

Is it easy to trade with Japan ?

in comparison with BPCs, Business Partner Cities affiliated with Osaka City, and other countries in the world, on the basis of "The Enabling Trade Report 2009" published by World Economic Forum

C o n t e n t s

- 1) The Enabling Trade Report 2009 by WEF
- 2) Singapore and Hong Kong are still ranked World-Top
... and Japan is 23rd position in 2009 ...
- 3) WEF's Opinion & Comments
 - 1 Warning against Protectionism
 - 2 General findings of the Enabling Trade Index
 - 3 About Japan
- 4) Assessment for other countries in the world
 - a) Asia and the Pacific
 - b) Europe and North America
 - c) Latin America

1) The Enabling Trade Report 2009 by WEF

World Economic Forum(hereinafter referred as WEF) which is very well known with its so-called Davos-Meeting published "The Enabling Trade Report 2009" on July 7th,2009, by analyzing the detail of the recent situation of policy, regulation, infrastructure, business environment etc. in each of 121 countries in the world.

Table-1 shows the ranking list from Singapore as the 1st place through Chad as the 121st in order of each Overall Index, together with each rank of 4 Subindexes of Market Access, Border Administration, Transport & communication infrastructure and Business Environment.

Table-2 is the Comparison Table, among 16countries and Japan, made by us, by simplifying and modifying WEF's "The Enabling Trade Index 2009" for each individual country which indicates rank and score for many pillars included in 4 Subindexes.

16 countries consist of 12 countries which have 13 cities with whom we, IBPC keep a very close relationship concluding Business Partner Cities Agreement and 4 countries of USA (from North America, having strong economic relationship with us), Germany (from Europe, as a strong exporter), Brazil(from BRICs, as an emerging market) and Russia (also from BRICs).

Note: How to read the Competitiveness on the Table-2

Next to the rank, or **×** indicates whether the indicator constitutes an advantage

() or disadvantage (**×**) for the country.

In order to identify variables as an advantage or disadvantage, the following rules apply:

- 1) For the top 10 economies in the overall ETI, any variables on which the economy is

ranked 10th or higher are considered to be advantages.

Any variables ranked below 10 are considered to be disadvantages.

For example, in the case of Hong Kong, which is ranked 2nd overall, its 7th rank in the variable "effectiveness and efficiency of clearance" makes this variable a competitive advantage (✓), whereas "firm-level technology absorption" on which it ranks 15th, constitutes a competitive disadvantage (✗) for the country.

2)For those economies with an overall rank on the ETI lower than 11th, any variables with a higher rank than the economy's overall rank are considered to be advantages. Any variables ranked equal to, or lower than, the economy's overall rank are disadvantages.

For instance, in the case of the Malaysia, ranked 28th overall, its rank of 2nd for the "cost to import" makes this variable a competitive advantage (✓). On the other hand, "tariff barriers" in which the Malaysia ranks 59th, represents a competitive disadvantages.(✗)

2) Singapore and Hong Kong are still ranked World-Top

... and Japan is 23rd position in 2009 ...

According to WEF, since the publication of the WEF Report in 2008, the Index has been enhanced by explicitly introducing the export dimension. As the result, Singapore got the 1st place and Hong Kong became 2nd instead of 1st place of 2008.

Singapore's overall ranking No. 1 reflects high rankings in all four Subindexes, Border Administration, Market Access, Transport & communication infrastructure and Business Environment.

Hong Kong SAR is ranked still very high although the "Market Access" is evaluated as 20th place.

On the other hand, many European countries are ranked high position.

Switzerland places 3rd overall, then Denmark (4th), Sweden (5th), Norway(7th),Finland (8th) Austria (9th) Netherland (10th) and Germany comes 11 th.

Other than European countries, Canada comes at 6th, and USA is ranked at 16 th.

Under such a circumstances, Japan took the 23rd position in the ranking, although WEF's evaluation was 13th position last year.

According to WEF, all of Japan's highly efficient and transparent border administration (13th) and its well-developed excellent transportation and communication infrastructure(15th), which includes the world top class ICTs technology absorption(1st), contribute to this rating.

The ranking is, however, severely offset by Japan's high barriers to market access in domestic and foreign markets (115th), as reflected in the high tariffs on agricultural products (101st), the complexity of tariffs (87th) or ease of hiring foreign labor(105th)in

Business environment, as well as barriers faced when exporting (121st) among 121countries !)

In addition, Japan's costly import and export procedures and limited openness to foreign participation are not conducive to facilitating trade flows. Japan could also benefit from improving its somewhat burdensome customs procedures (43rd).

The reasons why the ranking is dropped down and the background of barriers for Japan's export are written in the following 3) WEF's Opinion & Comments.

As a reference , following is the summary of the ranking of 16 countries including BPC countries and Japan as explained in 1) above.

(note: 12 BPC countries are listed in Table-2 and hereunder, in the order of the year of BPC-agreement with us)

Japan	23rd
Hong Kong SAR	2nd
Singapore	1st
Thailand (Bangkok)	50th
Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur)	28th
Philippines (Manila)	82nd
Indonesia (Jakarta)	62nd
Korea (Seoul)	26th
China (Shanghai & Tianjin)	49th
Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City)	89th
India (Mumbai)	76th
Australia (Melbourne)	14th
New Zealand (Auckland)	11th
U S A	16th
Germany	12th
Brazil	87th
Russia	109th

Further details are to be referred to the [Table-2](#) attached hereto.

3) WEF's Opinion & Comments

<Based on indication of "Executive Summary" and E-mail from WEF>

3-1) Warning against Protectionism

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

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

Although these measures are not the main driver of the present slump in world trade, the risk of protectionism is still present.

By ranking countries according to the barriers to trade they have in place, the *Report* serves as a reminder both of the risks of protectionism demonstrated in previous downturns and of the widespread prosperity and poverty reduction associated with the expansion of international trade in the years leading up to 2008

3-2) General findings of the Enabling Trade Index

The results of the ETI show a strong correlation between a country's level of income and its ease of getting goods across borders. High-income countries on average tend to be more open to trade, have better infrastructure facilities, and boast favorable business environments and efficient border administrations.

Low-income countries, on the other hand, tend to show weaknesses particularly with respect to ICT infrastructure, along with a low transparency and efficiency of border administration and, in a number of countries, less open trade policies.

At the same time, regulatory environments and physical security are at levels comparable with the high-income group.

3-3) About Japan

As we had a question why the Overall Ranking of Japan fell down to 23rd in 2009 from 13th of 2008, we sent an E-mail to WEF and asked the reason.

WEF's answer to our question was that their evaluation on the Market Access had affected seriously, as reflected to 115th in 2009 from 4th of 2008.

According to WEF, Japan has a very complex and high tariff regime especially for agricultural products and it becomes the very big barrier (101st in the world).

And WEF says that this tariff barrier makes Japan's export difficult, as Japanese exporters face the world highest (121st) tariffs.

It seems that these points are the reasons of WEF's explanation that the Index has been enhanced by explicitly introducing the export dimension in 2009 in comparison with 2008. As the result, ranking of Market Access and, in turn Overall Index became 23rd.

Although it may be controversial matter especially for Japanese whether the WEF's assessment on Japan should be reasonable or not, we think we should receive it sincerely and seriously as WEF is one of the most authoritative and influential organizations in the world now.

4) Assessment for other countries in the world

It would be worthwhile and interesting also for us to know how WEF analyze and evaluate other countries and economies in the world which we extracted and listed up on the Table-2.

Followings are their comments included in their "Executive Summary", although WEF do not comment on all of our BPC Countries:

a) Asia and the Pacific

Singapore's positive results reflect high rankings in all four subindexes, namely Market Access, Border Administration, Transport & communication infrastructure and Business Environment. Customs procedures are assessed as the least burdensome in the world, and time and cost for both import and export are among the lowest for all countries covered. Singapore's exporters also face relatively low tariffs in target markets (13th).

However, less congested roads and improvements to the ICT infrastructure could further increase the ease of getting goods across borders in Singapore. The country's excellent regulatory environment facilitates operations of traders through openness to foreign participation, fair domestic competition, and a highly transparent and efficient government.

Hong Kong SAR's open domestic market mirrors the economy's high dependence on exports and imports.

Hong Kong does not apply tariffs on imported products, yet its exported products face more barriers than Singapore's, as reflected in tariffs faced (119th) combined with a low margin of preference in target markets (112th).

Hong Kong's strong ranking also rests on its efficient customs procedures, well-developed transport and communications infrastructure, and a regulatory environment that promotes and facilitates an open and secure business environment.

The economy's openness to foreign participation is attested to by the prevalence of foreign ownership and relative absence of capital controls (1st).

Traders could, however, further benefit from improvements to the very congested roads (89th) and more commitments to open up the transport sector under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) framework (55th).

New Zealand comes in 11th. Its highly efficient and transparent border administration contributes to this ranking, as do the country's very low tariffs for agricultural products.

Exports, however, face high barriers. The country's regulatory environment is characterized by fairly good ratings on ethics and a low level of corruption, as well as an effective domestic competition policy, though obstacles still persist in hiring foreign labor and regulation of FDI.

Upgrading the quality of infrastructure, especially roads and railroads, would be beneficial to further facilitate a smooth flow of goods both across borders and to destinations inside the country.

Australia occupies the 14th position overall. The rating reflects many aspects that the country does particularly well in facilitating the flow of goods across borders and to destination, including its strong

performances with respect to transparent border administration, the quality of transport services, and its high level of commitment in the sector under GATS, as well as its regulatory environment, which promotes intense domestic competition.

The results are, however, somewhat offset by high domestic and foreign market barriers. Australia applies very high tariffs for non-agricultural products in comparison with economies at a similar level of development, placing the country 96th on this indicator. Lowering these tariffs would further boost the country's openness to trade.

Taiwan and Korea, Rep.

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

Malaysia occupies the 28th position in the ETI rankings.

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

China ranks 49th among the countries covered.

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

Indonesia comes in at 62nd place, reflecting a pretty balanced performance on all four subindexes. The flow of goods in and out of the country benefits from the low cost of import

and export procedures, as well as a regulatory environment that is fairly open toward foreign participation, although businesses are concerned about the level of corruption at borders and the high costs incurred to fight terrorism.

Improvements in transport infrastructure and wide adoption of ICTs would tremendously help the country to better connect with its trading partners.

India occupies the 76th position. Although the country has a fairly good border

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

b) Europe and North America

Germany, the world's biggest exporter, ranks 12th overall.

The country is the world leader on the quality of transport infrastructure, in particular thanks to high levels of maritime connectivity. There exists some room for improvement in terms of customs administration, particularly an upgrading of customs services. As for the regulatory environment (12th), Germany ranks reasonably well on all the indicators, with the exception of the openness to foreign participation where it places 25th because of the difficulty of hiring foreign labor (76th).

Market access is Germany's Achilles' heel, where it ranks lower than most EU countries because of the pervasiveness of non-tariff measures.

The United States comes in at 16th position overall.

Its performance is uneven across the nine pillars of the index. The country obtains high rankings for the quality of transport infrastructure (3rd) and the associated services (14th), as well as for the availability and use of ICTs (12th). The country also owes much to the extent and availability of customs services (2nd). Also praised are the efficiency of customs administration (10th) and of import and export procedures (16th). On a less positive note, the business environment is less attractive than it could be (23rd).

Among other issues, businesses voice their concern about the level of security and indicate that the threat of terrorism and crime and violence impose significant costs. Finally, the United States ranks 49th in the market access component. Although only a small share of goods is subjected to duties and agricultural markets are less protected than in other countries, the US tariff structure is complex (89th) and US exporters face some of the highest barriers in the world (114th).

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

c) Latin America

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

Table—1 : The Enabling Trade Index 2009

Source: The Global Enabling Trade Reform Published 07 July 2009 by WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM

Country / Economy	OVERALL INDEX		SUBINDEXES							
			Market access		Border administration		Transport and communications infrastructure		Business environment	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Singapore	1	5.97	2	5.63	1	6.49	3	5.64	3	6.13
Hong Kong SAR	2	5.57	20	4.75	7	5.89	5	5.57	4	6.08
Switzerland	3	5.44	38	4.48	10	5.80	9	5.49	6	6.01
Denmark	4	5.44	86	3.81	3	6.31	8	5.50	2	6.15
Sweden	5	5.44	88	3.81	2	6.41	4	5.63	7	5.90
Canada	6	5.35	13	4.96	12	5.64	17	5.27	17	5.52
Norway	7	5.33	21	4.72	18	5.47	20	5.11	5	6.02
Finland	8	5.33	78	3.84	9	5.80	16	5.37	1	6.29
Austria	9	5.29	84	3.81	6	5.92	6	5.55	8	5.89
Netherlands	10	5.27	87	3.81	4	6.04	2	5.64	15	5.59
New Zealand	11	5.27	39	4.39	5	5.95	22	4.97	11	5.75
Germany	12	5.24	90	3.79	11	5.65	1	5.77	10	5.75
Luxembourg	13	5.12	58	4.00	24	5.19	13	5.41	9	5.89
Australia	14	5.07	97	3.72	17	5.54	14	5.39	14	5.62
Ireland	15	5.02	96	3.73	8	5.82	23	4.94	16	5.59
United States	16	5.02	49	4.16	15	5.58	10	5.48	36	4.85
France	17	5.02	89	3.81	19	5.46	7	5.54	23	5.26
United Arab Emirates	18	4.97	65	3.95	20	5.34	24	4.91	13	5.68
Chile	19	4.96	3	5.58	21	5.31	43	3.87	29	5.09
United Kingdom	20	4.93	79	3.84	14	5.62	11	5.47	39	4.81
Belgium	21	4.92	80	3.82	29	5.02	12	5.45	20	5.40
Estonia	22	4.84	71	3.91	16	5.58	27	4.64	24	5.25
Japan	23	4.78	115	3.10	13	5.63	15	5.38	31	5.02
Bahrain	24	4.76	26	4.65	25	5.17	41	4.07	27	5.14
Taiwan	25	4.75	99	3.70	27	5.15	19	5.12	30	5.03
Korea, Rep.	26	4.73	106	3.47	22	5.28	21	4.99	26	5.16
Spain	27	4.72	75	3.86	28	5.07	18	5.13	38	4.82
Malaysia	28	4.70	32	4.60	33	4.66	29	4.59	33	4.96
Israel	29	4.66	35	4.54	23	5.25	32	4.37	56	4.46
Portugal	30	4.63	63	3.96	35	4.63	26	4.74	25	5.21
Slovenia	31	4.61	82	3.82	26	5.16	31	4.55	35	4.89
Cyprus	32	4.56	74	3.88	47	4.31	28	4.60	18	5.45
Mauritius	33	4.54	10	4.99	37	4.62	55	3.55	32	5.00
Oman	34	4.52	23	4.69	49	4.23	45	3.74	19	5.43
Qatar	35	4.50	102	3.62	34	4.63	42	4.04	12	5.70
Czech Republic	36	4.39	94	3.76	30	4.92	35	4.32	50	4.58
Jordan	37	4.39	61	3.97	36	4.62	52	3.61	22	5.36
Hungary	38	4.39	81	3.82	31	4.69	34	4.34	45	4.70
Croatia	39	4.36	28	4.63	52	4.16	37	4.18	55	4.49
Lithuania	40	4.36	60	3.97	42	4.46	36	4.28	41	4.75
Tunisia	41	4.36	70	3.91	32	4.67	59	3.46	21	5.40
Saudi Arabia	42	4.36	40	4.39	38	4.61	47	3.70	42	4.73
Costa Rica	43	4.36	5	5.44	46	4.31	70	3.24	58	4.44
Latvia	44	4.33	73	3.90	39	4.60	39	4.09	43	4.72
Italy	45	4.30	66	3.94	48	4.25	25	4.75	66	4.27
Slovak Republic	46	4.30	93	3.77	40	4.52	33	4.36	51	4.56
Greece	47	4.30	59	3.98	57	3.99	30	4.58	47	4.65
Turkey	48	4.19	14	4.93	56	4.05	49	3.65	75	4.15
China	49	4.19	103	3.60	43	4.43	38	4.16	49	4.58
Thailand	50	4.18	98	3.72	41	4.48	40	4.07	59	4.44
Uruguay	51	4.18	22	4.71	53	4.15	78	3.09	40	4.76
Moldova	52	4.15	6	5.38	72	3.59	58	3.46	73	4.16
Panama	53	4.06	54	4.08	50	4.22	44	3.75	71	4.21
Romania	54	4.05	72	3.90	44	4.39	51	3.62	65	4.28
Morocco	55	4.01	51	4.09	51	4.21	65	3.36	63	4.38
El Salvador	56	4.00	1	5.64	61	3.90	91	2.90	104	3.58
Poland	57	3.98	77	3.85	45	4.37	46	3.71	80	3.99
Guatemala	58	3.97	8	5.08	55	4.07	72	3.22	109	3.50
Kuwait	59	3.96	76	3.86	78	3.52	54	3.55	34	4.90
Namibia	60	3.93	33	4.60	79	3.47	75	3.16	54	4.51
South Africa	61	3.92	92	3.78	54	4.12	50	3.62	76	4.14
Indonesia	62	3.82	53	4.07	66	3.75	79	3.04	60	4.43
Albania	63	3.82	30	4.63	60	3.91	94	2.82	83	3.91
Armenia	64	3.81	42	4.25	87	3.25	61	3.42	64	4.33
Peru	65	3.81	25	4.65	59	3.93	89	2.94	95	3.70
Honduras	66	3.80	16	4.87	82	3.42	82	3.01	84	3.91
Gambia, The	67	3.78	108	3.37	70	3.63	84	3.00	28	5.13
Macedonia, FYR	68	3.78	62	3.97	71	3.60	57	3.46	78	4.09
Malawi	69	3.77	12	4.97	97	3.06	112	2.44	48	4.60
Azerbaijan	70	3.77	52	4.07	103	2.91	62	3.40	46	4.68
Ukraine	71	3.76	24	4.68	95	3.07	60	3.43	85	3.87
Bulgaria	72	3.76	55	4.02	69	3.64	48	3.68	97	3.68
Madagascar	73	3.75	4	5.45	86	3.26	115	2.37	82	3.93
Mexico	74	3.74	43	4.25	62	3.87	74	3.20	98	3.67
Egypt	75	3.72	117	3.05	65	3.78	66	3.35	44	4.71
India	76	3.72	116	3.06	58	3.94	64	3.36	53	4.51
Nicaragua	77	3.71	15	4.91	83	3.38	105	2.54	79	4.01
Sri Lanka	78	3.70	64	3.95	67	3.75	69	3.29	90	3.82
Jamaica	79	3.70	85	3.81	73	3.59	53	3.56	89	3.83
Zambia	80	3.64	19	4.76	102	2.96	111	2.45	62	4.39
Dominican Republic	81	3.64	69	3.91	64	3.80	73	3.20	99	3.64
Philippines	82	3.62	56	4.02	68	3.72	77	3.09	100	3.63
Senegal	83	3.62	109	3.36	76	3.54	81	3.01	52	4.55
Colombia	84	3.61	48	4.16	74	3.55	76	3.13	103	3.58
Uganda	85	3.60	9	5.06	99	2.99	98	2.61	94	3.76
Ghana	86	3.60	67	3.94	80	3.45	102	2.56	57	4.44
Brazil	87	3.58	100	3.67	77	3.53	68	3.33	93	3.79
Bolivia	88	3.55	11	4.98	75	3.55	106	2.53	118	3.16
Vietnam	89	3.54	112	3.24	85	3.28	71	3.24	61	4.40
Lesotho	90	3.51	7	5.25	105	2.84	118	2.33	101	3.63
Cambodia	91	3.50	27	4.65	98	3.00	109	2.50	87	3.85
Tanzania	92	3.50	41	4.33	92	3.17	119	2.25	67	4.24
Kazakhstan	93	3.49	45	4.20	119	2.27	63	3.39	77	4.10
Mozambique	94	3.49	17	4.84	90	3.21	117	2.36	107	3.56
Ethiopia	95	3.48	91	3.79	89	3.22	96	2.71	72	4.20
Benin	96	3.47	47	4.17	101	2.97	99	2.60	74	4.16
Argentina	97	3.46	95	3.75	84	3.35	67	3.33	111	3.42
Kenya	98	3.45	34	4.59	108	2.77	93	2.88	105	3.58
Mali	99	3.44	37	4.51	111	2.64	113	2.40	68	4.23
Pakistan	100	3.43	111	3.26	63	3.85	80	3.04	102	3.58
Kyrgyz Republic	101	3.43	18	4.77	116	2.46	86	2.98	108	3.53
Bosnia and Herzegovina	102	3.42	107	3.41	81	3.44	85	2.98	86	3.87
Ecuador	103	3.41	36	4.53	107	2.80	87	2.97	112	3.36
Burkina Faso	104	3.41	46	4.20	112	2.64	101	2.58	69	4.22
Paraguay	105	3.39	31	4.62	93	3.16	103	2.56	115	3.22
Cameroon	106	3.35	83	3.82	96	3.07	104	2.55	81	3.97
Mauritania	107	3.31	44	4.24	110	2.67	110	2.47	88	3.84
Syria	108	3.30	121	2.25	91	3.17	88	2.96	37	4.83
Russian Federation	109	3.29	113	3.16	106	2.82	56	3.49	96	3.70
Nepal	110	3.22	29	4.63	113	2.58	107	2.51	117	3.17
Bangladesh	111	3.20	57	4.01	104	2.88	108	2.50	110	3.42
Algeria	112	3.18	118	2.76	88	3.24	90	2.90	92	3.81
Mongolia	113	3.17	110	3.36	109	2.71	95	2.82	91	3.81
Tajikistan	114	3.14	104	3.57	118	2.40	116	2.37	70	4.22
Guyana	115	3.13	114	3.13	94	3.14	92	2.90	113	3.34
Burundi	116	2.99	68	3.92	114	2.57	120	2.16	114	3.30
Nigeria	117	2.97	120	2.72	100	2.98	100	2.60	106	3.57
Zimbabwe	118	2.91	101	3.67	117	2.42	114	2.38	116	3.17
Venezuela	119	2.84	105	3.48	120	2.25	83	3.01	121	2.61
Cote d'Ivoire	120	2.78	119	2.74	115	2.55	97	2.70	119	3.15
Chad	121	2.77	50	4.16	121	2.00	121	1.98	120	2.96

Table – 2: The Enabling Trade Index Comparison Table (Ranking & Competitiveness)

Source: The Global Enabling Trade Report Published 07 July 2009 by WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM

INDICATOR	Japan		Hong Kong SAR	Singapore	Thailand	Malaysia	Philippines	Indonesia	Korea, Rep.	China	Vietnam	India	Australia	New Zealand	United States	Germany	Brazil	Russian Federation
	RANK/121	SCORE	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121	RANK/121
2009 INDEX (Overall)	23	4.8	2	1	50	28	82	62	26	49	89	76	14	11	16	12	87	109
MARKET ACCESS (1st pillar : Domestic and foreign)	115	3.1	20	2	98	32	56	53	106	103	112	116	97	39	49	90	100	113
1.01 Tariff barriers	40 × 3.6	1 ○	2 ○	69 ×	59 ×	46 ○	62 ×	76 ×	110 ×	115 ×	94 ×	86 ×	29 ×	30 ×	3 ○	84 ×	114 ×	
Tariff barriers for non-agricultural products	36 × 2.0	1 ○	1 ○	75 ×	64 ×	55 ×	68 ×	63 ×	113 ×	115 ×	92 ×	96 ×	31 ×	33 ×	5 ○	87 ×	109 ×	
Tariff barriers for agricultural products	101 × 24.9	1 ○	4 ○	111 ×	94 ×	57 ×	43 ○	118 ×	92 ×	115 ×	113 ×	3 ○	2 ○	8 ○	14 ×	49 ○	106 ×	
1.02 Non-tariff barriers	88 × 65.4	n/a	38 ×	40 ○	28 ×	86 ×	66 ×	n/a	35 ○	50 ○	48 ○	30 ×	37 ×	29 ×	75 ×	82 ×	44 ○	
1.03 Complexity of tariffs	87 × 3.8	1 ○	4 ○	119 ×	78 ×	64 ×	51 ×	70 ×	53 ×	60 ×	85 ×	52 ×	56 ×	89 ×	92 ×	18 ○	90 ×	
Variance of tariffs	113 × 26.5	1 ○	4 ○	97 ×	112 ×	17 ○	43 ○	116 ×	31 ○	108 ×	107 ×	8 ○	6 ○	12 ○	58 ×	37 ○	104 ×	
Domestic tariff peaks	76 × 7.4	1 ○	24 ×	119 ×	118 ×	84 ×	61 ×	60 ×	58 ×	62 ×	68 ×	66 ×	69 ×	85 ×	87 ×	1 ○	64 ×	
Specific tariffs	83 × 6.7	1 ○	39 ×	119 ×	64 ×	1 ○	50 ○	59 ×	58 ×	1 ○	84 ×	53 ×	52 ×	89 ×	90 ×	1 ○	118 ×	
Number of distinct tariffs	85 × 716	1 ○	24 ×	91 ×	67 ×	35 ○	58 ×	68 ×	64 ×	41 ○	88 ×	53 ×	28 ×	90 ×	92 ×	39 ○	119 ×	
1.04 Share of duty-free imports	15 ○ 79	1 ○	2 ○	77 ×	10 ○	67 ×	58 ×	65 ×	69 ×	98 ×	97 ×	62 ×	18 ×	20 ×	22 ×	82 ×	83 ×	
1.05 Tariffs faced	121 × 6.2	119 ×	13 ×	17 ○	30 ×	29 ○	47 ○	104 ×	57 ×	37 ○	48 ○	112 ×	115 ×	114 ×	60 ×	49 ○	43 ○	
1.06 Margin of preference in target markets	120 × 1.7	112 ×	78 ×	67 ×	74 ×	64 ×	79 ×	116 ×	118 ×	80 ×	110 ×	119 ×	115 ×	65 ×	84 ×	68 ×	50 ○	
BORDER ADMINISTRATION	13	5.6	7	1	41	33	68	66	22	43	85	58	17	5	15	11	77	106
2nd pillar : Efficiency of customs administration	11	5.5	14	1	43	44	54	75	18	45	117	51	24	8	10	21	98	74
2.01 Burden of customs procedures	43 × 4.3	3 ○	1 ○	48 ○	26 ○	95 ×	86 ×	17 ○	40 ○	83 ×	65 ×	21 ×	8 ○	37 ×	20 ×	116 ×	110 ×	
2.02 Customs services index	4 ○ 11.5	26 ×	8 ○	38 ○	60 ×	31 ○	64 ×	16 ○	53 ×	112 ×	48 ○	23 ×	13 ×	2 ○	23 ×	74 ×	55 ×	
3rd pillar : Efficiency of import-export procedures	19	5.7	3	1	11	22	48	37	13	30	49	62	32	20	16	8	67	107
3.01 Effectiveness and efficiency of clearance	11 ○ 3.8	7 ○	3 ○	32 ○	23 ○	51 ×	43 ○	27 ×	35 ○	37 ○	47 ○	17 ×	18 ×	19 ×	4 ○	67 ×	115 ×	
3.02 Time for import	22 ○ 11	2 ○	1 ○	30 ○	34 ×	40 ○	83 ×	11 ○	74 ×	67 ×	54 ×	25 ×	14 ×	2 ○	9 ○	53 ×	99 ×	
3.03 Documents for import	15 ○ 5	5 ○	5 ○	2 ○	44 ×	66 ×	30 ○	30 ×	30 ○	66 ×	85 ×	30 ×	15 ×	15 ○	15 ×	44 ○	117 ×	
3.04 Cost to import	44 × 1,047	7 ○	1 ○	20 ○	2 ○	22 ○	9 ○	17 ○	3 ○	35 ○	37 ○	60 ×	26 ×	61 ×	32 ×	65 ×	102 ×	
3.05 Time for export	23 × 10	4 ○	1 ○	33 ○	55 ×	43 ○	70 ×	13 ○	70 ×	82 ×	46 ○	18 ×	23 ×	4 ○	8 ○	33 ○	103 ×	
3.06 Documents for export	5 ○ 4	5 ○	5 ○	5 ○	67 ×	83 ×	24 ○	5 ○	67 ×	42 ○	83 ×	42 ×	67 ×	5 ○	5 ○	83 ×	83 ×	
3.07 Cost to export	49 × 989	7 ○	2 ○	7 ○	1 ○	31 ○	15 ○	27 ×	3 ○	22 ○	46 ○	70 ×	36 ×	50 ×	33 ×	74 ×	111 ×	
4th pillar : Transparency of border administration	16	5.7	12	4	67	40	115	94	33	55	99	70	8	3	21	15	65	109
4.01 Irregular payments in exports and imports	16 ○ 5.9	13 ×	2 ○	72 ×	44 ×	116 ×	88 ×	32 ×	46 ○	102 ×	77 ×	9 ○	5 ○	29 ×	17 ×	70 ×	105 ×	
4.02 Corruption Perceptions Index	17 ○ 7.3	11 ×	4 ○	62 ×	37 ×	104 ×	94 ×	32 ×	57 ×	91 ×	67 ×	8 ○	1 ○	17 ×	13 ×	62 ×	107 ×	
TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE	15	5.4	5	3	40	29	77	79	21	38	71	64	14	22	10	1	68	56
5th pillar : Availability and quality of transport infrastructure	23	4.8	11	12	33	22	92	82	29	30	108	51	17	20	3	8	93	64
5.01 Airport density	68 × 0.6	97 ×	78 ×	74 ×	24 ○	75 ×	98 ×	87 ×	113 ×	102 ×	118 ×	3 ○	5 ○	14 ○	76 ×	67 ×	50 ○	
5.02 Transshipment connectivity index	15 ○ 82.4	9 ○	12 ×	37 ○	13 ○	80 ×	26 ○	11 ○	9 ○	67 ×	20 ○	29 ×	31 ×	5 ○	3 ○	24 ○	58 ×	
5.03 Paved roads	41 × 77.7	1 ○	1 ○	21 ○	35 ×	108 ×	57 ×	43 ×	34 ○	79 ×	62 ×	67 ×	51 ×	49 ×	1 ○	116 ×	47 ○	
5.04 Road congestion	72 × 63	89 ×	86 ×	n/a	76 ×	24 ○	70 ×	84 ×	27 ○	n/a	3 ○	31 ×	52 ×	48 ×	87 ×	34 ○	65 ×	
5.05 Quality of air transport infrastructure	44 × 5.1	2 ○	1 ○	25 ○	17 ○	81 ×	68 ×	23 ○	67 ×	84 ×	61 ×	16 ×	20 ×	11 ○	3 ○	91 ×	80 ×	
5.06 Quality of railroad infrastructure	3 ○ 6.5	5 ○	10 ○	46 ○	17 ○	81 ×	56 ×	7 ○	28 ○	64 ×	21 ○	26 ×	42 ×	16 ×	4 ○	82 ×	32 ○	
5.07 Quality of roads	19 ○ 5.6	5 ○	3 ○	30 ○	17 ○	84 ×	95 ×	13 ○	46 ○	92 ×	77 ×	29 ×	45 ×	8 ○	4 ○	100 ×	94 ×	
5.08 Quality of port infrastructure	23 × 5.2	2 ○	1 ○	43 ○	15 ○	90 ×	94 ×	25 ○	49 ×	100 ×	83 ×	36 ×	21 ×	10 ○	4 ○	111 ×	68 ×	
6th pillar : Availability and quality of transport services	4	5.8	6	1	27	16	47	54	23	19	36	46	9	31	14	3	56	68
6.01 Liner Shipping Connectivity Index	12 ○ 66.6	2 ○	3 ○	22 ○	9 ○	31 ○	38 ○	10 ○	1 ○	47 ○	20 ○	21 ×	43 ×	6 ○	4 ○	27 ○	60 ×	
6.02 Ease and affordability of shipment	9 ○ 3.8	7 ○	2 ○	31 ○	25 ○	64 ×	44 ○	24 ○	27 ○	45 ○	39 ○	12 ○	9 ○	20 ×	4 ○	73 ×	86 ×	
6.03 Competence of the logistics industry	5 ○ 4.1	9 ○	2 ○	29 ○	26 ○	65 ×	49 ○	21 ○	26 ○	54 ×	31 ○	18 ×	16 ×	12 ○	2 ○	47 ○	76 ×	
6.04 Ability and ease of tracking	7 ○ 4.1	8 ○	1 ○	36 ○	28 ×	65 ×	33 ○	25 ○	31 ○	51 ×	42 ○	12 ○	19 ×	10 ○	5 ○	62 ×	106 ×	
6.05 Timeliness of shipments in reaching destination	6 ○ 4.3	7 ○	1 ○	28 ○	26 ○	67 ×	57 ×	29 ×	36 ○	64 ×	46 ○	20 ×	22 ×	18 ×	7 ○	68 ×	79 ×	
6.06 Postal service efficiency	2 ○ 6.7	4 ○	7 ○	46 ○	56 ×	111 ×	102 ×	21 ○	40 ○	49 ○	50 ○	14 ×	11 ×	6 ○	12 ×	25 ○	41 ○	
6.07 GATS commitments in the transport sector	8 ○ 52.1	55 ×	41 ×	17 ○	42 ×	5 ○	52 ×	68 ×	54 ×	10 ○	68 ×	4 ○	68 ×	68 ×	20 ×	66 ×	n/a	
7th pillar : Availability and use of ICTs	21	5.5	6	11	59	43	86	91	14	60	66	93	17	20	12	3	54	50
7.01 Firm-level technology absorption	1 ○ 6.3	15 ×	12 ×	56 ×	20 ○	45 ○	60 ×	14 ○	43 ○	49 ○	24 ○	16 ×	22 ×	2 ○	11 ○	40 ○	96 ×	
7.02 Mobile telephone subscribers	55 × 83.9	4 ○	8 ○	14 ○	52 ×	76 ×	91 ×	47 ×	84 ×	101 ×	109 ×	38 ×	40 ×	57 ×	18 ×	70 ×	24 ○	
7.03 Broadband internet subscribers	17 ○ 22.1	10 ○	22 ×	69 ×	52 ×	78 ×	88 ×	7 ○	46 ○	67 ×	85 ×	16 ×	21 ×	14 ○	15 ×	53 ×	57 ×	
7.04 Internet users	15 ○ 68.9	26 ×	16 ×	63 ×	23 ○	94 ×	98 ×	8 ○	72 ×	65 ×	91 ×	14 ×	13 ×	10 ○	11 ○	40 ○	62 ×	
7.05 Telephone lines	28 × 40.0	5 ○	24 ×	74 ×	63 ×	91 ×	84 ×	15 ○	44 ○	32 ○	94 ×	14 ×	25 ×	10 ○	2 ○	56 ×	36 ○	
BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT	31	5.0	4	3	59	33	100	60	26	49	61	53	14	11	36	10	93	96
8th pillar : Regulatory environment	26	4.8	6	1	48	25	98	55	27	45	64	46	11	9	23	12	95	109
8.01 Property rights	13 ○ 6.1	16 ×	4 ○	57 ×	34 ×	86 ×	99 ×	31 ×	49 ×	72 ×	51 ×	8 ○	15 ×	20 ×	6 ○	63 ×	107 ×	
8.02 Ethics and corruption	33 × 4.0	11 ×	1 ○	55 ×	25 ○	107 ×	51 ×	21 ○	45 ○	50 ○	62 ×	12 ○	7 ○	28 ×	16 ×	108 ×	95 ×	
8.03 Undue influence	18 ○ 5.0	12 ×	9 ○	46 ○	36 ×	93 ×	53 ×	28 ×	52 ×	60 ×	43 ○	8 ○	5 ○	30 ×	7 ○	55 ×	91 ×	
8.04 Government inefficiency	25 × 4.4	2 ○	1 ○	40 ○	12 ○	99 ×	54 ×	32 ×	37 ○	68 ×	50 ○	16 ×	23 ×	33 ×	20 ×	111 ×	103 ×	
8.05 Domestic competition	29 × 4.9	6 ○	1 ○	47 ○	20 ○	101 ×	40 ○	28 ×	49 ×	58 ×	41 ○	3 ○	7 ○	8 ○	13 ×	105 ×	89 ×	
8.06 Openness to foreign participation	80 × 4.6	2 ○	1 ○	87 ×	52 ×	92 ×	20 ○	46 ×	88 ×	68 ×	69 ×	45 ×	24 ×	32 ×	25 ×	90 ×	119 ×	
Ease of hiring foreign labor	105 × 4.0	22 ×	4 ○	91 ×	47 ×	106 ×	28 ○	52 ×	42 ○	54 ×	98 ×	79 ×	55 ×	44 ×	76 ×	58 ×	116 ×	
Prevalence of foreign ownership	92 × 4.5	1 ○	3 ○	82 ×	60 ×	91 ×	24 ○	48 ×	97 ×	96 ×	62 ×	35 ×	22 ×	44 ×	29 ×	73 ×	115 ×	
Business impact of rules on FDI																		