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Women, Business and the Law 2021 is the seventh in a series of annual studies measuring the laws and regulations that affect women’s economic opportunity in 190 economies. The project presents eight indicators structured around women’s interactions with the law as they move through their careers: Mobility, Workplace, Pay, Marriage, Parenthood, Entrepreneurship, Assets, and Pension.

Amidst a global pandemic that threatens progress toward gender equality, Women, Business and the Law 2021 identifies barriers to women’s economic participation and encourages reform of discriminatory laws. This year, the study also includes important findings on government responses to the COVID-19 crisis and pilot research related to childcare and women’s access to justice.

By examining the economic decisions women make throughout their working lives, as well as the pace of reform over the past 50 years, Women, Business and the Law makes an important contribution to research and policy discussions about the state of women’s economic empowerment. The indicators build evidence of the critical relationship between legal gender equality and women’s employment and entrepreneurship.

Data in Women, Business and the Law 2021 are current as of October 1, 2020.
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The unprecedented challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic have exposed and deepened global inequality. For many women around the world, this could mean not only economic insecurity, but also threats to their health and safety. In times like these, a legal environment that encourages women’s economic inclusion can make them less vulnerable in the face of a crisis.

Yet in difficult moments many women start at a disadvantage. *Women, Business and the Law 2021* identifies the laws and regulations that restrict women’s economic opportunity in 190 economies. From the basics of movement in the community to the challenges of working, parenting, and retiring, the data offer objective, measurable benchmarks for global progress toward gender equality. They also emphasize the policy actions that could be taken to improve economic opportunity for women.

This year’s study is the seventh in the series, and again the results are promising. Despite the adversities of the last year, many economies made gender equality a priority. Every region improved its average score, with economies in the Middle East and North Africa seeing the greatest increase. Globally, several of the changes eliminated job restrictions or aimed to reduce the gender wage gap. Other improvements were good-practice legislation related to marriage and parenthood or to removing constraints to women’s entrepreneurship.

Still, many laws continue to inhibit women’s ability to enter the workforce or start a business. On average, women have just three-quarters of the rights of men. New measures may also be necessary to safeguard their economic opportunities during this time of crisis. *Women, Business and the Law 2021* presents evidence of the ways in which governments have responded to women’s unique needs throughout the pandemic. Many have implemented innovative solutions, ensuring that women maintain access to childcare, justice systems, and protection from domestic violence, even during widespread shutdowns. The study also introduces two pilot projects on childcare and women’s access to justice, both of which are foundational to women’s success in the labor force.

Gender equality is a fundamental human right. More important, it can boost economic growth and improve development outcomes. There has never been a more important time to ensure women’s economic empowerment. As economies adapt to difficult circumstances, the World Bank Group will continue striving to improve conditions for their most vulnerable populations. By recognizing barriers to success and highlighting solutions, *Women, Business and the Law 2021* is an important tool in that effort.

*Mari Elka Pangestu*
*Managing Director, Development Policy and Partnerships*
*The World Bank*
## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATM</td>
<td>automated teller machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (United Nations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>special administrative region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>Women, Business and the Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All dollar amounts are US dollars unless otherwise indicated.
CHAPTER 1

Findings

- Better performance in the areas measured by the Women, Business and the Law index is associated with a more narrow gender gap in development outcomes, higher female labor force participation, lower vulnerable employment, and greater representation of women in national parliaments.
- On average, women have just three-quarters of the legal rights afforded to men.
- Ten economies—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Sweden—score 100 on the Women, Business and the Law index.
- Since 2019, 27 economies from all regions have enacted reforms increasing gender equality.
- Most reforms introduced or amended laws affecting pay and parenthood. There were no reforms addressing gender differences in property and inheritance as measured by the Assets indicator.
- The Middle East and North Africa and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) high-income economies improved their laws the most in 2019/20.
- Over the last 50 years, three regions—OECD high income, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Sub-Saharan Africa—have seen a record gain in their average scores of more than 30 points.

Although much progress has been made over the past 50 years, global gender equality had not yet been achieved when crisis struck in 2020. COVID-19 has directly and disproportionately jeopardized women’s social and economic capabilities. Because they make up the majority of health, social service, and unpaid care workers, women are uniquely susceptible to the effects of the pandemic. In addition, women continue to earn less than men for the same work, as well as face a higher risk of violence in their homes.

It may be impossible to fully prepare for such a situation, but governments take an important step toward safeguarding their economies when the legal environment encourages and incentivizes women’s work. The importance of legal equality is not limited to disaster preparedness or mitigating the effects of a pandemic. When women are given the same opportunities as men, they enter and remain in the labor force, strengthening economies and enabling development. Gender equality in the law is also associated with better development outcomes, such as lower rates of vulnerable employment and extreme poverty among female workers.¹
Yet despite progress, discriminatory laws across the world continue to threaten not only women’s fundamental human rights, but also their economic security. Barriers to employment and entrepreneurship at every stage of life limit equality of opportunity, failing to adequately support working women. Women face these challenges in even the most developed economies. Worldwide they have, on average, just three-quarters of the rights of men. Governments must take urgent action to close this gap or risk worsening the effects of the pandemic.

By presenting a data set and an index highlighting opportunities for reform, *Women, Business and the Law* 2021 is an important tool in the pursuit of women’s economic empowerment. The seventh in a series, this study examines progress toward gender equality by measuring the laws and regulations that restrict women’s economic inclusion in 190 economies. It also presents compelling findings on gender-sensitive government responses to COVID-19, as well as pilot research on both childcare and enhancing women’s access to justice (box 1.1).

*Women, Business and the Law* aims to develop research and collect data that will highlight good practices in these two areas.

Yet despite progress, discriminatory laws across the world continue to threaten not only women’s fundamental human rights, but also their economic security. Barriers to employment and entrepreneurship at every stage of life limit equality of opportunity, failing to adequately support working women. Women face these challenges in even the most developed economies. Worldwide they have, on average, just three-quarters of the rights of men. Governments must take urgent action to close this gap or risk worsening the effects of the pandemic.

By presenting a data set and an index highlighting opportunities for reform, *Women, Business and the Law* 2021 is an important tool in the pursuit of women’s economic empowerment. The seventh in a series, this study examines progress toward gender equality by measuring the laws and regulations that restrict women’s economic inclusion in 190 economies. It also presents compelling findings on gender-sensitive government responses to COVID-19, as well as pilot research on both childcare and enhancing women’s access to justice (box 1.1).

*Women, Business and the Law* provides policy makers with actionable benchmarks on women’s economic opportunity and further evidence of the relationship between legal gender equality and economic outcomes. In particular, this edition finds that in economies where women face less discrimination under the law, greater progress has been made in closing the gender gap in such outcomes. Authorities in several economies have taken note of this finding: despite a global pandemic, 27 economies in all regions and income groups enacted reforms across indicators and increased good practice legislation in 45 instances.2

**Measuring laws and regulations that affect women’s economic empowerment**

Since its inception in 2009, *Women, Business and the Law* has collected data on the laws and regulations that restrict women’s economic opportunities. In 2020, the project
began examining these data by means of an index structured around a woman’s working life. This perspective aligns different areas of the law with the decisions women make as they begin, progress through, and end their careers.

The eight Women, Business and the Law indicators coincide with the various milestones a typical woman might experience or achieve in her lifetime (figure 1.1). The indicators were chosen based on statistically significant associations with outcomes related to women’s economic empowerment, such as women’s labor force participation rates. They measure explicit gender-based differences in the law, as well as the presence of certain nondiscrimination and other good practice legislation that incentivizes women’s employment and entrepreneurship.

The Pay indicator, for example, measures legislation on remuneration and job restrictions—factors likely to influence a woman’s decision to enter the workforce and her choice of career. Each indicator looks at a specific set of regulations and the ways in which they affect women’s economic participation as entrepreneurs and employees. Policy makers interested in improving equality of economic opportunity can look at their economy’s scores on each indicator as a starting point for legal reform.

The Women, Business and the Law index relies on a series of assumptions to ensure comparability across economies. For example, the woman in question is assumed to reside in the main business city of her economy and to be employed in the formal sector. To remain actionable, the data set is also constructed using only laws and regulations in force. Unless they are codified, religious and customary laws are not considered. Finally, although it is critical to ensuring women’s economic inclusion, implementation of laws is also not currently measured. Instead, Women, Business and the Law identifies legal differences between men and women as one step toward a better understanding of where women’s economic rights may be restricted in practice. Future Women, Business and the Law research will consider how to include de facto indicators to complement the set of de jure indicators developed and presented in this report. (For the complete methodology of Women, Business and the Law indicators, see the data notes in appendix A.)

In this study, 35 questions are scored across the eight indicators. Overall scores are then calculated by taking the average of each indicator, with 100 representing the highest possible score (see table 1.1 for an example using Ecuador). The final Women,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Indicator score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>1. Can a woman choose where to live in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can a woman travel outside her home in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can a woman apply for a passport in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Can a woman travel outside the country in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>1. Can a woman get a job in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Does the law prohibit discrimination in employment based on gender?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is there legislation on sexual harassment in employment?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Are there criminal penalties or civil remedies for sexual harassment in employment?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1. Does the law mandate equal remuneration for work of equal value?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can a woman work at night in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can a woman work in a job deemed dangerous in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Can a woman work in an industrial job in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>1. Is there no legal provision that requires a married woman to obey her husband?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can a woman be head of household in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is there legislation specifically addressing domestic violence?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Can a woman obtain a judgment of divorce in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Does a woman have the same rights to remarry as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood</td>
<td>1. Is paid leave of at least 14 weeks available to mothers?</td>
<td>No = 0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Does the government administer 100% of maternity leave benefits?</td>
<td>No = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is paid leave available to fathers?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Is there paid parental leave?</td>
<td>No = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Is dismissal of pregnant workers prohibited?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>1. Does the law prohibit discrimination in access to credit based on gender?</td>
<td>No = 0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can a woman sign a contract in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can a woman register a business in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Can a woman open a bank account in the same way as a man?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>1. Do men and women have equal ownership rights to immovable property?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do sons and daughters have equal rights to inherit assets from their parents?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Do male and female surviving spouses have equal rights to inherit assets?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Does the law grant spouses equal administrative authority over assets during marriage?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Does the law provide for the valuation of nonmonetary contributions?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>1. Is the age at which men and women can retire with full pension benefits the same?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Is the age at which men and women can retire with partial pension benefits the same?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is the mandatory retirement age for men and women the same?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Are periods of absence due to childcare accounted for in pension benefits?</td>
<td>Yes = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business and the Law index score presents the share of good laws in each economy weighted by the indicators. Thus, the index serves as an easily replicable way to gauge the regulatory environment for women as entrepreneurs and employees.

By measuring progress toward gender equality over time, Women, Business and the Law offers policy makers a benchmarking tool that exposes potential challenges, identifies good practices, and presents lessons learned. The narrow focus of the indicators provides a basis for equality of opportunity in the areas measured that can be complemented with additional data to fit the needs of a particular economy. By informing research and policy discussions about the state of women’s economic opportunities, Women, Business and the Law emphasizes the work still to be done to ensure equal economic opportunities for all.

Does equality under the law matter for closing gender gaps?

A significant body of research links legal reforms aimed at achieving gender equality to women’s economic outcomes. Women’s economic empowerment benefits the wider economy by reducing income inequality and increasing diversity and economic resilience. Furthermore, gender gaps in entrepreneurship and employment are associated with lower levels of income and productivity. Economies at higher levels of economic development have, in general, greater levels of gender equality. In fact, in the relationship between economic development and legal gender equality, the causality likely runs in both directions.

As is common in emerging fields of analysis, however, not all studies have found positive effects. For example, extended periods of family leave for female employees after childbirth have been associated with a drop in female employment and earnings in the short run. In India, a legislative reform that granted unmarried daughters equal inheritance rights has been associated with a range of positive outcomes, including greater investment in girls’ education, delayed age of marriage, increased financial inclusion, and more investment in sanitation. Nonetheless, other studies have uncovered some unintended consequences of this reform. These include parents circumventing the law so that daughters will not receive an inheritance, higher female infant mortality and feticide, and a higher suicide rate driven by a rise in marital conflicts. Unintended consequences can arise in contexts where multiple constraints exist and perpetuate gender inequality, thereby pointing to the need for a more holistic approach to addressing such a deep-rooted issue.

Another concern that often emerges is that where gendered social norms are deeply entrenched or where legal reform goes against customary law, changes to the law will not improve women’s circumstances. Indeed, reforms of discriminatory laws have not always been well implemented, leaving women to suffer the consequences. Moreover, even when legal reforms are implemented, cultural and economic factors may pose challenges to women exerting their rights.

Ideally, laws reflect the values of a society, but both laws and social norms need to change over time to adapt to their circumstances and contexts. That said, the relationship between laws and culture is complex. In some cases, laws precede social norms, and in others social behavior changes first, while laws are slower to adapt. Studies have shown that when laws conflict strongly with social norms, they do not
achieve their intended effect and are more difficult to enforce. Some argue that the importance of informal rules has often been underestimated. The same is true of the monitoring and transactions costs associated with the codification of formal laws.

Thus it is not necessarily true that just one or the other matters. Changing formal and customary laws may be a mutually reinforcing process. Research suggests that legal reform can have a magnetic effect, drawing norms in the same positive direction. Analyses of specific legislative changes that granted women more economic rights, such as India’s 2005 Hindu Succession Amendment Act and Rwanda’s 1999 Succession Law, have found evidence that legal reform is important.

Indeed, growing research shows that reforms in the areas captured by the Women, Business and the Law index are associated with a range of better outcomes for women, including more entrepreneurship, better access to finance, a more abundant female labor supply, and a reduction in the gender wage gap. Removing barriers that restrict the ability of women to move freely, sign contracts, and work outside the home has also been correlated with a larger female labor supply. Fewer legal barriers are associated with access to better jobs for women, such as those requiring higher skill levels, offering higher wages, or presenting an opportunity to manage others. It is also well documented that granting women the right to control assets, most notably land, may result in more bargaining power for them within their households. The implications of this include greater agency in household and marital matters and investment in better agricultural practices. Research has found that women’s ability to own and manage land is positively associated with their access to finance. More broadly, land rights may play an important role in establishing more equal gender relations within households and boosting women’s status in society.

New research based on the Women, Business and the Law data provides further evidence of a positive relationship between women’s economic rights and their economic inclusion and opportunities. This analysis looks at the relationship between legal gender discrimination and a range of metrics of women’s economic inclusion and empowerment. The general pattern of results reveals that where women face fewer legal barriers, they are more empowered.

Whereas the Women, Business and the Law index tracks progress toward closing gender-based gaps in legislation, the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index tracks progress made by economies in closing gaps between women and men in opportunities and outcomes. It measures gender-based gaps in economic participation and opportunity, health outcomes, educational attainment, and political empowerment. The aggregate index score captures the percentage of gender gaps in opportunities and outcomes closed to date. According to the most recent results, that percentage is 68.6% globally.

Women, Business and the Law data reveal that greater progress has been made in closing gender gaps in legislation, suggesting that, on average, legal reforms may precede improvements in women’s opportunities and outcomes. However, the range of economy scores shows greater variation between achievement of legal gender parity: the lowest Women, Business and the Law index score is 26.3 and the highest, 100. The Global Gender Gap Index 2020 ranges between 49.4 and 87.7. Correlating the two measures shows that where women face less discrimination under the law, greater progress has been made in closing gender gaps in opportunities and outcomes (figure 1.2).
Analysis also shows that greater equality under the law is associated with more women participating in the labor force (figure 1.3). In the relationship between the Women, Business and the Law index and specific metrics of women’s economic inclusion and empowerment, one of the most fundamental outcomes is the female labor force participation rate.

A deeper dive into the relationship between the Women, Business and the Law index and women’s economic inclusion shows that legal equality is associated not only with more female employment in the aggregate, but also with fewer female workers in vulnerable employment. Vulnerable employment refers to those workers who either are self-employed without any employees or are unpaid family workers. This is a noteworthy association: vulnerable employees are those who are least likely to have access to social protection and safety nets or to be able to save, leaving them exposed to economic shocks and at the greatest risk of poverty. On average, women are more likely than men to be engaged in vulnerable employment, and women’s relative risk of vulnerable employment is higher in low- and lower-middle-income economies. The relationship between legal equality and women in vulnerable employment varies notably by region and warrants further study.

Women’s political representation may also have important outcomes for women’s rights. Research has revealed that economies with greater female representation in the
national legislature are more likely to pass laws on sexual harassment, rape, divorce, and domestic violence.\textsuperscript{27} According to data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), on average 25% of seats in national lawmaking bodies are held by women. In only four economies are at least half of legislative seats held by women: Rwanda (61%), Cuba (53%), Bolivia (53%), and the United Arab Emirates (50%).\textsuperscript{28}

As women’s economic rights increase, so, too, does their representation in national lawmaking bodies (figure 1.4). However, even in the economies that receive the highest scores in the Women, Business and the Law index, the average proportion of legislative seats held by women is only about one-third. The relationship between legal equality and women’s legislative representation could go in either direction—as noted earlier, previous research has shown that having more female legislators is associated with an improved legal environment for women.

In contexts in which multiple constraints perpetuate gender inequality, the need for a more holistic approach to addressing deep-rooted issues will, of course, be necessary. More evidence is needed of the role and limitations of the law in affecting women’s economic outcomes. However, the results presented here highlight some of the ways in which greater legal equality is correlated with greater empowerment for women. More research is under way to uncover the pathways through which legal reforms can help women reach their full potential, as well as to better understand how more progress can be made in removing legal barriers.
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\caption{Legal Gender Equality and Female Labor Force Participation}
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\textbf{FIGURE 1.3 | LEGAL GENDER EQUALITY AND FEMALE LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION}

\begin{itemize}
  \item $y = 0.57x + 15.15$; \textit{t-stat(x)} = 9.51
\end{itemize}


\textit{Note:} The figure presents the correlation between the WBL index score and the female labor force participation rate for women aged 15–64 in 2019, according to modeled estimates from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Each point represents a single economy. A fitted regression line is also included. Although the graph presents a simple correlation, the relationship remains positive and statistically significant after controlling for income, measured as gross domestic product (GDP) per capita provided in the World Bank’s World Development Indicators (WDI) database (\url{https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators}), and economy-level and time fixed effects. This statistical relationship should not be interpreted as causal. The regression of the female labor force participation rate on the WBL index includes 176 economies for the period 1991–2019, as determined by data availability. OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
**Data insights**

*Women, Business and the Law 2021* updates the index presented in its previous edition by capturing reforms that occurred between September 2, 2019, and October 1, 2020. In 2020, the average global score is 76.1 out of 100 (above the average 75.5 in 2019), indicating that the world has achieved about three-quarters of good practice legislation as measured by the indicators. Up from eight in 2019, ten economies—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Sweden—score 100, meaning that women are on an equal legal standing with men across all areas measured (table 1.2). (For the complete *Women, Business and the Law* data set, please see the economy data in appendix B.)

Of the 39 economies with scores higher than 90, 28 are OECD high-income economies, and seven are in Europe and Central Asia. The remaining four are in Latin America and the Caribbean, East Asia and the Pacific, and Sub-Saharan Africa. No economy in the Middle East and North Africa or South Asia scores 90 or higher.

When economies are classified by income level, high-income ones score the highest, with an average score of 85.9 out of 100. Upper-middle-income economies
### TABLE 1.2: WOMEN, BUSINESS AND THE LAW 2021 INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>70.6 Malaysia</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>69.4 Jordan</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>✖</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>Venezuela, RB</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>68.1 Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>Puerto Rico (US)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep.</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>Micronesia, Fed. Sts.</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Women, Business and the Law Database.

Note: Economies with a green check mark (✔) saw an improvement in score due to reforms in one or more areas. The economy with a red X (✖) implemented at least one change reducing its score.
are 10.6 points behind, with an average score of 75.3. Lower-middle- and low-income economies have average scores of 70.8 and 66.1, respectively. These scores demonstrate that the average low-income economy has about two-thirds of good practice legislation identified by the indicators. The gap in the average score between high-income economies and the rest of the world is 14.3 points.

By region, OECD high-income economies score the highest, followed by Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and East Asia and the Pacific (figure 1.5). Economies in Sub-Saharan Africa have an average regional score of 71, while economies in South Asia score 63.7. Economies in the Middle East and North Africa have the lowest average score, 51.5. The performance of economies within each region varies. Middle East and North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa economies have the largest variation in scores—more than 60 points difference between the best- and worst-scoring economies.

More than half of the economies in Sub-Saharan Africa score higher than the regional average score of 71 (figure 1.6). Mauritius has a score of 91.9, the highest in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. As of 2020, Mauritius scores 100 in six of the eight Women, Business and the Law indicators: Mobility, Workplace, Pay, Marriage, Entrepreneurship, and Assets. The remaining gaps to close are in the Parenthood and Pension indicators. Under Parenthood, Mauritius is still lacking paid parental leave, and maternity leave benefits are not 100% administered by the government. Under Pension, Mauritius has not accounted for periods of absence due to childcare in pension benefits. Every region has examples of economies whose governments are implementing good practice laws and those that still have room to improve. These examples can inspire other governments in the region looking to reform.
FIGURE 1.6 | ECONOMIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA HAVE LARGE VARIATION IN WBL INDEX SCORES

Where do economies stand on each indicator?

The Mobility, Workplace, Marriage, Entrepreneurship, and Assets indicators have an average global score above 75, meaning economies have implemented many of the good practices measured by these indicators (figure 1.7). By contrast, average scores are lower for the Pay, Parenthood, and Pension indicators. Regional performance on each of these also varies, with OECD high-income economies performing above average on all indicators. All other regions have more diverse performances and room to improve, especially economies in South Asia and the Middle East and North Africa.

Parenthood, with an average score of 54.8, remains the indicator with the most room to improve. It measures whether paid maternity leave of at least 14 weeks is available to mothers, whether maternity benefits are 100% administered by the government, whether any paid leave is available to fathers, whether there is paid parental leave, and whether dismissal of pregnant women is prohibited.

Although more than half of the economies measured mandate paid leave specifically for fathers, the global median duration of that leave is just seven calendar days in the economies that have it. Fathers in East Asia and the Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, and OECD high-income economies receive the longest paid leave. Only 44 economies have paid parental leave. In 2019, the European Union (EU) passed a new directive aimed at increasing the amount of leave available to both parents and at redistributing childcare responsibilities between men and women. EU states now have three years to adopt legislation complying with the directive. Because of this advance, *Women, Business and the Law* expects more reforms in this area among the top-scoring economies.

The second-lowest performance is on the Pay indicator, with an average score of 67.5. Should a woman successfully enter and remain in the labor force, it is imperative that she not face job restrictions or receive lower pay than a man holding...
Under the Pay indicator, the data reveal that more than half of the good practice legislation achieved is related to laws that affect women’s pay. Yet 88 economies still restrict the jobs women can hold.

Removing laws that prohibit women from working in certain jobs is not the only legislative approach to tackling the gender pay gap: legally mandating employers to provide men and women who perform work of equal value with the same remuneration is also critical. Today, fewer than half of economies worldwide (90) have mandated equal remuneration for work of equal value. Most of them are OECD high-income economies, with the fewest mandating equal remuneration for work of equal value in East Asia and the Pacific, South Asia, and Middle East and North Africa (map 1.1).

Leaving the workforce to take care of family members is one reason women are left with smaller pensions at the end of their working life. Another reason is laws that mandate different retirement ages for men and women. Retirement ages remain unequal in close to one-third of the economies covered, with a difference of five or more years between women and men in more than half of the economies in the Middle East and North Africa, including Algeria, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Libya, Oman, and the Republic of Yemen (figure 1.8). Despite a significant effort by governments to gradually equalize retirement ages between men and women across Europe and Central Asia, a difference of five years remains across 26% of economies in the region, including Belarus, Georgia, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. By contrast, of the 44 economies covered with mandatory pension systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, women’s statutory retirement age is five years earlier than men’s only in Cabo Verde and Mozambique.
The urgent need for reform is even more glaring today because the COVID-19 pandemic has widened the long-existing gender pay gap. Women are more likely than men to take leave from work or resign their positions to care for children in the event of illness or the closure of schools or daycare centers. Even if they manage to hold on to their positions, women are still at higher risk of having to submit to greater earnings penalties as a result of the pandemic. Reforming laws to achieve greater gender equality should remain a priority as governments enact measures to recover from the shocks imposed by this crisis.

**FINDINGS**

**FIGURE 1.8 | DIFFERENCES IN THE RETIREMENT AGE OF MEN AND WOMEN STILL EXIST IN ALL REGIONS**

Note: The gap in retirement age is calculated as the deduction of a woman’s retirement age from a man’s retirement age. The total number of economies in the sample is 178: East Asia and Pacific, 23; Europe and Central Asia, 23; Latin America and Caribbean, 32; Middle East and North Africa, 17; OECD high income, 34; South Asia, 5; Sub-Saharan Africa, 44. Twelve economies have no mandated pension systems. OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

The urgent need for reform is even more glaring today because the COVID-19 pandemic has widened the long-existing gender pay gap. Women are more likely than men to take leave from work or resign their positions to care for children in the event of illness or the closure of schools or daycare centers. Even if they manage to hold on to their positions, women are still at higher risk of having to submit to greater earnings penalties as a result of the pandemic. Reforming laws to achieve greater gender equality should remain a priority as governments enact measures to recover from the shocks imposed by this crisis.

**Under what indicators did economies reform in 2019/20?**

A surprising number of reforms were recorded even as the pandemic raged throughout much of the period measured. Since 2019, 27 economies have implemented reforms aimed at equality of opportunity across seven of the eight indicators measured, leading to 45 positive data changes. Of these changes, 17 resulted from legal changes enacted by economies in the Middle East and North Africa region. Although it has the lowest scores, the region has advanced the most as a result of its reform efforts, with 25% of the region’s economies implementing at least one reform (figure 1.9). Despite having the highest scores, OECD high-income economies continued to reform, with nearly 20% of economies changing at least one law toward gender equality. Progress in the rest of the world was slower during 2020, with other regions recording fewer reforms than in previous years.
Most reforms were implemented in laws affecting women’s pay

The Pay indicator recorded the most improvement in scores, with changes to 11 data points indicating reductions in wage inequality as a result of reforms by eight economies (table 1.3). Bahrain, Montenegro, Saudi Arabia, and Vietnam eliminated restrictions on women’s employment in jobs previously deemed dangerous for women. Montenegro and Saudi Arabia also eliminated all restrictions on women’s employment in industrial jobs such as mining, construction, manufacturing, and the water sector, setting men and women on equal terms in choice of employment opportunities. Costa Rica and Saudi Arabia lifted bans on women’s night work.

The Marshall Islands, New Zealand, and the United Arab Emirates reformed their laws to introduce legislation mandating equal remuneration for men and women who perform work of equal value. The Equal Pay Amendment Act in New Zealand addresses historic inequalities in pay for women and provides a mechanism for equal pay for jobs of equal value, including for different jobs of the same value. The act enables workers or unions to raise a pay equity claim directly with their employer and makes court action a last resort.

Reforms related to parental leave and marriage remain high on economies’ agendas

Laws affecting women’s work after having children, as measured by the Parenthood indicator, remained high on the reform agenda. Five economies made reforms in this area, leading to improvements in eight data points. Ethiopia increased paid maternity
leave from 90 to 120 days and guaranteed the right to three days of paid paternity leave for the first time. Suriname, which previously was one of only six economies worldwide without any form of paid leave related to the birth of a child, introduced 16 weeks of paid maternity leave and eight days of paid paternity leave. Austria also introduced paid paternity leave, while Ireland and the United Arab Emirates introduced paid parental leave as an individual entitlement, giving each employee an equal right to paid leave for the birth of a child. The United Arab Emirates is now the first and only economy in the Middle East and North Africa to have paid parental leave.

Paternity leave is one of the most prevalent reforms under the Parenthood indicator because of growing recognition that gender equality in the home is needed to achieve gender equality in the workplace. However, research finds that fathers tend to take paternity leave only when it is highly compensated and specifically allocated to them. For that reason, some economies recently changed their leave policies to promote fathers’ uptake of leave. Estonia, which began the process of gradually reconfiguring its leave policies in 2017, abandoned its two-week paternity leave benefits policy and instead introduced one month of paid parental leave for fathers (the “daddy month”). In Iceland, mothers and fathers are now individually entitled to one more month of paid leave each, while the amount of shared parental leave has been reduced by a month. Meanwhile, Spain began gradually increasing paternity leave in 2019 to equalize it with maternity leave by 2021 at 16 weeks each.

With seven positive changes, the third most frequent area of reform is related to laws measured by the Marriage indicator, particularly in the area of domestic violence legislation. Recent studies have emphasized the staggering economic costs of domestic violence. Kuwait and Madagascar introduced specific and comprehensive legislation on domestic violence for the first time. Kuwait’s new law not only prohibits any form

---

**TABLE 1.3**

**ECONOMIES ACROSS ALL REGIONS UNDERTOOK REFORMS TOWARD GENDER EQUALITY IN 2019/20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>No. of data points reformed</th>
<th>Economies</th>
<th>Example of reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Benin, Fiji, Jordan, United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Fiji allowed a woman to apply for a passport in the same way as a man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marshall Islands, Senegal, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Sierra Leone adopted legislation on sexual harassment in employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bahrain, Costa Rica, Marshall Islands, Montenegro, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Vietnam</td>
<td>Costa Rica lifted a ban on women’s night work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chile, Kuwait, Madagascar, Portugal, Puerto Rico (US), Rwanda, United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>The United Arab Emirates no longer requires a married woman to obey her husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Austria, Ethiopia, Ireland, Suriname, United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Ireland introduced two weeks of paid parental leave as an individual entitlement for each parent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bahrain, Jordan, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Pakistan allowed women to register a business in the same way as men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bahrain, Brazil, Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenia equalized the age at which men and women can retire with full pension benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note: The Assets indicator is not included this table because no reforms were recorded in the period measured.*
of physical, psychological, sexual, or financial domestic abuse, but also provides for protection orders and services for survivors of violence. Specifically, the law calls for shelters, a hotline, counseling services, and legal assistance for survivors of domestic violence. Madagascar’s new law establishes criminal penalties for different forms of gender-based violence, such as physical, psychological, emotional, or economic abuse in the private and public spheres, as well as a process to obtain protection orders. Furthermore, the new law stipulates that the state must support survivors through health care, psychological and legal aid services, and allocation of necessary resources.

Also under the Marriage indicator, Chile, Portugal, Puerto Rico (US), and Rwanda abolished the specified time that a woman had to wait before remarrying after finalization of a divorce. New civil codes in Chile and Puerto Rico introduced gender-neutral language allowing both spouses to remarry as soon as a divorce is finalized. Portugal’s previous civil code provided for internuptial periods for both men and women. However, the woman’s waiting time was 300 days, whereas the man’s was 180 days. Rwanda equalized a provision in the family law that required widows—but not widowers—to wait 300 days before remarrying after the death of their spouse. The new law revokes the internuptial period for both men and women. The previous restriction on a woman’s ability to remarry was intended to avoid a potential conflict of paternity between her previous husband and future husband.

**Economies also reformed under the Mobility, Workplace, and Entrepreneurship indicators**

Four economies improved on six data points under the Mobility indicator. It tracks the differences between the rules that govern the rights of men and women to obtain a passport and travel abroad, choose where to live, and leave their home at will. Mobility affects every step in a working woman’s life cycle. Limitations in this area reduce opportunities for women to build networks with other entrepreneurs and exchange vital information on market opportunities, ultimately preventing them from developing their full potential as successful entrepreneurs. Increasing women’s mobility, including the opportunity to freely commute to and from a workplace outside of the home, can give women access to better employment opportunities.

Benin, Fiji, and Jordan removed procedural requirements that made it more burdensome for women than men to apply for a passport. In Benin, a 2019 circular issued by the Ministry of the Interior and Public Security instructed all concerned departments that in the interest of establishing equal treatment between men and women, married women were no longer required to provide a copy of their marriage certificate when applying for an ordinary passport. The United Arab Emirates abolished provisions imposing legal consequences when a woman abstained from traveling with her husband or left the marital home without a lawful excuse. It also removed stipulations that a woman must live with her husband in the home chosen by him.

The Workplace indicator examines legal protections in the workplace such as the right to nondiscrimination and freedom from sexual harassment. The United Arab Emirates removed restrictions on a woman’s right to get a job. Both the Marshall Islands and Senegal enacted new legislation directly prohibiting gender-based discrimination in employment. And Sierra Leone adopted legislation on sexual harassment in employment.
The new law introduces comprehensive definitions and penalties for sexual harassment offenses in the area of employment and other settings, whereas the previous law contained no specific references to employment. Addressing sexual harassment in the workplace is key to achieving fundamental labor market goals, including closing the gender pay gap.34

Under the Entrepreneurship indicator, five economies have enacted reforms since 2019. Pakistan allowed women to register a business in the same way as men. Through their central bank’s regulatory powers, Bahrain and Jordan introduced the right to nondiscrimination based on gender in access to finance. To comply with Bahrain’s Central Bank directive, banks and financial institutions must ensure that all regulated financial services are provided without discrimination based on sex. Because Central Bank directives are not always publicly accessible or widely disseminated, after adoption of the directive the United Arab Emirates, where a similar provision was introduced in 2019, launched a dissemination campaign to raise awareness among citizens. The authorities also issued a message announcing adoption of the provision, in English and Arabic, on all ATM screens in the country.

The Marshall Islands and Uzbekistan introduced rights to nondiscrimination in access to finance through broader legislation that also guaranteed gender equality. The Marshall Islands’ Gender Equality Act of 2019 provides that women are entitled to access loans, grants, mortgages, credit, or any other financial service on an equal basis with men. Similarly, Uzbekistan’s Law on the Guarantees of Equal Rights and Opportunities for Men and Women of 2019 prescribes nondiscrimination in the provision of movable and immovable property, land, financial assets, and loans. Despite these reforms, 108 economies still lack legal provisions that expressly prohibit gender-based discrimination in access to finance. For women who become entrepreneurs, access to finance is likely necessary. Meanwhile, women worldwide still earn, own, and learn less than their husbands and brothers.35

Fewer economies undertook reforms related to Pension and Assets

Only three economies announced changes increasing gender equality as measured by the Pension indicator: Bahrain, Brazil, and Slovenia. Differences in women’s working lives relative to those of men can result in unequal economic outcomes in retirement. To address this issue, Slovenia equalized the age (65 years) at which men and women can retire and receive full benefits, following a gradual-increase schedule introduced by the Pension and Disability Act in 2013. Bahrain also made strides under this indicator by accounting for periods of childcare in pension benefits for the first time. Brazil eliminated retirement with partial pension benefits for both men and women. At the same time, the Slovak Republic implemented a change that widened the legal gender gap. A new law established different ages for men and women to retire with full and partial pension benefits and made the mandatory retirement age for men and women unequal.

Finally, no reforms have been recorded under the Assets indicator since 2019. Strong property rights can allow women to leverage assets for economic gain, increasing their financial security and providing them with the collateral needed to start a business. Governments in the 75 economies in which men and women still do not have equal rights to manage and inherit property should consider adopting good practice legislation in this area.
Fifty years of legal change

Regional patterns have remained similar over the last 50 years, with the OECD high-income, Europe and Central Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean economies leading the way toward legal gender equality. In addition, the OECD high-income, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Sub-Saharan Africa regions have each recorded a gain in their average score of more than 30 points since 1970—the largest of all regions (figure 1.10). Over the last 10 years, the pace of reform has picked up in the Middle East and North Africa and South Asia, with a gain in the average score of more than 10 points in each region. The East Asia and the Pacific and Sub-Saharan Africa regions have each gained more than seven points.

The distribution of economies and their scores on the Women, Business and the Law index has changed significantly over time (figure 1.11). Whereas 1970 saw 12 economies scoring 25 or below on the index, by 1995 there were only five economies in this category. By 2008, there were none. At the same time, in 1970 no economies scored above 75, and the highest score, 71.3, was achieved by only Denmark and Sweden.

In 1975 the United Nations launched a Decade for Women, and in 1979 the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), known as the international bill of rights for women, was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. This decade of action led to many reforms increasing gender equality, with economies in better standing being among the first to ratify the convention. By 1986 nine economies were in the highest quartile, and only seven were in the lowest. By 1995 the number of top-scoring economies had grown to 21. Belgium and Luxembourg were the first economies to reach a score of 100 in 2011. They were soon followed by Denmark in 2012, Sweden in 2013, Latvia in 2014, France in 2015, Iceland in 2016, Canada in 2019, and Ireland and Portugal in 2020.
By 2010, when the United Nations established UN Women to define and promote global standards for achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women, the number of economies scoring above 75 surpassed those of the other categories. However, based on the 35 questions measured by Women, Business and the Law, laws in only 10 economies treat men and women equally today.

Although all economies have improved over the 50-year period, the pace of reform has been slow. In 20 economies in 2020, women continued to have half or fewer of the legal rights of men. These economies are mostly in the Middle East and North Africa, South Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa regions, where, according to the data, reform momentum is growing. If the pace of change stays the same, however, at least another 30 years will be needed to achieve legal gender parity globally. Based on annual year-to-year increases in the average Women, Business and the Law index by region, predictions call for OECD high-income economies to be the first region to reach an average score of 100 by 2025, followed by Latin America and the Caribbean in 2043 and Europe and Central Asia in 2044.

The pace of reform has varied between indicators as well (figure 1.12). Even though the Workplace and Parenthood indicators were at their lowest in 1970, with 17.8% (135 of 760) and 16.4% (156 of 950) of positive data points, respectively, these indicators have demonstrated the strongest performance of all indicators covered by Women, Business and the Law over the last 50 years. Between 1970 and 2020, 61.8% (470 of 760)
of data points were reformed under the Workplace indicator and 38.4% (365 of 950) under the Parenthood indicator. Despite this progress, however, Parenthood remains the indicator with the lowest scores. Nearly half of the data points under Parenthood (429 of 950) need reform, the largest gap of all indicators.

Because of the historically slow pace of progress, the regional distribution of scores under the Assets indicator has not changed significantly over time (figure 1.13). The Europe and Central Asia, OECD high-income, and Latin America and the Caribbean economies have the highest scores, with almost all economies implementing good practices related to women’s property ownership and inheritance. Sub-Saharan Africa has reformed steadily over the last five decades, and today more than 50% of economies score 80 or above, meaning they have most of the good legislation measured.

Other regions, such as the Middle East and North Africa and South Asia, have seen little reform in this area. Besides the fact that relatively fewer laws under the Assets indicator are subject to reform, the slow pace of change may stem from the difficulty in reforming laws governing property ownership and inheritance, especially when engrained social norms dictate inheritance rules. Even when new legislation is passed, implementation is often hindered by social norms and women’s lack of awareness of their rights. These social perceptions play an important role in influencing whether women can claim their rights to land and property. Recent research confirms that, although there is substantial variation, in almost all economies men are more likely than women to own property. This research also finds that legal frameworks related to women’s rights to inheritance, immovable property, and marital regimes, as measured by Women, Business and the Law, are a reliable predictor of women’s actual property shares. Economies with higher scores on the Assets indicator generally have higher levels of women’s property ownership.35
What’s next?

Women, Business and the Law is committed to informing policy discussions on how to improve women’s economic opportunities and outcomes in all contexts. Policy makers, international organizations, civil society organizations, gender equality advocates, investors, and researchers can use its findings in many ways. For example, the data can help identify good practices and compare how favorable the regulatory environments of economies are for women business owners and workers. Data can also assist with assessing the economic impacts of laws and regulations on women’s prospects as employees and entrepreneurs, thereby bolstering traditional human rights arguments with economic research. The findings can be used to inform legislative change, make evidence-based decisions on policy reform and private investment, and support research on institutions and regulation (box 1.2).

Future editions of Women, Business and the Law will strive to maintain these functionalities, both by refining current methodology to better reflect the legal environment for women worldwide and pursuing new research that complements the index or provides opportunities to expand it.

Considering this, Women, Business and the Law is proposing a small number of methodological changes to improve the quality and accuracy of the data presented in subsequent studies. One change is to measure laws based on their date of enforcement, rather than enactment, for all questions. Other methodology refinements will affect the Marriage, Parenthood, and Entrepreneurship indicators. These proposed changes are detailed in the data notes in appendix A.

Women, Business and the Law will also pursue a substantial research agenda. Although this study details new areas of focus, including childcare and women’s access to justice, other topics such as girls’ education, elder care, women with disabilities, and legal identity are being considered. Such research may result in additions to the index, but
**BOX 1.2 HOW HAVE WOMEN, BUSINESS AND THE LAW DATA AND FINDINGS BEEN USED TO PROMOTE POLICY REFORM?**

Women, Business and the Law data can provide important evidence to support the design of policy interventions that promote women’s economic empowerment. Increasingly, World Bank Group operations are using Women, Business and the Law data and evidence to inform project design and target discriminatory legal frameworks. The World Bank recently supported the government of Madagascar with an ambitious agenda to improve human capital. One of the three main pillars of the development policy operation aimed to strengthen legal frameworks for the protection of women and girls. Women, Business and the Law data also helped to identify important legislative gaps, such as lack of legal protection against domestic violence. In Azerbaijan and Vietnam, the World Bank supported the reform of labor legislation to remove job restrictions for women as identified by Women, Business and the Law data. And government demand is increasing for advisory services related to Women, Business and the Law indicators, with new World Bank and International Finance Corporation operations supporting legal reforms to improve women’s access to employment in Chad and Sierra Leone.

Disseminating findings through in-country events and methodology workshops is also instrumental to raising awareness about the importance of legal reform to address gender disparities. The Women, Business and the Law team has organized workshops with civil society organizations (CSOs) in 17 Sub-Saharan African economies since 2016. The workshops brought together CSOs, policy makers, and development actors to discuss barriers to women’s economic opportunities and how to use data and evidence to amplify core messages about the economic consequences of gender equality reforms. In early 2020, the World Bank organized a peer-to-peer learning event in Libreville, Gabon, to discuss the impact of discriminatory laws and practices on women’s empowerment and good practice laws that enhance women’s economic opportunities. The event brought together ministers of women’s affairs, senior leaders, and policy makers from 14 West and Central African economies, including the First Ladies of Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Gabon.

Women, Business and the Law data are also used by other institutions to influence policy change. For example, together with UN Women and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Women, Business and the Law contributes its data and expertise to inform Sustainable Development Goal 5.1.1 (https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/), “Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote, enforce and monitor equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex.” The Millennium Challenge Corporation (https://www.mcc.gov/who-we-select/indicator/gender-in-the-economy-indicator) uses Women, Business and the Law data in its Gender in the Economy Indicator, which is used to assess economies’ commitments to promoting gender equality. And several other institutions use Women, Business and the Law data to construct their own indicators, such as the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security’s index (https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/), the International Trade Center’s SheTrades Outlook (https://www.shetrades.com/en/projects/shetrades-outlook), the Equal Measures 2030’s SDG Gender Index (https://data.em2030.org/2019-sdg-gender-index/indicator/gender-equality-and-data-sources/), the Global Governance Forum’s Gender Equality and Governance Index (GEGI) (https://globalgovernanceforum.org/global-issues/gender-equality/), and others. Arizona State University’s Global SDG 5 Notification Tool (https://globalfutures.asu.edu/sdg5-training/) also provides users with insight into country-level progress on legal gender equality and aims to inform parliamentarians about
also could lead to the production of case studies or policy briefs that measure outcomes or present a picture of the implementation of legislation in selected economies.

Refining and building on this work will develop new insight into how women’s employment and entrepreneurship are affected by discrimination and, in turn, how discrimination affects economic outcomes such as women’s participation in the labor market. By staying both relevant and valuable to the field of gender equality, the data can serve as an important tool in the pursuit of more resilient and equitable economies.

Notes
2. Forty-five data points changed from “No” to “Yes” as a result of reform efforts. Three data points changed from “Yes” to “No” because of negative changes in the law.
10. For example, there is evidence from Ghana that reforms to inheritance laws led to few positive changes in terms of women’s inheritance (Gedzi 2012). Two studies of legal reform in Pakistan found that a positive legal change has not allowed women to claim their entitled inheritances because of factors such as lack of education, patriarchal behaviors, and forced marriages (Ahmad, Batool, and Dziegielewski 2016; Holden and Chaudhary 2013).
13. Williamson and Kerekes 2011. The authors’ analysis pertains specifically to the importance of formal and informal institutions as they relate to property rights.
17. Amin and Islam 2015; Htun, Jensenius, and Nelson-Nufiez 2019; Zabalza and Tzannatos 1985. Although many studies are based on correlations, Field et al. (2016) provide experimental evidence that depositing wages in a woman’s own bank account (as opposed to that of the male head of household) increases her labor supply, thereby illustrating that financial autonomy can exert a causal impact on female labor force participation rates.
24. Although several data sets provide insight into gender equality and women’s economic opportunities across economies, the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index was chosen for correlation with the Women, Business and the Law index because of the range of topics it covers, as well as its expansive coverage across economies and over time.
26. The relationship between the Women, Business and the Law index and the proportion of female employees in vulnerable employment was confirmed using panel data regressions on data for 179 economies covering the period 1991–2019. The relationship is statistically significant after controlling for income (measured as GDP per capita) and economy-level and time fixed effects.
34. Deloitte 2019; Lancaster and van der Meulen Rodgers 2020; McLaughlin, Uggen, and Blackstone 2017.
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In the period from September 2, 2019, to October 1, 2020, *Women, Business and the Law* recorded reforms resulting in 36 changes to indicator scores that improved gender equality in employment and entrepreneurial activity in 27 economies. Over the same period, one economy implemented a change widening the legal gender gap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform increasing gender parity</th>
<th>Change decreasing gender parity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Austria**
- **Parenthood**

Austria introduced 30 days of paid paternity leave.

**Bahrain**
- **Pay**

Bahrain made job opportunities more equal for men and women by eliminating discriminatory restrictions on women’s employment in arduous jobs.

- **Entrepreneurship**

Bahrain made access to credit easier for women by prohibiting gender-based discrimination in financial services.

- **Pension**

Bahrain explicitly accounted for periods of absence due to childcare in pension benefits.

**Benin**
- **Mobility**

Benin allowed women to apply for a passport in the same way as men.

**Brazil**
- **Pension**

Brazil eliminated the possibility of retiring with partial pension benefits. Previously, the ages at which men and women could retire with partial pension benefits were unequal.

**Chile**
- **Marriage**

Chile gave women the same rights to remarry as men.
Costa Rica
✓ Pay
Costa Rica lifted a ban on women’s night work.

Ethiopia
✓ Parenthood
Ethiopia increased paid maternity leave from 90 to 120 days and introduced three days of paid paternity leave.

Fiji
✓ Mobility
Fiji allowed women to apply for a passport in the same way as men.

Ireland
✓ Parenthood
Ireland introduced two weeks of paid parental leave as an individual entitlement for each parent.

Jordan
✓ Mobility
Jordan allowed women to apply for a passport in the same way as men.
✓ Entrepreneurship
Jordan made access to credit easier for women by prohibiting gender-based discrimination in financial services.

Kuwait
✓ Marriage
Kuwait enacted legislation protecting women from domestic violence.

Madagascar
✓ Marriage
Madagascar enacted legislation protecting women from domestic violence.

Marshall Islands
✓ Workplace
✓ Pay
The Marshall Islands mandated equal remuneration for work of equal value.

✓ Entrepreneurship
The Marshall Islands made access to credit easier for women by prohibiting gender-based discrimination in financial services.

Montenegro
✓ Pay
Montenegro made job opportunities more equal for men and women by eliminating discriminatory restrictions on women’s employment in industrial jobs such as those in the mining, construction, manufacturing, and water sectors. It also removed restrictions on women’s employment in jobs deemed dangerous.

New Zealand
✓ Pay
New Zealand mandated equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Pakistan
✓ Entrepreneurship
Pakistan allowed women to register a business in the same way as men.

Portugal
✓ Marriage
Portugal gave women the same rights to remarry as men.

Puerto Rico (US)
✓ Marriage
Puerto Rico gave women the same rights to remarry as men.

Rwanda
✓ Marriage
Rwanda gave women the same rights to remarry as men.

Saudi Arabia
✓ Pay
Saudi Arabia eliminated all restrictions on women’s employment.
Senegal
✓ Workplace

Senegal prohibited gender-based discrimination in employment.

Sierra Leone
✓ Workplace

Sierra Leone adopted legislation on sexual harassment in employment.

Slovak Republic
✗ Pension

The Slovak Republic established different ages for men and women to retire with full and partial pension benefits. The mandatory retirement age for men and women is now unequal.

Slovenia
✓ Pension

Slovenia equalized the age (65 years) at which men and women can retire with full pension benefits.

Suriname
✓ Parenthood

Suriname introduced 16 weeks of paid maternity leave and eight days of paid paternity leave.

United Arab Emirates
✓ Mobility

The United Arab Emirates allowed women to choose where to live and to travel abroad in the same way as men. The United Arab Emirates also allowed a married woman to leave the home without her husband’s permission.

✓ Workplace

The United Arab Emirates allowed a woman to get a job without permission from her husband.

✓ Pay

The United Arab Emirates mandated equal remuneration for work of equal value.

✓ Marriage

The United Arab Emirates no longer requires a married woman to obey her husband.
✓ **Parenthood**

The United Arab Emirates introduced five days of paid parental leave as an individual entitlement for each parent. Fathers now have paid leave to care for their newborn children.

**Uzbekistan**

✓ **Entrepreneurship**

Uzbekistan made access to credit easier for women by prohibiting gender-based discrimination in financial services.

**Vietnam**

✓ **Pay**

Vietnam made job opportunities more equal for men and women by eliminating discriminatory restrictions on women’s employment in jobs deemed dangerous.
CHAPTER 2

Women and COVID-19

- COVID-19 has largely affected sectors in which the share of female employment is high.

- Since onset of the pandemic, close to 40 economies have introduced leave or benefit policies to help employed parents reconcile their jobs with their newly expanded childcare obligations.

- For women navigating family law issues, justice systems have implemented novel methods of serving their constituents while maintaining safety as a priority, including remote hearings where digital infrastructure allows. At least 72 economies have introduced measures to declare family cases urgent or essential during lockdown, and 88 economies have allowed remote court access.

- The pandemic has had disproportionate impacts on women’s health and safety. Many governments have acted to mitigate such effects, including by introducing services dedicated to protecting women from violence.

By early 2020, it had become clear that COVID-19 was not just a public health emergency; it would also have lasting social and economic impacts. Reports suggested that it would affect men and women differently, noting that data collection and analysis could provide valuable insights into the gender dimensions of disease outbreak and response. In particular, strong legal frameworks and justice systems would be critical for maintaining stability, safeguarding citizens’ rights, and providing emergency relief during times of crisis. Information about an economy’s preparedness in the event of a pandemic and any actions taken after its outbreak could aid in creating effective and equitable policies and interventions in the future.

Indeed, it appears women will bear the brunt of the pandemic’s effects on the global economy. Evidence has already begun to emerge on its impacts on their economic opportunity. Although recessions are often associated with a disproportionate impact on male employment, COVID-19 has largely affected sectors in which the share of female employment is high.\(^1\) Data from the World Bank’s Enterprise Analysis Unit reveal a larger drop in the proportion of female full-time employees relative to male full-time employees (figure 2.1).\(^2\) Collection efforts are still ongoing, but the data reveal that more women than men have been forced to take leave from or quit their jobs due to illness, childcare
interruptions, or mobility restrictions. They also suggest that the proportion of male and female employees who have been laid off or furloughed is similar.

Figure 2.1 is a mere snapshot of the gendered impacts of the pandemic; continued data collection and evaluation are needed to provide a more complete assessment. To assist in such efforts, Women, Business and the Law added research questions related to COVID-19 to its questionnaires (figure 2.2). Questions were not necessarily based on Women, Business and the Law indicators; rather, they were chosen in conjunction with the theme of each questionnaire and were based on the ability of local experts in each respondent pool to provide current information. The data, collected between April and October 2020, were verified with secondary sources. The new questions were designed to gather information about measures, both legal and programmatic, provisional and permanent, that governments implemented to address the unprecedented challenges faced by women employees and entrepreneurs during the pandemic.

Three distinct themes emerged during collection and analysis of these data. First, employed parents, and particularly mothers, were facing unprecedented levels of unpaid care work that were incompatible with the demands of most jobs in the labor market. Second, stay-at-home orders and other restrictions may also have been preventing women from safely and effectively accessing justice. And, third, the crisis was disproportionately threatening women’s health and safety, making the allocation of resources and services to mitigate any impact vital. Considering measures implemented across themes, the data show that economies with greater gender equality were more likely to address these challenges. The average Women, Business and the Law index score for economies that adopted at least one of the
measures tracked is 82.0, compared with 64.5 for economies in which no evidence was found of action taken.

The following sections explore Women, Business and the Law’s preliminary findings in each area. The data are intended to provide examples of measures that governments may consider implementing should their specific contexts require them during this time. The evidence presented here encourages further research on the impacts of COVID-19 on gender equality, and should be considered together with other data on the subject as they become available.

**Responding to the childcare crisis**

As the COVID-19 pandemic unfolded, droves of women were being forced out of the labor force. This outcome was in part because women are often concentrated in occupations most vulnerable to an economic downturn, such as hospitality and services, and so are subject to greater job losses than men. Women may also find their childcare responsibilities increased at the expense of paid work if they are the secondary wage earner in the family.

In large part, however, it was widespread gender inequality in the home and lack of childcare that continued to affect women’s work. With almost every economy temporarily or indefinitely shutting down schools and childcare centers, mothers were bearing the brunt of increased childcare, often having to choose between their jobs and their families. For frontline workers who cannot work from home—the majority of whom worldwide are women—school closures and childcare shutdowns were particularly challenging. Even when both parents were fortunate enough to be able to work from home, men were still not performing the same amount of childcare and unpaid work as women. Furthermore, many employers were discriminating against mothers and failed to or could not accommodate their childcare needs.

Although exacerbated, this unequal distribution of care work within households and lack of childcare support for working parents are nothing new. In the prepandemic world, women were spending 4.5 hours a day on unpaid work, whereas men were spending less than half of that time. Although men were doing more care work than before lockdowns began, COVID-19 simply exposed, more than ever, the childcare crisis across the world that is escalating gender inequality.
Women, Business and the Law has explored how policy makers addressed this crisis during the pandemic through social protection measures and changes to labor and employment law. Specifically, it has investigated three categories of new childcare measures: (1) childcare leave policies, (2) childcare measures for essential workers, and (3) other forms of childcare assistance available to parents during the pandemic.

Before the onset of COVID-19, less than a quarter of all economies legally guaranteed employed parents any time off for childcare. These policies are almost exclusively found in Europe and Central Asia and among the high-income member economies of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Although the exact details and even the titles of these leave policies differ considerably from one economy to another, they all provide parents of young and school-age children with time off for childcare purposes.11

With the widespread closure of schools and care facilities, however, close to 40 economies from all regions, except East Asia and the Pacific and South Asia, ushered in leave or benefit policies to help employed parents reconcile their jobs with newly expanded childcare obligations. More than three-fourths of these economies are classified as high-income. Approximately three-fifths introduced temporary policies during school closures, while the remaining economies changed existing ones.

The COVID-19 childcare leave and benefit policies examined here vary widely. For eligibility, the right to leave as well as to any compensation is almost always tied to formal employment. For example, in Switzerland parents applying for childcare benefits must be covered by the Swiss social security insurance program and must be employed or engaged in self-employment. Parents working in the informal sector are not eligible. In lower-income economies where women are largely working informally, governments considering childcare leave or benefit policies should ensure they have access to any programs implemented in response to the pandemic.12

In some economies such as Cyprus and Romania an employee must be unable to work from home to receive childcare leave. In others, such as France, anyone affected by lack of regular childcare is eligible. Some governments also limit eligibility based on the age of the child. In Chile and Poland, only parents of children under the age of eight are eligible, whereas in Bulgaria and Portugal parents with children up to age 12 can take childcare leave. In a few economies, including Algeria, only mothers are entitled to childcare leave.

The duration of COVID-era childcare leave and benefit policies can also fluctuate. In economies such as Argentina and North Macedonia, the duration of childcare leave or of the payment of benefits is based on the duration of the state of emergency or school closure. Meanwhile, other economies have established a maximum duration ranging from about three days (Greece) to three months (the United States). In at least one economy, Fiji, leave was shortened to maintain the stability of jobs and businesses. The Employment Relations (Amendment) Act 2020 reduced both paternity and family care leave from five to two business days.

When it comes to wage compensation for income lost because of childcare obligations, benefits are typically based on a percentage of the parent’s income. In Italy, between March and July 2020 parents were jointly entitled to 30 days of leave paid at 50% of the parent’s salary. In France, workers with children affected by school closures
were entitled to up to 70% of wage compensation until they reopened. Leave can also be unpaid, such as in Canada, or in rare cases, be fully paid, such as in the Seychelles.

In most economies providing such compensation, cash benefits are funded by the government. In Malta, parents unable to work from home but who had to take care of their children under 16 years of age were eligible for a cash benefit during school closures. Portugal offered an allowance to parents who had children under the age of 12 and who had to miss work because of the closure of schools and day cares. In Japan, the government offered to partially compensate employers for the special paid leave they gave employees unable to work because of the closure of their child’s care or education facility. In other economies such as West Bank and Gaza employers must pay for all or part of childcare leave.

Many governments also took specific measures to provide childcare for essential workers on the frontline of the COVID-19 pandemic. Some 20 economies introduced such measures once the pandemic spread. New Zealand funded home-based childcare for children of essential workers unable to find alternative care arrangements during the lockdown. Similarly, Singapore required preschools to stay open for parents who provide essential services, with priority given to health care workers unable to work from home and low-income essential workers.

Other forms of childcare assistance have also proved critical. Although leave and benefits are essential, many parents left without childcare during COVID-19-induced lockdowns were not eligible or simply could not afford to take leave without full pay or stopping work. To address these challenges, some economies introduced innovative childcare assistance measures, such as free childcare or compensation specifically designated for childcare (table 2.1). Such measures are heavily concentrated among OECD high-income economies.

Supporting the childcare industry itself was also key to ensuring it did not collapse during and after the pandemic. Some governments provided support to childcare providers, including allocation of funds and tax relief. In the United Kingdom, eligible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.1</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF CHILDCARE MEASURES INTRODUCED DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Type of measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Paid childcare leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Free childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Childcare support for essential workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Exemption from paying kindergarten fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Babysitting vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Tax credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

childcare centers will not have to pay any business rates, a type of property tax, from 2020 to 2021. Similarly, in Hong Kong SAR, China, qualified childcare centers are eligible for a Child Care Centre Special Grant administered by the Social Welfare Department to help manage financial difficulties arising from suspension of their services due to COVID-19.

Overall, *Women, Business and the Law* found that pandemic-related childcare measures were few and far between. They were also likely insufficient to tackle the motherhood penalty and solve the childcare crisis. Even before the pandemic, fathers’ uptake of paid parental leave compared with mothers’ was abysmally low in the majority of the 44 economies guaranteeing it. In Japan, only 7.5% of eligible fathers took paid parental leave in 2019, despite having one of the most generous policies in the world. And in the United Kingdom, it is estimated that only 2–8% of eligible couples made use of shared parental leave benefits in 2016.

Long-term strategies to build robust childcare infrastructure, encourage fathers to share equally in unpaid care work, and reconcile the demands of both childcare and the workplace are critical to achieving gender equality. To promote fathers’ uptake of leave and help redistribute unpaid care work in the home, some governments are designing parental leave policies that are highly compensated, include specific nontransferable allocations for fathers, or provide sharing bonuses. Other interventions, such as strengthening nondiscrimination laws, are also needed to ensure that a basic legal framework enabling women’s economic inclusion is in place. The private sector can also play a role by allowing flexible work arrangements to support parents. Finally, investments in the childcare industry, which also benefit children’s cognitive development, are critical to boost gender equality and improve women’s labor force participation.

### Accessing the court system

Globally, women initiate the majority of family law cases, including formalizing marriage or divorce, seeking custody of children, and requesting protection from violence. Access to court is therefore an important component of women’s security, voice, and agency. Family courts worldwide have taken several approaches to enabling women to access the justice system during the pandemic. Even and especially during a state of emergency, it is important to declare certain cases as “urgent” or “essential” ones that must be addressed. Procedures that offer women a safe alternative to in-person hearings must also be introduced or expanded.

Although the pandemic has altered the functioning of many economies’ judicial systems, governments responded to these challenges by enabling women to access justice in several innovative ways. At least 72 economies introduced measures to declare family cases urgent or essential during lockdown. Slovenia’s judiciary enacted a decree in March 2020 calling on courts to hold hearings only for a limited number of urgent cases, including those related to the upbringing and care of children and maintenance obligations. In South Africa, which has one of the highest rates of gender-based violence in Sub-Saharan Africa, the chief justice authorized all heads of court and magistrates in the superior and lower courts to enable access for urgent matters such as bail applications, maintenance, domestic violence, and children-related cases.
Together with Ethiopia, South Africa also treated domestic violence cases as urgent, with courts continuing to hear cases.

Procedurally, 88 economies across all regions allowed remote court proceedings for family law matters. Such measures were most common in the OECD high-income region, followed by Europe and Central Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean (figure 2.3). The form and extent of these measures vary, encompassing fully digital court databases and electronic filing procedures, as well as virtual hearings conducted via videoconference, phone, or a social media platform. Sometimes, small adjustments to existing procedures can go a long way toward easing women’s access to justice. Norway dedicated a phone line to urgent requests for mediation in divorce proceedings while family welfare offices were closed. In addition, 12 economies—Argentina, Brazil, France, Greece, India, Ireland, Kenya, Portugal, Puerto Rico (US), Trinidad and Tobago, the United States, and Uruguay—automatically extended protection orders as a direct response to the health crisis.

At times, it became essential to create new online portals to meet demands. As part of their COVID-19 emergency plan, Puerto Rico’s judicial branch launched an online platform for the submission of protection order applications so the applicant would not have to go in person to the court or police headquarters. The Barbados judiciary introduced virtual courts and began conducting hearings by videoconference for urgent cases, which included violence against women and girls.21 China also launched online platforms to facilitate the application process for protection orders. In the Middle East and North Africa, Lebanon was the only country to introduce hearings to obtain protection orders via video call. The attorney general of the Court of Cassation also issued a circular that included an updated procedure for public prosecution of domestic violence cases.22

Although some economies were already equipped to conduct remote proceedings, others enacted new laws to respond to the crisis. At least 79 economies introduced
laws or policies on remote access to courts because of COVID-19 and after lockdowns were launched worldwide (table 2.2). In Mauritania, the public prosecution office created a digital platform via WhatsApp where citizens could file complaints and submit pictures and documents related to cases. In India, the Delhi High Court allowed family courts to record evidence via videoconferencing during the pandemic. Finally, Ghana accelerated its program on electronic filing and remote case access for judges. However, it is not yet fully functional countrywide because of a lack of internet access and network issues.

Marginalized groups, including women and the poor, have faced higher barriers in accessing the technology and infrastructure they need to receive services during the pandemic. In developed economies, nearly 87% of people have access to the internet, whereas in developing economies only 47% benefit from such access. Worldwide, 58.3% of men and 48.4% of women have internet access—a gender gap that is especially prevalent in low-income economies.

Flexible approaches can be helpful when addressing multiple gaps such as these. New technologies and mobile services have proved essential to guaranteeing access to justice for women during the COVID-19 crisis. For example, because the internet infrastructure in Guinea-Bissau is not strong enough to support videoconferencing, court procedures related to child custody and alimony can be carried out by phone.

However, a lack of available resources and insufficient infrastructure may make implementation difficult. In 68 economies, the justice system has not responded to the crisis, meaning that remote access to family courts is not possible and family cases were not declared urgent. And in 18 economies where physical access to courts was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Type of measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Greater use of electronic filing and remote hearings for family law cases</td>
<td>Although both the Ontario Court of Justice and Superior Court allowed electronic filings and hearings by phone and videoconferences before onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, including when filing for divorce, family lawyers noticed an uptake in the use of these means during the crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Issuance of ruling on use of technology for child custody arrangements</td>
<td>In April 2020, the Supreme Court of India prescribed guidelines for the functioning of the courts through videoconferencing in matters related to family law (among others), and high courts throughout the country followed suit. The high court in Mumbai also directed a woman to arrange for videoconferencing between her two children and their father during the lockdown, having held that the lockdown should not prevent a father from seeing and talking to his children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Declaration of urgency for family matters</td>
<td>Although courts limited their activities to help prevent the spread of COVID-19, in April 2020 the Tokyo Family Court announced that urgent family cases, including urgent child custody cases, would be processed as usual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Launch of remote hearings and electronic document submission for divorce and child custody proceedings</td>
<td>In May 2020, the Lagos judiciary in Nigeria approved hearings via electronic platforms such as Skype or Zoom for urgent cases related to divorce proceedings and child custody cases. Documents could be submitted via both email and WhatsApp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Issuance of protocols on remote hearings of family law matters</td>
<td>In March 2020, the family law division of the courts published detailed protocols on how to conduct hearings remotely via teleconference, Skype, email, and other means of electronic communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

completely restricted, seven did not provide any remote proceedings. Such measures should be introduced and not remain temporary; they should be implemented beyond the pandemic. Policy makers also need to address gaps in digital literacy and access to information technology for marginalized groups. Remote access to family courts will help to alleviate an undue burden on women who are juggling work, mobility constraints, childcare, and other family responsibilities for years to come.

**Protecting women’s health and safety**

As new findings continue to emerge about the effects of the coronavirus, its secondary impacts on the health and safety of women and girls become clearer. Easier access to health care and equalization of health insurance premiums paid by women and men have become especially important as women try, with increasing difficulty, to access vital services in a pandemic.

To combat these disparities, governments and insurance companies could adopt gender-sensitive responses to meet the needs of women during the COVID-19 pandemic, including by taking into account barriers to women’s digital and financial inclusion, acknowledging their increased caretaking responsibilities, and providing resources to help them cope with the multifaceted challenges of the crisis. For example, insurers often incorporate information on several factors when determining premium rates: health status, age, gender, geographic location, occupation, and family size, among others. Such factors can be used to justify higher premium rates, especially for women.

Although these rates need not be motivated by a pandemic, a prohibition of discrimination in this area could protect women when such situations arise. In the United States, data reveal that women paid more than men for the same health insurance coverage until 2014 when the Affordable Care Act (ACA) was enacted and enforced a prohibition on gender rating in the calculation of health insurance premiums at the federal level. After its enactment, the percentage of women ages 19–64 who reported delaying or skipping necessary care because of health insurance costs fell to an all-time low (38%) versus nearly half of women (48%) in 2010. Such a law could be a helpful tool in preventing gender-based discrimination when accessing health insurance.

Forty-four out of the 190 economies measured by *Women, Business and the Law* legally prohibit discrimination based on gender when calculating health insurance premiums. The Civil Code of the Czech Republic states that an insurer may not use pregnancy or maternity “as an aspect in determining the amount of the insurance premium or in calculating the insurance benefit.” Cabo Verde’s Decree-Law No. 35 of 2010 stipulates that “in the signing, execution and termination of the insurance contract, discriminatory practices based on ancestry, sex, race, language, territory of origin, religion, political or ideological beliefs, education, economic situation, social condition or sexual orientation, as well as for people with disabilities or aggravated health risk, are prohibited.” Iceland uses its gender equality law to eliminate discrimination “when deciding the amount of benefits due to insurance contract or under other related financial service.” Such protections against discrimination can ensure that women remain both healthy and financially resilient during this time.
Some economies have also acted to reduce the impact of the pandemic on women’s access to family planning and reproductive health services. In June 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommended prioritizing access to sexual and reproductive health services, which can be severely disrupted during virus outbreaks, disempowering women and girls and exposing them to health risks. Economies have been acting promptly on these recommendations. Guidelines released by the Indian Ministry of Health recommend the continuation of routine reproductive health services, including walk-ins for family planning services. In the United States, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommended that health care providers offer quality family planning services while minimizing in-person contact between patients and providers, including through digital health services.

For women facing threats to their safety, governments have also allocated resources and services to mitigate the impact of violence. Forced coexistence, job loss, and escalating stress and anxiety about the future can lead to greater tension in the household, turning many partners into abusers or exacerbating existing abuse. Indeed, the pandemic has contributed to a rise in both the severity and frequency of gender-based violence. Ensuring the provision or continuity of services, including access to health care, psychological assistance, legal aid, shelters, dedicated police resources, livelihood support, and hotlines, as established by international legal standards, has therefore been of paramount importance for survivors of gender-based violence throughout the pandemic. Without such support, the stretched capacity of response services could contribute to larger losses for women and a heightened perception of impunity among perpetrators.

Preliminary research finds that since early 2020 economies around the world have introduced about 125 new measures to facilitate women’s access to services protecting them from gender-based violence (table 2.3). These measures, which take different forms, may include emergency services provided by justice or women’s affairs ministries, emergency decrees or protocols issued by governments, or approval of additional budget for the establishment of new services or enhancement of existing ones, among other things. Such services either complement and support existing programs or introduce new ones.

Of the services measured, hotlines were the most frequent, accounting for about one-fourth of all services introduced. Emerging data indicate a spike in calls to domestic violence hotlines in many economies after outbreak of the pandemic. For example, after acknowledging a fivefold increase in the rate of violence against women over the same period last year, the Tunisian Ministry of Women, Family, Children and Seniors launched a toll-free phone line to enable women to report exposure to domestic violence during the period of isolation. This 24/7 hotline service provided psychological, social, and legal counseling services. Similarly, to protect women at risk of gender-based violence, Jamaica’s Ministry of Health and Wellness established a hotline staffed by volunteers to help people seeking information and guidance. As part of their orientation, the hotline operators received training in gender-based violence awareness and prevention.

For some families, heightened health anxieties coupled with economic pressures have exacerbated already combustible domestic relationships, which has increased victims’ mental stress. To combat this situation, the Arab Republic of Egypt launched the “Our Mental Health Is a Priority” initiative in May 2020. With the help of psychologists and professional institutions, this initiative has supported the mental health of
Egyptian women and has raised the public’s awareness of mental health during this challenging time.37

In view of the adoption of social distancing measures and the lower budgets of civil society and women’s organizations (the main operators of shelters), it is not surprising that only 17 economies introduced dedicated shelters during the pandemic. Canada’s federal government approved a financial aid package to support people experiencing homelessness and women facing gender-based violence. Funds were allotted specifically to women’s shelters to address their immediate needs and support indigenous women and children escaping violence.38 Similarly, the Danish government opened 55 new
emergency shelters in five cities that guaranteed abused women and children safety and provisions for their basic needs.\textsuperscript{31}

Although in most economies police and legal aid actors focused on enforcing quarantine and social distancing measures, those in some economies continued to provide support for women in abusive relationships. After witnessing a spike in domestic violence cases, the Singapore Police Force referred survivors to social services such as legal assistance or shelters, even when no explicit request was made.\textsuperscript{32} In India, the National Legal Services Authority began providing online legal assistance services through a panel of women lawyers in each district who aid survivors of domestic violence and child abuse.\textsuperscript{33}

For many women suffering from physical abuse, fear of contracting the coronavirus was a deterrent from seeking medical care, a situation exacerbated by the burden of financial insecurity and the risk of job loss. Access to dedicated health care and livelihood services therefore became fundamental. In Uzbekistan, women entering the Center for Rehabilitation and Adaptation of Victims of Violence received food, medicine, and hygiene products.\textsuperscript{34} However, as health care systems became overburdened and prioritized COVID-19 cases, specific medical support for survivors of violence became the least offered. Just four economies were providing such health care–related services during the crisis.

Finally, a range of exceptional services were also introduced. In Thailand, Twitter launched a new search prompt with the hashtag #ThereIsHelp to redirect users experiencing gender-based violence to local hotlines.\textsuperscript{35} In the United Kingdom, the home secretary announced a new national communications campaign with the hashtag #YouAreNotAlone to reach out to those at risk of abuse.\textsuperscript{36} Spain also implemented an effective measure, the AlertCops app, which provides violence survivors with timely assistance. The app sends an alert to the police with the victim’s GPS location.\textsuperscript{37} In Italy, the State Police app YouPol was updated to receive domestic violence complaints, not only from survivors themselves but also from neighbors or other family members, including anonymously. Montenegro, Pakistan, and the Philippines also created online platforms or apps to assist women seeking help. In Argentina, Belgium, Cabo Verde, Chile, France, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom, pharmacies provided antiviolence measures and advice to survivors. They also activated emergency police protocols through the use of code words such as “masque-19” and “mascherina 1522” (box 2.1).

Diverse responses to domestic violence such as these are fundamental, but prevention measures, which are equally essential, are largely absent. Governments still have room to enact measures and policies aimed at addressing the roots of this epidemic of violence. National plans targeting education, supporting healthy relationship skills, questioning gender roles and social and cultural norms, and creating protective environments are some of the long-term measures that could mitigate the emergence of domestic violence under any circumstances.

**Setting the agenda**

The continuing effects of COVID-19 on gender equality will surely contribute to the research agenda in this field going forward. One area of further exploration is economies’ expanded use of digital technology to implement government-to-person
Evidence indicates that direct government cash transfers to low-income women increase their control over financial decisions, enhance their empowerment and prospects for economic recovery, and improve their resilience in the long run. The use of mobile money platforms to deliver COVID-19 relief can therefore empower women financially.

Sustained and wide-ranging data collection on these and other topics will be needed to effectively measure the impacts of the pandemic on women’s economic empowerment. Areas of additional analysis could include the impact of COVID-19 on women’s mobility and access to property, women’s decision-making in disease prevention and response, and girls’ education during and after the pandemic. Efforts are already under way with the assistance of organizations such as the United Nations Development Programme and UN Women (box 2.2). At the World Bank, the Gender Innovation Lab has published evidence on mechanisms that can help protect the lives and livelihoods of women and girls—at the household level, in firms and farms, and during adolescence—in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Projects responding to COVID-19 will also consider the pandemic’s differing impacts on men and women. To aid in this effort, the World Bank’s Gender Group has issued guidance for health response projects during the pandemic.

Confronting the gendered effects of COVID-19 will require a concerted effort from a variety of actors, including governments, international organizations, and civil society. Women, Business and the Law recognizes the nuances in the extent of the pandemic and the ideal provision of services by different sources in different economy contexts.
Across the globe, the economic and social fallout of COVID-19 is reinforcing gender inequalities. To understand how governments are addressing these challenges, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UN Women created the Global COVID-19 Gender Response Tracker, which by September 2020 had collected and analyzed over 2,500 government measures across 206 economies and territories. Sources of the tracker’s data include databases on COVID-19 responses, such as the World Bank’s Real-Time Review of Country Measures of the Social Protection and Jobs Responses to COVID-19; a global survey of UN Women and UNDP regional and country offices on violence against women; self-reporting by member states in their submissions for the UN secretary general’s report on violence against women; and desk research.

Gender analysis

Measures in the sample were classified into four policy categories: social protection, labor markets, fiscal and economic policies, and violence against women and girls. Of the 2,500 measures, a subset of 992 measures across 164 economies and territories were identified as gender-sensitive in that these measures seek to directly address the specific risks and challenges that women and girls face from the pandemic. These measures include those dealing with violence against women, which are categorized as gender-sensitive by default; social protection and labor market measures that target women’s economic security or address unpaid care; and fiscal and economic measures that support female-dominated sectors of the economy.

Findings on gender-sensitive measures

The first iteration of the tracker data was launched in September 2020. They will be updated on a quarterly basis and will expand into new policy areas in 2021. Findings from the data include the following:

- Over 70% of all gender-sensitive measures (704 in 135 economies) address violence against women and girls, including by strengthening helplines and other reporting mechanisms, shelters, and police and judicial responses.
- By contrast, the global social protection and labor market responses have been largely gender-blind, with only 10% of these measures targeting women’s economic security (177 in 85 economies) and 8% providing support for unpaid care (111 in 60 economies).
- Among the most important economic security measures are cash transfers, food assistance, or in-kind benefits that give women priority as the main recipients, as well as support for female entrepreneurs and female informal workers.
- To support unpaid care, 36 economies have expanded family leave provisions, while others have launched “cash-for-care” programs that compensate parents for school and childcare closures. Only 12 economies kept their childcare services open during lockdowns to support essential workers with children.
- Similarly, few actions have been taken to cushion the COVID-19 shocks to businesses and sectors with large shares of women; only one in 10 fiscal and economic measures channel resources to female-dominated sectors of the economy.

By pointing to gaps and challenges, the tracker is an important advocacy and accountability tool when in the hands of gender equality advocates. It also provides an array of positive examples from which policy makers can draw inspiration. The tool is being used in global, regional, and national policy dialogues geared toward driving forward a gender-equitable crisis response and recovery.

Source: This box was drafted by Silke Staab, Esuna Dugarova, and Constanza Tabbush. See https://data.undp.org/gendertracker/ for tracker and methodological note.
As the world continues to feel the effects of COVID-19, more data will become available on both its impacts on gender equality and best practices to counter any negative consequences.

For women everywhere, the secondary effects of the pandemic on their livelihoods, economic security, and safety require immediate and sustained attention. Targeted measures that recognize the unique difficulties women are facing during this time, but also foster a legal environment that supports their equality of economic opportunity, can help close the gap in existing and exacerbated inequalities. This will ensure that women, and as a result their communities and economies, are both prepared for and resilient in meeting unexpected challenges.

Notes
11. Childcare leave is a leave policy generally available to both parents to provide care for their children. It is distinct from maternity, paternity, and parental leave because it is unrelated to the birth of a child or the first years of life. However, it may have strong similarities or even overlap with parental leave in some economies. Childcare leave is also distinct from leave to care for children who are ill or have disabilities. Typically, laws establishing childcare leave do not explicitly list school closures or the unavailability of regular childcare as a permitted reason to access childcare leave. Still, such laws are often worded broadly to allow for a variety of childcare-related purposes.
17. IFC 2020a.
25. IFC 2020b.
27. NWLC 2012; Pear 2012.
29. WHO 2020b.
31. CDC 2020.
33. COE 2018; UN Women 2015.
34. De Paz et al. 2020.
35. UN Women 2020.
44. United Kingdom, Parliament 2020.
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Women, Business and the Law 2021 presents studies of two new areas: childcare and access to justice.

Because women are often primary caregivers, unpaid care work is one of the main barriers to their employment and job retention. The first section of this chapter examines the need to reduce this barrier through the provision of childcare.

Laws are effective only if redress procedures and institutions are in place to implement them. Several ways of measuring women’s access to justice are explored in the second section of this chapter.

Future editions of Women, Business and the Law will seek to publish the results of these efforts as they apply to women’s economic opportunities and outcomes.

Mapping out measures that address challenges faced by women during the COVID-19 pandemic has only amplified two areas that Women, Business and the Law would like to research further: childcare and women’s access to justice. Women will not receive equal opportunities at work if their childcare needs are not met. Meeting such needs requires a more equitable sharing of responsibilities with men, as well as more support from both government and the private sector in the provision of care for young children. As for access to justice, although Women, Business and the Law has underscored that laws are an important first step toward ensuring gender equality, without justice to enable their implementation they will not have their intended effect.

Each topic is fundamental to the effort to close persistent gender gaps in women’s economic inclusion. Because of their relevance and importance, Women, Business and the Law will produce research and analysis that highlight the barriers women continue to face in these two areas. This effort will not necessarily result in the inclusion of new indicators in the Women, Business and the Law index. Although objective indicators can and should be used to better inform policy makers, there are limitations to creating them. Understanding local context, including political, legal, economic, and cultural climates, for example, is essential for producing indicators. In addition, sufficient human and financial resources must be dedicated to identifying and overcoming any methodological challenges. Finally, extensive country coverage, comparability across economies, and feasibility of annual data collection are vital for success. The addition of new indicators will thus depend on the results of the pilot effort and ability to address these limitations.

With these considerations in mind, the following sections present background research and preliminary suggestions for further research and analysis in the areas of childcare and access to justice. Women, Business and the Law will use this presentation
as a starting point from which to delve further into identifying potential avenues of measurement of these topics, with the hope that the findings will prove useful for both public and private sector actors.

**Accessing childcare for women’s economic opportunity**

The worldwide COVID-19 crisis highlighted the importance of access to high-quality, affordable childcare and exposed the financial vulnerability of the childcare sector. Many childcare providers feared they would not be able to reopen without public support.⁴ Because of the closure of childcare centers at the outset of the pandemic, parents faced hardship in dealing with additional care work. Women are primarily responsible for unpaid care at home, and they have also been affected more than men in terms of paid work. Policy makers and firms should better align childcare policies with the needs of working parents and, in particular, working mothers.

**Why does childcare matter for women’s economic empowerment?**

Research has documented the positive impact that the availability, affordability, and quality of childcare can have on women’s participation in the labor market, their hours of work, and their wages.⁵ A link has also been drawn between the availability and affordability of childcare and economic growth as related to fertility rates and the female labor supply.⁶

Government childcare policies are wide-ranging, and, globally, childcare options are diverse. Each economy must consider potential hurdles in the design of childcare provision, depending on its specific context. Hurdles could include persuading working parents who are not involved in the early development of their children that childcare is a necessity or providing guarantees that childcare offered outside the home is higher in quality than other options.

Literature on the impact of government funding on public and private childcare facilities, the effects of subsidies and tax credits given to families and employers, and informal childcare is helpful to understanding the relationship between childcare policies and women’s labor market outcomes.⁷ Although not exhaustive, the literature summarized in table 3.1 is a useful synthesis of the childcare options available to working parents and a snapshot of the advantages and limitations of each.

The literature reveals the costs and benefits of investments in childcare for women’s economic opportunities and participation in the labor market. Yet, government support for and intervention in regulating childcare go beyond their effects on female workers, and can be driven by externalities and market imperfections, including broader societal spillovers, information asymmetries, and costs. For example, expanding childcare services could be a source of job growth. It has been estimated that 43–53 million practitioners would be required to meet the gap in childcare access worldwide, with low- and lower-middle economies accounting for nearly 80% of the gap.⁸

Quality of care, another central concern, affects society at large in several ways. The low wages of childcare workers, for example, affect the quality and stability of the childcare workforce. More public spending on quality childcare will therefore improve the cognitive, social, and emotional skills of young children, who, in turn, will succeed
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as they move through school and enter the workforce as adults. Because they will get better jobs and earn more, it is argued, tax revenues will also increase. Likewise, children who attend quality childcare will be less likely to engage in criminal activity or use social services as adults, thereby reducing government spending. Childcare provision could also present parents with opportunities for further education. Therefore, returns on investment in early childcare pay back public investment in the long term.

The same returns apply to employers, who suffer losses in productivity when parents miss work to fill gaps in childcare or to tend to a sick child. Those losses come with a price tag. For example, in laying out the business case for employer-supported childcare in Fiji, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) found that staff time lost from childcare responsibilities was costing the private sector on average as much as $254,000 a year, or $460 per employee. In addition, parents who drop out of the labor market to provide at-home care for their young children lose wages and see reductions in retirement benefits. Low-income families are especially vulnerable to fluctuations in the childcare market because of limitations on what they can afford.

TABLE 3.1 CHILDCARE POLICIES AND CORRESPONDING ECONOMIC OUTCOMES: A LITERATURE SUMMARY

| Government funding of public and private childcare facilities | • High-quality, affordable childcare, partially or fully funded by the government, has been positively associated with female employment in analyses of policies in Argentina (Berlinski, Galiani, and McEwan 2011); Germany (Geyer, Haan, and Wrohlich 2015; Haan and Wrohlich 2011); Spain (Nollenberger and Rodríguez-Piñas 2015); and the United States (Herbst 2017).
  • Evidence from Vietnam has found that the use of childcare increases the probability of women having wage-earning jobs by 41% and formal jobs by 26% (Dang, Hiraga, and Nguyen 2019).
  • Access to formal public childcare in Indonesia has been found to increase the likelihood of women with age-eligible children participating in the labor force by 13.3% (Halim, Johnson, and Perova 2017).
  • Several authors have found a positive relationship between the universal low-fee, high-quality preschool provided in Quebec, Canada, and the female labor supply—see, for example, Baker, Gruber, and Milligan (2008); Haeck, Lefebvre, and Merrigan (2015); Lefebvre and Merrigan (2008); and Lefebvre, Merrigan, and Verstraete (2009).
  • Access to subsidized childcare can also have a significant positive impact on women’s employment rates and work hours, as evidence from Latin America and the Caribbean shows (Diaz and Rodriguez-Chamussy 2013; Thévenon 2013).
  • Research from Havnes and Mogstad (2011) finds that universal childcare may not be effective if it merely replaces already available informal childcare arrangements.
  • New research has shown that in Austria heavily subsidized childcare was not associated with a reduction in gender gaps in the labor market (Kleven et al. 2020).

| Subsidies and tax credits given to families and employers | • In France, providing low-income families with childcare subsidies was found to boost the female labor supply (Givord and Marbot 2015).
  • In Nairobi, Kenya, offering low-income women subsidies increased their probability of employment and allowed single mothers to shift to standard working hours (Clark et al. 2019).
  • In the Netherlands, a 50% reduction in childcare fees for all parents and a simultaneous increase in tax credits for low-income working parents increased the female labor supply and hours worked (Bettendorf, Jongen, and Muller 2015).
  • However, policies can also have unintended consequences. For example, in Chile a policy mandating employers to provide childcare without government support significantly reduced the starting salary of female workers (Prada, Rucci, and Urzúa 2015).

| Informal childcare | • Research by Quisumbing, Hallman, and Ruel (2007) compares the situation in Guatemala City, Guatemala, where the formal sector is predominant, with that of Accra, Ghana, where female employment is largely informal. They find that access to formal childcare increases women’s employment only in locations where most women work in the formal sector.
  • Other studies have shown that, for single mothers, a combination of formal and informal care is associated with a larger female labor supply (Baxter et al. 2007; Brady and Perales 2016).
  • Research by Halim, Johnson, and Perova (2017) shows that in Indonesia women who have access to informal childcare arrangements, notably those living with older family members who can help take care of children, tend to have higher labor force participation. In urban areas, these women return to work nearly two years sooner after giving birth than new mothers without access to informal childcare.
Beyond these considerations, gaps in information limit parents’ ability to make childcare decisions. Parents often lack sufficient details about childcare characteristics, including the attributes of high-quality childcare services, the location and availability of care, the relative costs of care, and the range of care alternatives. These information asymmetries around childcare provision suggest the state should confront and revisit norms of family privacy and embrace a greater public role in the childcare market.

In response to these realities, as well as major social and economic changes, improved access to childcare has moved higher on the policy agenda of the governments of many economies. Although there are no internationally established standards to serve as a guide to regulatory measures for the provision of childcare, international conventions and unions recognize working parents’ need for outside childcare support and call for childcare facilities to be available. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) calls for the establishment and development of a network of childcare facilities to enable parents to combine family obligations with work responsibilities. Similarly, the International Labour Organization’s Convention on Workers with Family Responsibilities No. 156 calls for measures to develop or promote childcare services compatible with national conditions and possibilities that will enable effective equality of opportunity for working men and women.

Although governments are not compelled to provide services, both conventions recognize their key role in promoting and encouraging the development of childcare services. In 2019 the European Union (EU) passed a new directive aimed at helping member states achieve a better work–life balance and more equally distributed care responsibilities by encouraging the use of EU funds to ensure a sufficient supply of high-quality, affordable childcare services and care facilities.

To meet the needs of working mothers and families, governments must therefore support a range of childcare options. Childcare can be funded and operated by the public or the private sector. Public childcare, directly funded and operated by the government, can be provided at center-based facilities, including nurseries, day cares, preschools, and kindergartens. Private childcare is funded and operated by for-profit or not-for-profit business entities. It includes home- and center-based care (figure 3.1).

**FIGURE 3.1 | TYPES OF CHILDCARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicly provided childcare</th>
<th>Publicly provided childcare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Center-based care in facilities operated and funded by the government (such as nurseries, day cares, preschools, and kindergartens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privately provided childcare</th>
<th>Family member bears the burden of care that may or may not be remunerated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Home-based care (in a child’s own home or caregiver’s home)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Center-based care (such as nurseries, day cares, preschools, and kindergartens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employer-provided or -supported care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-private partnerships</th>
<th>Employer-provided or -supported care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Center-based care (such as nurseries, day cares, preschools, and kindergartens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Women, Business and the Law team.
In addition, employers may provide or support childcare for their employees under certain conditions. The recent growth in private sector engagement in the provision of childcare may also be characterized by more sophisticated arrangements, including public-private partnerships (PPPs). Such partnerships give both government and the private sector an opportunity to leverage resources to bring market-based solutions to providing childcare.¹

When it comes to the delivery of childcare services, economies use different institutional arrangements. The Nordic economies have the most affordable large-scale childcare, running publicly funded and operated systems. The public expenditure on childcare is 1.6% of the gross domestic product (GDP) of Sweden and 1.3% of the GDP of Norway.² The Republic of Korea also recently devised an extensive affordable childcare system by adopting a mixed model that allows it to diversify funding sources and provide working families with the opportunity to choose.² Despite the mixed system, the government invests 1% of GDP on childcare and early learning and has some of the highest enrollment rates for children of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) economies. In contrast, the United States relies on privately provided childcare, spending only 0.3% of GDP—the third lowest expenditure among OECD economies after Ireland and Turkey.¹² Low levels of government expenditure on childcare in these three economies are also accompanied by some of the lowest enrollment rates among OECD economies.¹¹

Overall, policy or regulatory frameworks on the provision of childcare services must reflect a coherent mandate, adequate finance and capacity, focus on child development, and strong coordination mechanisms to bring in all stakeholders. Many economies do not have a stand-alone childcare policy. Instead, they have a multitude of policies involving different ministries, including social welfare, labor, education, and youth and sports. Because they have their own objectives, plans, and programs related to childcare, regulation of childcare may become decentralized and uncoordinated.

Coordination with other social policies, including maternity and parental leave in which parents are paid to stay home as caregivers, may also affect the regulation and provision of childcare services. Maternity and parental leave policies can help new parents reconcile the competing claims of work and family life.¹³ The availability of high-quality affordable childcare is a complementary policy that gives parents a flexible solution, especially when economic pressure to participate in the labor force increases.

Childcare services for children ages three to five years have steadily increased over the last 20 years, largely because of rising access to preschool across economies. However, a gap for children under three years remains.¹³ This gap may stem from the fact that governments tend to more often regulate childcare for older children than for younger children. Absent or insufficient regulatory frameworks for children under three years may reflect the limited childcare available for this age group or expectations that mothers and families are responsible for early childhood care. Lack of regulation can also be a disincentive for potential providers (such as those differentiating themselves based on quality), whereas parents may find it more difficult to entrust the care of their children to providers if they are not regulated.

Policies intended to make childcare affordable and of good quality vary by economy. Governments may opt for legally requiring employers to provide or support childcare for their employees. The parameters of this care could include minimum structural quality
and safety standards such as licensing and accreditation, operating hours, inspection for compliance with laws, and reporting mechanisms to the government. However, the literature on child development suggests that the “process” elements of quality (such as caregiver-to-child and child-to-child interactions) are more important for improving children’s development outcomes. A range of incentives could also be granted to parents, employers, and private childcare providers to reduce the cost of private childcare and make it more affordable for families.

**Toward available, affordable, and quality childcare**

In 2018, *Women, Business and the Law* collected pilot data on employer-supported childcare and private stand-alone childcare centers within the collaborative framework of the IFC’s Tackling Childcare project. Drawing on 10 case studies, the project fills the gap on how companies can identify the type of childcare support that best suits the needs of their employees. Building on this research, future editions of *Women, Business and the Law* will contribute more analysis based on research and new data related to three main pillars of childcare—availability, affordability, and quality. In the process, the team will also leverage and complement other sources of data, including from OECD and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF; box 3.1). Potential inclusion of such data in the index to facilitate and promote reform will also be explored.

**BOX 3.1 EXISTING DATA ON CHILDCARE**

The existing data on childcare are primarily published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). In view of the strong demand for cross-national indicators on the situations of families and children, the OECD Family Database was developed to provide the indicators on family outcomes and policies across OECD economies, its enhanced engagement partners, and European Union member states. The database brings together information from various national and international databases within both OECD and external organizations. The area of public policies for families and children covers seven indicators related to formal care and the typology of childcare systems: legal entitlement to childcare, public spending on childcare, net enrollment in childcare, informal childcare arrangements, childcare support, typology of childcare services, and quality of childcare. Legal entitlement refers to a right to a spot in a childcare facility that guarantees availability of childcare. Each indicator typically presents the data on a particular issue as well as the relevant definitions and methodology, comparability and data issues, information on sources, and, when appropriate, raw data or descriptive information across economies. Despite global coverage, the available UNICEF data on childcare are limited to net attendance rates in the framework of early childhood education programs, specifically enrollment of children ages three to five in preprimary school.


Support for childcare has well-documented, widespread benefits for economic development and women’s labor force participation. By collecting and evaluating data on childcare provision, the team will contribute to the World Bank Group’s growing effort to shape an informed, evidence-based policy dialogue around the overall design and effectiveness of childcare policies.
The role of the justice sector in legal implementation

For more than 10 years, *Women, Business and the Law* has taken as its starting point that the law can help women reach their full potential. It is the framework by which governments can identify barriers to women’s success and, by removing them, boost their labor force participation. In fact, over time *Women, Business and the Law* has consistently found that reforms increasing women’s equality of opportunity contribute to higher female labor force participation, more successful economies, and better development outcomes. These findings have galvanized action toward legal reform, resulting in over 400 positive changes in the areas measured since 2009.

For women to thrive in the world of work, however, the laws that guarantee their equality of opportunity must be meaningfully implemented and enforced. This requires not only enacting the rules and regulations that put laws into effect, but also ensuring that all relevant parties comply with them. Successful application of the law requires a comprehensive effort from all branches of government, including the judiciary. By strengthening the rule of law and narrowing inequality, access to justice can be a fundamental component of sustainable economic growth. If inclusive, it allows all people to use the legal system to advocate for their interests and ensure enforcement of the law. The success of statutory laws hinges on the ability of justice institutions to both fulfill their mandate and address any violations. Governments must therefore ensure that women’s access to justice is comprehensive. While legal gender equality is the first step toward generating tangible outcomes, including greater economic participation for women, reforms must also be fully implemented through strong justice sector institutions.

**Why does access to justice matter for women’s economic empowerment?**

Discrimination in the law is only one of many sources of gender imbalance. Equal opportunities for women depend on a complex interplay of social, cultural, and economic factors. Although laws may be equal, prevailing discriminatory social norms, deeply rooted stereotypes, unconscious bias, and even ignorance or reluctance by institutions responsible for enforcing rights can be a major stumbling block to the implementation of legislation. This restricts women’s opportunities in practice. For example, even in economies mandating nondiscrimination based on gender in employment, employers frequently discriminate in favor of men—who more often are unencumbered with childbearing responsibilities—and against women—who are perceived as secondary breadwinners.

The enforcement of rights and women’s ability to seek redress is therefore critical to translating formal laws into real outcomes (table 3.2). Although France and Senegal, for example, have very similar legal systems, access to justice in each is very different, leading to different economic landscapes. Social attitudes may result not only in hesitant implementation, but also in hesitant or even discriminatory enforcement. And if women are not able to claim and enforce their rights, equal laws on the books, while a first step, will have only a limited impact on their economic activity. Thus, proper implementation requires an accessible and effective justice system to ensure that infringements of rights are penalized. A well-functioning judiciary is essential to economic development and sustained growth.
The dysfunction and underperformance of court systems negatively affect women, in particular. Factors limiting access to justice such as affordability, cumbersome procedures, and lack of awareness of rights may have impacts on both men and women. However, lower literacy rates, lower incomes, lower mobility, and less extended digital and social networks all disproportionately affect women’s access to justice. Other barriers, such as biases in state institutions, social stigma, psychological trauma in bringing claims, and lack of gender-sensitive procedures, are more directly gender-specific. These challenges are even harder for women who are subject to multiple disadvantages. As a result, the justice gap for women is still rampant, particularly in economies where the circumstances for women are worse overall.

Beyond these concerns, unequal access to justice is expensive for both governments and citizens. At the societal level, these costs include higher public spending on unemployment benefits, social assistance, and health services. In Canada, it is estimated that unmet legal needs represent major annual costs to the state, amounting to a combined total of approximately Can$800 million. This figure includes an annual Can$248 million in social assistance payments, Can$450 million in employment insurance payments, and Can$101 million in health care costs. Recent studies in the United States also find that funding of legal services there could return as much as 11 times the amount invested by reducing public expenditure and generating income. For example, a mother who is able to effectively secure spousal and child support will not require public benefits. Similarly, a woman who suffers domestic abuse and procures a restraining order will lose fewer days of work and gain more income. Such savings can drive millions of dollars into a local economy and empower women to provide for themselves and their families.

International standards set forth by general recommendations on women’s access to justice highlight the importance of access for women’s economic empowerment. Economic sustainability cannot be achieved without respect for the rule of law and protection of rights, both of which require an effective judiciary that resolves cases in a reasonable time and is inclusive and accessible to the public. The literature notes the difficulty in monitoring and assessing the implementation and enforcement of rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.2</th>
<th>ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND CORRESPONDING ECONOMIC OUTCOMES: A LITERATURE SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women’s economic empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Unequal access to justice is related to financial burdens, increased stress, strain on family relationships, inability to work, lost income, and political instability. Investing in women’s access to justice would have returns in terms of national income, competitiveness at the macroeconomic level, and economic growth (High-level Group on Justice for Women 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic growth</strong></td>
<td>A well-functioning judiciary—one that is accessible, efficient, and predictable and resolves cases within a reasonable time frame—is needed to achieve sustainable economic progress (World Bank 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Latin America, the strength of judicial systems has been linked to economic performance (Sherwood, Shepherd, and De Souza 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dam (2006) has associated judicial independence and the strength and efficiency of judiciaries with economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deseau, Leval, and Schmiegelow (2019) find that disputes resolved at a relatively low cost, without dysfunctional delay and discrimination, increase five-year GDP per capita growth rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private sector growth</strong></td>
<td>A stronger judiciary is associated with more rapid growth of small firms (Islam 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In India, state-level court efficiency is highly predictive of growth in the formal manufacturing sector (Amirapu 2017; Chemin 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Italy, improvements in judicial efficiency have reduced credit constraints and increased lending (Jappelli, Pagano, and Bianco 2005). However, inefficiencies in the judicial system have directly contributed to lower investments and a difficult business environment (Esposito, Lanau, and Pompe 2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- The literature notes the difficulty in monitoring and assessing the implementation and enforcement of rights.
- Beyond these concerns, unequal access to justice is expensive for both governments and citizens. At the societal level, these costs include higher public spending on unemployment benefits, social assistance, and health services. In Canada, it is estimated that unmet legal needs represent major annual costs to the state, amounting to a combined total of approximately Can$800 million. This figure includes an annual Can$248 million in social assistance payments, Can$450 million in employment insurance payments, and Can$101 million in health care costs. Recent studies in the United States also find that funding of legal services there could return as much as 11 times the amount invested by reducing public expenditure and generating income. For example, a mother who is able to effectively secure spousal and child support will not require public benefits. Similarly, a woman who suffers domestic abuse and procures a restraining order will lose fewer days of work and gain more income. Such savings can drive millions of dollars into a local economy and empower women to provide for themselves and their families.

- International standards set forth by general recommendations on women’s access to justice highlight the importance of access for women’s economic empowerment. Economic sustainability cannot be achieved without respect for the rule of law and protection of rights, both of which require an effective judiciary that resolves cases in a reasonable time and is inclusive and accessible to the public. The literature notes the difficulty in monitoring and assessing the implementation and enforcement of rights.
It also calls for more public data on the issues women face when accessing justice, especially in the world of work, in order to explore the relationship between de jure and de facto equality of opportunity. A measure of the implementation and enforcement of laws affecting women’s economic inclusion is therefore needed to fully understand the legal and judicial constraints to gender equality in business and employment.

While useful, other data sets have not yet met the need for this information. At the global level, the Enforcing Contracts indicator of the World Bank’s Doing Business project captures important aspects of the performance of the judicial system when it comes to commercial cases. However, this work does not focus on gender. Instead, the only gender dimension captured by the indicator, under its Quality of the Judicial Processes Index, is a measure of whether a woman’s testimony carries as much weight as a man’s in commercial cases.

Additional research, such as OECD’s Equal Access to Justice for Inclusive Growth report, the Center on International Cooperation’s Justice for All report, and the World Justice Project’s Rule of Law Index measures effective access to justice across a set of economies (figure 3.2). The World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index, OECD’s Social Institutions and Gender Index, and the United Nations Development

**Figure 3.2 | Other Global Justice Data**

**Enforcing Contracts**

The Enforcing Contracts indicator of the World Bank Group’s Doing Business index measures the time and cost required to resolve a commercial dispute through a local first-instance court. It also produces a Quality of the Judicial Processes index that evaluates whether economies have adopted a series of good practices that promote quality and efficiency in the court system.

For more information: https://www.doingbusiness.org/en/methodology/enforcing-contracts.

**Equal Access to Justice for Inclusive Growth**

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Equal Access to Justice for Inclusive Growth report looks at how governments can ensure that everyone has access to justice and that justice processes and services are responsive to people’s needs. The report identifies access to justice principles and promising practices, as well as measurement tools and indicators to help economies monitor their progress.


**Justice for All**

The Task Force on Justice of New York University’s Center on International Cooperation presents in its Justice for All report a synthesis of the scale and nature of the justice gap, an analysis of the costs of injustice, an estimate of the costs to provide access to basic justice services, and the most common justice problems people face globally. The Task Force on Justice is an initiative of the Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies, a multistakeholder partnership to accelerate delivery of the SDG 16 targets for peace, justice, and strong institutions.

For more information: https://cic.nyu.edu/publications/justice-for-all.

**Rule of Law Index**

The World Justice Project’s Rule of Law Index measures the rule of law based on the experiences and perceptions of the general public and legal practitioners and experts worldwide. The index provides scores and rankings based on eight factors: Constraints on Government Powers, Absence of Corruption, Open Government, Fundamental Rights, Order and Security, Regulatory Enforcement, Civil Justice, and Criminal Justice.


Sources: World Bank Group, OECD Development Center, Center on International Cooperation, and World Justice Project.

a. Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) states, “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.”
Programme’s Gender Inequality Index\textsuperscript{32} track gender inequalities across several practice and outcome areas. Global Integrity’s Africa Integrity Indicators track both de jure and de facto corruption and governance in 54 African economies, including a social development section that consists of 24 indicators on gender, rights, welfare, rural sector, business environment, health, education, and civil registration.\textsuperscript{33} Despite this impressive undertaking, however, the scope of Global Integrity’s project is not global, and scores do not represent an evaluation of women’s access to justice. Thus, the Women, Business and the Law data collection and analysis will aim to bridge these approaches by studying access to justice through a gender lens.

**Toward equal access to justice and implementation**

The role of the justice sector in ensuring gender equality and implementation of the law is multifaceted. A variety of factors could provide valuable insight into its functioning, including the presence of institutions, certain processes and procedures, and statistics and outcomes. With this research, Women, Business and the Law hopes to focus specifically on the ways in which women’s access to justice can be ensured both through implementation of the good practice legislation covered by the project’s indicators and through the passage of specific laws and regulations.

This work will endeavor to fill the knowledge gap by collecting and analyzing data on the processes and procedures relevant to women’s access to justice, as well as the good practice legislation that can ensure it. This effort may include using one of the Women, Business and the Law questions as a starting point to assess whether the law represented by the question itself is effectively implemented through the justice sector. For example, of the 190 economies measured, 159 prohibit discrimination in employment based on gender. This question allows broad study of similar provisions across economies and regions and could be used to consider the time and cost of a case brought by a female victim of discrimination. Such an approach could also be used to study implementation of other questions in the index.

Through this exercise, potential barriers to implementation of de jure indicators could also be identified for future study. Examples that complement current Women, Business and the Law data include the ease and cost of access to justice, effectiveness of complaints procedures, and importance of awareness-raising campaigns among public officials, employers, and employees.

Other measures that promote women’s access to justice could also be considered. Institutions of justice, such as customary and personal law courts, dedicated and specialized family courts, and human rights institutions could be examined because of their particular relevance to women. Topics such as small claims court access, the provision of legal aid, and women’s representation in the judiciary may also prove pertinent to this discussion.

Any published findings will review the available evidence on this subject, including the data sets described here, for correlation with or further explanation of Women, Business and the Law results. Together, the data presented will investigate whether laws, as measured by the Women, Business and the Law index, are actionable on the ground for female employees and entrepreneurs. Above all, the intent of this work is to ease the process of identifying good practices that ensure accessible, timely, and affordable remedies for women seeking justice. Such quantitative data could help
provide a complete picture of the life cycle of legislation and encourage economies to move rapidly toward more efficient and comprehensive access to justice for women everywhere.

**What’s next?**

Most of the current *Women, Business and the Law* indicators measure the differences between men and women under the law. However, selecting a clear benchmark that tackles the trade-offs when considering these areas may depart from this trend. Although the empirical evidence demonstrates the disproportionate effects of the availability of childcare services and access to justice on women’s participation in the labor market, these issues are not necessarily a matter of legal gender gaps.

Given their broad scope, the potential results of this research could take several different forms. Any questionnaire will undergo substantial peer review and consultation with academics and practitioners before its dissemination to local experts. To ensure that data are comparable across economies, a set of standardized assumptions will be determined. A questionnaire would also be piloted in several economies in a diverse sample of regions. Results may be published as case studies or policy briefs complementing the *Women, Business and the Law* index. If coverage can be expanded to 190 economies and remain comparable and feasible for annual data collection, the addition of indicators to the index will be considered. Complementary economic research will also aim to establish links between legislative principles and improving women’s position as active participants in the workforce and the broader economy.

Growing evidence directly links each of these areas to women’s economic opportunities. Although in its early stages, this research aims to highlight the role that childcare and access to justice play in ensuring that the equality promised by law is actionable. In expanding its scope to include these issues, *Women, Business and the Law* hopes to continue providing a rich body of data that can be used to generate policies and provide a road map for further research.

**Notes**

1. NAEYC 2020.
2. Indeed, research from Olivetti and Petrongolo (2017) presents an overview of the evidence from high-income economies on the impacts of family policies on female labor market outcomes and finds that childcare is more strongly associated with better labor market outcomes for women than family leave policies.
4. In this discussion, *informal care* refers to unpaid care provided mainly by relatives and family friends.
15. For more information about case studies produced by the International Finance Corporation in 2019 and 2020 within the framework of the Tackling Childcare project, see the IFC website, https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/topics_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/gender+at+ifc/priorities/employment/tackling_childcare_the_business_case_for_employer_supported_childcare.
17. UN Women and UNDP, n.d.
21. The justice gap is defined as the disparity in access to justice and satisfaction of legal needs experienced by women and girls (High-level Group on Justice for Women 2019).
27. OECD 2019a.
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Women, Business and the Law measures laws and regulations affecting women’s economic inclusion in 190 economies. Although progress has been made over the last 50 years, the data confirm that more work is needed to ensure that women have equality of opportunity when entering the workforce and starting their own business.

To highlight these opportunities for change, Women, Business and the Law 2021 presents an index structured around the stages of a woman’s working life (figure A.1). This framework helps align areas of the law with the economic decisions women make as they experience various milestones. The indicators not only represent women’s interactions with the law as they begin, progress through, and end their careers, but also are an easily replicable measure of the legal environment that women face as entrepreneurs and employees. This edition of Women, Business and the Law presents an update of the index based on the laws and regulations reformed between September 2, 2019, and October 1, 2020.

**Methodology**

Women, Business and the Law is based on an analysis of the domestic laws and regulations that affect women’s economic opportunities. The indicators were selected on the basis of their association with measures of women’s economic empowerment and through research and consultation with experts. They are also inspired by the international legal frameworks set out in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW); the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women General Recommendations (CEDAW GR); the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (DEVAW); and the International Labour Organization (ILO) Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100); Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183); and Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190).
**TABLE A.1 WOMEN, BUSINESS AND THE LAW INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can a woman choose where to live in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can a woman travel outside her home in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can a woman apply for a passport in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can a woman travel outside the country in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can a woman get a job in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the law prohibit discrimination in employment based on gender? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there legislation on sexual harassment in employment? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there criminal penalties or civil remedies for sexual harassment in employment? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the law mandate equal remuneration for work of equal value? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can a woman work at night in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can a woman work in a job deemed dangerous in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can a woman work in an industrial job in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriage (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there no legal provision that requires a married woman to obey her husband? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can a woman be head of household in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there legislation specifically addressing domestic violence? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can a woman obtain a judgment of divorce in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does a woman have the same rights to remarry as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenthood (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is paid leave of at least 14 weeks available to mothers? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the government administer 100% of maternity leave benefits? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is paid leave available to fathers? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there paid parental leave? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is dismissal of pregnant workers prohibited? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurship (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the law prohibit discrimination in access to credit based on gender? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can a woman sign a contract in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can a woman register a business in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can a woman open a bank account in the same way as a man? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do men and women have equal ownership rights to immovable property? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do sons and daughters have equal rights to inherit assets from their parents? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do male and female surviving spouses have equal rights to inherit assets? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the law grant spouses equal administrative authority over assets during marriage? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the law provide for the valuation of nonmonetary contributions? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pension (0–100)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the age at which men and women can retire with full pension benefits the same? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the age at which men and women can retire with partial pension benefits the same? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the mandatory retirement age for men and women the same? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are periods of absence due to childcare accounted for in pension benefits? ([Yes = 1, No = 0])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A: DATA NOTES

The data set and analysis can be used to support research and policy discussions on the ways in which the legal environment influences women’s economic activity. Thirty-five data points are scored across eight indicators composed of four or five binary questions, with each indicator representing a different phase of a woman’s life (table A.1). Indicator-level scores are obtained by calculating the unweighted average of responses to the questions within that indicator and scaling the result to 100. Overall scores are then calculated by taking the average of each indicator, with 100 representing the highest possible score.

Examining the data for one economy illustrates how scoring works in the index. In figure A.2, Ecuador receives a score of 100 for Mobility, Workplace, Pay, Marriage, Assets, and Pension, which indicates that no legal constraints were found in the areas measured under these indicators.

Under Parenthood, however, the lack of paid maternity leave of at least 14 weeks, government-administered maternity leave benefits, or paid parental leave results in a score of 40. The score for Entrepreneurship is 75 because the law does not prohibit gender-based discrimination in access to credit.

Based on this information, the overall score for Ecuador is calculated as the unweighted average of all eight indicator scores on a scale of 0–100, with 100 representing the best score overall. Ecuador thus scores 89.4 on the Women, Business and the Law index.

Strengths and limitations of the methodology

To construct the index, Women, Business and the Law relies on the feedback of over 2,000 respondents with expertise in family, labor, and criminal law, including lawyers, judges, academics, and members of civil society organizations working locally on gender issues. Besides filling out written questionnaires, respondents provide references to relevant legislation. The Women, Business and the Law team then collects the texts of these laws and regulations and verifies questionnaire responses for accuracy. Responses are validated against codified sources of national law, including constitutions, codes, laws, statutes, rules, regulations, and procedures in areas such as labor, social security, civil procedure, violence against women, marriage and family, inheritance, nationality, and land. The data reflect legislation enacted as of October 1, 2020, unless otherwise indicated.

This unique approach has both strengths and limitations (table A.2). Because the indicators are binary, they may not reflect the nuances or details of some of the policies measured. Indicators are also based on standardized assumptions to ensure comparability across economies. For example, an assumption used for questions on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A.2 METHODOLOGICAL STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of standardized assumptions</td>
<td>Data are comparable across economies, and methodology is transparent.</td>
<td>Scope of data is smaller; only regulatory reforms in the areas measured can be systematically tracked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of largest business city only</td>
<td>Data collection is manageable, and data are comparable.</td>
<td>In federal economies, data could be less representative where there are differences in laws across locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the most populous group</td>
<td>Data are comparable across economies where there are parallel legal systems prescribing different rights for different groups of women.</td>
<td>Restrictions that apply to minority populations may not be covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the formal sector</td>
<td>Attention remains centered on the formal economy, where regulations are more relevant.</td>
<td>The reality faced by women in the informal sector, which may be a significant population in some economies, is not reflected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure of codified law only</td>
<td>Indicators are actionable because the law is what policy makers can change.</td>
<td>Where systematic implementation of legislation is lacking, regulatory changes alone will not achieve the desired results; social and cultural norms are not considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Maternity leave is that the woman in question has one child. Although maternity leave benefits often differ for multiple births, only data for individual births are captured. Another assumption is that the woman in question is located in the largest business city of the economy. In federal economies, laws affecting women can vary by state or province. Even in nonfederal economies, women in rural areas and small towns could face more restrictive local legislation. Such restrictions are not captured by Women, Business and the Law unless they are also found in the main business city. Finally, where personal law prescribes different rights and obligations for different groups of women, the data focus on the most populous group, which may mean that restrictions applying only to minority populations are missed.

Although it ensures comparability of the data, this use of standardized assumptions is limited in its ability to fully reflect the diversity of women’s experiences. Women, Business and the Law recognizes that the laws it measures do not apply to all women in the same way. Women face intersectional forms of discrimination based on gender, sex, sexuality, race, gender identity, religion, family status, ethnicity, nationality, disability, and a myriad of other grounds. Women, Business and the Law therefore encourages readers to interpret the data in conjunction with other available research.

Women, Business and the Law also focuses solely on the ways in which the formal legal and regulatory environment determines whether women can work or open their own business. Although many women in developing economies are employed by the informal sector, a goal of this project is to define some of the features of the legal framework that make it more difficult for women to transition from the informal to the formal economy.
This project also recognizes the often-large gaps between laws on the books and actual practice. One reason for these gaps may be poor implementation of legislation stemming from weak enforcement, poor design, or low institutional capacity. Nonetheless, identifying legal differences is one step toward better understanding where women’s economic rights may be restricted in practice.

*Women, Business and the Law* acknowledges that equal opportunities for women in business and the workplace depend on an interplay of economic, social, and cultural factors. For example, unless women are able to get an education or build their skills, equalizing laws affecting entrepreneurship and employment could mean little. Other factors, such as infrastructure, also may affect the ability and desire of women to work. In addition, social and cultural norms may prevent women from running a business or working outside the home. Within this overall picture, *Women, Business and the Law* recognizes the limitations of its assumptions and its focus on statutory law. Even though such assumptions may come at the expense of specificity, they also ensure data comparability across economies.

**Indicators and questions**

This section looks more closely at the 35 scored binary questions, grouped by indicator (box A.1).

Answers to the questions are based on codified law only. Customary law is not taken into account unless it has been codified. Where the answer differs according to the legal system (for example, in mixed legal systems where different laws govern different groups of people within an economy), the answer used is the one that applies to the majority of the population. Supranational law, such as that enacted by the Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa (OHADA), is not considered when domestic law contravenes supranational rules and limits the legal capacity of women. Some questions take into account the enactment date of laws and regulations and some the

**BOX A.1 ASSUMPTIONS USED TO ENSURE COMPARABILITY**

**The woman in question**

- resides in the economy’s main business city.
- has reached the legal age of majority and is capable of making decisions as an adult, is in good health, and has no criminal record.
- is a lawful citizen of the economy being examined.
- is a cashier in the food retail sector in a supermarket or grocery store that has 60 employees.
- is a cisgender, heterosexual woman in a monogamous first marriage registered with the appropriate authorities (de facto marriages and customary unions are not measured).

(continued on next page)
BOX A.1 ASSUMPTIONS USED TO ENSURE COMPARABILITY (CONTINUED)

- is of the same religion as her husband.
- is in a marriage under the rules of the default marital property regime, or the most common regime for that jurisdiction, which will not change during the course of the marriage.
- is not a member of a union, unless membership is mandatory. Membership is considered mandatory when collective bargaining agreements cover more than 50 percent of the workforce in the food retail sector and when they apply to individuals who were not party to the original collective bargaining agreement.

For the questions on maternity, paternity, and parental leave, it is assumed that
- the woman gave birth to her first child without complications on October 1, 2020, and her child is in good health. Answers will therefore correspond to legislation in force as of October 1, 2020, even if the law provides for changes over time.
- both parents have been working long enough to accrue any maternity, paternity, and parental benefits.
- if maternity benefit systems are not mandatory or they were not in force as of October 1, 2020, they are not measured.

For the questions on inheritance rights, it is assumed that
- the deceased has not left a will, so the rules of intestate succession apply.
- when determining the inheritance rights of spouses, male and female surviving spouses do not have any living children.

For the questions on retirement and pensions, it is assumed that
- the woman gave birth without complications to two healthy children.
- the woman ceased all paid activity during periods of childcare. If the period covered by a pension credit is conditioned on the age of the child, the period until the child reaches age one is counted.
- if transitional provisions gradually change the retirement age, the answer will reflect the retirement age as of October 1, 2020, even if the law provides for changes over time.
- if a mandatory contributory pension system applicable to the private sector and a noncontributory universal pension system coexist, the answers will correspond with the rules applicable to the mandatory contributory pension system.
- if pension systems are not mandatory or were not in force as of October 1, 2020, they are not measured.

date of enforcement, whereas a few consider the state of implementation. For example, questions that measure the provision of a benefit such as paid leave or old age pension consider only laws that are in force and systems through which benefits are paid that are in place and operational. No changes to the *Women, Business and the Law* methodology were made for this edition.

**Mobility**

The Mobility indicator measures constraints on a woman’s agency and freedom of movement, both of which are likely to influence her decision to enter the labor force and engage in entrepreneurial activity. This indicator has four components that measure:

- **Whether a woman can choose where to live in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman choosing where to live. A score of 0 is assigned if there are explicit restrictions on a woman choosing where to live, if the husband chooses the family residence, if a woman’s domicile automatically follows that of her husband, or if the husband has more legal weight than the woman in determining where the family will live.

- **Whether a woman can travel outside her home in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman traveling alone domestically. A score of 0 is assigned if permission, additional documentation, or the presence of her husband or guardian is required for a woman to travel alone domestically. A score of 0 is also assigned if a woman must justify her reasons for leaving the home, or if leaving the home without a valid reason is considered disobedience with legal consequences, such as loss of right to maintenance.

- **Whether a woman can apply for a passport in the same way as a man.** This question considers actual application forms available at the relevant agency or on official government websites, regardless of what the law specifies. A score of 1 is assigned if there are no gender differences in passport application procedures. A score of 0 is assigned if an adult woman needs the permission or signature of her husband, father, or other relative or guardian to apply for a passport. A score of 0 is also assigned if passport application procedures or forms require a woman to provide details about her husband, father, or other relative or guardian, or additional documents such as a marriage certificate, whereas the same is not required for a man.

- **Whether a woman can travel outside the country in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman traveling alone internationally. A score of 0 is assigned if permission, additional documentation, or the presence of her husband or a guardian is required for a woman to leave the country. A score of 0 is also assigned if the law requires a married woman to accompany her husband out of the country if he wishes her to.
The Workplace indicator analyzes laws affecting women's decisions to enter the labor market, including women's legal capacity and ability to work, as well as protections in the workplace against discrimination and sexual harassment. Antidiscrimination legislation is positively associated with women’s employment and earnings, whereas sexual harassment can negatively influence women’s career trajectories. This indicator has four components that assess:

- **Whether a woman can get a job in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman’s legal capacity and ability to get a job or pursue a trade or profession. A score of 0 is assigned if a husband can prevent his wife from working, or if permission or additional documentation is required for a woman to work but not a man. A score of 0 is also assigned if it is considered a form of disobedience with legal consequences, such as loss of maintenance, for a woman to work contrary to her husband’s wishes or the interests of the family.

- **Whether the law prohibits discrimination in employment based on gender.** A score of 1 is assigned if the law prohibits employers from discriminating based on sex or gender or mandates equal treatment of women and men in employment. A score of 0 is assigned if the law does not prohibit such discrimination or only prohibits it in one aspect of employment, such as pay or dismissal.

- **Whether there is legislation on sexual harassment in employment.** A score of 1 is assigned if legal provisions specifically protect against sexual harassment in employment, including unwelcome verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature. A score of 0 is assigned if there is no such legislation. A score of 0 is also assigned if the law addresses harassment in general but makes no reference to acts of a sexual nature or contact, or if it states only that the employer has a duty to prevent sexual harassment but no provisions prohibit it or provide sanctions or other forms of redress.

- **Whether there are criminal penalties or civil remedies for sexual harassment in employment.** A score of 1 is assigned if the law establishes criminal sanctions, such as fines or imprisonment, for sexual harassment in employment. A score of 1 is also assigned if the provision in the criminal code provides for reparation or damages for offenses covered by the code, or if the law provides for civil remedies or compensation for victims of sexual harassment in employment or the workplace, even after dismissal of the victims. A score of 0 is assigned if the law establishes neither criminal sanctions for sexual harassment in employment nor civil remedies or compensation for victims of sexual harassment in employment or the workplace. A score of 0 is also assigned if the law only prohibits sexual harassment in employment and sets forth that the employer should apply discretionary sanctions.
The Pay indicator measures laws affecting occupational segregation and the gender wage gap. Restrictions on certain jobs have been found to be negatively correlated with female employment. This indicator has four components that assess:

- **Whether the law mandates equal remuneration for work of equal value.** "Remuneration" refers to the ordinary, basic, or minimum wage or salary and any additional emoluments payable directly or indirectly, whether in cash or in kind, by the employer to the worker and arising from the worker’s employment. "Work of equal value" refers not only to the same or similar jobs but also to different jobs of the same value. A score of 1 is assigned if employers are legally obliged to pay equal remuneration to male and female employees who perform work of equal value in accordance with these definitions. A score of 0 is assigned if the law limits the principle of equal remuneration to equal work, the same work, similar work, or work of a similar nature. A score of 0 is also assigned if the law limits the broad concept of "remuneration" to only basic wages or salary, or if the law limits the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value to the same place of business or same employer.

- **Whether a woman can work at night in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if nonpregnant and non-nursing women can work at night in the same way as men. A score of 1 is also assigned when restrictions on women’s ability to work at night do not apply to the food retail sector, women’s consent to work at night is required, or an employer needs to comply with safety measures (such as providing transportation). A score of 0 is assigned if the law broadly prohibits women, including those with children over the age of one, from working at night or limits the hours women can work at night. A score of 0 is also assigned if the law gives the relevant authority the power to restrict or prohibit women’s night work, regardless of the content of any decisions issued by that authority.

- **Whether a woman can work in a job deemed dangerous in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if no laws prohibit or restrict nonpregnant and non-nursing women from working in a broad and subjective category of jobs deemed “hazardous,” “arduous,” or “morally inappropriate.” A score of 0 is assigned if the law prohibits or restricts women from working in jobs deemed hazardous, arduous, or morally inappropriate. A score of 0 is also assigned if the employer or relevant authority can determine whether particular jobs are too hazardous, arduous, or morally inappropriate for women but not for men, regardless of the content of any decisions issued by that employer or authority.

- **Whether a woman can work in an industrial job in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if nonpregnant and non-nursing women can work in the mining, construction, manufacturing, energy, water, agriculture, and transportation industries.
in the same way as men. A score of 0 is assigned if the law prohibits women from working in these industries. A score of 0 is also assigned if women’s employment in the relevant industries is restricted in any way, such as by prohibiting women from working at night in “industrial undertakings,” or by giving the relevant authority the power to prohibit or restrict women from working in certain jobs or industries, regardless of the content of any decisions issued by that authority.

Marriage

The Marriage indicator measures legal constraints related to marriage and divorce. Legal discrimination against women, including limits on their ability to be head of household, has been found to be negatively correlated with labor force participation. Unequal rights in marriage and divorce can also have negative effects on women’s intrahousehold bargaining power and jeopardize their financial security when a divorce is finalized. This indicator has five components that measure:

- **Whether there is no legal provision that requires a married woman to obey her husband.** A score of 1 is assigned if there is no provision requiring a married woman to obey her husband. A score of 0 is assigned if there is an explicit provision stating that a married woman must obey her husband, or if disobedience of a husband has legal ramifications for his wife, such as loss of her right to maintenance.

- **Whether a woman can be head of household in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman being head of household or head of family. A score of 0 is assigned if there is a provision designating the husband as head of household or stipulating that the husband leads the family. A score of 0 is also assigned if a male is designated as the default family member who receives the family book or equivalent document that is needed for access to services. Gender restrictions under tax law are not measured by this question.

- **Whether there is legislation specifically addressing domestic violence.** A score of 1 is assigned if there is legislation addressing domestic violence that includes criminal sanctions or provides for protection orders for domestic violence. A score of 0 is assigned if there is no legislation addressing domestic violence, if the domestic violence legislation does not provide for sanctions or protection orders, or if only a specific category of women or family member is protected. A score of 0 is also assigned if there is only a provision that increases penalties for general crimes covered in the criminal code if committed between spouses or within the family.

- **Whether a woman can obtain a judgment of divorce in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if the process to obtain a judgment of divorce is equal for women and men or provides additional protections for women, such as prohibiting a husband from initiating divorce proceedings while his wife is pregnant. A score of 0 is assigned if there are procedural or evidentiary differences for women, if only men can initiate divorce proceedings, or if divorce is legally prohibited.

- **Whether a woman has the same rights to remarry as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if women and men have equal rights to remarry. A score of 0 is assigned if provisions limit a woman’s right to remarry, such as requiring a waiting period before remarriage to which a man is not subject. A score of 0 is also assigned if divorce is legally prohibited.
The Parenthood indicator examines laws affecting women’s work during and after pregnancy. Women are more likely to return to work if the law mandates maternity leave. This indicator has five components that measure:

- **Whether paid leave of at least 14 weeks is available to mothers.** A score of 1 is assigned if mothers are legally entitled to at least 14 weeks (98 calendar days) of paid leave for the birth of a child through maternity leave, parental leave, or a combination of both. A score of 0 is assigned if the law does not establish paid leave for mothers, or if the length of paid leave is less than 14 weeks.

- **Whether the government administers 100% of maternity leave benefits.** A score of 1 is assigned if leave benefits are fully administered by a government entity, including compulsory social insurance schemes (such as social security), public funds, government-mandated private insurance, or employer reimbursement of any maternity leave benefits paid directly to an employee. A score of 0 is assigned if any of the cost is shared by the employer. A score of 0 is also assigned if contributions or taxes are mandated only for female employees, if the social insurance scheme that provides maternity leave benefits is optional, or if no paid leave is available to expectant and new mothers.

- **Whether paid leave is available to fathers.** A score of 1 is assigned if fathers are legally entitled to at least one day of paid paternity leave for the birth of a child, or if the law reserves a portion of paid parental leave specifically for fathers—that is, through “use-it-or-lose-it” policies or fathers’ quotas. A score of 1 is also assigned if fathers are individually entitled to paid parental leave. A score of 0 is assigned if the law does not guarantee fathers any paid paternity leave or other specific leave for the birth of a child. A score of 0 is also assigned if allowances for the birth of a child must be deducted from annual or sick leave.

- **Whether there is paid parental leave.** A score of 1 is assigned if parents are legally entitled to some form of full-time paid parental leave, either shared between mother and father or as an individual entitlement that each can take regardless of the other. A score of 0 is assigned if the law does not mandate any form of paid parental leave.

- **Whether dismissal of pregnant workers is prohibited.** A score of 1 is assigned if the law explicitly prohibits the dismissal of pregnant women, if pregnancy cannot serve as grounds for termination of a contract, or if dismissal of pregnant workers is considered a form of unlawful termination, unfair dismissal, or wrongful discharge. A score of 0 is assigned if there are no provisions prohibiting the dismissal of pregnant workers, or if the law only prohibits the dismissal of pregnant workers during maternity leave, for a limited period of the pregnancy, or when pregnancy results in illness or disability.

---

The Entrepreneurship indicator measures constraints on women starting and running a business. Having access to a bank account is strongly correlated with women’s labor supply. This indicator has four components that measure:

- **Whether the law prohibits discrimination in access to credit based on gender.** A score of 1 is assigned if the law prohibits discrimination by creditors based on sex
or gender or prescribes equal access for both men and women when conducting financial transactions or entrepreneurial activities or receiving financial assistance. A score of 1 is also assigned if the law prohibits gender discrimination when accessing goods and services (and services are defined to include financial services). A score of 0 is assigned if the law does not prohibit such discrimination, or if the law does not provide for effective remedies.

- **Whether a woman can sign a contract in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if a woman obtains full legal capacity upon reaching the age of majority and there are no restrictions on her signing legally binding contracts. A score of 0 is assigned if a woman has limited legal capacity to sign a contract or needs the signature, consent, or permission of her husband or guardian to do so.

- **Whether a woman can register a business in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman registering a business. A score of 0 is assigned if a woman has limited legal capacity to register a business. This includes situations in which she needs her husband’s or guardian’s permission, signature, or consent to register a business. A score of 0 is also assigned if the registration process at any stage requires a woman to provide additional information or documentation that is not required of a man.

- **Whether a woman can open a bank account in the same way as a man.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on a woman opening a bank account. A score of 0 is assigned if a woman has limited legal capacity or is required to provide any additional permission or documentation that is not required of a man. A score of 0 is also assigned if legal provisions limit the ability of a woman to open a bank account, such as stating that only a married woman who is separately employed from her husband may open a bank account in her own name.

### Assets

The Assets indicator examines gender differences in property and inheritance law. Improving property and inheritance rights is positively associated with female earnings and employment as well as women’s access to housing and land. This indicator has five components that measure:

- **Whether men and women have equal ownership rights to immovable property.** A score of 1 is assigned if there are no restrictions on women’s legal capacity and rights to immovable property. A score of 0 is assigned if women’s rights to own or administer property are legally restricted. A score of 0 is also assigned if there are gender differences in the legal treatment of spousal property, such as granting the husband administrative control of marital property. This includes instances in which legal systems are supported by custom and judicial precedent.

- **Whether sons and daughters have equal rights to inherit assets from their parents.** A score of 1 is assigned if sons and daughters have the same rights to inherit assets from their parents. A score of 0 is assigned if there are gender-based differences in the recognition of children as heirs to property.
• **Whether male and female surviving spouses have equal rights to inherit assets.** A score of 1 is assigned if surviving spouses of either gender with no living children have the same inheritance rights. A score of 0 is assigned if there are gender-based differences in the inheritance rights of surviving spouses with no living children.

• **Whether the law grants spouses equal administrative authority over assets during marriage.** A score of 1 is assigned if spouses retain administrative power over the assets each brought to the marriage or acquired during marriage, and their accrued value, without the need for spousal consent. A score of 1 is also assigned if spouses administer their separate property, but for major transactions, such as selling or pledging the property as collateral, spousal consent is required, or if both spouses have equal rights in the administration and transaction of joint property. A score of 0 is assigned if the husband has administrative rights over all property, including any separate property of the wife.

• **Whether the law provides for the valuation of nonmonetary contributions.** Nonmonetary contributions include caring for minor children, taking care of the family home, or any other nonmonetized contribution from a stay-at-home spouse. A score of 1 is assigned if there is an explicit legal recognition of such contributions and the law provides for equal or equitable division of the property or the transfer of a lump sum to the stay-at-home spouse based on nonmonetary contributions. A score of 1 is also assigned if the default marital property regime is full community, partial community, or deferred community of property because these regimes implicitly recognize nonmonetary contributions at the time of property division and benefit both spouses regardless of who purchased the property or holds title to it. A score of 0 is assigned if the default marital property regime is not full or partial community or deferred full or partial community, and there is no explicit legal provision providing for equal or equitable division of property based on nonmonetary contributions.

---

Pension

The Pension indicator assesses laws affecting the size of a woman’s pension. Early retirement can widen the potential gender gap in pension levels and increase women’s risk of poverty in old age. This indicator has four components that measure:

• **Whether the age at which men and women can retire with full pension benefits is the same.** A score of 1 is assigned if the statutory age at which men and women can retire and receive an irrevocable minimum old-age pension is the same. A score of 0 is assigned if there is a difference in the statutory age or if there is no mandatory pension scheme implemented for private sector workers.

• **Whether the age at which men and women can retire with partial pension benefits is the same.** Partial pension benefits refer to a reduced or proportional minimum old-age pension payable to workers who did not accumulate enough work experience or periods of contribution or have not reached the statutory age to qualify for a minimum old-age pension. A score of 1 is assigned if the age at which men and women can retire and receive partial pension benefits is the same, or if the age at which men and women can retire and receive partial benefits is not mandated. A score of 0 is
assigned if the age at which men and women can retire and receive partial pension benefits is different, or if there is no mandatory pension scheme implemented for private sector workers.

• **Whether the mandatory retirement age for men and women is the same.** A score of 1 is assigned if the legally established age at which men and women must retire is the same, or if there is no mandatory retirement age. A score of 0 is assigned if the age at which men and women must retire is different.

• **Whether periods of absence from work due to childcare are taken into account in pension benefits.** A score of 1 is assigned if pension contributions are paid or credited during maternity or parental leave, or the leave period is considered a qualifying period of employment used for the purpose of calculating pension benefits. A score of 1 is also assigned if there are mechanisms to compensate for any contribution gaps and to ensure that the leave period does not reduce the assessment base or pension amounts, or if there are no mandatory contributory pension schemes, but there is a noncontributory universal social pension conditioned on noncontributory requirements with no means test attached. A score of 0 is assigned if there are no compensating pension arrangements for periods of childcare, or if there is no mandatory contributory pension scheme for private sector workers and no noncontributory universal social pension.

**Reforms**

Each year, *Women, Business and the Law* indicators capture changes to domestic laws and regulations that affect women’s economic opportunities. Summaries of such changes are listed in the annex that follows chapter 1, thereby acknowledging the legal reform efforts undertaken by governments during the period reviewed. Any legislative or regulatory change that affects the score assigned to a given economy on any question under the eight indicators is classified as a reform. A final reform count is then calculated from the number of changes per indicator per economy.

For questions that refer to legal rights, the change must be mandatory, meaning that women can enforce their rights in court or sanctions can be leveled by a regulatory body such as a central bank, employment tribunal, national human rights commission, or other enforcement body, including the police. For questions that refer to benefits, such as maternity, parental, or pension benefits, women must be able to obtain the benefit as of the cutoff date. Policies, guidelines, model rules, principles, and recommendations are excluded, as are ratified international conventions when they have not been incorporated into domestic law. Reforms affecting the *Women, Business and the Law* indicators include but are not limited to amendments to or the introduction of a new constitution, labor law, family or personal status law, penal code, or administrative procedure.

**Proposed methodological changes**

The following changes in methodology have been proposed for future studies:

• **Date of reform.** Some *Women, Business and the Law* questions measure impediments to women’s economic opportunity, whereas others analyze the provision of benefits. Because of the differences in these types of questions, those on impediments consider
the enactment date of laws and regulations, whereas questions that measure the provision of a benefit such as paid leave or pension consider only laws that are in force and operational. To better measure implementation of the law, *Women, Business and the Law* proposes in future cycles to begin measuring laws based on their date of enforcement rather than their date of enactment for all questions.

• **Marriage.** Unequal bargaining power within the household puts married women at a disadvantage compared with married men. The question of whether a woman is or is not legally required to obey her husband currently captures only explicit spousal obedience provisions. This approach does not account for the fact that many legal systems establish unequal power dynamics between husband and wife—for example, a woman who abstains from marital relations with her husband may face legal ramifications. *Women, Business and the Law* therefore proposes including under this question provisions that provide exemptions for marital rape or otherwise negatively affect a woman’s decision-making power within the household.

• **Parenthood.** Gender equality in the workplace is not possible without gender equality in the home. Although paternity and parental leave have the potential to redistribute unpaid care work, emerging research shows that the design of leave policies matters more for gender equality than simply their existence. In all economies that provide paid parental leave, women use it significantly more than men. Moreover, very long parental leave policies may negatively affect a woman’s career progression and earnings because she has spent too much time out of the labor force. The key to designing leave policies that do not exacerbate gender inequality may be promoting fathers’ uptake of leave. *Women, Business and the Law* thus proposes establishing longer thresholds for both the question on whether there is paid leave available for the father and the question on whether there is paid parental leave. In addition, *Women, Business and the Law* proposes refining the question on paid parental leave in order to encourage more equitable use of leave policies.

• **Entrepreneurship.** Access to credit is a major barrier to women’s entrepreneurship. *Women, Business and the Law* is seeking to refine the methodology for this indicator and potentially add new questions to better measure women’s financial inclusion.

More detailed data on each economy included in this report appear on the project website at https://wbl.worldbank.org. The team welcomes feedback on the methodology and construction of this set of indicators, and it looks forward to improving their coverage and scope. Comments can be offered by contacting the *Women, Business and the Law* team at wbl@worldbank.org.

**Notes**
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## APPENDIX B

### Economy Data

Indicators capture legal differences between men and women in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>MOBILITY</th>
<th>WORKPLACE</th>
<th>PAY</th>
<th>MARRIAGE</th>
<th>PARENTHOOD</th>
<th>ENTREPRENEURSHIP</th>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>PENSION</th>
<th>WBL 2021 INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Pension</th>
<th>WBL 2021 INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, Arab Rep.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX B: ECONOMY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Pension</th>
<th>WBL 2021 INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong SAR, China</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia, Fed. Sts.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Parenthood</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Pension</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico (US)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>MOBILITY</th>
<th>WORKPLACE</th>
<th>PAY</th>
<th>MARRIAGE</th>
<th>PARENTHOOD</th>
<th>ENTREPRENEURSHIP</th>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>PENSION</th>
<th>WBL 2021 INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, China</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela, RB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank and Gaza</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

Acknowledgments

Data collection and analysis for Women, Business and the Law 2021 were conducted by a World Bank Group team led by Tea Trumbic (Program Manager, Women, Business and the Law), under the general direction of Norman V. Loayza (Director, Global Indicators Group, Development Economics) and Rita Ramalho (Senior Manager, Global Indicators Group, Development Economics). Overall guidance for preparation of the report was provided by Aart Kraay (Deputy Chief Economist and Director of Development Policy, Development Economics).

Members of the core research team were Nelsy Affoum, Nayda Almodóvar Reteguis, Nisha Arekapudi, Julia Constanze Braunmiller, Nour Chamseddine, Claudia Lenny Corminales, Sheng Cui, Marie Dry, Marina Elefante, Mahmoud Elsaman, Nadine Elshokeiry, Aida Hammoud Watson, Marie Caitriona Hyland, Viktoria Khaitina, Gloria Daniele Kuoh, Olga Kuzmina, Kook Hee Lee, Natalia Mazoni Silva Martins, Olena Mykhalchenko, Alena Sakhonchik, Isabel Santagostino Recavarren, Katrin Schulz, Friederike Strub, Siyi Wang, and Yasmin Zand. The team was assisted by Consuelo Jurado Tan, Vadim Absaliamov, Dania Arayssi, Mila Cantar, Catalina Carbonell, Katya El Tayeb, Jessica Maeda Jeri, Liang Shen, Shidi Wendy Wu, and Bize Yang.

Support for Women, Business and the Law is provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, government of Sweden, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

The Women, Business and the Law 2021 outreach strategy is managed by Chisako Fukuda, supported by Nina Vucenic, Mikael Reventar, and World Bank Group communications colleagues at headquarters and around the world. Development and management of the Women, Business and the Law website and other technical services were supported by Manasi Amalraj, Rajesh Ammassamveettil, Neda Bostani, Arun Chakravarthi Nageswaran, Patrizia Cocca, Varun Doiphode, Fengsheng Huang, Anna Maria Kojzar, Akash Pradhan, Kamalesh Sengaonkar, Shrikant Bhaskar Shinde, and Geoffrey Shott.

The team is grateful for valuable comments provided by colleagues, both within and outside the World Bank Group, and for guidance provided by the World Bank Group’s Executive Directors. The team would especially like to acknowledge the guidance of S Anukriti, Frances Beaton-Day, Klaus Decker, Amanda Devercelli, Maria Quesada Gamez, Tazeen Hasan, Talip Kilic, Young Eun Kim, Leora Klapper, Rudaba Nasir, Izzati Ab Razak, and Lina Shaharuddin.

This report was made possible by the generous contributions of more than 2,300 lawyers, judges, academics, civil society representatives, and public officials from 190 economies. Contact details for local partners are available on the Women, Business and the Law website at http://wbl.worldbank.org. The names of local partners wishing to be acknowledged individually are also listed. Global and regional contributors are firms that have completed multiple questionnaires from their various offices around the world.
GLOBAL CONTRIBUTORS
Advocates for International Development (A4ID)
Allen & Overy
Arias
Baker McKenzie
Dechert
Dentons
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer
GRATA International
International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ)
Latham & Watkins
Linklaters
Musawah for Equality in the Family
Norton Rose Fulbright
Shearman & Sterling
Tilleke & Gibbins
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
UN Women
White & Case

AFGHANISTAN
Ahmad Fardin Howaida
Tolo Legal Services Co.
Sayed Asil Sadiqi
Abdul Basir Sarwari
Abdul Basir Sarwari Advocacy Company
Sharif Sharafat
DAI Musharifat
Tahmina Sobat
Latifa Sultan
Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (AIHRC)
Negina Sultan
Legal Oracles
Durani Waziri
Lawyer

Yamina Kebir
Cabinet Kebir
Larbaoui Malika
Bouchaib Law Firm
Mohamad Moussi

ANGOLA
Inês Albuquerque e Castro
FCB Sociedade de Advogados
Sofia Chaves
Elieser Corte Real
Fátima Freitas & Associados–Sociedade de Advogados
Catarina de Sottomayor Barbosa
FCB Sociedade de Advogados
Fátima Freitas
Fátima Freitas & Associados–Sociedade de Advogados
Igor Fortes Gabriel
FBL Advogados
Isabel Gavião
MG Advogados
Berta Grilo
FBL Advogados
Vanessa Matos Mendes
PLMJ Legal Network–Mozambique Desk
Edila Maria Melo Ribeiro
Lawyer
Petra Nascimento
Rede Mulher Angola
Alexandra Do Nascimento
Gonçalves
MG Advogados
Catarina Neto Fernandes
Miranda Correia Amendoeira & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados RL
Itweva Nogueira
Dentons
Fernanda Ricardo
Rede Mulher Angola
Leniza Sampaio
MG Advogados
Jacob Sanganjo
Fátima Freitas & Associados–Sociedade de Advogados
Sousa Silva
CIMA–Marcas e Patentes
Henrique Sungeti
Rede Mulher Angola
Elsa Tchicanha
Bruno Xavier de Pina

ALBANIA
Mirela Arqimandriti
Gender Alliance for Development Center
Ledja Burnazi Mitllari
University of New York Tirana
Teuta Dedaj
Albanian Women Empowerment Network (AWEN)
Ada Güven
Beder University–Department of Law
Dudi Ilias
Adriatik Lapaj
Lawyer
Ines Leskaj
Albanian Women Empowerment Network (AWEN)
Eni Mazniku
Ruhr University Bochum
Megi Reçi
Civil Rights Defenders
Erida Visoçi
Prosecution Office of Vlora

ALGERIA
Radia Abdous
Ghellal & Mekerba
Kada Afa
Université de la Formation Continue
Narimene Benabdallah
Université d’Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA
Sherrie-Ann Bradshaw
S. Bradshaw & Associates
Alethea Byers
Family and Social Services
Rushaine Cunningham
Dentons
Alexandrina Wong
Women Against Rape Inc.

ARGENTINA
Ana Alicia Ariet Guevara
Poder Judicial Pcia. de Mendoza
Úrsula Basset
Universidad Austral & Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina
Mabel Bianco
La Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer (FEIM)
Mónica Burlón
Estudio Jurídico Mónica Burlón & Asociados
Carina Marcela Castrillón
Bulló Abogados
Claudia Susana Catalín
Gobierno de la Provincia de Santa Fe
Agatha Ciancaglini
Troller
Dirección General de Políticas de Género (DGPG)
Graciela Beatriz De Oto
Suma Veritas
Cristina Devoto
Asociación Argentina de Ética y Comercio de Servicios
Milagros Etcheberry
Le Fort
Cámara Argentina de Comercio y Servicios
Sebastián Ignacio Fortuna
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Derecho
Consuelo García
Consuelo García Law Firm
Rodrigo Fermín García
Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal
Jorge Daniel Grispo
Estudio Grispo & Asociados
Diego Sebastián Kelly
Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal
Esteban Mancuso
Cámara Argentina de Comercio y Servicios
Mariano Raul Maranta
Bulló Abogados
Maria Cecilia Massone
Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal
Sofía Gabriela Nufiez
Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal
Juan Pablo Olmo
Ministerio Público de la Defensa
Sofía María Parra Sanfet
Tamara Quiroga
Cámara Argentina de Comercio y Servicios
Liliana Ronconi
Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET)
Estefanía A. Santarelli
Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal
Enrique Mariano Stile
Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal
Federico Ariel Vashchetto
Defensoría General de la Nación Argentina
Matías Bolis Wilson
Cámara Argentina de Comercio y Servicios
Silvana Florencia Yazbek
Instituto de la Democracia y Elecciones (IDEMOE)

ARMENIA
Hayk Abrahamyan
Open Society Foundations
Anna Barikyan
Confederation of Trade Unions of Armenia
Davit Hunanyan
AM Law Firm
Ara Khzmalyan
Adwise Business & Legal Consulting
Vanik Margaryan
AM Law Firm
Maro Matosian
Women’s Support Center
Larisa Minasyan
Open Society Foundations
Hasnik Ohnikiyan
lex Law Firm
Siranush Sahakyan
Path of Law
Tirayr Vardazaryan
Gayane Virabyan
K & P Law Firm
Arpine Yeghiykan
Maseral LLC

AUSTRALIA
Marco Bianchino
Pearson Emerson
Amelia Ikin
Allen & Overy
Christy Miller
Clayton Utz
Stephen Page
Page Provan Pty. Limited
Susan Pearson
Pearson Emerson
Scarlett Storm
Clayton Utz
Jorja Sumner
Allen & Overy
Tineka Winter
Pearson Emerson
Jane Wright
Work Dynamic Australia

AZERBAIJAN
Fidan Abdurrahimli
Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
Sevil Aliyeva
Sonakhanim Gaybaliyeva
Javid Hajiyev
Fina LLP
Gunel Ismayilbeyli
Lawyer
Ummi Jalilova
GRATA International
Lala Karimi

AUSTRIA
Verein Wiener Frauenhäuser
Agneszkac Branding
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Karin
Buzanich-Sommerregger
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Barbara Deitzer
Isabel Firneis
Wolf Theiss
Hans Georg Laimer
Zeiler Fredo Zadkovich
Birgitt Haller
Institute of Conflict Research (IKF)
Georg Krakow
Baker McKenzie-Diwok Hermann Petsche Rechtsanwälte LL& Co. KG
Theresa Nindl
Vavrovsky Heine Marth Rechtsanwälte GmbH
Alexander Petsche
Baker McKenzie-Diwok Hermann Petsche Rechtsanwälte LL& Co. KG
Gert-Peter Reissner
University of Innsbruck
Eva-Maria Ségur-Cabanac
Baker McKenzie-Diwok Hermann Petsche Rechtsanwälte LL& Co. KG
Matthias Unterrieder
Wolf Theiss
Verena Vinzenz
University of Innsbruck
Lukas Wieser
Zeiler Fredo Zadkovich
Jasmin Rosita Zareie
Baker McKenzie-Diwok Hermann Petsche Rechtsanwälte LL& Co. KG

AZERBAIJAN
Fidan Abdurrahimli
Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
Sevil Aliyeva
Sonakhanim Gaybaliyeva
Javid Hajiyev
Fina LLP
Gunel Ismayilbeyli
Lawyer
Ummi Jalilova
GRATA International
Lala Karimi
Kamala Khalilova
Fina LLP
Azad Mammadli  
Partner inwest  
Affärsrådmäktarna AB

Shahin Mammadzalizada  
Baku State University

Gulzada Mirzamammadova  
Socar Polymer LLC

Ruslan Mirzayev  
Adrem Attorneys

Kifayat Nasirli  
Adrem Attorneys

Araz Poladov

Shabnam Sadigova  
GRATA International

Mahammad Safarli  
Azerbaijan Football Federation

Fidan Salmanova  
GRATA International

Shahla Samedova  
Baku State University

Elnara Yusibova

---

BAHRAIN

Zaina Albuainain  
Al Tamimi & Company

Zeean Al Mansoori  
Al Tamimi & Company & Associates

Ismail Alnasiri  
Inovest

Reem Al Rayes  
Zeean Al Mansoori & Associates

Noor Al Taref  
Zu’bi & Partners Attorneys & Legal Consultants

Foutoun Hajjar  
Al Tamimi & Company

Omar Naghawai

Eman Omar  
Zu’bi & Partners Attorneys & Legal Consultants

Fatema Sarhan  
Al Tamimi & Company

---

BANGLADESH

Sarmin Akther  
Bangladesh Law Partners BDLP

Shajib Mahmood Alam  
Bangladesh Law Partners BDLP

Tania Amir  
Amir & Amir Law Associates

Rawshon Ara Begum  
Shariatpur Judge Court

Md. Khademul Islam Choyon

Sattar&Co.

Rafiqul Islam  
Obiter Dictum

Israt Jahan  
Shariatpur Judge Court

Md. Imran Jahan

Sultana Nasrin  
Amir & Amir Law Associates

Md. Noushad Parvez  
Advocacy Legal

Nabila Rafique  
Amir & Amir Law Associates

Md. Rafinur Rahman  
Bangladesh Law Partners BDLP

Christabel Randolph  
Supreme Court of Bangladesh

Akram Hossain Rifat  
Bangladesh Law Partners BDLP

Chitrav Shahabuddin

Mehnaz Siddiqui  
Judicial Administration Training Institute

Muhammad Rashel Siddiqui  
Obiter Dictum

---

BARBADOS

T’shara A. Sealy  
Virtus Legal

Christopher Blackman  
Juris Chambers

Margot Greene  
Solo Practitioner and Queen’s Counsel

Michelle M. Russell  
MR Law

Wendy Straker  
Juris Chambers

Rickeada Taylor  
Virtus Legal

Heather Walker  
Chancery Chambers

---

BELGIUM

Marie Beudels  
Eleanor Coets  
Hill Dickinson LLP

Audrey Fayt  
Tribunal de 1ère Instance du Hainaut

Cécile Firket  
Avocat

Nanyi Kaluma  
Allen & Overy

Sylvie Lacombe  
Tetra Law

Valerie Lejeune  
Association d’Avocats Schmitz, Jottrand, Kies, Risopoulos et Gernay

Julie Malinguereau  
Tetra Law

Michaela Roegiers  
Brussels Court of Justice

Simon Troch  
Latham & Watkins

Catherine Van de Heyning  
Artes Law

Evelien Van Espen  
Allen & Overy

---

BELIZE

Dolores Balderamos Garcia  
Dolores Balderamos Garcia Law Office

Stevanni L. Duncan  
Barrow & Williams LLP

Andrea McSweeney  
Mckoy

Deshawn Arzu Torres  
Mckoy Torres LLP

---

BENIN

Régis Lionel Aballo  
L’Ecole Régionale Supérieur de la Magistrature (ERSUMA)

Agnila Rafikou Alabi  
Cabinet Rafikou A. Alabi

Nda Kouagou Camille  
SOS Children’s Villages Benin
APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Albert Djidohokpin
SOS Children’s Villages Benin
Sarah Lacomme
Evelyne Quenum
Alexandrine Salzonou-Bedie
Cabinet Salzonou
Guy-Lambert Yêkpê
Cabinet G.L. Yêkpê

BHUTAN

Sangay Chhedup
Bhutan National Legal Institute
Deki Dema
UNICEF Bhutan
Kinley Gyltschen
Office of the Attorney General
Dema Lham
Jigme Singye Wangchuck School of Law
Dona Mathew
UN Women
Sonam Tobgay
Bank of Bhutan Ltd.
Chimmi Wangmo
Bhutan Law Chamber

BOLIVIA

Andrea Bollmann Duarte
Iby Bueno Ayala
Grissett Carrasco Guerra
C.R. & F. Rojas Abogados
Polina Chtchek
ESPCS Multidisciplinary Consulting
René Claire Veizaga
Moreno Baldívieso
Syntia Vilma Cuestas Zeballos
Jinky Irusta
Oficina Jurídica Para la Mujer
Claudia López Monterrey
ESPCS Multidisciplinary Consulting

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Jasmin Cengic
ERC ZIPO d.o.o. Sarajevo
Fedad Dupovac
Advokatska Kancelarija Spaho
Ariana
Hadžiahmetović-Softić
Marč & Co. Law Firm
Edin Ibrahim Federation
The Human Rights Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Igor Letica
Sajić o.d. Banja Luka
Mirela Mazulović
Sajić o.d. Banja Luka
Mišo Pašić
Advokatska kancelarija Stevanović
Lejla Polpara
Attorney
Aleksandar Sajić
Sajić o.d. Banja Luka
Emir Spaho
Advokatska Kancelarija Spaho
Mehmed Spaho
Advokatska Kancelarija Spaho
Selma Spaho
Advokatska Kancelarija Spaho

BOTSWANA

Garebamono & Pillar Law Practice
University of Botswana
Lesego Gaetwesepe

BRAZIL

Barbara Müssnich
Aragão (BMA)
Marina Angioletti
Marina Angioletti
Family Law Office
Josycler Arana
Universidade Federal Fluminense
Murilo Caldeira
Germínian
Machado, Meyer, Sendacz e Opice Advogados
Leticia Calderaró Batista
Calderaró Advocacia
Clara Costa
Conversa com Elas
Lígia Maura Costa
Lígia Maura Costa Advocacia
Carla Demchuk
Ana Thais Dias Safe
Carneiro
Advocacia Safe
Carneiro
Christiana Fontenelle
Bichara Advogados
Jorge Gonzaga
Matsumoto
Bichara Advogados
Leonor José Vieira
Leamir Vieira Advocacia Previdenciária
Andressa Lin Fidelis
Latham & Watkins LLP
Thais Machado
Federal Regional Court of 4th Region
Paula Máryko Sobral
Sherman & Sterling LLP

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Hasnah Hassan & Associates
Sabrina Azaharaini
Cheok Advocates & Solicitors
Robin Cheok
Cheok Advocates & Solicitors
Hajah Norajimah Haji Aji
Ministry of Home Affairs, Department of Labor
Norizzah Hazirah Hj Awg Hussin
Ministry of Home Affairs, Department of Labor
Norkhatijah Zainal
Royal Brunei Police Force
**APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

**CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC**
- Ben Kabagambe
- Brice Kevin Kakpayen
- Cabinet Morouba
- Baptiste Lushombo
- American Bar Association
- Raymond Ndakala
  - Bairro de Centrafrique

**CHAD**
- Moko Adoumbaye
- Rachel Beida
  - Cabinet Ndei Obed
- Thomas Dingamgoto
  - Cabinet Thomas Dingamgoto
- Masra Djimas
  - Societé Civile d’Avocats

**COLOMBIA**
- Universidad de Antioquia
  - White & Case LLP
- Julieta Abello
- María Margarita Bucheli Eraso
- María Isabel Lopera Vélez
- Carlos Alberto López Henao
- Carlos López Abogados
- Adriana Martínez Piedrahita
- DGA Abogados
- Lina Mejía
- Maria Rocha
- Leonardo Salamanca Anzola
  - S&G Consultores SAS
- Nathaly Tovar

**CHINA**
- Beijing Zhongze Women’s Legal Aid Center
- Moghe Chen
  - Linklaters Zhao Sheng
- Jing He
  - Jun He LLP
- Lillian Ji
  - Morrison & Foerster LLP
- Jie Jin
  - Linklaters Zhao Sheng
- Emily Ma
  - Linklaters Zhao Sheng
- Xuekai Vincent Qian
  - Dentons
- Simonette Santos
- Danping Shen
  - Morrison & Foerster LLP
- Jinlan Sun
  - Kim & Chang
- Xue Tao
  - Dentons
- Jeffrey Wilson
  - Jun He LLP
- Dylan Wu
- Ke Wu
  - Dechert LLP
- Xiaotong Wu
  - Guangdong Win Long Law Firm
- Han Yang
  - Commerce & Finance Law Offices

**COMOROS**
- Aboubakar Abdou
- Abdourahaman Abidate
  - Shawiri Scoops
- Maimouna Ibrahim
  - National Commission for Solidarity, Social Protection and Gender Promotion
- Moufida Mohamed Abdouhalik
  - EFOICOM (Femmes Entrepreneurs Comoriennes)

**CONGO, REP.**
- Patrice Bazolo
  - Pwc
- Fernand Carle
  - Cabinet d’Avocats Fernand Carle
- Bob Kaben Massouka
  - Cabinet d’Avocats Maître Bob Kaben Massouka
- Laëtitia Nadine Loko
  - Blanchard Nguouala Association Congolaise des Professionnels du Droit
- Franck Darnod Nguimbi Mbenze
  - Cabinet d’Avocats Claude Coelho
- Sylvie Niombo
  - Issan Giska Ntsila Cabinet d’Avocats Ntsila

**CONGO, DEM. REP.**
- Aline Bahati Cibambo
  - Université Catholique de Bukavu
- Justine Masika Bihamba
  - Synergie des Femmes pour les Victimes de Violences Sexuelle (SFVS)
- Dorcas Buzigire
  - Mercy Corps
- Serge Faray Salumu
- Fabien Kadima
- Emile Luketa Mukuna
  - University of Lumbubashi
- Ezechiel Lwesso
  - Collège Georges Misamu
- Brigitte Mawazo
  - IFHD NGABO Initiative Féminine pour la Défense des Droits Humains et le Développement
- Marie Migani
  - Centre d’appui à la Promotion de la Santé–CAPSA asbl
- Salvador Minani
  - Alpha Justice Chambers
- Roger Mulamba
  - RMK & Associés
- Dunia Prince Zongwe
  - Walter Sisulu University
COSTA RICA
Rocio Amador Hasbun
Bufete Amador

Larissa Arroyo
Navarrete
Asociación Ciudadana ACCEDER

Estefanía Battalla
Arias

Carolina Flores Bedoya
Arias

Cristina Guerrini
Arias

Marianne Pál-Hegedüs
Ortega
LatamLex Abogados

Daniel Rodríguez Molina
ERP Lawyers

German Rojas
Arias

Eduardo Rojas Piedra
ERP Lawyers

Augusto Solís Rodríguez
Arias

CÔTE D’IVOIRE
Association des Femmes Juristes de Côte d’Ivoire (AFJCI)

Marienne Allomo
Imboua-Kouauo-Tella & Associés

Charise Ane
Groupe Dogué-Abbé Yao et Associés

Simone Assa-Akoh
Société d’Avocats Baze, Koyo, Assa

Françoise Angeline
Koudjhis-Offoumou

Carine Bleu
Imboua-Kouauo-Tella & Associés

Agnès Doh
ONG ADPF

Patrick Famien
Imboua-Kouauo-Tella & Associés

Claude-Andréée Groga
Chauveau & Associés

Moumouni Konaté
Konfirm-Advies

Rosemonde Kuié
ONG AVIDE (Africa’s Volunteers for International Development)

Edwige N’Gouan
Cabinet Jean-François Chauveau

Patricia N’Guessan
Cabinet Jean-François Chauveau

Marguerite Yoli-Bi Koné
West Africa Network for Peacebuilding

Seydou Zerbo
SCPA Dogué-Abbé Yao et Associés

CROATIA
Sanja Bezbradica Jelavic
Jelavić i partneri j.t.d.

Marko Borsky
Marko Borsky Law Office

Andrea Gubić
Divjak, Topič & Bahtijarević Law Firm

Ema Marušić
Marko Borsky Law Office

Kristina Mihanjević
Women’s Room–Center for Sexual Rights

Maja Mitrović

Karla Novosel
Law Office Karla Novosel

Nela Pamukovic
Centre for Women Victims

Zdravka Sadažkov
B.a.B.e-Be active, Be emancipated

Barbara Šimić
Divjak, Topič & Bahtijarević Law Firm

Michal Ptáček
Radošová Ptáček, advokátní kancelár

Filip Šperl
Kocián Šolc Balaštík

Václav Žaloudek
White & Case LLP

DENMARK
Elsebeth Aaes-Jørgensen
Norrbom Vindinq

Mads Bernstorn
MK Law Firm

Maria Bekke Eiersted
Kromann Reumert Law Firm

Johanne Snog Gillesberg
Statistics Denmark

Marianne Granhøj
Kromann Reumert Law Firm

Hanne Hartoft
Aalborg University, Department of Law

Majken Johansen
Advokat Majken Johansen

Mette Klingsten
MK Law Firm

Anne Mørk
Aalborg University, Department of Law

Kathe Nielsen
Kromann Reumert Law Firm

Linda Nielsen
University of Copenhagen

Tina Reissmann
Labora Legal

Carley Wilson
MK Law Firm

Mathilde Worch Jensen
University of Copenhagen
APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DJIBOUTI
Hassan Mouhoumed Abdoulkader
Cabinet d’Avocat Abdoulkader Hassan
Mahdi Boulboul Ali
Beryl Claire Asiago
AnalytiQ Consult
Sofia Curradi
Cabinet Avocats Associés Djibouti
Abayazid & Abdourahman
Fatima Karroum
Zahra Youssouf Kayad

DOMINICA
Jo-Anne Cuffy
Danielle Edwards
Attorney-at-Law
Emette Kangal
CC Law Practitioners LLP
Tara Leevy
Attorney-at-Law
Nawana Shillingford
University of the West Indies

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
José Manuel Alburquerque Prieto
Ontier Albuquerque
Merielin Almonte
Merielin Almonte Estudio Legal
Joan Carolina Arbaje Bergès
Distrito Legal
Lidia Aybar
Distrito Legal
Pamela Beníz Arbaje
Guzmán Ariza & Asociados
Jonattan A. Boyero Galán
Camañó–De Herrera & Boyero. Abogados (CDHB)
Yuleid Galice
Merielin Almonte Estudio Legal
Prinkin Jiménez
Ontier Albuquerque
Dilia Leticia Jorge Mera
DLJM Firma de Abogados
Carol Matos De La Cruz
María Jesús Pola
Lawyer
Katherine Vallejo
Ontier Albuquerque

ECUADOR
Daniela Estefanía Aguirre Salamea
María Fernanda Aguirre Salamea
María Laura Barrera Barrera, Andrade–Cevallos & Abogados
Patrick Barrera Barrera, Andrade–Cevallos & Abogados
María Angélica Campoverde
Gálvez & Asociados
Mariuxi Paola Cedeño Flori
Universidad Metropolitana
Piedad Gálvez Cortes de Varea
Gálvez & Asociados
Ana Carolina González Cevallos
Fabian Jaramillo Jaramillo Dávila Abogados
Diego Jaramillo Terán Jaramillo Dávila Abogados
Libertad Machado López
Universidad Metropolitana
Gabriela Paredes Gootman
Sempérgui Ontaneda Abogados
Gabriela Salazar Sempérgui Ontaneda Abogados
Farith Simon
Cristina Valencia Araujo

EGYPT, ARAB REP.
Dalia Abdul Ghany
Sharkawy & Sarhan
Mohamed Abdelgawad ADSERO–Ragy Soliman & Partners
Nehad Abu-Alkamsan
The Egyptian Center for Women’s Rights
Inas Farah
Beyit–Joint Venture of Almarai & PepsiCo.
Adham Hashish
Alexandria University Faculty of Law
Tarek Hossam
Youssef Sallam ADSERO–Ragy Soliman & Partners
Marwa Sharafeldin
Musawah for Equality in the Family
Ali Shohayeb
ADSERO–Ragy Soliman & Partners
Darah Zakaria ADSERO–Ragy Soliman & Partners

EL SALVADOR
Ruth Beraliz Argüeta
Lilian Arias Arias Law
Christian Bará Cousin
Bara Legal Corporation
Rafael Burgos Arias Law
Silvia Juárez
ORMUSA, Asoc. Organización de Mujeres Salvadoreñas por la Paz
Carolina Lazo Arias Law
Jessenia Consuelo Martínez Coto
Procuraduría General de la República
Marina Melara
Corte Suprema de Justicia
Ernesto Morales
Lilian Margarita Ulloa Alvarenga
Corte Suprema de Justicia

EQUATORIAL GUINEA
Javier Iñiguez
Lechêne, Iñiguez & Partners
Damien Lanuza
Estela Mercedes Nse Mansogo
Permanent Mission of Equatorial Guinea to the United Nations
Pablo Obama
Centurion Law Group
Serafina Sialo

ERITREA
UNDP
Suleiman Ahmedin
UNHCR Eritrea
Senai W. Andemariam
Natnael Fitsum Tekeste
Ministry of Justice
Henok Gebregziabher
Ruta Gebremichael
Najat Humed
Sebri Ibrahim
Ministry of Justice
Senay Kufu
Ghebremeskel SNS Group
Adam Teklehaymanot
Lawyer
Isaías Tekli
Asmara University
Temesgen Tesfu
Ministry of Justice
Awet Tewelde
Ministry of Justice
Wegahta Zere

ESTONIA
White & Case LLP
Merle Eriksson
University of Tartu
Trinu Hiob
Njord Law Firm
Vladislav Leiri
Law Firm Sorainen
Karín Madisson
Law Firm Sorainen
Lauri Paulus
Tamar Ruseishvil
Ketevan Shubashvili
Office of Public Defender of the Republic of Georgia
Chiora Taktakishvili
Ilia State University
Revaz Tkemaladze
Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Georgia

GERMANY

Kathleen Acott
Barbara Angene
Marco Daub
sfh Schumacher Steuerberatungs-gesellschaft mbH
Nicole Janssen
Sidley Austin LLP
Christina Mann
Latham & Watkins LLP
Xenia Pisarewska
Sidley Austin LLP
Heiko Recktenwald
Bärbel Schmidt
Independent Consultant
Vanessa Sekker
Latham & Watkins LLP
Jürgen Streng
Mayer Brown International LLP
Sabine Vorbrodt

GREECE

International Organization for Migration
Niki Alexandrou
Norton Rose Fullbright Greece
Nikos Anastopoulos
Politis & Partners
Barbara Angelopoulou
Avramopoulos & Partners Law Firm
Alexandra Argyropoulou
AP Legal
Ioanna Chanoumi
Kyriakides Georgopoulos Law Firm
Chara Chioni-Chotourman
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
Konstantinos Dimitropoulos
Dimitropoulos, Karpidou & Associates
Eirini Kikarea
University of Cambridge
Ioanna Kyriazi
Kyriakides Georgopoulos Law Firm
Stavroula Lymousi
Apostolos Papadimitriou
Costas D. Papadimitriou
Costas D. Papadimitriou and Partners Law Company
Dimitra Papayiannopoulos
Norton Rose Fullbright Greece
Evangelos Politis
Politics & Partners
Maria Rigaki
EY Law
Emmanouil Savoidakis
Politics & Partners
Kostas Spaidiotis
KPSY Law Firm
Dimitris Theodoropoulos
Politis & Partners
Matina Tsili
Bitros Holding SA
Viktoria Zloga

GRENADA

Henry, Henry & Bristol
Anderson Andall
CityScape
Kaisha Ince
Attorney General’s Office Grenada
Rosana John
Wilkinson, Wilkinson & Wilkinson
Jacqueline Lorice Pascal
Grenada National Organisation of Women (GNOW)
Rae Thomas
Franco Chambers and Company
Herricia L. Willis
H.L. Willis & Associates

GUATEMALA

White & Case LLP
Pedro Aragón
Aragón & Aragón
Geovani Javier
Avendaño Maldonado
María Elena Barrientos
Arias
Ana Rocío Beltetón G.
IDEA Next
Ana Gabriela Contreras García
Lawyer
Liz Gordillo
Arias
Rita María Grajeda Díaz
Juan Pablo Martínez Arias
Oscar Alfredo Pineda Chavarria
IDEA Next
Gabriela Rivera
Eleusis Zelada Rosal Arias

GUINEA

Amara Bangoura
Cabinet d’Avocats Amaraya
Youssouf Bangoura
Attorney-at-Law
Amadou Babahein Camara
Fanta Camara
Ministry of Investments and Public Private Partnerships
Ibrahima Diallo
P.C.U.D.
Siba Dopavogui
Organisation Catholique pour la Promotion Humaine (OCPH) / Caritas Guinée
Mamadouba Doumbouya
Cabinet d’Avocats Amaraya
Mohamed Lamine Fofana
Sylla & Partners
Djenabou Fofana Ndiaye
Lorny Center
Frederic Loua Foromo
Tossa Montcho
Les Mêmes Droits pour Tous
Germaine Pascaline Tolno
Les Mêmes Droits pour Tous
Sadou Savané
Sylla & Partners

GUINEA-BISSAU

João Pedro C. Alves de Campos
Camões IP
Emílio Ano Mendes
GB Legal-Miranda Alliance
Juliano Augusto Fernandes
Julafer & Lopesfino Advogados Associados
Monica Indami
Bissau First Instance Court, Commercial Division
Armando Mango
Ismael Mendes de Medina
GB Legal-Miranda Alliance
Helder Pires
Paloma Velasco Velasco
EU Delegation Guinea Bissau

GHANA

Lom Ahlijah
Ghana Grid Company
Valery Atuwo
Kimathi & Partners
Hilary Gbedemah
The Law Institute
Abass Hamza
HACEP-Ghana
Mawunya Kudu
Cynthia Nimo-Ampedu
Human Rights Advocacy Center
Nicole-Marie Poku
Sory @ Law
Judith Naa Ode Stephens

APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
## GUYANA
- Liza Hanoman, Guyana Integrity Commission
- Sherrie Hewitt, Guyana Sugar Corporation Incorporated
- Ayana Jennifer McCalman, McCalman & Co. Legal Services
- Charles Ogle, Ministry of Social Protection
- Selwyn Pieters, Pieters Law Office
- Shawn Shewram
- Nirvana Singh
- Kayreen Stephenson, Ministry of Legal Affairs, Attorney General’s Chambers
- Kean Trotman, Guyana Association of Women Lawyers
- Kimbely Yearwood, Lawyer

## HAITI
- Johanna-Sylvain Joseph, Cabinet d’Avocats Johanna Sylvain
- Elizabeth Mentor Lafontant
- Patrick Laurent, Cabinet Patrick Laurent & Associés
- Landy Leconte, Avocats Sans Frontières–Canada
- Dilia Lemaire, Mouvement des Femmes Haïtiennes pour l’Éducation et le Développement (MOUFHED)
- Alain Lemithé, Cabinet Menard-Lemithé
- Noël Marie Ange Forn Deside

## HONDURAS
- Gina María Aronne Laitano
- Alessia Bonilla Rietti
- Alma Coello
- Dulce Maria Enamorado Ramos, Programa Ciudad Mujer
- Wendy Carolina Estévez Paredes, Programa Ciudad Mujer
- Edwin Ramón Flores Salinas, ECUA-Honduras
- Fanny Gallo, IDLO
- Shadia García, Banco Centroamericano de Integración Económica (BOIC)
- Rosa Paz Haslam, Programa Ciudad Mujer
- Ana Incisana di Camerana, IDLO
- Sara Nardičchia, IDLO
- Jazna Vanessa Oquel Garcia & Bodán-Honduras
- Aída Romero, IDLO
- Gabriela María Williams Cruz, ECUA-Honduras
- Roberto Alejandro Williams Cruz, ECUA-Honduras

## HUNGARY
- Haya Aftab, Latham & Watkins
- Áron Barta, Kinstellar Hungary
- Judit Budai, Szecskay Attorneys at Law
- Anna James, Latham & Watkins
- Lilla Kiss, Szecskay Attorneys at Law
- Máthé Kiss, Szecskay Attorneys at Law

## ICELAND
- Pierre Brule
- Bjarneig Eiríksdóttir, Vik Law Firm
- Hjórdís Guðbrandsdóttir
- Diljá Helgadóttir, Van Boel & Bellis
- Erna Lýsdóttir, Logos Lögmannabjónustu
- Flosi Hrafn Sigurðsson, OPUS Legal Services

## INDIA
- Priyanka Anand, Indialaw LLP
- Meghna Bal, Hammurabi & Solomon Partners
- Sweta Bharti, Hammurabi & Solomon Partners
- Kshitija Chile, Alliance University
- Bhargavi Chakka, Alliance University
- Miheer Dhondye, Indialaw LLP
- Sneha Dubey, Indialaw LLP
- Aanchal Kapoor, Lawyer
- Manoj Kumar, Hammurabi & Solomon Partners
- Radhika Mathur, ANM Global
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Names and Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td>Soumyashree Meesaraganda Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiju P.V. Indialaw LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweta Patel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akshit Rajpal ANM Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vrajal Sapovadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adria Thakur Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eklavya Vasudev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beauty Erwati Siswojo LBH-APIK Nusa Tenggara Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaretha Hanita Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blanca P. Putri Kadarisman Soewito Suhardiman Eddy mushry Kardono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursyahbani Katjasungkana Indonesian Legal Aid Association for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas Kodrat Andreas FK &amp; Katjasungkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurul Kodriati Rijka Anissa Women Crisis Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adella Kristi HHP Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rusmaini Lenggogeni Soewito Suhardiman Eddy mushry Kardono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeremia Gorby Katjasungkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nababan Prayogo Advocaten (DHP Lawyers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugianto Osman Ginting &amp; Reksodiputro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indri Pramitaswari Gurino HHP Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niken Prawesti Griya Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Dhanu Prayogo Advocaten (DHP Lawyers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Samid Ginting &amp; Reksodiputro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiki Setiawan Kiki Setiawan and Partners Law Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rahadiyan Yana HHP Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRAN, ISLAMIC REP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean-Charles Albitre Ferdowsi Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baharak Barzin Ferdowsi Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohsen Ghorbani Tossanlo Ghorbani Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siamak Goudarzi Afsarin Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mojgan Honarmandjavan Anooshiravan Karimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ezatollah Karimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setareh Kerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul-Arthur Luzu Ferdowsi Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parya Maleknia Attorney-at-Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baki Maneche Ferdowsi Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manoochehr Sarhang Khanlari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nayan Abbas Nativé-Degramaci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bushra Al-Obaidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maha Alsakban Women’s Human Rights Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacquelyn Foster Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeyad Saeed Iraq Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRELAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivana Back Trinity College Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Benson Women’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Cahill Mason Hayes &amp; Curran LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roisin Aine Costello Maynooth University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blathnaid Evans Leman Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Faulkner Arthur Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethan Heathcote White &amp; Case LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roisin Liddy-Murphy Conyers Dill &amp; Pearman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monica Mazzone Women's Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emar Murphy Lavelle Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Nic Chárthaigh Mason Hayes &amp; Curran LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Pia Hickey Leiden University Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Rodger Loatham &amp; Watkins LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Stafford Mason Hayes &amp; Curran LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrichetta Sandra Bellini Formera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business and Professional Women International (BPWII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marco Boldini Orrick, Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alessandro Bovio Alture Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marco Calabrese Studio Legale Calabrese &amp; A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massimiliano Castellari Studio Andino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Vittoria Cazzola Orrick, Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stefania Citone Studio Legale Calabrese &amp; A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniele Consolo Orrick, Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silvia Dal Cin Accelerate Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federica Di Mario Salonia Associati Studio Legale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francesca Elefante Studio Legale Elefante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Gangemi Portolano Cavallo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francesca Garbarino Italian Centre for the Promotion of Mediation (CIPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberto Lama Alture Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giliola Langher Business and Professional Women International (BPWII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Miklos Antenone AVRA Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chiara Moraschi Chiara Moraschi Law Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Pagliara WATTI Avvocati &amp; Rechtsanwälte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Maria Pavone Orrick, Herrington &amp; Sutcliffe LLP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eun-Jee Kwak
Kim & Chang
Sun-Ha Kweon
Kim & Chang
Jieun Lee
Liberty Law Office
Jung Lae Lee
Kim & Chang
Hyunah Park
Yulchon LLC
Yeon Ha Park
Labor Corporation Sinsung
Seunghyun Seo
Lee & Ko
Hyesoo Sung
Labor Corporation Sinsung
Jai Eun Yoo
Yulchon LLC

KOSOVO
Genc Alimehmeti
University of Tirana
Ronja Berisha
Zana Govori
European Asylum Support Office
Bardhyi Hasanapaj
University of Prishtina, Law Faculty
Olga Jovic-Prlainovic
University of Prishtina
Donikë Kastrati
Eneida Lajqi
NLB Banka
Vlora Marmullakaj
Diellza Mujaj
Leiden University Law School
Artan Qerkini
Sejdiu & Qerkini
Valmira Rashiti
Kosovo Women’s Network
Bonita Salihu
Valbona Salihu
Lawyers Association Norma
Nita Shaia
University of Prishtina
Xhevdet Shala
KLG Law Firm

KUWAIT
Mosaaed AlAjeel
Allen & Overy LLP
Faisal Alfahad
Dr. Faisal Alfahad & Partners
Dalal Al Ghunaim
Athra Alefaai
Athra Alefaai Legal Group
Dalal Al Sulaiti
Meshari Alosaimi Law Firm
Dema Al Yatama
Dalal S. Sharar

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC
Aicholpon Alieva
Kalikova & Associates Law Firm
Elena Bit-Avravig
Veritas Law Agency
Samara Dumanova
Lorenz Limited Liability Company
Adinaí Dzekshenova
Kalikova & Associates Law Firm
Víctor Efremov
Veritas Law Agency
Chynara Esengeldieva
Lorenz Limited Liability Company
Sara Kabaeva
Lorenz Limited Liability Company
Lenara Mambetalieva
Lorenz Limited Liability Company
Aalumguj Osmanalieva
Lawyer
Jibek Tenizbaeva
Lorenz Limited Liability Company
Lidiya Vasilieva
Veritas Law Agency

LAO PDR
Rosie Cole
Arion Legal

LATVIA
Mārtiņš Birģelis
Renārs Gasūns
Klauber Baltics
Valerijis Ickevics
V. Ickeviks, Sworn Attorneys-at-Law
Irina Kostina
Ellex Klavins
Anna Krasanova
Ivo Maskalāns
Cobalt Legal
Ieva Miluna
Ieva Miluna Consulting
Ints Skaldis
Ellex Klavins

LEBANON
Elias Abdelnour
Moghabghab & Associates Law Firm
Michel Abi Saab
Allen & Overy
Kamal Abou’Zahr
Kamal Abou Zahr Law Office
Guida Anani
Chafic Georges El
Chab Majdalani
Lawyer
Melkar El Khoury
Central Research House
Samer El Khoury
Etude Badri et Salim El Meouchi
Marie Thérèse El-Mir
Rassemblement Démocratique des Femmes Libanaises
Joya Farah
Rana Khafif
Kamal Abou Zahr Law Office
Joelle Khater
Etude Badri et Salim El Meouchi
Joumana Merhi
Rassemblement Démocratique des Femmes Libanaises
Outeiba Merhi
Rassemblement Démocratique des Femmes Libanaises
Ghassan Moghabghab
Moghabghab & Associates Law Firm
Tarek Moghabghab
Moghabghab & Associates Law Firm
Lara Saade
Maysa Schender
Lebanese Council to Resist Violence Against Women
Ghenwa Schinder
Lebanese Council to Resist Violence Against Women
Laura Schinder
Lebanese Council to Resist Violence Against Women
Manar Zeaiter
Rassemblement Démocratique des Femmes Libanaises
APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mariyam Mohamed Didi
Al-ha Rasheed
Hisaan, Riffath & Co.
Shuaib Shah
Shah, Hussain & Co.

MALI
Daouda Ba
Vaughan Avocats
Almahamoud Ibrahima Dicko
Djibril Guindo
Cabinet d'Avocats Associés Jurifis Consult
Mamoudou Samassekou
Faculté de Droit Privé de l’Université de Sciences Juridiques et Politiques de Bamako
Alhassane Soukouna
Vaughan Avocats

MALTA
Francesca Anastasi
GVZH Advocates
Romina Bartolo
Iuris Malta Advocates
Karl Briffa
GVZH Advocates
Ann Bugeja
GVZH Advocates
Christine Calleja
Mamo TCV Advocates
Lara Dimitrijevic
Women’s Rights Foundation
Ariana Falzon
GVZH Advocates
Nicole Fenech
Mamo TCV Advocates
Francesca Hili
GVZH Advocates
Andrew J. Zammit
GVZH Advocates

MARSHALL ISLANDS
Marshall Islands Police Department
Daisy Alik-Momotaro
Weto in Mour: Violence Against Women and Girls Support Service, Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)

MAURITIUS
Kenneth Barden
Lawyer
Candida Kaious
Weto in Mour: Violence Against Women and Girls Support Service, Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)
Christy McKay
Weto in Mour: Violence Against Women and Girls Support Service, Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)
Danyia Note
Weto in Mour: Violence Against Women and Girls Support Service, Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)
Tanya Terry
Weto in Mour: Violence Against Women and Girls Support Service, Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)

MAURITANIA
Mounina Abdellah
Binor & Associés
Mohamed Marouf Bousbe
Diego Gaspar de Valenzuela Cueto
Hades Consulting
Oum Kalthoum Hamdionou
Oumar Mohamed Moctar
Zeinabou Taleb Moussa
Association Mauritanienne pour la Santé de la Mère et de l’Enfant

MEXICO
Viridiana Alanis
White & Case, S.C.
Adolfo Armas
Goodrich, Riquelme y Asociados
Ayesha Borja
Instituto Federal de Defensoría Pública
Laura Campos
White & Case, S.C.
Edgar Centeno
Goodrich, Riquelme y Asociados
Jesus Alejandro Cortés
Cuatrecasas
Irma Garcia
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)
Jorge Garcia de Fresno
Graham Cuatrecasas
Verónica Garzón Bonetti
Asistencia Legal por los Derechos Humanos-ASILEGAL

MICRONESIA, FED. STS.
David C. Angyal
Ramp & Mida Law Firm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maartje Govaert</strong></td>
<td>Norton Rose Fulbright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wendy Guns</strong></td>
<td>Open Universiteit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astrid Helstone</strong></td>
<td>Stibbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hosna Korishi</strong></td>
<td>Stibbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexander Daniel Leufink</strong></td>
<td>Link Advocaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugenie Nunes</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Europe LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marije Ozinga</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Europe LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sigrid Romijn</strong></td>
<td>Dutch Advocaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aniek Schadd</strong></td>
<td>Morrison &amp; Foerster LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tamara Ubink</strong></td>
<td>Norton Rose Fulbright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annette van Beers</strong></td>
<td>Norton Rose Fulbright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thessa van Zoeren</strong></td>
<td>KroeseWevers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hayden Wilson</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Kensington Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Ibro Adamou</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Kensington Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvia Njoku</strong></td>
<td>Imo State Universal Basic Education Board (IMSUBEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maarten van Beers</strong></td>
<td>Norton Rose Fulbright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thessa van Zoeren</strong></td>
<td>KroeseWevers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ZEALAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White &amp; Case LLP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew Austin</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mai Chen</strong></td>
<td>Chen Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penny Ehrhardt</strong></td>
<td>Ehrhardt Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saunoamaali’i Karanina Sumeo</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laurie McGregor</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phillipa Muir</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicola Pear</strong></td>
<td>University of Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amelia Retter</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Kensington Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blair Shepherd</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kate Tennent</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicola Pear</strong></td>
<td>University of Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amelia Retter</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Kensington Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blair Shepherd</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ea Visser</strong></td>
<td>Stibbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NICARAGUA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bertha Arguello Arias</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerva Adriana Bellorin Rodríguez Acalaw</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miriam del Socorro Espinoza Acalaw</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valeska Massiell Fonseca Torres García &amp; Bodán</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lois González</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claraliz Oviedo Maglione</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alvarado y Asociados</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alfonso Porras Díaz Acalaw</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sofía de Carmen Rivas Arias</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>María Mercedes Román</strong></td>
<td>Acalaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEJ Consulting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isabela Ruiz Perdomo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carlos Eduardo Téllez Páramo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diogenes Emilianio Velasquez Vela Acalaw</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consell Danois pour les Réfugiés</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Djibril Abarchi</strong></td>
<td>Abdou Moumouni University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zaida Abdoul Aziz Amadou</strong></td>
<td>Groupe IAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ousseynou S. Damien Aw</strong></td>
<td>Géni &amp; Kébé SCP d’Avocats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mai Kassoum Daouami Ouanou</strong></td>
<td>Commission Nationale d’Eligibilité au Statut des Réfugiés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ibrahim Haby</strong></td>
<td>CONGAFEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oyinkan Adebimpe</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adeola Ajayi</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akinwunmi Ajoboye</strong></td>
<td>Punuka Attorneys &amp; Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ifeamaka Anekwe</strong></td>
<td>NYU School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brenda Anugwom</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charles Asugha</strong></td>
<td>C.C. Asugha and Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jovita Duruzor Daniels</strong></td>
<td>Federal University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Edokpayi</strong></td>
<td>Punuka Attorneys &amp; Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joseph Erimunjeze</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Ekemezie</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvia Njoku</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Titilola Olatunde-Fasogbon</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olumide Oko</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chisom Okolie</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nkpoikana Meyen</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Ekemezie</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anastasia Onyi Iyizoba</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvia Njoku</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH MACEDONIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martina Angelkovic</strong></td>
<td>Debarliev, Dameski &amp; Kelesoska Advocates-at-Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniela Antonovska</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olivera Docevska</strong></td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K.M. Padonu &amp; Associates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ojukwu Ogezi</strong></td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Folake Elias Adebowale</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elizabeth Idigbe</strong></td>
<td>Punuka Attorneys &amp; Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvia Iwejuo</strong></td>
<td>Liberty Consultants &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Titilola Olatunde-Fasogbon</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olivia Muir</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicola Pear</strong></td>
<td>University of Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amelia Retter</strong></td>
<td>Dentons Kensington Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blair Shepherd</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kate Tennent</strong></td>
<td>Simpson Grierson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvia Njoku</strong></td>
<td>Udo Uduma &amp; Belo-Osagie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mireya Peart</td>
<td>Red de Mujeres Afrolatinoamericanas, Afrocariéneas y de la Diáspora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Perez</td>
<td>Fundamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Gabriela Santiago</td>
<td>Paredes &amp; Asociados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela Tejeira</td>
<td>Fundamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odalys Troadt Arias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PAPUA NEW GUINEA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igua Guba</td>
<td>Aliens Linkaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Karre</td>
<td>Magisterial Services of Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavie Kendino</td>
<td>Dentons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond Kipa</td>
<td>Wang Dee Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Kuman</td>
<td>Aliens Linkaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicka Pitoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Poglia</td>
<td>Aliens Linkaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony William Roden-Paru</td>
<td>O’Brien’s Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Sabo-Kelis</td>
<td>Kumul Consolidated Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Taviri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mek Tumul</td>
<td>Aliens Linkaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PARAGUAY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria José Achón Paredes</td>
<td>Vouga &amp; Olmedo Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea María Arriola Ortega</td>
<td>Secretaría de Género del Poder Judicial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María José Ayala</td>
<td>Centro de Estudios Ambientales y Sociales (CEAMSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matías Chaves</td>
<td>Ferrere Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Doldán</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysol Estigarribia</td>
<td>Ferrere Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Maria Gagliardone</td>
<td>Departamento Jurídico, Instituto de Derecho y Economía Ambiental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysmel Reinerio Gaona Villaba</td>
<td>Aprevin Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Guan Velázquez</td>
<td>Ferrere Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria del Rocio Penayo Zarza</td>
<td>Moreno Ruffinelli &amp; Asociados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giannine María G. Pistilli Bernal</td>
<td>Secretaría de Género del Poder Judicial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodolfo G. Vouga Vouga Olmedo Abogados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PERU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Abeo</td>
<td>Estudio Olaechea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Balta</td>
<td>Rodrigo, Elías &amp; Medrano Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Cermeneño</td>
<td>Rodrigo, Elías &amp; Medrano Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilibeth Cienfuegos Quiñones &amp; Cia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Durand</td>
<td>Ministerio de Trabajo y Promoción del Empleo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Víctor Ferro</td>
<td>Estudio Rubio Leguia Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clea Guerra Romero</td>
<td>Centro de la Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Ibazeta</td>
<td>Estudio Morey &amp; Morey Rotalde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fioella Patricia Morey Rotalde</td>
<td>Estudio Morey &amp; Morey Rotalde Abogados SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pía Olea Ubillús</td>
<td>Genderlab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria Osorio</td>
<td>Estudio Miranda &amp; Amado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucianna Polar</td>
<td>Estudio Olaechea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Fernando Quiñones</td>
<td>Quiñones &amp; Cia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Ramirez Chavez</td>
<td>Estudio Rubio Leguia Normand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilianna Pilar Tsuboyama Shiroma</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Valega</td>
<td>Estudio Ferrero Abogados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PHILIPPINES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya Abdullah Saligan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Caballes</td>
<td>Legal Alternatives for Women Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathrine Celine Castro</td>
<td>MOSVELDTT Law Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Patricia Cervantes-Poco</td>
<td>Ateneo de Manila University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Celine Mari A. Chan</td>
<td>Angara Abello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>POLAND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michal Balcerzak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominika Dörre-Kolasa</td>
<td>Raczkowski sp.k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Glogowska-Balcerzak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika Kamińska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizaveta Kapitonova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Masiota</td>
<td>Masiot–Adwokaci i Radowie Prawni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcin Menkes</td>
<td>Queritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grzegorz Pilszcz</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnieszka Paulina Regiec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Szutkiewicz</td>
<td>Raczkowski sp.k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PORTUGAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telma Carvalho</td>
<td>Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceição Cunha</td>
<td>Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Faculdade de Direito, Porto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria da Glória Leitão</td>
<td>Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catarina de Oliveira Carvalho</td>
<td>Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Faculdade de Direito, Porto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cláudia dos Santos Silva  
Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira

Elisabete Ferreira  
Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Faculdade de Direito, Porto

Rita Lobo Xavier  
Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Porto

Stéfanie Luz  
Coiado Guerreiro–Sociedade de Advogados, SP, RL

Paula Santos Silva  
Associação de Mulheres Contra a Violência (AMCV)

Maria Shearman de Macedo  
Associação de Mulheres Contra a Violência (AMCV)

Zulmarie Alverio Ramos  
Departamento de Justicia de Puerto Rico

Odemaris Chacon  
Estrella LLC

Rafael Díaz-Gonzáles

Caroline Fontanet Smith

Mariana Muñiz-Lara  
DLA Piper

Janice del Rosario  
Oficina de Ética Gubernamental

Mekki Abbas Mekki  
Ahmed Mohamednoor Al Mushiri Law Office

Hamzeh M. Abdelhady  
Al-Khalifa Law Firm

Michel Abi Saab  
Allen & Overy

Ahmed Al-Mushiri  
Ahmed Mohamednoor Al Mushiri Law Office

Muhammad Ameen Hashim  
Al Sulaiti Law Firm

Kirk Durrant  
DWF Law

Rana Elbashir  
Sultan Al-Abdulla & Partners

Buthaina Elgahani  
Sultan Al-Abdulla & Partners

Sarra Eljallil  
Sultan Al-Abdulla & Partners

Mohamed Fouad  
Sultan Al-Abdulla & Partners

Maha Lawson  
Simmons & Simmons Middle East LLP

Moonira Mamoon  
Sultan Al-Abdulla & Partners

Mohammad Manauar  
Al-Khalifa Law Firm

Carmen Marquez Luzzardo  
DWF Law

Elisa Matni  
Simmons & Simmons Middle East LLP

Mohamed Y. Mattar

Fahad Mohd Al-Ansari  
Fahad Al-Ansari Law Firm

Michael Palmer  
Squire Patton Boggs LLP

Omar Quoteshat  
Sultan Al-Abdulla & Partners

Andrew Wingfield  
Simmons & Simmons Middle East LLP

Diana Andrei  
ČERHA HEMPEL SPRL

Andra Badulescu  
ČERHA HEMPEL SPRL

Alexandra Columban  
Equality and Human Rights Action Centre (ACTEDO)

Ileana Glodeanu  
Wolf Theiss

Adelina Iftime-Blaeger  
Wolf Theiss

Mircea Miloș  
Covasna County Police Inspectorate

Mirela Nathanson  
ČERHA HEMPEL SPRL

Vlad Neacșu  
Popovici Nitu Stoica & Asociații

Diana Ștețiu  
Wolf Theiss

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Maryana Batalova  
Dechert LLP

Pavel Dunaev  
Dechert LLP

Valery Getmanenko  
Baker & McKenzie

Evgenia Korotkova  
Dechert LLP

Elena Kukushkina  
Baker & McKenzie

Alexander Nurik  
The Centre for Social and Labour Rights (CSLR)

Olga Renova  
Forward Legal

Tatiana Shlenchakova  
Dechert LLP

Yulianna Vertinskaya  
GE Renewable Sector

WOMEN, BUSINESS AND THE LAW 2021

SAMOA

Lina Chang  
Samoa Victim Support Group (SVSG)

Tima Leavai  
Leavai Law

Suisala Mele Maualaivao  
UN Women

Tomasi Peni  
International Labour Organization

Adi Tafunai  
Women in Business Development

SAN MARINO

Confederazione Sammarinese del Lavoro

Luciano Angelini  
University of Urbino Carlo Bo

Irene Avaldi  
Studio Legale Taurini e Hazan

Alessandro Bugli  
Studio Legale Taurini e Hazan

Michele Chiaruzzi  
Research Centre for International Relations at the University of San Marino

Désiré Kamanzi  
ENSofrica Rwanda

Andrews Kananga  
The Legal Aid Forum

Doreen Karehe  
ENSofrica Rwanda

Susan Kayisanaboo  
ENSofrica Rwanda

Penelope Kwakirikunda  
Lawyer

Janvieri Mukantwali  
UN Women

Nadine Mumporeze

Norbert N. Munana  
M-Advocates & Partners

Mary Musoni  
The Legal Aid Forum

Marie Françoise Umutoni  
Consultant

Emma Carine Uwantege  
UN Women

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

Sara da Silva  
OAS

RENATA DO NASCIMENTO  
OAS
Elena D’Amelio 
Research Centre for International Relations at the University of San Marino

Emanuela Montanari
Studio Legale Avv. Enrica Zenato

SAO TOMÉ AND PRÍNCIPE

Sofia Chaves
Dulcinea Correia
LM & Associados

Marina Costa Cabral
VoA–Viera de Almeida & Associados

Filipa Duarte Goncalves
Miranda Correia
Amendoaere & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados RL

Maria Figueiredo
Miranda Correia
Amendoaere & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados RL

Geneleyse Franca e Lagos
STP Counsel

Monteiro Luicelio
LM & Associados

Helena Manoel Viana
VoA–Viera de Almeida & Associados

Sofia Martins
Miranda Correia
Amendoaere & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados RL

Vanessa Matos Mendes
PLMJ Legal Network–Mozambique Desk

Luicelio Monteiro
LM & Associados

Virna Neves
VoA–Viera de Almeida & Associados

Americo Oliveira
Fegros
VoA–Viera de Almeida & Associados

Catarina Veiga Ribeiro
Miranda Correia
Amendoaere & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados RL

Sandra Saraiva
PLMJ Legal Network–Mozambique Desk

Joe Teixeira
LM & Associados

Bruno Xavier de Pina

SAUDI ARABIA

Amena Ali
The Law Firm of Wael A. Alissa in association with Dentons & Co.

Basem AlMaghthawi
AlMaghthawi & Partners

Yara Alsaeedi
AlMaghthawi & Partners

Tarek A. Alsohaini
Sohaibani Law Firm

Alia Al Suaidar
Allen & Overy LLP

Alia Alsaudari
Allen & Overy LLP

Julian Johansen
Allen & Overy LLP

Azam Khour
Law Office of Azzam Faisal Khour

Deniz Kozakci
Sohaibani Law Firm

Fadi Obiadat
Law Office of Azzam Faisal Khour

Faris Qadi
Law Office of Azzam Faisal Khour

SENEGAL

Mohamed Abdallah Dieng
Géni & Kébé SCP d’Avocats

Ousseynoun S. Damien Aw
Géni & Kébé SCP d’Avocats

Sény Samya Coly
Cabinet Maître Cheikh Fall

Aby Diallo
Association des Juristes Sénégalais

Soukayna Ndao Diallo
Banque Mondiale Senegal

Mactar Diassi
Etude Maître Mactar Dassi

Ibrahima Dieng
ALPHADEV

Alioune Dione
AFreeMAction

Ndye Coumba Gueye Ka
Association des Juristes Sénégalais

Diakhâté Mor
ALPHADEV

Mame Coumba Ngom
COPINA Sénégal

Ababacar Sadikh Niang
Tribunal Regional de Tambacounda

Aby Sane
Ministère de la Femme de l’Enfance et de l’Entrepreneuriat Féminin

Djiby Seidy
Géni & Kébé SCP d’Avocats

SERBIA

Mirjana Antic
Lawyer

Olga Cvejić Jančić
University Educons–Sremska Kamenica, Faculty of European Legal and Political Studies–Novi Sad

Marija Jovanovic
Law office of Marija N. Jovanovic

Jelena Kuveljic Dmitric
Law Offices JKD

Ana Popović
Živković Samardžić Law Office

Aleksandra Ristić
Law Office Milošević

Fatmata Sorie
Legal Access through Women Yearning for Equality Rights and Social Justice

SINGAPORE

Kokila Annamalai
Georgia Dawson
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer

Nithya Devi
Wilson Foo Yu Kang
Trident Law Corporation

Tracy Gani
Rajah & Tann Asia LLP

Li Sian Goh
Association of Women for Action & Research (AWARE)
APPENDIX C: ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

**SPAIN**

Blanca Ballester
Casanelia
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)

Mario Barros García
Uría Menéndez

Enrichetta Sandra Bellini Fornera
Business and Professional Women International (BPWI)

Ignasi Beltran de Heredia Ruiz
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)

Maria Susana Fernandez Iglesias
Susana Fdez Abogados

Antonio Fernández García
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)

Marta García
Mandaloniz
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid

Maria Josefa García
Tamargo
Norte Abogados

Maria López Garayalde
Ashurst LLP

Raquel Mendieta Grande
Ashurst LLP

Eugenia Revilla Esteve
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)

Isabel Rodríguez Léon
Uría Menéndez

Carlos Rogel Vide
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Janaina (Jana) Telles

Daniel Toscani
Universitat de València

Aura Esthier Vilaite Nicuesa
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)

**SRI LANKA**

Hansi Abayaratne
D.L. & F. De Saram

Rochelle Ariyawansa
Chamber 32B

Kithmini Aviruppol
Savantha De Saram
D.L. & F. De Saram

Ruwan Dias
Chamber 32B

Sandali Fernando
Chamber 32B

Ranani Jayasundere
The Asia Foundation

Ruvini Katugaha
Ranani Mutteetuwegama
Tiruchelvam Associates

Dunya Peiris
D.L. & F. De Saram

Anjalee Perera
Pailtha Perera
Chamber 32B

Gishani Rajaneththi
Tiruchelvam Associates

Heshika Rupasinghe
Tiruchelvam Associates

Ratnam Usha Saraniya
John Wilson Partners, Attorneys-at-Law & Notaries Public

Shirani Widanapathirana
John Wilson
John Wilson Partners, Attorneys-at-Law & Notaries Public

**ST. LUCIA**

Michelle Anthony-Desir Du Boulay, Anthony & Co.

Mary Juliana Charles

Samantha Charles

Maureen John-Xavier
Chambers of John & John Inc.

Renee St. Rose

Terentia Toussaint-Carroll

Leandra Gabrielle Verneuil
Leandra Verneuil Chambers

**ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES**

Heidi Badenock

Rene M. Baptiste
Baptiste & Co. Law Firm Inc.

Moureeze Franklyn
Baptiste & Co. Law Firm Inc.

LaKeisha K. John-Farrell
Dentons

Lanthea Leigterwood

Nelcia Marshall-Robinson
Committee for the Development of Women (CEW)

Colleen McDonald
Family Court

Jeanie Ollivierre
Marion House

Samantha Robertson
St. Vincent & the Grenadines Human Rights Association

Beverly Thomas
Solicitor & Crown Counsel

**SUDAN**

Arwa Abdaldaim
AIH Law Firm

Zeinab Abdalla
Said Al Shahry Law Office (SASLO)

Mohamed Abdeen
Abdeen & Co. Law Firm

Abdelrahman Al Gasim
Darfur Bar Association

Yassir Ali
AIH Law Firm

Ayat Barsi
Abdeen & Co. Law Firm

Shukri Dawi Mohamed
Shukri Dawi Law Firm

Amel Taha
Lawyer

**SURINAME**

Yvonne Baal
Anton de Kom
University of Suriname

Serena Essed
Schurman Advocaten

Merlin Gout
M.A. Gout

Charline Hoever

Trujah Kensmil
Essed & Sohansingh Law Firm

Iris Nazir
Essed & Sohansingh Law Firm
Naytiwut Jamallsawat
Blumenthal Richter & Sumet
Noparat Kaewsringarm
Allen & Overy
Dusita Khanijou
Tilleke & Gibbins
Onnicha Khongthon
Blumenthal Richter & Sumet
Rada Lamsam
Siem Premier International Law Office Limited
John Lewis
Anglo-Thai Legal
Patsharamon Manathat
Linklaters LLP
Somporn Manodamrongtham
Chanler MMH Limited
Sutada Mekrungruengkul
National Human Rights Commission of Thailand
William Nophakoon
Baker McKenzie
Nitchakarn Pangcharoen
Linklaters LLP
Pattarapreya Sangsawang
Linklaters LLP
Derik Schmidt Tilleke & Gibbins
Prachaya Sriwatcharodorn
Linklaters
Vítita Subhawat
Allen & Overy
Khun Thongchai Anglo-Thai Legal
Juthamart Vacher
Linklaters LLP
Pimvimol (June) Vipamaneerut
Tilleke & Gibbins
Kanokon Worachanyawong
Siam Premier International Law Office Limited
Khun Xhulio
Anglo-Thai Legal

TIMOR-LESTE
Rui Andrade
VdA–Vieira de Almeida & Associados
Mariana Baptista Borges
Tiago Cochofel de Azevedo
VdA–Vieira de Almeida & Associados
Marina Costa Cabral
VdA–Vieira de Almeida & Associados
Neolanda Flores
Abreu Advogados and C&C Advogados
Gonçalo Neves Lestro
Elisa Pereira
Abreu Advogados and C&C Advogados
Catarina Pinto Correia
VdA–Vieira de Almeida & Associados

TOGO
Kékéli Edo Agboli
Tribunal de Commerce de Lomé
Godwin Téko Seyram
Amenyu
SCP Table & Associés
Dodji Elvire Assogbavi-Atsu
Akokah Ayewouadan
University of Lome
Pimom Charlotte Fawiyi
Mayi Gnafam
Programme d’Appui à la Femme et à l’Enfance Déshéritée (PAFED)
Rouki Kegbero épouse Kloutse
Koutub de Lomé
Biava Kodjo Kloutse
Université de Kara
Akpene Kpegbé
Martial Akakpo et Associés
P. Kafui Elome Rachel Molley
Organisation Nationale d’Appui au Développement (ONAD)

Adoudé Tounou-Glodzro
Groupe de Réflexion et d’Action Femme, Démocratie et Développement (GF2D/CRIF)
Koimla Yovo
Flores Services

TONGA
Clive Edwards
Edwards Law
Fitilagi Fa’anunu
Tonga Legal Aid Center
Linda Folaumoeto’i
Attorney General’s Office of Tonga

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
Chanelle Aching
Beckhan Chambers
Karina Cavita
Organization for Abused and Battered Individuals (OABI)
Asa Archie
Sherna Alexander
Organization for Abused and Battered Individuals (OABI)
Akhail Khan
Ariana Krishingee
Pollonais, Blanc, de la Bastide and Jacelon
Leonora Le Saldo
Organization for Abused and Battered Individuals (OABI)
Umesh Nandalal
Deloitte & Touche
Rachel Esther Alexander Shade
Organization for Abused and Battered Individuals (OABI)

TUNISIA
Aïda Beji Kallel
Chambre Nationale des Femmes Chefs d’Entreprise
Abdessatar Ben Moussa
Ligue Tunisiennne des Droits de l’Homme
Hela Ben Salem
Mahmoud Anis Bettaieb
Cabinet d’Avocats Bettaieb
Béchir Ghachem
GLA
Wael Haffar
Lawyer
Safa Haouel
Cabinet d’Avocats Bettaieb
Amel Mejri
Azaiz Sammoud
Lawyer

TURKEY
Duygu Alkan
Mavioglu & Alkan Law Office (ADMD)
Selin Beceni
BTS & Partners
Burcu Çınar
BTS & Partners
Elif Demiroz-Tan
Cakmak Attorneys-at-Law
Ilayda Dogan
Mavioglu & Alkan Law Office (ADMD)
Emine Dundar
Lawyer
Egemen Egemenoglu
Egemenoglu Law Firm
Elvin Egemenoglu
Egemenoglu Law Firm
Irmak Ergin
Norton Rose Fulbright LLP
Selçuk Esenyl
Esenyl & Partners
Lawyers and Consultants
Ayse Nur Gedik
Kamer Foundation
Nilson Gürsoy
Lawyer
Ekin Inal  
Inal Unver Attorney Partnership

Yavuz Iskit  
Inal Unver Attorney Partnership

Selcan Koçak  
Esenyel & Partners Lawyers and Consultants

Fikret Taha Kursun  
Kurşun & Kourou Law Firm

Kardelen Lule  
Mavioglu & Alkan Law Office (ADMD)

Mert Mustecaplioglu  
Inal Unver Attorney Partnership

Yeşeren Sözüer  
BTS & Partners

Dilara Tamtürk  
Mavioglu & Alkan Law Office (ADMD)

Musa Toprak  
Tero Law Firm

Zeynep Unlü  
BTS & Partners

Turker Yıldırım  
Esenyel & Partners Lawyers and Consultants

Serap Zuvin  
Cakmak Attorneys-at-Law

UGANDA

Brenda Peace Amito  
Tulane International (TILLC)

Lillian Andama  
Justice and Constitutional Affairs Ministry

David Akky Batema  
Ndkiabona High Court of Uganda

Kulia Angela Lucy Izama  
Charles Kalumiya  
Kampala Associated Advocates

Elizabeth Kemigisha  
FIDA Uganda

Sarah Khainza  
Capital Markets Authority

Brigitte Kusiliwa Sendi  
Shanubi, Musoke & Co. Advocates

Bernard Mukasa  
Ortus Advocates

Edine Eva Murungi  
Akena Shanubi, Musoke & Co. Advocates

Sheila Christine Nabbale  
Shanubi, Musoke & Co. Advocates

Brenda Nakibira  
Doreen Nawaali Masembe, Makubuya, Adhiko, Karugoba & Ssekatowa Advocates

UKRAINE

Kateryna Borozdina  
International Women’s Rights Center La Strada-Ukraine

Maria Dmytrieva  
Feminism UA

Yulia Eismont  
Kinstellar Ukraine

Kateryna Ilikhiieva  
Kyiv National Economics University

Olena Koptieva  
International Development Organization (IDLO)

Olena Kuchynska  
Kinstellar Ukraine

Roman Mohyla  
Law Offices of Roman Mohyla

Volodymyr Monastyrykyy  
Dentons

Oleksandra Piskun  
Dentons

Olga Prosyanyuk  
AVER LEX

Andriy Tsvyetkov  
Attorneys’ Association Gestors

Oksana Zakharchenko  
Attorneys’ Association Gestors

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Amal Affif  
Affifi Law Office

Maitha Al Hashimi  
Al Tamimi & Company

Taiba Al Saffar  
Al Tamimi & Company

Farah El Yacoubi  
Allen & Overy

Stefania Franchini  
Diana Hamade  
Diana Hamade Attorneys-at-Law

Aqsa Khan Sadiq  
Taylor Wessing

Sara Khoja  
Clyde & Co.

Ahmed Nofal  
Ahmed Ibrahim Law Office

UNITED STATES

Sanctuary for Families

Artemis Anninos  
Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP

Jessica Childress  
The Childress Firm PLLC

John Chtchekine  
Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP

Adam Cznikiewicz  
Latham & Watkins LLP

Jacquelyn Foster  
Lawyer

Robin Graine  
Graine Mediation

Allison Ianni  
EPT Legal

Soumyashree Meesaraganda  
Lawyer

Elena Paraskevas-Thadani  
EPT Legal

Xueqing Shan  
Shearman & Sterling LLP

Celia Vilas Sherman  
Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP

Anna Stockamore  
Shearman & Sterling LLP

Michael Leftley  
Addleshaw Goddard LLP

Jade Levin  
Dechert LLP

Klaudia Mach  
Milbank LLP

Marcella Papadouli  
Shearman & Sterling LLP

Jeremy Townend  
JLWT Consultancy

UNITED KINGDOM

Helen Almond  
Addleshaw Goddard LLP

Bilyana Belcheva  
Shearman & Sterling LLP

Chloe-Jane Belton  
Dechert LLP

Emily Bodger  
Ashurst LLP

Ruth Buchanan  
Ashurst LLP

Jennifer Ellis  
Milbank LLP

Jasmine Henricson  
The AIRE Centre

Sandeep Kaur  
Milbank LLP
URUGUAY
Leticia Barrios
Bergstein Abogados
Noemi Caballero
Estudio Bado, Kuster, Zerba & Rachetti
Alvaro Carrau
Estudio Bado, Kuster, Zerba & Rachetti
Edgardo Centurión
Mallarino
Ateneo Abogados
Guillermo Duarte
Bergstein Abogados
Mariana Fernandez
Posadas Posadas y Vecino
Cecilia Halty
Ferrere Abogados
Ignacio Lopez
Ateneo Abogados
Marisana Pisón
Bergstein Abogados
Verónica Raffo
Ferrere Abogados
Bruna Royol
Bergstein Abogados
Agustín Texo
Estudio Bado, Kuster, Zerba & Rachetti
Pablo Varela
Pérez-Llorca

VIETNAM
Huong Bui
RHTLaw Vietnam
Thu Huong Giang Dam
Honor Partnership Law Company Limited
Vi Dang
RHTLaw Vietnam
Nhi Le
Rajah & Tann
Nguyen Le Khanh
Kelvin Chia Partnership
Ha Nguyen
Lexcomm Vietnam
Hai Thao Nguyen
Mayer Brown JSM
Tien Lap Nguyen
NH Quang & Associates
Tieu My Nguyen
Honor Partnership Law Company Limited
Van Anh Nguyen
Center for Studies and Applied Sciences in Gender, Family, Women and Adolescents (CSAGA)
Viet Thu Trang Nguyen
Honor Partnership Law Company Limited
Anh Phuong Pham
Honor Partnership Law Company Limited
Kim Cuong Phung
Honor Partnership Law Company Limited
Chau Huy Quang
Rajah & Tann LCT Lawyers
Vy Tran
RHTLaw Vietnam
Thu Hang Vu
Honor Partnership Law Company Limited
Benjamin Yap
RHTLaw Vietnam

WEST BANK AND GAZA
Mohammed AbuHashem
AbuHashem
Ashraf Abu Hayyeh
Al-Haq
Saad Al Kayed
Equity Legal Group

YEMEN, REP.
Aromaimh Mostafa
Abdulgali
Office of Agents Law Firm, Consulting and Legal
Ameen Abdulraaqeb
Office of Agents Law Firm, Consulting and Legal
Alshrihy Mohammad
Abdulraaqeb
Office of Agents Law Firm, Consulting and Legal
Khaled Al-Buraihi
Khaled Al-Buraihi for Advocacy & Legal Services
Emad Algarash
Yemen Organization for Defending Rights and Democratic Freedoms
Maher Al-Sablani
Maher
Nabil Alshami
The Counselor for Legal Services

ZAMBIA
Jay Mutale Chisanga
Corpus Legal Practitioners
Chanda Chungu
Mulenga Mundashi
Kasunde Legal Practitioners
The World Bank Group is committed to reducing its environmental footprint. In support of this commitment, we leverage electronic publishing options and print-on-demand technology, which is located in regional hubs worldwide. Together, these initiatives enable print runs to be lowered and shipping distances decreased, resulting in reduced paper consumption, chemical use, greenhouse gas emissions, and waste.

We follow the recommended standards for paper use set by the Green Press Initiative. The majority of our books are printed on Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)–certified paper, with nearly all containing 50–100 percent recycled content. The recycled fiber in our book paper is either unbleached or bleached using totally chlorine-free (TCF), processed chlorine-free (PCF), or enhanced elemental chlorine-free (EECF) processes.

More information about the Bank’s environmental philosophy can be found at http://www.worldbank.org/corporateresponsibility.
Women, Business and the Law 2021 is the seventh in a series of annual studies measuring the laws and regulations that affect women’s economic opportunity in 190 economies. The project presents eight indicators structured around women’s interactions with the law as they move through their lives and careers: Mobility, Workplace, Pay, Marriage, Parenthood, Entrepreneurship, Assets, and Pension.

This year’s report updates all indicators as of October 1, 2020 and builds evidence of the links between legal gender equality and women’s economic inclusion. By examining the economic decisions women make throughout their working lives, as well as the pace of reform over the past 50 years, Women, Business and the Law 2021 makes an important contribution to research and policy discussions about the state of women’s economic empowerment. Prepared during a global pandemic that threatens progress toward gender equality, this edition also includes important findings on government responses to COVID-19 and pilot research related to childcare and women’s access to justice.