

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter 1 | 1 |
| Country Overview | 1 |
| Country Overview | 2 |
| Key Data | 3 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 4 |
| Africa | 5 |
| Chapter 2 | 7 |
| Political Overview | 7 |
| History | 8 |
| Political Conditions | 9 |
| Political Risk Index | 22 |
| Political Stability | 36 |
| Freedom Rankings | 51 |
| Human Rights | 63 |
| Government Functions | 65 |
| Government Structure | 66 |
| Principal Government Officials | 70 |
| Leader Biography | 71 |
| Leader Biography | 71 |
| Foreign Relations | 72 |
| National Security | 75 |
| Defense Forces | 76 |
| Chapter 3 | 78 |
| Economic Overview | 78 |
| Economic Overview | 79 |
| Nominal GDP and Components | 81 |
| Population and GDP Per Capita | 83 |
| Real GDP and Inflation | 84 |
| Government Spending and Taxation | 85 |
| Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment | 86 |
| Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate | 87 |
| Data in US Dollars | 88 |
| Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units | 89 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Energy Consumption and Production QUADS | 90 |
| World Energy Price Summary | 91 |
| CO2 Emissions | 92 |
| Agriculture Consumption and Production | 93 |
| World Agriculture Pricing Summary | 95 |
| Metals Consumption and Production | 96 |
| World Metals Pricing Summary | 98 |
| Economic Performance Index | 99 |
| Chapter 4 | 111 |
| Investment Overview | 111 |
| Foreign Investment Climate | 112 |
| Foreign Investment Index | 114 |
| Corruption Perceptions Index | 127 |
| Competitiveness Ranking | 139 |
| Taxation | 148 |
| Stock Market | 148 |
| Partner Links | 148 |
| Chapter 5 | 150 |
| Social Overview | 150 |
| People | 151 |
| Human Development Index | 153 |
| Life Satisfaction Index | 156 |
| Happy Planet Index | 168 |
| Status of Women | 177 |
| Global Gender Gap Index | 179 |
| Culture and Arts | 188 |
| Etiquette | 189 |
| Travel Information | 189 |
| Diseases/Health Data | 198 |
| Chapter 6 | 204 |
| Environmental Overview | 204 |
| Environmental Issues | 205 |
| Environmental Policy | 205 |
| Greenhouse Gas Ranking | 207 |
| Global Environmental Snapshot | 218 |
| Global Environmental Concepts | 229 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| International Environmental Agreements and Associations | 243 |
| Appendices | 267 |
| Bibliography | 268 |

Chapter 1

Country Overview

Country Overview

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

Sao Tome and Principe is an island country in Western Africa. With a population of around 212,600, it is one of the smallest countries in Africa. From the late 1400s the Portuguese began settling on the islands and establishing sugar plantations. With a decline in sugar production, coffee and cocoa became the islands' economic mainstays in the 19th century. A movement for independence began in the late 1950s, and following a 1974 change of government in Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe became independent in 1975. Democratic reforms were not instituted until the late 1980s, and the 1990 constitution created a multi-party democracy. With cocoa as its main export product, the country's economy is extremely vulnerable to external shocks and is dependent on foreign financial assistance. Oil and natural gas reserves were discovered offshore from Sao Tome and Principe in the early 1990s, and the country hopes to reduce dependence on donors and cocoa exports by exploiting offshore oil. Drilling is under way and commercial production is expected to begin within a few years.

Key Data

| Key Data | |
|--------------------|--|
| Region: | Africa |
| Population: | 194006 |
| Climate: | Tropical; hot, humid; one rainy season (October to May). |
| Languages: | Portuguese |
| Currency: | 1 dobra (Db\$) = 100 centimos |
| Holiday: | Independence Day is 12 July (1975), National Heroes' Day is 4 February |
| Area Total: | 960 |
| Area Land: | 960 |
| Coast Line: | 209 |

Sao Tome and Principe

Country Map



Africa

Regional Map



© MAGELLAN Geographix® Santa Barbara, CA (800) 929-4MAP

Chapter 2

Political Overview

History

Portuguese navigators between 1469 and 1472, settling São Tomé in 1493 when Avaro Caminha received the land as a grant from the Portuguese crown, first discovered the islands. Principe was settled in 1500 under a similar arrangement.

By the mid-1500s, with the help of slave labor, the Portuguese settlers had turned the islands into Africa's foremost exporter of sugar. São Tomé and Principe were taken over and administered by the Portuguese crown in 1522 and 1573, respectively.

The 16th century was a vibrant but terrible time for cultural formation in São Tomé and Principe. The tragedy of slavery brought about a caste system in which many of African descent suffered indiscriminately. Religion also became a weapon. Portuguese settlers brought with them Catholicism. Those who had learned to practice Protestantism and other religions faced persecution even within their own caste. Most notably, the Portuguese settlers mirrored policies in Lisbon by bringing about charges of "covert Judaism." While there was no history of Jewish settlement on the islands, accusations of secret Judaism were used to subvert political opposition.

Correlations between economic decline, charges of Judaism and episodes of violence suggest that Machiavellian politics and economics were at the core of the much-touted religious battles on São Tomé in the 16th and early 17th centuries. The result was the rise of Catholic homogeneity that is still prevalent today.

Sugar cultivation declined over the next 100 years, and by the mid-1600s, São Tomé was little more than a port of call for bunkering ships. In the early 1800s, two new cash crops, coffee and cocoa, were introduced. The rich volcanic soils proved well suited to the new cash crop industry, and soon extensive plantations (rocas), owned by Portuguese companies or absentee landlords, occupied almost all of the good farmland. By 1908, São Tomé had become the world's largest producer of cocoa, still the country's most important crop.

The "rocas" system, which gave the plantation managers a high degree of authority, led to abuses against the African farm workers. Although Portugal officially abolished slavery in 1876, the practice of forced paid labor continued. In the early 1900s, an internationally publicized controversy arose over charges that Angolan contract workers were being subjected to forced labor

and unsatisfactory working conditions.

Sporadic labor unrest and dissatisfaction continued well into the 20th century, culminating in an outbreak of riots in 1953 in which several hundred African laborers were killed in a clash with their Portuguese rulers. This "Batepa Massacre" remains a major event in the colonial history of the islands, and the government officially observes its anniversary.

By the late 1950s, when other emerging nations across the African continent were demanding independence, a small group of São Toméans had formed the Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe (MLSTP), which eventually established its base in nearby Gabon. Picking up momentum in the 1960s, events moved quickly after the overthrow of the Caetano dictatorship in Portugal in April 1974.

The new Portuguese regime was committed to the dissolution of its overseas colonies; in November 1974, their representatives met with the MLSTP in Algiers and worked out an agreement for the transfer of sovereignty. After a period of transitional government, São Tomé and Príncipe achieved independence on July 12, 1975, choosing as its first president the MLSTP Secretary-General Manuel Pinto da Costa.

The rapidity with which the Portuguese left the country took the new leadership by surprise, leaving them ill prepared. The Portuguese has established a significant infrastructure. Unfortunately, São Tomé and Príncipe lacked the economic and human resources to maintain it and the infrastructure rapidly declined.

At independence, President Manuel Pinto da Costa set up a socialist regime with heavy state control. This decision left the country dependent on the export of cocoa and heavily in need of food, agricultural and manufacturing imports. When cocoa prices collapsed in the mid- 1980s, the economy was severely damaged. However, with the state revenues garnered, the leadership set up admirable systems of health and education that continue to serve the country today.

Note on History: In certain entries, open source content from the State Department Background Notes and Country Guides have been used. A full listing of sources is available in the Bibliography.

Political Conditions

The Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe (MLSTP) is one of the main political parties, which developed out of the independence movement which swept across Africa in the 1990s. Although the party established its base in nearby Gabon, it picked up momentum in the 1960s, reaching some degree of ascendancy after the overthrow of the Caetano dictatorship in Portugal in April 1974. The new Portuguese regime was committed to the dissolution of its overseas colonies; in November 1974, their representatives met with the MLSTP in Algiers and worked out an agreement for the transfer of sovereignty. After a period of transitional government, São Tomé and Príncipe achieved independence on July 12, 1975, choosing as its first president the MLSTP Secretary-General Manuel Pinto da Costa.

The rapidity with which the Portuguese left the country took the new leadership by surprise, leaving them ill prepared to deal with the aftermath. The Portuguese had established a significant infrastructure and unfortunately, São Tomé and Príncipe's newly-independent leadership lacked the economic and human resources required for its maintenance. Consequently, the developed infrastructure rapidly declined.

At independence, President Manuel Pinto da Costa set up a socialist regime with heavy state control. This decision left the country dependent on the export of cocoa and heavily in need of food, agricultural and manufacturing imports. When cocoa prices collapsed in the mid- 1980s, the economy was severely damaged. Nevertheless, using state revenues, the leadership set up admirable systems of health and education that continue to serve the country's populace today.

In 1990, São Tomé became one of the first African countries to embrace democratic reform and changes to the constitution. As well, the legalization of opposition political parties led to elections in 1991 that were nonviolent, free and transparent. Miguel Trovoada, a former prime minister who had been in exile since 1986, returned as an independent candidate and was elected president. He was re-elected in São Tomé's second multiparty presidential election in 1996 (which is noted below).

The Party of Democratic Convergence (PCD) toppled the MLSTP to take a majority of seats in the National Assembly, with the MLSTP becoming an important and vocal minority party. Municipal elections followed in late 1992, in which the MLSTP came back to win a majority of seats on five of seven regional councils. In early legislative elections in October 1994, the MLSTP won a plurality of seats in the assembly.

Then, on Aug. 15, 1995, a group of about 40 retired army officers organized an attempted coup d'etat. While the coup initially succeeded and the president was arrested, the international reaction was swift. The United States condemned the coup three days later, having joined a chorus of voices, which included the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and a number of African states. Over a week passed and then the coup leaders stepped down under the aegis of an amnesty agreement; the legitimate government was restored.

One of the provisions of the amnesty agreement was that the government would give financial compensation and farmland to the coup d'etat leaders. When this still had not happened by July 4, 1998, this cadre of army retirees issued an ultimatum to the government. The prime minister rejected this ultimatum, but there was no retaliation and the conflict remained unresolved.

Some protests occurred in 1996, 1997 and 1998, due to governmental problems in São Tomé and Príncipe. Security forces were needed to stop demonstrators in August 1996, who were protesting the shortages of power and water supplies. This demonstration emerged because of press reports claiming that the government had allegedly spent US\$500,000 of state money on luxury cars for cabinet ministers.

Meanwhile, in December 1996, a plan for the revision of the constitution was drawn up. It was submitted to the legislature and included some new proposals. The main goal was to redefine presidential powers. It included a proposal that the president could not dissolve the legislature until a newly created state council was consulted. It also proposed that the president not control foreign policy. The constitutional reforms were never implemented.

The presidential elections of 1996 did not bring a great deal of competition for President Travoada. As aforementioned, he easily won with a large victory and achieved a strong mandate, granted by the high 79 percent voter turnout.

In April 1997, following the introduction of a 140 percent increase in fuel prices, violent protests erupted in the capital. Security forces were deployed to stop the demonstrators who had blocked roads. In March 1998, civil service employees chose to strike.

Because of the political struggle between the president and the government during this period, President Trovoada proposed the creation of a unity forum for national reconciliation in which the country's problems could be debated. He later announced that a comprehensive revision of the constitution would take place in the indefinite future, but this did not, in fact, occur.

The next elections for the National Assembly were held on Nov. 8, 1998. Nine political parties competed for 55 seats at stake. The ruling MLSTP won with 31 seats, followed by the "Accao Democratica Independente" (ADI) with 16 seats and the "Partido da Convergencia Democratica-Grupa de Reflexao" (PCD) with eight seats. As these were the first truly competitive elections after the coup attempt, their success was crucial to the continued democratic progress of the country. The primary issues of the elections included the exploration of offshore oil reserves and the country's proposed entry into the monetary franc zone. The MLSTP argued that the party had improved economic conditions and political stability since 1995. The PCD advocated a coalition rule. International observers monitored polling. The elections went off without incident and a new cabinet was sworn in Jan. 5, 1999.

In March 1999, Finance Minister Alfonso Varela was dismissed from his post after it was discovered that he was involved with people being investigated for a \$500 million financial scandal. São Tomé treasury bonds were confiscated when three men were arrested in Belgium for illegal financial activity. The bonds were discovered to have been released without authorization. Former Central Bank governor and World Bank advisor Adelin Castelo David replaced Varela.

The two most pressing issues in São Tomé and Príncipe in recent years have been the promulgation of democracy and the expansion of the economy. Having weathered the 1995 coup, the electoral body and governing institutions have proven resilient. However, some scholars question whether this has really meant the coming of democracy to the country. There is seemingly little room for the broadening and deepening of democratic roots, as neo-patrimonial rule is still pervasive in this microstate. Political culture and societal values continue to impinge on the work of politicians, in effect devaluing the multiparty electoral process. Yet, São Toméan society has been laying the groundwork for real change. Civil society, especially farmers groups and coops, have surged in recent years to become a force to be reckoned with. This health development of public voice can only serve to improve upon São Tomé's limited democracy.

The quality of governance in São Tomé and Príncipe is also admirable as compared to much of Africa. While patronage network persist, outright corruption is relatively low. Moreover, leaders have proven accountable for their actions. For instance, in March 2000, the country was paralyzed by a civil service strike. The political crisis mounted at the same time as concerns about the propriety of Foreign Minister Paulo Jorge Espirito Santo emerged. The foreign minister chose to step down rather than weather the political storm. The Minister of Labor and Public Administration Emilio Lima also planned to step down, but the preemptive action of the foreign minister quelled the crisis making it unnecessary. President Trovoada appointed Joaquim Rafael Branco to the post of foreign minister on May 10, 2000.

When the next major strike occurred, a health workers strike in November 2000, the government was well-seasoned in its negotiations. It stood ready to accept a new salary framework and a negotiated wage increase, and the strike was settled in 10 days. An education workers strike that started in October 2000 took somewhat longer to resolve, but neither it nor the health workers strike resulted in significant violence or death. This reflects a certain institutional capacity to confront crises.

The next major political challenge São Tomé and Príncipe faced were the imminent elections and change of power. Presidential elections were scheduled for July 2001. President Trovoada was constitutionally barred from running for a third time; it appeared that he was ready to honor this constitutional mandate. São Tomé and Príncipe would, therefore, be faced with the turnover test of institutional capacity. It was charged with proving that second elections could bring new leadership without threatening regime stability. In the lead up to the elections, there was no candidate who

seemed assured victory. (The possible candidates were not yet finalized but are discussed below in the section dealing with election results.)

The second pressing issue that São Tomé and Príncipe faced was economic. The demise of the international cocoa market necessitated the exploration of alternative economic pursuits. Under consideration was investment in tourism. The beauty of the country, coupled with its historic sites, and its lively culture, makes it a tourism destination. However, the cost of traveling the islands is exorbitant, averaging US\$1,000 from Lisbon. Poor tourist infrastructure means tourists must face second-rate accommodations for high prices.

The government has also considered promoting a tax-free trading zone. This is a popular and successful economic pursuit of island microstates such as the Seychelles. The government has already released export tariffs. However, for trade to be successful, the country would need to invest in the excavation of a deep-water harbor.

The greatest optimism has come from the discovery of offshore oil. In 1999 the American consortium, Environmental Remediation Holding (ERHC) bought a 49 percent interest in the oil reserves by investing in seismic studies and exploration. The government also granted Island Oil Exploration Ltd the sole right for six months, starting in February 1999, to oversee financing and development of an offshore logistics center on São Tomé. Oil seeps have been known about for a decade, but it is only recently that it is being explored with vigor; Mobil will hold the dominant share in production once it begins. This is a real boon for Mobil as it adds to their already substantial holdings in Nigeria, Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea. While the drilling was already being planned, the fact that the reserves sit in more than 2000 meters of water created logistical challenges.

In February 2001, the government of Prime Minister da Costa expanded its relationships in the petroleum sector. After three years of negotiation it signed an agreement with the Norwegian company PGS. This company was then charged with conducting seismic tests in hitherto unexplored territorial waters. Experts expressed the belief that there is the potential to discover oil seeps as large as those discovered by Island Oil Exploration Ltd. and Mobil.

Perhaps the most important recent agreement affecting the oil industry in São Tomé and Príncipe was the April 2001 agreement with Nigeria to form a joint development zone. The agreement laid aside the existing territorial dispute in favor of bilateral economic cooperation. Specifically, Nigerian interests would invest in oil exploration and recovery; the two countries would share the profits of any ventures. For Nigeria, the deal stood to increase the oil reserve, provide jobs and investment opportunities. For São Tomé and Príncipe the deal has drawn on Nigeria's existing oil sector strength in the global marketplace, its expertise, and its economic investment. Both government released statements strongly affirming their support of the agreement.

Against this backdrop of economic potential, the challenge for São Tomé and Príncipe was to resolve the economic crisis before it has a significant political fallout. In this regard, a number of new relationships were seen as helpful to São Tomé and Príncipe overcoming its short to medium-term economic troubles. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) announced that it would work with the UNDP to increase development funding to the country. This came on the heels of an IMF agreement for a three-year, US\$8.9 million program to support economic reform (an act largely viewed as a stabilization measure). The government has also entered into "cooperative" or "friendship" agreements with Libya and Angola, as well as finalizing terms for the settlement of maritime differences with Nigeria. The African Development Bank also signed a water supply agreement in an effort to aid in São Tomé and Príncipe's growing fresh water crisis, as well as a US\$2 million infrastructure investment in April 2001. In a critical win for the development of São Tomé and Príncipe, in January 2001 the World Bank approved US\$200 million in debt relief for the country under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative.

The government viewed these developments as important progress in terms of both foreign relations and economic growth, but it also recognized that they would not bring about a long-term solution to the lack of economic pursuits. It seemed that for the moment, President Trovoada was hoping that his sustained social and political stability, in addition to oil revenues, would bring the country into a new era of prosperity for São Tomé and Príncipe. It appeared likely that the victor in the 2001 elections would continue to take the country down this path.

In the presidential elections held on July 29, 2001, Fradique de Meneses won 56.3 percent of the vote and the election. Manuel Pinto de Costa was his closest competitor winning 38.4 percent of the vote. The election was also contested by Carlos Tiny (mentioned above), Victor Montiero and Francisco Fortunato Pires. Fradique de Meneses was sworn into office in September 2001.

Then, in the parliamentary elections held in March 2002, the MLSTP won 39.6 percent of the vote and 24 seats, while the opposition alliance -- Force for Change Democratic Movement - Democratic Convergence Party-Reflection Group (MDFM-PCD) -- won 39.4 percent of the vote and 23 seats. The election was very close showing no absolute winner.

In the aftermath of the election, President Menezes appointed De Menezes appointed Gabriel Costa as prime minister and the two main political parties concurred on power sharing and broad-based governance. By September 2002, Prime Minister Costa and his administration were dismissed and President Menezes named a new government. In October 2002, Maria das Neves Ceita Baptista de Sousa became the new prime minister.

Meanwhile, in August 2002, President Menezes announced plans for a United States naval base in Sao Tome and Principe, which was charged with protecting the country's oil interests. The new prime minister backed the plan and planned to introduce austerity measures aimed at bringing the country's economic woes under control. In these regards, the new prime minister said that cutting

foreign debt would be her government's "priority of priorities" for 2003. The prime minister also noted that future oil revenues would not be included in the country's current budget because contracts were still in the process of being negotiated.

Other related plans included the construction of a "sheltering port" (alluded to earlier in the report) from which the United States Navy could patrol the Gulf of Guinea and protect the oil resources. The port would also function as a trading post for the region and presumably will form a core component of the new prime minister's economic policy.

In 2003, Sao Tome and Principe reached an oil rights agreement with Nigeria by which the tiny country would garner 40 percent of eventual oil revenue. The agreement has been predicted to yield up to \$100 million next year, since, as aforementioned, the country is believed to possess sizable oil reserves. Such an economic yield would help mitigate against the ongoing problem of an astronomically high foreign debt burden,

Despite the promising nature of the developments noted above, the political domain was about to be destabilized. In July 2003, a coup d'etat led by Major Fernando Pereira deposed President Fradique de Menezes. Major Pereira said that the army's actions were driven by their perception that the government was corrupt, poverty was rampant and citizens were not treated with equality.

The coup d'etat leaders released several government ministers who had been held in custody for several days, however, they were to remain under house arrest. The government ministers were also instructed that they would not be allowed to advocate any of their views on the future of the country. Prime Minister Maria das Neves remained in the hospital under surveillance while the deposed President Menezes was exiled to a Nigerian hotel.

The African Union, the United Nations and various individual countries, such as the United States, condemned the coup d'etat. Citizens of Sao Tome and Principe observed that they did not wish their country to be affected by the kind of violence that often plagues neighboring Africa. Meanwhile, international mediators from other Portuguese-speaking countries, such as Portugal, Brazil and Angola, arrived in Sao Tome and Principe to try to reach an agreement, which would restore President Menezes to the presidency.

A deal was finally reached which would (1) create a new national unity government; (2) establish greater transparency, responsibility and government oversight in regard to oil deals; and (3) establish a national forum in which political parties and citizens could express their views. Under the agreement, President Menezes would resume his responsibilities as the head of state and amnesty was given to the plotters of the coup d'etat.

Political crisis returned to Sao Tome in March 2004 as tensions in the national unity government

mounted. Ministers from the Force for Change Democratic Movement (MDFM) party dropped out of Prime Minister das Neves' cabinet after being accused of implementing agreements without her approval. Foreign Minister Mateus Meira Rita and Natural Resources Minister Tome Vera Cruz both claimed they had informed the prime minister of the agreements. President Menezes supported both of the ministers. After the ministers were dismissed from the cabinet, the MDFM withdrew their two remaining ministers from the government. Menezes attempted to prevent a cabinet reshuffle but then relented. Das Neves replaced the ministers with members from her own party, the Liberation Movement of Sao Tome and Principe (MLSTP), and from Menezes' Independent Democratic Action party (ADI).

The new cabinet fared no better. In September 2004, das Neves and other ministers in her cabinet faced allegations of corruption. Das Neves was accused of embezzling from an aid fund. The prime minister said the president was behind the allegations and was attempting to topple her government. Menezes dismissed das Neves after appeals from opposition parties. The MLSTP was then charged to name a new prime minister and form a new government. In late September, former Labor minister Damiao Vaz d'Almeida was named prime minister. Diogenes Moniz, the head of the aid fund at the center of the controversy, was arrested days later.

In February 2005, on the bilateral agenda, Sao Tome and Principe, along with Nigeria, signed a joint agreement with multinational energy companies allowing for offshore oil exploration and providing for production sharing in a joint development zone. This decision had been reached by the President Menezes alone -- without consultation of the government of the prime minister and the government.

By mid-2005, Prime Minister Vaz de Almeida issued his resignation to President Menezes on the basis of a deteriorating relationship with the head of state. In particular, the prime minister said he strongly disagreed with the president over how to deal with a likely civil service strike, which began in June 2005. Other issues of contention included the aforementioned decision by the president to award a contract to foreign oil countries for joint development offshore.

A week after Vaz de Almeida's resignation was tendered, President Menezes offered up the name of the governor of the Central Bank in Sao Tome and Principe, Maria do Carmo Silveira, as the new prime minister. In an official decree, the president declared that he had appointed do Carmo Silveira as head of government. Do Carmo Silveira was trained as an economist in the former Soviet Union and has been a member of the MLSTP, which had held a slender majority in parliament, but which has not enjoyed the best of terms with the president. Her appointment constituted another situation of ongoing "co-habitation" whereby the head of state and head of government have come from different parties.

Upon taking office, Prime Minister Maria do Carmo Silveira said she was willing to resume negotiations with the public servant unions, given the their threat of a national strike. Silveira

acknowledged the need to work with public servants to find a solution to the salary demands and promised an open dialogue. Silveira also said that macroeconomic stability would be her government's priority. That said, she was also looking for accountability by those in office, noted that health and education were also important concerns, and she said that she could not promise "miraculous solutions or magical formulas to resolve the chronic problems faced by the country." By the close of June 2005, she had offered her governing plan before parliament.

A month later, opposition politicians accused the new prime minister of breaking the law by occupying both the post of head of government and head of the Central Bank. Despite this issue, around the same period, the new prime minister claimed victory in resolving the wage dispute with public service unions.

In August 2005, President Menezes was at the forefront of the political scene following his measures oriented toward a referendum aimed at resolving the political turmoil that had been ongoing in recent years. There was some dispute about who actually called for the referendum. Regardless, the referendum was regarded as an unconstitutional measure by certain legal experts in the country.

By March 2006, attention turned to legislative elections. The political landscape of the time was marked by demonstrations in certain parliamentary constituencies as people protested against their living conditions. The state of unrest promised to have an impact on the election process, specifically in areas where the protests were taking place.

Legislative elections in Sao Tome and Principe were then held in early April 2006. The elections showed a likely victory for the president's Forces for Change Democratic Movement (MDFM)-Democratic Convergence coalition.

The National Electoral Commission said that provisional results indicated 37.1 percent of the votes and 23 seats in the 55-member legislature going to the coalition, which was backed by President Fradique de Menezes. In second place with 28.8 percent of the vote share and 19 seats in parliament was the ruling Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe. In third place stood the Democratic Independent Alliance, backed by former President Miguel Trovoada, with 19.9 percent of the votes and 12 parliamentary seats. The remaining seat was won by the Movement for New Direction party, which secured 4.6 percent of the votes cast. There was a delay in the official announcement of results due to the state of unrest, which was discussed above.

The results meant that the president's coalition gained the distinction of being the country's largest political party, albeit without an overall majority in parliament. A new prime minister -- Tome Soares da Vera Cruz of the president's leading coalition -- came to power on April 21, 2006.

In July 2006, presidential elections were held. Turnout was not as high some would have liked,

with up to 37 percent of eligible voters abstaining. Still, the election transpired peacefully with irregularities and problems occurring only in four precincts. Provisional results indicated that President Fradique de Menezes had won re-election and a second term in office convincingly. Indeed, it was reported that he had a 20 percent advantage over his opponent, Patrice Trovoada.

In the first part of 2007, attention turned to the economic realm when the global financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which agreed to forgive \$360 million in debt owed by Sao Tome and Principe. The move resulted in debt forgiveness of approximately 90 percent of the outstanding foreign debt owed by this country.

Also in the first part of 2007, an agreement was forged with Nigeria regarding the establishment of a joint military commission, intended to protect their respective energy interests in the Gulf of Guinea.

In the first part of 2008, the country's opposition leader, Patrice Trovoada, became prime minister. Prime Minister Patrice Trovoada's tenure in power was short-lived because by May 2008, the head of government was dismissed after the parliament successfully passed a vote of no confidence against coalition government. One month later, Rafael Branco, the leader of the country's second largest party, was sworn into power as the prime minister at the helm of a new governing coalition.

By the close of the year 2008, the country was embroiled in a corruption scandal that involved a number of high-ranking former government officials, including ex-prime ministers. All such individuals were scheduled to appear in court.

In February 2009, national security was on the agenda when an apparent attempted coup d'etat against President Fradique Menezes was thwarted. Almost 40 people were detained and questioned in conjunction with their alleged associations in the attempted ousting of the president from office. Ultimately, Arlecio Costa -- the opposition leader and head of the Christian Democratic Front, was jailed for his involvement in the coup plot. About a year later in early 2010, Arlecio Costa was pardoned for the aforementioned crime.

August 2010 saw parliamentary elections ensue in Sao Tome and Principe. Those elections were initially scheduled to take place much earlier in the year, but turnout on the actual election day on August 1, 2010 was a high 88 percent. The elections resulted in victory for the opposition party, Independent Democratic Action (ADI), led by Patrice Trovoada. Indeed, the ADI garnered 26 seats -- a plurality in the 55-seat unicameral National Assembly. The Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe-Social Democratic Party or MLSTP-PSD of Prime Minister Rafael Branco acquired the next highest number of seats -- 21. The Party for Democratic Convergence or PCD of Delfim Neves -- a member of the ruling coalition -- carried seven seats. President Menezes' Force for Change Democratic Movement or MDFM won only one seat.

Consequently, Patrice Trovoada was on track to become the new prime minister and head of government, succeeding Branco.

A presidential election was scheduled to be held in Sao Tome and Principe on July 17, 2011. This election date was delayed from 2010 to the current time frame due to allegations of a corrupt deal between the political elite in Sao Tome and Principe and several Nigerian oil companies. Typically, the president in Sao Tome and Principe is elected to power by popular vote for a five-year term and is eligible for a second term. The incumbent head of state was President Fradique de Menezes, who first came to power in 2001 and was re-elected to power in 2006 with 60 percent of the vote share against Patrice Trovoada who garnered 38.5 percent and was serving as prime minister since the 2010 parliamentary elections. Clearly, the incumbent president -- Fradique de Menezes -- was not eligible to contest the 2011 elections having now completed two terms in office in a system with term limits.

The main candidates contesting the 2011 presidential election were: former dictator Manuel Pinto da Costa, who was running as an independent but who was a leading figure in the opposition party Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe/Social Democratic Party (MLSTP/PSD); former Prime Minister Maria das Neves, who was running as an independent as well and also came from the ranks of the (MLSTP/PSD); former defense minister Elsa Pinto, who joined the contest as an independent; Aurelio Martins, a journalist and businessman; as well as Prime Minister Evaristo Carvalho of the governing party Independent Democratic Action.

The election finally ensued on July 17, 2011 -- a delayed date due to the fact that the country was embroiled in a corruption scandal involving the political elite in Sao Tome and Principe and several Nigerian oil companies. Following the vote, Pinto da Costa received a plurality of the vote share - - 38.42 percent -- but not an absolute majority. He would have to face a runoff against his next closest competitor. However, there was confusion as to who that might be with both Carvalho and Neves identified. Ultimately, it was determined that Carvalho was in second place and would contest the second round on Aug. 7, 2011.

Voters again went to the polls on Aug. 7, 2011 to cast their ballots in the second round of the presidential election. According to news reports on the ground, Manuel Pinto da Costa won the most votes -- 52.88 percent -- against Evaristo Carvalho, who garnered the rest of the vote share. The outcome was the return to presidential power for da Costa, who was regarded as something of a dictator during his earlier tenure. Now, though, he was poised to reclaim the top post and succeed outgoing President Fradique de Menezes. Incoming President da Costa promised to concentrate on economic development, particularly as regards natural resources of oil and cocoa, as well as growth in the tourism sector.

Note that at the end of 2012, Gabriel Arcanjo Ferreira Da Costa was named to be the new prime minister and asked to form a government.

In mid-February 2014, President Manuel Pinto da Costa of Sao Tome and Principe was warning of “discontent in the barracks” when striking soldiers failed to report for duty for the presidential honor guard. The situation was sparked when about 300 junior and non-commissioned officers went on strike at the start of the month to protest their low wages and also demand improved housing and healthcare at a time when the country was suffering from high inflation. Indeed, prices of food staples, electrical power, water, and other basic needs were straining the already-paltry resources of average citizens. Clearly, the sense of discontent from among the low-ranking military personnel reached a new low, as shown by their decision to boycott their honor guard duty at the airport when the president was departing the country for a state visit to the Republic of Congo.

Cognizant of the economic challenges facing the country, President Pinto da Costa said, "We are currently experiencing so many difficulties and many people are not happy." The situation has thus raised anxieties about unrest in the island nation state off the coast of western Africa, with particular fears about the prospects of a military coup. Although Sao Tome has largely escape the brutal political violence that has often rocked much of post-colonial Africa, it has nonetheless been subject to political turbulence in the form of occasional attempted coups. This type of political turbulence could undoubtedly derail interest by foreign investors in the country's burgeoning energy exploration endeavors.

Parliamentary elections were set to be held in Sao Tome and Principe in October 2014. At stake would be the composition of the unicameral "Assembleia Popular Nacional" (National People's Assembly), composed of 55 seats where members are elected by direct, popular vote to serve four-year terms.

The previous elections were held in 2010 and resulted in victory for the opposition party, Independent Democratic Action (ADI), led by Patrice Trovoada. The ADI garnered 26 seats -- a plurality in the 55-seat National Assembly. The Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe-Social Democratic Party or MLSTP-PSD of Prime Minister Rafael Branco acquired the next highest number of seats -- 21. The Party for Democratic Convergence or PCD of Delfim Neves -- a member of the ruling coalition -- carried seven seats. President Meneses' Force for Change Democratic Movement or MDFM won only one seat. Consequently, Patrice Trovoada became the new prime minister and head of government, succeeding Branco. However, he lost a parliamentary majority in 2012 and was succeeded as prime minister by Gabriel Arcanjo Ferreira Da Costa.

In 2014, it was to be seen which party would win control over the legislative branch of government. The major election issues included improved living conditions and environmental conservation.

After the ballots were counted on election day -- Oct. 12, 2014 -- it was the Independent

Democratic Action that enjoyed victory, winning 33 of the 55 seats in the National People's Assembly. Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe-Social Democratic Party would hold the second most seats in parliament, although with a reduced total of 16 seats. Democratic Convergence Party won five seats -- a reduction in seats from the previous parliament. Union of Democrats for Citizenship and Development won one seat while Force for Change Democratic Movement won zero seats and would no longer be a presence in parliament.

The next presidential election in Sao Tome and Principe was to be held in 2016.

Editor's Note:

Sao Tome and Principe is a Portuguese-speaking nation state located off the coast of Western Africa. The population of around 200,000 means that Sao Tome and Principe is one of the smallest countries in Africa. From the late 1400s the Portuguese began settling on the islands and establishing sugar plantations. With a decline in sugar production, coffee and cocoa became the country's economic mainstays in the 19th century. A movement for independence began in the late 1950s, and following a 1974 change of government in Portugal, Sao Tome and Principe gained its independence in 1975. Democratic reforms were not instituted until the late 1980s, although it was not until the establishment of the 1990 constitution that the country became a multi-party democracy. With cocoa as its main export product, the country's economy is extremely vulnerable to external shocks and is dependent on foreign financial assistance. Oil and natural gas reserves were discovered offshore from Sao Tome and Principe in the early 1990s, and the country hopes to reduce dependence on donors and cocoa exports by exploiting offshore oil and natural gas reserves. Drilling is under way in the hydrocarbon-rich Gulf of Guinea and commercial production was expected to begin within a few years. Political turmoil could negatively affect Sao Tome and Principe's search for energy reserves.

-- January 2015

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief and Executive Vice President, www.countrywatch.com; see Bibliography for reference sources. Supplementary sources: Gerhard Seibert, World Bank, The Oil Daily, The Oil and Gas Journal, David Johnson, Lexis-Nexis, FIRST, Reliefweb, and the United Nations.

Political Risk Index

Political Risk Index

The **Political Risk Index** is a proprietary index measuring the level of risk posed to governments, corporations, and investors, based on a myriad of political and economic factors. The [Political Risk Index](#) is calculated using an established methodology by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on varied criteria* including the following consideration: political stability, political representation, democratic accountability, freedom of expression, security and crime, risk of conflict, human development, jurisprudence and regulatory transparency, economic risk, foreign investment considerations, possibility of sovereign default, and corruption. Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the highest political risk, while a score of 10 marks the lowest political risk. Stated differently, countries with the lowest scores pose the greatest political risk. A score of 0 marks the most dire level of political risk and an ultimate nadir, while a score of 10 marks the lowest possible level of political risk, according to this proprietary index. Rarely will there be scores of 0 or 10 due to the reality that countries contain complex landscapes; as such, the index offers a range of possibilities ranging from lesser to greater risk.

| Country | Assessment |
|-------------|------------|
| Afghanistan | 2 |
| Albania | 4 |
| Algeria | 6 |
| Andorra | 9 |
| Angola | 4 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Antigua | 8 |
| Argentina | 4 |
| Armenia | 4-5 |
| Australia | 9.5 |
| Austria | 9.5 |
| Azerbaijan | 4 |
| Bahamas | 8.5 |
| Bahrain | 6 |
| Bangladesh | 3.5 |
| Barbados | 8.5-9 |
| Belarus | 3 |
| Belgium | 9 |
| Belize | 8 |
| Benin | 5 |
| Bhutan | 5 |
| Bolivia | 5 |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | 4 |
| Botswana | 7 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Brazil | 7 |
| Brunei | 7 |
| Bulgaria | 6 |
| Burkina Faso | 4 |
| Burma (Myanmar) | 4.5 |
| Burundi | 3 |
| Cambodia | 4 |
| Cameroon | 5 |
| Canada | 9.5 |
| Cape Verde | 6 |
| Central African Republic | 3 |
| Chad | 4 |
| Chile | 9 |
| China | 7 |
| China: Hong Kong | 8 |
| China: Taiwan | 8 |
| Colombia | 7 |
| Comoros | 5 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Congo DRC | 3 |
| Congo RC | 4 |
| Costa Rica | 8 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 4.5 |
| Croatia | 7 |
| Cuba | 4-4.5 |
| Cyprus | 5 |
| Czech Republic | 8 |
| Denmark | 9.5 |
| Djibouti | 4.5 |
| Dominica | 7 |
| Dominican Republic | 6 |
| East Timor | 5 |
| Ecuador | 6 |
| Egypt | 5 |
| El Salvador | 7 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 4 |
| Eritrea | 3 |

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Estonia | 8 |
| Ethiopia | 4 |
| Fiji | 5 |
| Finland | 9 |
| Fr. Yugoslav Rep. Macedonia | 5 |
| France | 9 |
| Gabon | 5 |
| Gambia | 4 |
| Georgia | 5 |
| Germany | 9.5 |
| Ghana | 6 |
| Greece | 4.5-5 |
| Grenada | 8 |
| Guatemala | 6 |
| Guinea | 3.5 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 3.5 |
| Guyana | 4.5 |
| Haiti | 3.5 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Holy See (Vatican) | 9 |
| Honduras | 4.5-5 |
| Hungary | 7 |
| Iceland | 8.5-9 |
| India | 7.5-8 |
| Indonesia | 6 |
| Iran | 3.5-4 |
| Iraq | 2.5-3 |
| Ireland | 8-8.5 |
| Israel | 8 |
| Italy | 7.5 |
| Jamaica | 6.5-7 |
| Japan | 9 |
| Jordan | 6.5 |
| Kazakhstan | 6 |
| Kenya | 5 |
| Kiribati | 7 |
| Korea, North | 1 |

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Korea, South | 8 |
| Kosovo | 4 |
| Kuwait | 7 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 4.5 |
| Laos | 4.5 |
| Latvia | 7 |
| Lebanon | 5.5 |
| Lesotho | 6 |
| Liberia | 3.5 |
| Libya | 2 |
| Liechtenstein | 9 |
| Lithuania | 7.5 |
| Luxembourg | 9 |
| Madagascar | 4 |
| Malawi | 4 |
| Malaysia | 8 |
| Maldives | 4.5 |
| Mali | 4 |

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Malta | 8 |
| Marshall Islands | 6 |
| Mauritania | 4.5-5 |
| Mauritius | 7 |
| Mexico | 6.5 |
| Micronesia | 7 |
| Moldova | 5 |
| Monaco | 9 |
| Mongolia | 5 |
| Montenegro | 6 |
| Morocco | 6.5 |
| Mozambique | 4.5-5 |
| Namibia | 6.5-7 |
| Nauru | 6 |
| Nepal | 4 |
| Netherlands | 9.5 |
| New Zealand | 9.5 |
| Nicaragua | 5 |

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Niger | 4 |
| Nigeria | 4.5 |
| Norway | 9.5 |
| Oman | 7 |
| Pakistan | 3.5 |
| Palau | 7 |
| Panama | 7.5 |
| Papua New Guinea | 5 |
| Paraguay | 6.5-7 |
| Peru | 7 |
| Philippines | 6 |
| Poland | 8 |
| Portugal | 7.5 |
| Qatar | 7.5 |
| Romania | 5.5 |
| Russia | 5.5 |
| Rwanda | 5 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 8 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Saint Lucia | 8 |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines | 8 |
| Samoa | 7 |
| San Marino | 9 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 5.5 |
| Saudi Arabia | 6 |
| Senegal | 6 |
| Serbia | 5 |
| Seychelles | 7 |
| Sierra Leone | 4.5 |
| Singapore | 9 |
| Slovak Republic (Slovakia) | 8 |
| Slovenia | 8 |
| Solomon Islands | 6 |
| Somalia | 2 |
| South Africa | 7 |
| Spain | 7.5 |
| Sri Lanka | 5 |

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Sudan | 3.5 |
| Suriname | 5 |
| Swaziland | 5 |
| Sweden | 9.5 |
| Switzerland | 9.5 |
| Syria | 2 |
| Tajikistan | 4.5 |
| Tanzania | 6 |
| Thailand | 6.5 |
| Togo | 4.5 |
| Tonga | 7 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8 |
| Tunisia | 6 |
| Turkey | 7 |
| Turkmenistan | 4.5 |
| Tuvalu | 7 |
| Uganda | 6 |
| Ukraine | 3.5-4 |

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| United Arab Emirates | 7 |
| United Kingdom | 9 |
| United States | 9.5 |
| Uruguay | 8 |
| Uzbekistan | 4 |
| Vanuatu | 7 |
| Venezuela | 4 |
| Vietnam | 5 |
| Yemen | 3 |
| Zambia | 4.5 |
| Zimbabwe | 3 |

*Methodology

The [Political Risk Index](#) is calculated by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on the combined scoring of varied criteria as follows --

1. political stability (record of peaceful transitions of power, ability of government to stay in office and carry out policies as a result of productive executive-legislative relationship, perhaps with popular support vis a vis risk of government collapse)
2. political representation (right of suffrage, free and fair elections, multi-party participation, and influence of foreign powers)
3. democratic accountability (record of respect for political rights, human rights, and civil liberties, backed by constitutional protections)

4. freedom of expression (media freedom and freedom of expression, right to dissent or express political opposition, backed by constitutional protections)
5. security and crime (the degree to which a country has security mechanisms that ensures safety of citizens and ensures law and order, without resorting to extra-judicial measures)
6. risk of conflict (the presence of conflict; record of coups or civil disturbances; threat of war; threats posed by internal or external tensions; threat or record of terrorism or insurgencies)
7. human development (quality of life; access to education; socio-economic conditions; systemic concern for the status of women and children)
8. jurisprudence and regulatory transparency (the impartiality of the legal system, the degree of transparency within the regulatory system of a country and the durability of that structure)
9. economic conditions (economic stability, investment climate, degree of nationalization of industries, property rights, labor force development)
10. corruption (the degree of corruption in a country and/or efforts by the government to address graft and other irregularities)

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the current climate of upheaval internationally -- both politically and economically -- has affected the ratings for several countries across the world.

North Korea, [Afghanistan](#), [Somalia](#), and [Zimbabwe](#) -- retain their low rankings.

Several Middle Eastern and North African countries, such as [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), [Libya](#), [Syria](#), [Iraq](#) and [Yemen](#) were downgraded in recent years due to political instability occurring in the "season of unrest" sweeping the region since 2011 and continuing today. The worst downgrades affected [Syria](#) where civil war is at play, along with the rampage of terror being carried out by Islamist terrorists who have also seized control over part of Syrian territory. [Iraq](#) has been further downgraded due to the rampage of Islamist terrorists and their takeover of wide swaths of Iraqi territory. [Libya](#) has also been downgraded further due to its slippage into failed state status; at issue in [Libya](#) have been an ongoing power struggle between rival militias. [Yemen](#) continues to hold steady with a poor ranking due to continued unrest at the hands of Houthi rebels, secessionists, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, and Islamic State. Its landscape has been further complicated by the fact that it is now the site of a proxy war between [Iran](#) and [Saudi](#)

[Arabia](#). Conversely, [Tunisia](#) and [Egypt](#) have seen slight upgrades as these countries stabilize.

In Africa, [Zimbabwe](#) continues to be one of the bleak spots of the world with the Mugabe regime effectively destroying the country's once vibrant economy, and miring [Zimbabwe](#) with an exceedingly high rate of inflation, debilitating unemployment, devolving public services, and critical food shortages; rampant crime and political oppression round out the landscape. [Somalia](#) also sports a poor ranking due to the continuing influence of the terror group, al-Shabab, which was not operating across the border in [Kenya](#). On the upside, [Nigeria](#), which was ineffectively dealing with the threat posed by the terror group, Boko Haram, was making some strides on the national security front with its new president at the helm. [Mali](#) was slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. But the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded due to the takeover of the government by Muslim Seleka rebels and a continued state of lawlessness in that country. [South Sudan](#) -- the world's newest nation state -- has not been officially included in this assessment; however, it can be unofficially assessed to be in the vicinity of "3" due to its manifold political and economic challenges. [Burkina Faso](#), [Burundi](#) and [Guinea](#) have been downgraded due to political unrest, with [Guinea](#) also having to deal with the burgeoning Ebola crisis.

In Europe, [Ukraine](#) was downgraded due to the unrest facing that country following its Maidan revolution that triggered a pro-Russian uprising in the eastern part of the country. [Russia](#) was also implicated in the Ukrainian crisis due to its intervention on behalf of pro-Russian separatists, as well as its annexation of the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. Strains on the infrastructure of southern and eastern European countries, such as [Serbia](#), [Croatia](#), and [Hungary](#), due to an influx of refugees was expected to pose social and economic challenges, and slight downgrades were made accordingly. So too, a corruption crisis for the Romanian prime minister has affected the ranking of that country. Meanwhile, the rankings for [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#) were maintained due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. [Greece](#), another euro zone nation, was earlier downgraded due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, no further downgrade was added since the country was able to successfully forge a bailout rescue deal with creditor institutions. Cyprus' exposure to Greek banks yielded a downgrade in its case.

In Asia, [Nepal](#) was downgraded in response to continuous political instability and a constitutional crisis that prevails well after landmark elections were held. Both [India](#) and [China](#) retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability. Increasing violence and political instability in [Pakistan](#) resulted in a downgrade for this country's already low rating. Meanwhile, [Singapore](#) retained its strong rankings due to its continued effective stewardship of the economy and political stability.

In the Americas, ongoing political and economic woes, as well as crime and corruption have affected the rankings for [Mexico](#), [Guatemala](#), and [Brazil](#). [Argentina](#) was downgraded due to its default on debt following the failure of talks with bond holders. [Venezuela](#) was downgraded due to

its mix of market unfriendly policies and political oppression. For the moment, the [United States](#) maintains a strong ranking along with [Canada](#), and most of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean; however, a renewed debt ceiling crisis could cause the [United States](#) to be downgraded in a future edition. Finally, a small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States.

Source:

Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

2015

Political Stability

Political Stability

The **Political Stability Index** is a proprietary index measuring a country's level of stability, standard of good governance, record of constitutional order, respect for human rights, and overall strength of democracy. The [Political Stability](#) Index is calculated using an established methodology* by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on a given country's record of peaceful transitions of power, ability of a government to stay in office and carry out its policies vis a vis risk credible risks of government collapse. Threats include coups, domestic violence and instability, terrorism, etc. This index measures the dynamic between the quality of a country's government and the threats that can compromise and undermine stability. Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the lowest level of political stability and an ultimate nadir, while a score of 10 marks the highest level of political stability possible, according to this proprietary index. Rarely will there be scores of 0 or 10 due to the reality that countries contain complex landscapes; as such, the index offers a range of possibilities ranging from lesser to greater stability.

| Country | Assessment |
|---------|------------|
| | |

| | |
|-------------|-------|
| | |
| Afghanistan | 2 |
| Albania | 4.5-5 |
| Algeria | 5 |
| Andorra | 9.5 |
| Angola | 4.5-5 |
| Antigua | 8.5-9 |
| Argentina | 7 |
| Armenia | 5.5 |
| Australia | 9.5 |
| Austria | 9.5 |
| Azerbaijan | 5 |
| Bahamas | 9 |
| Bahrain | 6 |
| Bangladesh | 4.5 |
| Barbados | 9 |
| Belarus | 4 |
| Belgium | 9 |
| | |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Belize | 8 |
| Benin | 5 |
| Bhutan | 5 |
| Bolivia | 6 |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | 5 |
| Botswana | 8.5 |
| Brazil | 7 |
| Brunei | 8 |
| Bulgaria | 7.5 |
| Burkina Faso | 4 |
| Burma (Myanmar) | 4.5 |
| Burundi | 4 |
| Cambodia | 4.5-5 |
| Cameroon | 6 |
| Canada | 9.5 |
| Cape Verde | 6 |
| Central African Republic | 3 |
| Chad | 4.5 |

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Chile | 9 |
| China | 7 |
| China: Hong Kong | 8 |
| China: Taiwan | 8 |
| Colombia | 7.5 |
| Comoros | 5 |
| Congo DRC | 3 |
| Congo RC | 5 |
| Costa Rica | 9.5 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 3.5 |
| Croatia | 7.5 |
| Cuba | 4.5 |
| Cyprus | 8 |
| Czech Republic | 8.5 |
| Denmark | 9.5 |
| Djibouti | 5 |
| Dominica | 8.5 |
| Dominican Republic | 7 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-------|
| East Timor | 5 |
| Ecuador | 7 |
| Egypt | 4.5-5 |
| El Salvador | 7.5-8 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 4.5 |
| Eritrea | 4 |
| Estonia | 9 |
| Ethiopia | 4.5 |
| Fiji | 5 |
| Finland | 9 |
| Fr.YugoslavRep.Macedonia | 6.5 |
| France | 9 |
| Gabon | 5 |
| Gambia | 4.5 |
| Georgia | 5 |
| Germany | 9.5 |
| Ghana | 7 |
| Greece | 6 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Grenada | 8.5 |
| Guatemala | 7 |
| Guinea | 3.5-4 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 4 |
| Guyana | 6 |
| Haiti | 3.5-4 |
| Holy See (Vatican) | 9.5 |
| Honduras | 6 |
| Hungary | 7.5 |
| Iceland | 9 |
| India | 8 |
| Indonesia | 7 |
| Iran | 3.5 |
| Iraq | 2.5 |
| Ireland | 9.5 |
| Israel | 8 |
| Italy | 8.5-9 |
| Jamaica | 8 |

| | |
|---------------|-------|
| Japan | 9 |
| Jordan | 6 |
| Kazakhstan | 6 |
| Kenya | 5 |
| Kiribati | 8 |
| Korea, North | 2 |
| Korea, South | 8.5 |
| Kosovo | 5.5 |
| Kuwait | 7 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 5 |
| Laos | 5 |
| Latvia | 8.5 |
| Lebanon | 5.5 |
| Lesotho | 5 |
| Liberia | 3.5-4 |
| Libya | 2 |
| Liechtenstein | 9 |
| Lithuania | 9 |

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Luxembourg | 9.5 |
| Madagascar | 4 |
| Malawi | 5 |
| Malaysia | 8 |
| Maldives | 4.5-5 |
| Mali | 4.5-5 |
| Malta | 9 |
| Marshall Islands | 8 |
| Mauritania | 6 |
| Mauritius | 8 |
| Mexico | 6.5-7 |
| Micronesia | 8 |
| Moldova | 5.5 |
| Monaco | 9.5 |
| Mongolia | 6.5-7 |
| Montenegro | 8 |
| Morocco | 7 |
| Mozambique | 5 |

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| Namibia | 8.5 |
| Nauru | 8 |
| Nepal | 4.5 |
| Netherlands | 9.5 |
| New Zealand | 9.5 |
| Nicaragua | 6 |
| Niger | 4.5 |
| Nigeria | 4.5 |
| Norway | 9.5 |
| Oman | 7 |
| Pakistan | 3 |
| Palau | 8 |
| Panama | 8.5 |
| Papua New Guinea | 6 |
| Paraguay | 8 |
| Peru | 7.5 |
| Philippines | 6 |
| Poland | 9 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Portugal | 9 |
| Qatar | 7 |
| Romania | 7 |
| Russia | 6 |
| Rwanda | 5 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 9 |
| Saint Lucia | 9 |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines | 9 |
| Samoa | 8 |
| San Marino | 9.5 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 7 |
| Saudi Arabia | 6 |
| Senegal | 7.5 |
| Serbia | 6.5 |
| Seychelles | 8 |
| Sierra Leone | 4.5 |
| Singapore | 9.5 |
| Slovak Republic (Slovakia) | 8.5 |

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Slovenia | 9 |
| Solomon Islands | 6.5-7 |
| Somalia | 2 |
| South Africa | 7.5 |
| Spain | 9 |
| Sri Lanka | 5 |
| Sudan | 3 |
| Suriname | 5 |
| Swaziland | 5 |
| Sweden | 9.5 |
| Switzerland | 9.5 |
| Syria | 2 |
| Tajikistan | 4.5 |
| Tanzania | 6 |
| Thailand | 6 |
| Togo | 5 |
| Tonga | 7 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8 |

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Tunisia | 5 |
| Turkey | 7.5 |
| Turkmenistan | 5 |
| Tuvalu | 8.5 |
| Uganda | 6 |
| Ukraine | 3.5-4 |
| United Arab Emirates | 7 |
| United Kingdom | 9 |
| United States | 9 |
| Uruguay | 8.5 |
| Uzbekistan | 4 |
| Vanuatu | 8.5 |
| Venezuela | 4.5-5 |
| Vietnam | 4.5 |
| Yemen | 2.5 |
| Zambia | 5 |
| Zimbabwe | 3 |

*Methodology

The Political Stability Index is calculated by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on the combined scoring of varied criteria as follows --

1. record of peaceful transitions of power (free and fair elections; adherence to political accords)
2. record of democratic representation, presence of instruments of democracy; systemic accountability
3. respect for human rights; respect for civil rights
4. strength of the system of jurisprudence, adherence to constitutional order, and good governance
5. ability of a government to stay in office and carry out its policies vis a vis risk credible risks of government collapse (i.e. government stability versus a country being deemed "ungovernable")
6. threat of coups, insurgencies, and insurrection
7. level of unchecked crime and corruption
8. risk of terrorism and other threats to national security
9. relationship with regional powers and international community; record of bilateral or multilateral cooperation
10. degree of economic strife (i.e. economic and financial challenges)

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the current climate of upheaval internationally -- both politically and economically -- has affected the ratings for several countries across the world. The usual suspects -- North Korea, [Afghanistan](#), and [Somalia](#) -- retain their low rankings. The reclusive and ultra-dictatorial North Korean regime, which has terrified the world with its nuclear threats, has exhibited internal instability. Of note was a cut-throat purge of hundreds of high ranking officials deemed to be a threat to Kim Jung-un. Despite their attempts to recover from years of lawlessness, war, and warlordism, both [Afghanistan](#) and [Somalia](#) continue to be beset by terrorism and turmoil. In [Afghanistan](#), while international forces have seen success in the effort against the terror group, al-Qaida, the other Islamist extremist group, the Taliban, continues to carry out a vicious insurgency using terrorism. In [Somalia](#), while the government attempts to do the nation's business, the terror

group, al-Shabab continues to make its presence known not only in [Somalia](#), but across the border into [Kenya](#) with devastating results/ Also in this category is [Iraq](#), which continues to be rocked by horrific violence and terrorism at the hands of Islamic State, which has taken over wide swaths of Iraqi territory.

Syria, [Libya](#), and [Yemen](#) have been added to this unfortunate echelon of the world's most politically unstable countries. [Syria](#) has been mired by the twin hazards of 1. a civil war as rebels oppose the Assad regime; and 2. the rampage of terror being carried out by Islamic State, which also seized control over vast portions of Syrian territory. Meanwhile, the post-Qaddafi landscape of [Libya](#) has devolved into chaos as rival militias battle for control -- the elected government of the country notwithstanding. Rounding out this grim triad is [Yemen](#), which was dealing with a Houthi rebellion, secessionists in the south, as well as the threat of terrorism from al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula as well as Islamic State, while also being the site of a proxy war between Shi'a [Iran](#) and Sunni [Saudi Arabia](#).

Meanwhile, several Middle Eastern and North African countries, such as [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), and [Bahrain](#) were downgraded in recent years due to political instability occurring in the "season of unrest" sweeping the region since 2011 and continuing today. All three of these countries have stabilized in recent years and have been upgraded accordingly. In [Bahrain](#), the landscape had calmed. In [Egypt](#), the secular military-backed government has generated criticism for its crackdown on the Muslim Brotherhood; however, the country had ratified the presidency via democratic elections and were on track to hold parliamentary elections as the country moved along the path of democratization. Perhaps the most impressive story was coming out of [Tunisia](#) -- the country whose Jasmine Revolution sparked the entire Arab Spring -- and where after a few years of strife, a new progressive constitution was passed into law and a secular government had been elected to power. [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), and [Bahrain](#) have seen slight upgrades as these countries stabilize.

In Africa, the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded the previous year due to the takeover of the government by Muslim Seleka rebels. Although the country has been trying to emerge from this crisis, the fact of the matter was that it was difficult to halt the precipitous decline into lawlessness in that country. [Zimbabwe](#) has maintained its consistently poor ranking due to the dictatorial regime of Mugabe, who continues to hold a tight grip on power, intimidates the opposition, squashes dissent, and oppresses the white farmer population of the country. Moving in a slightly improved direction is [Nigeria](#), which has sported abysmal ratings due to the government's fecklessness in dealing with the threat posed by the Islamist terror group, Boko Haram. Under its newly-elected government, there appears to be more of a concerted effort to make national security a priority action item. [Mali](#) was also slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. Political instability has visited [Burkina Faso](#) and [Burundi](#) as the leaders of those countries attempted to side-step constitutional limits to hold onto power. In [Burundi](#), an attempted

coup ensued but quelled, and the president won a (questionable) new term in office; unrest has since punctuated the landscape. In [Burkina Faso](#), the political climate has turned stormy as a result of a successful coup that ended the rule of the president, and then a putsch against the transitional government. These two African countries have been downgraded as a result.

It should be noted that the African country of South [Sudan](#) -- the world's newest nation state -- has not been officially included in this assessment; however, it can be unofficially assessed to be in the vicinity of "3" due to its manifold political and economic challenges. [Guinea](#) has endured poor rankings throughout, but was slightly downgraded further over fears of social unrest and the Ebola health crisis.

In Europe, [Ukraine](#) was downgraded due to the unrest facing that country following its Maidan revolution that triggered a pro-Russian uprising in the eastern part of the country. [Russia](#) was also implicated in the Ukrainian crisis due to its intervention on behalf of pro-Russian separatists, as well as its annexation of the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. [Serbia](#) and [Albania](#) were slightly downgraded due to eruptions of unrest, while [Romania](#) was slightly downgraded on the basis of corruption charges against the prime minister. [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#) were downgraded due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. [Greece](#), another euro zone nation, was downgraded the previous year due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, the country successfully forged a rescue deal with international creditors and stayed within the Euro zone. Greek voters rewarded the hitherto unknown upstart party at the polls for these efforts. As a result, [Greece](#) was actually upgraded slightly as it proved to the world that it could endure the political and economic storms. Meanwhile, [Germany](#), [France](#), [Switzerland](#), the [United Kingdom](#), the [Netherlands](#), and the Scandinavian countries continue to post impressive ranking consistent with these countries' strong records of democracy, freedom, and peaceful transfers of power.

In Asia, [Nepal](#) was downgraded in response to continuous political instability well after landmark elections that prevails today. [Cambodia](#) was very slightly downgraded due to post-election instability that has resulted in occasional flares of violence. Despite the "trifecta of tragedy" in [Japan](#) in 2011 -- the earthquake, the ensuing tsunami, and the resulting nuclear crisis -- and the appreciable destabilization of the economic and political terrain therein, this country has only slightly been downgraded. Japan's challenges have been assessed to be transient, the government remains accountable, and there is little risk of default. Both [India](#) and [China](#) retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability. Increasing violence and political instability in [Pakistan](#) resulted in a downgrade for this country's already low rating.

In the Americas, [Haiti](#) retained its downgraded status due to ongoing political and economic woes. [Mexico](#) was downgraded due to its alarming rate of crime. [Guatemala](#) was downgraded due to charges of corruption, the arrest of the president, and uncertainty over the outcome of elections. [Brazil](#) was downgraded due to the corruption charges erupting on the political landscape, the

stalling of the economy, and the increasingly loud calls for the impeachment of President Rousseff. [Argentina](#) was downgraded due to its default on debt following the failure of talks with bond holders. [Venezuela](#) was downgraded due to the fact that the country's post-Chavez government is every bit as autocratic and nationalistic, but even more inclined to oppress its political opponents. [Colombia](#) was upgraded slightly due to efforts aimed at securing a peace deal with the FARC insurgents. A small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States. Meanwhile, the [United States](#), [Canada](#), [Costa Rica](#), [Panama](#), and most of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean retain their strong rankings due to their records of stability and peaceful transfers of power.

In the Pacific, [Fiji](#) was upgraded due to its return to constitutional order and democracy with the holding of the first elections in eight years.

In Oceania, [Maldives](#) has been slightly downgraded due to the government's continued and rather relentless persecution of the country's former pro-democracy leader - former President Nasheed.

Source:

Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

2015

Freedom Rankings

Freedom Rankings

Freedom in the World

Editor's Note: This ranking by Freedom House quantifies political freedom and civil liberties into a single combined index on each sovereign country's level of freedom and liberty. The initials "PR"

and "CL" stand for Political Rights and Civil Liberties, respectively. The number 1 represents the most free countries and the number 7 represents the least free. Several countries fall in the continuum in between. The freedom ratings reflect an overall judgment based on survey results.

| Country | PR | CL | Freedom Status | Trend Arrow |
|----------------------|-----|----|----------------|-------------|
| Afghanistan | 6 ? | 6 | Not Free | |
| Albania* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Algeria | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Andorra* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Angola | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Antigua and Barbuda* | 3 ? | 2 | Free | |
| Argentina* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Armenia | 6 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Australia* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Austria* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Azerbaijan | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Bahamas* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Bahrain | 6 ? | 5 | Not Free ? | |
| Bangladesh* | 3 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|---|-------------|---|
| Barbados* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Belarus | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Belgium* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Belize* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Benin* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Bhutan | 4 | 5 | Partly Free | |
| Bolivia* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina* | 4 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Botswana* | 3 ? | 2 | Free | |
| Brazil* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Brunei | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Bulgaria* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Burkina Faso | 5 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Burma | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| Burundi* | 4 | 5 | Partly Free | ↑ |
| Cambodia | 6 | 5 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Cameroon | 6 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Canada* | 1 | 1 | Free | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|---|-------------|---|
| Cape Verde* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Central African Republic | 5 | 5 | Partly Free | |
| Chad | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Chile* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| China | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Colombia* | 3 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Comoros* | 3 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Congo (Brazzaville) | 6 | 5 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Congo (Kinshasa) | 6 | 6 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Costa Rica* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Croatia* | 1 ? | 2 | Free | |
| Cuba | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Cyprus* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Czech Republic* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Denmark* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Djibouti | 5 | 5 | Partly Free | |
| Dominica* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|---|-----|-------------|---|
| Dominican Republic* | 2 | 2 | Free | ↓ |
| East Timor* | 3 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Ecuador* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Egypt | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| El Salvador* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Equatorial Guinea | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| Eritrea | 7 | 7 ? | Not Free | |
| Estonia* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Ethiopia | 5 | 5 | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Fiji | 6 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Finland* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| France* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Gabon | 6 | 5 ? | Not Free ? | |
| The Gambia | 5 | 5 ? | Partly Free | |
| Georgia | 4 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Germany* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Ghana* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Greece* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Grenada* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Guatemala* | 4 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Guinea | 7 | 6 ? | Not Free | |
| Guinea-Bissau* | 4 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Guyana* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Haiti* | 4 | 5 | Partly Free | |
| Honduras | 4 ? | 4 ? | Partly Free | |
| Hungary* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Iceland* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| India* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Indonesia* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Iran | 6 | 6 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Iraq | 5 ? | 6 | Not Free | |
| Ireland* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Israel* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Italy* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Jamaica* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Japan* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|---------------|---|
| Jordan | 6 ? | 5 | Not Free ? | |
| Kazakhstan | 6 | 5 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Kenya | 4 | 4 ? | Partly Free | |
| Kiribati* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Kosovo | 5 ? | 4 ? | Partly Free ? | |
| Kuwait | 4 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Kyrgyzstan | 6 ? | 5 ? | Not Free ? | |
| Laos | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Latvia* | 2 | 1 | Free | |
| Lebanon | 5 | 3 ? | Partly Free | |
| Lesotho* | 3 ? | 3 | Partly Free ? | |
| Liberia* | 3 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Libya | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| Liechtenstein* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Lithuania* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Luxembourg* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Macedonia* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | ↑ |
| Madagascar | 6 ? | 4 ? | Partly Free | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Malawi* | 3 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Malaysia | 4 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Maldives* | 3 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Mali* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Malta* | 1 | 1 | Free | ↓ |
| Marshall Islands* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Mauritania | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Mauritius* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Mexico* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Micronesia* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Moldova* | 3 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Monaco* | 2 | 1 | Free | |
| Mongolia* | 2 | 2 | Free | ↑ |
| Montenegro* | 3 | 2 ? | Free ? | |
| Morocco | 5 | 4 | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Mozambique | 4 ? | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Namibia* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Nauru* | 1 | 1 | Free | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Nepal | 4 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Netherlands* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| New Zealand* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Nicaragua* | 4 | 4 ? | Partly Free | |
| Niger | 5 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Nigeria | 5 | 4 | Partly Free | ↓ |
| North Korea | 7 | 7 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Norway* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Oman | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Pakistan | 4 | 5 | Partly Free | |
| Palau* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Panama* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Papua New Guinea* | 4 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Paraguay* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Peru* | 2 | 3 | Free | |
| Philippines | 4 | 3 | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Poland* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Portugal* | 1 | 1 | Free | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|-------------|---|
| Qatar | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Romania* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Russia | 6 | 5 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Rwanda | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Saint Lucia* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines* | 2 | 1 | Free | |
| Samoa* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| San Marino* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Sao Tome and Principe* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Saudi Arabia | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Senegal* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Serbia* | 2 ? | 2 | Free | |
| Seychelles* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Sierra Leone* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Singapore | 5 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Slovakia* | 1 | 1 | Free | ↓ |
| Slovenia* | 1 | 1 | Free | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Solomon Islands | 4 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Somalia | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| South Africa* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| South Korea* | 1 | 2 | Free | |
| Spain* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Sri Lanka* | 4 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Sudan | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| Suriname* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Swaziland | 7 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Sweden* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Switzerland* | 1 | 1 | Free | ↓ |
| Syria | 7 | 6 | Not Free | |
| Taiwan* | 1 ? | 2 ? | Free | |
| Tajikistan | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Tanzania | 4 | 3 | Partly Free | |
| Thailand | 5 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Togo | 5 | 4 ? | Partly Free | |
| Tonga | 5 | 3 | Partly Free | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|-----|-------------|---|
| Trinidad and Tobago* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Tunisia | 7 | 5 | Not Free | |
| Turkey* | 3 | 3 | Partly Free | ↓ |
| Turkmenistan | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| Tuvalu* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Uganda | 5 | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Ukraine* | 3 | 2 | Free | |
| United Arab Emirates | 6 | 5 | Not Free | |
| United Kingdom* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| United States* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Uruguay* | 1 | 1 | Free | |
| Uzbekistan | 7 | 7 | Not Free | |
| Vanuatu* | 2 | 2 | Free | |
| Venezuela | 5 ? | 4 | Partly Free | |
| Vietnam | 7 | 5 | Not Free | ↓ |
| Yemen | 6 ? | 5 | Not Free ? | |
| Zambia* | 3 | 4 ? | Partly Free | |
| Zimbabwe | 6 ? | 6 | Not Free | |

Methodology:

PR and CL stand for political rights and civil liberties, respectively; 1 represents the most free and 7 the least free rating. The ratings reflect an overall judgment based on survey results.

? ? up or down indicates a change in political rights, civil liberties, or status since the last survey.

↑ ↓ up or down indicates a trend of positive or negative changes that took place but that were not sufficient to result in a change in political rights or civil liberties ratings of 1-7.

* indicates a country's status as an electoral democracy.

Source:

This data is derived from the latest edition of Freedom House's Freedom in the World 2010 edition.

Available at URL: <http://www.freedomhouse.org>

Updated:

Reviewed in 2015

Human Rights

Human Rights in Sao Tome and Principe

Overview

The government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe works to respect the civil and human rights of its citizens. However, certain existing problems are exacerbated by poverty and high levels of unemployment. Prison conditions are very harsh, and the judicial system is seen as inefficient and influenced by external sources. Child labor is a problem, as is official corruption. There are also inhumane labor conditions in the agriculture sector. Overall, the country has a better than average human rights record when compared with many other countries in the world.

Human Development Index (HDI) Rank:

See full listing of the Human Development Index located in the Social Overview of this report for

this country's current rank.

Human Poverty Index Rank:

Not Ranked

Gini Index:

N/A

Life Expectancy at Birth (years):

68 years

Unemployment Rate:

N/A

Population living on \$1 a day (%):

N/A

Population living on \$2 a day (%):

N/A

Population living beneath the Poverty Line (%):

54%

Internally Displaced People:

N/A

Total Crime Rate (%):

N/A

Health Expenditure (% of GDP):

Public: 9.7%

% of GDP Spent on Education:

N/A

Human Rights Conventions Party to:

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (Signed but not yet ratified)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Signed but not yet ratified)
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Signed but not yet ratified)
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (Signed but not yet ratified)

- Conventions on the Rights of the Child
- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees
- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Signed but not yet ratified)

*Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index that measures the level of well-being in 177 nations in the world. It uses factors such as poverty, literacy, life-expectancy, education, gross domestic product, and purchasing power parity to assess the average achievements in each nation. It has been used in the United Nation's Human Development Report since 1993.

*Human Poverty Index Ranking is based on certain indicators used to calculate the Human Poverty Index. Probability at birth of not surviving to age 40, adult literacy rate, population without sustainable access to an improved water source, and population below income poverty line are the indicators assessed in this measure.

*The Gini Index measures inequality based on the distribution of family income or consumption. A value of 0 represents perfect equality (income being distributed equally), and a value of 100 perfect inequality (income all going to one individual).

*The calculation of the total crime rate is the % of the total population which has been effected by property crime, robbery, sexual assault, assault, or bribery (corruption) related occurrences.

Government Functions

A new constitution was passed by the National Assembly in April 1990, approved in an August public referendum, and promulgated in September. Under the new constitution, São Tomé and Príncipe held multiparty elections for the first time since independence. Shortly after the constitution took effect, the National Assembly formally legalized opposition parties and permitted independent candidates to participate in the January 1991 legislative elections. The National Assembly is the supreme organ of the state and the highest legislative body. Its members are elected for a four-year term and meet semi-annually.

The president of the republic is elected to a five-year term by direct universal suffrage and a secret ballot. Candidates are chosen at their party's national conference (or individuals may run independently). A presidential candidate must obtain an outright majority of the popular vote in

either a first or second tour of voting in order to be elected president. The prime minister is named by the president but must be ratified by the majority party and thus normally comes from a list of its choosing. The prime minister, in turn, names the 14 members of the cabinet. The National Assembly is made up of 55 members, all of whom must stand for re-election every five years.

The Supreme Tribunal administers justice at the highest level. Formerly responsible to the National Assembly, under the 1990 constitution, the judiciary is independent. Administratively, the country is divided into seven municipal districts, six on São Tomé and one comprising Príncipe. Governing councils in each district maintain a limited number of autonomous decision-making powers, and are re-elected every five years.

Since the constitutional reforms of 1990 and the elections of 1991, São Tomé has made great strides toward developing its democratic institutions and further guaranteeing the civil and human rights of its citizens. São Toméans have freely changed their government through peaceful and transparent elections, and while there have been disagreements and political conflicts within the branches of government and the National Assembly, the debates have been carried out and resolved in open, democratic and legal fora, in accordance with the provisions of São Toméan law.

Three major political parties and several minor ones actively participate in government and openly express their views. Freedom of the press is respected, and there are two independent newspapers in addition to the government paper. The government's respect for human rights is exemplary; the government does not engage in repressive measures against its citizens, and respect for individuals' rights to due process and protection from government abuses is widely honored. Freedom of expression is accepted, and the government has taken no repressive measures to silence critics.

Government Structure

Names:

conventional long form:

Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Príncipe

conventional short form:

São Tomé and Príncipe

Type:

Republic

Executive Branch:

Chief of state:

President Manuel Pinto DA COSTA (since September 2011). See 2011 Elections note below; president elected by popular vote for a five-year term (eligible for a second term). The next election is to be held in 2016.

Note on 2011 Elections:

A presidential election was scheduled to be held in Sao Tome and Principe on July 17, 2011. This election date was delayed from 2010 to the current time frame due to allegations of a corrupt deal between the political elite in Sao Tome and Principe and several Nigerian oil companies. Typically, the president in Sao Tome and Principe is elected to power by popular vote for a five-year term and is eligible for a second term. The incumbent head of state was President Fradique de Menezes, who first came to power in 2001 and was re-elected to power in 2006 with 60 percent of the vote share against Patrice Trovoada who garnered 38.5 percent and was serving as prime minister since the 2010 parliamentary elections. Clearly, the incumbent president -- Fradique de Menezes -- was not eligible to contest the 2011 elections having now completed two terms in office in a system with term limits.

The main candidates contesting the 2011 presidential election were: former dictator Manuel Pinto da Costa, who was running as an independent but who was a leading figure in the opposition party Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe/Social Democratic Party (MLSTP/PSD); former Prime Minister Maria das Neves, who was running as an independent as well and also came from the ranks of the (MLSTP/PSD); former defense minister Elsa Pinto, who joined the contest as an independent; Aurelio Martins, a journalist and businessman; as well as Prime Minister Evaristo Carvalho of the governing party Independent Democratic Action.

The election finally ensued on July 17, 2011 -- a delayed date due to the fact that the country was embroiled in a corruption scandal involving the political elite in Sao Tome and Principe and several Nigerian oil companies. Following the vote, Pinto da Costa received a plurality of the vote share - - 38.42 percent -- but not an absolute majority. He would have to face a runoff against his next closest competitor. However, there was confusion as to who that might be with both Carvalho and Neves identified. Ultimately, it was determined that Carvalho was in second place and would contest the second round on Aug. 7, 2011.

Voters again went to the polls on Aug. 7, 2011 to cast their ballots in the second round of the

presidential election. According to news reports on the ground, Manuel Pinto da Costa won the most votes -- 52.88 percent -- against Evaristo Carvalho, who garnered the rest of the vote share. The outcome was the return to presidential power for da Costa, who was regarded as something of a dictator during his earlier tenure. Now, though, he was poised to reclaim the top post and succeed outgoing President Fradique de Menezes.

Head of government:

Prime Minister Patrice Emery TROVOADA (since 2014). The prime minister is chosen by the National Assembly and approved by the president. It was to be seen if the 2014 election results would contribute to a change in the head of government.

Cabinet:

Council of Ministers was appointed by the president on the proposal of the prime minister

Legislative Branch:

Unicameral "Assembleia Popular Nacional" (National People's Assembly):

Assembly is composed of 55 seats; members are elected by direct, popular vote to serve four-year terms

Elections:

Elections held Oct. 12, 2014; election results are as follows -- percent of vote by party - NA; seats by party - ADI 33, MLSTP-PSD 16, PCD-GR 5, other 1

2014 elections:

Parliamentary elections were set to be held in Sao Tome and Principe in October 2014. At stake would be the composition of the unicameral "Assembleia Popular Nacional" (National People's Assembly), composed of 55 seats where members are elected by direct, popular vote to serve four-year terms.

The previous elections were held in 2010 and resulted in victory for the opposition party, Independent Democratic Action (ADI), led by Patrice Trovoada. The ADI garnered 26 seats -- a plurality in the 55-seat National Assembly. The Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe-Social Democratic Party or MLSTP-PSD of Prime Minister Rafael Branco acquired the next highest number of seats -- 21. The Party for Democratic Convergence or PCD of Delfim Neves -- a member of the ruling coalition -- carried seven seats. President Menezes' Force for Change Democratic Movement or MDFM won only one seat. Consequently, Patrice Trovoada became the new prime minister and head of government, succeeding Branco. However, he lost a parliamentary majority in 2012 and was succeeded as prime minister by Gabriel Arcanjo Ferreira Da Costa.

In 2014, it was to be seen which part would win control over the legislative branch of government. The major election issues included improved living conditions and environmental conservation.

After the ballots were counted on election day -- Oct. 12, 2014 -- it was the Independent Democratic Action that enjoyed victory, winning 33 of the 55 seats in the National People's Assembly. Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe-Social Democratic Party would hold the second most seats in parliament, although with a reduced total of 16 seats. Democratic Convergence Party won five seats -- a reduction in seats from the previous parliament. Union of Democrats for Citizenship and Development won one seat while Force for Change Democratic Movement won zero seats and would no longer be a presence in parliament.

Judicial Branch:

Supreme Court, judges are appointed by the National Peoples Assembly

Constitution:

Approved March 1990; effective Sept. 10, 1990

Legal System:

Based on Portuguese law system and customary law; has not accepted compulsory ICJ jurisdiction

Administrative Divisions:

Two districts (concelhos, singular - concelho); Principe, São Tomé

Suffrage:

18 years of age; universal

Political Parties and Leaders:

Force for Change Democratic Movement or MDFM [Fradigue Bandeira Melo DE MENEZES]

Independent Democratic Action or ADI [Patrice TROVOADA]

Movement for the Liberation of Sao Tome and Principe-Social Democratic Party or MLSTP-PSD [Aurelio MARTINS]

Party for Democratic Convergence-Reflection Group or PCD-GR [Leonel Mario D'ALVA]

other small parties

Principal Government Officials

The Government:

Pres. Manuel Pinto DA COSTA

Prime Min. Patrice Emery TROVOADA

Min. of Agriculture, Rural Development, & Fisheries Antonio Alvaro DA GRACA DIAS

Min. of Commerce, Tourism, & Industry Demostenes Vasconelos Pires DOS SANTOS

Min. of Defense & Public Security Oscar Aguiar Sacramento e SOUSA, Lt. Col.

Min. of Education, Culture, & Training Jorge Lopes Bom JESUS

Min. of Foreign Affairs, Cooperation, & Communities Natalie Pedro da Costa UMBELINA NETO

Min. of Health & Social Affairs Leonel Pinto D'ASSUNCAO PONTES, Dr.

Min. of Internal Affairs & Civilian Protection Raul Antonio DA COSTA CRAVID

Min. of Justice, Public Admin., & Parliamentary Affairs Edite Ramos DA COSTA TEN JUA

Min. of Labor, Solidarity, Women, & Family Affairs Maria Tome De ARAUJO

Min. of National Defense & Internal Order Oscar Aguiar SACRAMENTO E SOUSA, Lt. Col.

Min. of Planning & Finance Helio Silva VAZ D'ALMEIDA

Min. of Public Works, Infrastructure, Natural Resources, & Environment Osvaldo Cravid Viegas D'ABREU

Min. of Trade, Industry, & Tourism Demonstenes Vasconcelos Pires dos SANTOS

Min. of Urban Development, Transportation, & Communications Benjamin Vera CRUZ

Min. of State for Press, Youth, & Sports Albertino Francisco BOA MORTE

Governor, Bank of Sao Tome & Principe

Ambassador to the US Carlos Filomeno Azevedo Agostinho das NEVES

Permanent Representative to the UN, New York Carlos Filomeno Azevedo Agostinho das NEVES

-- as of 2015

Leader Biography

Leader Biography

President of Sao Tome and Principe

A presidential election was scheduled to be held in Sao Tome and Principe on July 17, 2011. This election date was delayed from 2010 to the current time frame due to allegations of a corrupt deal between the political elite in Sao Tome and Principe and several Nigerian oil companies. Typically, the president in Sao Tome and Principe is elected to power by popular vote for a five-year term and is eligible for a second term. The incumbent head of state was President Fradique de Menezes, who first came to power in 2001 and was re-elected to power in 2006 with 60 percent of the vote share against Patrice Trovoada who garnered 38.5 percent and was serving as prime minister since the 2010 parliamentary elections. Clearly, the incumbent president -- Fradique de Menezes -- was not eligible to contest the 2011 elections having now completed two terms in office in a system with term limits.

The main candidates contesting the 2011 presidential election were: former dictator Manuel Pinto da Costa, who was running as an independent but who was a leading figure in the opposition party Movement for the Liberation of São Tomé and Príncipe/Social Democratic Party (MLSTP/PSD); former Prime Minister Maria das Neves, who was running as an independent as well and also came from the ranks of the (MLSTP/PSD); former defense minister Elsa Pinto, who joined the contest as an independent; Aurelio Martins, a journalist and businessman; as well as Prime Minister Evaristo Carvalho of the governing party Independent Democratic Action.

The election finally ensued on July 17, 2011 -- a delayed date due to the fact that the country was embroiled in a corruption scandal involving the political elite in Sao Tome and Principe and several Nigerian oil companies. Following the vote, Pinto da Costa received a plurality of the vote share -

- 38.42 percent -- but not an absolute majority. He would have to face a runoff against his next closest competitor. However, there was confusion as to who that might be with both Carvalho and Neves identified. Ultimately, it was determined that Carvalho was in second place and would contest the second round on Aug. 7, 2011.

Voters again went to the polls on Aug. 7, 2011 to cast their ballots in the second round of the presidential election. According to news reports on the ground, Manuel Pinto da Costa won the most votes -- 52.88 percent -- against Evaristo Carvalho, who garnered the rest of the vote share. The outcome was the return to presidential power for da Costa, who was regarded as something of a dictator during his earlier tenure. Now, though, he was poised to reclaim the top post and succeed outgoing President Fradique de Menezes. Incoming President da Costa promised to concentrate on economic development, particularly as regards natural resources of oil and cocoa, as well as growth in the tourism sector.

Foreign Relations

General Relations

Until independence in 1975, São Tomé and Príncipe had few ties abroad except those that passed through Portugal. Following independence, the new government sought to expand its diplomatic relationships. A common language, tradition, and colonial experience have led to close collaboration between São Tomé and other ex-Portuguese colonies in Africa, particularly Angola. São Toméan relations with other African countries in the region, such as Congo and Gabon, are also good.

While the São Toméan government has maintained a foreign policy based on nonalignment and cooperation with any country willing to assist in its economic development, it has recently begun to emphasize ties with the United States and Europe.

Regional Relations

São Tomé and Príncipe have maintained important trade links between the mainland states of

Gabon, Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea. It also maintains friendly relations with the other former Portuguese African colonies and with Brazil and Portugal. In 1996, these countries formed the "Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa" (CPLP). The CPLP attempts to benefit from cooperation in technical, cultural and social issues.

São Tomé and Príncipe has continued to maintain close ties with the government of Angola. In 2000 it signed a friendship agreement in the hopes that this would further trade between the two countries. In November 1999 President Trovoada paid an official visit to Nigeria to discuss a long-standing maritime dispute. The culmination of the meeting came in August 2000 where the two sides signed a "one-third line effect" agreement delineating the waters equidistant from each other with proportional lines. The importance of the event is marked by the rise in petroleum and fisheries potential in the area as well as maritime potential. This agreement paved the way for a April 2001 agreement between the two countries to establish a joint development zone.

In 2000-2001 São Tomé and Príncipe has also reached out to Cameroon in an effort to calm existing disputes and promote cooperation. In January 2001 the São Toméan delegation made an important trip to Cameroon in an effort to promote military cooperation. The likely result of the meeting will be an agreement on the training of military officials.

In April 2000 President Trovoada visited Libya for the first time. The two countries signed a friendship agreement that São Tomé and Príncipe hopes will aid in its fuel crisis and with other trade issues. The pressing issue at hand was São Tomé and Príncipe's support for Libyan president Moammar al-Qadhafi's Africa Union Bill put forward at the Organization of African Unity Summit in July 2000. President Trovoada agreed to support the bill. In February 2001 Libya paid 30 percent of São Tomé and Príncipe's arrears to the OAU so that it can regain voting rights that had been suspended due to payment arrears and vote for the bill.

In 2003, Sao Tome and Principe reached an oil rights agreement with Nigeria by which the tiny country would garner 40 percent of eventual oil revenue. The agreement was predicted to yield up to \$100 million next year since the country is believed to possess sizable oil reserves.

In 2005, both countries signed a joint agreement with major multinational oil companies for oil exploration offshore and for production sharing.

Other Significant Relations

The United States (U.S.) was among the first countries to accredit an ambassador to São Tomé and Príncipe. The U.S. Ambassador based in Gabon is accredited to São Tomé on a non-resident basis. The ambassador and embassy staffs make regular visits to the islands. The first São Toméan ambassador to the United States, resident in New York City, was accredited in 1985. In 1986, São

Toméan President da Costa visited the United States and met with then-Vice President Bush.

U.S. relations with São Tomé are excellent. The United States Peace Corps maintains 20 volunteers on the islands, working primarily in the health and rural appropriate technology sectors. Voice of America (VOA) and the government of São Tomé signed a long term agreement in 1992 for the establishment of a relay transmitter station in São Tomé; VOA currently broadcasts to most of central Africa from this facility, and is looking to expand the operation. The U.S. government also maintains a number of smaller assistance programs in São Tomé, administered through non-governmental organizations or the embassy in Libreville.

Relations with the U.S. have become more important in recent years with the discovery of oil off the São Toméan coast. The U.S. conglomerate Environmental Remediation Holding (ERHC) holds a 49 percent share in the country's oil interests and the American-based Mobil Corporation holds exclusive drilling rights. The move in 2000 by the São Toméan government to release export tariffs and liberalize terms of trade have also acted to improve relations.

In recognition of the advances made in institutional development and economic reform, the São Toméan Government has been the recipient of significant debt relief in 2001. The Belgian government forgave approximately US\$1 million in debt in February 2001. More significantly, the country qualified for US\$200 million in multilateral debt relief from the World Bank under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative.

The HIPC was launched in 1996 as a comprehensive effort to reduce debt in the world's poorest countries. Countries can qualify in two stages. In the first stage, a debtor country must establish a satisfactory policy and performance track record (normally three years). It is on these grounds that the São Tomé and Príncipe qualified. In the second stage, the country must implement a broad reaching poverty reduction strategy. While the World Bank does not mandate any specific government ideology, the poverty reduction strategy must be implemented with the broad participation of civil society.

In June 1999, São Tomé announced that it would be allowing European Union countries to fish in its waters for a period of three years for \$2 million. In addition to the financial compensation, São Tomé would also receive help in personnel training and development of ocean-land communication systems.

Relations with the United Kingdom (U.K.) have been good although there is no resident diplomatic representation by either party. The U.K. allocated aid to Sao Tome and Principe through the European Union and trade is minimal.

Sao Tome and Principe also have good ties with other Lusophone countries, such as Portuguese and Brazil. Indeed, its closest relationships have been with other Portuguese-speaking African

countries, and specifically, with Angola, as well as with Portugal itself -- its main trading partner. China suspended diplomatic relations with São Tomé and Príncipe in July 1997, due to São Tomé and Príncipe's establishment of diplomatic relations with Taiwan.

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief at www.countrywatch.com. See Bibliography for list of research sources.

National Security

External Threats

No nation poses an immediate threat to Sao Tome and Principe 's national security.

Crime

The United States (U.S.) Department of State indicates that the incidence of theft on the islands of Sao Tome and Principe is fairly high. Burglary, pick pocketing and armed robbery are more common in the 'tourist areas' of the islands.

Insurgencies

At present, no organized insurgent movements inside or outside of Sao Tome and Principe threaten its government or its general population. The island nation has experienced two coups in the last decade, however. Sao Tome and Principe received its independence from Portugal in July 1975. It adopted a democratic system of government in 1990 and multi-party elections were held a year later. A military junta overthrew the central government in 1995. Angolan officials facilitated the peaceful reinstatement of Sao Tome and Principe 's legitimate leaders a week later. Subsequent multiparty elections were held in 1996 and 2001, both without incident. Fradique de Menezes officially assumed the presidency upon inauguration in September 2001. Following parliamentary elections in March 2002, a military junta overthrew Sao Tome and Principe 's government for the second time in ten years. Many of the coup participants had fought as foreign mercenaries in South Africa 's army during apartheid. In July 2003, international intervention fostered a peaceful reversal of the coup. De Menezes was reinstated and remained in office, re-elected most recently in 2006.

Changes to the position of prime minister occurred in the last several years -- the most recent following election of 2006. Aside from the two short-lived coups, political conditions in Sao Tome and Principe have been generally stable since the 1990 introduction of democratic reforms.

Terrorism

There is no specific threat of terrorism against Sao Tome and Principe, nor has it been a traditional target of terrorist violence. Sao Tome is currently party to none of the international conventions and protocols pertaining to terrorism.

Defense Forces

Military Data

Military Branches:

Armed Forces of Sao Tome and Principe (Forças Armadas de Sao Tome e Principe, FASTP): Army, Coast Guard of Sao Tome e Principe (Guarda Costeira de Sao Tome e Principe, GCSTP; also called "Navy"), Presidential Guard, National Guard

Eligible age to enter service:

18 is the legal minimum age for compulsory military service; 17 is the legal minimum age for voluntary service

Mandatory Service Terms:

N/A

Manpower in general population-fit for military service:

N/A

Manpower reaching eligible age annually:

N/A

Military Expenditures (in US \$):

N/A

Percent of GDP:

N/A

*Note that Sao Tome and Principe's army is a tiny force with almost no resources at its disposal and would be wholly ineffective operating unilaterally; infantry equipment is considered simple to operate and maintain but may require refurbishment or replacement after 25 years in tropical climates; poor pay, working conditions, and alleged nepotism in the promotion of officers have been problems in the past, as reflected in the 1995 and 2003 coups; these issues are being addressed with foreign assistance aimed at improving the army and its focus on realistic security concerns; command is exercised from the president, through the Minister of Defense, to the Chief of the Armed Forces (infantry, technical issues) and the Chief of the General Staff (logistics, administration, finances)

Chapter 3

Economic Overview

Economic Overview

Overview

Sao Tome and Principe is a poor, island nation and one of the smallest countries in Africa. Its economy is highly dependent on exports of goods and services, primarily cocoa and tourism. The economy remains vulnerable to external shocks, and is highly dependent on foreign financial assistance. In the early 1990s oil and natural gas reserves were discovered offshore from Sao Tome and Principe, and exploratory drilling began in 2001. In August 2009, a new round of exploratory drillings in the Joint Development Zone with Nigeria started. If commercially viable reserves are confirmed, initiation of oil production could start in 2015.

After several years of robust growth averaging over 6 percent per year, economic activity slowed in Sao Tome and Principe in 2009 as a result of the global economic crisis, with a sharp decline in foreign direct investment taking a toll on construction and trade-related activities. While tourism continued to grow due to improved tourism infrastructure, it remains small in relation to the overall economy. Reflecting the government's strong commitment to prudent macroeconomic policies, however, fiscal performance has improved in recent years largely due to a decline in expenditure. A new government took office after the elections in August 2010 underscored the importance of a stable macroeconomic environment for promoting growth and reducing poverty. Economic growth picked up slightly in 2010 boosted by an increase in externally-financed public investment projects. In April 2011 the country completed a Threshold Country Program with The Millennium Challenge Corporation to help increase tax revenues, reform customs, and improve the business environment. But as of mid-2011 Sao Tome and Principe had not succeeded in convincing oil majors to invest in its energy sector after initial excitement faded because of disappointing results from wells. In August 2012, Manuel Pinto da Costa won the country's presidential election, pledging to concentrate on economic development, with a particular focus on natural resources of oil and cocoa, as well as growth in the tourism sector. In July 2012, the International Monetary Fund approved a three-year, US\$4 million Extended Credit Facility arrangement for Sao Tome and Principe. In September 2012, an IMF mission praised the Sao Tome and Principe authorities for their commitment to "hard-won fiscal prudence." According to the IMF, the country's strict control over non-priority spending had offset the underperformance of fiscal revenue due to weaker economic activity. IMF officials projected that the country would still see growth in 2012, but that downside risks remained such as lower project implementation due to continued difficulties securing financing. Meanwhile, inflation had declined to its lowest level in a decade in April 2012

before climbing again in August, mainly due to heavy rains that disrupted the supply, and increased the cost of, perishables such as fruits and vegetables.

Growth slid in 2012, mainly because of reductions in both private and public consumption. Due to an emphasis on consolidation, the country's budget deficit was projected to fall to a single at the end of 2012. Overall, São Tomé has great potential to become a middle-income country based on its size and GDP per capita, if its resource wealth from oil is efficiently and transparently managed. Looking ahead, real gross domestic product (GDP) growth was projected to be 5.2 percent and 5.8 percent in 2013 and 2014, respectively, thanks to an increase in foreign direct investment, the oil signature bonus and the inception of the country's major infrastructure projects, notably the deepwater seaport. In mid-November 2013, China unveiled plans to open a trade mission to promote projects in Sao Tome and Principe. In the late 1990s, China had severed ties with Sao Tome and Principe over the African nation's diplomatic recognition of Taiwan. The planned \$400 million deepwater port could be a target for potential collaboration between the two countries, according to officials. The island's economy remains heavily dependent on cocoa exports but the fact that it is located in the middle of the Gulf of Guinea has raised interest in its potential as a possible future oil and gas producer. Overall in 2013, the economy grew at a steady pace – although lower than forecast. Meanwhile, inflation fell to single digits and international reserves remained at comfortable levels. Positive economic performance led São Tomé and Príncipe to be classified by the World Bank in 2013 as a middle-income country because its gross national income per capita surpassed the cutoff point of US \$1205 for the third consecutive year.

In 2013, the French oil company Total abandoned exploration in block 1 of the Joint Development Zone with Nigeria, creating uncertainty over oil production in São Tomé and Príncipe, but there was continued interest from other oil companies, according to the government.

The country, which has strong governance based on the rule of law, held a free and transparent legislative election in October 2014, offering a promising environment for political stability and enhanced investor confidence. Meanwhile, real GDP growth increased in 2014, driven by improved agricultural production and services, according to the African Development Bank. The trend was expected to continue into 2015.

In October 2015, Portugal's energy company Galp Energia said it had reached agreement to take a 45 percent stake in Block 6 offshore Sao Tome and Principe.

Economic Performance

After growing at a strong rate from 2005 to 2008, real GDP slowed in 2009 and 2010 as a result of the global economic crisis.

According to CountryWatch estimated calculations for 2014:

Real GDP growth rate was: 4.9 percent

The fiscal deficit/surplus as percent of GDP (%) was: -11.7

Inflation was measured at: 12.7 percent

Updated in 2015

**Please note that the figures in our Economic Performance section are estimates or forecasts based on IMF-based data that are formulated using CountryWatch models of analysis.*

Supplementary Sources: International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank, African Economic Outlook and Reuters

Nominal GDP and Components

| Nominal GDP and Components | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Nominal GDP (LCU billions) | 4,375.54 | 5,021.26 | 5,732.12 | 6,184.44 | 7,170.64 |
| Nominal GDP Growth Rate (%) | 17.656 | 14.757 | 14.157 | 7.891 | 15.946 |
| Consumption (LCU billions) | 3,603.26 | 3,995.81 | 4,644.28 | 4,964.58 | 6,606.10 |
| Government Expenditure (LCU billions) | 674.251 | 675.120 | 774.721 | 818.894 | 1,089.66 |
| Gross Capital Formation (LCU billions) | 2,172.95 | 2,354.32 | 2,390.66 | 2,828.99 | 2,300.91 |
| Exports of Goods & Services (LCU billions) | 517.107 | 649.480 | 631.292 | 736.101 | 787.449 |

| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | |
| Imports of Goods & Services (LCU billions) | 2,592.02 | 2,653.48 | 2,708.84 | 3,164.12 | 3,613.48 |

Population and GDP Per Capita

| Population and GDP Per Capita | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Population, total (million) | 0.1830 | 0.1880 | 0.1930 | 0.1980 | 0.2030 |
| Population growth (%) | 2.809 | 2.732 | 2.660 | 2.591 | 2.520 |
| Nominal GDP per Capita (LCU 1000s) | 23,910,064.24 | 26,708,811.96 | 29,700,082.88 | 31,234,555.56 | 35,323,000.00 |

Real GDP and Inflation

| Real GDP and Inflation | | | | | |
|--|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Real Gross Domestic Product (LCU billions 2005 base) | 955.094 | 1,033.65 | 1,088.64 | 1,098.59 | 1,163.33 |
| Real GDP Growth Rate (%) | 6.463 | 8.225 | 5.321 | 0.9131 | 5.893 |
| GDP Deflator (2005=100.0) | 458.127 | 485.780 | 526.537 | 562.946 | 616.390 |
| Inflation, GDP Deflator (%) | 10.514 | 6.036 | 8.390 | 6.915 | 9.494 |

Government Spending and Taxation

| Government Spending and Taxation | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Government Fiscal Budget (billions) | 2,145.38 | 2,225.32 | 1,763.28 | 1,962.43 | 2,909.96 |
| Fiscal Budget Growth Rate (percentage) | 17.596 | 3.726 | -20.7625 | 11.294 | 48.284 |
| National Tax Rate Net of Transfers (%) | 37.063 | 33.562 | 32.610 | 26.168 | 31.788 |
| Government Revenues Net of Transfers (LCU billions) | 1,621.72 | 1,685.21 | 1,869.26 | 1,618.37 | 2,279.38 |
| Government Surplus(-) Deficit(+) (LCU billions) | -523.6580 | -540.1070 | 105.976 | -344.0570 | -630.5760 |
| Government Surplus(+) Deficit(-) (%GDP) | -11.9678 | -10.7564 | 1.849 | -5.5633 | -8.7939 |

Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment

| Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Money and Quasi-Money (M2) (LCU billions) | 1,566.12 | 1,853.60 | 2,147.33 | 2,508.00 | 2,907.94 |
| Money Supply Growth Rate (%) | 10.497 | 18.356 | 15.847 | 16.796 | 15.946 |
| Lending Interest Rate (%) | 26.950 | 26.168 | 23.280 | 15.898 | 15.581 |
| Unemployment Rate (%) | 13.496 | 13.897 | 13.682 | 13.466 | 13.033 |

Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate

| Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Official Exchange Rate (LCU/\$US) | 17,226.54 | 19,312.53 | 18,917.87 | 18,297.17 | 21,995.83 |
| Trade Balance NIPA (\$US billions) | -0.1204 | -0.1038 | -0.1098 | -0.1327 | -0.1285 |
| Trade Balance % of GDP | -47.4207 | -39.9104 | -36.2440 | -39.2601 | -39.4111 |
| Total Foreign Exchange Reserves (\$US billions) | 0.0523 | 0.0516 | 0.0638 | 0.0634 | 0.0724 |

Data in US Dollars

| Data in US Dollars | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Nominal GDP (\$US billions) | 0.2540 | 0.2600 | 0.3030 | 0.3380 | 0.3260 |
| Exports (\$US billions) | 0.0300 | 0.0336 | 0.0334 | 0.0402 | 0.0358 |
| Imports (\$US billions) | 0.1505 | 0.1374 | 0.1432 | 0.1729 | 0.1643 |

Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units

| Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Petroleum Consumption (TBPD) | 0.9056 | 0.9056 | 0.9000 | 0.9260 | 0.9526 |
| Petroleum Production (TBPD) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Petroleum Net Exports (TBPD) | -0.9056 | -0.9056 | -0.9000 | -0.9260 | -0.9526 |
| Natural Gas Consumption (bcf) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Natural Gas Production (bcf) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Natural Gas Net Exports (bcf) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Consumption (1000s st) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Production (1000s st) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Net Exports (1000s st) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Nuclear Production (bil kwh) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Hydroelectric Production (bil kwh) | 0.0100 | 0.0100 | 0.0104 | 0.0109 | 0.0112 |
| Renewables Production (bil kwh) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

Energy Consumption and Production QUADS

| Energy Consumption and Production QUADS | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Petroleum Consumption (Quads) | 0.0019 | 0.0019 | 0.0019 | 0.0020 | 0.0020 |
| Petroleum Production (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Petroleum Net Exports (Quads) | -0.0019 | -0.0019 | -0.0019 | -0.0020 | -0.0020 |
| Natural Gas Consumption (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Natural Gas Production (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Natural Gas Net Exports (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Consumption (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Production (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Net Exports (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Nuclear Production (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Hydroelectric Production (Quads) | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 |
| Renewables Production (Quads) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

World Energy Price Summary

| World Energy Price Summary | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Petroleum-WTI (\$/bbl) | 95.054 | 94.159 | 97.943 | 93.112 | 48.709 |
| Natural Gas-Henry Hub (\$/mmbtu) | 3.999 | 2.752 | 3.729 | 4.369 | 2.614 |
| Coal Thermal-Australian (\$/mt) | 121.448 | 96.364 | 84.562 | 70.130 | 57.511 |

CO2 Emissions

| CO2 Emissions | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Petroleum Based (mm mt C) | 0.0432 | 0.0432 | 0.0429 | 0.0442 | 0.0454 |
| Natural Gas Based (mm mt C) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Coal Based (mm mt C) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Total CO2 Emissions (mm mt C) | 0.0432 | 0.0432 | 0.0429 | 0.0442 | 0.0454 |

Agriculture Consumption and Production

| Agriculture Consumption and Production | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Corn Total Consumption (1000 metric tons) | 1.097 | 0.9450 | 0.8240 | 0.7680 | 0.7303 |
| Corn Production (1000 metric tons) | 1.083 | 0.9142 | 0.7728 | 0.7310 | 0.6813 |
| Corn Net Exports (1000 metric tons) | -0.0140 | -0.0308 | -0.0512 | -0.0370 | -0.0490 |
| Soybeans Total Consumption (1000 metric tons) | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 |
| Soybeans Production (1000 metric tons) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Soybeans Net Exports (1000 metric tons) | -0.0002 | -0.0002 | -0.0002 | -0.0002 | -0.0002 |
| Rice Total Consumption (1000 metric tons) | 0.0315 | 0.0059 | 0.0315 | 0.0460 | 0.0426 |
| Rice Production (1000 metric tons) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Rice Net Exports (1000 metric tons) | -0.0315 | -0.0059 | -0.0315 | -0.0460 | -0.0426 |

| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Coffee Total Consumption (metric tons) | 27.458 | 38.335 | 45.771 | 54.824 | 53.360 |
| Coffee Production (metric tons) | 5.806 | 5.800 | 3.917 | 1.941 | 1.758 |
| Coffee Net Exports (metric tons) | -21.6528 | -32.5350 | -41.8535 | -52.8834 | -51.6024 |
| Cocoa Beans Total Consumption (metric tons) | 24.400 | 24.400 | 24.400 | 24.400 | 24.400 |
| Cocoa Beans Production (metric tons) | 2,243.64 | 2,314.74 | 2,776.29 | 2,735.52 | 2,771.66 |
| Cocoa Beans Net Exports (metric tons) | 2,219.24 | 2,290.34 | 2,751.89 | 2,711.12 | 2,747.26 |
| Wheat Total Consumption (1000 metric tons) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Wheat Production (1000 metric tons) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Wheat Net Exports (1000 metric tons) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

World Agriculture Pricing Summary

| World Agriculture Pricing Summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Corn Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton) | 291.684 | 298.417 | 259.389 | 192.881 | 169.750 |
| Soybeans Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton) | 540.667 | 591.417 | 538.417 | 491.771 | 390.417 |
| Rice Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton) | 458.558 | 525.071 | 473.989 | 425.148 | 386.033 |
| Coffee Pricing Summary (\$/kilogram) | 5.976 | 4.111 | 3.076 | 4.424 | 3.526 |
| Cocoa Beans Pricing Summary (\$/kilogram) | 2.980 | 2.392 | 2.439 | 3.062 | 3.135 |
| Wheat Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton) | 316.264 | 313.242 | 312.248 | 284.895 | 203.177 |

Metals Consumption and Production

| Metals Consumption and Production | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Copper Consumption (1000 mt) | 0.0010 | 0.0010 | 0.0010 | 0.0010 | 0.0009 |
| Copper Production (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Copper Net Exports (1000 mt) | -0.0010 | -0.0010 | -0.0010 | -0.0010 | -0.0009 |
| Zinc Consumption (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Zinc Production (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Zinc Exports (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Lead Consumption (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Lead Production (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Lead Exports (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Tin Consumption (1000 mt) | 0.0752 | 0.0080 | 0.0220 | 0.1380 | 0.1326 |
| Tin Production (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Tin Exports (1000 mt) | -0.0752 | -0.0080 | -0.0220 | -0.1380 | -0.1326 |
| Nickel Consumption (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Nickel Production (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Nickel Exports (1000 mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Gold Consumption (kg) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Gold Production (kg) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Gold Exports (kg) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Silver Consumption (mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Silver Production (mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Silver Exports (mt) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

World Metals Pricing Summary

| World Metals Pricing Summary | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Copper (\$/mt) | 8,828.19 | 7,962.35 | 7,332.10 | 6,863.40 | 5,510.46 |
| Zinc (\$/mt) | 2,193.90 | 1,950.41 | 1,910.26 | 2,160.97 | 1,931.68 |
| Tin (\$/mt) | 26,053.68 | 21,125.99 | 22,282.80 | 21,898.87 | 16,066.63 |
| Lead (\$/mt) | 2,400.81 | 2,064.64 | 2,139.79 | 2,095.46 | 1,787.82 |
| Nickel (\$/mt) | 22,910.36 | 17,547.55 | 15,031.80 | 16,893.38 | 11,862.64 |
| Gold (\$/oz) | 1,569.21 | 1,669.52 | 1,411.46 | 1,265.58 | 1,160.66 |
| Silver (\$/oz) | 35.224 | 31.137 | 23.850 | 19.071 | 15.721 |

Economic Performance Index

Economic Performance Index

The Economic Performance rankings are calculated by CountryWatch's editorial team, and are based on criteria including sustained economic growth, monetary stability, current account deficits, budget surplus, unemployment and structural imbalances. Scores are assessed from 0 to 100 using this aforementioned criteria as well as CountryWatch's proprietary economic research data and models.

| | Bank stability risk | Monetary/ Currency stability | Government Finances | Empl./ Unempl. | Econ.GNP growth or decline/ forecast |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | 0 - 100 | 0 - 100 | 0 - 100 | 0 - 100 | % |
| North Americas | | | | | |
| Canada | 92 | 69 | 35 | 38 | 3.14% |
| United States | 94 | 76 | 4 | 29 | 3.01% |
| Western Europe | | | | | |
| Austria | 90 | 27 | 30 | 63 | 1.33% |
| Belgium | 88 | 27 | 19 | 23 | 1.15% |
| Cyprus | 81 | 91 | 16 | 80 | -0.69% |
| Denmark | 97 | 70 | 45 | 78 | 1.20% |
| Finland | 89 | 27 | 41 | 33 | 1.25% |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|--------|
| France | 87 | 27 | 18 | 27 | 1.52% |
| Germany | 86 | 27 | 22 | 21 | 1.25% |
| Greece | 79 | 27 | 5 | 24 | -2.00% |
| Iceland | 90 | 17 | 2 | 34 | -3.04% |
| Italy | 85 | 27 | 37 | 24 | 0.84% |
| Ireland | 92 | 27 | 11 | 10 | -1.55% |
| Luxembourg | 99 | 27 | 28 | 66 | 2.08% |
| Malta | 77 | 27 | 41 | 51 | 0.54% |
| Netherlands | 91 | 27 | 26 | 74 | 1.30% |
| Norway | 98 | 44 | 10 | 76 | 1.08% |
| Portugal | 77 | 27 | 13 | 20 | 0.29% |
| Spain | 83 | 27 | 9 | 3 | -0.41% |
| Sweden | 94 | 72 | 54 | 32 | 1.23% |
| Switzerland | 97 | 86 | 55 | 77 | 1.53% |
| United Kingdom | 85 | 12 | 9 | 37 | 1.34% |
| Central and Eastern Europe | | | | | |
| Albania | 44 | 60 | 33 | 6 | 2.30% |
| Armenia | 45 | 59 | 49 | 30 | 1.80% |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|-----|----|-----|--------|
| Azerbaijan | 56 | 4 | 84 | 99 | 2.68% |
| Belarus | 59 | 21 | 83 | 98 | 2.41% |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 34 | 68 | 69 | N/A | 0.50% |
| Bulgaria | 58 | 75 | 88 | 49 | 0.20% |
| Croatia | 69 | 68 | 94 | 9 | 0.18% |
| Czech Republic | 80 | 89 | 29 | 70 | 1.67% |
| Estonia | 72 | 90 | 66 | 92 | 0.80% |
| Georgia | 36 | 60 | 53 | 56 | 2.00% |
| Hungary | 70 | 66 | 26 | 54 | -0.16% |
| Latvia | 67 | 100 | 65 | 44 | -3.97% |
| Lithuania | 65 | 91 | 87 | 79 | -1.65% |
| Macedonia (FYR) | 53 | 69 | 56 | 2 | 2.03% |
| Moldova | 23 | 36 | 81 | 67 | 2.50% |
| Poland | 74 | 74 | 38 | 12 | 2.72% |
| Romania | 62 | 56 | 70 | 62 | 0.75% |
| Russia | 73 | 18 | 90 | 8 | 4.00% |
| Serbia | 48 | 49 | 52 | 5 | 1.97% |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Montenegro | 39 | 27 | 73 | 1 | -1.70% |
| Slovak Republic | 80 | 62 | 30 | 14 | 4.06% |
| Slovenia | 81 | 27 | 36 | 65 | 1.12% |
| Ukraine | 41 | 11 | 57 | N/A | 3.68% |
| Africa | | | | | |
| Algeria | 57 | 18 | 96 | 7 | 4.55% |
| Angola | 49 | 1 | 97 | N/A | 7.05% |
| Benin | 19 | 91 | 20 | N/A | 3.22% |
| Botswana | 68 | 58 | 76 | N/A | 6.33% |
| Burkina Faso | 16 | 91 | 13 | N/A | 4.41% |
| Burundi | 2 | 91 | 6 | N/A | 3.85% |
| Cameroon | 26 | 91 | 91 | N/A | 2.58% |
| Cape Verde | 52 | 87 | 4 | N/A | 4.96% |
| Central African Republic | 9 | 91 | 32 | N/A | 3.18% |
| Chad | 22 | 91 | 89 | N/A | 4.42% |
| Congo | 52 | 87 | 87 | N/A | 12.13% |
| Côte d'Ivoire | 25 | 91 | 82 | 28 | 2.98% |
| Dem. Republic | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Congo | 4 | 91 | 47 | N/A | 5.44% |
| Djibouti | 31 | 76 | 50 | N/A | 4.47% |
| Egypt | 37 | 20 | 24 | 69 | 5.01% |
| Equatorial Guinea | 82 | 91 | 85 | N/A | 0.94% |
| Eritrea | 1 | 3 | 1 | 18 | 1.81% |
| Ethiopia | 6 | 45 | 8 | N/A | 6.96% |
| Gabon | 64 | 91 | 96 | N/A | 5.36% |
| Gambia | 8 | 48 | 86 | N/A | 4.82% |
| Ghana | 9 | 11 | 69 | N/A | 4.50% |
| Guinea | 10 | 7 | 91 | N/A | 3.03% |
| Guinea-Bissau | 5 | 91 | 46 | N/A | 3.47% |
| Kenya | 20 | 41 | 59 | N/A | 4.11% |
| Lesotho | 13 | 40 | 12 | N/A | 2.98% |
| Liberia | 12 | 73 | 74 | N/A | 5.92% |
| Libya | 73 | 2 | 94 | N/A | 5.22% |
| Madagascar | 4 | 22 | 24 | N/A | -1.02% |
| Malawi | 7 | 25 | 55 | N/A | 5.96% |
| Mali | 20 | 91 | 82 | N/A | 5.12% |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Mauritania | 15 | 13 | 93 | N/A | 4.58% |
| Mauritius | 65 | 52 | 56 | 55 | 4.10% |
| Morocco | 37 | 72 | 48 | 26 | 3.23% |
| Mozambique | 12 | 23 | 71 | N/A | 6.45% |
| Namibia | 40 | 39 | 62 | N/A | 1.70% |
| Niger | 10 | 91 | 21 | N/A | 4.41% |
| Nigeria | 30 | 6 | 61 | N/A | 6.98% |
| Rwanda | 21 | 40 | 68 | N/A | 5.39% |
| Sao Tome & Principe | 1 | 61 | 100 | N/A | 3.40% |
| Senegal | 24 | 91 | 63 | N/A | 3.44% |
| Seychelles | 60 | 67 | 97 | N/A | 4.01% |
| Sierra Leone | 5 | 10 | 39 | N/A | 4.77% |
| Somalia | 2 | 38 | 59 | N/A | 3.19% |
| South Africa | 61 | 37 | 70 | N/A | 2.59% |
| Sudan | 16 | 5 | 73 | N/A | 5.52% |
| Swaziland | 32 | 44 | 79 | N/A | 1.09% |
| Tanzania | 15 | 45 | 32 | N/A | 6.17% |
| Togo | 8 | 91 | 92 | N/A | 2.56% |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| Tunisia | 50 | 61 | 44 | 39 | 4.00% |
| Uganda | 11 | 17 | 54 | N/A | 5.59% |
| Zambia | 29 | 20 | 49 | N/A | 5.84% |
| Zimbabwe | 0 | 8 | 16 | N/A | 2.24% |
| South and Central America | | | | | |
| Argentina | 66 | 3 | 80 | 36 | 3.50% |
| Belize | 47 | 76 | 80 | N/A | 1.00% |
| Bolivia | 32 | 51 | 61 | 81 | 3.99% |
| Brazil | 71 | 47 | 78 | 11 | 5.50% |
| Chile | 78 | 25 | 92 | 73 | 4.72% |
| Columbia | 47 | 52 | 34 | 47 | 2.25% |
| Costa Rica | 60 | 42 | 39 | 57 | 3.45% |
| Ecuador | 43 | 76 | 75 | 64 | 2.51% |
| El Salvador | 35 | 76 | 67 | N/A | 1.04% |
| Guatemala | 46 | 59 | 58 | N/A | 2.52% |
| Honduras | 27 | 47 | 58 | N/A | 2.00% |
| Mexico | 69 | 42 | 52 | 61 | 4.07% |
| Nicaragua | 23 | 49 | 42 | N/A | 1.75% |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| Panama | 66 | 76 | 72 | 45 | 5.00% |
| Paraguay | 35 | 46 | 66 | 16 | 5.27% |
| Peru | 59 | 66 | 75 | 22 | 6.33% |
| Suriname | 58 | 26 | 81 | 59 | 4.02% |
| Uruguay | 70 | 26 | 27 | N/A | 5.71% |
| Venezuela | 55 | 1 | 28 | 13 | -2.63% |
| Caribbean | | | | | |
| Antigua & Barbuda | 72 | 76 | 15 | N/A | -2.01% |
| Bahamas | 74 | 76 | 45 | 87 | -0.50% |
| Barbados | 67 | 76 | 33 | 15 | -0.50% |
| Bermuda | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Cuba | 45 | 76 | 18 | 95 | 0.25% |
| Dominica | 53 | 76 | 65 | N/A | 1.40% |
| Dominican Republic | 54 | 39 | 43 | 4 | 3.50% |
| Grenada | 63 | 76 | 48 | N/A | 0.80% |
| Guyana | 28 | 56 | 17 | N/A | 4.36% |
| Haiti | 11 | 27 | 89 | N/A | -8.50% |
| Jamaica | 42 | 9 | 85 | 19 | -0.28% |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| St Lucia | 55 | 76 | 67 | N/A | 1.14% |
| St Vincent & Grenadines | 49 | 76 | 95 | N/A | 0.50% |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 82 | 37 | 77 | 72 | 2.13% |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Bahrain | 84 | 76 | 62 | 91 | 3.48% |
| Iran | 51 | 19 | 40 | 58 | 3.01% |
| Iraq | 48 | 9 | 8 | N/A | 7.27% |
| Israel | 87 | 62 | 12 | 48 | 3.20% |
| Jordan | 41 | 51 | 3 | N/A | 4.10% |
| Kuwait | 96 | 4 | 99 | N/A | 3.10% |
| Lebanon | 63 | 54 | 2 | N/A | 6.00% |
| Oman | 76 | 16 | 88 | N/A | 4.71% |
| Qatar | 99 | 16 | 83 | N/A | 18.54% |
| Saudi Arabia | 76 | 8 | 98 | N/A | 3.70% |
| Syria | 61 | 24 | 40 | N/A | 5.00% |
| Turkey | 75 | 23 | 27 | 60 | 5.20% |
| United Arab Emirates | 96 | 24 | 98 | 94 | 1.29% |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Yemen | 28 | 2 | 78 | N/A | 7.78% |
| Asia | | | | | |
| Afghanistan | 17 | 70 | 74 | N/A | 8.64% |
| Bangladesh | 13 | 43 | 25 | N/A | 5.38% |
| Bhutan | 24 | 55 | 5 | N/A | 6.85% |
| Brunei | 78 | 19 | 99 | 75 | 0.48% |
| Cambodia | 18 | 67 | 42 | N/A | 4.77% |
| China | 54 | 90 | 19 | 68 | 11.03% |
| Hong Kong | 89 | 76 | 14 | 82 | 5.02% |
| India | 31 | 38 | 34 | 35 | 8.78% |
| Indonesia | 42 | 46 | 37 | 31 | 6.00% |
| Japan | 88 | 89 | 6 | 71 | 1.90% |
| Kazakhstan | 62 | 13 | 76 | 42 | 2.40% |
| Korea North | 18 | 65 | 23 | N/A | 1.50% |
| Korea South | 83 | 63 | 22 | 85 | 4.44% |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 24 | 15 | 84 | 88 | 4.61% |
| Laos | 17 | 54 | 7 | N/A | 7.22% |
| Macao | 91 | 76 | 14 | 82 | 3.00% |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| Malaysia | 68 | 65 | 44 | 90 | 4.72% |
| Maldives | 44 | 55 | 17 | N/A | 3.45% |
| Mongolia | 33 | 5 | 77 | 93 | 7.22% |
| Myanmar | 3 | 41 | 72 | N/A | 5.26% |
| Nepal | 3 | 14 | 25 | N/A | 2.97% |
| Pakistan | 19 | 15 | 31 | 41 | 3.00% |
| Papua New Guinea | 75 | 50 | 11 | N/A | 7.96% |
| Philippines | 30 | 48 | 53 | 43 | 3.63% |
| Singapore | 93 | 75 | 63 | 40 | 5.68% |
| Sri Lanka | 38 | 22 | 10 | N/A | 5.50% |
| Taiwan | 84 | 88 | 35 | 89 | 6.50% |
| Tajikistan | 6 | 6 | 60 | 97 | 4.00% |
| Thailand | 56 | 64 | 90 | 96 | 5.46% |
| Turkmenistan | 51 | 53 | 68 | N/A | 12.00% |
| Uzbekistan | 40 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 8.00% |
| Vietnam | 25 | 12 | 20 | N/A | 6.04% |
| Pacific | | | | | |
| Australia | 96 | 63 | 31 | 46 | 2.96% |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| Fiji | 46 | 53 | 3 | N/A | 2.06% |
| Marshall Islands | 27 | 76 | 46 | N/A | 1.08% |
| Micronesia (Fed. States) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| New Caledonia | 96 | 73 | 51 | 52 | 2.00% |
| New Zealand | 98 | 73 | 51 | 52 | 2.00% |
| Samoa | 34 | 88 | 64 | N/A | -2.77% |
| Solomon Islands | 14 | 71 | 1 | N/A | 3.36% |
| Tonga | 26 | 57 | 38 | N/A | 0.60% |
| Vanuatu | 33 | 58 | 47 | N/A | 3.80% |

Source:

CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

This material was produced in 2010; it is subject to updating in 2012.

div style='margin-top:40%;padding-top:40%>

Chapter 4

Investment Overview

Foreign Investment Climate

Background

This small, poor island economy has become increasingly dependent on cocoa since independence in 1975. Cocoa production has substantially declined in recent years because of drought and mismanagement. Sao Tome and Principe has to import all fuels, most manufactured goods, consumer goods, and a substantial amount of food. Over the years, it has had difficulty servicing its external debt and has relied heavily on concessional aid and debt rescheduling. Sao Tome and Principe benefited from \$200 million in debt relief in December 2000 under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) program, which helped bring down the country's \$300 million debt burden. In August 2005, the government signed on to a new 3-year IMF Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) program worth \$4.3 million. Considerable potential exists for development of a tourist industry, and the government has taken steps to expand facilities in recent years. The government also has attempted to reduce price controls and subsidies. Potential exists for the development of petroleum resources in Sao Tome and Principe's territorial waters in the oil-rich Gulf of Guinea, which are being jointly developed in a 60-40 split with Nigeria, but any actual production is at least several years off. The first production licenses were sold in 2004, though a dispute over licensing with Nigeria delayed the country's receipt of more than \$20 million in signing bonuses for almost a year.

Foreign Investment Assessment

Economic reforms from the 1980s onward, in conjunction with infrastructure development funded by foreign donors, were aimed at developing a business friendly regime and ultimately, at attracting foreign investment and exchange. The government hopes to promote investment in tropical agriculture, industrial fishing, tourism, the development of a regional free trade zone and oil service center, and oil exploration. That said, the government has not formed detailed regulation needed for investment. As well, corruption and lack of transparency remain obstacles to foreign investment.

Agriculture and Industry

Agriculture - products: cocoa, coconuts, palm kernels, copra, cinnamon, pepper, coffee, bananas, papayas, beans; poultry; fish

Industries: light construction, textiles, soap, beer; fish processing; timber

Import Commodities and Import Partners

Imports - commodities: machinery and electrical equipment, food products, petroleum products

Imports - partners: Portugal 51.6%, Germany 11.3%, Italy 6.5%, Belgium 4.8%, Netherlands 4.8%

Export Commodities and Export Partners

Exports - commodities: cocoa 80%, copra, coffee, palm oil

Exports - partners: Netherlands 41.7%, Canada 16.7%, Belgium 8.3%, Germany 8.3%, Philippines 8.3%

Roads, Airports, Ports and Harbors

Highways: total: 320 km

Ports and harbors: Santo Antonio, Sao Tome

Airports: 2

Telephone System

Telephone system:

general assessment: adequate facilities

domestic: minimal system

international: country code - 239

satellite earth station - 1 Intelsat (Atlantic Ocean)

Internet Users

15,000 and on the increase

Labor Force

Labor force - by occupation: population mainly engaged in subsistence agriculture and fishing
note: shortages of skilled workers

Legal System and Considerations

The legal system is based on Portuguese legal system and customary law.

Corruption Perception Ranking

N/A; see Corruption Perception index reported by Transparency International elsewhere in this report, from least to most corrupt countries.

Cultural Considerations

Portuguese etiquette has influenced cultural interactions.

Country Website

N/A

Foreign Investment Index

Foreign Investment Index

The Foreign Investment Index is a proprietary index measuring attractiveness to international investment flows. The Foreign Investment Index is calculated using an established methodology by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on a given country's economic stability (sustained economic growth, monetary stability, current account deficits, budget surplus), economic risk (risk of non-servicing of payments for goods or services, loans and trade-related finance, risk of sovereign default), business and investment climate (property rights, labor force and laws,

regulatory transparency, openness to foreign investment, market conditions, and stability of government). Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the lowest level of foreign investment viability, while a score of 10 marks the highest level of foreign investment viability, according to this proprietary index.

| Country | Assessment |
|-------------|------------|
| Afghanistan | 2 |
| Albania | 4.5 |
| Algeria | 6 |
| Andorra | 9 |
| Angola | 4.5-5 |
| Antigua | 8.5 |
| Argentina | 5 |
| Armenia | 5 |
| Australia | 9.5 |
| Austria | 9-9.5 |
| Azerbaijan | 5 |
| Bahamas | 9 |
| Bahrain | 7.5 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Bangladesh | 4.5 |
| Barbados | 9 |
| Belarus | 4 |
| Belgium | 9 |
| Belize | 7.5 |
| Benin | 5.5 |
| Bhutan | 4.5 |
| Bolivia | 4.5 |
| Bosnia-Herzegovina | 5 |
| Botswana | 7.5-8 |
| Brazil | 8 |
| Brunei | 7 |
| Bulgaria | 5.5 |
| Burkina Faso | 4 |
| Burma (Myanmar) | 4.5 |
| Burundi | 4 |
| Cambodia | 4.5 |
| Cameroon | 5 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Canada | 9.5 |
| Cape Verde | 6 |
| Central African Republic | 3 |
| Chad | 4 |
| Chile | 9 |
| China | 7.5 |
| China: Hong Kong | 8.5 |
| China: Taiwan | 8.5 |
| Colombia | 7 |
| Comoros | 4 |
| Congo DRC | 4 |
| Congo RC | 5 |
| Costa Rica | 8 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 4.5 |
| Croatia | 7 |
| Cuba | 4.5 |
| Cyprus | 7 |
| Czech Republic | 8.5 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Denmark | 9.5 |
| Djibouti | 4.5 |
| Dominica | 6 |
| Dominican Republic | 6.5 |
| East Timor | 4.5 |
| Ecuador | 5.5 |
| Egypt | 4.5-5 |
| El Salvador | 6 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 4.5 |
| Eritrea | 3.5 |
| Estonia | 8 |
| Ethiopia | 4.5 |
| Fiji | 5 |
| Finland | 9 |
| Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia | 5 |
| France | 9-9.5 |
| Gabon | 5.5 |
| Gambia | 5 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Georgia | 5 |
| Germany | 9-9.5 |
| Ghana | 5.5 |
| Greece | 5 |
| Grenada | 7.5 |
| Guatemala | 5.5 |
| Guinea | 3.5 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 3.5 |
| Guyana | 4.5 |
| Haiti | 4 |
| Holy See (Vatican) | n/a |
| Hong Kong (China) | 8.5 |
| Honduras | 5.5 |
| Hungary | 8 |
| Iceland | 8-8.5 |
| India | 8 |
| Indonesia | 5.5 |
| Iran | 4 |

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Iraq | 3 |
| Ireland | 8 |
| Israel | 8.5 |
| Italy | 8 |
| Jamaica | 5.5 |
| Japan | 9.5 |
| Jordan | 6 |
| Kazakhstan | 6 |
| Kenya | 5 |
| Kiribati | 5.5 |
| Korea, North | 1 |
| Korea, South | 9 |
| Kosovo | 4.5 |
| Kuwait | 8.5 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 4.5 |
| Laos | 4 |
| Latvia | 7 |
| Lebanon | 5 |

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| Lesotho | 5.5 |
| Liberia | 3.5 |
| Libya | 3 |
| Liechtenstein | 9 |
| Lithuania | 7.5 |
| Luxembourg | 9-9.5 |
| Madagascar | 4.5 |
| Malawi | 4.5 |
| Malaysia | 8.5 |
| Maldives | 6.5 |
| Mali | 5 |
| Malta | 9 |
| Marshall Islands | 5 |
| Mauritania | 4.5 |
| Mauritius | 7.5-8 |
| Mexico | 6.5-7 |
| Micronesia | 5 |
| Moldova | 4.5-5 |

| | |
|-------------|-------|
| Monaco | 9 |
| Mongolia | 5 |
| Montenegro | 5.5 |
| Morocco | 7.5 |
| Mozambique | 5 |
| Namibia | 7.5 |
| Nauru | 4.5 |
| Nepal | 4 |
| Netherlands | 9-9.5 |
| New Zealand | 9.5 |
| Nicaragua | 5 |
| Niger | 4.5 |
| Nigeria | 4.5 |
| Norway | 9-9.5 |
| Oman | 8 |
| Pakistan | 4 |
| Palau | 4.5-5 |
| Panama | 7 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Papua New Guinea | 5 |
| Paraguay | 6 |
| Peru | 6 |
| Philippines | 6 |
| Poland | 8 |
| Portugal | 7.5-8 |
| Qatar | 9 |
| Romania | 6-6.5 |
| Russia | 6 |
| Rwanda | 4 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 8 |
| Saint Lucia | 8 |
| Saint Vincent and Grenadines | 7 |
| Samoa | 7 |
| San Marino | 8.5 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 4.5-5 |
| Saudi Arabia | 7 |
| Senegal | 6 |

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Serbia | 6 |
| Seychelles | 5 |
| Sierra Leone | 4 |
| Singapore | 9.5 |
| Slovak Republic (Slovakia) | 8.5 |
| Slovenia | 8.5-9 |
| Solomon Islands | 5 |
| Somalia | 2 |
| South Africa | 8 |
| Spain | 7.5-8 |
| Sri Lanka | 5.5 |
| Sudan | 4 |
| Suriname | 5 |
| Swaziland | 4.5 |
| Sweden | 9.5 |
| Switzerland | 9.5 |
| Syria | 2.5 |
| Tajikistan | 4 |

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Taiwan (China) | 8.5 |
| Tanzania | 5 |
| Thailand | 7.5-8 |
| Togo | 4.5-5 |
| Tonga | 5.5-6 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8-8.5 |
| Tunisia | 6 |
| Turkey | 6.5-7 |
| Turkmenistan | 4 |
| Tuvalu | 7 |
| Uganda | 5 |
| Ukraine | 4.5-5 |
| United Arab Emirates | 8.5 |
| United Kingdom | 9 |
| United States | 9 |
| Uruguay | 6.5-7 |
| Uzbekistan | 4 |
| Vanuatu | 6 |

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Venezuela | 5 |
| Vietnam | 5.5 |
| Yemen | 3 |
| Zambia | 4.5-5 |
| Zimbabwe | 3.5 |

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the global economic crisis (emerging in 2008) had affected many countries across the world, resulting in changes to their rankings. Among those countries affected were top tier economies, such as the [United Kingdom](#), [Iceland](#), [Switzerland](#) and [Austria](#). However, in all these cases, their rankings have moved back upward in the last couple of years as anxieties have eased. Other top tier countries, such as [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#), suffered some effects due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. Greece, another euro zone nation, was also downgraded due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, Greece's position on the precipice of default incurred a sharper downgrade than the other four euro zone countries mentioned above. Cyprus' exposure to Greek bank yielded a downgrade in its case. Slovenia and [Latvia](#) have been slightly downgraded due to a mix of economic and political concerns but could easily be upgraded in a future assessment, should these concerns abate. Meanwhile, the crisis in eastern [Ukraine](#) fueled downgrades in that country and neighboring [Russia](#).

Despite the "trifecta of tragedy" in [Japan](#) in 2011 -- the earthquake, the ensuing tsunami, and the resulting nuclear crisis -- and the appreciable destabilization of the economic and political terrain therein, this country has only slightly been downgraded. Japan's challenges have been assessed to be transient, the government remains accountable, and there is little risk of default. Both [India](#) and China retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability.

There were shifts in opposite directions for [Mali](#) and [Nigeria](#) versus the [Central African Republic](#), [Burkina Faso](#), and [Burundi](#). [Mali](#) was slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. Likewise, a new government in [Nigeria](#) generated a slight upgrade as the country attempts to confront corruption, crime, and terrorism. But the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded due to the

takeover of the government by Seleka rebels and the continued decline into lawlessness in that country. Likewise, the attempts by the leaders of [Burundi](#) and [Burkina Faso](#) to hold onto power by by-passing the constitution raised eyebrows and resulted in downgrades.

Political unrest in [Libya](#) and [Algeria](#) have contributed to a decision to marginally downgrade these countries as well. [Syria](#) incurred a sharper downgrade due to the devolution into de facto civil war and the dire security threat posed by Islamist terrorists. [Iraq](#) saw a similar downgrade as a result of the takeover of wide swaths of territory and the threat of genocide at the hands of Islamist terrorists. [Yemen](#), likewise, has been downgraded due to political instability at the hands of secessionists, terrorists, Houthi rebels, and the intervention of external parties. Conversely, [Egypt](#) and [Tunisia](#) saw slight upgrades as their political environments stabilize.

At the low end of the spectrum, devolving security conditions and/or economic crisis have resulted in countries like [Pakistan](#), [Afghanistan](#), [Somalia](#), and [Zimbabwe](#) maintaining their low ratings.

The [United States](#) continues to retain its previous slight downgrade due to the enduring threat of default surrounding the debt ceiling in that country, matched by a conflict-ridden political climate. In the case of [Mexico](#), there is limited concern about default, but increasing alarm over the security situation in that country and the government's ability to contain it. In [Argentina](#), a default to bond holders resulted in a downgrade to that country. Finally, a small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States.

Source:

CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

2015

Corruption Perceptions Index

Corruption Perceptions Index

Transparency International: [Corruption Perceptions Index](#)

Editor's Note:

Transparency International's [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) is a composite index which ranks countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials. This index indicates the views of national and international business people and analysts about the levels of corruption in each country. The highest (and best) level of transparency is indicated by the number, 10. The lower (and worse) levels of transparency are indicated by lower numbers.

| Rank | Country/Territory | CPI 2009 Score | Surveys Used | Confidence Range |
|------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|
| 1 | New Zealand | 9.4 | 6 | 9.1 - 9.5 |
| 2 | Denmark | 9.3 | 6 | 9.1 - 9.5 |
| 3 | Singapore | 9.2 | 9 | 9.0 - 9.4 |
| 3 | Sweden | 9.2 | 6 | 9.0 - 9.3 |
| 5 | Switzerland | 9.0 | 6 | 8.9 - 9.1 |
| 6 | Finland | 8.9 | 6 | 8.4 - 9.4 |
| 6 | Netherlands | 8.9 | 6 | 8.7 - 9.0 |
| 8 | Australia | 8.7 | 8 | 8.3 - 9.0 |
| 8 | Canada | 8.7 | 6 | 8.5 - 9.0 |
| 8 | Iceland | 8.7 | 4 | 7.5 - 9.4 |
| 11 | Norway | 8.6 | 6 | 8.2 - 9.1 |
| 12 | Hong Kong | 8.2 | 8 | 7.9 - 8.5 |
| 12 | Luxembourg | 8.2 | 6 | 7.6 - 8.8 |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 14 | Germany | 8.0 | 6 | 7.7 - 8.3 |
| 14 | Ireland | 8.0 | 6 | 7.8 - 8.4 |
| 16 | Austria | 7.9 | 6 | 7.4 - 8.3 |
| 17 | Japan | 7.7 | 8 | 7.4 - 8.0 |
| 17 | United Kingdom | 7.7 | 6 | 7.3 - 8.2 |
| 19 | United States | 7.5 | 8 | 6.9 - 8.0 |
| 20 | Barbados | 7.4 | 4 | 6.6 - 8.2 |
| 21 | Belgium | 7.1 | 6 | 6.9 - 7.3 |
| 22 | Qatar | 7.0 | 6 | 5.8 - 8.1 |
| 22 | Saint Lucia | 7.0 | 3 | 6.7 - 7.5 |
| 24 | France | 6.9 | 6 | 6.5 - 7.3 |
| 25 | Chile | 6.7 | 7 | 6.5 - 6.9 |
| 25 | Uruguay | 6.7 | 5 | 6.4 - 7.1 |
| 27 | Cyprus | 6.6 | 4 | 6.1 - 7.1 |
| 27 | Estonia | 6.6 | 8 | 6.1 - 6.9 |
| 27 | Slovenia | 6.6 | 8 | 6.3 - 6.9 |
| 30 | United Arab Emirates | 6.5 | 5 | 5.5 - 7.5 |
| 31 | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 6.4 | 3 | 4.9 - 7.5 |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 32 | Israel | 6.1 | 6 | 5.4 - 6.7 |
| 32 | Spain | 6.1 | 6 | 5.5 - 6.6 |
| 34 | Dominica | 5.9 | 3 | 4.9 - 6.7 |
| 35 | Portugal | 5.8 | 6 | 5.5 - 6.2 |
| 35 | Puerto Rico | 5.8 | 4 | 5.2 - 6.3 |
| 37 | Botswana | 5.6 | 6 | 5.1 - 6.3 |
| 37 | Taiwan | 5.6 | 9 | 5.4 - 5.9 |
| 39 | Brunei Darussalam | 5.5 | 4 | 4.7 - 6.4 |
| 39 | Oman | 5.5 | 5 | 4.4 - 6.5 |
| 39 | Korea (South) | 5.5 | 9 | 5.3 - 5.7 |
| 42 | Mauritius | 5.4 | 6 | 5.0 - 5.9 |
| 43 | Costa Rica | 5.3 | 5 | 4.7 - 5.9 |
| 43 | Macau | 5.3 | 3 | 3.3 - 6.9 |
| 45 | Malta | 5.2 | 4 | 4.0 - 6.2 |
| 46 | Bahrain | 5.1 | 5 | 4.2 - 5.8 |
| 46 | Cape Verde | 5.1 | 3 | 3.3 - 7.0 |
| 46 | Hungary | 5.1 | 8 | 4.6 - 5.7 |
| 49 | Bhutan | 5.0 | 4 | 4.3 - 5.6 |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 49 | Jordan | 5.0 | 7 | 3.9 - 6.1 |
| 49 | Poland | 5.0 | 8 | 4.5 - 5.5 |
| 52 | Czech Republic | 4.9 | 8 | 4.3 - 5.6 |
| 52 | Lithuania | 4.9 | 8 | 4.4 - 5.4 |
| 54 | Seychelles | 4.8 | 3 | 3.0 - 6.7 |
| 55 | South Africa | 4.7 | 8 | 4.3 - 4.9 |
| 56 | Latvia | 4.5 | 6 | 4.1 - 4.9 |
| 56 | Malaysia | 4.5 | 9 | 4.0 - 5.1 |
| 56 | Namibia | 4.5 | 6 | 3.9 - 5.1 |
| 56 | Samoa | 4.5 | 3 | 3.3 - 5.3 |
| 56 | Slovakia | 4.5 | 8 | 4.1 - 4.9 |
| 61 | Cuba | 4.4 | 3 | 3.5 - 5.1 |
| 61 | Turkey | 4.4 | 7 | 3.9 - 4.9 |
| 63 | Italy | 4.3 | 6 | 3.8 - 4.9 |
| 63 | Saudi Arabia | 4.3 | 5 | 3.1 - 5.3 |
| 65 | Tunisia | 4.2 | 6 | 3.0 - 5.5 |
| 66 | Croatia | 4.1 | 8 | 3.7 - 4.5 |
| 66 | Georgia | 4.1 | 7 | 3.4 - 4.7 |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 66 | Kuwait | 4.1 | 5 | 3.2 - 5.1 |
| 69 | Ghana | 3.9 | 7 | 3.2 - 4.6 |
| 69 | Montenegro | 3.9 | 5 | 3.5 - 4.4 |
| 71 | Bulgaria | 3.8 | 8 | 3.2 - 4.5 |
| 71 | FYR Macedonia | 3.8 | 6 | 3.4 - 4.2 |
| 71 | Greece | 3.8 | 6 | 3.2 - 4.3 |
| 71 | Romania | 3.8 | 8 | 3.2 - 4.3 |
| 75 | Brazil | 3.7 | 7 | 3.3 - 4.3 |
| 75 | Colombia | 3.7 | 7 | 3.1 - 4.3 |
| 75 | Peru | 3.7 | 7 | 3.4 - 4.1 |
| 75 | Suriname | 3.7 | 3 | 3.0 - 4.7 |
| 79 | Burkina Faso | 3.6 | 7 | 2.8 - 4.4 |
| 79 | China | 3.6 | 9 | 3.0 - 4.2 |
| 79 | Swaziland | 3.6 | 3 | 3.0 - 4.7 |
| 79 | Trinidad and Tobago | 3.6 | 4 | 3.0 - 4.3 |
| 83 | Serbia | 3.5 | 6 | 3.3 - 3.9 |
| 84 | El Salvador | 3.4 | 5 | 3.0 - 3.8 |
| 84 | Guatemala | 3.4 | 5 | 3.0 - 3.9 |

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------|-----|----|-----------|
| 84 | India | 3.4 | 10 | 3.2 - 3.6 |
| 84 | Panama | 3.4 | 5 | 3.1 - 3.7 |
| 84 | Thailand | 3.4 | 9 | 3.0 - 3.8 |
| 89 | Lesotho | 3.3 | 6 | 2.8 - 3.8 |
| 89 | Malawi | 3.3 | 7 | 2.7 - 3.9 |
| 89 | Mexico | 3.3 | 7 | 3.2 - 3.5 |
| 89 | Moldova | 3.3 | 6 | 2.7 - 4.0 |
| 89 | Morocco | 3.3 | 6 | 2.8 - 3.9 |
| 89 | Rwanda | 3.3 | 4 | 2.9 - 3.7 |
| 95 | Albania | 3.2 | 6 | 3.0 - 3.3 |
| 95 | Vanuatu | 3.2 | 3 | 2.3 - 4.7 |
| 97 | Liberia | 3.1 | 3 | 1.9 - 3.8 |
| 97 | Sri Lanka | 3.1 | 7 | 2.8 - 3.4 |
| 99 | Bosnia and Herzegovina | 3.0 | 7 | 2.6 - 3.4 |
| 99 | Dominican Republic | 3.0 | 5 | 2.9 - 3.2 |
| 99 | Jamaica | 3.0 | 5 | 2.8 - 3.3 |
| 99 | Madagascar | 3.0 | 7 | 2.8 - 3.2 |
| 99 | Senegal | 3.0 | 7 | 2.5 - 3.6 |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 99 | Tonga | 3.0 | 3 | 2.6 - 3.3 |
| 99 | Zambia | 3.0 | 7 | 2.8 - 3.2 |
| 106 | Argentina | 2.9 | 7 | 2.6 - 3.1 |
| 106 | Benin | 2.9 | 6 | 2.3 - 3.4 |
| 106 | Gabon | 2.9 | 3 | 2.6 - 3.1 |
| 106 | Gambia | 2.9 | 5 | 1.6 - 4.0 |
| 106 | Niger | 2.9 | 5 | 2.7 - 3.0 |
| 111 | Algeria | 2.8 | 6 | 2.5 - 3.1 |
| 111 | Djibouti | 2.8 | 4 | 2.3 - 3.2 |
| 111 | Egypt | 2.8 | 6 | 2.6 - 3.1 |
| 111 | Indonesia | 2.8 | 9 | 2.4 - 3.2 |
| 111 | Kiribati | 2.8 | 3 | 2.3 - 3.3 |
| 111 | Mali | 2.8 | 6 | 2.4 - 3.2 |
| 111 | Sao Tome and Principe | 2.8 | 3 | 2.4 - 3.3 |
| 111 | Solomon Islands | 2.8 | 3 | 2.3 - 3.3 |
| 111 | Togo | 2.8 | 5 | 1.9 - 3.9 |
| 120 | Armenia | 2.7 | 7 | 2.6 - 2.8 |
| 120 | Bolivia | 2.7 | 6 | 2.4 - 3.1 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 120 | Ethiopia | 2.7 | 7 | 2.4 - 2.9 |
| 120 | Kazakhstan | 2.7 | 7 | 2.1 - 3.3 |
| 120 | Mongolia | 2.7 | 7 | 2.4 - 3.0 |
| 120 | Vietnam | 2.7 | 9 | 2.4 - 3.1 |
| 126 | Eritrea | 2.6 | 4 | 1.6 - 3.8 |
| 126 | Guyana | 2.6 | 4 | 2.5 - 2.7 |
| 126 | Syria | 2.6 | 5 | 2.2 - 2.9 |
| 126 | Tanzania | 2.6 | 7 | 2.4 - 2.9 |
| 130 | Honduras | 2.5 | 6 | 2.2 - 2.8 |
| 130 | Lebanon | 2.5 | 3 | 1.9 - 3.1 |
| 130 | Libya | 2.5 | 6 | 2.2 - 2.8 |
| 130 | Maldives | 2.5 | 4 | 1.8 - 3.2 |
| 130 | Mauritania | 2.5 | 7 | 2.0 - 3.3 |
| 130 | Mozambique | 2.5 | 7 | 2.3 - 2.8 |
| 130 | Nicaragua | 2.5 | 6 | 2.3 - 2.7 |
| 130 | Nigeria | 2.5 | 7 | 2.2 - 2.7 |
| 130 | Uganda | 2.5 | 7 | 2.1 - 2.8 |
| 139 | Bangladesh | 2.4 | 7 | 2.0 - 2.8 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 139 | Belarus | 2.4 | 4 | 2.0 - 2.8 |
| 139 | Pakistan | 2.4 | 7 | 2.1 - 2.7 |
| 139 | Philippines | 2.4 | 9 | 2.1 - 2.7 |
| 143 | Azerbaijan | 2.3 | 7 | 2.0 - 2.6 |
| 143 | Comoros | 2.3 | 3 | 1.6 - 3.3 |
| 143 | Nepal | 2.3 | 6 | 2.0 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Cameroon | 2.2 | 7 | 1.9 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Ecuador | 2.2 | 5 | 2.0 - 2.5 |
| 146 | Kenya | 2.2 | 7 | 1.9 - 2.5 |
| 146 | Russia | 2.2 | 8 | 1.9 - 2.4 |
| 146 | Sierra Leone | 2.2 | 5 | 1.9 - 2.4 |
| 146 | Timor-Leste | 2.2 | 5 | 1.8 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Ukraine | 2.2 | 8 | 2.0 - 2.6 |
| 146 | Zimbabwe | 2.2 | 7 | 1.7 - 2.8 |
| 154 | Côte d'Ivoire | 2.1 | 7 | 1.8 - 2.4 |
| 154 | Papua New Guinea | 2.1 | 5 | 1.7 - 2.5 |
| 154 | Paraguay | 2.1 | 5 | 1.7 - 2.5 |
| 154 | Yemen | 2.1 | 4 | 1.6 - 2.5 |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 158 | Cambodia | 2.0 | 8 | 1.8 - 2.2 |
| 158 | Central African Republic | 2.0 | 4 | 1.9 - 2.2 |
| 158 | Laos | 2.0 | 4 | 1.6 - 2.6 |
| 158 | Tajikistan | 2.0 | 8 | 1.6 - 2.5 |
| 162 | Angola | 1.9 | 5 | 1.8 - 1.9 |
| 162 | Congo Brazzaville | 1.9 | 5 | 1.6 - 2.1 |
| 162 | Democratic Republic of Congo | 1.9 | 5 | 1.7 - 2.1 |
| 162 | Guinea-Bissau | 1.9 | 3 | 1.8 - 2.0 |
| 162 | Kyrgyzstan | 1.9 | 7 | 1.8 - 2.1 |
| 162 | Venezuela | 1.9 | 7 | 1.8 - 2.0 |
| 168 | Burundi | 1.8 | 6 | 1.6 - 2.0 |
| 168 | Equatorial Guinea | 1.8 | 3 | 1.6 - 1.9 |
| 168 | Guinea | 1.8 | 5 | 1.7 - 1.8 |
| 168 | Haiti | 1.8 | 3 | 1.4 - 2.3 |
| 168 | Iran | 1.8 | 3 | 1.7 - 1.9 |
| 168 | Turkmenistan | 1.8 | 4 | 1.7 - 1.9 |
| 174 | Uzbekistan | 1.7 | 6 | 1.5 - 1.8 |
| 175 | Chad | 1.6 | 6 | 1.5 - 1.7 |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|---|-----------|
| 176 | Iraq | 1.5 | 3 | 1.2 - 1.8 |
| 176 | Sudan | 1.5 | 5 | 1.4 - 1.7 |
| 178 | Myanmar | 1.4 | 3 | 0.9 - 1.8 |
| 179 | Afghanistan | 1.3 | 4 | 1.0 - 1.5 |
| 180 | Somalia | 1.1 | 3 | 0.9 - 1.4 |

Methodology:

As noted above, the highest (and best) level of transparency with the least perceived corruption is indicated by the number, 10. The lower (and worse) levels of transparency are indicated by lower numbers.

According to Transparency International, the [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) (CPI) table shows a country's ranking and score, the number of surveys used to determine the score, and the confidence range of the scoring.

The rank shows how one country compares to others included in the index. The CPI score indicates the perceived level of public-sector corruption in a country/territory.

The CPI is based on 13 independent surveys. However, not all surveys include all countries. The surveys used column indicates how many surveys were relied upon to determine the score for that country.

The confidence range indicates the reliability of the CPI scores and tells us that allowing for a margin of error, we can be 90% confident that the true score for this country lies within this range.

Note:

Kosovo, which separated from the Yugoslav successor state of [Serbia](#), is not listed above. No calculation is available for [Kosovo](#) at this time, however, a future corruption index by Transparency International may include the world's newest country in its tally. Taiwan has been listed above despite its contested status; while Taiwan claims sovereign status, [China](#) claims ultimate jurisdiction over Taiwan. Hong Kong, which is also under the rubric of Chinese

sovereignty, is listed above. Note as well that Puerto Rico, which is a [United States](#) domain, is also included in the list above. These inclusions likely have to do with the size and fairly autonomous status of their economies.

Source:

Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index; available at URL: <http://www.transparency.org>

Updated:

Uploaded in 2011 using most recent ranking available; reviewed in 2015.

Competitiveness Ranking

Competitiveness Ranking

Editor's Note:

The Global Competitiveness Report's competitiveness ranking is based on the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI), which was developed for the World Economic Forum. The GCI is based on a number of competitiveness considerations, and provides a comprehensive picture of the competitiveness landscape in countries around the world. The competitiveness considerations are: institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomic environment, health and primary education, higher education and training, goods market efficiency, labour market efficiency, financial market development, technological readiness, market size, business sophistication, and innovation. The rankings are calculated from both publicly available data and the Executive Opinion Survey.

| Country/Economy | GCI 2010 Rank | GCI 2010 Score | GCI 2009 Rank | Change 2009-2010 |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Switzerland | 1 | 5.63 | 1 | 0 |
| Sweden | 2 | 5.56 | 4 | 2 |
| Singapore | 3 | 5.48 | 3 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|------|----|----|
| United States | 4 | 5.43 | 2 | -2 |
| Germany | 5 | 5.39 | 7 | 2 |
| Japan | 6 | 5.37 | 8 | 2 |
| Finland | 7 | 5.37 | 6 | -1 |
| Netherlands | 8 | 5.33 | 10 | 2 |
| Denmark | 9 | 5.32 | 5 | -4 |
| Canada | 10 | 5.30 | 9 | -1 |
| Hong Kong SAR | 11 | 5.30 | 11 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | 12 | 5.25 | 13 | 1 |
| Taiwan, China | 13 | 5.21 | 12 | -1 |
| Norway | 14 | 5.14 | 14 | 0 |
| France | 15 | 5.13 | 16 | 1 |
| Australia | 16 | 5.11 | 15 | -1 |
| Qatar | 17 | 5.10 | 22 | 5 |
| Austria | 18 | 5.09 | 17 | -1 |
| Belgium | 19 | 5.07 | 18 | -1 |
| Luxembourg | 20 | 5.05 | 21 | 1 |
| Saudi Arabia | 21 | 4.95 | 28 | 7 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|----|------|----|----|
| Korea, Rep. | 22 | 4.93 | 19 | -3 |
| New Zealand | 23 | 4.92 | 20 | -3 |
| Israel | 24 | 4.91 | 27 | 3 |
| United Arab Emirates | 25 | 4.89 | 23 | -2 |
| Malaysia | 26 | 4.88 | 24 | -2 |
| China | 27 | 4.84 | 29 | 2 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 28 | 4.75 | 32 | 4 |
| Ireland | 29 | 4.74 | 25 | -4 |
| Chile | 30 | 4.69 | 30 | 0 |
| Iceland | 31 | 4.68 | 26 | -5 |
| Tunisia | 32 | 4.65 | 40 | 8 |
| Estonia | 33 | 4.61 | 35 | 2 |
| Oman | 34 | 4.61 | 41 | 7 |
| Kuwait | 35 | 4.59 | 39 | 4 |
| Czech Republic | 36 | 4.57 | 31 | -5 |
| Bahrain | 37 | 4.54 | 38 | 1 |
| Thailand | 38 | 4.51 | 36 | -2 |
| Poland | 39 | 4.51 | 46 | 7 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|----|------|----|----|
| Cyprus | 40 | 4.50 | 34 | -6 |
| Puerto Rico | 41 | 4.49 | 42 | 1 |
| Spain | 42 | 4.49 | 33 | -9 |
| Barbados | 43 | 4.45 | 44 | 1 |
| Indonesia | 44 | 4.43 | 54 | 10 |
| Slovenia | 45 | 4.42 | 37 | -8 |
| Portugal | 46 | 4.38 | 43 | -3 |
| Lithuania | 47 | 4.38 | 53 | 6 |
| Italy | 48 | 4.37 | 48 | 0 |
| Montenegro | 49 | 4.36 | 62 | 13 |
| Malta | 50 | 4.34 | 52 | 2 |
| India | 51 | 4.33 | 49 | -2 |
| Hungary | 52 | 4.33 | 58 | 6 |
| Panama | 53 | 4.33 | 59 | 6 |
| South Africa | 54 | 4.32 | 45 | -9 |
| Mauritius | 55 | 4.32 | 57 | 2 |
| Costa Rica | 56 | 4.31 | 55 | -1 |
| Azerbaijan | 57 | 4.29 | 51 | -6 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----|------|-----|-----|
| Brazil | 58 | 4.28 | 56 | -2 |
| Vietnam | 59 | 4.27 | 75 | 16 |
| Slovak Republic | 60 | 4.25 | 47 | -13 |
| Turkey | 61 | 4.25 | 61 | 0 |
| Sri Lanka | 62 | 4.25 | 79 | 17 |
| Russian Federation | 63 | 4.24 | 63 | 0 |
| Uruguay | 64 | 4.23 | 65 | 1 |
| Jordan | 65 | 4.21 | 50 | -15 |
| Mexico | 66 | 4.19 | 60 | -6 |
| Romania | 67 | 4.16 | 64 | -3 |
| Colombia | 68 | 4.14 | 69 | 1 |
| Iran | 69 | 4.14 | n/a | n/a |
| Latvia | 70 | 4.14 | 68 | -2 |
| Bulgaria | 71 | 4.13 | 76 | 5 |
| Kazakhstan | 72 | 4.12 | 67 | -5 |
| Peru | 73 | 4.11 | 78 | 5 |
| Namibia | 74 | 4.09 | 74 | 0 |
| Morocco | 75 | 4.08 | 73 | -2 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|----|------|-----|-----|
| Botswana | 76 | 4.05 | 66 | -10 |
| Croatia | 77 | 4.04 | 72 | -5 |
| Guatemala | 78 | 4.04 | 80 | 2 |
| Macedonia, FYR | 79 | 4.02 | 84 | 5 |
| Rwanda | 80 | 4.00 | n/a | n/a |
| Egypt | 81 | 4.00 | 70 | -11 |
| El Salvador | 82 | 3.99 | 77 | -5 |
| Greece | 83 | 3.99 | 71 | -12 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 84 | 3.97 | 86 | 2 |
| Philippines | 85 | 3.96 | 87 | 2 |
| Algeria | 86 | 3.96 | 83 | -3 |
| Argentina | 87 | 3.95 | 85 | -2 |
| Albania | 88 | 3.94 | 96 | 8 |
| Ukraine | 89 | 3.90 | 82 | -7 |
| Gambia, The | 90 | 3.90 | 81 | -9 |
| Honduras | 91 | 3.89 | 89 | -2 |
| Lebanon | 92 | 3.89 | n/a | n/a |
| Georgia | 93 | 3.86 | 90 | -3 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Moldova | 94 | 3.86 | n/a | n/a |
| Jamaica | 95 | 3.85 | 91 | -4 |
| Serbia | 96 | 3.84 | 93 | -3 |
| Syria | 97 | 3.79 | 94 | -3 |
| Armenia | 98 | 3.76 | 97 | -1 |
| Mongolia | 99 | 3.75 | 117 | 18 |
| Libya | 100 | 3.74 | 88 | -12 |
| Dominican Republic | 101 | 3.72 | 95 | -6 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 102 | 3.70 | 109 | 7 |
| Benin | 103 | 3.69 | 103 | 0 |
| Senegal | 104 | 3.67 | 92 | -12 |
| Ecuador | 105 | 3.65 | 105 | 0 |
| Kenya | 106 | 3.65 | 98 | -8 |
| Bangladesh | 107 | 3.64 | 106 | -1 |
| Bolivia | 108 | 3.64 | 120 | 12 |
| Cambodia | 109 | 3.63 | 110 | 1 |
| Guyana | 110 | 3.62 | 104 | -6 |
| Cameroon | 111 | 3.58 | 111 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Nicaragua | 112 | 3.57 | 115 | 3 |
| Tanzania | 113 | 3.56 | 100 | -13 |
| Ghana | 114 | 3.56 | 114 | 0 |
| Zambia | 115 | 3.55 | 112 | -3 |
| Tajikistan | 116 | 3.53 | 122 | 6 |
| Cape Verde | 117 | 3.51 | n/a | n/a |
| Uganda | 118 | 3.51 | 108 | -10 |
| Ethiopia | 119 | 3.51 | 118 | -1 |
| Paraguay | 120 | 3.49 | 124 | 4 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 121 | 3.49 | 123 | 2 |
| Venezuela | 122 | 3.48 | 113 | -9 |
| Pakistan | 123 | 3.48 | 101 | -22 |
| Madagascar | 124 | 3.46 | 121 | -3 |
| Malawi | 125 | 3.45 | 119 | -6 |
| Swaziland | 126 | 3.40 | n/a | n/a |
| Nigeria | 127 | 3.38 | 99 | -28 |
| Lesotho | 128 | 3.36 | 107 | -21 |
| Côte d'Ivoire | 129 | 3.35 | 116 | -13 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Nepal | 130 | 3.34 | 125 | -5 |
| Mozambique | 131 | 3.32 | 129 | -2 |
| Mali | 132 | 3.28 | 130 | -2 |
| Timor-Leste | 133 | 3.23 | 126 | -7 |
| Burkina Faso | 134 | 3.20 | 128 | -6 |
| Mauritania | 135 | 3.14 | 127 | -8 |
| Zimbabwe | 136 | 3.03 | 132 | -4 |
| Burundi | 137 | 2.96 | 133 | -4 |
| Angola | 138 | 2.93 | n/a | n/a |
| Chad | 139 | 2.73 | 131 | -8 |

Methodology:

The competitiveness rankings are calculated from both publicly available data and the Executive Opinion Survey, a comprehensive annual survey conducted by the World Economic Forum together with its network of Partner Institutes (leading research institutes and business organizations) in the countries covered by the Report.

Highlights according to WEF --

- The [United States](#) falls two places to fourth position, overtaken by [Sweden](#) and [Singapore](#) in the rankings of the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2010-2011
- The People's Republic of [China](#) continues to move up the rankings, with marked improvements in several other Asian countries
- [Germany](#) moves up two places to fifth place, leading the Eurozone countries
- [Switzerland](#) tops the rankings

Source:

World Economic Forum; available at URL: <http://www.weforum.org>

Updated:

2011 using most recent ranking available; reviewed in 2015.

Taxation

There is a 30% flat taxation rate for commercial, industrial, and service-oriented businesses. An additional 15% tax is levied on taxable profits exceeding 3 million dobras. Exemptions are granted on investments of dividends from non-profit entities, and on profits from agricultural activities. Other special exemptions are issued within the parameters of the investment code.

Stock Market

There is no stock market information available for Sao Tome and Principe.

Partner Links

Partner Links

Chapter 5

Social Overview

People

Demography and Culture

Of São Tomé and Príncipe's total population (about 164,000), most inhabitants live on São Tomé and 7,000 live on Príncipe.

The first inhabitants of the islands were the Portuguese who came around 1470. The Portuguese quickly began bringing slaves to São Tomé and Príncipe from different regions of the African mainland, thus setting the stage for divisions throughout the colonial period. These divisions, however, were complimented and re-arranged by secondary divisions within the caste-like São Toméan plantation economy. The slaves were used for two purposes. First, the Portuguese used the slaves to develop plantation agriculture. Second, slaves became a primary export, making the islands an import slave depot for the Portuguese Empire. Today the population is predominantly comprised of descendants of these slaves.

The social divisions embedded during the long colonial period persist today by way of six identifiable ethnic groups. These groups include: Mestiço, or mixed-blood; descendants of African slaves brought to the islands during the early years of settlement from Benin, Gabon, Congo, and Angola (these people also are known as "filhos da terra" or sons of the land); Angolares, reputedly descendants of Angolan slaves who survived a 1540 shipwreck and now earn their livelihood fishing; Forros, descendants of freed slaves when slavery was abolished; Servicais, contract laborers from Angola, Mozambique and Cape Verde, living temporarily on the islands; Tongas, children of Servicais born on the islands; and Europeans, primarily Portuguese.

Language is equally influenced by the former feudal structure, but also by geographic location. São Toméense and Angolar are spoken on São Tomé, while Principense is spoken on Príncipe. Both are Creole languages based on Portuguese. They share an 88 percent lexical similarity and thus are easily mutually understood. Annobonese, a variety of Equatorial Guinean Creole, and Angolar are also both based on Portuguese and mutually understandable. The primary linguistic influence lies in those languages with a significant vocabulary stemming from Western Bantu languages brought by slaves. A full third of the Angolar lexicon is of Bantu origin, most likely from KiMbundu spoken in Angola. Over time, this linguistic difference has helped establish an ethnic distinction between Angolars and Forros who speak predominantly São Toméense.

The islanders have been absorbed largely into a common Luso-African culture. Almost all belong to the Roman Catholic, Evangelical Protestant or Seventh-Day Adventist Churches, which in turn retain close ties with churches in Portugal.

Society and Human Development

In comparison to their continental counterparts, São Toméneses tend to benefit from a strong health infrastructure. Vaccinations are high, salt is iodized keeping goiter and anemia low; the two branches of the Central Hospital services virtually all of the population. However, cases of malaria have surged since the 1980s. This particularly virulent strain has made the disease far and away the number one cause of death in the country. The number of AIDS cases has been few to date, but public health campaigns to increase contraceptive use have met with only limited success raising concerns about the potential destruction the disease could bring in a short period of time.

Many social trends have been positive in São Tomé and Príncipe. Life expectancy is high at 68 years of age. Infant mortality is rated at 38.36 deaths per 1000 births. Food security, while dependent on imports, is relatively high. Most importantly, literacy is high at 85 percent. While there is still a significant gender gap, it is diminishing as women hold a third of professional positions in the country. They do, however, remain under-represented at economic and decision-making levels.

Note: About 7.1 percent of GDP in this country is spent on health expenditures.

One notable indicator used to measure a country's quality of life is the Human Development Index (HDI), which is compiled annually since 1990 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The HDI is a composite of several indicators, which measure a country's achievements in three main areas of human development: longevity, knowledge and education, as well as economic standard of living. In a ranking of 169 countries, the HDI places Sao Tome and Principe in the medium human development category, at 127th place. Note: Although the concept of human development is complicated and cannot be properly captured by values and indices, the HDI, which is calculated and updated annually, offers a wide-ranging assessment of human development in certain countries, not based solely upon traditional economic and financial indicators.

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief at www.countrywatch.com. See Bibliography for list of research sources.

Human Development Index

Human Development Index

Human Development Index (Ranked Numerically)

The [Human Development Index](#) (HDI) is used to measure quality of life in countries across the world. The HDI has been compiled since 1990 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on a regular basis. The HDI is a composite of several indicators, which measure a country's achievements in three main arenas of human development: longevity, education, and economic standard of living. Although the concept of human development is complicated and cannot be properly captured by values and indices, the HDI offers a wide-ranging assessment of human development in certain countries, not based solely upon traditional economic and financial indicators. For more information about the methodology used to calculate the HDI, please see the "Source Materials" in the appendices of this review.

| Very High Human Development | High Human Development | Medium Human Development | Low Human Development |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Norway | 43. Bahamas | 86. Fiji | 128. Kenya |
| 2. Australia | 44. Lithuania | 87. Turkmenistan | 129. Bangladesh |
| 3. New Zealand | 45. Chile | 88. Dominican Republic | 130. Ghana |
| 4. United States | 46. Argentina | 89. China | 131. Cameroon |
| 5. Ireland | 47. Kuwait | 90. El Salvador | 132. Myanmar (Burma) |
| 6. Liechtenstein | 48. Latvia | 91. Sri Lanka | 133. Yemen |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 7. Netherlands | 49. Montenegro | 92. Thailand | 134. Benin |
| 8. Canada | 50. Romania | 93. Gabon | 135. Madagascar |
| 9. Sweden | 51. Croatia | 94. Surname | 136. Mauritania |
| 10. Germany | 52. Uruguay | 95. Bolivia | 137. Papua New Guinea |
| 11. Japan | 53. Libya | 96. Paraguay | 138. Nepal |
| 12. South Korea | 54. Panama | 97. Philippines | 139. Togo |
| 13. Switzerland | 55. Saudi Arabia | 98. Botswana | 140. Comoros |
| 14. France | 56. Mexico | 99. Moldova | 141. Lesotho |
| 15. Israel | 57. Malaysia | 100. Mongolia | 142. Nigeria |
| 16. Finland | 58. Bulgaria | 101. Egypt | 143. Uganda |
| 17. Iceland | 59. Trinidad and Tobago | 102. Uzbekistan | 144. Senegal |
| 18. Belgium | 60. Serbia | 103. Micronesia | 145. Haiti |
| 19. Denmark | 61. Belarus | 104. Guyana | 146. Angola |
| 20. Spain | 62. Costa Rica | 105. Namibia | 147. Djibouti |
| 21. Hong King | 63. Peru | 106. Honduras | 148. Tanzania |
| 22. Greece | 64. Albania | 107. Maldives | 149. Cote d'Ivoire |
| 23. Italy | 65. Russian Federation | 108. Indonesia | 150. Zambia |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 24. Luxembourg | 66. Kazakhstan | 109. Kyrgyzstan | 151. Gambia |
| 25. Austria | 67. Azerbaijan | 110. South Africa | 152. Rwanda |
| 26. United Kingdom | 68. Bosnia and Herzegovina | 111. Syria | 153. Malawi |
| 27. Singapore | 69. Ukraine | 112. Tajikistan | 154. Sudan |
| 28. Czech Republic | 70. Iran | 113. Vietnam | 155. Afghanistan |
| 29. Slovenia | 71. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | 114. Morocco | 156. Guinea |
| 30. Andorra | 72. Mauritius | 115. Nicaragua | 157. Ethiopia |
| 31. Slovakia | 73. Brazil | 116. Guatemala | 158. Sierra Leone |
| 32. United Arab Emirates | 74. Georgia | 117. Equatorial Guinea | 159. Central African Republic |
| 33. Malta | 75. Venezuela | 118. Cape Verde | 160. Mali |
| 34. Estonia | 76. Armenia | 119. India | 161. Burkina Faso |
| 35. Cyprus | 77. Ecuador | 120. East Timor | 162. Liberia |
| 36. Hungary | 78. Belize | 121. Swaziland | 163. Chad |
| 37. Brunei | 79. Colombia | 122. Laos | 164. Guinea-Bissau |
| 38. Qatar | 80. Jamaica | 123. Solomon Islands | 165. Mozambique |

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| 39. Bahrain | 81. Tunisia | 124. Cambodia | 166. Burundi |
| 40. Portugal | 82. Jordan | 125. Pakistan | 167. Niger |
| 41. Poland | 83. Turkey | 126. Congo RC | 168. Congo DRC |
| 42. Barbados | 84. Algeria | 127. Sao Tome and Principe | 169. Zimbabwe |
| | 85. Tonga | | |

Methodology:

For more information about the methodology used to calculate the HDI, please see the "Source Materials" in the appendices of this Country Review.

Reference:

As published in United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Report 2010.

Source:

United Nations Development Programme's [Human Development Index](http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/) available at URL: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

Updated:

Uploaded in 2011 using ranking available; reviewed in 2015

Life Satisfaction Index

Life Satisfaction Index

Life Satisfaction Index

Created by Adrian G. White, an Analytic Social Psychologist at the University of Leicester, the "Satisfaction with Life Index" measures subjective life satisfaction across various countries. The data was taken from a metastudy (see below for source) and associates the notion of subjective happiness or life satisfaction with qualitative parameters such as health, wealth, and access to basic education. This assessment serves as an alternative to other measures of happiness that tend to rely on traditional and quantitative measures of policy on quality of life, such as GNP and GDP. The methodology involved the responses of 80,000 people across the globe.

| Rank | Country | Score |
|------|-------------|--------|
| 1 | Denmark | 273.4 |
| 2 | Switzerland | 273.33 |
| 3 | Austria | 260 |
| 4 | Iceland | 260 |
| 5 | The Bahamas | 256.67 |
| 6 | Finland | 256.67 |
| 7 | Sweden | 256.67 |
| 8 | Iran | 253.33 |
| 9 | Brunei | 253.33 |
| 10 | Canada | 253.33 |
| 11 | Ireland | 253.33 |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------|--------|
| 12 | Luxembourg | 253.33 |
| 13 | Costa Rica | 250 |
| 14 | Malta | 250 |
| 15 | Netherlands | 250 |
| 16 | Antiguaand Barbuda | 246.67 |
| 17 | Malaysia | 246.67 |
| 18 | New Zealand | 246.67 |
| 19 | Norway | 246.67 |
| 20 | Seychelles | 246.67 |
| 21 | Saint Kitts and Nevis | 246.67 |
| 22 | United Arab Emirates | 246.67 |
| 23 | United States | 246.67 |
| 24 | Vanuatu | 246.67 |
| 25 | Venezuela | 246.67 |
| 26 | Australia | 243.33 |
| 27 | Barbados | 243.33 |
| 28 | Belgium | 243.33 |
| 29 | Dominica | 243.33 |
| | | |

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--------|
| 30 | Oman | 243.33 |
| 31 | Saudi Arabia | 243.33 |
| 32 | Suriname | 243.33 |
| 33 | Bahrain | 240 |
| 34 | Colombia | 240 |
| 35 | Germany | 240 |
| 36 | Guyana | 240 |
| 37 | Honduras | 240 |
| 38 | Kuwait | 240 |
| 39 | Panama | 240 |
| 40 | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 240 |
| 41 | United Kingdom | 236.67 |
| 42 | Dominican Republic | 233.33 |
| 43 | Guatemala | 233.33 |
| 44 | Jamaica | 233.33 |
| 45 | Qatar | 233.33 |
| 46 | Spain | 233.33 |
| 47 | Saint Lucia | 233.33 |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------|--------|
| 48 | Belize | 230 |
| 49 | Cyprus | 230 |
| 50 | Italy | 230 |
| 51 | Mexico | 230 |
| 52 | Samoa | 230 |
| 53 | Singapore | 230 |
| 54 | Solomon Islands | 230 |
| 55 | Trinidad and Tobago | 230 |
| 56 | Argentina | 226.67 |
| 57 | Fiji | 223.33 |
| 58 | Israel | 223.33 |
| 59 | Mongolia | 223.33 |
| 60 | São Tomé and Príncipe | 223.33 |
| 61 | El Salvador | 220 |
| 62 | France | 220 |
| 63 | Hong Kong | 220 |
| 64 | Indonesia | 220 |
| 65 | Kyrgyzstan | 220 |

| | | |
|----|----------------|--------|
| 66 | Maldives | 220 |
| 67 | Slovenia | 220 |
| 68 | Taiwan | 220 |
| 69 | East Timor | 220 |
| 70 | Tonga | 220 |
| 71 | Chile | 216.67 |
| 72 | Grenada | 216.67 |
| 73 | Mauritius | 216.67 |
| 74 | Namibia | 216.67 |
| 75 | Paraguay | 216.67 |
| 76 | Thailand | 216.67 |
| 77 | Czech Republic | 213.33 |
| 78 | Philippines | 213.33 |
| 79 | Tunisia | 213.33 |
| 80 | Uzbekistan | 213.33 |
| 81 | Brazil | 210 |
| 82 | China | 210 |
| 83 | Cuba | 210 |

| | | |
|-----|------------------|--------|
| 84 | Greece | 210 |
| 85 | Nicaragua | 210 |
| 86 | Papua New Guinea | 210 |
| 87 | Uruguay | 210 |
| 88 | Gabon | 206.67 |
| 89 | Ghana | 206.67 |
| 90 | Japan | 206.67 |
| 91 | Yemen | 206.67 |
| 92 | Portugal | 203.33 |
| 93 | Sri Lanka | 203.33 |
| 94 | Tajikistan | 203.33 |
| 95 | Vietnam | 203.33 |
| 96 | Bhutan | 200 |
| 97 | Comoros | 196.67 |
| 98 | Croatia | 196.67 |
| 99 | Poland | 196.67 |
| 100 | Cape Verde | 193.33 |
| 101 | Kazakhstan | 193.33 |

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|
| 102 | South Korea | 193.33 |
| 103 | Madagascar | 193.33 |
| 104 | Bangladesh | 190 |
| 105 | Republic of the Congo | 190 |
| 106 | The Gambia | 190 |
| 107 | Hungary | 190 |
| 108 | Libya | 190 |
| 109 | South Africa | 190 |
| 110 | Cambodia | 186.67 |
| 111 | Ecuador | 186.67 |
| 112 | Kenya | 186.67 |
| 113 | Lebanon | 186.67 |
| 114 | Morocco | 186.67 |
| 115 | Peru | 186.67 |
| 116 | Senegal | 186.67 |
| 117 | Bolivia | 183.33 |
| 118 | Haiti | 183.33 |
| 119 | Nepal | 183.33 |

| | | |
|-----|------------------------|--------|
| 120 | Nigeria | 183.33 |
| 121 | Tanzania | 183.33 |
| 122 | Benin | 180 |
| 123 | Botswana | 180 |
| 124 | Guinea-Bissau | 180 |
| 125 | India | 180 |
| 126 | Laos | 180 |
| 127 | Mozambique | 180 |
| 128 | Palestinian Authority | 180 |
| 129 | Slovakia | 180 |
| 130 | Myanmar | 176.67 |
| 131 | Mali | 176.67 |
| 132 | Mauritania | 176.67 |
| 133 | Turkey | 176.67 |
| 134 | Algeria | 173.33 |
| 135 | Equatorial Guinea | 173.33 |
| 136 | Romania | 173.33 |
| 137 | Bosnia and Herzegovina | 170 |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--------|
| 138 | Cameroon | 170 |
| 139 | Estonia | 170 |
| 140 | Guinea | 170 |
| 141 | Jordan | 170 |
| 142 | Syria | 170 |
| 143 | Sierra Leone | 166.67 |
| 144 | Azerbaijan | 163.33 |
| 145 | Central African Republic | 163.33 |
| 146 | Republic of Macedonia | 163.33 |
| 147 | Togo | 163.33 |
| 148 | Zambia | 163.33 |
| 149 | Angola | 160 |
| 150 | Djibouti | 160 |
| 151 | Egypt | 160 |
| 152 | Burkina Faso | 156.67 |
| 153 | Ethiopia | 156.67 |
| 154 | Latvia | 156.67 |
| 155 | Lithuania | 156.67 |

| | | |
|-----|---------------|--------|
| 156 | Uganda | 156.67 |
| 157 | Albania | 153.33 |
| 158 | Malawi | 153.33 |
| 159 | Chad | 150 |
| 160 | Côte d'Ivoire | 150 |
| 161 | Niger | 150 |
| 162 | Eritrea | 146.67 |
| 163 | Rwanda | 146.67 |
| 164 | Bulgaria | 143.33 |
| 165 | Lesotho | 143.33 |
| 166 | Pakistan | 143.33 |
| 167 | Russia | 143.33 |
| 168 | Swaziland | 140 |
| 169 | Georgia | 136.67 |
| 170 | Belarus | 133.33 |
| 171 | Turkmenistan | 133.33 |
| 172 | Armenia | 123.33 |
| 173 | Sudan | 120 |

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--------|
| 174 | Ukraine | 120 |
| 175 | Moldova | 116.67 |
| 176 | Democratic Republic of the Congo | 110 |
| 177 | Zimbabwe | 110 |
| 178 | Burundi | 100 |

Commentary:

European countries, such as [Denmark](#), [Iceland](#), [Finland](#), [Sweden](#), [Switzerland](#), [Austria](#) resided at the top of the ranking with highest levels of self-reported life satisfaction. Conversely, European countries such as [Latvia](#), [Lithuania](#), [Moldova](#), [Belarus](#) and [Ukraine](#) ranked low on the index. African countries such as Democratic Republic of Congo, [Zimbabwe](#) and [Burundi](#) found themselves at the very bottom of the ranking, and indeed, very few African countries could be found in the top 100. [Japan](#) was at the mid-way point in the ranking, however, other Asian countries such as [Brunei](#) and [Malaysia](#) were in the top tier, while [Pakistan](#) was close to the bottom with a low level of self-identified life satisfaction. As a region, the Middle East presented a mixed bag with Saudi Arabians reporting healthy levels of life satisfaction and Egyptians near the bottom of the ranking. As a region, Caribbean countries were ranked highly, consistently demonstrating high levels of life satisfaction. The findings showed that health was the most crucial determining factor in life satisfaction, followed by prosperity and education.

Source:

White, A. (2007). A Global Projection of Subjective Well-being: A Challenge To Positive Psychology? *Psychiatry* 56, 17-20. The data was extracted from a meta-analysis by Marks, Abdallah, Simms & Thompson (2006).

Uploaded:

Based on study noted above in "Source" ; reviewed in 2015

Happy Planet Index

Happy Planet Index

The Happy Planet Index (HPI) is used to measure human well-being in conjunction with environmental impact. The HPI has been compiled since 2006 by the New Economics Foundation. The index is a composite of several indicators including subjective life satisfaction, life expectancy at birth, and ecological footprint per capita.

As noted by NEFA, the HPI "reveals the ecological efficiency with which human well-being is delivered." Indeed, the index combines environmental impact with human well-being to measure the environmental efficiency with which, country by country, people live long and happy lives. The countries ranked highest by the HPI are not necessarily the ones with the happiest people overall, but the ones that allow their citizens to live long and fulfilling lives, without negatively impacting this opportunity for either future generations or citizens of other countries. Accordingly, a country like the [United States](#) will rank low on this list due to its large per capital ecological footprint, which uses more than its fair share of resources, and will likely cause planetary damage.

It should be noted that the HPI was designed to be a counterpoint to other well-established indices of countries' development, such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which measures overall national wealth and economic development, but often obfuscates the realities of countries with stark variances between the rich and the poor. Moreover, the objective of most of the world's people is not to be wealthy but to be happy. The HPI also differs from the [Human Development Index](#) (HDI), which measures quality of life but not ecology, since it [HPI] also includes sustainability as a key indicator.

| Rank | Country | HPI |
|------|--------------------|------|
| 1 | Costa Rica | 76.1 |
| 2 | Dominican Republic | 71.8 |
| 3 | Jamaica | 70.1 |
| 4 | Guatemala | 68.4 |

| | | |
|----|--------------|------|
| 5 | Vietnam | 66.5 |
| 6 | Colombia | 66.1 |
| 7 | Cuba | 65.7 |
| 8 | El Salvador | 61.5 |
| 9 | Brazil | 61.0 |
| 10 | Honduras | 61.0 |
| 11 | Nicaragua | 60.5 |
| 12 | Egypt | 60.3 |
| 13 | Saudi Arabia | 59.7 |
| 14 | Philippines | 59.0 |
| 15 | Argentina | 59.0 |
| 16 | Indonesia | 58.9 |
| 17 | Bhutan | 58.5 |
| 18 | Panama | 57.4 |
| 19 | Laos | 57.3 |
| 20 | China | 57.1 |
| 21 | Morocco | 56.8 |
| 22 | Sri Lanka | 56.5 |

| | | |
|----|---------------------|------|
| 23 | Mexico | 55.6 |
| 24 | Pakistan | 55.6 |
| 25 | Ecuador | 55.5 |
| 26 | Jordan | 54.6 |
| 27 | Belize | 54.5 |
| 28 | Peru | 54.4 |
| 29 | Tunisia | 54.3 |
| 30 | Trinidad and Tobago | 54.2 |
| 31 | Bangladesh | 54.1 |
| 32 | Moldova | 54.1 |
| 33 | Malaysia | 54.0 |
| 34 | Tajikistan | 53.5 |
| 35 | India | 53.0 |
| 36 | Venezuela | 52.5 |
| 37 | Nepal | 51.9 |
| 38 | Syria | 51.3 |
| 39 | Burma | 51.2 |
| 40 | Algeria | 51.2 |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------|------|
| 41 | Thailand | 50.9 |
| 42 | Haiti | 50.8 |
| 43 | Netherlands | 50.6 |
| 44 | Malta | 50.4 |
| 45 | Uzbekistan | 50.1 |
| 46 | Chile | 49.7 |
| 47 | Bolivia | 49.3 |
| 48 | Armenia | 48.3 |
| 49 | Singapore | 48.2 |
| 50 | Yemen | 48.1 |
| 51 | Germany | 48.1 |
| 52 | Switzerland | 48.1 |
| 53 | Sweden | 48.0 |
| 54 | Albania | 47.9 |
| 55 | Paraguay | 47.8 |
| 56 | Palestinian Authority | 47.7 |
| 57 | Austria | 47.7 |
| 58 | Serbia | 47.6 |

| | | |
|----|------------------------|------|
| 59 | Finland | 47.2 |
| 60 | Croatia | 47.2 |
| 61 | Kyrgyzstan | 47.1 |
| 62 | Cyprus | 46.2 |
| 63 | Guyana | 45.6 |
| 64 | Belgium | 45.4 |
| 65 | Bosnia and Herzegovina | 45.0 |
| 66 | Slovenia | 44.5 |
| 67 | Israel | 44.5 |
| 68 | South Korea | 44.4 |
| 69 | Italy | 44.0 |
| 70 | Romania | 43.9 |
| 71 | France | 43.9 |
| 72 | Georgia | 43.6 |
| 73 | Slovakia | 43.5 |
| 74 | United Kingdom | 43.3 |
| 75 | Japan | 43.3 |
| 76 | Spain | 43.2 |

| | | |
|----|----------------|------|
| 77 | Poland | 42.8 |
| 78 | Ireland | 42.6 |
| 79 | Iraq | 42.6 |
| 80 | Cambodia | 42.3 |
| 81 | Iran | 42.1 |
| 82 | Bulgaria | 42.0 |
| 83 | Turkey | 41.7 |
| 84 | Hong Kong | 41.6 |
| 85 | Azerbaijan | 41.2 |
| 86 | Lithuania | 40.9 |
| 87 | Djibouti | 40.4 |
| 88 | Norway | 40.4 |
| 89 | Canada | 39.4 |
| 90 | Hungary | 38.9 |
| 91 | Kazakhstan | 38.5 |
| 92 | Czech Republic | 38.3 |
| 93 | Mauritania | 38.2 |
| 94 | Iceland | 38.1 |

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------|------|
| 95 | Ukraine | 38.1 |
| 96 | Senegal | 38.0 |
| 97 | Greece | 37.6 |
| 98 | Portugal | 37.5 |
| 99 | Uruguay | 37.2 |
| 100 | Ghana | 37.1 |
| 101 | Latvia | 36.7 |
| 102 | Australia | 36.6 |
| 103 | New Zealand | 36.2 |
| 104 | Belarus | 35.7 |
| 105 | Denmark | 35.5 |
| 106 | Mongolia | 35.0 |
| 107 | Malawi | 34.5 |
| 108 | Russia | 34.5 |
| 109 | Chad | 34.3 |
| 110 | Lebanon | 33.6 |
| 111 | Macedonia | 32.7 |
| 112 | Republic of the Congo | 32.4 |

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|------|
| 113 | Madagascar | 31.5 |
| 114 | United States | 30.7 |
| 115 | Nigeria | 30.3 |
| 116 | Guinea | 30.3 |
| 117 | Uganda | 30.2 |
| 118 | South Africa | 29.7 |
| 119 | Rwanda | 29.6 |
| 120 | Democratic Republic of the Congo | 29.0 |
| 121 | Sudan | 28.5 |
| 122 | Luxembourg | 28.5 |
| 123 | United Arab Emirates | 28.2 |
| 124 | Ethiopia | 28.1 |
| 125 | Kenya | 27.8 |
| 126 | Cameroon | 27.2 |
| 127 | Zambia | 27.2 |
| 128 | Kuwait | 27.0 |
| 129 | Niger | 26.9 |
| 130 | Angola | 26.8 |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------|------|
| 131 | Estonia | 26.4 |
| 132 | Mali | 25.8 |
| 133 | Mozambique | 24.6 |
| 134 | Benin | 24.6 |
| 135 | Togo | 23.3 |
| 136 | Sierra Leone | 23.1 |
| 137 | Central African Republic | 22.9 |
| 138 | Burkina Faso | 22.4 |
| 139 | Burundi | 21.8 |
| 140 | Namibia | 21.1 |
| 141 | Botswana | 20.9 |
| 142 | Tanzania | 17.8 |
| 143 | Zimbabwe | 16.6 |

Source: This material is derived from the Happy Planet Index issued by the New Economics Foundation (NEF).

Methodology: The methodology for the calculations can be found at URL: <http://www.happyplanetindex.org/>

Status of Women

Gender Related Development Index (GDI) Rank:

Not Ranked

Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) Rank:

Not Ranked

Female Population:

50,000

Female Life Expectancy at birth:

68.9 years

Total Fertility Rate:

5.6

Maternal Mortality Ratio (2000):

N/A

Total Number of Women Living with HIV/AIDS:

N/A

Ever Married Women, Ages 15-19 (%):

20%

Mean Age at Time of Marriage:

18

Contraceptive Use Among Married Women, Any Method (%):

N/A

Female Adult Literacy Rate:

N/A

Combined Female Gross enrollment ratio for Primary, Secondary and Tertiary schools:

59%

Female-Headed Households (%):

33%

Economically Active Females (%):

N/A

Female Contributing Family Workers (%):

N/A

Female Estimated Earned Income:

N/A

Seats in Parliament held by women (%):

Lower or Single House: 9.1%

Upper House or Senate: N/A

Year Women Received the Right to Vote:

1975

Year Women Received the Right to Stand for Election:

1975

*The Gender Development Index (GDI) is a composite index which measures the average achievement in a country. While very similar to the Human Development Index in its use of the same variables, the GDI adjusts the average achievement of each country in terms of life expectancy, enrollment in schools, income, and literacy in accordance to the disparities between males and females.

*The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) is a composite index measuring gender inequality in three of the basic dimensions of empowerment; economic participation and decision-making, political participation and decision-making, and power over economic resources.

*Total Fertility Rate (TFR) is defined as the average number of babies born to women during their reproductive years. A TFR of 2.1 is considered the replacement rate; once a TFR of a population reaches 2.1 the population will remain stable assuming no immigration or emigration takes place. When the TFR is greater than 2.1 a population will increase and when it is less than 2.1 a population will eventually decrease, although due to the age structure of a population it will take years before a low TFR is translated into lower population.

*Maternal Mortality Rate is the number of deaths to women per 100,000 live births that resulted from conditions related to pregnancy and or delivery related complications.

*Economically Active Females are the share of the female population, ages 15 and above, whom supply, or are able to supply, labor for the production of goods and services.

*Female Contributing Family Workers are those females who work without pay in an economic

enterprise operated by a relative living in the same household.

*Estimated Earned Income is measured according to Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) in US dollars.

Global Gender Gap Index

Global Gender Gap Index

Editor's Note:

The Global Gender Gap Index by the World Economic Forum ranks most of the world's countries in terms of the division of resources and opportunities among males and females. Specifically, the ranking assesses the gender inequality gap in these four arenas:

1. Economic participation and opportunity (salaries and high skilled employment participation levels)
2. Educational attainment (access to basic and higher level education)
3. Political empowerment (representation in decision-making structures)
4. Health and survival (life expectancy and sex ratio)

| | 2010 rank | 2010 score | 2010 rank among 2009 countries | 2009 rank | 2009 score | 2008 rank | 2008 score | 2007 rank |
|---------|-----------|------------|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Country | | | | | | | | |
| Iceland | 1 | 0.8496 | 1 | 1 | 0.8276 | 4 | 0.7999 | 4 |
| Norway | 2 | 0.8404 | 2 | 3 | 0.8227 | 1 | 0.8239 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|----|--------|----|
| Finland | 3 | 0.8260 | 3 | 2 | 0.8252 | 2 | 0.8195 | 3 |
| Sweden | 4 | 0.8024 | 4 | 4 | 0.8139 | 3 | 0.8139 | 1 |
| New Zealand | 5 | 0.7808 | 5 | 5 | 0.7880 | 5 | 0.7859 | 5 |
| Ireland | 6 | 0.7773 | 6 | 8 | 0.7597 | 8 | 0.7518 | 9 |
| Denmark | 7 | 0.7719 | 7 | 7 | 0.7628 | 7 | 0.7538 | 8 |
| Lesotho | 8 | 0.7678 | 8 | 10 | 0.7495 | 16 | 0.7320 | 26 |
| Philippines | 9 | 0.7654 | 9 | 9 | 0.7579 | 6 | 0.7568 | 6 |
| Switzerland | 10 | 0.7562 | 10 | 13 | 0.7426 | 14 | 0.7360 | 40 |
| Spain | 11 | 0.7554 | 11 | 17 | 0.7345 | 17 | 0.7281 | 10 |
| South Africa | 12 | 0.7535 | 12 | 6 | 0.7709 | 22 | 0.7232 | 20 |
| Germany | 13 | 0.7530 | 13 | 12 | 0.7449 | 11 | 0.7394 | 7 |
| Belgium | 14 | 0.7509 | 14 | 33 | 0.7165 | 28 | 0.7163 | 19 |
| United Kingdom | 15 | 0.7460 | 15 | 15 | 0.7402 | 13 | 0.7366 | 11 |
| Sri Lanka | 16 | 0.7458 | 16 | 16 | 0.7402 | 12 | 0.7371 | 15 |
| Netherlands | 17 | 0.7444 | 17 | 11 | 0.7490 | 9 | 0.7399 | 12 |
| Latvia | 18 | 0.7429 | 18 | 14 | 0.7416 | 10 | 0.7397 | 13 |
| United States | 19 | 0.7411 | 19 | 31 | 0.7173 | 27 | 0.7179 | 31 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Canada | 20 | 0.7372 | 20 | 25 | 0.7196 | 31 | 0.7136 | 18 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 21 | 0.7353 | 21 | 19 | 0.7298 | 19 | 0.7245 | 46 |
| Mozambique | 22 | 0.7329 | 22 | 26 | 0.7195 | 18 | 0.7266 | 43 |
| Australia | 23 | 0.7271 | 23 | 20 | 0.7282 | 21 | 0.7241 | 17 |
| Cuba | 24 | 0.7253 | 24 | 29 | 0.7176 | 25 | 0.7195 | 22 |
| Namibia | 25 | 0.7238 | 25 | 32 | 0.7167 | 30 | 0.7141 | 29 |
| Luxembourg | 26 | 0.7231 | 26 | 63 | 0.6889 | 66 | 0.6802 | 58 |
| Mongolia | 27 | 0.7194 | 27 | 22 | 0.7221 | 40 | 0.7049 | 62 |
| Costa Rica | 28 | 0.7194 | 28 | 27 | 0.7180 | 32 | 0.7111 | 28 |
| Argentina | 29 | 0.7187 | 29 | 24 | 0.7211 | 24 | 0.7209 | 33 |
| Nicaragua | 30 | 0.7176 | 30 | 49 | 0.7002 | 71 | 0.6747 | 90 |
| Barbados | 31 | 0.7176 | 31 | 21 | 0.7236 | 26 | 0.7188 | n/a |
| Portugal | 32 | 0.7171 | 32 | 46 | 0.7013 | 39 | 0.7051 | 37 |
| Uganda | 33 | 0.7169 | 33 | 40 | 0.7067 | 43 | 0.6981 | 50 |
| Moldova | 34 | 0.7160 | 34 | 36 | 0.7104 | 20 | 0.7244 | 21 |
| Lithuania | 35 | 0.7132 | 35 | 30 | 0.7175 | 23 | 0.7222 | 14 |
| Bahamas | 36 | 0.7128 | 36 | 28 | 0.7179 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Austria | 37 | 0.7091 | 37 | 42 | 0.7031 | 29 | 0.7153 | 27 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Guyana | 38 | 0.7090 | 38 | 35 | 0.7108 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Panama | 39 | 0.7072 | 39 | 43 | 0.7024 | 34 | 0.7095 | 38 |
| Ecuador | 40 | 0.7072 | 40 | 23 | 0.7220 | 35 | 0.7091 | 44 |
| Kazakhstan | 41 | 0.7055 | 41 | 47 | 0.7013 | 45 | 0.6976 | 32 |
| Slovenia | 42 | 0.7047 | 42 | 52 | 0.6982 | 51 | 0.6937 | 49 |
| Poland | 43 | 0.7037 | 43 | 50 | 0.6998 | 49 | 0.6951 | 60 |
| Jamaica | 44 | 0.7037 | 44 | 48 | 0.7013 | 44 | 0.6980 | 39 |
| Russian Federation | 45 | 0.7036 | 45 | 51 | 0.6987 | 42 | 0.6994 | 45 |
| France | 46 | 0.7025 | 46 | 18 | 0.7331 | 15 | 0.7341 | 51 |
| Estonia | 47 | 0.7018 | 47 | 37 | 0.7094 | 37 | 0.7076 | 30 |
| Chile | 48 | 0.7013 | 48 | 64 | 0.6884 | 65 | 0.6818 | 86 |
| Macedonia, FYR | 49 | 0.6996 | 49 | 53 | 0.6950 | 53 | 0.6914 | 35 |
| Bulgaria | 50 | 0.6983 | 50 | 38 | 0.7072 | 36 | 0.7077 | 25 |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 51 | 0.6973 | 51 | 41 | 0.7058 | 41 | 0.7045 | 70 |
| Israel | 52 | 0.6957 | 52 | 45 | 0.7019 | 56 | 0.6900 | 36 |
| Croatia | 53 | 0.6939 | 53 | 54 | 0.6944 | 46 | 0.6967 | 16 |
| Honduras | 54 | 0.6927 | 54 | 62 | 0.6893 | 47 | 0.6960 | 68 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|--------|----|----|--------|-----|--------|----|
| Colombia | 55 | 0.6927 | 55 | 56 | 0.6939 | 50 | 0.6944 | 24 |
| Singapore | 56 | 0.6914 | 56 | 84 | 0.6664 | 84 | 0.6625 | 77 |
| Thailand | 57 | 0.6910 | 57 | 59 | 0.6907 | 52 | 0.6917 | 52 |
| Greece | 58 | 0.6908 | 58 | 85 | 0.6662 | 75 | 0.6727 | 72 |
| Uruguay | 59 | 0.6897 | 59 | 57 | 0.6936 | 54 | 0.6907 | 78 |
| Peru | 60 | 0.6895 | 60 | 44 | 0.7024 | 48 | 0.6959 | 75 |
| China | 61 | 0.6881 | 61 | 60 | 0.6907 | 57 | 0.6878 | 73 |
| Botswana | 62 | 0.6876 | 62 | 39 | 0.7071 | 63 | 0.6839 | 53 |
| Ukraine | 63 | 0.6869 | 63 | 61 | 0.6896 | 62 | 0.6856 | 57 |
| Venezuela | 64 | 0.6863 | 64 | 69 | 0.6839 | 59 | 0.6875 | 55 |
| Czech Republic | 65 | 0.6850 | 65 | 74 | 0.6789 | 69 | 0.6770 | 64 |
| Tanzania | 66 | 0.6829 | 66 | 73 | 0.6797 | 38 | 0.7068 | 34 |
| Romania | 67 | 0.6826 | 67 | 70 | 0.6805 | 70 | 0.6763 | 47 |
| Malawi | 68 | 0.6824 | 68 | 76 | 0.6738 | 81 | 0.6664 | 87 |
| Paraguay | 69 | 0.6804 | 69 | 66 | 0.6868 | 100 | 0.6379 | 69 |
| Ghana | 70 | 0.6782 | 70 | 80 | 0.6704 | 77 | 0.6679 | 63 |
| Slovak Republic | 71 | 0.6778 | 71 | 68 | 0.6845 | 64 | 0.6824 | 54 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----|--------|----|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Vietnam | 72 | 0.6776 | 72 | 71 | 0.6802 | 68 | 0.6778 | 42 |
| Dominican Republic | 73 | 0.6774 | 73 | 67 | 0.6859 | 72 | 0.6744 | 65 |
| Italy | 74 | 0.6765 | 74 | 72 | 0.6798 | 67 | 0.6788 | 84 |
| Gambia, The | 75 | 0.6762 | 75 | 75 | 0.6752 | 85 | 0.6622 | 95 |
| Bolivia | 76 | 0.6751 | 76 | 82 | 0.6693 | 80 | 0.6667 | 80 |
| Brueni Darussalem | 77 | 0.6748 | 77 | 94 | 0.6524 | 99 | 0.6392 | n/a |
| Albania | 78 | 0.6726 | 78 | 91 | 0.6601 | 87 | 0.6591 | 66 |
| Hungary | 79 | 0.6720 | 79 | 65 | 0.6879 | 60 | 0.6867 | 61 |
| Madagascar | 80 | 0.6713 | 80 | 77 | 0.6732 | 74 | 0.6736 | 89 |
| Angola | 81 | 0.6712 | 81 | 106 | 0.6353 | 114 | 0.6032 | 110 |
| Bangladesh | 82 | 0.6702 | 82 | 93 | 0.6526 | 90 | 0.6531 | 100 |
| Malta | 83 | 0.6695 | 83 | 88 | 0.6635 | 83 | 0.6634 | 76 |
| Armenia | 84 | 0.6669 | 84 | 90 | 0.6619 | 78 | 0.6677 | 71 |
| Brazil | 85 | 0.6655 | 85 | 81 | 0.6695 | 73 | 0.6737 | 74 |
| Cyprus | 86 | 0.6642 | 86 | 79 | 0.6706 | 76 | 0.6694 | 82 |
| Indonesia | 87 | 0.6615 | 87 | 92 | 0.6580 | 93 | 0.6473 | 81 |
| Georgia | 88 | 0.6598 | 88 | 83 | 0.6680 | 82 | 0.6654 | 67 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Tajikistan | 89 | 0.6598 | 89 | 86 | 0.6661 | 89 | 0.6541 | 79 |
| El Salvador | 90 | 0.6596 | 90 | 55 | 0.6939 | 58 | 0.6875 | 48 |
| Mexico | 91 | 0.6577 | 91 | 98 | 0.6503 | 97 | 0.6441 | 93 |
| Zimbabwe | 92 | 0.6574 | 92 | 95 | 0.6518 | 92 | 0.6485 | 88 |
| Belize | 93 | 0.6536 | 93 | 87 | 0.6636 | 86 | 0.6610 | 94 |
| Japan | 94 | 0.6524 | 94 | 101 | 0.6447 | 98 | 0.6434 | 91 |
| Mauritius | 95 | 0.6520 | 95 | 96 | 0.6513 | 95 | 0.6466 | 85 |
| Kenya | 96 | 0.6499 | 96 | 97 | 0.6512 | 88 | 0.6547 | 83 |
| Cambodia | 97 | 0.6482 | 97 | 104 | 0.6410 | 94 | 0.6469 | 98 |
| Malaysia | 98 | 0.6479 | 98 | 100 | 0.6467 | 96 | 0.6442 | 92 |
| Maldives | 99 | 0.6452 | 99 | 99 | 0.6482 | 91 | 0.6501 | 99 |
| Azerbaijan | 100 | 0.6446 | 100 | 89 | 0.6626 | 61 | 0.6856 | 59 |
| Senegal | 101 | 0.6414 | 101 | 102 | 0.6427 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Suriname | 102 | 0.6407 | 102 | 78 | 0.6726 | 79 | 0.6674 | 56 |
| United Arab Emirates | 103 | 0.6397 | 103 | 112 | 0.6198 | 105 | 0.6220 | 105 |
| Korea, Rep. | 104 | 0.6342 | 104 | 115 | 0.6146 | 108 | 0.6154 | 97 |
| Kuwait | 105 | 0.6318 | 105 | 105 | 0.6356 | 101 | 0.6358 | 96 |
| Zambia | 106 | 0.6293 | 106 | 107 | 0.6310 | 106 | 0.6205 | 101 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|-----|------------------------|-----|
| Tunisia | 107 | 0.6266 | 107 | 109 | 0.6233 | 103 | 0.6295 | 102 |
| Fiji | 108 | 0.6256 | 108 | 103 | 0.6414 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Guatemala | 109 | 0.6238 | 109 | 111 | 0.6209 | 112 | 0.6072 | 106 |
| Bahrain | 110 | 0.6217 | 110 | 116 | 0.6136 | 121 | 0.5927 | 115 |
| Burkina Faso | 111 | 0.6162 | 111 | 120 | 0.6081 | 115 | 0.6029 | 117 |
| India | 112 | 0.6155 | 112 | 114 | 0.6151 | 113 | 0.6060 | 114 |
| Mauritania | 113 | 0.6152 | 113 | 119 | 0.6103 | 110 | 0.6117 | 111 |
| Cameroon | 114 | 0.6110 | 114 | 118 | 0.6108 | 117 | 0.6017 | 116 |
| Nepal | 115 | 0.6084 | 115 | 110 | 0.6213 | 120 | 0.5942 | 125 |
| Lebanon* | 116 | 0.6084 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Qatar | 117 | 0.6059 | 116 | 125 | 0.5907 | 119 | 0.5948 | 109 |
| Nigeria | 118 | 0.6055 | 117 | 108 | 0.6280 | 102 | 0.6339 | 107 |
| Algeria | 119 | 0.6052 | 118 | 117 | 0.6119 | 111 | 0.6111 | 108 |
| Jordan | 120 | 0.6048 | 119 | 113 | 0.6182 | 104 | 0.6275 | 104 |
| Ethiopia | 121 | 0.6019 | 120 | 122 | 0.5948 | 122 | 0.5867 | 113 |
| Oman | 122 | 0.5950 | 121 | 123 | 0.5938 | 118 | 0.5960 | 119 |
| Iran | 123 | 0.5933 | 122 | 128 | 0.5839 | 116 | 0.6021 | 118 |
| Syria | 124 | 0.5926 | 123 | 121 | 0.6072 | 107 | 0.6181 | 103 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|--------|-----|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|
| Egypt | 125 | 0.5899 | 124 | 126 | 0.5862 | 124 | 0.5832 | 120 |
| Turkey | 126 | 0.5876 | 125 | 129 | 0.5828 | 123 | 0.5853 | 121 |
| Morocco | 127 | 0.5767 | 126 | 124 | 0.5926 | 125 | 0.5757 | 122 |
| Benin | 128 | 0.5719 | 127 | 131 | 0.5643 | 126 | 0.5582 | 123 |
| Saudi Arabia | 129 | 0.5713 | 128 | 130 | 0.5651 | 128 | 0.5537 | 124 |
| Côte d'Ivoire* | 130 | 0.5691 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mali | 131 | 0.5680 | 129 | 127 | 0.5860 | 109 | 0.6117 | 112 |
| Pakistan | 132 | 0.5465 | 130 | 132 | 0.5458 | 127 | 0.5549 | 126 |
| Chad | 133 | 0.5330 | 131 | 133 | 0.5417 | 129 | 0.5290 | 127 |
| Yemen | 134 | 0.4603 | 132 | 134 | 0.4609 | 130 | 0.4664 | 128 |
| Belarus | n/a | n/a | n/a | 34 | 0.7141 | 33 | 0.7099 | 23 |
| Uzbekistan | n/a | n/a | n/a | 58 | 0.6913 | 55 | 0.6906 | 41 |
| | | | | | | | | |

*new country 2010

Commentary:

According to the report's index, Nordic countries, such as [Iceland](#), [Norway](#), [Finland](#), and [Sweden](#) have continued to dominate at the top of the ranking for gender equality. Meanwhile, [France](#) has

seen a notable decline in the ranking, largely as a result of decreased number of women holding ministerial portfolios in that country. In the Americas, the [United States](#) has risen in the ranking to top the region, predominantly as a result of a decreasing wage gap, as well as higher number of women holding key positions in the current Obama administration. [Canada](#) has continued to remain as one of the top ranking countries of the Americas, followed by the small Caribbean island nation of Trinidad and Tobago, which has the distinction of being among the top three countries of the Americans in the realm of gender equality. [Lesotho](#) and South African ranked highly in the index, leading not only among African countries but also in global context. Despite [Lesotho](#) still lagging in the area of life expectancy, its high ranking was attributed to high levels of female participation in the labor force and female literacy. The [Philippines](#) and [Sri Lanka](#) were the top ranking countries for gender equality for Asia, ranking highly also in global context. The [Philippines](#) has continued to show strong performance in all strong performance on all four dimensions (detailed above) of the index. Finally, in the Arab world, the [United Arab Emirates](#) held the highest-rank within that region of the world; however, its placement near the bottom of the global list highlights the fact that Arab countries are generally poor performers when it comes to the matter of gender equality in global scope.

Source:

This data is derived from the latest edition of The Global Gender Gap Report by the World Economic Forum.

Available at URL:

<http://www.weforum.org/en/Communities/Women%20Leaders%20and%20Gender%20Parity/Gende>

Updated:

Based on latest available data as set forth in chart; reviewed in 2014

Culture and Arts

Content coming soon.

Etiquette

Cultural Dos and Taboos

1. A handshake is an acceptable form of greeting.
2. Dress is casual. Beachwear should only be worn at the beach or pool.
3. Note that Portuguese etiquette has influenced much of the country's social conventions.
4. Do not photograph military or government structures. It's always best to ask permission before photographing people.
5. Expect to haggle in the market.

Travel Information

Please Note

This is a generalized travel guide and it is intended to coalesce several resources, which a traveler might find useful, regardless of a particular destination. As such, it does not include travel warnings for specific "hot spot" destinations.

For travel alerts and warnings, please see the United States Department of State's listings available at URL:

<http://travel.state.gov/content/passports/english/alertswarnings.html>

Please note that travel to the following countries, based on these warnings, is ill-advised, or should be undertaken with the utmost precaution:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Honduras, Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, North Korea, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories of West Bank and Gaza, Philippines areas of Sulu Archipelago, Mindanao, and southern Sulu Sea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, Venezuela, and Yemen.

International Travel Guide

Checklist for Travelers

1. Take out travel insurance to cover hospital treatment or medical evacuation. Overseas medical costs are expensive to most international travelers, where one's domestic, nationalized or even private health insurance plans will not provide coverage outside one's home country. Learn about "reciprocal insurance plans" that some international health care companies might offer.
2. Make sure that one's travel insurance is appropriate. If one intends to indulge in adventurous activities, such as parasailing, one should be sure that one is fully insured in such cases. Many traditional insurance policies do not provide coverage in cases of extreme circumstances.
3. Take time to learn about one's destination country and culture. Read and learn about the place one is traveling. Also check political, economic and socio-cultural developments at the destination by reading country-specific travel reports and fact sheets noted below.
4. Get the necessary visas for the country (or countries) one intends to visit - but be aware that a visa does not guarantee entry. A number of useful sites regarding visa and other entry requirements are noted below.
5. Keep in regular contact with friends and relatives back at home by phone or email, and be sure to leave a travel itinerary.
6. Protect one's personal information by making copies of one's passport details, insurance policy, travelers checks and credit card numbers. Taking copies of such documents with you, while leaving another collection copies with someone at home is also good practice for travelers. Taking copies of one's passport photograph is also recommended.
7. Stay healthy by taking all possible precautions against illness. Also, be sure to take extra supplies of prescription drugs along for the trip, while also taking time to pack general pharmaceutical supplies, such as aspirin and other such painkillers, bandages, stomach ailment medication, anti-inflammatory medication and anti-bacterial medication.
8. Do not carry illicit drugs. Understand that the punishment for possession or use of illegal drugs in some countries may be capital punishment. Make sure your prescription drugs are legal in the countries you plan to visit.
9. Know the laws of one's destination country and culture; be sure to understand the repercussions of breaking those laws and regulations. Often the transparency and freedoms of the juridical

system at home is not consistent with that of one's destination country. Become aware of these complexities and subtleties before you travel.

10. For longer stays in a country, or where the security situation is volatile, one should register one's self and traveling companions at the local embassy or consulate of one's country of citizenship.

11. Women should take care to be prepared both culturally and practically for traveling in a different country and culture. One should be sure to take sufficient supplies of personal feminine products and prescription drugs. One should also learn about local cultural standards for women, including norms of dressing. Be aware that it is simply inappropriate and unsafe for women to travel alone in some countries, and take the necessary precautions to avoid risk-filled situations.

12. If one is traveling with small children, one should pack extra supplies, make arrangements with the travel carrier for proper seating that would adequately accommodate children, infants or toddlers. Note also that whether one is male or female, traveling with children means that one's hands are thus not free to carry luggage and bags. Be especially aware that this makes one vulnerable to pickpockets, thieves and other sorts of crime.

13. Make proper arrangements for accommodations, well in advance of one's arrival at a destination. Some countries have limited accommodation, while others may have culturally distinctive facilities. Learning about these practicalities before one travels will greatly aid the enjoyment of one's trip.

14. Travel with different forms of currency and money (cash, traveler's checks and credit cards) in anticipation that venues may not accept one or another form of money. Also, ensuring that one's financial resources are not contained in one location, or by one person (if one is traveling with others) can be a useful measure, in the event that one loses a wallet or purse.

15. Find out about transportation in the destination country. In some places, it might be advisable to hire a local driver or taxi guide for safety reasons, while in other countries, enjoying one's travel experience may well be enhanced by renting a vehicle and seeing the local sights and culture independently. Costs may also be prohibitive for either of these choices, so again, prior planning is suggested.

Tips for Travelers

A passport is required. A visa is required and must be obtained in advance. Travelers should obtain the latest information and details from the Permanent Mission of Sao Tome and Principe, 400 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10022, telephone (212) 317-0533. Overseas, inquiries should be made at the nearest Sao Tomean diplomatic mission.

Crimes such as burglary, pick-pocketing and armed robbery do occur. Such crimes can occur anywhere, but the prevalence is much higher in public places, such as in markets, on the streets or near hotels. The loss or theft abroad of a passport should be reported immediately to local police

and to the nearest appropriate embassy or consulate.

Medical facilities in Sao Tome and Principe are extremely limited. Many medicines are not available.

Doctors and hospitals often expect immediate cash payment for health services. Uninsured travelers who require medical care overseas may face extreme difficulties.

Please check with your own insurance company to confirm whether your policy applies overseas, including provision for medical evacuation and for adequacy of coverage. Serious medical problems requiring hospitalization and/or medical evacuation back to your country can be very expensive. Please ascertain whether payment will be made to the overseas hospital or doctor or whether you will be reimbursed later for expenses that you incur. Some insurance policies also include coverage for psychiatric treatment and for disposition of remains in the event of death.

While in a foreign country, you may encounter road conditions which differ significantly from those in your country. The information below concerning Sao Tome and Principe is provided for general reference only and may not be totally accurate in a particular location or circumstance.

Safety of Public Transportation: Public Transportation is not available.

Urban Road Conditions/Maintenance: Fair

Rural Road Conditions/Maintenance: Poor

Availability of Roadside Assistance: Non-existent.

Streets in the city of Sao Tome are paved, but large potholes exist everywhere. Major roads outside of town are also paved, but less worn. Animals on the roads can be a major obstacle. There is no street lighting outside the capital. Some roads may be impassable without a four-wheel drive vehicle.

While in a foreign country, you are subject to that country's laws and regulations. Persons violating Sao Tome and Principe's laws, even unknowingly, may be expelled, arrested or imprisoned. Penalties for possession, use or trafficking in illegal drugs in Sao Tome and Principe are strict, and convicted offenders can expect jail sentences and heavy fines.

Credit cards are accepted only at two or three of the island's major hotels. Travelers checks can be cashed at major local banks. U.S. dollars are widely accepted at tourist establishments.

Note: This information is directly quoted from the United States Department of State Consular Information Sheet.

Sources: *United States Department of State Consular Information Sheet*

Business Culture: Information for Business Travelers

For general information on etiquette in Sao Tome and Principe see our Cultural Etiquette page.

Online Resources Regarding Entry Requirements and Visas

Foreign Entry Requirements for Americans from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1765.html

Visa Services for Non-Americans from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/visa/visa_1750.html

Visa Bulletins from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/visa/frvi/bulletin/bulletin_1360.html

Visa Waivers from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/visa/temp/without/without_1990.html - new

Passport and Visa Information from the Government of the United Kingdom
<http://www.bia.homeoffice.gov.uk/>

Visa Information from the Government of Australia
<http://www.dfat.gov.au/visas/index.html>

Passport Information from the Government of Australia
<https://www.passports.gov.au/Web/index.aspx>

Passport Information from the Government of Canada
http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/passport_passeport-eng.asp

Visa Information from the Government of Canada
http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/visas-eng.asp

Online Visa Processing by Immigration Experts by VisaPro
<http://www.visapro.com>

Sources: United States Department of State, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Government of Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Government of Canada Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Useful Online Resources for Travelers

Country-Specific Travel Information from United States

http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1765.html

Travel Advice by Country from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/>

General Travel Advice from Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/General>

Travel Bulletins from the Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/TravelBulletins/>

Travel Tips from Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/tips/index.html>

Travel Checklist by Government of Canada

http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/checklist_sommaire-eng.asp

Travel Checklist from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/staying-safe/checklist>

Your trip abroad from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/brochures/brochures_1225.html

A safe trip abroad from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/safety/safety_1747.html

Tips for expatriates abroad from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/residing/residing_1235.html

Tips for students from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/studying/studying_1238.html <http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/broc>

Medical information for travelers from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/health/health_1185.html

US Customs Travel information

<http://www.customs.gov/xp/cgov/travel/>

Sources: United States Department of State; United States Customs Department, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Government of Australia; Government of Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Other Practical Online Resources for Travelers

Foreign Language Phrases for Travelers

<http://www.travlang.com/languages/>

<http://www.omniglot.com/language/phrases/index.htm>

World Weather Forecasts

<http://www.intellicast.com/>

<http://www.wunderground.com/>

<http://www.worldweather.org/>

Worldwide Time Zones, Map, World Clock

<http://www.timeanddate.com/>

<http://www.worldtimezone.com/>

International Airport Codes

<http://www.world-airport-codes.com/>

International Dialing Codes

<http://www.kropla.com/dialcode.htm>

<http://www.countrycallingcodes.com/>

International Phone Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/phones.htm>

International Mobile Phone Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/mobilephones.htm>

International Internet Café Search Engine

<http://cybercaptive.com/>

Global Internet Roaming

<http://www.kropla.com/roaming.htm>

World Electric Power Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/electric.htm>

<http://www.kropla.com/electric2.htm>

World Television Standards and Codes

<http://www.kropla.com/tv.htm>

International Currency Exchange Rates

<http://www.xe.com/ucc/>

Banking and Financial Institutions Across the World

<http://www.123world.com/banks/index.html>

International Credit Card or Automated Teller Machine (ATM) Locator

<http://visa.via.infonow.net/locator/global/>

<http://www.mastercard.com/us/personal/en/cardholderservices/atmlocations/index.html>

International Chambers of Commerce

<http://www.123world.com/chambers/index.html>

World Tourism Websites

<http://123world.com/tourism/>

Diplomatic and Consular Information

United States Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.usembassy.gov/>

United Kingdom Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/about-the-fco/embassies-and-posts/find-an-embassy-overseas/>

Australia's Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/missions/>

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/embassies.html>

Canada's Embassies and High Commissions

<http://www.international.gc.ca/ciw-cdm/embassies-ambassades.aspx>

Resources for Finding Embassies and other Diplomatic Posts Across the World

<http://www.escapeartist.com/embassy1/embassy1.htm>

Safety and Security

Travel Warnings by Country from Government of Australia

<http://www.smarttraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/>

Travel Warnings and Alerts from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/tw/tw_1764.html

http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/pa/pa_1766.html

Travel Reports and Warnings by Government of Canada

http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries_pays/menu-eng.asp

http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries_pays/updates_mise-a-jour-eng.asp

Travel Warnings from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/>

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/?action=noTravelAll#noTravelAll>

Sources: United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the United States Department of State, the Government of Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Government of Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Other Safety and Security Online Resources for Travelers

United States Department of State Information on Terrorism

<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/>

Government of the United Kingdom Resource on the Risk of Terrorism

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?>

[pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1044011304926](http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1044011304926)

Government of Canada Terrorism Guide

<http://www.international.gc.ca/crime/terrorism-terrorisme.aspx?lang=eng>

Information on Terrorism by Government of Australia

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/icat/index.html>

FAA Resource on Aviation Safety

<http://www.faasafety.gov/>

In-Flight Safety Information for Air Travel (by British Airways crew trainer, Anna Warman)

<http://www.warman.demon.co.uk/anna/inflight.html>

Hot Spots: Travel Safety and Risk Information

<http://www.airsecurity.com/hotspots/HotSpots.asp>

Information on Human Rights

<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/>

Sources: The United States Department of State, the United States Customs Department, the Government of Canada, the Government of United Kingdom, the Government of Australia, the Federal Aviation Authority, Anna Warman's In-flight Website, Hot Spots Travel and Risk Information

Diseases/Health Data

Please Note: Most of the entry below constitutes a generalized health advisory, which a traveler might find useful, regardless of a particular destination.

As a supplement, however, the reader will also find below a list of countries flagged with current health notices and alerts issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Please note that travel to the following countries, based on these 3 levels of warnings, is ill-advised, or should be undertaken with the utmost precaution:

Level 3 (highest level of concern; avoid non-essential travel) --

Guinea - Ebola

Liberia - Ebola
Nepal - Earthquake zone
Sierra Leone - Ebola

Level 2 (intermediate level of concern; use utmost caution during travel) --

Cameroon - Polio
Somalia - Polio
Vanuatu - Tropical Cyclone zone
Throughout Middle East and Arabia Peninsula - MERS ((Middle East Respiratory Syndrome)

Level 1 (standard level of concern; use practical caution during travel) -

Australia - Ross River disease
Bosnia-Herzegovina - Measles
Brazil - Dengue Fever
Brazil - Malaria
Brazil - Zika
China - H7N9 Avian flu
Cuba - Cholera
Egypt - H5N1 Bird flu
Ethiopia - Measles
Germany - Measles
Japan - Hand, foot, and mouth disease (HFMD)
Kyrgyzstan - Measles
Malaysia -Dengue Fever
Mexico - Chikungunya
Mexico - Hepatitis A
Nigeria - Meningitis
Philippines - Measles
Scotland - Mumps
Singapore - Hand, foot, and mouth disease (HFMD)
South Korea - MERS ((Middle East Respiratory Syndrome)
Throughout Caribbean - Chikungunya
Throughout Central America - Chikungunya
Throughout South America - Chikungunya
Throughout Pacific Islands - Chikungunya

For specific information related to these health notices and alerts please see the CDC's listing available at URL:

<http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/notices>

Health Information for Travelers to Sao Tome & Principe

Food and waterborne diseases are the number one cause of illness in travelers. Travelers' diarrhea can be caused by viruses, bacteria, or parasites, which are found throughout the region and can contaminate food or water. Infections may cause diarrhea and vomiting (*E. coli*, *Salmonella*, cholera, and parasites), fever (typhoid fever and toxoplasmosis), or liver damage (hepatitis). Make sure your food and drinking water are safe. (See below.)

Malaria is a preventable infection that can be fatal if left untreated. Prevent infection by taking prescription antimalarial drugs and protecting yourself against mosquito bites (see below). Most travelers to malaria risk areas in this region should take mefloquine to prevent malaria. Your risk of malaria is high in all parts of these countries, including cities, except for most of the Cape Verde Islands. For more detailed information about the risk in specific locations, see Malaria in West Africa (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/regionalmalaria/wafrica.htm>).

Yellow fever vaccination is recommended and may be required for entry into certain of these countries. If you travel to West Africa, the easiest and safest thing to do is get a yellow fever vaccination and a signed certificate. For detailed information, see Comprehensive Yellow Fever Vaccination Requirements (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/yelfever.htm>).

Dengue, filariasis, leishmaniasis, onchocerciasis, and trypanosomiasis (sleeping sickness) are diseases carried by insects that also occur in this region. Protecting yourself against insect bites (see below) will help to prevent these diseases.

Schistosomiasis, a parasitic infection, is found in fresh water in the region. Do not swim in fresh water (except in well-chlorinated swimming pools) in these countries. (For more information, please see the Swimming Precautions on the Making Travel Safe page at URL <http://www.cdc.gov/travel/safety.htm>.)

Because motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of injury among travelers, walk and drive defensively. Avoid nighttime travel if possible and always use seat belts.

CDC Recommends the Following Vaccines (as Appropriate for Age):

See your doctor at least 4-6 weeks before your trip to allow time for shots to take effect.

- Hepatitis A or immune globulin (IG).

- Hepatitis B, if you might be exposed to blood (for example, health-care workers), have sexual contact with the local population, stay longer than 6 months, or be exposed through medical treatment.
- Meningococcal meningitis, for travel to most of these countries (see meningitis map at URL <http://www.cdc.gov/travel/meninmap.htm>) from December through June.
- Yellow fever.
- Rabies, if you might be exposed to wild or domestic animals through your work or recreation.
- Typhoid, particularly if you are visiting developing countries in this region.
- As needed, booster doses for tetanus-diphtheria, measles, and a one-time dose of polio vaccine for adults. Hepatitis B vaccine is now recommended for all infants and for children ages 11-12 years who did not complete the series as infants.

To Stay Healthy, Do:

- Wash hands often with soap and water.
- Drink only bottled or boiled water, or carbonated (bubbly) drinks in cans or bottles. Avoid tap water, fountain drinks, and ice cubes. If this is not possible, make water safer by BOTH filtering through an "absolute 1-micron or less" filter AND adding iodine tablets to the filtered water. "Absolute 1-micron filters" are found in camping/outdoor supply stores.
- Eat only thoroughly cooked food or fruits and vegetables you have peeled yourself. Remember: boil it, cook it, peel it, or forget it.
- Take your malaria prevention medication before, during, and after travel, as directed. (See your doctor for a prescription.)
- Protect yourself from insects by remaining in well-screened areas, using repellents (applied sparingly at 4-hour intervals) and permethrin-impregnated mosquito nets, and wearing long-sleeved shirts and long pants from dusk through dawn.
- To prevent fungal and parasitic infections, keep feet clean and dry, and do not go barefoot.
- Always use latex condoms to reduce the risk of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases.

To Avoid Getting Sick:

- Don't eat food purchased from street vendors.
- Don't drink beverages with ice.
- Don't eat dairy products unless you know they have been pasteurized.
- Don't share needles with anyone.
- Don't handle animals (especially monkeys, dogs, and cats), to avoid bites and serious diseases (including rabies and plague). (For more information, please see the Animal-Associated Hazards on the Making Travel Safe page.)
- Don't swim in fresh water. Salt water is usually safer. (For more information, please see the Swimming Precautions on the Making Travel Safe page.)

What You Need To Bring with You:

- Long-sleeved shirt and long pants to wear while outside whenever possible, to prevent illnesses

carried by insects (e.g., malaria, dengue, filariasis, leishmaniasis, and onchocerciasis).

- Insect repellent containing DEET (diethylmethyltoluamide), in 30%-35% strength for adults and 6%-10% for children. Unless you are staying in air-conditioned or well-screened housing, purchase a bed net impregnated with the insecticide permethrin. (Bed nets can be purchased in camping or military supply stores.)
- Over-the-counter antidiarrheal medicine to take if you have diarrhea.
- Iodine tablets and water filters to purify water if bottled water is not available. See Do's above for more details about water filters.
- Sunblock, sunglasses, hat.
- Prescription medications: make sure you have enough to last during your trip, as well as a copy of the prescription(s).

After You Return Home:

If you have visited an area where there is risk for malaria, continue taking your malaria medication weekly for 4 weeks after you leave the area.

If you become ill after your trip—even as long as a year after you return—tell your doctor where you have traveled.

For More Information:

Ask your doctor or check the CDC web sites for more information about how to protect yourself against diseases that occur in West Africa, such as:

For information about diseases-

Carried by Insects

Dengue, Malaria, Yellow Fever

Carried in Food or Water

Cholera, *Escherichia coli*, diarrhea, Hepatitis A, Schistosomiasis, Typhoid Fever

Person-to-Person Contact

Hepatitis B, HIV/AIDS

For more information about these and other diseases, please check the Diseases (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/diseases.htm>) section and the Health Topics A - Z (<http://www.cdc.gov/health/diseases.htm>).

An outbreak of meningitis occurred in recent years in several central, east, and west African countries, including Ethiopia, Chad, Cameroon, Burkino Faso, and Benin. For more information on this outbreak and recommendations, see the following sites:

Travelers' Health Information on Meningococcal Disease
(<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/diseases/menin.htm>)

World Health Organization Disease Outbreak News
(<http://www.who.int/disease-outbreak-news/>)

Note:

This country is located in the West Africa health region.

Sources:

The Center for Disease Control Destinations Website:
<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/indianrg.htm>

Chapter 6

Environmental Overview

Environmental Issues

Current Issues:

- deforestation
- soil erosion
- soil nutrient depletion

Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Mtc):

0.0

Country Rank (GHG output):

183rd

Natural Hazards:

N/A

Environmental Policy

Regulation and Jurisdiction:

The regulation and protection of the environment in Sao Tome and Principe is under the

jurisdiction of the following:

- Ministry of Social Facilities and Environment
- Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
- The Office of the Secretary for Infrastructure and Environment of the Autonomous Region of Principe

Major Non-Governmental Organizations:

N/A

International Environmental Accords:

Party to:

- Biodiversity
- Climate Change
- Desertification
- Endangered Species
- Environmental Modification
- Law of the Sea
- Ozone Layer Protection
- Ship Pollution

Signed but not ratified:

- None

Kyoto Protocol Status (year ratified):

Sao Tome and Principe is not a signatory to the Kyoto Protocol

Greenhouse Gas Ranking

Greenhouse Gas Ranking

GHG Emissions Rankings

| Country Rank | Country |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 1 | United States |
| 2 | China |
| 4 | Russia |
| 5 | Japan |
| 6 | India |
| 7 | Germany |
| 8 | United Kingdom |
| 9 | Canada |
| 10 | Korea, South |
| 11 | Italy |
| 12 | Mexico |
| 13 | France |

| | |
|----|--------------|
| 14 | South Africa |
| 15 | Iran |
| 16 | Indonesia |
| 17 | Australia |
| 18 | Spain |
| 19 | Brazil |
| 20 | Saudi Arabia |
| 21 | Ukraine |
| 22 | Poland |
| 23 | Taiwan |
| 24 | Turkey |
| 25 | Thailand |
| 26 | Netherlands |
| 27 | Kazakhstan |
| 28 | Malaysia |
| 29 | Egypt |
| 30 | Venezuela |
| 31 | Argentina |

| | |
|----|----------------------|
| 32 | Uzbekistan |
| 33 | Czech Republic |
| 34 | Belgium |
| 35 | Pakistan |
| 36 | Romania |
| 37 | Greece |
| 38 | United Arab Emirates |
| 39 | Algeria |
| 40 | Nigeria |
| 41 | Austria |
| 42 | Iraq |
| 43 | Finland |
| 44 | Philippines |
| 45 | Vietnam |
| 46 | Korea, North |
| 47 | Israel |
| 48 | Portugal |
| 49 | Colombia |

| | |
|----|---------------------|
| 50 | Belarus |
| 51 | Kuwait |
| 52 | Hungary |
| 53 | Chile |
| 54 | Denmark |
| 55 | Serbia & Montenegro |
| 56 | Sweden |
| 57 | Syria |
| 58 | Libya |
| 59 | Bulgaria |
| 60 | Singapore |
| 61 | Switzerland |
| 62 | Ireland |
| 63 | Turkmenistan |
| 64 | Slovakia |
| 65 | Bangladesh |
| 66 | Morocco |
| 67 | New Zealand |

| | |
|----|--------------------|
| 68 | Oman |
| 69 | Qatar |
| 70 | Azerbaijan |
| 71 | Norway |
| 72 | Peru |
| 73 | Cuba |
| 74 | Ecuador |
| 75 | Trinidad & Tobago |
| 76 | Croatia |
| 77 | Tunisia |
| 78 | Dominican Republic |
| 79 | Lebanon |
| 80 | Estonia |
| 81 | Yemen |
| 82 | Jordan |
| 83 | Slovenia |
| 84 | Bahrain |
| 85 | Angola |

| | |
|-----|----------------------|
| 86 | Bosnia & Herzegovina |
| 87 | Lithuania |
| 88 | Sri Lanka |
| 89 | Zimbabwe |
| 90 | Bolivia |
| 91 | Jamaica |
| 92 | Guatemala |
| 93 | Luxembourg |
| 94 | Myanmar |
| 95 | Sudan |
| 96 | Kenya |
| 97 | Macedonia |
| 98 | Mongolia |
| 99 | Ghana |
| 100 | Cyprus |
| 101 | Moldova |
| 102 | Latvia |
| 103 | El Salvador |
| | |

| | |
|-----|---------------|
| 104 | Brunei |
| 105 | Honduras |
| 106 | Cameroon |
| 107 | Panama |
| 108 | Costa Rica |
| 109 | Cote d'Ivoire |
| 110 | Kyrgyzstan |
| 111 | Tajikistan |
| 112 | Ethiopia |
| 113 | Senegal |
| 114 | Uruguay |
| 115 | Gabon |
| 116 | Albania |
| 117 | Nicaragua |
| 118 | Botswana |
| 119 | Paraguay |
| 120 | Tanzania |
| 121 | Georgia |
| | |

| | |
|-----|------------------|
| 122 | Armenia |
| 123 | Congo, RC |
| 124 | Mauritius |
| 125 | Nepal |
| 126 | Mauritius |
| 127 | Nepal |
| 128 | Mauritania |
| 129 | Malta |
| 130 | Papua New Guinea |
| 131 | Zambia |
| 132 | Suriname |
| 133 | Iceland |
| 134 | Togo |
| 135 | Benin |
| 136 | Uganda |
| 137 | Bahamas |
| 138 | Haiti |
| 139 | Congo, DRC |
| | |

| | |
|-----|-------------------|
| 140 | Guyana |
| 141 | Mozambique |
| 142 | Guinea |
| 143 | Equatorial Guinea |
| 144 | Laos |
| 145 | Barbados |
| 146 | Niger |
| 147 | Fiji |
| 148 | Burkina Faso |
| 149 | Malawi |
| 150 | Swaziland |
| 151 | Belize |
| 152 | Afghanistan |
| 153 | Sierra Leone |
| 154 | Eritrea |
| 155 | Rwanda |
| 156 | Mali |
| 157 | Seychelles |

| | |
|-----|--------------------------------|
| 158 | Cambodia |
| 159 | Liberia |
| 160 | Bhutan |
| 161 | Maldives |
| 162 | Antigua & Barbuda |
| 163 | Djibouti |
| 164 | Saint Lucia |
| 165 | Gambia |
| 166 | Guinea-Bissau |
| 167 | Central African Republic |
| 168 | Palau |
| 169 | Burundi |
| 170 | Grenada |
| 171 | Lesotho |
| 172 | Saint Vincent & the Grenadines |
| 173 | Solomon Islands |
| 174 | Samoa |
| 175 | Cape Verde |

| | |
|------------|---------------------|
| 176 | Nauru |
| 177 | Dominica |
| 178 | Saint Kitts & Nevis |
| 179 | Chad |
| 180 | Tonga |
| 181 | Sao Tome & Principe |
| 182 | Comoros |
| 183 | Vanuatu |
| 185 | Kiribati |
| Not Ranked | Andorra |
| Not Ranked | East Timor |
| Not Ranked | Holy See |
| Not Ranked | Hong Kong |
| Not Ranked | Liechtenstein |
| Not Ranked | Marshall Islands |
| Not Ranked | Micronesia |
| Not Ranked | Monaco |
| Not Ranked | San Marino |

| | |
|------------|---------|
| Not Ranked | Somalia |
| Not Ranked | Tuvalu |

* European Union is ranked 3rd

Cook Islands are ranked 184th

Niue is ranked 186th

Global Environmental Snapshot

Introduction

The countries of the world face many environmental challenges in common. Nevertheless, the nature and intensity of problem vary from region to region, as do various countries' respective capacities, in terms of affluence and infrastructure, to remediate threats to environmental quality.

Consciousness of perils affecting the global environment came to the fore in the last third or so of the 20th century has continued to intensify well into the new millennium. According to the United Nations Environment Programme, considerable environmental progress has been made at the level of institutional developments, international cooperation accords, and public participation. Approximately two-dozen international environmental protection accords with global implications have been promulgated since the late 1970s under auspices of the United Nations and other international organizations, together with many additional regional agreements. Attempts to address and rectify environmental problems take the form of legal frameworks, economic instruments, environmentally sound technologies and cleaner production processes as well as conservation efforts. Environmental impact assessments have increasingly been applied across the globe.

Environmental degradation affects the quality, or aesthetics, of human life, but it also displays potential to undermine conditions necessary for the sustainability of human life. Attitudes toward the importance of environmental protection measures reflect ambivalence derived from this bifurcation. On one hand, steps such as cleaning up pollution, dedicating parkland, and suchlike, are seen as embellishments undertaken by wealthy societies already assured they can successfully perform those functions deemed, ostensibly, more essential-for instance, public health and education, employment and economic development. On the other hand, in poorer countries, activities causing environmental damage-for instance the land degradation effects of unregulated logging, slash-and-burn agriculture, overgrazing, and mining-can seem justified insofar as such

activities provide incomes and livelihoods.

Rapid rates of resource depletion are associated with poverty and high population growth, themselves correlated, whereas consumption per capita is much higher in the most developed countries, despite these nations' recent progress in energy efficiency and conservation. It is impossible to sequester the global environmental challenge from related economic, social and political challenges.

First-tier industrialized countries have recently achieved measurable decreases in environmental pollution and the rate of resource depletion, a success not matched in middle income and developing countries. It is believed that the discrepancy is due to the fact that industrialized countries have more developed infrastructures to accommodate changes in environmental policy, to apply environmental technologies, and to invest in public education. The advanced industrialized countries incur relatively lower costs in alleviating environmental problems, in comparison to developing countries, since in the former even extensive environmental programs represent a rather minuscule percentage of total expenditures. Conversely, budget constraints, lagged provision of basic services to the population, and other factors such as debt service and militarization may preclude institution of minimal environmental protection measures in the poorest countries.

A synopsis for the current situation facing each region of the world follows:

Regional Synopsis: Africa

The African continent, the world's second-largest landmass, encompasses many of the world's least developed countries. By global standards, urbanization is comparatively low but rising at a rapid rate. More heavily industrialized areas at the northern and southern ends of the continent experience the major share of industrial pollution. In other regions the most serious environmental problems typically stem from inefficient subsistence farming methods and other forms of land degradation, which have affected an increasingly extensive area under pressure of a widely impoverished, fast-growing population. Africa's distribution of natural resources is very uneven. It is the continent at greatest risk of desertification, especially in the Sahel region at the edge of the Sahara but also in other dry-range areas. Yet at the same time, Africa also harbors some of the earth's richest and most diverse biological zones.

Key Points:

Up to half a billion hectares of African land are moderately to severely degraded, an occurrence reflecting short-fallow shifting cultivation and overgrazing as well as a climatic pattern of recurrent droughts.

Soil degradation is severe along the expanse directly south of the Sahara, from the west to the east coasts. Parts of southern Africa, central-eastern Africa, and the neighboring island of Madagascar suffer from serious soil degradation as well.

Africa contains about 17 percent of the world's forest cover, concentrated in the tropical belt of the continent. Many of the forests, however, are severely depleted, with an estimated 70 percent showing some degree of degradation.

Population growth has resulted in continuing loss of arable land, as inefficient subsistence farming techniques affect increasingly extensive areas. Efforts to implement settled, sustainable agriculture have met with some recent success, but much further progress in this direction is needed. Especially in previously uninhabited forestlands, concern over deforestation is intensifying.

By contrast, the African savanna remains the richest grassland in the world, supporting a substantial concentration of animal and plant life. Wildlife parks are sub-Saharan Africa's greatest tourist attraction, and with proper management-giving local people a stake in conservation and controlling the pace of development-could greatly enhance African economies.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of northern, southern and eastern Africa are currently threatened, while the biological diversity in Mauritania and Madagascar is even further compromised with over 20 percent of the mammal species in these two countries currently under threat.

With marine catch trends increasing from 500,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 3,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Water resource vulnerability is a major concern in northeastern Africa, and a moderate concern across the rest of the continent. An exception is central Africa, which has plentiful water supplies.

Many Africans lack adequate access to resources, not just (if at all) because the resources are unevenly distributed geographically, but also through institutional failures such as faulty land tenure systems or political upheaval. The quality of Africa's natural resources, despite their spotty distribution, is in fact extraordinarily rich. The infrastructure needed to protect and benefit from this natural legacy, however, is largely lacking.

Regional Synopsis: Asia and the Pacific

Asia-earth's largest landmass-and the many large and nearly innumerable small islands lying off its Pacific shore display extraordinarily contrasting landscapes, levels of development, and degrees of

environmental stress. In the classification used here, the world's smallest continent, Australia, is also included in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Asia-Pacific region is home to 9 of the world's 14 largest urban areas, and as energy use for utilities, industry and transport increases in developing economies, urban centers are subject to worsening air quality. Intense population density in places such as Bangladesh or Hong Kong is the quintessential image many people have of Asia, yet vast desert areas such as the Gobi and the world's highest mountain range, the Himalayas, span the continent as well. Forested areas in Southeast Asia and the islands of Indonesia and the Philippines were historically prized for their tropical hardwood, but in many places this resource is now severely depleted. Low-lying small island states are extremely vulnerable to the effects of global warming, both rising sea levels and an anticipated increase in cyclones.

Key Points:

Asian timber reserves are forecast to be depleted in the next 40 years. Loss of natural forest is irreversible in some areas, but plantation programs to restore tree cover may ameliorate a portion of the resulting land degradation.

Increased usage of fossil fuels in China and other parts of southern Asia is projected to result in a marked increase in emissions, especially in regard to carbon dioxide. The increased usage of energy has led to a marked upsurge in air pollution across the region.

Acidification is an emerging problem regionally, with sulfur dioxide emissions expected to triple by 2010 if the current growth rate is sustained. China, Thailand, India, and Korea seem to be suffering from particularly high rates of acid deposition. By contrast, Asia's most highly developed economy, Japan, has effected substantial improvements in its environmental indicators.

Water pollution in the Pacific is an urgent concern since up to 70 percent of the water discharged into the region's waters receives no treatment. Additionally, the disposal of solid wastes, in like manner, poses a major threat in a region with many areas of high population density.

The Asia-Pacific region is the largest expanse of the world's land that is adversely affected by soil degradation.

The region around Australia reportedly suffers the largest degree of ozone depletion.

The microstates of the Pacific suffer land loss due to global warming, and the consequent rise in the levels of ocean waters. A high-emissions scenario and anthropogenic climate impact at the upper end of the currently predicted range would probably force complete evacuation of the lowest-elevation islands sometime in this century.

The species-rich reefs surrounding Southeast Asia are highly vulnerable to the deleterious effects of coastal development, land-based pollution, over-fishing and exploitative fishing methods, as well as marine pollution from oil spills and other activities.

With marine catch trends increasing from 5,000,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 20,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of China and south-east Asia are currently threatened, while the biological diversity in India, Japan, Australia, the Philippines, Indonesia and parts of Malaysia is even further compromised with over 20 percent of the mammal species in these countries currently under threat.

Water resource vulnerability is a serious concern in areas surrounding the Indian subcontinent.

Regional Synopsis: Central Asia

The Central Asian republics, formerly in the Soviet Union, experience a range of environmental problems as the result of poorly executed agricultural, industrial, and nuclear programs during the Soviet era. Relatively low population densities are the norm, especially since upon the breakup of the U.S.S.R. many ethnic Russians migrated back to European Russia. In this largely semi-arid region, drought, water shortages, and soil salinization pose major challenges.

Key Points:

The use of agricultural pesticides, such as DDT and other chemicals, has contributed to the contamination of soil and groundwater throughout the region.

Land and soil degradation, and in particular, increased salinization, is mostly attributable to faulty irrigation practices.

Significant desertification is also a problem in the region.

Air pollution is prevalent, mostly due to use of low octane automobile fuel.

Industrial pollution of the Caspian Sea and the Aral Sea, as a result of industrial effluents as well as mining and metal production, presents a challenge to the countries bordering these bodies of water.

One of the most severe environmental problems in the region is attributable to the several billion

tons of hazardous materials stored in landfills across Central Asia.

Uzbekistan's particular problem involves the contraction of the Aral Sea, which has decreased in size by a third, as a consequence of river diversions and poor irrigation practices. The effect has been the near-total biological destruction of that body of water.

Kazakhstan, as a consequence of being the heartland of the former Soviet Union's nuclear program, has incurred a high of cancerous malignancies, biogenetic abnormalities and radioactive contamination.

While part of the Soviet Union, the republics in the region experienced very high levels of greenhouse gas emissions, as a consequence of rapid industrialization using cheap but dirty energy sources, especially coal.

By contrast, however, there have recently been substantial reductions in the level of greenhouse gas emissions, especially those attributable to coal burning, with further decreases anticipated over the next decade. These changes are partially due to the use of cleaner energy technologies, such as natural gas, augmented by governmental commitment to improving environmental standards.

Regional Synopsis: Europe

Western Europe underwent dramatic transformation of its landscape, virtually eliminating large-scale natural areas, during an era of rapid industrialization, which intensified upon its recovery from World War II. In Eastern Europe and European Russia, intensive land development has been less prevalent, so that some native forests and other natural areas remain. Air and water pollution from use of dirty fuels and industrial effluents, however, are more serious environmental problems in Eastern than in Western Europe, though recent trends show improvement in many indicators. Acid rain has inflicted heavy environmental damage across much of Europe, particularly on forests. Europe and North America are the only regions in which water usage for industry exceeds that for agriculture, although in Mediterranean nations agriculture is the largest water consumer.

Key Points:

Europe contributes 36 percent of the world's chlorofluorocarbon emissions, 30 percent of carbon dioxide emissions, and 25 percent of sulfur dioxide emissions.

Sulfur and nitrogen oxide emissions are the cause of 30 to 50 percent of Central and Eastern Europe's deforestation.

Acid rain has been an environmental concern for decades and continues to be a challenge in parts

of Western Europe.

Overexploitation of up to 60 percent of Europe's groundwater presents a problem in industrial and urban areas.

With marine catch trends increasing from 5,000,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 20,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of western Europe, Eastern Europe and Russia are currently threatened, while the biological diversity on the Iberian Peninsula is even further compromised with over 40 percent of the mammal species in this region currently under threat. As a result, there has been a 10 percent increase in protected areas of Europe.

A major environmental issue for Europe involves the depletion of various already endangered or threatened species, and most significantly, the decline of fish stocks. Some estimates suggest that up to 50 percent of the continent's fish species may be considered endangered species. Coastal fisheries have been over-harvested, resulting in catch limits or moratoriums on many commercially important fish species.

Fortunately, in the last few years, these policies have started to yield measurable results with decreasing trends in marine fish catch.

Recently, most European countries have adopted cleaner production technologies, and alternative methods of waste disposal, including recycling.

The countries of Eastern Europe have made air quality a major environmental priority. This is exemplified by the Russian Federation's addition to the 1995 "Berlin Mandate" (transnational legislation based on resolutions of the Rio Earth Summit) compelling nations to promote "carbon sinks" to absorb greenhouse gases.

On a relative basis, when compared with the degree of industrial emissions emitted by many Eastern European countries until the late 1980s, there has been some marked increase in air quality in the region, as obsolete plants are closed and a transition to cleaner fuels and more efficient energy use takes place.

Regional Synopsis: The Middle and Near East

Quite possibly, the Middle East will exemplify the adage that, as the 20th century was a century

fixated on oil, the 21st century will be devoted to critical decisions about water. Many (though far from all) nations in the Middle East rank among those countries with the largest oil and gas reserves, but water resources are relatively scarce throughout this predominantly dry region. Effects of global warming may cause moderately high elevation areas that now typically receive winter "snowpack" to experience mainly rain instead, which would further constrain dry-season water availability. The antiquities and religious shrines of the region render it a great magnet for tourism, which entails considerable economic growth potential but also intensifies stresses on the environment.

Key Points:

Water resource vulnerability is a serious concern across the entire region. The increased usage of, and further demand for water, has exacerbated long-standing water scarcity in the region. For instance, river diversions and industrial salt works have caused the Dead Sea to shrink by one-third from its original surface area, with further declines expected.

The oil industry in the region contributes to water pollution in the Persian Gulf, as a result of oil spills, which have averaged 1.2 million barrels of oil spilt per year (some sources suggest that this figure is understated). The consequences are severe because even after oil spills have been cleaned up, environmental damage to the food webs and ecosystems of marine life will persist for a prolonged period.

The region's coastal zone is considered one of the most fragile and endangered ecosystems of the world. Land reclamation, shoreline construction, discharge of industrial effluents, and tourism (such as diving in the Red Sea) contribute to widespread coastal damage.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of the Middle East are currently threatened.

Since the 1980s, 11 percent of the region's natural forest has been depleted.

Regional Synopsis: Latin America and the Caribbean

The Latin American and Caribbean region is characterized by exceedingly diverse landforms that have generally seen high rates of population growth and economic development in recent decades. The percentage of inhabitants residing in urban areas is quite high at 73.4 percent; the region includes the megacities of Mexico City, Sao Paulo, and Rio de Janeiro. The region also includes the world's second-highest mountain range, the Andes; significant expanses of desert and grassland; the coral reefs of the Caribbean Sea; and the world's largest contiguous tropical forest in the Amazon basin. Threats to the latter from subsistence and commercial farming, mineral exploitation and timbering are well publicized. Nevertheless, of eight countries worldwide that still retain at least 70

percent of their original forest cover, six are in Latin America. The region accounts for nearly half (48.3 percent) of the world's greenhouse gas emissions derived from land clearing, but as yet a comparatively minuscule share (4.3 percent) of such gases from industrial sources.

Key Points:

Although Latin America is one of the most biologically diverse regions of the world, this biodiversity is highly threatened, as exemplified by the projected extinction of up to 100,000 species in the next few decades. Much of this loss will be concentrated in the Amazon area, although the western coastline of South America will also suffer significant depletion of biological diversity. The inventory of rainforest species with potentially useful commercial or medical applications is incomplete, but presumed to include significant numbers of such species that may become extinct before they are discovered and identified.

Up to 50 percent of the region's grazing land has lost its soil fertility as a result of soil erosion, salinization, alkalinization and overgrazing.

The Caribbean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Pacific Ocean have all been contaminated by agricultural wastes, which are discharged into streams that flow into these major waters. Water pollution derived from phosphorous, nitrates and pesticides adversely affects fish stocks, contributes to oxygen depletion and fosters overgrowth of aquatic vegetation. Marine life will continue to be severely compromised as a result of these conditions.

Due to industrial development in the region, many beaches of eastern Latin America and the Caribbean suffer from tar deposits.

Most cities in the region lack adequate sewage treatment facilities, and rapid migration of the rural poor into the cities is widening the gap between current infrastructure capacity and the much greater level needed to provide satisfactory basic services.

The rainforest region of the Amazon Basin suffers from dangerously high levels of deforestation, which may be a significant contributory factor to global warming or "the greenhouse effect." In the late 1990s and into the new millennium, the rate of deforestation was around 20 million acres of rainforest being destroyed annually.

Deforestation on the steep rainforest slopes of Caribbean islands contributes to soil erosion and landslides, both of which then result in heavy sedimentation of nearby river systems. When these sedimented rivers drain into the sea and coral reefs, they poison the coral tissues, which are vital to the maintenance of the reef ecosystem. The result is marine degradation and nutrient depletion. Jamaica's coral reefs have never quite recovered from the effects of marine degradation.

The Southern Cone of Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay) suffers the effects of greatly increased ultraviolet-B radiation, as a consequence of more intense ozone depletion in the southern hemisphere.

Water resource vulnerability is an increasingly major concern in the northwestern portion of South America.

Regional Synopsis: North America

North American nations, in particular the United States and Canada, rank among the world's most highly developed industrial economies—a fact which has generated significant pollution problems, but also financial resources and skills that have enabled many problems to be corrected. Although efforts to promote energy efficiency, recycling, and suchlike have helped ease strains on the environment in a part of the world where per capita consumption levels are high, sprawling land development patterns and recent preferences many households have demonstrated for larger vehicles have offset these advances.

Meanwhile, a large portion of North America's original forest cover has been lost, though in many cases replaced by productive second-growth woodland. In recent years, attitudes toward best use of the region's remaining natural or scenic areas seem to be shifting toward recreation and preservation and away from resource extraction. With increasing attention on the energy scarcity in the United States, however, there is speculation that this shift may be short-lived. Indeed, the energy shortage on the west coast of the United States and associated calls for energy exploration, indicate a possible retrenchment toward resource extraction. At the same time, however, it has also served to highlight the need for energy conservation as well as alternative energy sources.

Despite generally successful anti-pollution efforts, various parts of the region continue to suffer significant air, water and land degradation from industrial, vehicular, and agricultural emissions and runoff. Mexico, as a middle-income country, displays environmental problems characteristic of a developing economy, including forest depletion, pollution from inefficient industrial processes and dirty fuels, and lack of sufficient waste-treatment infrastructure.

Key Points:

Because of significantly greater motor vehicle usage in the United States (U.S.) than in the rest of the world, the U.S. contribution of urban air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, especially carbon dioxide, is disproportionately high in relation to its population.

Acid rain is an enduring issue of contention in the northeastern part of the United States, on the border with Canada.

Mexico's urban areas suffer extreme air pollution from carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and other toxic air pollutants. Emissions controls on vehicles are in their infancy, compared to analogous regulations in the U.S.

The cities of Mexico, including those on the U.S. border, also discharge large quantities of untreated or poorly treated sewage, though officials are currently planning infrastructure upgrades.

Deforestation is noteworthy in various regions of the U.S., especially along the northwest coastline. Old growth forests have been largely removed, but in the northeastern and upper midwestern sections of the United States, evidence suggests that the current extent of tree cover probably surpasses the figure for the beginning of the 20th century.

Extreme weather conditions in the last few years have resulted in a high level of soil erosion along the north coast of California; in addition, the coastline itself has shifted substantially due to soil erosion and concomitant landslides.

Agricultural pollution-including nitrate contamination of well water, nutrient runoff to waterways, and pesticide exposure-is significant in various areas. Noteworthy among affected places are California's Central Valley, extensive stretches of the Midwest, and land in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Inland waterways, especially around the Great Lakes, have substantially improved their water quality, due to concentrated efforts at reducing water pollution by governmental, commercial and community representatives. Strict curbs on industrial effluents and near-universal implementation of sewage treatment are the chief factors responsible for this improvement.

A major environmental issue for Canada and the United States involves the depletion of various already endangered or threatened species, and most significantly, the decline of fish stocks. Coastal fisheries have been over-harvested, resulting in catch limits or moratoriums on many commercially important fish species. In the last few years, these policies have started to yield measurable results with decreasing trends in marine fish catch.

Due to the decay of neighboring ecosystems in Central America and the Caribbean, the sea surrounding Florida has become increasingly sedimented, contributing to marine degradation, nutrient depletion of the ecosystem, depletion of fish stocks, and diseases to coral species in particular.

Polar Regions

Key Points:

The significant rise in sea level, amounting 10 to 25 centimeters in the last 100 years, is due to the melting of the Arctic ice sheets, and is attributed to global warming.

The Antarctic suffers from a significant ozone hole, first detected in 1976. By 1985, a British scientific team reported a 40 percent decrease in usual regeneration rates of the ozone. Because a sustained increase in the amount of ultraviolet-B radiation would have adverse consequences upon all planetary life, recent environmental measures have been put into effect, aimed at reversing ozone depletion. These measures are projected to garner significant results by 2050.

Due to air and ocean currents, the Arctic is a sink for toxic releases originally discharged thousands of miles away. Arctic wildlife and Canada's Inuit population have higher bodily levels of contaminants such as PCB and dioxin than those found in people and animals in much of the rest of the world.

Global Environmental Concepts

1. Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases

The Greenhouse Effect:

In the early 19th century, the French physicist, Jean Fourier, contended that the earth's atmosphere functions in much the same way as the glass of a greenhouse, thus describing what is now understood as the "greenhouse effect." Put simply, the "greenhouse effect" confines some of the sun's energy to the earth, preserving some of the planet's warmth, rather than allowing it to flow back into space. In so doing, all kinds of life forms can flourish on earth. Thus, the "greenhouse effect" is necessary to sustain and preserve life forms and ecosystems on earth.

In the late 19th century, a Swedish chemist, Svante Arrhenius, noticed that human activities, such as the burning of coal and other fossil fuels for heat, and the removal of forested lands for urban development, led to higher concentrations of greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide and methane, in the atmosphere. This increase in the levels of greenhouse gases was believed to advance the "greenhouse effect" exponentially, and might be related to the trend in global warming.

In the wake of the Industrial Revolution, after industrial development took place on a large scale and the total human population burgeoned simultaneously with industrialization, the resulting increase in greenhouse gas emissions could, many scientists believe, be significant enough to have some bearing on climate. Indeed, many studies in recent years support the idea that there is a linkage between human activities and global warming, although there is less consensus on the extent to which this linkage may be relevant to environmental concerns.

That said, some scientists have argued that temperature fluctuations have existed throughout the evolution of the planet. Indeed, Dr. S. Fred Singer, the president of the Science and Environment Policy Project has noted that 3,000-year-old geological records of ocean sediment reveal changes in the surface temperature of the ocean. Hence, it is possible that climate variability is merely a normal fact of the planet's evolution. Yet even skeptics as to anthropogenic factors concur that any substantial changes in global temperatures would likely have an effect upon the earth's ecosystems, as well as the life forms that inhabit them.

The Relationship Between Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases:

A large number of climatologists believe that the increase in atmospheric concentrations of "greenhouse gas emissions," mostly a consequence of human activities such as the burning of fossil fuels, are contributing to global warming. The cause notwithstanding, the planet has reportedly warmed 0.3°C to 0.6°C over the last century. Indeed, each year during the 1990s was one of the very warmest in the 20th century, with the mean surface temperature for 1999 being the fifth warmest on record since 1880.

In early 2000, a panel of atmospheric scientists for the National Research Council concluded in a report that global warming was, indeed, a reality. While the panel, headed by Chairman John Wallace, a professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Washington, stated that it remained unclear whether human activities have contributed to the earth's increasing temperatures, it was apparent that global warming exists.

In 2001, following a request for further study by the incoming Bush administration in the [United States](#), the National Academy of Sciences again confirmed that global warming had been in existence for the last 20 years. The study also projected an increase in temperature between 2.5 degrees and 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. Furthermore, the study found the leading cause of global warming to be emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels, and it noted that greenhouse gas accumulations in the earth's atmosphere was a result of human activities.

Within the scientific community, the controversy regarding has centered on the difference between surface air and upper air temperatures. Information collected since 1979 suggests that while the earth's surface temperature has increased by about a degree in the past century, the atmospheric temperature five miles above the earth's surface has indicated very little increase. Nevertheless, the

panel stated that this discrepancy in temperature between surface and upper air does not invalidate the conclusion that global warming is taking place. Further, the panel noted that natural events, such as volcanic eruptions, can decrease the temperature in the upper atmosphere.

The major consequences of global warming potentially include the melting of the polar ice caps, which, in turn, contribute to the rise in sea levels. Many islands across the globe have already experienced a measurable loss of land as a result. Because global warming may increase the rate of evaporation, increased precipitation, in the form of stronger and more frequent storm systems, is another potential outcome. Other consequences of global warming may include the introduction and proliferation of new infectious diseases, loss of arable land (referred to as "desertification"), destructive changes to existing ecosystems, loss of biodiversity and the isolation of species, and concomitant adverse changes in the quality of human life.

International Policy Development in Regard to Global Warming:

Regardless of what the precise nature of the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming may be, it seems that there is some degree of a connection between the phenomena. Any substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and global warming trends will likely involve systematic changes in industrial operations, the use of advanced energy sources and technologies, as well as global cooperation in implementing and regulating these transformations.

In this regard, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stipulated the following objectives:

1. To stabilize "greenhouse gas" concentrations within the atmosphere, in such a manner that would preclude hazardous anthropogenic intervention into the existing biosphere and ecosystems of the world. This stabilization process would facilitate the natural adaptation of ecosystems to changes in climate.
2. To ensure and enable sustainable development and food production on a global scale.

*** See section on "International Environmental Agreements and Associations" for information related to international policies related to limiting greenhouse gases and controlling climate change emanating from historic summits at Kyoto, Copenhagen, Doha, and Paris. ***

2. Air Pollution

Long before global warming reared its head as a significant issue, those concerned about the

environment and public health noted the deleterious effects of human-initiated combustion upon the atmosphere. Killer smogs from coal burning triggered acute health emergencies in London and other places. At a lower level of intensity motor vehicle, power plant, and industrial emissions impaired long-range visibility and probably had some chronic adverse consequences on the respiratory systems of persons breathing such air.

In time, scientists began associating the sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides released from coal burning with significant acid deposition in the atmosphere, eventually falling as "acid rain." This phenomenon has severely degraded forestlands, especially in Europe and a few parts of the [United States](#). It has also impaired some aquatic ecosystems and eaten away the surface of some human artifacts, such as marble monuments. Scrubber technology and conversion to cleaner fuels have enabled the level of industrial production to remain at least constant while significantly reducing acid deposition. Technologies aimed at cleaning the air and curtailing acid rain, soot, and smog may, nonetheless, boomerang as the perils of global warming become increasingly serious. In brief, these particulates act as sort of a sun shade -- comparable to the effect of volcanic eruptions on the upper atmosphere whereby periods of active volcanism correlate with temporarily cooler weather conditions. Thus, while the carbon dioxide releases that are an inevitable byproduct of combustion continue, by scrubbing the atmosphere of pollutants, an industrial society opens itself to greater insolation (penetration of the sun's rays and consequent heating), and consequently, it is likely to experience a correspondingly greater rise in ambient temperatures.

The health benefits of removing the sources of acid rain and smog are indisputable, and no one would recommend a return to previous conditions. Nevertheless, the problematic climatic effects of continually increasing emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases pose a major global environmental challenge, not as yet addressed adequately.

3. Ozone Depletion

The stratospheric ozone layer functions to prevent ultraviolet radiation from reaching the earth. Normally, stratospheric ozone is systematically disintegrated and regenerated through natural photochemical processes. The stratospheric ozone layer, however, has been depleted unnaturally as a result of anthropogenic (man-made) chemicals, most especially chlorine and bromide compounds such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, and various industrial chemicals in the form of solvents, refrigerants, foaming agents, aerosol propellants, fire retardants, and fumigants. Ozone depletion is of concern because it permits a greater degree of ultraviolet-B radiation to reach the earth, which then increases the incidences of cancerous malignancies, cataracts, and human immune deficiencies. In addition, even in small doses, ozone depletion affects the ecosystem by disturbing food chains, agriculture, fisheries and other forms of biological diversity.

Transnational policies enacted to respond to the dangers of ozone depletion include the 1985

Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. The Montreal Protocol was subsequently amended in London in 1990, Copenhagen in 1992 and Vienna in 1995. By 1996, 155 countries had ratified the Montreal Protocol, which sets out a time schedule for the reduction (and eventual elimination) of ozone depleting substances (OPS), and bans exports and imports of ODS from and to non-participant countries.

In general, the Protocol stipulates that developed countries must eliminate halon consumption by 1994 and CFC consumption by 1996, while developing countries must eliminate these substances by 2010. Consumption of methyl bromide, which is used as a fumigant, was to be frozen at the 1995 in developed countries, and fully eliminated in 2010, while developing countries are to freeze consumption by 2002, based on average 1995-1998 consumption levels. Methyl chloroform is to be phased out by 2005. Under the Montreal Protocol, most ODS will be completely eliminated from use by 2010.

4. Land Degradation

In recent decades, land degradation in more arid regions of the world has become a serious concern. The problem, manifest as both "desertification" and "devegetation," is caused primarily by climate variability and human activities, such as "deforestation," excessive cultivation, overgrazing, and other forms of land resource exploitation. It is also exacerbated by inadequate irrigation practices. Although the effects of droughts on drylands have been temporary in the past, today, the productivity and sustainability of these lands have been severely compromised for the long term. Indeed, in every region of the world, land degradation has become an acute issue.

Desertification and Devegetation:

"Desertification" is a process of land degradation causing the soil to deteriorate, thus losing its nutrients and fertility, and eventually resulting in the loss of vegetation, known as "devegetation." As aforementioned, "desertification" and "devegetation" are caused by human activities, yet human beings are also the greatest casualties. Because these forms of land degradation affect the ability of the soil to produce crops, they concomitantly contribute to poverty. As population increases and demographic concentrations shift, the extent of land subject to stresses by those seeking to wrest subsistence from it has inexorably risen.

In response, the United Nations has formed the Convention to Combat Desertification-aimed at implementing programs to address the underlying causes of desertification, as well as measures to prevent and minimize its effects. Of particular significance is the formulation of policies on transboundary resources, such as areas around lakes and rivers. At a broader level, the Convention

has established a Conference of Parties (COP), which includes all ratifying governments, for directing and advancing international action.

To ensure more efficacious use of funding, the Convention intends to reconfigure international aid to utilize a consultative and coordinated approach in the disbursement and expenditure of donor funds. In this way, local communities that are affected by desertification will be active participants in the solution-generation process. In-depth community education projects are envisioned as part of this new international aid program, and private donor financing is encouraged. Meanwhile, as new technologies are developed to deal with the problem of desertification, they need to be distributed for application across the world. Hence, the Convention calls for international cooperation in scientific research in this regard.

Desertification is a problem of sustainable development. It is directly connected to human challenges such as poverty, social and economic well-being and environmental protection as well. Broader environmental issues, such as climate change, biological diversity, and freshwater supplies, are indirectly related, so any effort to resolve this environmental challenge must entail coordinated research efforts and joint action.

Deforestation:

Deforestation is not a recent phenomenon. For centuries, human beings have cut down trees to clear space for land cultivation, or in order to use the wood for fuel. Over the last 200 years, and most especially after World War II, deforestation increased because the logging industry became a globally profitable endeavor, and so the clearing of forested areas was accelerated for the purposes of industrial development. In the long term, this intensified level of deforestation is considered problematic because the forest is unable to regenerate itself quickly. The deforestation that has occurred in tropical rainforests is seen as an especially serious concern, due to the perceived adverse effects of this process upon the entire global ecosystem.

The most immediate consequence of deforestation is soil degradation. Soil, which is necessary for the growth of vegetation, can be a fragile and vital property. Organically, an extensive evolution process must take place before soil can produce vegetation, yet at the same time, the effects of natural elements, such as wind and rain, can easily and quickly degrade this resource. This phenomenon is known as soil erosion. In addition, natural elements like wind and rain reduce the amount of fertile soil on the ground, making soil scarcity a genuine problem. When fertile topsoil that already exists is removed from the landscape in the process of deforestation, soil scarcity is further exacerbated. Equally significant is the fact that once land has been cleared so that the topsoil can be cultivated for crop production, not only are the nutrient reserves in the soil depleted, thus producing crops of inferior quality, but the soil structure itself becomes stressed and deteriorates further.

Another direct result of deforestation is flooding. When forests are cleared, removing the cover of vegetation, and rainfall occurs, the flow of water increases across the surface of land. When extensive water runoff takes place, the frequency and intensity of flooding increases. Other adverse effects of deforestation include the loss of wildlife and biodiversity within the ecosystem that supports such life forms.

At a broader level, tropical rainforests play a vital role in maintaining the global environmental system. Specifically, destruction of tropical rainforests affects the carbon dioxide cycle. When forests are destroyed by burning (or rotting), carbon dioxide is released into the air, thus contributing to an intensified "greenhouse effect." The increase in greenhouse gas emissions like carbon dioxide is a major contributor to global warming, according to many environmental scientists. Indeed, trees themselves absorb carbon dioxide in the process of photosynthesis, so their loss also reduces the absorption of greenhouse gases.

Tropical rainforest destruction also adversely affects the nitrogen cycle. Nitrogen is a key nutrient for both plants and animals. Plants derive nitrogen from soil, while animals obtain it via nitrogen-enriched vegetation. This element is essential for the formation of amino acids, and thereby for proteins and biochemicals that all living things need for metabolism and growth. In the nitrogen cycle, vegetation acquires these essential proteins and biochemicals, and then cyclically returns them to the atmosphere and global ecosystem. Accordingly, when tropical rainforest ecosystems are compromised, not only is vegetation removed; the atmosphere is also affected and climates are altered. At a more immediate level, the biodiversity within tropical rainforests, including wildlife and insect species and a wealth of plant varieties, is depleted. Loss of rare plants is of particular concern because certain species as yet unknown and unused could likely yield many practical benefits, for instance as medicines.

As a result of the many challenges associated with deforestation, many environmental groups and agencies have argued for government policies on the sustainable development of forests by governments across the globe. While many countries have instituted national policies and programs aimed at reducing deforestation, and substantial research has been advanced in regard to sustainable and regenerative forestry development, there has been very little progress on an international level. Generally speaking, most tropical rainforests are located in developing and less developed countries, where economic growth is often dependent upon the exploitation of tropical rainforests. Timber resources as well as wildlife hunting tend to be particularly lucrative arenas.

In places such as the Amazon, where deforestation takes place for the construction of energy plants aimed at industrialization and economic development, there is an exacerbated effect on the environment. After forests are cleared in order to construct such projects, massive flooding usually ensues. The remaining trees then rot and decay in the wake of the flooding. As the trees deteriorate, their biochemical makeup becomes more acidic, producing poisonous substances such

as hydrogen sulphide and methane gases. Acidified water subsequently corrodes the mechanical equipment and operations of the plants, which are already clogged by rotting wood after the floodwaters rise.

Deforestation generally arises from an economically plausible short-term motivation, but nonetheless poses a serious global concern because the effects go beyond national boundaries. The United Nations has established the World Commission on Forest and Sustainable Development. This body's task is to determine the optimal means of dealing with the issue of deforestation, without unduly affecting normal economic development, while emphasizing the global significance of protecting tropical forest ecosystems.

5. Water Resources

For all terrestrial fauna, including humans, water is the most immediate necessity to sustain life. As the population has increased and altered an ever-greater portion of the landscape from its natural condition, demand on water resources has intensified, especially with the development of industrialization and large-scale irrigation. The supply of freshwater is inherently limited, and moreover distributed unevenly across the earth's landmasses. Moreover, not just demand for freshwater but activities certain to degrade it are becoming more pervasive. By contrast, the oceans form a sort of "last wilderness," still little explored and in large part not seriously affected by human activity. However, coastal environments - the biologically richest part of the marine ecosystem-are experiencing major depletion due to human encroachment and over-exploitation.

Freshwater:

In various regions, for instance the Colorado River in the western [United States](#), current withdrawals of river water for irrigation, domestic, and industrial use consume the entire streamflow so that almost no water flows into the sea at the river's mouth. Yet development is ongoing in many such places, implying continually rising demand for water. In some areas reliant on groundwater, aquifers are being depleted at a markedly faster rate than they are being replenished. An example is the San Joaquin Valley in California, where decades of high water withdrawals for agriculture have caused land subsidence of ten meters or more in some spots. Naturally, the uncertainty of future water supplies is particularly acute in arid and semi-arid regions. Speculation that the phenomenon of global warming will alter geographic and seasonal rainfall patterns adds further uncertainty.

Water conservation measures have great potential to alleviate supply shortages. Some city water systems are so old and beset with leaking pipes that they lose as much water as they meter. Broad-scale irrigation could be replaced by drip-type irrigation, actually enhancing the sustainability of

agriculture. In many areas where heavy irrigation has been used for decades, the result is deposition of salts and other chemicals in the soil such that the land becomes unproductive for farming and must be abandoned.

Farming is a major source of water pollution. Whereas restrictions on industrial effluents and other "point sources" are relatively easy to implement, comparable measures to reform hydraulic practices at farms and other "nonpoint sources" pose a significantly knottier challenge. Farm-caused water pollution takes the following main forms:

- Nitrate pollution found in wells in intensive farming areas as a consequence of heavy fertilizer use is a threat to human health. The most serious danger is to infants, who by ingesting high-nitrate water can contract methemoglobinemia, sometimes called "blue baby syndrome," a potentially fatal condition.
- Fertilizer runoff into rivers and lakes imparts unwanted nutrients that cause algae growth and eventual loss of oxygen in the body of water, degrading its ability to support fish and other desirable aquatic life.
- Toxic agricultural chemicals - insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides - are detectable in some aquifers and waterways.

In general, it is much easier to get a pollutant into water than to retrieve it out. Gasoline additives, dry cleaning chemicals, other industrial toxins, and in a few areas radionuclides have all been found in water sources intended for human use. The complexity and long time scale of subterranean hydrological movements essentially assures that pollutants already deposited in aquifers will continue to turn up for decades to come. Sophisticated water treatment processes are available, albeit expensive, to reclaim degraded water and render it fit for human consumption. Yet source protection is unquestionably a more desirable alternative.

In much of the developing world, and even some low-income rural enclaves of the developed world, the population lacks ready access to safe water. Surface water and shallow groundwater supplies are susceptible to contamination from untreated wastewater and failing septic tanks, as well as chemical hazards. The occurrence of waterborne disease is almost certainly greatly underreported.

Marine Resources:

Coastal areas have always been desirable places for human habitation, and population pressure on them continues to increase. Many types of water degradation that affect lakes and rivers also affect coastal zones: industrial effluents, untreated or partially treated sewage, nutrient load from

agriculture figure prominently in both cases. Prospects for more extreme storms as a result of global warming, as well as the pervasiveness of poorly planned development in many coastal areas, forebode that catastrophic hurricanes and landslides may increase in frequency in the future. Ongoing rise in sea levels will force remedial measures and in some cases abandonment of currently valuable coastal property.

Fisheries over much of the globe have been overharvested, and immediate conservation measures are required to preserve stocks of many species. Many governments subsidized factory-scale fishing fleets in the 1970s and 1980s, and the resultant catch increase evidently surpassed a sustainable level. It is uncertain how much of the current decline in fish stocks stems from overharvesting and how much from environmental pollution. The deep ocean remains relatively unaffected by human activity, but continental shelves near coastlines are frequently seriously polluted, and these close-to-shore areas are the major biological nurseries for food fish and the smaller organisms they feed on.

6. Environmental Toxins

Toxic chemical pollution exploded on the public consciousness with disclosure of spectacularly polluted industrial areas such as Love Canal near Buffalo, New York. There is no question that pollutants such as organophosphates or radionucleides can be highly deleterious to health, but evidence to date suggests that seriously affected areas are a localized rather than universal problem.

While some explore the possibilities for a lifestyle that fully eschews use of modern industrial chemicals, the most prevalent remediative approach is to focus on more judicious use. The most efficient chemical plants are now able to contain nearly all toxic byproducts of their production processes within the premises, minimizing the release of such substances into the environment. Techniques such as Integrated Pest Management (IPM) dictate limited rather than broadcast use of pesticides: application only when needed using the safest available chemical, supplemented as much as possible with nontoxic controls.

While heightened public awareness and growing technical sophistication suggest a hopeful outlook on limiting the damage from manmade environmental toxins, one must grant that previous incidents of their misuse and mishandling have already caused environmental damage that will have to be dealt with for many years to come. In the case of the most hazardous radioactive substances, the time scale for successful remediation actually extends beyond that of the recorded history of civilization. Moreover, in this era of high population density and rapid economic growth, quotidian activities such as the transport of chemicals will occasionally, seemingly inevitably result in accidents with adverse environmental consequences.

7. "Islandization" and Biodiversity

With increased awareness regarding the adverse effects of unregulated hunting and habitat depletion upon wildlife species and other aspects of biodiversity, large-scale efforts across the globe have been initiated to reduce and even reverse this trend.

In every region of the world, many species of wildlife and areas of biodiversity have been saved from extinction. Nationally, many countries have adopted policies aimed at preservation and conservation of species, and one of the most tangible measures has been the proliferation of protected habitats. Such habitats exist in the form of wildlife reserves, marine life reserves, and other such areas where biodiversity can be protected from external encroachment and exploitation.

Despite these advances in wildlife and biodiversity protection, further and perhaps more intractable challenges linger. Designated reserves, while intended to prevent further species decline, exist as closed territories, fragmented from other such enclaves and disconnected from the larger ecosystem. This environmental scenario is referred to as "islandization." Habitat reserves often serve as oversized zoos or game farms, with landscapes and wildlife that have effectively been "tamed" to suit. Meanwhile, the larger surrounding ecosystem continues to be seriously degraded and transformed, while within the islandized habitat, species that are the focus of conservation efforts may not have sufficient range and may not be able to maintain healthy genetic variability.

As a consequence, many conservationists and preservationists have demanded that substantially larger portions of land be withheld as habitat reserves, and a network of biological corridors to connect continental reserves be established. While such efforts to combat islandization have considerable support in the [United States](#), how precisely such a program would be instituted, especially across national boundaries, remains a matter of debate. International conservationists and preservationists say without a network of reserves a massive loss of biodiversity will result.

The concept of islandization illustrates why conservation and preservation of wildlife and biodiversity must consider and adopt new, broader strategies. In the past, conservation and preservation efforts have been aimed at specific species, such as the spotted owl and grizzly bear in North America, the Bengal tiger in Southeast Asia, the panda in [China](#), elephants in Africa. Instead, the new approach is to simultaneously protect many and varied species that inhabit the same ecosystem. This method, referred to as "bio-regional conservation," may more efficaciously generate longer-term and more far-reaching results precisely because it is aimed at preserving entire ecosystems, and all the living things within.

More About Biodiversity Issues:

This section is directly taken from the United Nations Environmental Program: "[Biodiversity](#)"

Assessment"

The Global Biodiversity Assessment, completed by 1500 scientists under the auspices of United Nations Environmental Program in 1995, updated what is known (or unknown) about global biological diversity at the ecosystem, species and genetic levels. The assessment was uncertain of the total number of species on Earth within an order of magnitude. Of its working figure of 13 million species, only 13 percent are scientifically described. Ecological community diversity is also poorly known, as is its relationship to biological diversity, and genetic diversity has been studied for only a small number of species. The effects of human activities on biodiversity have increased so greatly that the rate of species extinctions is rising to hundreds or thousands of times the background level. These losses are driven by increasing demands on species and their habitats, and by the failure of current market systems to value biodiversity adequately. The Assessment calls for urgent action to reverse these trends.

There has been a new recognition of the importance of protecting marine and aquatic biodiversity. The first quantitative estimates of species losses due to growing coral reef destruction predict that almost 200,000 species, or one in five presently contributing to coral reef biodiversity, could die out in the next 40 years if human pressures on reefs continue to increase.

Since Rio, many countries have improved their understanding of the status and importance of their biodiversity, particularly through biodiversity country studies such as those prepared under the auspices of UNEP/GEF. The [United Kingdom](#) identified 1250 species needing monitoring, of which 400 require action plans to ensure their survival. Protective measures for biodiversity, such as legislation to protect species, can prove effective. In the USA, almost 40 percent of the plants and animals protected under the Endangered Species Act are now stable or improving as a direct result of recovery efforts. Some African countries have joined efforts to protect threatened species through the 1994 Lusaka Agreement, and more highly migratory species are being protected by specialized cooperative agreements among range states under the Bonn Agreement.

There is an emerging realization that a major part of conservation of biological diversity must take place outside of protected areas and involve local communities. The extensive agricultural areas occupied by small farmers contain much biodiversity that is important for sustainable food production. Indigenous agricultural practices have been and continue to be important elements in the maintenance of biodiversity, but these are being displaced and lost. There is a new focus on the interrelationship between agrodiversity conservation and sustainable use and development practices in smallholder agriculture, with emphasis on use of farmers' knowledge and skills as a source of information for sustainable farming.

Perhaps even more important than the loss of biodiversity is the transformation of global biogeochemical cycles, the reduction in the total world biomass, and the decrease in the biological productivity of the planet. While quantitative measurements are not available, the eventual

economic and social consequences may be so significant that the issue requires further attention.

Specific sources used for this section:

Bendall, Roger. 1996. "Biodiversity: the follow up to Rio". The Globe 30:4-5, April 1996.

Global Environmental Change: Human and Policy Implications. 1995. Special issue on "People, Land Management and Environmental Change", Vol. 3, No. 4, September 1995.

Golubev, Genady N. (Moscow University) In litt. 29 June 1996.

Heywood, V.H. (ed.). 1995. Global Biodiversity Assessment. United Nations Environment Programme. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heywood, V.H. 1996. "The Global Biodiversity Assessment". The Globe, 30:2-4, April 1996.

Reaka-Kudla, Marjorie. 1996. Paper presented at American Association for Advancement of Science, February 1996. Quoted in Pain, Stephanie. "Treasures lost in reef madness". New Scientist, 17 February 1996.

Uitto, Juha I., and Akiko Ono (eds). 1996. Population, Land Management and Environmental Change. The United Nations University, Tokyo.

USFWS. 1994. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report to Congress, cited in news release 21 July

1994.

Online resources used generally in the Environmental Overview:

Environmental Protection Agency Global Warming Site. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming>

Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations: Forestry. URL: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/sofo/en/>

Global Warming Information Page. URL: <http://globalwarming.org>

U n i t e d N a t i o n s E n v i r o n m e n t a l P r o g r a m . U R L : http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO_Products/Assessment_Reports/

United Nations Global Environmental Outlook. URL: <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/>

Note on Edition Dates:

The edition dates for textual resources are noted above because they were used to formulate the original content. We also have used online resources (cited above) to update coverage as needed.

Information Resources

For more information about environmental concepts, CountryWatch recommends the following resources:

The United Nations Environmental Program Network (with country profiles)

[<http://www.unep.net/>](http://www.unep.net/)

The United Nations Environment Program on Climate Change

[<http://climatechange.unep.net/>](http://climatechange.unep.net/)

The United Nations Environmental Program on Waters and Oceans

<http://www.unep.ch/earthw/Pdepwat.htm>

The United Nations Environmental Program on Forestry: "Forests in Flux"

<http://www.unep-wcmc.org/forest/flux/homepage.htm>

FAO "State of the World's Forests"

<http://www.fao.org/forestry/FO/SOFO/SOFO99/sofo99-e.stm>

World Resources Institute.

<http://www.wri.org/>

Harvard University Center for Health and the Global Environment

<http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/the-review.html>

The University of Wisconsin Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment

<http://sage.aos.wisc.edu/>

International Environmental Agreements and Associations

International Policy Development in Regard to Global Warming:

Introduction

Regardless of what the precise nature of the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming may be, it seems that there is some degree of a connection between the phenomena. Any substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and global warming trends will likely involve systematic changes in industrial operations, the use of advanced energy sources and technologies, as well as global cooperation in implementing and regulating these transformations.

In this regard, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stipulated the following objectives:

1. To stabilize "greenhouse gas" concentrations within the atmosphere, in such a manner that would preclude hazardous anthropogenic intervention into the existing biosphere and ecosystems of the world. This stabilization process would facilitate the natural adaptation of ecosystems to changes in climate.
2. To ensure and enable sustainable development and food production on a global scale.

Following are two discussions regarding international policies on the environment, followed by listings of international accords.

Special Entry: The Kyoto Protocol

The UNFCCC was adopted at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, and entered into force in 1994. Over 175 parties were official participants.

Meanwhile, however, many of the larger, more industrialized nations failed to reach the emissions' reduction targets, and many UNFCCC members agreed that the voluntary approach to reducing emissions had not been successful. As such, UNFCCC members reached a consensus that legally binding limits were necessitated, and agreed to discuss such a legal paradigm at a meeting in Kyoto, [Japan](#) in 1997. At that meeting, the UNFCCC forged the Kyoto Protocol. This concord is the first legally binding international agreement that places limits on emissions from industrialized countries. The major greenhouse gas emissions addressed in the Kyoto Protocol include carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and methane.

The provisions of the Kyoto Protocol stipulate that economically advanced nations must reduce their combined emissions of greenhouse gases, by approximately five percent from their 1990 levels, before the 2008-2010 deadline. Countries with the highest carbon dioxide emissions, such as the [United States](#) (U.S.), many of the European Union (EU) countries, and [Japan](#), are to reduce emissions by a scale of 6 to 8 percent. All economically advanced nations must show "demonstrable progress" by 2005. In contrast, no binding limits or timetable have been set on developing countries. Presumably, this distinction is due to the fact that most developing countries - - with the obvious exceptions of [India](#) and [China](#) -- simply do not emit as many greenhouse gases as do more industrially advanced countries. Meanwhile, these countries are entrenched in the process of economic development.

Regardless of the aforementioned reasoning, there has been strong opposition against the asymmetrical treatment assigned to emissions limits among developed and developing countries. Although this distinction might be regarded as unfair in principle, associations such as the Alliance of Small Island States have been vocal in expressing how global warming -- a result of greenhouse gas emissions - has contributed to the rise in sea level, and thus deleteriously affected their very

existence as island nation states. For this reason, some parties have suggested that economically advanced nations, upon returning to their 1990 levels, should be required to further reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by a deadline of 2005. In response, interested parties have observed that even if such reductions were undertaken by economically advanced nations, they would not be enough to completely control global warming. Indeed, a reduction in the rate of fossil fuel usage by developing nations would also be necessary to have substantial ameliorative effect on global warming. Indeed, a reduction in the rate of fossil fuel usage by developing nations would also be necessary to have substantial ameliorative effect on global warming.

As such, the Protocol established a "Clean Development Mechanism" which permits developed countries to invest in projects aimed at reducing emissions within developing countries in return for credit for the reductions. Ostensibly, the objective of this mechanism is to curtail emissions in developing countries without unduly penalizing them for their economic development. Under this model, the countries with more potential emissions credits could sell them to other signatories of the Kyoto Protocol, whose emissions are forecast to significantly rise in the next few years. Should this trading of emissions credits take place, it is estimated that the Kyoto Protocol's emissions targets could still be met.

In 1999, the International Energy Outlook projected that Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and Newly Independent States, as well as parts of Asia, are all expected to show a marked decrease in their level of energy-related carbon emissions in 2010. Nations with the highest emissions, specifically, the U.S., the EU and [Japan](#), are anticipated to reduce their emissions by up to 8 percent by 2012. By 2000, however, the emissions targets were not on schedule for achievement. Indeed, the U.S. Department of Energy estimates forecast that by 2010, there will be a 34 percent increase in carbon emissions from the 1990 levels, in the absence of major shifts in policy, economic growth, energy prices, and consumer trends. Despite this assessment in the U.S., international support for the Kyoto Protocol remained strong, especially among European countries and island states, who view the pact as one step in the direction away from reliance on fossil fuels and other sources of greenhouse gases.

In 2001, U.S. President, George W. Bush, rejected his country's participation in the Kyoto Protocol, saying that the costs imposed on the global economic system, and especially, on the US, overshadowed the benefits of the Protocol. He also cited the unfair burden on developed nations to reduce emissions, as another primary reasons for withdrawal from the international pact, as well as insufficient evidence regarding the science of global warming. Faced with impassioned international disapproval for his position, the U.S. president stated that his administration remained interested in dealing with the matter of global warming, but would endorse alternative measures to combat the problem, such as voluntary initiatives limiting emissions. Critics of Bush's position, however, have noted that it was the failure of voluntary initiatives to reduce emissions following the Rio Summit that led to the establishment of the Kyoto Protocol in the first place.

In the wake of the Bush administration's decision, many participant countries resigned themselves to the reality that the goals of the Kyoto Protocol might not be achieved without U.S. involvement. Nevertheless, in Bonn, [Germany](#), in July 2001, the remaining participant countries struck a political compromise on some of the key issues and sticking points, and planned to move forward with the Protocol, irrespective of the absence of the U.S. The key compromise points included the provision for countries to offset their targets with carbon sinks (these are areas of forest and farmland which can absorb carbon through the process of photosynthesis). Another compromise point within the broader Bonn Agreement was the reduction of emissions cuts of six gases from over 5 percent to a more achievable 2 percent. A third key change was the provision of funding for less wealthy countries to adopt more progressive technologies.

In late October and early November 2001, the UNFCCC's 7th Conference of the Parties met in Marrakesh, [Morocco](#), to finalize the measures needed to make the Kyoto Protocol operational. Although the UNFCCC projected that ratification of the Protocol would make it legally binding within a year, many critics noted that the process had fallen short of implementing significant changes in policy that would be necessary to actually stop or even slow climate change. They also maintained that the absence of U.S. participation effectively rendered the Protocol into being a political exercise without any substance, either in terms of transnational policy or in terms of environmental concerns.

The adoption of the compromises ensconced within the Bonn Agreement had been intended to make the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol more palatable to the U.S. In this regard, it failed to achieve its objective as the Bush administration continued to eschew participation in the international accord. Still, however, the Bonn Agreement did manage to render a number of other positive outcomes. Specifically, in 2002, key countries, such as [Russia](#), [Japan](#) and [Canada](#) agreed to ratify the protocol, bringing the number of signatories to 178. The decision by key countries to ratify the protocol was regarded as "the kiss of life" by observers.

By 2005, on the eve of a climate change conference in London, British Prime Minister Tony Blair was hoping to deal with the problems of climate change beyond the provisions set forth in the Kyoto Protocol. Acknowledging that the Kyoto Protocol could not work in its current form, Blair wanted to open the discussion for a new climate change plan.

Blair said that although most of the world had signed on to Kyoto, the protocol could not meet any of its practical goals of cutting greenhouse gas emissions without the participation of the United States, the world's largest polluter. He also noted that any new agreement would have to include India and China -- significant producers of greenhouse gas emissions, but exempt from Kyoto because they have been classified as developing countries. Still, he said that progress on dealing with climate change had been stymied by "a reluctance to face up to reality and the practical action needed to tackle problem."

Blair also touted the "huge opportunities" in technology and pointed toward the possibilities offered by wind, solar and nuclear power, along with fuel cell technology, eco-friendly biofuels, and carbon capture and storage which could generate low carbon power. Blair also asserted that his government was committed to achieving its domestic goal of reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 20 percent by 2010.

In the United States, President George W. Bush has said that global warming remained a debatable issue and despite conclusions reached by his own Environmental Protection Agency, he has not agreed with the conclusion that global warming and climate change are linked with human activities. Bush has also refused to ratify Kyoto on the basis of its economic costs.

Australia, an ally of the United States, has taken a similarly dim view of the Kyoto Protocol. Ahead of the November 2005 climate change meeting in Canada in which new goals for the protocol were to be discussed, Australia's Environment Minister, Ian Campbell, said that negotiating new greenhouse gas emission levels for the Kyoto Protocol would be a waste of time. Campbell said, "There is a consensus that the caps, targets and timetables approach is flawed. If we spend the next five years arguing about that, we'll be fiddling and negotiating while Rome burns." Campbell, like the Bush administration, has also advocated a system of voluntary action in which industry takes up new technologies rather than as a result of compelling the reduction of emissions. But the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) has called on its government to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, to establish a system of emissions trading, and to set binding limits on emissions. Interestingly, although it did not sign on to Kyoto, Australia was expected to meet its emissions target by 2012 (an 8 percent increase in 1990 levels in keeping with the country's reliance on coal). But this success has nothing to do with new technologies and is due to state-based regulations on land clearing.

Note: The Kyoto Protocol calls for developed nations to cut greenhouse emissions by 5.2 percent of 1990 levels by 2012.

Special Entry: Climate Change Summit in Copenhagen (2009) --

In December 2009, the United Nations Climate Change Summit opened in the Danish capital of Copenhagen. The summit was scheduled to last from Dec. 7-18, 2009. Delegates from more than 190 countries were in attendance, and approximately 100 world leaders, including British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and [United States](#) President Barack Obama, were expected to participate. At issue was the matter of new reductions targets on greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

Despite earlier fears that little concurrence would come from the conference, effectively pushing significant actions forward to a 2010 conference in [Mexico](#) City, negotiators were now reporting that the talks were productive and several key countries, such as [South Africa](#), had pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The two main issues that could still lead to cleavages were

questions of agreement between the industrialized countries and the developing countries of the world, as well as the overall effectiveness of proposals in seriously addressing the perils of climate change.

On Dec. 9, 2009, four countries -- the [United Kingdom](#), [Australia](#), [Mexico](#) and [Norway](#) -- presented a document outlining ideas for raising and managing billions of dollars, which would be intended to help vulnerable countries dealing with the perils of climate change. Described as a "green fund," the concept could potentially help small island states at risk because of the rise in sea level. [Bangladesh](#) identified itself as a potential recipient of an assistance fund, noting that as a country plagued by devastating floods, it was particularly hard-hit by climate change. The "green fund" would fall under the rubric of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, for which developed countries have been committed to quantifying their emission reduction targets, and also to providing financial and technical support to developing countries.

The [United Kingdom](#), [Australia](#), [Mexico](#) and [Norway](#) also called for the creation of a new legal treaty that would replace the Kyoto Protocol. This new treaty, which could go into force in 2012, would focus largely on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. But [Australia](#) went even further in saying that the successor treaty to the Kyoto Protocol, should be one with provisions covering all countries. Such a move would be a departure from the structure of the Kyoto Protocol, which contained emissions targets for industrialized countries due to the prevailing view that developed countries had a particular historic responsibility to be accountable for climate change. More recently, it has become apparent that substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions demanded by scientists would only come to pass with the participation also of significant developing nation states, such as [China](#) and [India](#). Indeed, one of the most pressing critiques of the Kyoto Protocol was that it was a "paper tiger" that failed to address the impact of the actions of emerging economies like [China](#) and [India](#), with its focus on the developed economies.

Now, in 2009, [China](#) -- as the world's biggest greenhouse gas emitter -- was responding this dubious distinction by vocalizing its criticism of the current scenario and foregrounding its new commitments. Ahead of the Copenhagen summit, [China](#) had announced it would reduce the intensity of its carbon emissions per unit of its GDP in 2020 by 40 to 45 percent against 2005 levels. With that new commitment at hand, [China](#) was now accusing the [United States](#) and the European Union of shirking their own responsibilities by setting weak targets for greenhouse gas emissions cuts. Senior Chinese negotiator, Su Wei, characterized the goals of the world's second largest greenhouse gas emitter -- the [United States](#) -- as "not notable," and the European Union's target as "not enough." Su Wei also took issue with [Japan](#) for setting implausible preconditions.

On Dec. 11, 2009, [China](#) demanded that developed and wealthy countries in Copenhagen should help deliver a real agreement on climate change by delivering on their promises to reduce carbon emissions and provide financial support for developing countries to adapt to global warming. In so doing, China's Vice Foreign Minister He Yafei said his country was hoping that a "balanced

outcome" would emerge from the discussions at the summit. Echoing the position of the Australian government, He Yafei spoke of a draft agreement as follows: "The final document we're going to adopt needs to be taking into account the needs and aspirations of all countries, particularly the most vulnerable ones."

China's Vice Foreign Minister emphasized the fact that climate change was "a matter of survival" for developing countries, and accordingly, such countries need wealthier and more developed countries to accentuate not only their pledges of emissions reduction targets, but also their financial commitments under the aforementioned United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. To that end, scientists and leaders of small island states in the Indian Ocean, the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, have highlighted the existential threat posed by global warming and the concomitant rise in sea level.

China aside, attention was also on [India](#) -- another major player in the developing world and a country with an industrializing economy that was impacting the environment. At issue was the Indian government's decision to set a carbon intensity target, which would slow emissions growth by up to 25 percent by the 2020 deadline. This strong position was resisted by some elements in [India](#), who argued that their country should not be taking such a strong position when developed wealthy countries were yet to show accountability for their previous commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The matter grew so heated that the members of the opposition stormed out of the parliament in protest as Indian Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh defended the policy. But the political pressure at home in [India](#) was leaving the Indian delegation in Copenhagen in a state of chaos as well. In fact, India's top environmental negotiator refused to travel to Copenhagen in protest of the government's newly-announced stance.

China and [India](#) were joined by [Brazil](#) and [South Africa](#) in the crafting of a draft document calling for a new global climate treaty to be completed by June 2010. Of concern has been the realization that there was insufficient time to find concurrence on a full legal treaty, which would leave countries only with a politically-binding text by the time the summit at Copenhagen closed. But Guyana's leader, President Bharrat Jagdeo, warned that the summit in [Denmark](#) would be classified as a failure unless a binding document was agreed upon instead of just political consensus. He urged his cohorts to act with purpose saying, "Never before have science, economics, geo-strategic self-interest and politics intersected in such a way on an issue that impacts everyone on the planet."

Likewise, [Tuvalu](#) demanded that legally binding agreements emerge from Copenhagen. Its proposal was supported by many of the vulnerable countries, from small island states and sub-Saharan Africa, all of whom warned of the catastrophic impact of climate change on their citizens. [Tuvalu](#) also called for more aggressive action, such as an amendment to the 1992 agreement, which would focus on sharp greenhouse gas emissions and the accepted rise in temperatures, due to the impact the rise in seas. The delegation from [Kiribati](#) joined the call by drawing attention to the fact that one village had to be abandoned due to waist-high water, and

more such effects were likely to follow. Kiribati's Foreign Secretary, Tessie Lambourne, warned that the people of [Kiribati](#) could well be faced with no homeland in the future saying, "Nobody in this room would want to leave their homeland." But despite such impassioned pleas and irrespective of warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that the rise in sea level from melting polar ice caps would deleteriously affect low-lying atolls such as such as [Tuvalu](#) and [Kiribati](#) in the Pacific, and the [Maldives](#) in the Indian Ocean, the oil-giant [Saudi Arabia](#) was able to block this move.

Meanwhile, within the developed countries, yet another power struggle was brewing. The European Union warned it would only agree to raise its target of 20 percent greenhouse gas emissions reductions to 30 percent if the [United States](#) demonstrated that it would do more to reduce its own emissions. It was unknown if such pressure would yield results. [United States](#) President Barack Obama offered a "provisional" 2020 target of 17 percent reductions, noting that he could not offer greater concessions at Copenhagen due to resistance within the [United States](#) Congress, which was already trying to pass a highly controversial "cap and trade" emissions legislation. However, should that emissions trading bill fail in the Senate, the [United States](#) Environment Protection Agency's declaration that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health and the environment was expected to facilitate further regulations and limits on power plants and factories at the national level. These moves could potentially strengthen the Obama administration's offering at Copenhagen. As well, President Obama also signaled that he would be willing to consider the inclusion of international forestry credits.

Such moves indicated willingness by the Obama administration to play a more constructive role on the international environmental scene than its predecessor, the Bush administration. Indeed, ahead of his arrival at the Copenhagen summit, President Barack Obama's top environmental advisors promised to work on a substantial climate change agreement. To that end, [United States](#) Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson said at a press conference, "We are seeking robust engagement with all of our partners around the world." But would this pro-engagement assertion yield actual results?

By Dec. 12, 2009, details related to a draft document prepared by Michael Zammit Cutajar, the head of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action, were released at the Copenhagen climate conference. Included in the document were calls for countries to make major reductions in carbon emissions over the course of the next decade. According to the Washington Post, industrialized countries were called on to make cuts of between 25 percent and 40 percent below 1990 levels -- reductions that were far more draconian than the [United States](#) was likely to accept. As discussed above, President Obama had offered a provisional reduction target of 17 percent. The wide gap between the released draft and the United States' actual stated position suggested there was much more negotiating in the offing if a binding agreement could be forged, despite the Obama administration's claims that it was seeking greater engagement on this issue.

In other developments, the aforementioned call for financial support of developing countries to deal with the perils of climate change was partly answered by the European Union on Dec. 11, 2009. The European bloc pledged an amount of 2.4 billion euros (US\$3.5 billion) annually from 2010 to 2012. Environment Minister Andreas Carlgren of [Sweden](#) -- the country that holds the rotating presidency of the European Union at the time of the summit -- put his weight behind the notion of a "legally binding deal." Meanwhile, Yvo de Boer, a top United Nations climate change official, focused less on the essence of the agreement and more on tangible action and effects saying, "Copenhagen will only be a success if it delivers significant and immediate action that begins the day the conference ends."

The division between developed and developing countries in Copenhagen reached new heights on Dec. 14, 2009, when some of the poor and less developed countries launched a boycott at the summit. The move, which was spurred by African countries but backed by [China](#) and [India](#), appeared to be geared toward redirecting attention and primary responsibility to the wealthier and more industrialized countries. The impasse was resolved after the wealthier and more industrialized countries offered assurances that they did not intend on shirking from their commitments to reducing greenhouse gases. As a result, the participating countries ceased the boycott.

Outside the actual summit, thousands of protestors had gathered to demand crucial global warming, leading to clashes between police and demonstrators elsewhere in the Danish capital city. There were reports of scattered violence across Copenhagen and more than 1,000 people were arrested.

Nevertheless, by the second week of the climate change summit, hopes of forging a strong deal were eroding as developed and developing nations remained deadlocked on sharing cuts in greenhouse gases, and particularly on the matters of financing and temperature goals. In a bid to shore up support for a new climate change, [United States](#) President Barack Obama joined other world leaders in Copenhagen. On Dec. 14, 2009, there was a standoff brewing between the [United States](#) and [China](#). At issue was China's refusal to accept international monitoring of its expressed targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The [United States](#) argued that China's opposition to verification could be a deal-breaker.

By the close of the summit, the difficult process eventually resulted in some consensus being cultivated. A draft text called for \$100 billion a year by 2020 to assist poor nations cope with climate change, while aiming to limit global warming to two degrees Celsius compared with pre-industrial levels. The deal also included specific targets for developed countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and called for reductions by developing countries as a share of their economies. Also included in the agreement was a mechanism to verify compliance. The details of the agreement were supported by President Barack Obama, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva.

This draft would stand as an interim agreement, with a legally-binding international pact unlikely to materialize until 2010. In this way, the summit in Copenhagen failed to achieve its central objective, which was to negotiate a successor to the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emissions.

Editor's Note

In the background of these developments was the growing global consciousness related to global warming and climate change. Indeed, as the Copenhagen summit was ongoing, it was clear there was enormous concurrence on the significance of the stakes with an editorial on the matter of climate change being published in 56 newspapers in 45 countries. That editorial warned that without global action, climate change would "ravage our planet." Meanwhile, a global survey taken by Globescan showed that concern over global warming had exponentially increased from 1998 -- when only 20 percent of respondents believed it to be a serious problem -- to 64 percent in 2009. Such survey data, however, was generated ahead of the accusations by climate change skeptics that some climate scientists may have overstated the case for global warming, based on emails derived in an illicit manner from a British University.

Special Entry: Climate change talks in Doha in [Qatar](#) extend life of Kyoto Protocol (2012)

December 2012 saw climate talks ensue in the Qatari city of Doha as representatives from countries across the world gathered to discuss the fate of the Kyoto Protocol, which seeks to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. The summit yielded results with decisions made (1) to extend the Kyoto Protocol until 2020, and (2) for wealthier countries to compensate poorer countries for the losses and damage incurred as a result of climate change.

In regards to the second matter, Malia Talakai of [Nauru](#), a leading negotiator for the Alliance of Small Island States, explained the necessity of the compensation package as follows: "We are trying to say that if you pollute you must help us."

This measure was being dubbed the "Loss and Damage" mechanism, and was being linked with [United States](#) President Barack Obama's request for \$60 billion from Congress to deal with the devastation caused by Hurricane Sandy months before. The sight of a hurricane bearing down on the northern Atlantic seaboard, along with the reality of the scope of reconstruction, appeared to have illustrated the economic costs of climate change -- not so much as a distant environmental issue -- but as a danger to the quotidian lives of people. Still, there was blame to be placed on the [United States](#) and European countries -- some of world's largest emitters -- for failing to do more to reduce emissions.

To that latter end, there was in fact little progress made on the central issue of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Had those emissions been reduced, there would have been less of a need to

financially deal with the devastation caused by climate change. One interpretation was that the global community was accepting the fact that industrialization was contributing to global warming, which had deleterious effects on the polar ice caps and concomitantly on the rise of sea level, with devastating effects for small island nations. Thus, wealthier countries were willing to pay around \$10 billion a year through 2020, effectively in "damages," to the poor countries that could be viewed as the "collateral damage" of industrial progress. But damages today could potentially be destruction tomorrow, leaving in place the existential challenges and burdens to be born by some of the world's smallest and least wealthy island countries.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the representative for the small island nation states at the Doha summit responded with ire, characterizing the lack of progress on reducing emissions as follows: "We see the package before us as deeply deficient in mitigation (carbon cuts) and finance. It's likely to lock us on the trajectory to a 3,4,5C rise in global temperatures, even though we agreed to keep the global average temperature rise of 1.5C to ensure survival of all islands. There is no new finance (for adapting to climate change and getting clean energy) -- only promises that something might materialize in the future. Those who are obstructive need to talk not about how their people will live, but whether our people will live."

Indeed, in most small island countries not just in the Pacific, but also the Caribbean and Indian Ocean, ecological concerns and the climate crisis have been dominant themes with dire life and death consequences looming in the background for their people. Small island nations in these region are already at risk from the rise of sea-level, tropical cyclones, floods. But their very livelihoods of fishing and subsistence farming were also at risk as a result of ecological and environmental changes. Increasingly high storm surges can wipe out entire villages and contaminate water supplies. Accordingly, the very existence of island nations, such as [Kiribati](#) and [Tuvalu](#), are at severe risk of being obliterated from the map. Yet even with the existential threat of being wiped off the map in the offing, the international community has been either slow or restrictive in its efforts to deal with global warming, climate change, economic and ecological damage, as well as the emerging global challenge of environmental refugees.

A 2012 report from the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the Pacific Regional Environment Program underlined the concerns of small island nations and their people as it concluded that the livelihoods of approximately 10 million people in Pacific island communities were increasingly vulnerable to climate change. In fact, low-lying islands in that region would likely confront losses of up to 18 percent of gross domestic product due to climate change, according to the report. The report covers 21 countries and territories, including [Fiji](#), [Kiribati](#), [Samoa](#) and [Tonga](#), and recommended environmental legislation intended to deal with the climate crisis facing the small island countries particularly. As noted by David Sheppard, the director general of the Pacific Regional Environment Program that co-sponsored this study: "The findings... emphasize the need more than ever to raise the bar through collective actions that address the region's environmental needs at all levels."

Regardless of the failures of the summit in [Qatar](#) (discussed above), the meeting did facilitate a process starting in 2015, which would bind both wealthy and poor countries together in the mission of forging a new binding treaty that would replace the Kyoto Protocol and tackle the central causes of climate change.

For more information on the threats faced in small island nations by climate change and the measures being undertaken to lobby for international action, please see the Alliance for Small Island States available online at the URL: <http://aosis.org/>

Special Report

COP 21 summit in Paris ends with historic agreement to tackle climate change; rare international consensus formed on environmental crisis facing the planet (2015) --

In mid-December 2015, the highly-anticipated United Nations climate conference of parties (COP) in Paris, [France](#), ended with a historic agreement. In fact, it would very likely be understood as the most significant international agreement signed by all the recognized countries of the world since the Cold War. Accordingly, the Paris Agreement was being distinguished as the first multilateral pact that would compel all countries across the world to cut its carbon emissions -- one of the major causes of increasing greenhouse gas emissions, which contribute to global warming, and its deleterious effects ranging from the dangerous rise in sea level to catastrophic climate change.

The accord, which was dubbed to be the "Paris Agreement," was the work of rigorous diplomacy and fervent environmental advocacy, and it aimed to address the climate change crisis facing the planet. As many as 195 countries were represented in the negotiations that led to the landmark climate deal. Indeed, it was only after weeks of passionate debate that international concurrence was reached in addressing the environmental challenges confronting the world, with particular attention to moving beyond fossil fuels and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The success of the COP 21 summit in Paris and the emergence of the landmark Paris Agreement was, to some extent, attributed to the efforts of France's Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius who presided over the negotiations. The French foreign minister's experience and credentials as a seasoned diplomat and respected statesman paid dividends. He skillfully guided the delegates from almost 200 countries and interest groups along the negotiations process, with ostensibly productive results and a reasonably robust deal to show for it.

On Dec. 12, 2015, French Foreign Minister Fabius officially adopted the agreement, declaring: "I now invite the COP to adopt the decision entitled Paris Agreement outlined in the document."

Looking out to the room I see that the reaction is positive, I see no objections. The Paris agreement is adopted." Once Foreign Minister Fabius' gavel was struck, symbolically inaugurating the Paris Agreement into force, the COP delegate rushed to their feet with loud and bouyant cheers as well as thunderous applause.

In general, the Paris Agreement was being hailed as a victory for enviromental activists and a triumph for international diplomats, while at the same time being understood as simply an initial -- and imperfect -- move in the direction of a sustainable future. China's chief negotiator, Xie Zhenhua, issued this message, saying that while the accord was not ideal, it should "not prevent us from marching historical steps forward."

United States President Barack Obama lauded the deal as both "ambitious" and "historic," and the work of strenuous multilateral negotiations as he declared, "Together, we've shown what's possible when the world stands as one." The [United States](#) leader acknowledged that the accord was not "perfect," but he reminded the critics that it was "the best chance to save the one planet we have. "

Former [United States](#) Vice President Al Gore, one of the world's most well known environmental advocates, issued a lengthy statement on the accomplishments ensconced in the Paris Agreement. He highlighted the fact that the Paris Agreement was a first step towards a future with a reduced carbon footprint on Planet Earth as he said, "The components of this agreement -- including a strong review mechanism to enhance existing commitments and a long-term goal to eliminate global-warming pollution this century -- are essential to unlocking the necessary investments in our future. No agreement is perfect, and this one must be strengthened over time, but groups across every sector of society will now begin to reduce dangerous carbon pollution through the framework of this agreement."

The central provisions of the Paris Agreement included the following items:

- Greenhouse gas emissions should peak as quickly as possible, with a move towards balancing energy sources, and ultimately the decrease of greenhouse gases in the second half of this century
- Global temperature increase would be limited to 1.5 degrees Centigrade above pre-industrial levels and would be held "well below" the two degrees Centigrade threshold
- Progress on these goals would be reviewed every five years beginning in 2020 with new greenhouse gas reduction targets issued every five years
- \$100 billion would be expended each year in climate finance for developing countries to move forward with green technologies, with further climate financing to be advanced in the years beyond

It should be noted that there both legally binding and voluntary elements contained within the Paris Agreement. Specifically, the submission of an emissions reduction target and the regular review of that goal would be legally mandatory for all countries. Stated differently, there would be a system in place by which experts would be able to track the carbon-cutting progress of each

country. At the same time, the specific targets to be set by countries would be determined at the discretion of the countries, and would not be binding. While there was some criticism over this non-binding element, the fact of the matter was that the imposition of emissions targets was believed to be a major factor in the failure of climate change talks in Copenhagen, [Denmark](#), in 2009.

In 2015, the talks faced challenges as several countries, such as [China](#) and [India](#), objected to conditions that would stymie economic and development. In order to avoid that kind of landmine, a system Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) was developed and formed the basis of the accord. As such, the Paris Agreement would, in fact, facilitate economic growth and development, as well as technological progress, but with the goal of long-term ecological sustainability based on low carbon sources. In fact, the agreement heralded as "the beginning of the end of the fossil fuel era." As noted by Nick Mabey, the head of the climate diplomacy organization E3G, said, "Paris means governments will go further and faster to tackle climate change than ever before. The transition to a low carbon economy is now unstoppable, ensuring the end of the fossil fuel age."

A particular sticking point in the agreement was the \$100 billion earmarked for climate financing for developing countries to transition from traditional fossil fuels to green energy technologies and a low carbon future. In 2014, a report by the International Energy Agency indicated that the cost of that transition would actually be around \$44 trillion by the mid-century -- an amount that would render the \$100 billion being promised to be a drop in the proverbial bucket. However, the general expectation was that the Republican-controlled Senate in the [United States](#), which would have to ratify the deal in that country, was not interested in contributing significant funds for the cause of climate change.

A key strength of the Paris Agreement was the ubiquitous application of measures to all countries. Of note was the frequently utilized concept of "flexibility" with regard to the Paris Agreement. Specifically, the varying capacities of the various countries in meeting their obligations would be anticipated and accorded flexibility. This aspect presented something of a departure from the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which drew a sharp distinction between developed and developing countries, and mandated a different set of obligations for those categories of countries. Thus, under Kyoto, [China](#) and [India](#) were not held to the same standards as the [United States](#) and European countries. In the Paris Agreement, there would be commitments from all countries across the globe.

Another notable strength of the Paris Agreement was the fact that the countries of the world were finally able to reach consensus on the vital necessity to limit global temperature increases to 1.5 degrees Centigrade. Ahead of the global consensus on the deal, and as controversy continued to surface over the targeted global temperature limits, the leaders of island countries were sounding the alarm about the melting of the Polar ice caps and the associated rise in seal level. Prime

Minister Enele Sopoaga of [Tuvalu](#) issued this dismal reminder: “Tuvalu’s future ... is already bleak and any further temperature increase will spell the total demise of [Tuvalu](#). No leader in this room carries such a level of worry and responsibility. Just imagine you are in my shoes, what would you do?” It was thus something of a victory for environmental advocates that the countries of the world could find consensus on the lower number -- 1.5 degrees rather than 2 degrees.

A significant weak point with regard to the Paris deal was a "loss and damage" provision, which anticipates that even with all the new undertakings intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move to a low carbon future, there would nonetheless be unavoidable climate change consequences. Those consequences ranged from the loss of arable land for farmers as well as soil erosion and contamination of potable water by sea water, to the decimation of territory in coastal zones and on small islands, due to the rise in sea level, with entire small island countries being rendered entirely uninhabitable. The reality was that peoples' homes across the world would be destroyed along with their way of life.

With that latter catastrophic effect being a clear and present danger for small island countries, the Association of Small Island States (AOSIS) demanded that the developed world acknowledge its responsibility for this irreversible damage.. Despite the fact that greenhouse gas emissions and the ensuing plague of global warming was, indeed, the consequence of development in the West (the [United States](#) and Europe) and the large power house countries, such as [Russia](#), [China](#) and [India](#), there was no appetite by those countries to sign on to unlimited liability. Under the Paris Agreement, there was a call for research on insurance mechanisms that would address loss and damage issues, with recommendations to come in the future.

The call for research was being regarded as an evasion of sorts and constituted the weakest aspect of the Paris Agreement. Not surprisingly, a coalition of small island nations demanded a "Marshall Plan" for the Pacific. Borrowing the term "Marshall Plan" from the post-World War II reconstruction effort, the coalition of Pacific island nation, which included [Kiribati](#), [Tuvalu](#), [Fiji](#), and the [Marshall Islands](#), called for an initiative that would include investment in renewable energy and shoreline protection, cultural preservation, economic assistance for economies in transition, and a plan for migration and resettlement for these countries as they confront the catastrophic effects of the melting of the Polar ice caps and the concomitant rise in sea level. The precise contours of the initiative remained unknown, unspecified, and a mere exercise in theory at the time of writing. Yet such an initiative would, at some point, have to be addressed, given the realities of climate change and the slow motion calamity unfolding each day for low-lying island nations across the world.

As noted by Vice President Greg Stone of Conservation International, who also functions as an adviser to the government of [Kiribati](#), “Imagine living in a place where you know it’s going to go away someday, but you don’t know what day that wave’s going to come over and wash your home away.” He added, “It’s a disaster we know is going to happen.” Meanwhile, the

intervening years promised to be filled with hardship for small island nations, such as [Kiribati](#). Stone explained, “For every inch of sea-level rise, these islands lose 10 feet of their freshwater table to saltwater intrusion,” Stone explained. “So it’s not just about the day the water finally goes over the island; it’s also about the day that there’s just not enough water left and everyone has to move off the island.” Presaging the future for island nations that could face submersion, Stone said, “If you look ahead 50 years, a country like [Kiribati](#) could become the first aqueous nation. possibility of migration. That is, they own this big patch of ocean, and they administer it from elsewhere.”

Foreign Minister Minister Tony Debrum of the [Marshall Islands](#) emerged as the champion advocating on behalf of small island nation states and a loose coalition of concerned countries from the Pacific to the Caribbean, but with support from the [United States](#). He addressed the comprehensive concerns of small island nations regarding the weaknesses of the deal, while simultaneously making clear that the Paris Agreement signified hope for the countries most at risk. In a formal statement, Debrum declared: "We have made history today. Emissions targets are still way off track, but this agreement has the tools to ramp up ambition, and brings a spirit of hope that we can rise to this challenge. I can go back home to my people and say we now have a pathway to survival." Debrum highlighted the imperatives of Pacific island nations, saying, “Our High Ambition Coalition was the lightning rod we needed to lift our sights and expectations for a strong agreement here in Paris. We were joined by countries representing more than half the world. We said loud and clear that a bare-bones, minimalist agreement would not fly. We instead demanded an agreement to mark a turning point in history, and the beginning of our journey to the post-carbon era.”

Debrum of the [Marshall Islands](#) espoused the quintessential synopsis of the accord and its effects for those most likely to be affected by climate change as he noted, “Climate change won’t stop overnight, and my country is not out of the firing line just yet, but today we all feel a little safer.”

Editor's Entry on [Environmental Policy](#):

The low-lying Pacific island nations of the world, including [Kiribati](#), [Tuvalu](#), the [Marshall Islands](#), [Fiji](#), among others, are vulnerable to the threats posed by global warming and climate change, derived from carbon emissions, and resulting in the rise in sea level. Other island nations in the Caribbean, as well as poor countries with coastal zones, were also at particular risk of suffering the deleterious effects of climate change.

Political policy in these countries are often connected to ecological issues, which have over time morphed into an existential crisis of sorts. Indeed, ecological concerns and the climate crisis have also been dominant themes with life and death consequences for the people of island nations in the Pacific. Indeed, the very livelihoods of fishing and subsistence farming remain at risk as a result of ecological and environmental changes. Yet even so, these countries are threatened by increasingly

high storm surges, which could wipe out entire villages and contaminate water supplies. Moreover, because these are low lying island nations, the sustained rise in sea level can potentially lead to the terrain of these countries being uninhabitable at best, and submerged at worst. Stated in plain terms, these countries are at severe risk of being obliterated from the map and their plight illuminates the emerging global challenge of environmental refugees. In these manifold senses, climate change is the existential crisis of the contemporary era.

Since the time of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, there have been efforts aimed at extending the life of that agreement, with an eye on minimizing greenhouse gas emissions, and thus minimizing the effects of climate change. Those endeavors have largely ended in failure, as exemplified by the unsuccessful Copenhagen talks in 2009 and the fruitless Doha talks in 2012 respectively. The success of the COP 21 talks in [France](#), with the adoption of the landmark Paris Agreement in 2015, was regarded as the first glimmer of hope. Not only did the Paris Agreement signify the triumph of international diplomacy and global consensus, but it also marked the start of the end of the fossil fuel era, with the path forward toward a low carbon future reliant on greener technologies. Most crucially, the Paris Agreement stood as the first significant response in recent times to the central challenge of climate change and its quotidian effects on the lives of real human beings across the world.

1. Major International Environmental Accords:

General Environmental Concerns

Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, Espoo, 1991.

Accords Regarding Atmosphere

Annex 16, vol. II (Environmental Protection: Aircraft Engine Emissions) to the 1044 Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, Montreal, 1981

Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP), Geneva, 1979

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), New York, 1992

Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, Vienna, 1985 including the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Depleted the Ozone Layer, Montreal, 1987

Accords Regarding Hazardous Substances

Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movements and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa, Bamako, 1991

Convention on Civil Liability for Damage Caused during Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road, Rail and Inland Navigation Vessels (CRTD), Geneva, 1989

Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), Basel, 1989

Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, Helsinki, 1992

Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region (Waigani Convention), Waigani, 1995

European Agreement Concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), Geneva 1957

FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, Rome, 1985

2. Major International Marine Accords:

Global Conventions

Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (London Convention 1972), London, 1972

International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by Protocol of 1978 relation thereto (MARPOL 73/78), London, 1973 and 1978

International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1969 (1969 CLC), Brussels, 1969, 1976, and 1984

International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage 1971 (1971 Fund Convention), Brussels, 1971

Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea (HNS), London 1996

International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response, and Co-operation (OPRC), London, 1990

International Convention Relation to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties (Intervention Convention), Brussels, 1969

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), Montego Bay, 1982

Regional Conventions

Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft (Oslo Convention), Oslo, 1972

Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution from Land-based Sources (Paris Convention), Paris, 1974

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention), Paris, 1992

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (1974 Helsinki Convention), Helsinki 1974

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (1992 Helsinki Convention), Helsinki 1992

Conventions within the UNEP Regional Seas Programme

Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution, Bucharest, 1992

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, Cartagena de Indias, 1983

Convention for the Protection, Management, and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region, Nairobi, 1985

Kuwait Regional Convention for Co-operation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution, [Kuwait](#), 1978

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and Coastal Region of

the Mediterranean Sea (Barcelona Convention), Barcelona, 1976

Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment, Jeddah, 1982

Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region, Noumea, 1986

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific, Lima, 1981

Convention for Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region, Abidjan, 1981

3. Major Conventions Regarding Living Resources:

Marine Living Resources

Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), Canberra, 1980

International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Rio de Janeiro, 1966

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW), Washington, 1946

Nature Conservation and Terrestrial Living Resources

Antarctic Treaty, Washington, D.C., 1959

Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention), Paris, 1972

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Nairobi, 1992

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Bonn, 1979

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Washington, D.C., 1973

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), Ramsar, 1971

Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), Paris 1994

FAO International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, Rome, 1983

International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994 (ITTA, 1994), Geneva, 1994

Freshwater Resources

Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, Helsinki, 1992

4. Major Conventions Regarding Nuclear Safety:

Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency (Assistance Convention), Vienna, 1986

Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (Notification Convention), Vienna, 1986

Convention on Nuclear Safety, Vienna, 1994

Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, Vienna, 1963

5. Major Intergovernmental Organizations

Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)

European Union (EU): Environment

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

International Labour Organization (ILO)

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC Funds)

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Environment Policy Committee (EPOC)

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

World Bank

World Food Programme (WFP)

World Health Organization (WHO)

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

World Trade Organization (WTO)

6. Major Non-Governmental Organizations

Atmosphere Action Network East Asia (AANEAA)

Climate Action Network (CAN)

Consumers International (CI)

Earth Council

Earthwatch Institute

Environmental Liaison Centre International (ELCI)

European Environmental Bureau (EEB)

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

Friends of the Earth International (FoEI)

Greenpeace International

International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)

International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)

International Solar Energy Society (ISES)

IUCN-The World Conservation Union

Pesticide Action Network (PAN)

Sierra Club

Society for International Development (SID)

Third World Network (TWN)

Water Environment Federation (WEF)

Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

World Federalist Movement (WFM)

World Resources Institute (WRI)

World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF)

7. Other Networking Instruments

Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)

Global Legislators for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE)

Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)

United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS)

Appendices

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources: Key Data

Altapedia. URL: http://www.atlapedia.com/online/country_index.htm

Ethnologue. URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com>

Geobase Global Statistics. URL: <http://www.geoba.se>

Infoplease. URL: <http://www.infoplease.com>

The Statesman's Year Book 2006. Barry Turner, ed. London: St. Martin's Press.

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.htm

United States Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

World Bank. URL: <http://www.worldbank.org/>

World Climate Data Online. URL: <http://www.worldclimate.com>

Methodology Note for Demographic Data:

The demographic numbers for cities and national populations listed in CountryWatch content are derived from the Geoba.se website, which analyzes data from the World Bank. The current demographic numbers displayed on the Countrywatch website are reflective of the latest available estimates.

The demographic information for language, ethnicity and religion listed in CountryWatch content is

derived from a mix of sources including the Altapedia, Central Intelligence Agency Factbook, Infoplease, and State Department Background Notes.

Sources: Political Overview

Agence [France](http://www.afp.com/en/) Presse. URL: <http://www.afp.com/en/>

BBC International News. URL: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Britannica Book of the Year. 1998-present. David Calhoun, ed. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.

Britannica Online URL :<http://www.eb.com>

Britannica Year in Review. URL: <http://www.britannica.com/browse/year>

Chiefs of State and Cabinet Members of Foreign Governments. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/chiefs/index.html>

Christian Science Monitor. URL: <http://www.csmonitor.com/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

CNN International News. URL:<http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Current Leaders of Nations. 1997. Jennifer Mossman, ed. Detroit: Gale Research

The Economist Magazine. (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

The Economist Country Briefings. URL: <http://www.economist.com/countries/>

Eldis Country Profiles. URL: <http://www.eldis.org/country/index.htm>

Elections Around the World. URL: <http://www.electionworld.org/>

Election Resources. URL: <http://electionresources.org/>

Europa World Yearbook 1999. Vols. I & II. 1999. London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Europe World Online. URL: <http://www.europaworld.com/pub/>

Financial Times. URL: <http://www.financialtimes.com>

Foreign Government Resources. URL: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/foreign.html>

[Human Rights](http://www.hrw.org) Watch. URL: <http://www.hrw.org>

IFES Election Guide. URL: <http://www.electionguide.org>

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. URL: <http://www.idea.int/>

International Who's Who 1997-1998, 61st Edition. 1997. London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Leadership Views, Chiefs of State Online. URL : <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/chiefs/index.html>

Library of Congress Country Studies. URL: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html>

New Encyclopedia Britannica. 1998. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

New York Times. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Patterns of Global Terrorism. n.d. [United States](http://www.state.gov) Department of State. Washington D.C.: [United States](http://www.state.gov) Department of State Publications.

Political Handbook of the World. n.d. Arthur S. Banks, Thomas C. Muller, ed. Binghamton, New York: CSA Publications.

Political Reference Almanac Online. URL: <http://www.polisci.com/almanac/nations.htm>

Reuters News. URL: <http://www.reuters.com/>

Rulers. URL: <http://rulers.org/>

The Guardian Online. URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

The Statesman's Year-Book 2006. Barry Turner, ed. London: St. Martin's Press.

United Nations Development Programme. URL: <http://hdr.undp.org>

United Nations Refugee Agency. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org>

[United States](#) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

[United States](#) Department of State, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers (WMEAT) URL : http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/bureau_ac/reports_ac.html

United States Department of State, Country Reports on [Human Rights](#) Practices. URL: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18245.htm>

[United States](#) Department of State, Background Notes. URL : http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html

Virtual Library: International Relations Resources. URL: <http://www.etown.edu/vl/countgen.html>

World Bank: Governance Indicators. URL: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance>

-- See also list of News Wires services below, which are also used for research purposes. --

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original Country Reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Sources: [Economic Overview](#)

BP Statistical Review of World Energy. URL: <http://www.bp.com/genericsection.do?categoryId=92&contentId=7005893>

BP Statistical Review of World Energy, June 1998. 1998 to present. Page 1.C. London: The British Petroleum Company.

International Monetary Fund, Direction of Trade Statistics Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics. 1998 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics Yearbook. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook, May 1999. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Labour Office, World Employment Report, 1998-99. 1998 to present. Geneva: International Labour Office.

United Nations Statistical Division Online. URL: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/default.htm>

United Nations Statistics Division, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (MBS On Line), November 1999 Edition. 1999 to present. New York: United Nations.

United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 43rd Issue. 1999. 1999 to present New York: United Nations.

United Nations, Food & Agricultural Organization, FAOSTAT Database. URL : <http://apps.fao.org/>
United Nations, Comtrade Data Base, <http://comtrade.un.org/>

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs.
URL:<http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Database

United States Geological Service, Mineral Information

United States Department of State, Country Commercial Guides. Washington, D.C. [United States of America](http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html). URL:http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html

The World Bank, Global Development Finance, Country Tables. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

The World Bank Group, World Development Indicators. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Yearbook of Tourism Statistics, World Tourism Organization. 1998 to present. Madrid: The World Tourism Organization.

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Methodology Notes for Economic Data:

Estimates by CountryWatch.com of GDP in dollars in most countries are made by converting local currency GDP data from the International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook to US dollars by market exchange rates estimated from the International Monetary Fund International Financial Statistics and projected out by the CountryWatch Macroeconomic Forecast. Real GDP was estimated by deflating current dollar values by the US GDP Implicit Price Deflator.

Exceptions to this method were used for:

- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Nauru
- Cuba
- Palau
- Holy See
- San Marino
- Korea, North
- [Serbia](#) & Montenegro
- Liberia
- Somalia
- Liechtenstein
- Tonga
- Monaco
- Tuvalu

In these cases, other data and/or estimates by CountryWatch.com were utilized.

Investment Overview

C o r r u p t i o n a n d T r a n s p a r e n c y I n d e x . U R L :
<http://www.transparency.org/documents/cpi/2001/cpi2001.html#cpi>
<<http://www.transparency.org/documents/>

Deloitte Tax Guides. URL: <http://www.deloittetaxguides.com>

Trade Policy Reviews by the World Trade Organization . URL: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tpr_e/tp_rep_e.htm#bycountry

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html

United States Department of State, Country Commercial Guides. 1996-2006. Washington, D.C. U n i t e d S t a t e s o f A m e r i c a . U R L : http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html

World Bank: Doing Business. URL: <http://www.doingbusiness.org>

World Bank: Governance Indicators. URL: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance>

Social Overview

Borden, G.A., Conaway, W.A., Morrison, T. 1994. *Kiss, Bow, or Shake Hands: How to do Business in Sixty Countries*. Holbrook, Massachusetts, 1994.

Center for Disease Control. URL: <http://www.cdc.gov>

Eldis Country Profiles. URL: <http://www.eldis.org/country/index.htm>

Ethnologue. URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>

Government of Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. URL: <http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo>

Government of Canada Foreign Affairs and International Trade. URL: http://www.voyage.gc.ca/consular_home-e.htm

Library of Congress Country Studies. URL: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html>

Lonely Planet. URL: <http://www.lonelyplanet.com/worldguide/>

Steve Kropla's Online Help For World Travelers. URL: <http://www.kropla.com/>

[United Kingdom](http://www.fco.gov.uk/) Ministry of Foreign and Commonwealth Office. URL: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/>

United Nations Human Development Report. URL: <http://www.undp.org/hdro>

UNICEF Statistical Database Online. URL: <http://www.unicef.org/statis/atoz.html>

[United States](http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. 2001. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html

United States Department of State, Commercial and Business Affairs: Travel Tips. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/cba_travel.html

United States Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs. URL: <http://travel.state.gov/>

World Health Organization. URL: <http://www.who.int/home-page/>

World News Connection, National Technical Information Service. Springfield, Virginia, USA.

Internet News Service, Xinhua News Agency (U.S.) Inc. Woodside, New York. URL: <http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/>

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Methodology Notes for the HDI:

Since 1990, the United Nations Development Programme, in concert with organizations across the globe, has produced the [Human Development Index](#) (or HDI). According to the UNDP, the index measures average achievement in basic human development in one simple composite index, and produces from this index a ranking of countries. The HDI is a composite of three basic components of human development: longevity, knowledge and standard of living. Longevity is measured by life expectancy. Knowledge is measured by combination of adult literacy and mean

years of schooling. Standard of living is measured by purchasing power, based on real GDP per capita (in constant US\$) adjusted for differences in international living costs (or, purchasing power parity, PPP). While the index uses these social indicators to measure national performance with regard to human welfare and development, not all countries provide the same level of information for each component needed to compute the index; therefore, as in any composite indicator, the final index is predicated on projections, predictions and weighting schemes. The index is a static measure, and thus, an incomplete measure of human welfare. In fact, the UNDP says itself the concept of human development focuses on the ends rather than the means of development and progress, examining in this manner, the average condition of all people in a given country.

Specifically, the index is calculated by determining the maximum and minimum for each of the three components (as listed above) and then measuring where each country stands in relation to these scales-expressed as a value between 0 and 1. For example, the minimum adult literary rate is zero percent, the maximum is 100 percent, and the reading skills component of knowledge in the HDI for a country where the literacy rate is 75 percent would be 0.75. The scores of all indicators are then averaged into the overall index.

For a more extensive examination of human development, as well as the ranking tables for each participating country, please visit: <http://www.undp.org>

Note on [History](#) sections

In some CountryWatch Country Reviews, open source content from the State Department Background Notes and Country Guides have been used.

Environmental Overview

Environmental Profiles: A Global Guide to Projects and People. 1993. Linda Sobel Katz, Sarah Orrick, and Robert Honig. New York: Garland Publishing.

The Environment Encyclopedia and Directory, 2nd Edition. 1998. London: Europa.

Environmental Protection Agency Global Warming Site. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming>

Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations: Forestry. URL: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/sofo/en/>

Global Warming Information Page. URL: <http://globalwarming.org>

Introduction to Global [Environmental Issues](#), 2nd Edition. 1997. Kevin Pickering and Lewis Owen.

London: Routledge.

Trends: Compendium of Data on Global Change. URL: http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/trends/emis/em_cont.htm

United Nations Environmental Program. URL: http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO_Products/Assessment_Reports/

United Nations Global Environmental Outlook. URL: <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/>

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

World Climate Data Online. URL: <http://www.worldclimate.com>

World Directory of Country Environmental Studies. 1996. The World Resource Institute.

World Factbook. US Central Intelligence Agency. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group.

1998-1999 World Resources Guide to the Global Environment by the World Resources Institute. May, 1998.

1998/1999 Yearbook of International Cooperation on Environment and Development. 1998. London: Earthscan Publications.

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Other Sources:

General information has also been used in the compilation of this review, with the courtesy of governmental agencies from this country.

News Services:

CANA Daily Bulletin. Caribbean Media Agency Ltd., St. Michael, [Barbados](#).

Central and Eastern Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for Central and Eastern Africa.

Daily News, Panafrican News Agency. Dakar, [Senegal](#).

PACNEWS, Pacific Islands Broadcasting Association. Suva, [Fiji](#).

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. Washington D.C. USA.

Reuters News. Thomson Reuters. New York, New York. USA.

Southern Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for Southern Africa.

Voice of America, English Service. Washington D.C.

West Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for West Africa. 1998-1999

Note: Some or all these news services have been used to research various sections of this Country Review.

USING COUNTRYWATCH.COM AS AN ELECTRONIC SOURCE:

MLA STYLE OF CITATION

Commentary

For items in a "Works Cited" list, CountryWatch.com suggests that users follow recommended patterns for indentation given in the *MLA Handbook*, 4th edition.

Individual Works

Basic form, using an Internet protocol:

Author/editor. *Title of Print Version of Work*. Edition statement (if given). Publication information (Place of publication: publisher, date), if given. *Title of Electronic Work*. Medium. Available Protocol (if applicable):Site/Path/File. Access date.

Examples:

Youngblood-Coleman, Denise. *Country Review: France*. 2003. Houston, Texas: CountryWatch Publications, 2003. *Country Review:France*. Online. Available URL : http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_country.asp?vCOUNTRY=61 October, 12, 2003.

Note:

This is the citation format used when the print version is not used in the reference.

Parts of Works

Basic form, using an Internet protocol:

Author/editor. "Part title." *Title of Print Version of Work*. Edition statement (if given). Publication information (Place of publication: publisher, date), if given. *Title of Electronic Work*. Medium. AvailableProtocol (if applicable): Site/Path/File. Access date.

Examples:

Youngblood-Coleman, Denise. "People." *CountryWatch.com: France*. 2003. Houston, Texas: CountryWatch Publications, 2003. *CountryWatch.com: France*. Online. Available URL : http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_topic.asp?vCOUNTRY=61&SECTION=SOCIAL&TOPIC=CLPEO&TYPE=TEXT. October 12, 2003.

Note:

This is the citation format used when the print version is not used in the reference.

For further source citation information, please email: editor@countrywatch.com or education@countrywatch.com.