

New business density (new registrations per 1,000 people ages 15-64), 2006-2016, World Bank²³.

This World Bank rating, New Business Density, characterizes the population's tendency to organize new enterprises and do business in the existing business climate.

The key indicator of the rating is the number of limited liability companies registered per year per thousand people aged 15–64.

The following indicators are used:

- density of enterprises (business density) - the total number of enterprises divided by the number of people of working age;
- density of newly-registered enterprises (new density) - the number of newly-registered enterprises divided by the number of people of working age;
- the level of the creation of new enterprises (entry rate) - the number of newly-registered enterprises divided by the total number of registered enterprises.

Table 9 below gives the comparative values of the New Business Density index for Eastern Partnership and EU countries:

Table 9

	Country Name	2014	2015	2016
1	Armenia	1,55126713	1,7221069	1,73579314
2	Azerbaijan	0,98483085	0,74519431	1,03166193
3	Belarus	1,04902531	0,87073514	1,09279176
4	Georgia	5,80437964	7,22388789	8,37019719
5	Moldova	1,92494214	1,80347658	1,75484162
6	Ukraine	1,04569643	1,20905663	1,54434595
	Average for EaP			2,58827193
	Average for EC	6,51406453	6,66903469	7,00242621

²³ <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.NDNS.ZS>

As can be seen from the table, the value of the index in Georgia exceeds the value in the EU. For the rest of the EaP countries, the index value is significantly lower than the EU average.