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Abstract

This paper aims to present a new index, the Political Will-ACT Index. The proposed index provides a measure for the readiness of low & middle income countries to cross development greyline. A line if a country cross mange to cross, it achieves sustainable development. The concept of Political Will-ACT merges political will with three other dimensions: ability, commitment, and tolerance.

The paper concludes that for countries to achieve sustainable economic development, they have to fulfill four conditions: (1) Their political leaders should have clear vision for achieving sustainable development. (2) Their governments must be committed to their reform agendas & programs. (3) The ability of the government to mobilize enough resources needed for implementing reform agendas. (4) Countries must tolerate the economic agents during executing reform programs & policies.
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1. Introduction

Economists and activists usually blame political will for the low level of development in developing countries. However, measuring political will is not an easy task and it only can be measured indirectly, Brinderhoff (2000). Many studies have shown the importance of political will and effective governance in achieving economic growth. Brinkerhoff (2000) argues that effective and democratic governance have strong impacts on sectorial reforms which is a very important aspect in economic development and prosperity for developing countries. I argue that even though political will is a prerequisite for achieving sustainable economic development, it is not an enough condition. The ability of any country to cross development greyline depends largely on, what I call, Political Will-ACT. This concept merges political will with three other dimensions: ability, commitment, and tolerance. According to this concept, political will is a prerequisite for crossing the development greyline of any country. Why this is the case? This is because development process is led by politics and mostly affected by it. The first step in development process for countries is the existence of the political will of their leaders and their influential institutions to achieve sustainable economic development. This political will must be transferred into actions. However, taking actions depends on the ability of political leaders to mobilize resources to fulfill the conditions needed for these actions to take place. Moreover, these actions are expected to have impacts on some economic agents. Thus, some groups may resist them which means that political leaders must find ways to pass their development policies & agendas through responding to these negatively affected groups. In this regards, awareness raising of the public regarding on the potential gains from reforms agendas is a core element for the continuity of development process. It also requires a great level of commitment from political leaders and their governments to go through development process in order to be successful in crossing development greyline.

From the above discussion, I argue that political will, by itself, is not enough to cross development greyline in any country. It must be accompanied with three other factors. Firstly, the ability of the government to implement reform agendas and the proposed economic transformation’s plans. Secondly, the existence of the commitment of political leaders to go through the development process and to take needed actions. Thirdly, using a tolerance approach in dealing with economic agents to overcome difficulties and challenges that may rise during transformation process.

This paper aims to present a new index, I call it Political Will-ACT Index. This index measures the level political will, ability, commitment and tolerance in low & middle income countries. Thus, Political Will-ACT Index provides a
measurment for the readiness of low & middle income countries to cross development gryline.

2. Literature Review

One of the most important frameworks designed to understand political will is the framework developed by Brinkerhoff (2000). According to this framework, political will incorporates individual actors, organizations, socio-economic & governance systems, and policies. Based on this study, we conclude that there are five main characteristics of political will in achieving economic development: (1) Reformers themselves have to believe in the importance of achieving economic sustainable development by implementing ambitious reform agendas. (2) Reformers should be able to use deep analysis in designing and implementing economic reform programs. (3) Reformers must have strong will and ability to mobilize resources needed to achieve sustainable economic development. (4) Reformers should be crediable in implementing reform policies. (5) Reformers must take the necessary steps to grantee the continuity of reform agendas, programs and policies.

Lassa J.A, et al. (2019) constructed the index of political will and/or commitments on disaster risk reduction (DRRPW Index) for 190 countries. The study uses five variables to construct this index which are: commitment to understand risk, governability of disaster risk, commitment to invest in DRR, administrative commitment to disaster preparedness, and early warning system. The constructed index has values between 0 and 1. The higher the value of DRRPW Index is, the higher is the political will of governments to reduce disaster risk. DRRPW Index emphasizes the importance of: (1) understanding the pay offs of disaster risk reduction. (2) government commitment for this issue. (3) mobilization of the resources needed to deal with disaster risk.

Hammergren (1998) emphasizes the importance of political will as a core element in Demand-Side Model of Reform. The study applies this model on the judicial reform programs in Latin America financed via USAID. The study concludes that political will is the driving force for Demand-Side Model of Reform. It also emphasizes that the necessary political will needed for reform may exist only in the attitude of few political leaders and being adobted by few influuncial political institutions. The study introduces a guide to design and exctue reform programs. The proposed guide emphasizes the following aspects of reforms. (1) The existence of clear vision & objectives for reform programs and the ability to mobilize resources to exute these programs. (2) The assessment of risks and pay offs of reform programs. (3) Reform programs are usually implemented through political process. Thus, governments need to tolerate the groups who get effected negatively by these reform programs. (4) Community participation is a key element for the success of reform programs. (5) Continuous monitoring and evaluation for reform programs is a very important aspect in order to deal with any complicolations and negative impacts of these programs. (6) Never let public dissatisfaction leading reform programs. However, information dissemination regarding the claimed successful outcomes of the reform programs is very important for mobilizing public support for these programs.

Radu (2015) analyzes the link between economic and political factors and its impact on economic growth in the CEE countries. The study concludes that both political stability and political certainty have a positive impact on economic growth in the CEE countries. Feng (2003) examines the impact of political institutions on economic performance. The study concludes that political institutions as represented by democracy and governance are very important factors in economic performance. Gourevitch (2008) presents the views that emphasize the impact of politics and political institutions on economic growth. The paper concludes that the political economy of development is a very important aspect in the development process.

3. Data

To collect data needed for the calculation of Political Will- ACT Index, the author depends mainly on: UNDP database, World Bank database, Sustainable Development Goals Report 2021 and Doing Business Report 2020. Finally, Even though the number of countries classified by OECD as low & middle income countries is 135, the author claculated Political Will- ACT Index for only 100 countries because of data limitation.

4. The Methodology of Constructing Political Will-ACT Index

To construct Political Will-ACT Index, the author followed five steps.

**Step (1): Identifying the dimensions of the Political Will-ACT Index.**

Political Will-ACT Index consists of four dimensions. **The first dimension** is Political Will, which measures to what extent the political leadership and government of a country have a clear vision for achieving sustainable development and crossing development greyline. **The second dimension** measures the ability (A) of a state to achieve its sustainable development agenda to be a developed country. This dimension includes institutional ability, financial ability, human capital, and private sector maturity. **The third dimension** measures the commitment (C) of the political leadership and the government of a specific country to implement its sustainable development agenda. **The fourth dimension** measures to what extent the leadership and the government of a country is successful in tolerating (T) the political, social and
economic impacts of its reform agenda. This dimension emphasizes change management smoothness and the claimed successful outcomes of reform programs.

Step (2): Identifying the appropriate indicators for the four dimensions of the Political Will-ACT Index.

To measure the four dimensions for the Political Will-ACT Index, the author selected sets of indicators to be proxies for these dimensions. Table (1) in the appendix shows all indicators included in the calculation of the Political Will-ACT Index and the source of data for each of these indicators.

Step (3): Transferring all indicators into indices between 0 and 1.

By taking a look into the dimensions of Political Will-ACT Index, we notice that indicators expressed in different units. Thus, it is very important to standardize these indicators by transforming them into indices between 0 and 1. The author used the following equation to make the required transformation of the indicators.

\[ \text{Indicator index} = \frac{(Actual \ Value - Minimum \ Value)}{(Maximum \ Value - Minimum \ Value)}. \]

Step (4): Creating the dimensions’ indices.

To create the four dimensions’ indices included in the Political Will-ACT Index, the author used the geometric mean for all indicators included in every dimension using the following equation.

\[ Dimension \ Index = (Indicator_1 \times Indicator_2 \times \ldots \times Indicator_n)^{1/n}. \]

Step (5): Calculating the Political Will-ACT Index.

To form the Political Will-ACT Index, the author aggregated the four dimension’s indices using the geometric mean for them as stated in the following equation:

\[ Political \ Will - ACT \ Index = \left( \frac{Political \ Will \ Index \times A \ Index \times C \ Index \times T \ Index}{4} \right)^{1/4}. \]

Finally, the author classifies the performance of countries in Political Will-ACT Index into four categories. The first category is the very high performance countries in which their performance in the Political Will Index exceeds the mean by one standard deviation or more. The second category is the high performance countries in which their performance is higher than the mean by less than one standard deviation. The third category is the low performance countries in which their performance in Political Will Index is less than the mean by less than one standard deviation. The fourth category is the Very low performance countries in which their performance is less than the mean by one standard deviation or more.

5. Dimension Indices

5.1 Political Will Index

Over the history, experiences have shown that the major factor for development is the political leaders who have strong will to develop their countries. Without strong political will to achieve sustainable development, this dream never comes true. Political will for achieving sustainable development is the driving force for all economic, social and political reform agendas. Thus, the dimension of political will is a very important aspect to be considered in the process of constructing the Political Will-ACT Index. Political will dimension includes two variables. The first variable measures to what extent political leaders have a clear vision for achieving sustainable development. To set a value for this variable, the author depends on Sustainable Development Goals Index (SDG) that evaluates each country’s overall performance on the 17 SDGs. The author argues that the countries’ performance on SDG Index reflects the vision of their leadership in achieving sustainable development. The second variable is adopting an ambitious reform agendas. To evaluate the existence, the quality, and the implementation of an economic reform program in a specific country, the author depends on various IMF reports to assess the following aspects of economic reform programs: Fiscal policy, monetary policy, foreign exchange policy, financial market stability, business environment, tax reform, social protection, job creations, foreign trade, anti-corruption, labor market, education, and judicial reform.

To evaluate the performance of countries in the Political Will Index, the author calculated the following statistics for the sample’s countries.

| Statistics | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|------------|---------|---------|------|-------------------|
| Value      | 0.012   | 0.954   | 0.576| 0.233             |

Based on the above statistics, countries are classified in terms of their performance in Political Will Index into four categories: very high performers, high performers, low performers, and very low performers. Figure (1) shows that the number of countries classified to be very high performers in Political Will Index is 20 countries. Belarus, Thailand, Bulgaria, Vietnam, and Serbia are the highest performers, respectively.
Figure (2) shows that 36 countries classified to be high performers which make the number of countries classified as very high & high performers in Political Will Index is 56 countries. The number illustrates the positive impact of international organization such as the UN and IMF in encouraging political leaders in the low & middle income countries to achieve sustainable development.

Figure (3) shows that the number of countries classified as low performers in the political Will Index is 26 countries.
Figure (4) shows that the number of countries classified as very low performers in the political Will Index is 18 countries. Which means that there are 44 countries classified as low & very low performers. The lowest performers are: Central Africa, Yemen, South Sudan, Afghanistan, and Chad, respectively. All these countries suffer from security threats, political instability, and social unrest. Thus, it is clear that when political leaders face security threats, political instability, and social unrest their priority will be dealing with such issues not to develop reform agendas for achieving sustainable development.

![Figure 4. Political Will Index for very low performance countries](image)

5.2 Ability Index

Ability Index consists of four variables. The first variable is institutional ability. Many theoretical and empirical studies have shown the importance of high quality institutions for sustainable development to take place in any country. To assess institutional ability three indicators are used. (1) Government effectiveness which captures the quality of policies’ formation & implementation as well the quality of services provided by governments. (2) Corruption control which captures to what extent power is exercised by government’s officials and the state elites to gain private benefits and achieve private goals. (3) Regulatory quality which captures to what extent governments are able to put in place sets of regulations that promote private sector and enhance business environment. The second variable is financial ability. Development requires financial resources to finance the activities and projects included in sustainable development plans. These resources may come from government and / or private sector. Also, it may come from domestic and / or foreign partners. For data availability reasons, the author uses foreign direct investment net inflows as a percentage of GDP as an indicator to capture the financial ability for countries to achieve sustainable development. Many empirical studies have shown the importance of FDI on economic growth through being a source of closing the financial gaps in development agendas. Moreover, the importance of FDI is not limited to being a source of finance. FDI is proven to be a good channel through which countries transfer knowledge and technology. The third variable is human capital ability. Both theoretical and empirical studies have shown the importance of stock of human capital in development process. To assess the level of human capital ability, human development index is used as a proxy. The fourth variable is the private sector maturity. The author argues that to what extent countries are able to cross development greyline depends largely on the maturity of their private sector. A mature private sector leads to a high level of investment, creativity and innovation. Moreover, private sector is keen to maximize profits which means achieving the optimum use of available resources which can be considered as a core element in development.

To evaluate the performance of countries in the Ability Index, the author calculated the following statistics for the sample’s countries.

| Statistics  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| Value       | 0.001   | 0.695   | 0.395 | 0.138              |

Based on the above statistics, countries are classified in term of their performance in Ability Index into four categories: very high performers, high performers, low performers, and very low performers. The following figures shows these categories.
Figure (5) shows that the number of countries classified to be very high performers in the Ability Index is 15 countries. The best performers are: Georgia, Malaysia, Fuji, South Africa, and Costa Rica, respectively.

Figure 5. Ability Index for very high performance countries

Figure (6) shows that the number of countries classified as high performers in the Ability Index is 35 countries. This means that 50 countries out of the 100 country in the sample have very high & high performance in the Ability Index. However, we notice that the highest performer only achieve 0.7 points on the Ability Index which means that developing countries face great challenges in terms of: the available sources of finance, weak institutions, low stock of human capital, and immature private sector.

Figure 6. Ability Index for high performance countries

Figure (7) shows that the number of countries classified as low performers in the Ability Index is 35 countries.

Figure 7. Ability Index for low performance countries
Figure (8) shows that the number of countries classified as very low performers in the Ability Index is 15 countries. This means that out of 100 countries in the sample, 50 countries of them have low & very low performance in the Ability Index. The lowest performers are: South Sudan, Mauritania, Yemen, Afghanistan, and Congo Dem., respectively. All of these countries are rich in terms of natural resources. However, they have not been able to maximize the benefit of their resources because of many political, security, and social reasons.

![Figure 8. Ability Index for very low performance countries](image)

5.3 Commitment Index

The majority of the low & middle income countries have reform agendas regardless who plays the role of being a catalyst for such agendas. From the author point of view, it does not make a substantial difference if it is a domestic catalyst or an international catalyst such IMF and World Bank in the case in which the international catalyst is able to build a high level of ownership by domestic officials for the reform agendas. The previous section discusses the countries’ ability in achieving reform agendas. This section emphasizes the importance of commitment to reform agendas & programs in the development process. Two indicators are used to assess countries’ commitment to reform agendas & programs. (1) Political stability which captures the potential level of violence and terrorism. Also, it shows the possibility of a sudden regime change. Political stability is an important element for implementing as well as continuity of reform agendas. (2) Ease of doing business which captures to what extent governments are committed to provide a friendly business environment. Without relaxing the procedures needed for establishing & running businesses, it is difficult for countries to encourage private sector to play its role as a partner in achieving sustainable development.

To evaluate the performance of countries in the Commitment Index, the author calculated the following statistics for the sample’s countries.

Table 3. Commitment Index’s Statistics

| Statistics | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|------------|---------|---------|------|--------------------|
| Value      | 0.001   | 0.845   | 0.539| 0.194              |

Based on the above statistics, countries are classified in terms of their performance in Commitment Index into four categories: very high performers, high performers, low performers, and very low performers. The following figures show these categories.

Figure (9) shows that the number of countries classified as very high performers in Commitment Index is 17 countries. The highest performers are: Malaysia, Bulgaria, Bhutan, Botswana, and Belarus.
Figure 9. Commitment index for very high performance countries

Figure (10) shows that the number of countries classified as high performers in Commitment Index is 43 countries. This means that out of the 100 country in the sample, 60 countries have high & very high performance in Commitment Index. We conclude from this number that officials in many of low & middle income countries are committed to their reform agendas even if these agendas are not ambitious enough. I argue that the reason behind that is the role of the international organizations such as IMF and the World Bank in monitoring economic reform programs in developing countries.

Figure 10. Commitment index for high performance countries

Figure (11) shows that number of countries classified as low performance in Commitment Index is 23 countries.

Figure 11. Commitment index for low performance countries
Figure (12) shows that the number of countries classified as very low performers in Commitment Index is 17 countries. This means that 40 countries out of the 100 countries included in the sample have low & very low performance in Commitment Index. The lowest performers are: Yemen, South Sudan, Afghanistan, Central Africa, and Iraq, respectively. We conclude from this analysis that when political leaders face security, political instability, and social segregation, it is very difficult for them to have a sense of commitment for reform programs they developed by themselves or / and international organizations.

Figure 12. Commitment index for very low performance countries

5.4 Tolerance Index

Development process leads to deep social, economic and political changes. Many agents get affected negatively during this process. Thus, relating the negative impacts and the groups who get affected negatively because of the development process is very important element for the implementation of the development agendas & reforms. To assess the degree of tolerance, the author uses two variables. The first variable is the change management smoothness. The degree of change management smoothness depends on three factors measured by three indicators. (1) Gini Coefficient which captures the level of income inequality in a society. The higher Gini Coefficient is, the more complicated procedures are needed in order to implement reform agendas. Countries that suffer from deep income inequality are most likely to face greater challenges during the implementation of their reform agendas. (2) Rule of law which captures the respect for the laws and the degree of property right protection, contract enforcement, and the quality of police and judicial systems. Countries that have a high degree of rule of law are likely to have smoother management change than those who have low degree of rule of law. (3) Voice and accountability which captures the ability of citizens to participate in selecting their governments. It also captures the degree of political & speech freedom. The higher the voice and accountability is, the more participation from citizens in forming reform agendas. Citizens participation in forming, implementing and monitoring reform policies leads to an increase in the level of their ownership of these policies. As citizens’ ownership of reform policies increases, the implementation and continuity of reform agendas & programs are most likely to be smoother. The second variable is the claimed successful outcomes. The author argues that when reform programs pay off and lead to a substantial improvement in economic performance, citizens are more likely to accept the reform agendas & programs. To assess the degree of reform agendas’ successful outcomes, three indicators are used. (1) The average of GDP per capita growth rate during the period of 2015-2019, just before COVID19 hit the global economy. A five-year average economic growth is used to capture its trend and to smooth out fluctuations during this period. (2) The average of inflation rate during the period of 2015–2019. (3) The average of unemployment rate during the period of 2015 – 2019. As these three indicators improve, citizens are more likely to support reform agendas. Economic growth, inflation and unemployment affect directly the real income per capita which has a great impact on the standards of living and poverty level in countries.

To evaluate the performance of countries in the Tolerance Index, the author calculated the following statistics for the sample’s countries.

Table 4. Commitment Index’s Statistics

| Statistics   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| Value        | 0.001   | 0.832   | 0.611 | 0.150              |
Based on the above statistics, countries are classified in terms of their performance in Tolerance Index into four categories: very high performers, high performers, low performers, and very low performers. The following figures show these categories.

Figure (13) shows that there are 10 countries classified as very high performers in Tolerance Index. The highest performers are: Bhutan, Vanuatu, India, Malaysia, and Moldova.

Figure (14) shows that there are 50 countries classified as high performers in Tolerance Index. This makes the number of countries classified as very high & high performers 60 countries. We conclude from this analysis that low & middle income countries give a substantial attention toward political and social aspects of reform agendas. The history has shown us that many reform agendas were dismissed because governments were not able to tolerate the economic and social impacts of these reforms.

Figure (15) shows that there are 28 countries classified as low performers in Tolerance Index.
Figure (16) shows that there are 12 countries classified as very low performers in terms of Tolerance Index. The lowest performers are: South Sudan, Yemen, South Africa, Sudan, and Eswatni, respectively. We conclude that as income inequality increases and social segregation becomes an issue, officials face serious challenges in tolerating the negative social & economic impact of reform agendas.

Figure 16. Tolerance Index for very low performance countries

6. Political Will-ACT Index
To evaluate the performance of countries in the Political Will-ACT Index, the author calculated the following statistics for the sample’s countries.

Table 5. Political Will-ACT Index’s Statistics

| Statistics | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|------------|---------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| Value      | 0.001   | 0.845   | 0.539 | 0.194              |

The author classified the performance of countries in Political Will-ACT Index into four categories as mentioned above. Figure(17) shows that there are 13 countries classified as very high performers in the Political Will-ACT Index. The highest performers are: Malaysia, Bulgaria Georgia, Costa Rica, and Thailand, respectively.
Figure (18) shows that there are 43 countries classified as high performers in the Political Will-ACT Index. This makes the number of countries classified as high & very high performers is 61 countries. This means that a substantial number of low & middle income countries have the political will and the ability to design and implement reform agendas. Moreover, it illustrates that developing countries are committed to implement their reform agendas and they are considering tolerance approaches during executing reform programs.

Figure (19) shows that there are 31 countries classified as low performers in terms of the Political Will-ACT Index.
Figure (20) shows that there are 13 countries classified as very low performers in terms of the Political Will-ACT Index. The lowest performers are: South Sudan, Yemen, Central Africa, Afghanistan, and Mauritania, respectively. We conclude that when countries suffer from security, political instability, and social segregation challenges the priority of their leaders move from development toward facing these challenges. Thus, there will not be a high level of political will neither commitment from the side of political leaders and influential institutions to design and implement reform programs. This means that developing countries should solve political instability, security problems, and social segregation complications before starting implementing ambitious reform agendas that lead them to cross development greyling.

![Figure 20. Political Will-ACT Index for very low performance countries](image)

7. Conclusion and Policy Implication

This section presents the calculated the Political Will-ACT Index and its four dimension indices: Political Will, Ability, Commitment and Tolerance. Figure (21) emphasizes the importance of political dimensions through the development process. As this figure shows, eight countries out of the ten highest performance countries in the Political Will-ACT Index, their high performance is derived by political will, commitment and tolerance dimensions. Thus, we conclude that countries whose political leaders have a clear vision for achieving sustainable development and their governments are committed to implement ambitious reform programs, they are the closest to cross development greyline. Beside having a clear vision and ambitious reform programs, countries must improve their business environment and stabilize their political system. Moreover, adopting an inclusive growth model accompanied with community participation and strong rule of law enhances the ability of governments in tolerating the social and economic impacts of reform programs. Finally, government must show some success in term of macroeconomic indicators in order to be able to continue in implementing their economic reform agendas.

![Figure 21. The highest performance countries in Political - Will-ACT Index](image)
Figure (22) illustrates that for the lowest performance countries, the priority of their leaders and influential institutions should be: reforming institutions, improving business environment, reforming education & health systems, achieving political stability, dealing with social segregation, and solving security problems.

Based on figures (21) and (22), we conclude that for low & middle income countries to cross development greyline, they must have political leaders who have clear agendas for developing their countries. Moreover, governments of these countries have to be committed to these reform agendas. This study emphasizes the importance of enhancing government effectiveness, fighting corruption, upgrading regulatory systems, enhancing the rule of law, encouraging community participation, improving business environment, achieving political stability, and spreading out the benefits of development to reach all society’s members. These are the conditions that low & middle income countries need to fulfill in order to be able to cross development greyline.
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| MOROCCO            | 23   | 0.763                | BANGLADESH         | 73   | 0.452                |
| ALBANIA            | 24   | 0.761                | MALAWI             | 74   | 0.450                |
| EL SALVADOR        | 25   | 0.761                | MALI               | 75   | 0.429                |
| CABO VERDE         | 26   | 0.741                | NIGERIA            | 76   | 0.401                |
| MEXICO             | 27   | 0.723                | ANGOLA             | 77   | 0.394                |
| MOLDOVA            | 28   | 0.722                | MADAGASCAR         | 78   | 0.372                |
| ALGERIA            | 29   | 0.718                | LESOTHO            | 79   | 0.372                |
| MALDIVES           | 30   | 0.717                | TANZANIA           | 80   | 0.366                |
| NEPAL              | 31   | 0.714                | DJIBOUTI           | 81   | 0.362                |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | 32   | 0.709                | BURKINA FASO       | 82   | 0.359                |
| INDIA              | 33   | 0.705                | MOZAMBIQUE         | 83   | 0.350                |
| SURINAME           | 34   | 0.697                | NIGER              | 84   | 0.347                |
| MONTENEGRO         | 35   | 0.688                | ZAMBIA             | 85   | 0.334                |
| PHILIPPINES        | 36   | 0.688                | ESWATINI           | 86   | 0.325                |
| BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA | 37   | 0.676                | SIERRA LEONE       | 87   | 0.314                |
| GAMBIA, THE        | 38   | 0.675                | ETHIOPIA           | 88   | 0.309                |
| SRI LANKA          | 39   | 0.671                | CONGO, REP.        | 89   | 0.294                |
| CAMBODIA           | 40   | 0.667                | BENIN              | 90   | 0.277                |
| MYANMAR            | 41   | 0.665                | SUDAN              | 91   | 0.265                |
| GHANA              | 42   | 0.661                | CONGO, DEM. REP.   | 92   | 0.211                |
| KYRGYZ REPUBLIC    | 43   | 0.659                | LIBERIA            | 93   | 0.151                |
| GABON              | 44   | 0.659                | BURUNDI            | 94   | 0.122                |
| BOTSWANA           | 45   | 0.646                | HAITI              | 95   | 0.120                |
| VANUATU            | 46   | 0.640                | CHAD               | 96   | 0.093                |
| INDONESIA          | 47   | 0.635                | AFGHANISTAN        | 97   | 0.062                |
| FIJI               | 48   | 0.633                | SOUTH SUDAN        | 98   | 0.061                |
| HONDURAS           | 49   | 0.630                | YEMEN, REP.        | 99   | 0.060                |
| IRAN, ISLAMIC REP. | 50   | 0.621                | CENTRAL AFRICAN REP.| 100  | 0.012                |
| Country         | Rank | Ability Index | Country         | Rank | Ability Index |
|-----------------|------|---------------|-----------------|------|---------------|
| GEORGIA         | 1    | 0.695         | KENYA           | 51   | 0.393         |
| MALAYSIA        | 2    | 0.693         | GUATEMALA       | 52   | 0.387         |
| FIJI            | 3    | 0.630         | GHANA           | 53   | 0.387         |
| SOUTH AFRICA    | 4    | 0.623         | SURINAME        | 54   | 0.382         |
| COSTA RICA      | 5    | 0.614         | LESOTHO         | 55   | 0.382         |
| THAILAND        | 6    | 0.605         | BURKINA FASO    | 56   | 0.377         |
| VIETNAM         | 7    | 0.587         | EGYPT, ARAB REP. | 57   | 0.371         |
| CABO VERDE      | 8    | 0.576         | KYRGYZ REPUBLIC | 58   | 0.367         |
| MONTENEGRO      | 9    | 0.572         | COTE D’IVOIRE   | 59   | 0.364         |
| BHUTAN          | 10   | 0.570         | ESWATINI        | 60   | 0.363         |
| BULGARIA        | 11   | 0.553         | BENIN           | 61   | 0.363         |
| JORDAN          | 12   | 0.550         | IRAN, ISLAMIC REP. | 62   | 0.362         |
| MONGOLIA        | 13   | 0.547         | BANGLADESH      | 63   | 0.359         |
| COLOMBIA        | 14   | 0.540         | MOZAMBIQUE      | 64   | 0.356         |
| TUNISIA         | 15   | 0.536         | NICARAGUA       | 65   | 0.355         |
| JAMAICA         | 16   | 0.532         | UZBEKISTAN      | 66   | 0.354         |
| ARMENIA         | 17   | 0.532         | TOGO            | 67   | 0.352         |
| BOTSWANA        | 18   | 0.528         | MYANMAR         | 68   | 0.342         |
| TURKEY          | 19   | 0.528         | ALGERIA         | 69   | 0.341         |
| MOROCCO         | 20   | 0.526         | DJIBOUTI        | 70   | 0.335         |
| NAMIBIA         | 21   | 0.524         | ZAMBIA          | 71   | 0.334         |
| SERBIA          | 22   | 0.519         | ETHIOPIA        | 72   | 0.332         |
| BRAZIL          | 23   | 0.514         | MALI            | 73   | 0.331         |
| PERU            | 24   | 0.513         | PAKISTAN        | 74   | 0.320         |
| ALBANIA         | 25   | 0.495         | GABON           | 75   | 0.315         |
| MALDIVES        | 26   | 0.494         | TANZANIA        | 76   | 0.313         |
| INDIA           | 27   | 0.488         | UGANDA          | 77   | 0.303         |
| SRI LANKA       | 28   | 0.483         | NIGER           | 78   | 0.299         |
| PHILIPPINES     | 29   | 0.479         | MADAGASCAR      | 79   | 0.284         |
| EL SALVADOR     | 30   | 0.471         | CAMEROON        | 80   | 0.282         |
| INDONESIA       | 31   | 0.468         | MALAWI          | 81   | 0.280         |
| VANUATU         | 32   | 0.466         | LIBERIA         | 82   | 0.279         |
| BOSNIA AND HERSZEGOVINA | 33 | 0.463 | GAMBIA, THE | 83 | 0.278 |
| CAMBODIA        | 34   | 0.459         | SIERRA LEONE    | 84   | 0.260         |
| RWANDA          | 35   | 0.456         | CONGO, REP.     | 85   | 0.259         |
| KAZAKHSTAN      | 36   | 0.452         | NIGERIA         | 86   | 0.254         |
| LEBANON         | 37   | 0.452         | TAJIKISTAN      | 87   | 0.250         |
| SENEGAL         | 38   | 0.448         | ANGOLA          | 88   | 0.248         |
| MEXICO          | 39   | 0.443         | BURUNDI         | 89   | 0.232         |
| BELARUS         | 40   | 0.442         | IRAQ            | 90   | 0.210         |
| HONDURAS        | 41   | 0.439         | CHAD            | 91   | 0.196         |
| PARAGUAY        | 42   | 0.428         | ZIMBABWE        | 92   | 0.196         |
| UKRAINE         | 43   | 0.425         | CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC | 93 | 0.194 |
| MOLDOVA         | 44   | 0.422         | HAITI           | 94   | 0.180         |
| ECUADOR         | 45   | 0.417         | SUDAN           | 95   | 0.173         |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | 46 | 0.417 | CONGO, DEM, REP. | 96 | 0.151 |
| NEPAL           | 47   | 0.414         | AFGHANISTAN     | 97   | 0.142         |
| BOLIVIA         | 48   | 0.406         | YEMEN, REP.     | 98   | 0.086         |
| ARGENTINA       | 49   | 0.399         | MAURITANIA      | 99   | 0.012         |
| AZERBAIJAN      | 50   | 0.395         | SOUTH SUDAN     | 100  | 0.001         |
Table 4A. Commitment Index

| Country        | Rank | Commitment Index | Country        | Rank | Commitment Index |
|----------------|------|------------------|----------------|------|------------------|
| MALAYSIA       | 1    | 0.845            | ECUADOR        | 51   | 0.577            |
| BULGARIA       | 2    | 0.815            | LESOTHO        | 52   | 0.577            |
| BHUTAN         | 3    | 0.812            | ESWATINI       | 53   | 0.575            |
| BOTSWANA       | 4    | 0.806            | TURKEY         | 54   | 0.566            |
| BELARUS        | 5    | 0.805            | BRAZIL         | 55   | 0.550            |
| RWANDA         | 6    | 0.802            | TOGO           | 56   | 0.547            |
| KAZAKHSTAN     | 7    | 0.800            | UGANDA         | 57   | 0.547            |
| MONGOLIA       | 8    | 0.783            | MALDIVES       | 58   | 0.546            |
| COSTA RICA     | 9    | 0.776            | CAMBODIA       | 59   | 0.543            |
| JAMAICA        | 10   | 0.776            | PHILIPPINES    | 60   | 0.540            |
| GEORGIA        | 11   | 0.776            | HONDURAS       | 61   | 0.523            |
| SERBIA         | 12   | 0.766            | GAMBIA, THE    | 62   | 0.516            |
| MONTENEGRO     | 13   | 0.763            | TANZANIA       | 63   | 0.503            |
| VANUATU        | 14   | 0.745            | BENIN          | 64   | 0.499            |
| VIETNAM        | 15   | 0.742            | EGYPT, ARAB REP.| 65  | 0.490            |
| FIJI           | 16   | 0.735            | UKRAINE        | 66   | 0.488            |
| THAILAND       | 17   | 0.733            | MOZAMBIQUE     | 67   | 0.484            |
| ALBANIA        | 18   | 0.719            | SURINAME       | 68   | 0.475            |
| MOLDOVA        | 19   | 0.712            | MAURITANIA     | 69   | 0.463            |
| MOROCCO        | 20   | 0.706            | BOLIVIA        | 70   | 0.462            |
| NAMIBIA        | 21   | 0.698            | ZIMBABWE       | 71   | 0.458            |
| COTE D'IVOIRE  | 22   | 0.698            | SIERRA LEONE   | 72   | 0.457            |
| PERU           | 23   | 0.695            | MADAGASCAR     | 73   | 0.447            |
| ARMENIA        | 24   | 0.694            | NICARAGUA      | 74   | 0.442            |
| UZBEKISTAN     | 25   | 0.689            | GABON          | 75   | 0.413            |
| AZERBAIJAN     | 26   | 0.684            | NIGER          | 76   | 0.413            |
| ZAMBIA         | 27   | 0.683            | BURKINA FASO   | 77   | 0.393            |
| SOUTH AFRICA   | 28   | 0.669            | ALGERIA        | 78   | 0.385            |
| JORDAN         | 29   | 0.669            | LIBERIA        | 79   | 0.380            |
| EL SALVADOR    | 30   | 0.664            | IRAN, ISLAMIC REP.| 80  | 0.378            |
| INDONESIA      | 31   | 0.657            | LEBANON        | 81   | 0.356            |
| KYRGYZ REPUBLIC| 32   | 0.651            | BANGLADESH     | 82   | 0.349            |
| CABO VERDE     | 33   | 0.650            | ETHIOPIA       | 83   | 0.347            |
| MEXICO         | 34   | 0.645            | ANGOLA         | 84   | 0.341            |
| INDIA          | 35   | 0.636            | MYANMAR        | 85   | 0.336            |
| GHANA          | 36   | 0.635            | NIGERIA        | 86   | 0.323            |
| BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA | 37 | 0.630 | HAITI         | 87   | 0.297            |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | 38 | 0.626 | CAMEROON     | 88   | 0.294            |
| SENEGAL        | 39   | 0.623            | BURUNDI        | 89   | 0.289            |
| SRI LANKA      | 40   | 0.617            | PAKISTAN       | 90   | 0.276            |
| PARAGUAY       | 41   | 0.614            | CONGO, REP.    | 91   | 0.268            |
| MALAWI         | 42   | 0.603            | SUDAN          | 92   | 0.266            |
| NEPAL          | 43   | 0.601            | MALI           | 93   | 0.254            |
| ARGENTINA      | 44   | 0.600            | CHAD           | 94   | 0.191            |
| COLOMBIA       | 45   | 0.598            | CONGO, DEM. REP.| 95  | 0.145            |
| TUNISIA        | 46   | 0.596            | IRAQ           | 96   | 0.114            |
| TAJIKISTAN     | 47   | 0.595            | CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC | 97 | 0.105 |
| DJIBOUTI       | 48   | 0.589            | AFGHANISTAN    | 98   | 0.085            |
| GUATEMALA      | 49   | 0.584            | SOUTH SUDAN    | 99   | 0.054            |
| KENYA          | 50   | 0.583            | YEMEN, REP.    | 100  | 0.001            |
| Country          | Rank | Tolerance Index | Country          | Rank | Tolerance Index |
|------------------|------|-----------------|------------------|------|-----------------|
| BHUTAN           | 1    | 0.832           | MALAWI           | 51   | 0.647           |
| VANUATU          | 2    | 0.816           | BOLIVIA          | 52   | 0.642           |
| INDIA            | 3    | 0.795           | JORDAN           | 53   | 0.641           |
| MALAYSIA         | 4    | 0.794           | MAURITANIA       | 54   | 0.638           |
| MOLDOVA          | 5    | 0.792           | MADAGASCAR       | 55   | 0.632           |
| BULGARIA         | 6    | 0.781           | LIBERIA          | 56   | 0.630           |
| FIJI             | 7    | 0.775           | COLOMBIA         | 57   | 0.626           |
| MONGOLIA         | 8    | 0.775           | CAMBODIA         | 58   | 0.622           |
| CABO VERDE       | 9    | 0.773           | SIERRA LEONE     | 59   | 0.613           |
| MALDIVES         | 10   | 0.762           | BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA | 60   | 0.611           |
| COSTA RICA       | 11   | 0.756           | KAZAKHSTAN       | 61   | 0.607           |
| INDONESIA        | 12   | 0.754           | TURKEY           | 62   | 0.603           |
| NEPAL            | 13   | 0.752           | GUATEMALA        | 63   | 0.598           |
| SENEGAL          | 14   | 0.751           | BOTSWANA         | 64   | 0.594           |
| SRI LANKA        | 15   | 0.749           | ALGERIA          | 65   | 0.592           |
| GHANA            | 16   | 0.746           | BELARUS          | 66   | 0.578           |
| THAILAND         | 17   | 0.739           | BRAZIL           | 67   | 0.578           |
| GEORGIA          | 18   | 0.738           | NIGERIA          | 68   | 0.571           |
| BURKINA FASO     | 19   | 0.737           | ARGENTINA        | 69   | 0.562           |
| JAMAICA          | 20   | 0.729           | LEBANON          | 70   | 0.554           |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | 21  | 0.726           | AZERBAIJAN       | 71   | 0.553           |
| PHILIPPINES      | 22   | 0.724           | EGYPT, ARAB REP. | 72   | 0.551           |
| PERU             | 23   | 0.718           | HONDURAS         | 73   | 0.547           |
| NIGER            | 24   | 0.717           | SURINAME         | 74   | 0.544           |
| COTE D'IVOIRE   | 25   | 0.717           | DJIBOUTI         | 75   | 0.531           |
| EL SALVADOR     | 26   | 0.711           | CAMEROON         | 76   | 0.530           |
| SERBIA           | 27   | 0.710           | HAITI            | 77   | 0.528           |
| ALBANIA          | 28   | 0.706           | MOZAMBIQUE       | 78   | 0.526           |
| BANGLADESH      | 29   | 0.705           | NICARAGUA        | 79   | 0.520           |
| KENYA           | 30   | 0.703            | ZIMBABWE         | 80   | 0.507           |
| TUNISIA         | 31   | 0.700            | ZAMBIA           | 81   | 0.497           |
| MONTENEGRO      | 32   | 0.689            | GABON            | 82   | 0.494           |
| GAMBIA, THE     | 33   | 0.688            | UZBEKISTAN       | 83   | 0.488           |
| TANZANIA        | 34   | 0.685            | IRAN, ISLAMIC REP. | 84   | 0.481           |
| KYRGYZ REPUBLIC | 35   | 0.684            | IRAQ             | 85   | 0.471           |
| MALI           | 36   | 0.678            | CHAD             | 86   | 0.471           |
| ARMENIA        | 37   | 0.676            | LESOTHO          | 87   | 0.470           |
| RWANDA         | 38   | 0.673            | AFGHANISTAN      | 88   | 0.463           |
| UGANDA         | 39   | 0.673            | NAMIBIA          | 89   | 0.451           |
| BENIN          | 40   | 0.672            | ANGOLA           | 90   | 0.448           |
| UKRAINE        | 41   | 0.671            | TAJIKISTAN       | 91   | 0.427           |
| MOROCCO        | 42   | 0.670            | BURUNDI          | 92   | 0.410           |
| ETHIOPIA       | 43   | 0.668            | CONGO, REP.      | 93   | 0.410           |
| PARAGUAY      | 44   | 0.667            | CONGO, DEM. REP. | 94   | 0.406           |
| VIETNAM       | 45   | 0.666            | CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC | 95   | 0.371           |
| PAKISTAN     | 46   | 0.663            | ESWATINI         | 96   | 0.370           |
| MEXICO       | 47   | 0.661            | SUDAN            | 97   | 0.355           |
| MYANMAR       | 48   | 0.659            | SOUTH AFRICA     | 98   | 0.180           |
| ECUADOR       | 49   | 0.657            | YEMEN, REP.      | 99   | 0.008           |
| TOGO           | 50   | 0.652            | SOUTH SUDAN      | 100  | 0.001           |
Table 6A. Political Will-ACT Index

| Country          | Rank | Political Will-ACT Index | Country          | Rank | Political Will-ACT Index |
|------------------|------|--------------------------|------------------|------|--------------------------|
| MALAYSIA         | 1    | 0.799                    | GUATEMALA        | 51   | 0.534                    |
| BULGARIA         | 2    | 0.756                    | PARAGUAY         | 52   | 0.533                    |
| GEORGIA          | 3    | 0.754                    | HONDURAS         | 53   | 0.530                    |
| COSTA RICA       | 4    | 0.751                    | NAMIBIA          | 54   | 0.529                    |
| THAILAND         | 5    | 0.745                    | SURINAME         | 55   | 0.512                    |
| VIETNAM          | 6    | 0.718                    | BOLIVIA          | 56   | 0.512                    |
| SERBIA           | 7    | 0.713                    | TOGO             | 57   | 0.510                    |
| JAMAICA          | 8    | 0.707                    | GAMBIA, THE      | 58   | 0.508                    |
| BHUTAN           | 9    | 0.699                    | ALGERIA          | 59   | 0.486                    |
| FIJI              | 10   | 0.690                    | UGANDA           | 60   | 0.485                    |
| PERU             | 11   | 0.685                    | MYANMAR          | 61   | 0.473                    |
| CABO VERDE       | 12   | 0.681                    | MALAWI           | 62   | 0.471                    |
| ARMENIA          | 13   | 0.678                    | LEBANON          | 63   | 0.462                    |
| MONTENEGRO       | 14   | 0.675                    | SOUTH AFRICA     | 64   | 0.460                    |
| MONGOLIA         | 15   | 0.667                    | GABON            | 65   | 0.454                    |
| BELARUS          | 16   | 0.666                    | IRAN, ISLAMIC REP.| 66   | 0.450                    |
| ALBANIA          | 17   | 0.661                    | BANGLADESH       | 67   | 0.447                    |
| JORDAN           | 18   | 0.661                    | TANZANIA         | 68   | 0.446                    |
| MOROCCO          | 19   | 0.660                    | BURKINA FASO     | 69   | 0.445                    |
| KAZAKHSTAN       | 20   | 0.659                    | LESOTHO          | 70   | 0.443                    |
| VANUATU          | 21   | 0.653                    | DJIBOUTI         | 71   | 0.441                    |
| INDIA            | 22   | 0.646                    | ZAMBIA           | 72   | 0.441                    |
| MOLDOVA          | 23   | 0.644                    | NICARAGUA        | 73   | 0.439                    |
| EL SALVADOR      | 24   | 0.641                    | BENIN            | 74   | 0.429                    |
| BOTSWANA         | 25   | 0.636                    | TAJIKISTAN       | 75   | 0.423                    |
| COLOMBIA         | 26   | 0.633                    | MOZAMBIQUE       | 76   | 0.422                    |
| RWANDA           | 27   | 0.623                    | NIGER            | 77   | 0.419                    |
| SRI LANKA        | 28   | 0.622                    | PAKISTAN         | 78   | 0.418                    |
| INDONESIA        | 29   | 0.620                    | MADAGASCAR       | 79   | 0.416                    |
| MALDIVES         | 30   | 0.619                    | ESWATINI         | 80   | 0.398                    |
| BRAZIL           | 31   | 0.615                    | MALI             | 81   | 0.396                    |
| TURKEY           | 32   | 0.610                    | ETHIOPIA         | 82   | 0.393                    |
| ECUADOR          | 33   | 0.609                    | SIERRA LEONE     | 83   | 0.389                    |
| MEXICO           | 34   | 0.608                    | ZIMBABWE         | 84   | 0.381                    |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC| 35 | 0.605                    | CAMEROON         | 85   | 0.376                    |
| NEPAL            | 36   | 0.604                    | NIGERIA          | 86   | 0.370                    |
| PHILIPPINES      | 37   | 0.599                    | ANGOLA           | 87   | 0.349                    |
| AZERBAIJAN       | 38   | 0.599                    | LIBERIA          | 88   | 0.317                    |
| GHANA            | 39   | 0.590                    | CONGO, REP.      | 89   | 0.302                    |
| BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA| 40| 0.589                    | IRAQ             | 90   | 0.280                    |
| UKRAINE          | 41   | 0.587                    | SUDAN            | 91   | 0.257                    |
| TUNISIA          | 42   | 0.587                    | HAITI            | 92   | 0.241                    |
| SENEGAL          | 43   | 0.585                    | BURUNDI          | 93   | 0.241                    |
| ARGENTINA        | 44   | 0.578                    | CONGO, DEM. REP. | 94   | 0.208                    |
| KYRGYZ REPUBLIC  | 45   | 0.573                    | CHAD             | 95   | 0.201                    |
| CAMBODIA         | 46   | 0.567                    | MAURITANIA       | 96   | 0.200                    |
| COTE D'IVOIRE    | 47   | 0.563                    | AFGHANISTAN      | 97   | 0.137                    |
| UZBEKISTAN       | 48   | 0.560                    | CENTRAL REPUBLIC | 98   | 0.098                    |
| KENYA            | 49   | 0.559                    | YEMEN, REP.      | 99   | 0.005                    |
| EGYPT, ARAB REP. | 50   | 0.538                    | SOUTH SUDAN      | 100  | 0.001                    |
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