
[resourcesecurityinstitute.org](http://resourcesecurityinstitute.org)
[www.laender-analysen.de](http://www.laender-analysen.de)
[www.css.ethz.ch/cad](http://www.css.ethz.ch/cad)
[www.crrccenters.org](http://www.crrccenters.org)

## POLITICAL COUNTRY RANKINGS

*Special Editor: Heiko Pleines*

■ A Brief Introduction to Political Country Rankings By Heiko Pleines, Bremen	2
■ DOCUMENTATION	
Political System-Related Country Rankings	4
Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI)	6
Freedom House: Freedom in the World	8
Freedom House: Freedom of the Press	9
Freedom House: Nations in Transit	11
Index of Democracy	16
Press Freedom Index	17
Corruption Perceptions Index	19
Worldwide Governance Indicators	20
■ DOCUMENTATION	
5.5 Years of Prison for EPDE Board Member Anar Mammadli	27
■ CHRONICLE	

German Association for  
East European Studies

Institute for European, Russian,  
and Eurasian Studies  
The George Washington  
University

Research Centre  
for East European Studies  
University of Bremen

Center  
for Security Studies  
ETH Zurich

Caucasus Research  
Resource Centers

The Caucasus Analytical Digest  
is supported by:

**ASCN**  
PROGRAMME  
ACADEMIC SWISS CAUCASUS NET

AN INITIATIVE OF GEBERT RUF STIFTUNG IN COOPERATION  
WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG

## A Brief Introduction to Political Country Rankings

By Heiko Pleines, Bremen

### The Nature of the Rankings

Since Freedom House began assessing the extent of freedom in the countries of the world in 1972, the idea of handing out “report card”-style audits to entire societies has won increasing numbers of supporters. In the last decade, several organizations launched new projects which systematically and comparatively assess the political state of affairs. As a result, the areas under investigation are being increasingly differentiated and the ranking systems are becoming increasingly complex.

Whereas the first Freedom House project, *Freedom in the World*, only differentiated political and civil rights, the organization’s *Nations in Transit* series, begun in 1995, now encompasses seven topic areas ranging from “democracy and governance,” “electoral process,” “independent media,” “civil society,” and “corruption” to “judicial framework and independence.” The Bertelsmann Transformation Index, which was introduced in 2003, evaluates nearly 40 indicators. The Global Integrity Report, which was first issued in the same year, tracks almost 300 indicators, but due to this in-depth level of investigation, only covers a smaller number of countries. In addition, there are several rankings that consciously focus only on certain aspects of a political system, such as freedom of the media or corruption.

The increasing number of indicators has also complicated the evaluation process. Whereas the first Freedom House ranking simply offers scores from 1 through 7 and groups all countries of the world into just three categories (free, partly free and unfree), the newer indices are based on composite values which allow for a more differentiated ranking of all countries in the world.

All political country rankings primarily refer to the ideals of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, and assess the extent to which individual countries meet these ideals. Perfect democracies with rule of law thus receive the highest marks, while dictatorships are generally at the bottom of the tables. Some rankings, however, also take into account the rulers’ management qualities or socio-economic indicators and criteria related to economic policy.

Most of the rankings are based on expert assessments. As a rule, one or two experts write up a country study, which is subsequently reviewed and, if necessary, corrected by other experts. The experts are generally well acquainted with the country in question in their capacities as academics or journalists. Alternatively, some indices such as the Corruption Perception Index published by Transparency International evaluate broader expert surveys. As a reaction to the increasing number of indices, the World Bank has created a meta-index. Worldwide Governance Indicators summarize the results of a total of 31 indices under the heading of a new index.

### Valid Data?

While many academics use country rankings in order to compare democratization processes internationally and to identify causal factors in successful transformations, others view such rankings as public-relations stunts or even as misleading.

The limits of their explanatory power can be seen when comparing several indices that purport to measure the same variables. Since 2002, the freedom of the press has been assessed by as many as three independent rankings, namely Freedom of the Press Rating (Reporters without Borders), *Nations in Transit—Media*, and the Press Freedom Index (both from Freedom House). The significant discrepancies in the development of the individual indices for many countries illustrate the limitations of quantifying the freedom of the press.

Overall, there are three major points of criticism concerning political country rankings. The first problem is that they rely on the subjective appraisals of experts. These experts derive their opinions from journalistic publications and from their own personal assessments as academics, journalists, and business professionals; as a rule, they have no access to other non-public sources. At the same time, the experts, who generally only scrutinize one country, are limited in their ability to draw comparisons between different countries. Therefore, there is no guarantee that two experts assessing different countries that are on the same level of development will award the same ranking to their respective countries. Because of changing experts and revisions of underlying criteria and indicators most rankings are also not comparable over time for the same country. Diego Giannone demonstrates this point exemplarily in an analysis of changes in the questionnaire of the Freedom House ranking.

The World Bank also tones down the applicability of its Worldwide Governance Indicators in the fine print. The section on “frequently asked questions” states that changes in country rankings over time may be caused by four dif-

ferent factors. Three of these are related to changes in surveying methods and are not connected to the development of the country in question. In conclusion, it is stated that two of these factors “typically only have very small effects on changes.”

The second problem of country rankings is the index construction. Often far-reaching assessments are drawn from a relatively low number of specific indicators. Moreover, the selection and weighting of the individual indicators necessarily has a subjective dimension and can influence the final index value considerably. That means the rankings do not simply state facts. They in fact claim that some aspects of political systems are more important than others and they try to have an impact on public debates through publication of their rankings. Again the study by Diego Gianone presents related criticism in a concise way.

A third problem of country rankings is the focus on precise scores and ranks, which suggest an accurateness which is simply not given. Often insignificant differences in the scores of individual dimensions of the rankings can move countries up or down several places. Bjørn Høyland et.al. have studied the uncertainty inherent in the estimation of scores. In this respect they praise the approach by Freedom House: “The classification of countries into groups based on the index score is in our view a better strategy than providing complete country rankings based on the same index score. While complete country rankings are very uncertain, the allocation of countries into groups is a much less uncertain endeavour, provided that one is willing to accept a limited number of groups.”

## Conclusion

In summary the validity of country rankings is limited and results need to be assessed critically. This is why, for example, the World Bank declares: “We recognize there are limitations to what can be achieved with this kind of cross-country, highly-aggregated data. Therefore, this type of data cannot substitute for in-depth, country-specific governance diagnostics as a basis for policy advice to improve governance in a particular country, but should rather be viewed as a complementing tool.” This is probably also why most organizations supply extensive country studies together with their country rankings. These, however, generally tend to be disregarded by the media and the general public.

A major problem of country rankings is thus that shorthand representations in the news media overstretch the explanatory power of such indices. This is particularly true of the Corruption Perceptions Index, published by Transparency International, which is regularly described in the mass media as a ranking of the world’s most corrupt countries, with development trends being indicated by comparison with the previous year. In its notes on the index, Transparency International denounces both of these uses as inadmissible. The index only measures perceptions, not actual corruption. Studies have demonstrated that this is a significant distinction. Direct comparisons with the values for the previous year are not admissible because of variations in sources used, moving averages over several years, and other methodological problems.

## Documentation

The following documentation offers an overview of the major political country rankings and their evaluation of the three countries of the South Caucasus. Each ranking is briefly introduced based on information provided online by the institution responsible for the ranking. For each ranking the position of the three South Caucasian countries is then indicated in tables and graphs. To allow for a comparison, the values of some further countries have been included.

### *About the author*

Dr Heiko Pleines is head of the department of politics and economics at the Research Centre for East European Studies (University of Bremen). He has been working as an independent country expert for the Bertelsmann Transformation Index, Global Integrity and Transparency International.

### *Further reading*

- Staffan Andersson, Paul M. Heywood: The politics of perception: use and abuse of Transparency International’s approach to measuring corruption, in: *Political Studies*, 57(4), 2009, 746–767.
- Carmen R. Apaza: Measuring governance and corruption through the worldwide governance indicators. Critiques, responses, and ongoing scholarly discussion, in: *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 42(1), 2009, 139–143.

*Continued overleaf*

- Matthijs Bogaards: Where to draw the line? From degree to dichotomy in measures of democracy, in: *Democratization* 19(4), 2012, 690–712.
- Diego Giannone: Political and ideological aspects in the measurement of democracy. The Freedom House case, in: *Democratization*, 17(1), 2010, 68–97.
- Bjørn Høyland, Karl Moene, Frederik Willumsen: The tyranny of international index rankings, in: *Journal of Development Economics* 97, 2012, 1–14.
- Stephen Knack: Measuring corruption in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. A critique of the cross-country indicators. Washington, DC: World Bank 2006 (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3968).
- Gerardo L. Munck: Measuring Democracy. Framing a needed debate, in: *Comparative Democratization (APSA)*, 9(1), 2011, 1–7.
- Carl J. Bon Tempo: From the Center-Right: Freedom House and Human Rights in the 1970s and 1980s, in: Akira Iriye, Petra Goedde and William I. Hitchcock (eds.): *The Human Rights Revolution. An International History*, Oxford University Press 2011.
- Jan Teorell: Over time, across space. Reflections on the production and usage of democracy and governance data, in: *Comparative Democratization (APSA)*, 9(1), 2011, 7–11.

## DOCUMENTATION

### Political System-Related Country Rankings

Current editor: Anastasia Stoll

Coordination: Heiko Pleines

Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI)	6
Freedom House: Freedom in the World	8
Freedom House: Freedom of the Press	9
Freedom House: Nations in Transit	11
Index of Democracy	16
Press Freedom Index	17
Corruption Perceptions Index	19
Worldwide Governance Indicators	20

### List of Figures

1: BTI Status Index 2014. Index Values and Rank	6
2: BTI Management Index 2014. Index Values and Rank	7
3: Freedom in the World: Political Rights 2014. Index Values	8
4: Freedom in the World: Civil Liberties 2014. Index Values	9
5: Freedom of the Press 2014	10
6: Freedom of the Press 1994–2013	10
7: Nations in Transit: National Democratic Governance 2013	11
8: Nations in Transit: Electoral Process in 2013	12
9: Nations in Transit: Civil Society in 2013	12

10: Nations in Transit: Independent Media 2013	13
11: Nations in Transit: Local Self-Government 2013	14
12: Nations in Transit: Judicial Framework and Independence 2013	14
13: Nations in Transit: Corruption 2013	15
14: Index of Democracy 2012. Overall Score, Rank, and Type of Regime	16
15: Index of Democracy, 2006–2012. Overall Score	17
16: Press Freedom Index 2014. Index Values and Rank	18
17: Press Freedom Index 2002–2014. Rank	18
18: Corruption Perceptions Index 2013: Scores and Ranking	19
19: Corruption Perceptions Index 1999–2013: Scores	19
20: Worldwide Governance Indicators 2012	20
21: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Voice and Accountability 1996–2012	21
22: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Political Stability/Absence of Violence 1996–2012	22
23: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Government Effectiveness 1996–2012	23
24: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Regulatory Quality 1996–2012	24
25: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Rule of Law 1996–2012	25
26: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Control of Corruption 1996–2012	26

### List of Tables

1: BTI Status Index 2003–2014. Index Values and Rank	7
2: BTI Management Index 2003–2014. Index Values and Rank	7
3: Freedom in the World: Political Rights 2002–2014. Index Values	8
4: Freedom in the World: Civil Liberties 2002–2014. Index Values	9
5: Nations in Transit: National Democratic Governance 2004–2013	11
6: Nations in Transit: Electoral Process in 1999–2013	12
7: Nations in Transit: Civil Society in 1999–2013	13
8: Nations in Transit: Independent Media 1999–2013	13
9: Nations in Transit: Local Self-Government 2004–2013	14
10: Nations in Transit: Constitutional State / Judicial Framework and Independence 1999–2013	15
11: Nations in Transit: Corruption 1999–2013	15
12: Worldwide Governance Indicators 2012	20

## Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI)

Prepared by: Bertelsmann Foundation (Gütersloh, Germany)

Since: 2003

Frequency: Every two years

Covered countries: 129

URL: <[www.bti-project.de/bti-home/](http://www.bti-project.de/bti-home/)>

Update: 22 April 2014

### Brief Description:

The Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI) is a global ranking that analyzes and evaluates development and transformation processes in transition and developing countries with more than 2 million inhabitants. The BTI analyzes the status of democratization and market liberalization as it evaluates actor's performance in managing these changes. The quantitative data is outlined in two parallel indices: the Status Index and the Management Index. On the basis of a codebook experts evaluate how well countries achieve 17 criteria.

The Status Index shows the development achieved by states on their way toward democracy and a market economy. States with functioning democratic and market-based structures receive the highest score. The Status Index's overall result represents the mean value of the scores for the dimensions "Political Transformation" and "Economic Transformation". The mean value is calculated using the exact, unrounded values for both these dimensions, which, in turn, derive from the ratings for the five political criteria (Stateness; Political Participation, Rule of Law, Stability of Democratic Institutions, Political and Social Integration) and the seven economic criteria (Level of Socioeconomic Development, Organization of the Market and Competition, Currency and Price Stability, Private Property, Welfare Regime, Economic Performance, Sustainability).

The Management Index evaluates management by political decision-makers while taking into consideration the level of difficulty. The Management Index's overall result is calculated by multiplying the intermediate result with a factor derived from the level of difficulty evaluation. The intermediate result is obtained by calculating the mean value of the ratings for the following criteria: Steering Capability, Resource Efficiency, Consensus-Building and International Cooperation. The level of difficulty evaluation takes into account the structural constraints on political management. It is obtained by calculating six indicators that evaluate a country's structural conditions, traditions of civil society, intensity of conflicts, level of education, economic performance and institutional capacity.

Figure 1: BTI Status Index 2014. Index Values and Rank




Table 1: BTI Status Index 2003–2014. Index Values and Rank

	2003 Index values (rank)	2006 Index values (rank)	2008 Index values (rank)	2010 Index values (rank)	2012 Index values (rank)	2014 Index values (rank)
Poland	9.4 (7)	8.90 (9)	8.76 (11)	8.86 (10)	9.05 (6)	9.16 (5)
Georgia	4.1 (79)	5.73 (61)	6.60 (38)	6.03 (52)	5.88 (58)	6.16 (48)
Armenia	5.7 (46)	6.26 (44)	6.41 (41)	5.75 (62)	5.59 (66)	5.71 (62)
Russia	6.0 (41)	6.14 (47)	5.94 (59)	5.70 (65)	5.73 (60)	5.24 (77)
Kazakhstan	5.1 (61)	5.48 (66.)	5.53 (68.)	5.24 (76.)	5.13 (79.)	5.05 (83.)
China	4.2 (77.)	4.42 (85.)	4.70 (85.)	4.79 (88.)	4.94 (84.)	5.01 (84.)
Azerbaijan	4.4 (72)	4.51 (82)	4.51 (87)	4.85 (86)	4.85 (85)	4.71 (88)

Figure 2: BTI Management Index 2014. Index Values and Rank




Table 2: BTI Management Index 2003–2014. Index Values and Rank

	2003 Index values (rank)	2006 Index values (rank)	2008 Index values (rank)	2010 Index values (rank)	2012 Index values (rank)	2014 Index values (rank)
Poland	6.6 (14)	6.36 (23)	5.27 (53)	6.52 (19)	6.79 (13)	7.21 (6)
Georgia	2.3 (95)	5.91 (35)	6.36 (23)	5.68 (42)	5.38 (53)	5.78 (41)
China	4.4 (55)	4.48 (70)	4.92 (67)	5.00 (64)	5.04 (64)	4.94 (66)
Armenia	5.1 (39)	5.08 (56)	5.14 (56)	4.36 (85)	4.70 (74)	4.84 (69)
Kazakhstan	3.3 (76)	4.13 (82)	4.69 (76)	4.70 (72)	4.69 (75)	4.67 (75)
Azerbaijan	3.2 (79)	3.50 (95)	3.83 (99)	4.05 (95)	4.00 (98)	3.95 (100)
Russia	5.5 (31)	3.84 (87)	3.84 (98)	3.41 (107)	3.96 (99)	3.90 (104)





Figure 4: Freedom in the World: Civil Liberties 2014. Index Values




Table 4: Freedom in the World: Civil Liberties 2002–2014. Index Values

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Poland	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Georgia	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
Armenia	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Kazakhstan	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Azerbaijan	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6
Russia	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
China	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

### *Freedom House: Freedom of the Press*

Prepared by: Freedom House (Washington, USA)

Established: 1980

Frequency: Annual

The data refer to the respective previous year.

Covered countries: at present 197

URL: <<http://freedomhouse.org/report>>

Update: 13 May 2014

#### **Brief Description:**

Countries are given a total score from 0 (best) to 100 (worst) on the basis of a set of 23 methodology questions divided into three subcategories. The degree to which each country permits the free flow of news and information determines the classification of its media as “Free,” “Partly Free,” or “Not Free.” Countries scoring 0 to 30 are regarded as having “Free” media; 31 to 60, “Partly Free” media; and 61 to 100, “Not Free” media.

Figure 5: Freedom of the Press 2014





Figure 6: Freedom of the Press 1994–2013



## Freedom House: Nations in Transit

Prepared by: Freedom House (Washington, USA)

Established: 1997

Frequency: Annual

The data refer to the respective previous year.

Covered countries: at present 29

URL: <<http://freedomhouse.org/report>>

Update: 23.04.2014

### Brief Description:

*Nations in Transit* measures progress and setbacks in democratization in countries and territories from Central Europe to the Eurasian region of the Former Soviet Union. The rating covers seven categories: electoral process; civil society; independent media; national democratic governance; local democratic governance; judicial framework and independence; and corruption. The ratings are based on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 representing the highest and 7 the lowest level of democratic progress.

Figure 7: Nations in Transit: National Democratic Governance 2013




Table 5: Nations in Transit: National Democratic Governance 2004–2013

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	4.75	5.00	5.00	5.25	5.25	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75
Azerbaijan	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.75	6.75
Georgia	5.75	5.50	5.50	5.00	5.75	6.00	6.00	5.75	5.75	5.50
Kazakhstan	6.25	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
Poland	2.00	2.50	2.75	3.25	3.50	3.25	3.25	2.75	2.50	2.50
Russia	5.25	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50

Figure 8: Nations in Transit: Electoral Process in 2013




Table 6: Nations in Transit: Electoral Process in 1999–2013

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	5.25	5.25	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75
Azerbaijan	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.75	6.75	7.00	7.00	7.00
Georgia	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	5.25	5.25	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.75	5.25	5.25	5.00	5.00	4.75
Kazakhstan	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
Poland	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.50	1.50	1.75	1.75	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.75	1.50	1.25	1.25
Russia	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.50	6.00	6.25	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75

NB: For 2000 no values were established. Therefore a moving average was built.

Figure 9: Nations in Transit: Civil Society in 2013




Table 7: Nations in Transit: Civil Society in 1999–2013

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75
Azerbaijan	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00	5.25	5.25	5.50	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.25
Georgia	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75
Kazakhstan	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.25
Poland	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.50	1.25	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Russia	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00	5.25	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.50	5.25	5.50

NB: For 2000 no values were established. Therefore a moving average was built.

Figure 10: Nations in Transit: Independent Media 2013




Table 8: Nations in Transit: Independent Media 1999–2013

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	5.00	5.25	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.75
Azerbaijan	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.50	5.50	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
Georgia	3.75	3.75	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.45	4.25
Kazakhstan	5.50	-	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.50	6.75	6.75	6.75	6.75
Poland	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.75	1.75	1.50	1.75	2.25	2.25	2.00	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.50
Russia	4.75	5.25	5.25	5.50	5.50	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25

NB: For 2000 no values were established. Therefore a moving average was built.

Figure 11: Nations in Transit: Local Self-Government 2013





Table 9: Nations in Transit: Local Self-Government 2004–2013

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	4.75	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.75
Azerbaijan	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50
Georgia	5.75	6.00	5.75	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50
Kazakhstan	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50
Poland	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.25	2.25	2.00	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75
Russia	5.25	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.00

Figure 12: Nations in Transit: Judicial Framework and Independence 2013




**Table 10: Nations in Transit: Constitutional State / Judicial Framework and Independence 1999–2013**

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.25	5.00	5.00	5.25	5.50	5.50	5.5	5.50	5.50
Azerbaijan	5.50	5.50	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.50	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50
Georgia	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	5.00	5.00	5.00
Kazakhstan	5.50	5.50	5.75	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50
Poland	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	2.00	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.25	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50
Russia	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.75	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.50	5.50	5.75	6.00	6.00

NB: For 2000 no values were established. Therefore a moving average was built.

**Figure 13: Nations in Transit: Corruption 2013**



**Table 11: Nations in Transit: Corruption 1999–2013**

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Armenia	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.75	5.50	5.50	5.5	5.25	5.25
Azerbaijan	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.26	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.75
Georgia	5.00	5.00	5.25	5.50	5.75	6.00	5.75	4.75	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.50
Kazakhstan	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
Poland	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.00	2.75	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25
Russia	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.00	5.75	5.75	5.75	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50

NB: For 2000 no values were established. Therefore a moving average was built.

## *Index of Democracy*

Prepared by: Economist Intelligence Unit

Established: 2007

Frequency: Annual, between 2010 and 2012; 2006 and 2008 also available

The data refer to the corresponding year of evaluation and are published one year later.

Covered countries: at present 165 states and 2 territories

URL: <<http://www.eiu.com/landing/special-reports>>

Update: 23 April 2014

### **Brief Description:**

The index provides a snapshot of the state of democracy worldwide for 165 independent states and two territories. The Economist Intelligence Unit's index of democracy, on a 0 to 10 scale, is based on the ratings for 60 indicators grouped in five categories: electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture. Each category has a rating on a 0 to 10 scale, and the overall index of democracy is the simple average of the five category indexes. Countries are placed within one of four types of regimes: full democracies; flawed democracies; hybrid regimes; and authoritarian regimes.

**Figure 14: Index of Democracy 2012. Overall Score, Rank, and Type of Regime**







Figure 15: Index of Democracy, 2006–2012. Overall Score



## Press Freedom Index

Prepared by: Reporters without Borders (Paris, France)

Established: 2002

Frequency: Annual

September to September in the year of publication

Covered countries: at present 180

URL: <<http://www.rsf.org>>

Update: 9 April 2013

### Brief Description:

The index measures the state of press freedom in the world. It reflects the degree of freedom journalists and news organizations enjoy in each country, and the efforts made by the state to respect and ensure respect for this freedom. Each one has a ranking and a score which together sum up the state of press freedom there. Reporters Without Borders compiled a questionnaire with 50 criteria for assessing the state of press freedom in each country. It includes every kind of violation directly affecting journalists (such as murders, imprisonment, physical attacks and threats) and news media (censorship, confiscation of issues, searches and harassment). The questionnaire was sent to partner organizations (18 freedom of expression groups in five continents) and 150 correspondents around the world, as well as to journalists, researchers, jurists and human rights activists. A scale devised by the organization was then used to give a country-score to each questionnaire.

In order to have a bigger spread in the scores and increase the differentiation between countries, the 2012 questionnaire had more answers assigning negative points. Although the point system has produced a broader distribution of scores than in 2010, each country's evolution over the years can still be plotted by comparing its position in the index rather than its score. The ranking reflects the situation during a specific period. This year's index takes account of events between 1 December 2010 and 30 November 2011. It does not look at human rights violations in general, just press freedom violations.

In 2013, there has been a major change in compiling the index, including the use of a new questionnaire. Quantitative data (e.g. number of journalists injured) is collected as well as qualitative (e.g. government interference in editorial content). Questions will be answered with the help of six criteria (Pluralism, Media Independence, Environment and Self-Censorship, Legislative Framework, Transparency and Infrastructure). Using weighted responses, countries are given a score of between 0 and 100 for each of the six overall criteria. Each country's final score is the result of these calculated scores. To increase comparability every country is assigned a rank and a score (0 best value and 100 worst value). A comparison of countries before and after 2013 is only possible through a comparison of ranks. Accordingly, the comparison over time is based on the ranks of countries and not on index values.

Figure 16: Press Freedom Index 2014. Index Values and Rank





Figure 17: Press Freedom Index 2002–2014. Rank



## Corruption Perceptions Index

Prepared by: Transparency International  
 Established: 1995  
 Frequency: Annual  
 Covered countries: at present 177  
 URL: <<http://www.transparency.org>>  
 Update: 24 April 2014

### Brief Description:

The Corruption Perceptions Index is a composite index that draws on multiple expert opinion surveys that poll perceptions of public sector corruption in countries around the world. It scores countries on a scale from zero to ten, with zero indicating high levels of perceived corruption and ten indicating low levels of perceived corruption. Since 2012 countries are scored from 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean). To ensure comparability the previous data (2011 including) were subsequently multiplied by the factor 10.

Figure 18: Corruption Perceptions Index 2013: Scores and Ranking





Figure 19: Corruption Perceptions Index 1999–2013: Scores



## Worldwide Governance Indicators

Prepared by: World Bank

Established: 1996

Frequency: Annual, between 1996 and 2002 every two years.

The data refer to the corresponding year of evaluation and are published one year later.

Covered countries: at present 215

URL: <<http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>>

Update: 24 April 2014

### Brief Description:

This index measures six dimensions of governance. The indicators are based on several hundred individual variables measuring perceptions of governance, drawn from 31 separate data sources constructed by 25 different organizations. The relevant index value shows the average of all relevant sources according to their reliability. Virtually all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5, with higher scores corresponding to better outcomes.

A number of revisions to the underlying source data have been made since 2011. The deletions from and revisions to the data from previous years on average have only minimal effects on the 1996–2009 data. For 2000–2009 the correlation between the original and the revised aggregate indicators is 0.997 (averaging across the six aggregate indicators and nine time periods). The effects of the data revisions are slightly larger in 1996 and 1998 as there are fewer data sources in this time period—so that changes to the underlying sources are more likely to result in changes in the aggregate indicators.

Table 12: Worldwide Governance Indicators 2012

	Voice and Accountability	Political Stability/Absence of Violence	Government Effectiveness	Regulatory Quality	Rule of Law	Control of Corruption
Armenia	-0.57	+0.11	-0.04	+0.33	-0.40	-0.53
China	-1.58	-0.54	+0.01	-0.26	-0.49	-0.48
Georgia	-0.02	-0.67	+0.57	+0.68	-0.03	+0.25
Kazakhstan	-1.15	-0.37	-0.44	-0.39	-0.66	-0.88
Poland	+1.06	+1.03	+0.66	+0.96	+0.74	+0.59
Russia	-0.96	-0.82	-0.43	-0.36	-0.82	-1.01
Azerbaijan	-1.26	-0.69	-0.78	-0.47	-0.81	-1.07

Figure 20: Worldwide Governance Indicators 2012




Figure 21: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Voice and Accountability 1996–2012




Figure 22: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Political Stability/Absence of Violence 1996–2012




Figure 23: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Government Effectiveness 1996–2012




Figure 24: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Regulatory Quality 1996–2012






Figure 25: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Rule of Law 1996–2012





Figure 26: Worldwide Governance Indicators: Control of Corruption 1996–2012



## 5.5 Years of Prison for EPDE Board Member Anar Mammadli



Baku, 26th May 2014

Today, the Baku Court of Grave Crimes sentenced Anar Mammadli, chairman of EMDS (Election Monitoring and Democracy Studies Centre) and EPDE board member to 5.5 years of imprisonment. His deputy Bashir Suleymanli was sentenced to 3,5 years and arrested in the courtroom. The head of the Public Association for International Cooperation of Volunteers Elnur Mammadov was given the same term with 2 years on probation.

They were found guilty under Articles 179.3.2 (appropriation in significant size), 192.2.2 (illegal entrepreneurship by an organized group), 213.1 (tax evasion), 308.2 (abuse of official authority with grave consequences) and 313 (service forgery) of the Criminal Code.

EPDE and its member organization EMDS consider the sentence groundless and unjust, and demand the remission of the sentence and immediate release of convicted in unfair trial Anar Mammadli, Bashir Suleymanli and Elnur Mammadov.

This trial is a reaction to EMDS' critical assessment of the Presidential elections in October 2013, an attempt to destroy independent and critical citizens' election observation in Azerbaijan and a proof of political discrimination that dominates the judicial system of Azerbaijan.

The Republic of Azerbaijan has just taken the chairmanship of the council of ministers of the Council of Europe. We appeal to all member states of the Council of Europe to protest this unacceptable violation of the European Convention of Human Rights.

A criminal case was opened at the end of October 2013. Anar Mammadli was in pre-trial detention since 16 December 2013, and the other two were under house arrest. Amnesty International Organization considers Anar Mammadli to be a prisoner of conscience. A criminal case was opened at the end of October 2013 and the other two were under house arrest.

More information here: <<http://www.contact.az/docs/2014/Politics/052600079631ru.htm#U4OONOE2Bo>>  
Source: <<http://www.epde.org/en/newsreader/items/id-55-years-of-prison-for-epde-board-member-anar-mammadli.html>>

*Editors' note: Anar Mammadli was the author of "EU–Azerbaijan Relations: Enhancing Human Rights and Democracy within Eastern Partnership Initiatives" in Caucasus Analytical Digest 35–36, 15 February 2012 <<http://www.laender-analysen.de/cad/pdf/CaucasusAnalyticalDigest35-36.pdf>>*

## CHRONICLE

## 16 April–18 June 2014

16 April 2014	Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Grigory Karasin declares the sixth round of talks on the normalization of Georgian–Russian ties “constructive” after meeting with the Georgian prime minister’s envoy for relations with Russia Zurab Abashidze in Prague and discussing economic and tourism relations
21 April 2014	The Azerbaijani Prosecutor-General’s Office charges journalist Rauf Mirqadirov with high treason for having allegedly worked with Armenia’s security services and provided them with information on Azerbaijan’s state secrets
22 April 2014	Iranian President Hassan Rouhani meets with newly appointed Georgian ambassador to Tehran Ioseb Chakhvashvili and stresses the importance of developing a railway project to link Iran with Georgia via Azerbaijan
24 April 2014	French foreign minister Laurent Fabius and German foreign minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier meet with the Georgian leadership in Tbilisi ahead of Georgia’s signing of an Association Agreement with the European Union
25 April 2014	Head of the Georgian Orthodox Church Patriarch Ilia II says that Georgia should enter European structures as “it is necessary for us”
27 April 2014	Azerbaijani authorities detain prominent human rights activist Leyla Yunus, and her husband, Arif Yunus, at Baku airport as they prepare to travel to Doha
1 May 2014	NATO Secretary General’s Special Representative for the Caucasus and Central Asia James Appathurai says during a visit to Georgia that the country “continues to improve” on its path toward NATO and the Alliance is considering next steps to bring it “even closer”
6 May 2014	The presidents of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey gather in Tbilisi for a trilateral summit to discuss cooperation in energy, trade, transportation and economic sectors
7 May 2014	An antidiscrimination law comes into force in Georgia that is opposed by the head of the Georgian Orthodox Church Patriarch Ilia II as it includes “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” on the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination
9 May 2014	Armenian President Serzh Sarkisian visits the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh to mark Victory Day
12 May 2014	French President Francois Hollande urges the EU during a visit to Yerevan to accept a “specific model for Armenia” that would allow the country to enter into an Association Agreement with the EU while joining a Russian-led Customs Union
13 May 2014	French President Francois Hollande ends a South Caucasus tour in Tbilisi aimed at developing EU–South Caucasus relations and addressing security threats in connection with the Ukrainian crisis
22 May 2014	Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Lukashevich says that it is Georgia’s sovereign right to sign an Association Agreement with the European Union, but it should consider the possible consequences pointing at Georgian exports to Russia
26 May 2014	The foreign ministers of Azerbaijan, Turkey and Turkmenistan discuss bilateral and trilateral ties in Baku and sign the Baku declaration for cooperation between the three Turkic-speaking countries in the spheres of energy, transportation, culture, tourism and education
26 May 2014	The head of an election watchdog in Azerbaijan Anar Mammadli is sentenced to five and a half years in detention for tax evasion and illegal business activities
27 May 2014	A Tbilisi court acquits former Georgian Defense Minister Davit Kezerashvili on charges of money-laundering and illegal property sales
29 May 2014	The Georgian Parliament passes a package of legislative amendments with its first reading that increases oversight mechanisms over government surveillance agencies, but does not envisage restricting the security agencies’ capabilities to access directly telecommunications service providers’ networks
30 May 2014	Georgian Prime Minister Irakli Garibashvili says that the Georgian police is “completely depoliticized” during a ceremony to mark the Georgian Police Day in the Black Sea town of Batumi
1 June 2014	Abkhaz de-facto President Aleksandr Ankvab announces that he is stepping down in order to maintain stability in Abkhazia following demonstrations demanding the government’s resignation
2 June 2014	German Chancellor Angela Merkel meets with Georgian Prime Minister Irakli Garibashvili in Berlin and hails Tbilisi for pursuing European integration as well as trying to normalize relations with Russia, while saying that she does not think that a Membership Action Plan (MAP) for Georgia will be on the agenda of the NATO summit in Wales in September
3 June 2014	OSCE’s chairman in office and Swiss Foreign Minister Didier Burkhalter arrives in Yerevan at the end of a South Caucasus tour to discuss Armenia–EU ties and the situation in the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh

5 June 2014	Georgian peacekeepers head to the Central African Republic to join a European Union peacekeeping mission
7 June 2014	U.S. Vice President Joe Biden meets with Georgian President Giorgi Margvelashvili on the sidelines of the inauguration ceremony of new Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko in Kiev
9 June 2014	Georgian Deputy Foreign Minister Davit Jalagania meets with the Turkish ambassador to Georgia to convey protest over the visit of a group of Turkish MPs to the breakaway region of Abkhazia
11 June 2014	Georgian Prime Minister Irakli Garibashvili says that comparing Crimea with the two breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia is a “big mistake” as Russia is “not interested in annexing” the two regions
12 June 2014	European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso arrives in Tbilisi and “underlines the EU support” for Georgia which is ahead of signing an Association Agreement with the Union
12 June 2014	German diplomat Herbert Salber is nominated as the new EU’s special envoy to the South Caucasus
13 June 2014	Several civil society organizations in Georgia ask the EU in an open letter to European Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy Štefan Füle to extend the mission of its special adviser for legal reforms and human rights in Georgia, Thomas Hammarberg
14 June 2014	European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso says during a visit to Baku that the EU and Azerbaijan are stepping up efforts to implement the Southern gas corridor that aims at transporting gas from Azerbaijan via Turkey, Greece, Albania, Italy and Bulgaria onto other European countries
15 June 2014	Local elections are held in Georgia with early polls showing a possible runoff in several cities between Georgian Dream and United National Movement candidates
18 June 2014	Armenian President Serzh Sargsyan holds talks with the Georgian leadership during a visit to Tbilisi and discusses the consequences of Armenia preparing to enter a Russian-led Customs Union and Georgia signing an Association Agreement with the European Union
18 June 2014	Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov visits Azerbaijan and holds talks with his Azerbaijani counterpart Elmar Mammadyarov on bilateral relations, developments in the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh and the crisis in Ukraine
18 June 2014	The twenty-eighth round of Geneva talks is disrupted as representatives from the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia walk out as they demand removing issues related to displaced persons and refugees from the agenda
18 June 2014	The breakaway region of South Ossetia announces its recognition of the “Luhansk People’s Republic” in eastern Ukraine as a sovereign, independent country

*Compiled by Lili Di Pippo*

*For the full chronicle since 2009 see <[www.laender-analysen.de/cad](http://www.laender-analysen.de/cad)>*

## ABOUT THE CAUCASUS ANALYTICAL DIGEST

Editors: Denis Dafflon, Lili Di Puppo, Iris Kempe, Natia Mestvirishvili, Matthias Neumann, Robert Orttung, Jeronim Perović, Heiko Pleines

The Caucasus Analytical Digest (CAD) is a monthly internet publication jointly produced by the Caucasus Research Resource Centers (<<http://www.crrccenters.org/>>), the Research Centre for East European Studies at the University of Bremen (<[www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de](http://www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de/)>), the Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies of the George Washington University (<[www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu](http://www.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu)>), the Resource Security Institute in Washington, DC (<[resourcesecurityinstitute.org/](http://resourcesecurityinstitute.org/)>), the Center for Security Studies (CSS) at ETH Zurich (<[www.css.ethz.ch](http://www.css.ethz.ch/)>), and the German Association for East European Studies (DGO). The Caucasus Analytical Digest analyzes the political, economic, and social situation in the three South Caucasus states of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia within the context of international and security dimensions of this region's development. CAD is supported by a grant from ASCN (<[www.ascn.ch](http://www.ascn.ch/)>).

To subscribe or unsubscribe to the Caucasus Analytical Digest, please visit our web page at <[www.css.ethz.ch/cad](http://www.css.ethz.ch/cad)>

An online archive with indices (topics, countries, authors) is available at <[www.laender-analysen.de/cad](http://www.laender-analysen.de/cad)>

### Center for Security Studies (CSS) at ETH Zurich

The Center for Security Studies (CSS) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich) is a Swiss academic center of competence that specializes in research, teaching, and information services in the fields of international and Swiss security studies. The CSS also acts as a consultant to various political bodies and the general public.

### Research Centre for East European Studies at the University of Bremen

Founded in 1982, the Research Centre for East European Studies (Forschungsstelle Osteuropa) at the University of Bremen is dedicated to the interdisciplinary analysis of socialist and post-socialist developments in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

### The Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies, The Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University

The Institute for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies is home to a Master's program in European and Eurasian Studies, faculty members from political science, history, economics, sociology, anthropology, language and literature, and other fields, visiting scholars from around the world, research associates, graduate student fellows, and a rich assortment of brown bag lunches, seminars, public lectures, and conferences.

### Resource Security Institute

The Resource Security Institute (RSI) is a non-profit organization devoted to improving understanding about global energy security, particularly as it relates to Eurasia. We do this through collaborating on the publication of electronic newsletters, articles, books and public presentations.

### Caucasus Research Resource Centers

The Caucasus Research Resource Centers program (CRRC) is a network of research centers in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. We strengthen social science research and public policy analysis in the South Caucasus. A partnership between the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Eurasia Partnership Foundation, and local universities, the CRRC network integrates research, training and scholarly collaboration in the region.

### ASCN

ASCN (<[www.ascn.ch](http://www.ascn.ch/)>) is a programme aimed at promoting the social sciences and humanities in the South Caucasus (primarily Georgia and Armenia). Its different activities foster the emergence of a new generation of talented scholars. Promising junior researchers receive support through research projects, capacity-building trainings and scholarships. The programme emphasizes the advancement of individuals who, thanks to their ASCN experience, become better integrated in international academic networks. The ASCN programme is coordinated and operated by the Interfaculty Institute for Central and Eastern Europe (IICEE) at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland). It is initiated and supported by Gebert RUF Stiftung <<http://www.grstiftung.ch/en.html>>.

The Caucasus Analytical Digest is supported by:



Any opinions expressed in the Caucasus Analytical Digest are exclusively those of the authors.

Reprint possible with permission by the editors.

Editors: Denis Dafflon, Lili Di Puppo, Iris Kempe, Natia Mestvirishvili, Matthias Neumann, Robert Orttung, Jeronim Perović, Heiko Pleines  
Layout: Cengiz Kibaroglu, Matthias Neumann, and Michael Clemens

ISSN 1867 9323 © 2014 by Forschungsstelle Osteuropa, Bremen and Center for Security Studies, Zürich  
Research Centre for East European Studies • Publications Department • Klagenfurter Str. 3 • 28359 Bremen • Germany  
Phone: +49 421-218-69600 • Telefax: +49 421-218-69607 • e-mail: [fsopr@uni-bremen.de](mailto:fsopr@uni-bremen.de) • Internet: [www.laender-analysen.de/cad/](http://www.laender-analysen.de/cad/)