

**TABLE 1: STATE FRAGILITY INDEX AND MATRIX 2015**

Monty G. Marshall and Gabrielle Elzinga-Marshall

Center for Systemic Peace

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Central African Rep.	24	12	12	■	■	War	■	■	SF	■	■		■	■	Afr
Dem. Rep. of Congo	23	13	10	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Afr
South Sudan	22	11	11	■	■	War	■	■	SF	■	■	5	■	■	Afr
Sudan (North)	22	11	11	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Mus
Afghanistan	21	11	10	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Mus
Burundi	21	12	9	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Afr
Yemen	21	10	11	■	■	War	■	■	SF	■	■		■	■	Mus
Somalia	20	10	10	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Mus
Chad	19	10	9	■	■	X	■	■	aut	■	■	3	■	■	Mus
Ethiopia	19	9	10	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Afr
Guinea	18	10	8	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Mus
Iraq	18	8	10	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■	25	■	■	Mus
Myanmar	18	8	10	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	
Niger	18	10	8	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Mus
Nigeria	18	9	9	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■	4	■	■	Afr
Côte d'Ivoire	17	9	8	■	■	X	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Mus
Guinea-Bissau	17	10	7	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Uganda	17	10	7	■	■	*	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Afr
Zimbabwe	17	9	8	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Afr
Angola	16	7	9	■	■	*	■	■	aut	■	■	25	■	■	Afr
Burkina Faso	16	9	7	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Cameroon	16	8	8	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Afr
Mali	16	8	8	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Mus
Mauritania	16	8	8	■	■		■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Mus

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Pakistan	16	8	8	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Mus
Rwanda	16	8	8	■	■	*	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Afr
Syria	16	9	7	■	■	War	■	■	SF	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Eritrea	15	9	6	■	■	*	■	■	AUT	■	■		■	■	Afr
Gambia	15	9	6	■	■		■	■	aut	■	■	X	■	■	Mus
Haiti	15	9	6	■	■	*	■	■	SF	■	■		■	■	
Liberia	15	9	6	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Malawi	14	8	6	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Sierra Leone	14	7	7	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Congo-Brazzaville	13	6	7	■	■	*	■	■	aut	■	■	19	■	■	Afr
Djibouti	13	7	6	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Libya	13	5	8	■	■	War	■	■	SF	■	■	24	■	■	Mus
Togo	13	7	6	■	■		■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Afr
Algeria	12	4	8	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■	12	■	■	Mus
Bangladesh	12	7	5	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Mus
Comoros	12	7	5	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Mus
Egypt	12	6	6	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Mus
Equatorial Guinea	12	4	8	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	79	■	■	Afr
India	12	8	4	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Kyrgyzstan	12	7	5	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Laos	12	6	6	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■		■	■	
Nepal	12	9	3	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Philippines	12	8	4	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Tajikistan	12	6	6	■	■	*	■	■	aut	■	■		■	■	Mus
Uzbekistan	12	5	7	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■		■	■	Mus
Zambia	12	5	7	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Cambodia	11	7	4	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	
Ghana	11	6	5	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Madagascar	11	8	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Mozambique	11	6	5	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Afr
Papua New Guinea	11	6	5	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■	1	■	■	
Sri Lanka	11	6	5	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Tanzania	11	7	4	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Afr
Venezuela	11	4	7	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■	23	■	■	
Azerbaijan	10	3	7	■	■	*	■	■	AUT	■	■	28	■	■	Mus
Benin	10	6	4	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Afr
Bolivia	10	4	6	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Colombia	10	3	7	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■	5	■	■	
Gabon	10	3	7	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■	45	■	■	Afr
Kenya	10	6	4	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Senegal	10	5	5	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Mus
Bahrain	9	3	6	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	4	■	■	Mus
Guyana	9	3	6	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Iran	9	2	7	■	■	*	■	■	AUT	■	■	7	■	■	Mus
Kazakhstan	9	3	6	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	30	■	■	Mus
Lesotho	9	7	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Afr
Paraguay	9	4	5	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Russia	9	4	5	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■	18	■	■	
Solomon Islands	9	6	3	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Swaziland	9	5	4	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	++	■	■	Afr
Turkey	9	4	5	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Turkmenistan	9	3	6	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	10	■	■	Mus
Ukraine	9	4	5	■	■	War	■	■	dem	■	■	+	■	■	
Ecuador	8	3	5	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■	7	■	■	
Moldova	8	4	4	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Nicaragua	8	4	4	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Saudi Arabia	8	0	8	■	■	*	■	■	AUT	■	■	102	■	■	Mus
South Africa	8	3	5	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Afr
Bhutan	7	4	3	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	
Guatemala	7	3	4	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Honduras	7	4	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Indonesia	7	4	3	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Israel	7	2	5	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Kosovo	7	3	4	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Mongolia	7	2	5	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
North Korea	7	2	5	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■		■	■	
Timor Leste	7	5	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	24	■	■	
Vietnam	7	5	2	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■		■	■	
Armenia	6	2	4	■	■	*	■	■	dem	■	■	+	■	■	
China	6	2	4	■	■	War	■	■	AUT	■	■	+	■	■	
Fiji	6	4	2	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■	+	■	■	
Georgia	6	3	3	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Jordan	6	3	3	■	■		■	■	aut	■	■	++	■	■	Mus
Morocco	6	4	2	■	■		■	■	aut	■	■	+	■	■	Mus
Peru	6	1	5	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Suriname	6	1	5	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■	+	■	■	
Brazil	5	1	4	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Cape Verde	5	3	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Afr
Cuba	5	1	4	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	+	■	■	
Lebanon	5	1	4	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	Mus
Malaysia	5	1	4	■	■		■	■	dem	■	■		■	■	Mus
Mexico	5	2	3	■	■	War	■	■	DEM	■	■	2	■	■	
Namibia	5	2	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Afr
Oman	5	2	3	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	64	■	■	Mus

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Thailand	5	3	2	■	■	War	■	■	aut	■	■	+	■	■	
Bosnia	4	2	2	■	■	*	■	■	—	■	■	+	■	■	
Dominican Republic	4	1	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
El Salvador	4	2	2	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Romania	4	1	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Serbia	4	2	2	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Trinidad and Tobago	4	0	4	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	20	■	■	
Tunisia	4	2	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Mus
United Arab Emirates	4	1	3	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	103	■	■	Mus
Belarus	3	2	1	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	++	■	■	
Botswana	3	2	1	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	Afr
Cyprus	3	0	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Jamaica	3	1	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Kuwait	3	0	3	■	■	*	■	■	AUT	■	■	201	■	■	Mus
Montenegro	3	3	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Panama	3	0	3	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Qatar	3	0	3	■	■		■	■	AUT	■	■	286	■	■	Mus
United States	3	2	1	■	■	X	■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Albania	2	1	1	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	Mus
Argentina	2	1	1	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■		■	■	
Australia	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Belgium	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Bulgaria	2	1	1	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Chile	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Croatia	2	0	2	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Greece	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Macedonia	2	1	1	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
New Zealand	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Norway	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	118	■	■	
Singapore	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	aut	■	■	X	■	■	
Uruguay	2	0	2	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Costa Rica	1	1	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Lithuania	1	1	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Mauritius	1	1	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Slovak Republic	1	0	1	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
South Korea	1	1	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Switzerland	1	0	1	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Austria	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Canada	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	20	■	■	
Czech Republic	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Denmark	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	1	■	■	
Estonia	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Finland	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
France	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Germany	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Hungary	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Ireland	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Italy	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Japan	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Latvia	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Luxembourg	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Netherlands	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Poland	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	
Portugal	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Slovenia	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	
Spain	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	++	■	■	

	Fragility Index	Effectiveness Score	Legitimacy Score	Security Effectiveness	Security Legitimacy	Armed Conflict Indicator	Political Effectiveness	Political Legitimacy	Regime Type	Economic Effectiveness	Economic Legitimacy	Net Oil Production or Consumption	Social Effectiveness	Social Legitimacy	Regional Effects
Sweden	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
Taiwan	0	0	0	■	■		■	■	DEM	■	■	X	■	■	
United Kingdom	0	0	0	■	■	*	■	■	DEM	■	■	+	■	■	

#### TECHNICAL NOTES TO THE STATE FRAGILITY INDEX AND MATRIX 2015:

The State Fragility Index and Matrix 2015 lists all independent countries in the world in which the total country population is greater than 500,000 in 2015 (167 countries). The Fragility Matrix scores each country on both Effectiveness and Legitimacy in four performance dimensions: Security, Political, Economic, and Social, at the end of the year 2015. Each of the Matrix indicators is rated on a four-point fragility scale: 0 “no fragility,” 1 “low fragility,” 2 “medium fragility,” and 3 “high fragility” with the exception of the Economic Effectiveness indicator, which is rated on a five-point fragility scale (including 4 “extreme fragility”). The State Fragility Index, then, combines scores on the eight indicators and ranges from 0 “no fragility” to 25 “extreme fragility.” A country’s fragility is closely associated with its *state capacity* to manage conflict; make and implement public policy; and deliver essential services and its *systemic resilience* in maintaining system coherence, cohesion, and quality of life; responding effectively to challenges and crises; and sustaining progressive development.

#### Fragility Indices

*State Fragility Index* = Effectiveness Score + Legitimacy Score (25 points possible)

*Effectiveness Score* = Security Effectiveness + Political Effectiveness + Economic Effectiveness + Social Effectiveness (13 points possible)

*Legitimacy Score* = Security Legitimacy + Political Legitimacy + Economic Legitimacy + Social Legitimacy (12 points possible)

**General Notes:** The State Fragility Index and Matrix was originally introduced in “Global Report on Conflict, Governance, and State Fragility 2007.” In order to standardize procedures for scoring each of the eight component indicators to make the indicators and indices comparable across time, we set threshold values for the categorical fragility scores based on cut-points derived from values in a baseline year (2004). This methodology effects continuous measures used for Economic Effectiveness (GDP per capita in constant 2005 US dollars); Economic Legitimacy (manufacturing exports as a percent of merchandise exports); Social Effectiveness (human development indicator; HDI); and Social Legitimacy (infant mortality rate); baseline specifications are provided in the relevant indicator explanations that follow. Social Effectiveness scores were revised slightly due to a change in the formulation of the Human Development Index by the UNDP *Human Development Report* in 2010. The Economic Effectiveness indicator was rescaled in 2009 and a fifth value was added to denote “extreme fragility” in countries that have a GDP per capita of \$500 or less (constant 2005 US\$). As the World Bank regularly revises historical, country-level GDP and periodically adjusts “constant” GDP figures to a new base year, we recode the entire time series of the Economic Effectiveness indicator annually using the most recent GDP figures provided by the World Bank; this may result in some changes to historical indicators and indices in the time-series data set. In addition, a fourth indicator was added in 2008 to the calculation of the Political Legitimacy Score (scores for all previous years have been recalculated; state fragility scores have been calculated for all countries annually beginning with 1995). As several of the Matrix indicators use “most recent year available” data, the Matrix scores are carried forward and adjusted when new data becomes available; see details below.

## Security Indicators

*Security Effectiveness ("seceff") Score:* Total Residual War, a measure of general security and vulnerability to political violence, 1991-2015 (25 years). Source: Monty G. Marshall, Major Episodes of Political Violence, 1946-2015, ([www.systemicpeace.org](http://www.systemicpeace.org)), variable name "actotal." The formula to calculate this score is based on two assumptions: (1) the residual effects of low level and/or short wars diminish relatively quickly; and (2) the residual effects of serious or protracted wars diminish gradually over a 25-year period. Three indicators are used to calculate each country's "residual war" score (*reswartot*): *warsum1-4* (sum of annual scores for all wars in which the country is directly involved for each continuous period of armed conflict); *yrnowar1-3* (interim years of "no war" between periods of armed conflict); and *yrpeace* (years of peace, or no war, since the end of most recent war period). For states with one war episode:  $reswartot = warsum - [yrpeace + (0.04yrpeace \times warsum)]$ . For countries with multiple periods of war, a *reswar* value is calculated for each, in chronological order. Thus, for a state with two episodes of war, to calculate the first episode:  $reswar1 = warsum1 - [yrnowar1 + (0.04yrnowar1 \times warsum1)]$ ; and for the second episode:  $reswartot = (reswar1 + warsum2) - \{yrpeace + [.04yrpeace \times (reswar1 + warsum2)]\}$ ; and so on. Any negative residual war (*reswar*) scores are converted to zero before calculating additional residual war scores. The final *reswartot* value is then converted to a four-point fragility scale, where: 0 = 0; 1 = 0.1-15; 2 = 15.1-100; and 3 = greater than 100.

*Security Legitimacy ("secleg") Score:* State Repression, a measure of state repression, 2001-2014. Source: Mark Gibney, Linda Cornett, and Reed Wood, Political Terror Scale (PTS; [www.politicalterror.org](http://www.politicalterror.org)). The PTS provides separate annual indicators drawn from U.S. State Department and Amnesty International reports; each indicator is coded on a five-point scale, from 1: "no repression" to 5: "systemic, collective repression." To determine the state repression score, we calculate the following: (1) nine-year average, 2001-2009; (2) four-year average, 2010-2013; and (3) most recent value, 2014; the three, mean indicators are then compared according to a fragility categorization: 0 = 1.0-2.0; 1 = 2.1-3.0; 2 = 3.1-4.0; and 3 = greater than 4.0. If the most recent year value agrees with the previous four-year average, then these two means are used to identify the repression category. When the most recent year score is not in agreement with the previous period, then the earlier nine-year mean is used to help determine a more general pattern in state repression. Historical treatments, that is, calculations of Security Legitimacy Scores for previous years, are further aided by reference to patterns in "future" PTS values. The exact year of change in the general practice of state repression and, so, the Security Legitimacy Score can be more confidently identified in the historical treatment.

**Referent Indicator:** The *Armed Conflict Indicator* provides a general indicator of the country's most recent experience with major armed conflict, including wars of independence, communal wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, and inter-state wars. Referent indicators are not used in the calculation of state fragility scores. Source: Major Episodes of Political Violence, 1946-2015, Center for Systemic Peace. A dark shaded "**War**" entry indicates a country is actively involved in a major armed conflict(s) in mid-2016; a medium shaded "**X**" indicates that the country has emerged from major armed conflict(s) in the past five years (since early 2011); and a light shaded "\*" indicates that the country has been directly involved in one or more major armed conflicts sometime during the previous twenty year period (1991-2010) but has not experienced a major armed conflict since, that is, for at least the past five years.

## Political Indicators

*Political Effectiveness ("poleff") Score:* Regime/Governance Stability, 2000-2015. Sources: Monty G. Marshall, Keith Jagers, and Ted Robert Gurr, Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2015; Henry S. Bienen and Nicolas van de Walle, Leadership Duration (updated by Monty G. Marshall); and Monty G. Marshall and Donna Ramsey Marshall, Coups d'Etat, 1946-2015, datasets ([www.systemicpeace.org](http://www.systemicpeace.org)). Three indicators are used to calculate the Regime/Governance Stability score: Regime Durability (Polity V, 2015); Current Leader's Years in Office (Leadership Duration, 2015); and Total Number of Coup Events 2000-2015, including successful, attempted, plotted, alleged coups and forced resignations or assassinations of chief executives, but not including coup events associated with Polity adverse regime changes (these major regime changes cause the "durability" score to be reset to "0" and, so, would be double-counted, see above). These indicators are scored such that: Durability < 10 years = 1; Leader Years in Office > 12 years = 1; and Total Coup Events: 1-2 = 1 and >2 = 2. These indicators are then added to produce the Regime/Governance Stability score (scores of 4 are recoded as 3). Note: Countries coded in the Polity IV dataset as an "interregnum" (i.e., total or near total collapse of central authority, -77) for the current year are scored 3 on the Political Effectiveness indicator.

*Political Legitimacy ("polleg") Score:* Regime/Governance Inclusion, 2015. Sources: Polity IV, 2015; Ted Robert Gurr, Monty G. Marshall, and Victor Asal, Minorities at Risk Discrimination 2015 (updated by Monty G. Marshall); and Ted Robert Gurr and Barbara Harff, Elite Leadership Characteristics 2015 (updated by Monty G. Marshall). In the 2007 report, four indicators were used to determine the Regime/Governance Inclusion score: Factionalism (Polity V, *parcomp* value 3 = 1); Ethnic Group Political Discrimination against 5% or more of the population (Discrimination: *POLDIS* values 2, 3, 4 = 1); Political Salience of Elite Ethnicity (Elite Leadership Characteristics: *ELETH* values 1 or 2 = 1); and Polity Fragmentation (Polity V, *fragment* value greater than 0 = 1). To these indicators, we have added Exclusionary Ideology of Ruling Elite (Elite Leadership Characteristics: *ELITI* value 1 =



1). Political Legitimacy Score is calculated by adding these five indicators; scores of 4 or 5 (rare) are recoded as 3. Note: Countries coded in the Polity V dataset as an “interregnum” (i.e., total or near total collapse of central authority, -77) for the current year are scored 3 on the Political Effectiveness indicator.

**Referent Indicator:** The *Regime Type* column provides a general indicator of the country’s regime type on 31 December 2015 based on the “polity” score recorded in the Polity V data series. An upper case “**AUT**” indicates the country is governed by an institutionalized autocratic regime (POLITY -6 to -10); a lower case “**aut**” indicates that the country is governed by an uninstitutionalized, or “weak,” autocratic regime (POLITY -5 to 0). An upper case “**DEM**” indicates an institutionalized democracy (POLITY 6 to 10) and a lower case “**dem**” indicates an uninstitutionalized, or “weak,” democratic regime (POLITY 1 to 5). Countries listed with a “**SF**” (state failure) are experiencing a “collapse of central authority” such that the regime has lost control of more than half of its territory through some combination of human and natural factors, usually due to serious armed challenges, poor performance, and diminished administrative capacity (Central African Republic, Haiti, Libya, South Sudan, Syria, Yemen); those denoted with dash “-” indicates that the central government is propped up by the presence of foreign forces and authorities that provide crucial security support for the local regime and, without which, central authority would be susceptible to collapse (Bosnia). Countries with transitional governments at the end of 2015 (Myanmar) are classified as either weak democracies (dem) or weak autocracies (aut) according to the transitional regime’s authority characteristics. As the Polity V indicator of “polar factionalism” has proven to be a very potent indicator of political instability, regimes that are denoted as factional (i.e., PARCOMP=3) are shaded; in addition, transitional (POLITY score -88), failed (POLITY score -77), and occupied (POLITY score -66) are also considered unstable and, so, are shaded for emphasis on this referent indicator.

### Economic Indicators

*Economic Effectiveness (“ecoeff”) Score:* Gross Domestic Product per Capita (constant 2005 US\$), 2009-2015. Source: World Bank, World Development Indicators, 2015 ([www.worldbank.org/data](http://www.worldbank.org/data)). The annual values for the past seven years are reviewed to verify that the value in the most recent year is consistent with values in previous years and that a threshold/category change in a country’s GDP per capita indicator score is part of a consistent trend and not simply a short-term aberration from that trend. The value for the most recent year (2015) is coded into a five-point fragility scale, based on cut-points derived from the threshold values for the fit of the State Fragility Index and GDP per capita in a baseline year (2005). The standardized categories are as follows: 4 = less than \$500.00; 3 = \$500.00 to \$1199.99; 2 = \$1200.00 to \$2999.99; 1 = \$3000.00 to \$7499.99; and 0 = greater than or equal to \$7500. When a country’s 2015 value exceeds the borderline value separating categories, the fifteen-year income growth indicator is used to assign the final score: selecting the higher fragility category if long-term growth is negative or the lower fragility category if long-term growth is positive. **Note:** These cutpoint values and the baseline year are consistent with the 2014 SFI, but differ from earlier versions of the Global Report due to revisions made by the World Bank in contemporary and historical data with the 2014 version of the data series. 2015 data has been published by the World Bank using 2010 as a baseline year; the real GDP data has been adjusted to 2005 US\$ for comparability with earlier iterations of the SFI. An update to 2010 US\$ is forthcoming.

*Economic Legitimacy (“ecoleg”) Score:* Share of Export Trade in Manufactured Goods, 2001-2015. Source: UN Development Programme, Structure of Trade, 2015, and World Bank, World Development Indicators (WDI), 2015, (manufacturing as a percentage of merchandise exports). Merchandise exports include two classes of products: manufactured goods and primary commodities; low percentage of manufactured goods indicates a high reliance on primary commodities for foreign exchange. The annual values of this variable are examined to ensure that the most recent annual value is a representative value within the established range for that country. The manufacturing percentage of merchandise exports is then converted to a four-point fragility score, where: 3 = less than or equal to 10; 2 = greater than 10 and less than or equal to 25; 1 = greater than 25 and less than or equal to 40; and 0 = greater than 40. The world’s main illicit drug producing/supplying countries: Afghanistan, Burma (Myanmar), and Columbia are given the highest value (3) on this indicator.

**Referent Indicator:** The *Net Oil Production or Consumption* indicator provides information on a country’s 2015 petroleum energy profile expressed in net “barrels per capita” as reported by the US Energy Information Administration ([www.eia.doe.gov](http://www.eia.doe.gov)). The indicator value is calculated by subtracting the country’s reported total daily consumption figure from its total daily production figure (in thousands of barrels), multiplying the result by 365 (to get an annual figure), and dividing by the country’s total population (in thousands). A dark-shaded numerical value (e.g., Qatar’s **261**) indicates a net petroleum producer expressed in barrels per capita. A single plus sign “+” indicates a minor net petroleum consuming country (1-5); a double plus sign “++” indicates a moderate net petroleum consuming country (5-10 barrels per capita) and an “**X**” indicates a major net consuming country (greater than 10 barrels per capita). Blank cells indicate country’s with low petroleum profiles (less than one barrel per capita producer or consumer). Disaggregated data for North and South Sudan were not available (na). Taken together, these countries are a minor net producer (1.2 barrels per capita).

## Social Indicators

*Social Effectiveness ("soceff") Score:* Human Capital Development, 2015. Source: UNDP *Human Development Report 2015*, Human Development Index (HDI), 2015 ([www.undp.org](http://www.undp.org)). Reported HDI values are converted according to a four-point fragility scale based on the cut-points of the lower three HDI quintiles in the baseline year, 2004. The Social Effectiveness Score is assigned as follows: 3 = less than or equal to .400; 2 = greater than .400 and less than or equal to .600; 1 = greater than .600 and less than or equal to .700; and 0 = greater than .700. **Note:** These cutpoints differ from those reported in the 2007-2009 editions of *Global Report*. This is due to a change in the formulation of the Human Development Index reported in the UNDP *Human Development Report* beginning in 2010. The new UNDP report provides scores for earlier years and orders countries similarly across the two (old and new) formulations of the HDI; thus the two indices could be combined to provide consistent coverage annually for the entire period, 1995-2015.

*Social Legitimacy ("socleg") Score:* Human Capital Care, 2015. Source: US Census Bureau, International Data Base, 2015, (IDB; [www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb](http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb)), Infant Mortality Rate, 2015. This indicator is based on the infant mortality rate (number of deaths of infants under one year of age from a cohort of 1,000 live births), with values converted to a four-point fragility scale based on the upper cut-points of the lower three quintiles of the infant mortality rates in the baseline year, 2004. The Social Legitimacy Score is assigned as follows: 3 = greater than 75.00; 2 = less than or equal to 75.00 and greater than 45.00; 1 = less than or equal to 45.00 and greater than 20.00; and 0 = less than or equal to 20.00. These scores are then adjusted according to ranking comparisons between the country's income level (GDP per capita) and human capital development (HDI). If the country's HDI ranking among the 167 countries listed is more than twenty-five places above its GDP per capita ranking (meaning it provides better human capital care than expected by its level of income) the Social Legitimacy Score (fragility) is lowered by one point. If HDI ranking is more than twenty-five places below GDP per capita ranking, the fragility score is increased by one point.

**Referent Indicator:** The *Regional Effects* indicator provides information to identify two important "neighborhood" clusters of countries: dark-shaded "**Mus**" indicates a country that is characterized by a Muslim majority (countries mainly located in northern Africa, the Middle East, and Central and Southeast Asia) and unshaded "**Afr**" indicates a country located in non-Muslim (sub-Saharan) Africa.