

Indices on Risk of Genocide

Genocide Prevention Project <http://www.preventorprotect.org/overview/other-indices.html> aggregated five well-regarded independent indices or watch lists – to create the Mass Atrocity Crimes Watch List 2008-09 -- a “watch list of watch lists.”¹ Following charts are compilations of respected indices on Burma that rank Burma as one of the highest risk country of genocide in the world.

Global Index of Red Alert Countries _Mass Atrocity Watch List 2008-2009²

Country	1.Harff: Countries at Risk of Genocide & Politicide (May 2008) (out of total score 6)	Harff Normalized Score	2. Peoples Under Threat 2008, Minority Rights Group International (out of total score 26)	MRG Normalized Score	3. The Failed States Index (out of total score 120)	FSI Normalized Score	4.Genocide Watch (out of total score 7)	GW Normalized Score	5. GI Net (area of concern=.66; radar area=.33)	GI-NET Normalized Score	Total Score (Sum of Normalized Scores)
Sudan	5.00	1.625	21.62	1.622	113.00	1.20	7.00	1.28	0.66	1.51	7.255
Burma	5.00	1.625	20.10	1.510	100.30	1.07	7.00	1.28	0.66	1.51	7.007
Somalia	3.00	0.975	22.80	1.712	114.20	1.22	7.00	1.28	0.66	1.51	6.708
Iraq	3.00	0.975	22.60	1.697	110.60	1.18	7.00	1.28	0.66	1.51	6.654
Pakistan	5.00	1.625	19.20	1.442	103.80	1.11	7.00	1.28	0.33	0.75	6.220
DR Congo	2.00	0.650	19.90	1.495	106.70	1.14	7.00	1.28	0.66	1.51	6.086
Sri Lanka	3.00	0.975	16.60	1.247	95.60	1.02	7.00	1.28	0.66	1.51	6.044
Afghanistan	3.00	0.975	20.90	1.570	105.40	1.12	7.00	1.28	0.33	0.75	5.715

¹ Genocide Prevention Project, *Mass Atrocity Crimes Indices and Watch Lists*, available at <http://www.preventorprotect.org/overview/other-indices.html>

² *Id.*

Global Index of Red Alert Countries 2010-2011 (GJC follows the same normalized score for 2010-2011 data that Mass Atrocity Watch List used in 2008-2009)

Country	1.Harff: Countries at Risk of Genocide & Politicide (May 2010)	Harff Normalized Score	2.Peoples Under Threat 2011, Minority Rights Group International (out of total score 26)	MRG Normalized Score	3.The Failed States Index (out of total 120 score 2011)	FSI Normalized Score	4.Genocide Watch (out of total score 7)	GW Normalized Score	5.GI Net (area of concern=.66; radar area=.33) No Data for 2010-2011	GI-NET Normalized Score	Total Score (Sum of Normalized Scores)
Burma	16.5	1.92	20.99	1.57	98.30	1.05	7.00	1.28	-	-	5.82
Sudan	14.5	1.72	21.89	1.65	108.7	1.16	7.00	1.28	-	-	5.81
Pakistan	13.5	1.62	20.70	1.55	102.30	1.09	7.00	1.28	-	-	5.54
Somalia	10.5	1.24	23.66	1.77	113.04	1.21	7.00	1.28	-	-	5.50
Zimbabwe	12.0	1.42	16.76	1.71	107.09	1.15	6.00	1.10	-	-	5.38
DR Congo	11.0	1.30	19.67	1.47	108.20	1.15	7.00	1.28	-	-	5.20

1.a. Genocide Watch Index of Genocides, Politicides, and Other Mass Murder Since 1945, With Stages in 2008/ 2011³

Nation	Years Of Episodes Since 1945	Cumulative Civilian Death Toll	Major Killers	Main Divisions	Highest Stage In 2008 / 2011
Burma (Myanmar)	1945 – 1948	1,000's rebels	Burma Ind Move	Ethnic, political, religious	7 – Politicide, genocidal massacres (Those countries at Stage 7 are currently at the mass killing stage. They have active genocides, recurring genocidal massacres, or ongoing politicides. They are erupting.)
	1948 – 1962	15,000 rebels,govt	U Nu govt,rebels		
	1962 -- 2007	100,000 Shan, Karen, NDU	SLORC, SPDC (Burmese gov't)		
	2007 – present	1000's monks, democracy parties	SPDC (Burmese government)		
		Villagers at ethnic areas	Civilian Government		

³ Id.

1.b. Risk of Genocide and Politicide in High- Conflict and Divided Countries 2007 and 2011 by Harff and Gurr⁴

Countries Risk Score	Cleavages	Open Conflict Since 1988	Genocide and Politicide ⁵ Since 1950	Ethnically Polarized Elite	Exclusionary Ideology	Current Regime Type	2004 Trade Openness	Possible Target Groups
2008 score Burma (12)	Ethnic/regional/political	High Ongoing	Yes:1978	Yes: Burma	Yes: Burman Nationalist	Autocracy	Very Low	Kachin;Karan; Shan;Chin; Arakanese, Democratic opposition
2011 Score Burma (16.5 highest risk index score)	Ethnic/regional/political	High Ongoing	Yes:1978	Yes: Burman	Yes: Burman Nationalist	Autocracy	Very Low	Kachin;Karan; Shan;Chin; Arakanese, Other

2. Overall Ranking of People under Threat 2008 and 2011⁶ (Index by Minority Right Group)

Country	Group	Conflict Indicators			Indicators of Group Divisions			Democracy/ governance indicators				Total
		Self determination conflict	Major armed conflict	Prior Genocide/ Politicide	Masive Movt- Refugees/ID Ps	Legacy of Vengeance- groupf grievance	Rise of factionalized elites	Voice and Accountability	Political Stability	Rule of Law	OECD country risk classification	
Burma												
2008	Kachin, Karenni, Karen, Mons, Rakhine, Rohingya, Shan, Chin (Zomis), Wa	5	5	1	8.5	6.3	7.5	-2.28	-0.69	-1.45	7	20.1
2011	Kachin, Karenni, Karen, Mons, Rakhine, Rohingya, Shan, Chin (Zomis), Wa	5	2	1	8.3	8.7	8.2	-2.17	-1.72	-1.52	7	20.99

⁴ Harff and Ted Robert Gurr, *Chart on Risk of Genocide and Politicide in High-Conflict and Divided 2007 Countries*, May 2007 and see also Barbara Harf, Assessing Risks of Genocide and Politicide: Global Watch List for 2011, available at http://www.gpanet.org/webfm_send/120.

⁵ Harff sought to identify risk factors for genocide or “politicide,” defined as follows: “Genocides and politicides are the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents—or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities—that are intended to destroy, in whole or part, a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group. In genocides the victimized groups are defined by their perpetrators primarily in terms of their communal characteristics. In politicides, in contrast, groups are defined primarily in terms of their political opposition to the regime and dominant groups.” (No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955. *American Political Science Review* (2003),

⁶Minority Rights Groups International, *Peoples under Threat 2011*, available at <http://www.minorityrights.org/10744/peoples-under-threat/peoples-under-threat-2011.html>. and see also at *People Under Threat 2011*, available at http://www.genocidewatch.org/images/At_Risk_11_Minority_Rights_Group_Risk_Table.pdf.

2. a. Specific Ranking of People under Threat 2008 / 2011 (Index by Minority Right Group)

Country	Group	Conflict Indicator				What do they assess Risk?
Burma	Kachin, Karenni, Karen, Mons, Rakhine, Rohingyas, Shan, Chin (Zomis), Wa	Self determination conflict ⁷	Major armed conflict	Prior Genocide/Politicide		<p>Conflict indicators: The base data used was Monty G Marshall, 'Major Episodes of Political Violence 1946-2007' (Center for Systemic Peace, 2007). In late 2011, there were twenty-one countries experiencing major armed conflicts within their territory (all of these are beset by societal warfare: including Myanmar (various non-Burman groups), and the Four of the current, major armed conflicts have a substantial drug production and trafficking component: Afghanistan, Colombia, Mexico, and Myanmar (Burma)).⁸</p> <p>Self-determinations conflicts in all years were ranked on a scale of 0-5 as follows: 5=ongoing armed conflict; 4=contained armed conflict; 3=settled armed conflict; 2=militant politics; 1=conventional politics.</p> <p>Major armed conflicts were classified as 2=ongoing in late 2010; 1=emerging from conflict since 2004 or ongoing conflict with deaths under 1,000.</p> <p>Prior genocide or politicide: Harff, US Political Instability Task Force (formerly State Failure Task Force). 1=one or more episodes since 1945.</p>
		5 (2008) 5 (2011)	5 (2008) 2 (2011)	1 (2008) 1 (2011)		
Indicators of Group Divisions						
Burma	Kachin, Karenni, Karen, Mons, Rakhine, Rohingyas, Shan, Chin (Zomis), Wa	Masive Movt-Refugees/IDPs	Legacy of Vengeance-group of grievance	Rise of factionalized elites		<p>Indicators of Group Division: Failed States Index, Fund for Peace and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010.</p>
		8.5 (2008) 8.3 (2011)	6.3 (2008) 8.7 (2011)	7.5 (2008) 8.2 (2011)		
Democracy/ governance indicators						
Burma	Kachin, Karenni, Karen, Mons, Rakhine, Rohingyas, Shan, Chin (Zomis), Wa	Voice and Accountability	Political Stability	Rule of Law	OECD country at risk	<p>Democracy/Worldwide Governance Indicators: Annual Governance Indicators, World Bank, 2008 and 2011. Ranges from approximately ----- 2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong)</p> <p>OECD country risk classification: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 'Country Risk Classifications of the Participants to the Arrangement on Officially Supported Export Credits', 2010. Where no classification is given, a value of 8 was accorded.</p>
		-2.28 (2008) -2.17 (2011)	-0.69(2008) -1.72(2011)	-1.45(2008) - 1.7 (2011)	7 7	

⁷ Self-determination conflicts, Monty G Marshall and Ted R Gurr, 'Peace and Conflict 2005' (CIDCM, University of Maryland, 2005) updated for 2007 using figures from Center for Systemic Peace, MRG and the Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research.

⁸ Global Report 2011: Conflict, Governance and State Fragility, available at <http://www.systemicpeace.org/GlobalReport2011.pdf>.

3. Failed State Indexes

Episodes of Political Instability / State failure⁹

Burma consistently and over time tops major global indices on repression, lawlessness, corruption, instability, and human insecurity which are the indicators that defined the state as the failed. Below is a compilation of respected indices, all of which rank Burma as one of the most insecure countries in the world.

Index	2005	2006	2007	2008	2010 ¹⁰	What does this mean?
Freedom House Index: Repression ¹¹ Range: 0 (best) – 7 (worst)	Political Rights: 7	Political Rights: 7	Political Rights: 7	Political Rights: 7	Political Rights: 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burma is one of eight countries in the world scored as being the most repressive (out of a total of 193 countries and 15 territories ranked). A Political Rights rating of 7 indicates that political rights are absent or virtually nonexistent as a result of the extremely oppressive nature of the regime. A Civil Liberties rating of 7 indicates virtually no freedom; an overwhelming fear of repression characterizes these societies. Burma has received the worst score in both categories (7 is the worst score) every year since 1990. Between 1972 (the first year the Freedom House rankings were conducted) and 1989, Burma never had a Political Rights rating lower than 6 and a Civil Liberties rating lower than 5.
	Civil Liberties: 7	Civil Liberties: 7	Civil Liberties: 7	Civil Liberties: 7	Civil Liberties: 6	
Fund for Peace: Lawlessness ¹²	Total Score: 93.4 Range: 0 (best) – 120 (worst)	Total Score: 96.5 Range: 0 (best) – 120 (worst)	Total Score: 97.0 Range: 0 (best) – 120 (worst)	Total Score: 98.0 Range: 0 (best) – 120	Total Score: 98.3 Range: 0 (best) – 120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burma is ranked 14th overall on the Failed State Index in 2008 and 18th in 2011. Burma's total score, as measured by twelve social, economic, and political indicators, has worsened by 3.1 points over the last 3 years, a 2.6% change.

⁹ See, Political Stability Task Force, Internal War and Failure of Governance 1955-2006, available at <http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/pitf/pitftabl.htm>. See also at Failed State Index 2010, available at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/06/21/2010_failed_states_index_interactive_map_and_rankings.

¹⁰ Freedom in the World 2012 Report, available at http://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/FIW%202012%20Booklet--Final.pdf.

¹¹ See, Freedom House, *Worst of the Worst: The World's Most Repressive Societies 2008*, available at http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/special_report/62.pdf Ranking

¹² See Fund for Peace, Promoting Sustainable Security, *Burma Country Report*, available at http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=49&Itemid=274

	Human Rights: 9.6 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Human Rights: 9.6 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Human Rights: 9.8 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Human Rights: 9.9 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Human Rights: 9.0 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burma’s Human Rights indicator (one of the twelve indicators that comprises the total score), which measures the suspension or arbitrary application of the rule of law and widespread violations of human rights, has worsened over the last 3 years by 0.2 points, a 2% change. The Group Grievance indicator, which measures the legacy of vengeance-seeking group grievance or group paranoia.
	Group Grievance: 6.3 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Group Grievance: 9.0 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Group Grievance: 9.1 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Group Grievance: 9.5 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	Group Grievance: 8.7 Range: 0 (best) – 10 (worst)	
Transparency International: Corruption ¹³	Rank of 155 out of 158 countries surveyed.	Rank of 160 out of 163 countries surveyed.	Rank of 162 out of 163 countries surveyed.	Rank of 178 out of 180 countries surveyed.	Rank of 176 out of 178 countries surveyed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perception of the degree of corruption in Burma has worsened each year for the last three years. Burma is the worst in the list before Somalia in 2011.¹⁴
Political Terror ¹⁵	3.97 Range: 0 (best) – 5 (worst)	4.14 Range: 0 (best) – 5 (worst)	4.5 Range: 0 (best) – 5 (worst)	5 Range: 0 (best) – 5 (worst)	5 Range: 0 (best) – 5 (worst)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burma was scored at 4.5 on the Political Terror Scale in 2006, outranked only by Sudan and Iraq. A score of 4 indicates that civil and political rights violations have expanded to large numbers of the population, and murders, disappearances, and torture are a common part of life. A score of 5 indicates that terror has expanded to the whole population, and leaders of these societies place no limits on the means or thoroughness with which they pursue personal or ideological goals. Troublingly, when viewed over the longer term, Burma’s score on the Political Terror Scale is worsening, and the rate at which it is

¹³ See Transparency International, *Annual Report 2008: Special Asia Pacific Section*, available at http://www.transparency.org/publications/publications/ar_2008_special_asia_pacific

¹⁴ See Transparency International, *Annual Report 2011*, available at http://www.transparency.org/publications/publications/annual_reports/annual_report_2010.

¹⁵ See, Gibney, M., Cornett, L., & Wood, R., (year of publication) *Political Terror Scale 1976-2006*. Retrieved March 26, 2008, from the Political Terror Scale Web site: <http://www.politicalterror scale.org/>, see also at Political Terror Scale Myanmar 2010, available at <http://politicalterror scale.org/countries.php?region=Eurasia&country=Myanmar>.

						worsening has been accelerating.
Risk of Genocide and Politicide¹⁶	-	-	12 (highest score)		-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A study prepared by Barbara Harff and Ted Robert Gurr ranked Burma as being at the highest risk of genocide and politicide of high-conflict and divided countries. It was ranked as posing a higher risk than Sudan, Algeria, Pakistan, Iraq, and Kosovo. (Range: 0-Best, 12-Worst)
Human Security Center: The World's Least Secure Countries¹⁷	-	-	29		-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three different measures of human insecurity give three separate least secure rankings. The 29 countries with countries with the highest levels of human rights abuses are listed, as are the 29 countries with the worst political instability and violence scores.
Core Human Rights Abuses	4	4	4	4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core human rights abuses rank is the combination rank of Amnesty International, U.S State Department. (Range: 0- Best and 4-Worst)
Political Instability	-0.87	-0.91	-1.13	-1.11	-1.19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political instability data is from the World Bank. Estimate of governance (ranges from approximately -2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong) governance performance)
Index	2002	2005	2007	2008	2011	
Refugee Population	148,500 ¹⁸	206,000 ¹⁹	748,000 ²⁰	790861 ²¹	797,388 ²²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between 1995 and 2010, the number of UNHCR-recognized refugees from Burma increased by 48% in Thailand, almost three fold in Malaysia, about four-fold in India.

¹⁶ Harff and Ted Robert Gurr, *Chart on Risk of Genocide and Politicide in High-Conflict and Divided 2007 Countries*, May 2007& See also also Barbara Harf, *Assessing Risks of Genocide and Politicide: Global Watch List for 2011*, available at http://www.gpanet.org/webfm_send/120.

¹⁷ See, Human Security Center, *Human Security Report 2005*, available at <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/>

¹⁸ See 2005 UNHCR Statistical Yearbook, Population of concern to UNHCR by country/territory of origin, 2001-2005, 2001-2005, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?id=4640637d2&tbl=STATISTIC>

¹⁹ See Id.

²⁰ See, 2006 UNHCR Statistical Yearbook , table 1. Refugees, asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees (refugees and IDPs), stateless persons, and others of concern to UNHCR by country/territory of asylum, end – 2006, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?id=478ce34a2&tbl=STATISTICS> and UNHCR Global Appeal 2008-2009 for Myanmar, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/home/PUBL/474ac8dde.pdf>

²¹ 2008 UNHCR Statistical Yearbook , table 1, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/4bcc5c9f9.html>.

²² Refugees, asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees (refugees and IDPs), stateless persons, and others of concern to UNHCR by country/territory of asylum | end-2010, available at <http://www.unhcr.org/4ef9c7269.html>.

Internal Displaced Person	633,000 ²³	600,000-1,000,000 ²⁴	3,000,000 ²⁵	451,000 ²⁶	450,000 ²⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic estimates for the total number of IDPs in Burma are not available, but several national and international non-governmental organizations are monitoring the IDP situation in areas hosting particular ethnic group.²⁸
Child Soldier	70,000 ²⁹	-	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is estimated that children may account for 35 to 45 percent of new recruits to the SPDC army.³⁰
Governance Indicators Index:	2004	2005	2006	2008	2011	What does this mean? [Ranges from approximately -2.5 (weak) to 2.5 (strong)]
World Bank Governance Indicators: Voice and Accountability ³¹	-2.21 Range: 2.5 best -2.5worst	-2.17 Range: 2.5 best -2.5worst	-2.18 Range: 2.5 best -2.5worst	-2.16 Range: 2.5 best -2.5worst	-2.09 Range: 2.5 best -2.5worst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voice and Accountability measures the extent to which country's citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media.³²
World Bank Governance Indicators: Effectiveness ³³	-1.55	-1.50	-1.45	-1.51	-1.67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government Effectiveness measures the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.³⁴

²³ See, Internal Displacement Monitoring Center, Global IDP project, Profile of Internal Displacement Myanmar (Burma), 20 July 2002 available at [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/\(httpInfoFiles\)/7CAF38936282C71E802570B500489F1F/\\$file/Myanmar+-Burma+-July+2002.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/(httpInfoFiles)/7CAF38936282C71E802570B500489F1F/$file/Myanmar+-Burma+-July+2002.pdf)

²⁴ See, Internal Displacement Monitoring Center, Global IDP project, Profile of Internal Displacement Myanmar (Burma), June 27, 2005, available at [http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/\(httpInfoFiles\)/C48DC02F9ED2DF94802570BA00557D3D/\\$file/Myanmar%20\(Burma\)%20-June%202005.pdf](http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/(httpInfoFiles)/C48DC02F9ED2DF94802570BA00557D3D/$file/Myanmar%20(Burma)%20-June%202005.pdf)

²⁵ See, Internal Displacement Monitoring Center, Myanmar (Burma) A Worsening Crisis of Internal Displacement: Profile of Internal Displacement Situation, March 28, 2007, available at [http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/\(httpEnvelopes\)/77C12CB7338CDAC9C12573E20054F7F7?OpenDocument](http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/(httpEnvelopes)/77C12CB7338CDAC9C12573E20054F7F7?OpenDocument)

²⁶ UNHCR data available at [http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/\(httpEnvelopes\)/7E38BA7B2364451AC12578C4005318B8?OpenDocument](http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/(httpEnvelopes)/7E38BA7B2364451AC12578C4005318B8?OpenDocument)

²⁷ Thailand Burma Border Consortium 2011, available at <http://www.tbcc.org/announcements/2011-10-25-media-release-idp-survey.pdf>

²⁸ See, Internal Displacement Monitoring Center, population profile and figure, available at <http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf>

²⁹ See, Human Rights Watch, My Gun was as Tall as Me: Child Soldiers in Burma, Oct 02, available at <http://www.studentgroups.ucla.edu/b Bruinsforburma/burma.html>

³⁰ See Id.

³¹ See, Kaufmann D., A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi, Governance Matters VI: Governance Indicators for 1996-2006

World Bank, available at http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi2007/sc_chart.asp

³² See, World Bank, available at <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>

³³ See, Kaufmann D., A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi, Governance Matters VI: Governance Indicators for 1996-2006

World Bank, available at http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi2007/sc_chart.asp. See also at World Bank, Worldwide Governance Indicator 2011, available at

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

³⁴ See, Id.,

World Bank Governance Indicators: Rule of Law ³⁵	-2.17	-2.22	-2.22	-1.19	-2.23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule of Law measures the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, in particular the quality of contract enforcement, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.³⁶
UNDP Index	2005	2006	2007	2008	2011	What does this mean? (Rank out of 182 countries)
Human Development Report: Human Development Index³⁷	129	130	132	138 ³⁸	149 ³⁹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human Development is a development paradigm that is about much more than the rise or fall of national incomes. It is about creating an environment in which people can develop their full potential and lead productive, creative lives in accord with their needs and interests.⁴⁰

³⁵ See, *Id.*,

³⁶ See, World Bank, *Governance Matters 2008 FAQ*, available at <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/faq.htm>.

³⁷ See, UNDP, Human Development Report 2005, 2006 and 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011 available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr05_complete.pdf, http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr06_complete.pdf, http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr07_complete.pdf.

³⁸ See, UNDP Human Development Index 2009, available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2009_EN_Complete.pdf.

³⁹ See, UNDP Human Development Index 2011, available at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/>

⁴⁰ See, UNDP Human Development Concept, available at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/humandev/>