





DETAILED METHODOLOGY OF MUNICIPAL COMPETITIVENESS INDEX (MCI) 2019-2020 DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING

Detailed Methodology of Municipal Competitiveness Index (MCI) 2019-2020

Data Collection and Processing

Table of Contents

| Abbreviations | 2 |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Background | 3 |
| Survey design | 3 |
| Data collection | 4 |
| Sample | 4 |
| Normalization of data | 5 |
| Data aggregation | 5 |
| MCI Ranking and grouping of municipalities | 5 |
| Operationalization of indicators | 7 |
| Sub-index 1. Starting a Business | 7 |
| Sub-index 2. Access to public (municipal) property | 10 |
| Sub-index 3. Transparency and data openness | 11 |
| Sub-index 4. Compliance cost | 12 |
| Sub-index 5. Taxes and duties | 13 |
| Sub-index 6. Informal payments and corruption | 14 |
| Sub-index 7. Security of operating a business | 16 |
| Sub-index 8. Leadership of municipal authorities | 17 |
| Sub-index 9. Development resources | 19 |
| Sub-index 10. Support of the innovations | 23 |

Annexes:

Questionnaire in English Questionnaire in Ukrainian Questionnaire in Russian

Abbreviations

MCI — Municipal Competitiveness Index SME — Small and medium enterprises

Introduction

Background

The Detailed Methodology of Municipal Competitiveness Index (MCI) data collection and processing is based on the Asia Foundation methodology of compiling economic governance index which was first pioneered in Vietnam in 2005. Later the methodology was replicated in Bangladesh, Indonesia, Cambodia, Kosovo, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Salvador, Sri-Lanka and the Philippines, adjusted to the unique country context.

The Detailed Methodology is also based on the Concept of "Design Proposal, Implementation, and Methodology of Ukraine Municipal Competitiveness Index" which was elaborated with the support of Natasha de Roos, international consultant, and considers Ukrainian local context. The mentioned Concept paper lists the proposed sub-indices and relevant indicators, potential data sources, the general methodology of survey and data processing. This Detailed Methodology identifies survey tools, data sources, the list of indicators to evaluate competitiveness of Ukrainian municipalities and contains the tools for questionnaire, initial data collection and processing to ensure most accurate, reliable, and relevant survey results.

Thus, MCI is an analytical tool to evaluate efficiency of economic governance in municipalities. Its main objective is providing motivation for local authorities for economic growth, and identification of regulatory barriers, corruption and opacity to be eliminated for better efficiency of private business. In addition, MCI can serve as a means of encouraging competition among municipalities in establishing favorable business climate.

The main goals of MCI application:

- o Measuring economic governance efficiency at the national and sub-national levels;
- Evaluation of local business climate perception by entrepreneurs;
- Municipal ranking formation (based on the measurement of economic governance efficiency and local business climate evaluation);
- o Monitoring the progress of individual municipalities over time.

MCI results can be used by:

- o *municipalities:* MCI allows to identify the best practices, compare the business climate between municipalities, identify weaknesses and room for improvement;
- the national government: MCI may serve as a tool to establish a dialogue between municipalities and the
 government in order to improve the business climate and identify the ways to harmonize regulations at the
 national level;
- o **business:** MCI presents the vision of the private sector of the entrepreneurship development policy and the interventions required to improve local business climate;
- o foreign investors: can use MCI to decide upon investment placement;
- o *international donors:* can use MCI to identify the goals and objectives of the new projects and for project impact monitoring.

Survey design

MCI is an aggregated indicator comprised of 10 governance components (sub-indices) to assess municipal competitiveness. These 10 components include:

- 1. Starting a business
- 2. Access to public (municipal) property
- 3. Transparency and data openness
- 4. Compliance cost
- 5. Taxes and duties
- 6. Informal payments and corruption
- 7. Security of operating a business
- 8. Leadership of municipal authorities
- 9. Development resources
- 10. Support of innovations

Each sub-index is based upon one or more indicators. The following sub-indices contain more than one indicator:

Component 6. Informal Payments and Corruption contains 2 dimensions:

Indicator 1. Bribes /gifts

Indicator 2. Anticorruption efforts

Component 8. Leadership of Municipal Authorities contains 2 dimensions:

Indicator 1. Business development support

Indicator 2. Public-private dialogue

Component 9. Development Resources contains 2 dimensions:

Indicator 1. Human resources

Indicator 2. Financial resources and infrastructure

Indicator 3. Business support infrastructure

Data collection

Two data collection techniques are applied in MCI development:

- 1) Computer assisted telephone interviews with business representatives in Ukrainian municipalities¹);
- 2) **Desk research** (collection and processing of statistical data, analysis of official web-sites of municipalities, documents, public information requests to the municipal authorities).

This Detailed Methodology contains Questionnaire for business managers / owners to be used for computer assisted telephone interviews. The questionnaire contains 84 questions, including:

- Section A Introduction to the interview
- Section B (questions B1-B14) General information about the interviewed businesses (location, type, form of incorporation, average number of employees, industry, gender of the owner/manager). The data collected with these questions, will allow to deeper analyze the differences between cities driven by these characteristics of companies. In addition, this will allow to identify any possible gender-related issues of running business specific to individual municipalities and industries. This block of questions also contains a question about three main local barriers of running a business. Answers to these questions will enable us to propose the solutions to municipalities to quickly eliminate such barriers, thus improving certain aspects of local business climate;
- Section B (questions B15-B16) Questions whether the company intends to change (expand or reduce) its scale of operation. Questions B15-B16 are used to create new variable. The new variable will be used for regression analysis of the relative contribution of each MCI sub-index;
- Section C Questions regarding Annual Business Climate Assessment. Section C is a part of ABCA survey² and it is not a part of MCI Index
- o Sections D-M Questions organized by MCI sub-indices and dimensions within the sub-indices.

Before conducting computer assisted telephone interviews, the team of interviewers will have orientation through the goal of the survey, data collection process, with detailed review of each question.

Data to be collected in the desk research, are described in detail in the "Operationalization of indicators" section of this Detailed Methodology. These data will be collected from statistic data sources or through analysis of documents and official municipal web-sites, public information requests to the city councils.

Sample

For computer assisted telephone interviews with business managers/owners, stratified random sampling is applied based on the Unified State Register of Legal Entities, Individual Entrepreneurs and Civil Organizations. Randomized stratified sampling includes the following steps:

- Obtaining the general population of businesses registered in each municipality (data from the Universal register) (excluding public, governmental, communal enterprises, farms, retail cooperative societies and citizens' associations)
- 2) Stratification of population in each municipality by two characteristics: a) individual entrepreneur (sole proprietor) and legal entity based on the share of employees; δ) state registration in 2018-2019 and state registration before 2018³
- 3) Identification of the total sample size for each municipality not least than 200 interviews (to ensure the margin of error of more than ± 7 percentage points with the confidence level of 0.95, excluding design effect)
- 4) Stratified random sampling with proper representation the structure of the general business population by business type (legal entity / sole proprietor) and the date of state registration

Computer assisted telephone interviews will be conducted with business representatives in the main random sample. Screening telephone calls will be placed to test the units of the main random sample for activity. In case any businesses

¹ In 2019 – 24 oblast cities, including the administrative centers of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts Kramatorsk and Sievierodonetsk, respectively. In 2021 – 45 largest by population cities of Ukraine; in 2023 – 60 largest by population cities of Ukraine.

² ABCA — Annual Business Climate Assessment — policy tool developed and implemented by the IER under USAID LEV Program in 2015-2017 — that aims at measuring the quality of the business environment for SME

³ For MCI ranking in 2019. In 2021: state registration in 2019-2020 and state registration before 2019; in 2023: state registration in 2021-2022 and state registration before 2021.

included in the main random sample are inactive (or in case of a failure of the contact attempt), a replacement will be drawn. The main respondent will also be identified in the screening telephone calls, whether it is the business owner or the business manager, as recommended by the business owner. If a firm refuses to respond, this is separately noted, and another unit is randomly selected from the general population.

The data collected in the survey are verified in random telephone calls placed to at least 10% of the respondents, with the use of the same questionnaire.

Normalization of data

All indicators within the sub-indices are normalized using the following formula:

- 1) For the incentive indicators (higher score of the indicator denotes better governance): [9*((Municipality score i Sample minimum) / (Sample maximum Sample minimum))+1]
- 2) For the disincentive indicators (higher score of the indicator denotes poorer governance): 11-[9*((Municipality score i Sample minimum)) / (Sample maximum Sample minimum))+1]

Please refer to the "Operationalization of indicators" sections defining whether the indicator is an incentive or a disincentive, for proper selection of the normalization formula to be applied to each indicator.

Normalization converts the values of each indicator around the 10-point scale.

Data aggregation

Normalized values of the indicators within each sub-index are aggregated, and the sub-index value is computed as simple arithmetic mean. If in a sub-index or a sub-index dimension hard data (statistical data) are used along with soft (survey) data, the hard data are weighted 40%, and the soft data – 60% of the total dimension score. In such case, weighted arithmetic mean is used for data aggregation and the sub-index value computing. Such aggregated dimension value is further aggregated in the sub-index using simple arithmetic mean. The aggregated MCI is computed as the sum of 10 sub-index values.

The next step is weighing the sub-indices through regression analysis. In the initial methodology, a hypothesis was put forward about the relationship between long-term expectations and the values of 10 sub-indices, as well as the impact of the component (the phenomena they measure) on long-term business expectations on business activity. In turn, long-term impact assessment factors were to be the basis for the design of weights for each sub-index, depending on the "importance" for long-term expectations. However, correlation and regression analysis showed no significant correlations between sub-indices and expectations. As a result, it was decided to calculate the MCI value without calibration. At the same time, testing of calibration procedures will be continued in the next MCI round.

The calibration can be done by estimating the marginal impact of each MCI sub-index on business expansion plans in the next two years. The variable for this estimation will be driven from Question B17, a new variable based on Questions B15 and B16 in which the respondents are asked about their two-year plans. The type of business (legal entity/individual entrepreneur) and the industry will be used as control variables. Regression coefficients will be used to obtain the relevant weight for each sub-index. The relative weights should be rounded to the closest 5th in order to obtain the final weight of each sub-index in percentages. Where regression coefficient is negative (e.g., taxes, informal charges, corruption, etc.), the lowest rounded positive value is used.

Aggregated MCI score may vary between 1 and 100.4

MCI Ranking and grouping of municipalities

Upon obtaining of weighted MCI municipalities are ranked from high to low.

The next step is breaking down the municipalities into three classes based on their MCI score:

- 1) High MCI
- 2) Average MCI
- 3) Low MCI

⁴ In practice, aggregated MCI score varies between 10 and 100. However, minimum aggregated score can be 1 in case it is impossible to calculate 9 of 10 subindices.

In case of even distribution by MCI value, the municipalities will split into three even classes (from high MCI score to low). If aggregated MCI values very significantly, classes with even (or uneven) intervals will be appropriate. In case of grouping with even intervals, the class interval (i) will be defined using the formula:

$$i = (x_{max} - x_{min}) / n,$$

where: x_{max} , x_{min} – MCI maximum and minimum values, respectively, n – number of classes.

Grouping with even intervals is achieved through subsequent adding of the class interval to the lower boundary of each class. Thus, for the "low MCI" class the interval will fall within the x_{min} to x_{min} +i range, and similarly for every next interval. The interval for the last class will fall within x_{max} -i to x_{max} range.

If even interval grouping places no municipalities into the average group, uneven interval grouping is applied. Uneven intervals can increase progressively from the lowest MCI score. The class intervals are defined by expertise.

Another solution to distribute municipalities into classes by their MCI score is to include 25% of the municipalities with the highest MCI score in Class 1, 25% of the municipalities with the lowest MCI score in Class 3, while the other 50% of municipalities will fall into the average class. This type of grouping was selected for MCI 2019-2020.

Operationalization of indicators

Sub-index 1. Starting a Business

I. Data source: Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

Data collection tool: Questionnaire for business managers / owners.

| Indicator | Time for state registration | Barriers during registration | Counselling during registration | Time for launching the business | Time to register changes in the |
|----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Question | D1. Remember how you went through the state registration process in 2018-2019. How many full days did it take, starting with the day of registration documents submission until the day of receiving the Extract from the Universal State Register? [scale] ≥1 If it is difficult to remember, ask for an estimate(days) 98. Did not pass state registration in 2018-2019 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | D2. Did you face any problems / barriers during the process of business registration? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | D3. When you were passing the state registration procedure in 2018-2019, did you have an opportunity to receive counseling or any other assistance in filling in / submission of documents for state registration? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | D4. How many full days passed from the date of submitting the documents for business registration to the date of the first sale? [scale] ≥1 If it is difficult to remember, ask for an estimate(days) 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | changes take? [scale] ≥1 If it is difficult to remember, |
| Data pro- cessing | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days | % of "yes" responses Base: all responses | % of "yes" responses Base: all responses | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days |
| Normalization | Disincentive | Disincentive | Incentive | Disincentive | Disincentive |

Table continued

| Indicator | Time for obtaining permits ⁵ | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Question | | s, and you will tell if you receive | d such a document ir | n 2018-2019. And if so | , how many full d | lays did you spen | d from the day |
| | the application was filed to the day you received it? | | | | | | |
| | If it is difficult to remember, ask for | an estimate | | | | | |
| Sub-question | Permits and registrations in con- | Location passport of the | Declaration of | Approval for com- | Approval for | Resolution on | Permission to |
| | struction (if needed, explain: noti- | temporary facility desig- | conformance of | mercial sign place- | outdoor ad- | state registra- | disturb beau- |
| | fication about the onset of prepar- | nated for commercial, | the business facili- | ment(days) | vertisement | tion of mar- | tification ob- |
| | atory and construction works, | household, social, cultural or | ties to fire safety | 7 | placement | ket operator | jects and |
| | permission for construction, decla- | other purposes used for | requirements | 98 Did not receive | ((days) ⁸ | capacity | amenities |
| | ration about readiness for com- | business activity ⁶ | (days) | such permits | 98 Did not re- | (days) ⁹ | (days) 10 |
| | missioning, certificate of commis- | (days) | 98 Did not receive | 99 (DO NOT READ | ceive such | 98 Did not re- | 98 Did not re- |
| | sioning of completed | 98 Did not receive such per- | such permits | OUT) Hard to say / | permits | ceive such | ceive such |
| | construction)(days) | mits | 99 (DO NOT READ | refuse | 99 (DO NOT | permits | permits |
| | 98 Did not receive such permits | 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) | OUT) Hard to say | | READ OUT) | 99 (DO NOT | 99 (DO NOT |
| | 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to | Hard to say / refuse | / refuse | | Hard to say / | READ OUT) | READ OUT) |
| | say / refuse | | | | refuse | Hard to say / | Hard to say / |
| | | | | | | refuse | refuse |
| Data processing | Arithmetic mean of the number of | Arithmetic mean of the | Arithmetic mean | Arithmetic mean | Arithmetic | Arithmetic | Arithmetic |
| in sub-ques- | days | number of days | of the number of | of the number of | mean of the | mean of the | mean of the |
| tions | | | days | days | number of | number of | number of |
| | Base: those who indicated the | Base: those who indicated | | | days | days | days |
| | number of days | the number of days | Base: those who | Base: those who | | | |
| | | | indicated the | indicated the | Base: those | Base: those | Base: those |
| | | | number of days | number of days | who indicated | who indicated | who indicated |
| | | | · | | the number of | the number | the number |
| | | | | | days | of days | of days |
| Data processing | Weighted arithmetic mean of proce | ssed data in sub-questions (the | weight is the percent | age of respondents to | the sub-question | ns) | |
| in questions | | . , | - • | - • | | - | |
| Normalization | Disincentive | _ | | | | | |

II. Data source: Statistical data

⁵ Only two out of seven subquestions were used for calculation of the indicator due to insufficient filling of the subsamples.

⁶ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

⁷ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

⁸ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

⁹ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

 $^{^{10}}$ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

Data collection method: Desk research

| Indicator | Number of public officers dealing with business registration per 10 000 registered businesses |
|---------------|---|
| Data source | Number of public officers dealing with business registration (including public officers at state administrations (district administrations) and local governance bodies (city councils), public notaries): Public information from the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine regarding the number of persons who have access to the State Register of Legal Entities, Individual Entrepreneurs and Public Organizations Number of registered businesses: Statistical data, Information about business activity, Table "Number of businesses in cities of oblast significance and rayons" (Regional Statistical Offices) |
| Formula | Number of public officers dealing with business registration / Number of registered businesses * 10 000 |
| Normalization | Incentive |

Sub-index 2. Access to public (municipal) property

I. **Data source:** Businesses

 $\textbf{\textit{Data collection method:}} \ \textbf{Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview}$

| Indicator | Documents certifying | Obtaining documents | Accessibility of infor- | Availability of infor- |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | ownership / land lease | ownership / land lease | mation about vacant | mation about munici- |
| | | | land plots | pal real estate |
| Question | E1. Do you (your | E3. How many full | E4 Is the infor- | E5. Is the infor- |
| | company / you as an indi- | days passed before the | mation about commu- | mation about munici- |
| | vidual entrepreneur) | documents were issued, | nal land plots vacant | pal real estate (in- |
| | have access to the docu- | from submitting the ap- | for rent which can be | cluding non- |
| | ments of ownership / | plication (or any other | used for construction | residential facilities), |
| | lease of the land plot | document) to the day of | or other purpose, | which is leased or can |
| | where the business oper- | receiving the confirming | available? | be leased for busi- |
| | ates? | documents (signing land | Read out | ness purposes, availa- |
| | Read out | lease agreement / receiv- | [single] | ble in your city? |
| | [single] | ing extract from State | 1. Yes | Read out |
| | 1. Yes | Land Register)? | 2. No | [single] |
| | 2. No | [scale] ≥1 | 99. (DO NOT READ | 1. Yes |
| | 3. Does not apply | (days) | OUT) Hard to say / re- | 2. No |
| | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) | fuse | 99. (DO NOT READ |
| | Hard to say / refuse | Hard to say / refuse | | OUT) Hard to say / |
| | | | | refuse |
| Data pro- | % of "yes" responses | Arithmetic mean of the | % of "yes" responses | % of "yes" responses |
| cessing | | number of days | | |
| | Base: all responses | | Base: all responses | Base: all responses |
| | | Base: those who indi- | | |
| | | cated the number of days | | |
| Normalization | Incentive | Disincentive | Incentive | Incentive |

Sub-index 3. Transparency and data openness

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

| Indicator | Access to information about | Access to information on local | Access to information on public |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | local budget | regulatory acts | procurements |
| Question | F1.1. Local budget infor- | F1.2 An opportunity to get ac- | F1.3 Availability of public procure- |
| | mation | quainted with the content of | ment information at the expense of |
| | Rate 1 to 5 | local regulatory acts Rate 1 to 5 | local budgets and utilities Rate 1 to |
| | 1 Poor | 1 Poor | 5 |
| | 2 Acceptable | 2 Acceptable | 1 Poor |
| | 3 Average | 3 Average | 2 Acceptable |
| | 4 Good | 4 Good | 3 Average |
| | 5 Excellent | 5 Excellent | 4 Good |
| | 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) | 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to | 5 Excellent |
| | Hard to say / refuse | say / refuse | 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say |
| | |) | / refuse |
| | | | |
| Data processing | % of "excellent" and "good" | % of "excellent" and "good" re- | % of "excellent" and "good" re- |
| | responses | sponses | sponses |
| | | | |
| | Base: all responses | Base: all responses | Base: all responses |
| Normalization | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive |

Sub-index 4. Compliance cost

I. *Data source:* Businesses

 $\textbf{\textit{Data collection method:}} \ \text{Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview}$

| Indicator | Time spent for compliance with local | Costs of legal compliance | Number of inspections | Costs of inspection |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | regulations | | | |
| Question | G1. How many | G2. What is | G3. How many times a | G4. How many |
| | days per year do you | the percentage | year are you visited by local | days per year do you |
| | (your company / you | of the annual in- | authorities inspectors for in- | (your company / you |
| | as an individual en- | come of you | specting your business (e.g., | as an individual entre- |
| | trepreneur) spend on | (your company / | architecture and construction | preneur) spend deal- |
| | compliance with lo- | you as an indi- | control, control of labor code | ing with inspectors |
| | cal regulations gov- | vidual entrepre- | compliance, beautification, | during the inspections |
| | erning your industry? | neur) spent on | public services, and amenities | referred to the previ- |
| | [scale] 0-365 | compliance with | control, control of fulfilling lia- | ous question? |
| | If it is difficult to re- | the require- | bilities of duties to the local | [scale] 0-365 |
| | member the number | ments of local | budget, control of public toi- | If it is difficult to re- |
| | of days, ask for an es- | regulations? | lets, parking lots and parking | member the number |
| | timate. If nothing is | [scale] 0-100 | area operation, etc.)? | of days, ask for an es- |
| | spent, write down 0 | Ask for an esti- | [scale] ≥0 | timate. If nothing is |
| | (zero). | mate. If nothing | If it is difficult to remember | spent, write down 0 |
| | (days) | is spent, write | the number of times, ask for | (zero) |
| | 99. (DO NOT READ | down 0 (zero). | an estimate. If the inspectors | (days) |
| | OUT) Hard to say / | (%) | did not visit, write down 0 | 99. (DO NOT READ |
| | refuse | 99. (DO NOT | (zero) | OUT) Hard to say / re- |
| | | READ OUT) Hard | (number of times) | fuse |
| | | to say / refuse | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard | |
| | | | to say / refuse | |
| Data pro- | Arithmetic mean of | Arithmetic mean | Arithmetic mean of the num- | Arithmetic mean of |
| cessing | the number of days | of the responses | ber of cases | the number of days |
| | | | | |
| | Base: those who indi- | Base: those who | Base: those who indicated | Base: those who indi- |
| | cated the number of | indicated the | number of times | cated the number of |
| | days | percentage | | days |
| Normalization | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive |

Sub-index 5. Taxes and duties

I. *Data source:* Businesses

 $\textbf{\textit{Data collection method:}} \ \text{Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview}$

| Indicator | Costs of tax pay- | Administrative burden im- | Burden of local | Benefits from local taxes |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| | ment | posed by tax regulations | taxes and duties | and duties payment |
| Question | H1. What | H2. How many days | H3. Do local | H4. Did you (your |
| | percentage of | do you (your company / | taxes and duties | company / you as an in- |
| | your company's / | you as an individual entre- | become an obsta- | dividual entrepreneur) |
| | your annual in- | preneur) spend to fulfill | cle for your busi- | receive benefits for pay- |
| | come is spent on | your taxation liabilities (in- | ness? | ing local taxes and duties |
| | taxes and duties | cluding data collection and | Read out | in 2018-2019? |
| | (including Uni- | processing, fiscal account- | [single] | Read out |
| | versal social fund | ing, filling in, submitting tax | 1. Yes | [single] |
| | contribution)? | reports, tax payment) | 2. No | 1. Yes |
| | [scale] 0-100 | [scale] 0-365 | 99. (DO NOT READ | 2. No |
| | Ask for an esti- | If it is difficult to remember | OUT) Hard to say / | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) |
| | mate in %. If | the number of days, ask for | refuse | Hard to say / refuse |
| | nothing is spent, | an estimate. If nothing is | | |
| | write down 0 | spent, write down 0 (zero). | | |
| | (zero) | (days) | | |
| | (%) | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) | | |
| | 99. (DO NOT | Hard to say / refuse | | |
| | READ OUT) Hard | | | |
| | to say / refuse | | | |
| Data pro- | Arithmetic mean | Arithmetic mean of the | % of "yes" re- | % of "yes" responses |
| cessing | of the responses | number of days | sponses | |
| | | | | Base: all responses |
| | Base: those who | Base: those who indicated | Base: all responses | |
| | indicated the | the number of days | | |
| | percentage | | | |
| Normalization | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | Incentive |

Sub-index 6. Informal payments and corruption

Dimension 1. Bribes/gifts
I. Data source: Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

Data collection tool: Questionnaire for business managers / owners.

| Indicator | Bribe solicitation | Offering bribes / gifts to municipal authority ¹¹ | Cases of offering bribes / gifts to mu- nicipal authority ¹² | Cost of offering bribes / gifts to municipal authority ¹³ |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Question | M1. Have businesses (or you as an individual entrepreneur) experienced situations related to socalled "informal payments" during 2018-2019 when interacting with city government representatives on any business issues? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | M2. Did your business experience this in 2018-2019 M2.1. You were asked for a bribe / gift in direct or indirect form, but you did not agree M2.2. You were asked for a bribe / gift in direct or indirect form, and you agreed M2.3. You offered a bribe / gift, either directly or indirectly, on your initiative 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | M3. How many times such situations have occurred during 2018-2019? [scale] ≥1 If it is difficult to remember the number of times, ask for an estimate(number of times) 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | M4. How much percent of your business's annual revenue did you spend on such "informal payments" during 2018-2019? [scale] 0-100 Ask for an estimate. If nothing was spent, write down 0 (zero)(%) 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse |
| Data pro- cessing | % of "yes" responses Base: all responses | M2_Aggr. Experience of corruption cases in 2018-2019 [single] create the new varia- ble from M2.1-M2.3: 1 "Reported the expe- rience" — if M2.1 = 1 or M2.2 = 1 or M2.3 = 1. 2 "Haven't reported the experience" — else. % of "Reported the ex- perience" responses Base: all responses | Arithmetic mean of the number of cases Base: those who indicated the number of times | Arithmetic mean of the responses Base: those who indicated the percentage |

_

 $^{^{\}rm 11}$ The indicator was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

 $^{^{12}}$ The indicator was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

¹³ The indicator was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

| Normaliza- | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive |
|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| tion | | | | |

Dimension 2. Anticorruption efforts

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

| Indicator | Anticorruption efforts |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | M5. Are you aware of local authorities implementing any special measures to prevent corruption (e.g., open budget system, digital municipal office, the system of corruption risk assessment and mitigation, municipal anti-corruption program / plan, etc.)? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse |
| Data processing | % of "yes" responses |
| | Base: all responses |
| Normalization | Incentive |

Sub-index 7. Security of operating a business

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

| Indicator | Shadow econ- | Losses due to | Amount of loss | Raider attacks | Business security |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| | omy | crime | due to criminal | | costs |
| | | | actions | | |
| Question | I1. In | I2. Has | I3. What | I4. Did your com- | I5. What are |
| | your opinion, | you (your | percentage of | pany experience a | the costs you incur to |
| | do your com- | company / you | your company's / | raider attack or | ensure security / pro- |
| | petitors oper- | as an individ- | yours annual in- | management re- | tection for your busi- |
| | ate in the | ual entrepre- | come were the | placement as a re- | ness (security, equip- |
| | shadow? | neur) experi- | losses caused by | sult of the plotted | ment, court |
| | Read out | enced any | such actions? | business conflict | procedure, payment |
| | [single] | losses due to | [scale] 0-100 | in 2018-2019? | for protection racket- |
| | 1. Yes | extortion, | Ask for an esti- | Read out | eering), in % to your / |
| | 2. No | theft, robbery, | mate in %. If | [single] | your company's an- |
| | 99. (DO NOT | vandalism, ar- | nothing was lost, | 1. Yes | nual income |
| | READ OUT) | son 2018- | write down 0 | 2. No | [scale] 0-100 |
| | Hard to say / | 2019? | (zero) | 99. (DO NOT READ | Ask for an estimate in |
| | refuse | Read out | (%) | OUT) Hard to say | %. If nothing is spent, |
| | | [single] | 99. (DO NOT | / refuse | write down 0 (zero) |
| | | 1. Yes | READ OUT) Hard | | (%) |
| | | 2. No | to say / refuse | | 99. (DO NOT READ |
| | | 99. (DO NOT | | | OUT) Hard to say / |
| | | READ OUT) | | | refuse |
| | | Hard to say / | | | |
| | | refuse | | | |
| Data pro- | % of "yes" re- | % of "yes" re- | Arithmetic mean | % of "yes" re- | Arithmetic mean of |
| cessing | sponses | sponses | of the responses | sponses | the responses |
| | | | | | |
| | Base: all re- | Base: all re- | Base: those who | Base: all re- | Base: those who indi- |
| | sponses | sponses | indicated the | sponses | cated the percentage |
| | | | percentage | | |
| Normalization | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive |

Sub-index 8. Leadership of municipal authorities

Dimension 1. Business development support

I. Data source: Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

Data collection tool: Questionnaire for business managers / owners.

| Indicator | Local government attitude | Support to business start-up | Support to development of exist- | |
|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| maicator | | Support to business start-up | | |
| | towards private business | | ing businesses | |
| Question | J1. In your opinion, | J2. Do you agree with | J3. Do you agree with the | |
| | what is the attitude of the lo- | the statement that the mu- | statement that the municipal | |
| | cal authorities to private | nicipal government supports | government supports the devel- | |
| | business? | business start-ups? | opment of the existing busi- | |
| | Rate 1 to 5 | Read out | nesses? | |
| | 1 Very bad | [single] | Read out | |
| | 2 Bad | 1. Yes | [single] | |
| | 3 Average | 2. No | 1. Yes | |
| | 4 Good | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) | 2. No | |
| | 5 Very good | Hard to say / refuse | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to | |
| | 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard | | say / refuse | |
| | to say / refuse | | | |
| Data pro- | % of "very good" and "good" | % of "yes" responses | % of "yes" responses | |
| cessing | responses | | | |
| | | Base: all responses | Base: all responses | |
| | Base: all responses | | | |
| Normaliza- | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive | |
| tion | | | | |

Source of data: Document, web-site review¹⁴ **Data collection method:** Desk research

| # | Indicator | Data source | Criteria | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Updated monetary appraisal of land plots | Municipal council resolution approving the technical documents on normative monetary appraisal of lands in the community / Public information request to the city council | The year of normative monetary appraisal of lands in the community | 2015 and later – 1 Before 2015 – 0 |
| 2 | City boundaries es- tablished | Resolution on establishing and/or changing the city boundaries adopted by the Parliament of Ukraine / Public information request to the city council | | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
| 3 | Differentiated single tax rates | Local council resolutions /Local tax and duty rates /Taxes, duties and charges, State Tax Service of Ukraine (https://tax.gov.ua/podatkita-zbori/mistsevi-podatki/) | Differentiated single tax rates for Group 1 and 2 tax payers conducting certain business operation, listed in the resolution of municipal council | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
| 4 | Designated corruption prevention department / officer | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council / Public infor- mation request to the city council | Structural department / public official authorized to perform anticorruption efforts established within the organizational structure of local executive authorities | Yes – 1 No – 0 |

-

¹⁴ These indicators are not normalized. The sub-index value is calculated as the sum of the score which may be in the range from 0 to 10.

| 5 | Availability of municipal policy to prevent corruption | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council / Public infor- mation request to the city council | Available strategy, program, plan or road map to implement public anticorruption policy in the city | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
|----|--|--|--|-------------------|
| 6 | Availability of city anticorruption hot- line | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council / Public infor- mation request to the city council | Information on direct local anti- corruption hot-line available on the official web-site of the munic- ipal council | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
| 7 | Publication of the resolution on local budget on the official web-site of the municipal council | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council | Resolutions on local budget for 2017-2019. | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
| 8 | Publication of the annual public procurement plan, attachment to the annual plan on the official web-site of the municipal council | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council | Annual procurement plans for 2017-2019. | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
| 9 | Specially designated advisory body within municipal council /office of the city mayor on business development | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council / Public infor- mation request to the city council | Council of entrepreneurs, council of manufacturers and entrepreneurs, SME development board, etc. | Yes – 1 No – 0 |
| 10 | Opportunity for private business to contribute comments, proposals and remarks at the official web-site of the municipal council | Official web-site of the mu- nicipal council | Contribute comments / remarks/ proposals | Yes – 1 No – 0 |

Dimension 2. Public-private dialogue

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

| Indicator | Participation of private business in elabora- | Conducting consultations with business | |
|---------------|--|--|--|
| | tion of local documents | | |
| Question | J4. Evaluate the opportunity for business representatives to participate in the elaboration of local documents (strategies, programs, plans) Rate 1 to 5 1 No opportunities 2 Limited opportunities 3 Average opportunities 4 Extensive opportunities 5 Very extensive opportunities 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | J5. According to your observations, is private business consulted before adopting a new regulation or amending an existing one, which affects or may affect the business? Rate 1 to 5 1 Never 2 Rarely 3 Occasionally 4 Often 5 Always 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | |
| Data pro- | % of answers "extensive opportunities" and | | |
| cessing | "very extensive opportunities" | , | |
| | | Base: all responses | |
| | Base: all responses | | |
| Normalization | Incentive | Incentive | |

Sub-index 9. Development resources

Dimension 1. Human resources

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

Data collection tool: Questionnaire for business managers / owners.

| Indicator | Workforce quality | Quality of vocational | Insufficient work- | Lack of workforce as a | |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | , | education | force training as a | barrier for business op- | |
| | | | barrier for business | eration | |
| | | | operation | | |
| Question | K1. How do you | K2. How do you | K3. In your | K4. In your opinion, | |
| | evaluate the quality of | evaluate the quality of | opinion, is the poor | is the lack of local work- | |
| | the workforce at the | vocational education | training of the local | force a serious barrier | |
| | local labor market? | of workers at the local | workforce a serious | for business operation in | |
| | Rate 1 to 5 | labor market? | barrier for business | your city? | |
| | 1 Poor | Rate 1 to 5 | operation in your | Read out | |
| | 2 Acceptable | 1 Poor | city? | [single] | |
| | 3 Average | 2 Acceptable | Read out | 1. Yes | |
| | 4 Good 3 Average | | [single] | 2. No | |
| | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 1. Yes | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) | |
| | 99 (DO NOT READ | 5 Excellent | 2. No | Hard to say / refuse | |
| | OUT) Hard to say / re- | 99 (DO NOT READ | 99. (DO NOT READ | | |
| | fuse | OUT) Hard to say / re- | OUT) Hard to say / | | |
| | | fuse | refuse | | |
| Data pro- | % of "excellent" and | % of "excellent" and | % of "yes" re- | % of "yes" responses | |
| cessing | "good" responses | "good" responses | sponses | | |
| | Base: all responses | Base: all responses | Base: all responses | Base: all responses | |
| Normaliza- tion | Incentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | Disincentive | |

II. **Data source:** Statistical data **Data collection method:** Desk research

| Indicator | % of working age population from total population (15-64 age) | Number of employees the firms need to fulfill the vacancies per 100 businesses |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Source | Regional offices of The State Statistics Service of Ukraine | Number of employees the firms need to fulfill the vacancies: Analytical and statistical information on the websites of the Regional offices of the State Employment Service of Ukraine Number of registered businesses: Statistical information, Business operation, table "Number of businesses in the cities of oblast significance and rayons" (Regional Statistical Offices) |
| Data pro- cessing | - | Number of employees the firms need to fulfill the vacancies / Number of registered businesses * 100 |
| Normaliza- tion | Incentive | Disincentive |

Dimension 2. Financial and infrastructure resources

I. Data source: Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

| Indicator | Financial support from local budget | Lack of financial resources as a barrier for |
|------------|--|---|
| | | business operation |
| Question | K5. Did you (your company / you as an indi- | K6. In your opinion, is the lack of finan- |
| | vidual entrepreneur) receive financial support | cial resources a serious barrier for business |
| | for business operation from local authorities in | operation in your city? |
| | 2018 -2019 (subsidized loans, compensation of | Read out |
| | loan interest, etc.)? | [single] |
| | Read out | 1. Yes |
| | [single] | 2. No |
| | 1. Yes | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse |
| | 2. No | |
| | 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | |
| Data pro- | % of "yes" responses | % of "yes" responses |
| cessing | | |
| | Base: all responses | Base: all responses |
| Normaliza- | Incentive | Disincentive |
| tion | | |

| Indicator | Complexity of the cor | nnection to the elec | tric grid/water-suppl | y/sewage/heating ¹⁵ | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Question | K8. Remember, the actual connection If it is difficult to reme | 1? | did it take from the o | | il the date of |
| Sub-question | K8.1 To electric grid Number of days [scale] ≥1(days) 98 Didn't connect 99(DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | K8.2 To gas supply system ¹⁶ Number of days [scale] ≥1(days) 98 Didn't connect 99(DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | K8.3 To centralized potable water supply ¹⁷ Number of days [scale] ≥1(days) 98 Didn't connect 99(DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | K8.4 To sewage system ¹⁸ Number of days [scale] ≥1(days) 98 Didn't connect 99(DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | K8.5 To centralized heating network¹9 Number of days [scale] ≥1(days) 98 Didn't connect 99(DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse |
| Sub-question response pro- cessing | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who in- dicated the number of days | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days | Arithmetic mean of the number of days Base: those who indicated the number of days |

¹⁵ Only one out of five sub-questions was used for calculation of the indicator due to insufficient filling of the subsamples.

¹⁶ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

¹⁷ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

¹⁸ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

¹⁹ The question was not included into calculations of MCI 2019-2020 due to insufficient filling of the subsample.

| Question re- | Weighted arithmetic mean of the processed sub-question responses (where weight is assigned |
|---------------|--|
| sponse pro- | by the percentage of the responses to the sub-questions) |
| cessing | |
| Normalization | Disincentive |

II. Data source: Statistical data

Data collection method: Desk research

| Indicator | Local budget expenditures for business support per 10 000 businesses |
|-----------------|--|
| Question | Local budget expenditures for business support (thousand UAH): Official web-site of the municipal council / Public information request to the city council Number of registered businesses: Statistical information, Business operation, table "Number of businesses in the cities of oblast significance and rayons" (Regional Statistical Offices) |
| Data processing | Local budget expenditures for business support / Number of registered businesses * 10 000 |
| Normalization | Incentive |

Dimension 3. Business support infrastructure

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

Data collection tool: Questionnaire for business managers / owners.

| Indicator | Accessibility of busi- | Quality of business | Availability of | Presence of | Membership in |
|------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | ness support services | support services | business sup- | business associ- | business associ- |
| | | | port infrastruc- | ations and busi- | ations |
| | | | ture | ness clubs in | |
| | | | | the city | |
| Question | K9. Did you (your | K10. How do | K11. Is | K12. Are | K13. Are |
| | company / you as an | you rate the quality | there a busi- | you aware of | you (your com- |
| | individual entrepre- | of the services you | ness support | any business | pany / you as |
| | neur) use any business | received? Rate 1 to | center operat- | associations or | an individual |
| | support services (in- | 5 | ing in your city | clubs (or any | entrepreneur) a |
| | formational, advisory, | 1 Poor | (an institution, | other member | member of any |
| | training, etc.) offered | 2 Acceptable | a department | associations for | business associ- |
| | by the municipal au- | 3 Average | within the | businesses) op- | ation? |
| | thorities in 2018 – | 4 Good | structure of the | erating in your | Read out |
| | 2019? | 5 Excellent | local authori- | city? | [single] |
| | Read out | 99 (DO NOT READ | ties)? | Read out | 1. Yes |
| | [single] | OUT) Hard to say / | Read out | [single] | 2. No |
| | 1. Yes | refuse | [single] | 1. Yes | 99. (DO NOT |
| | 2. No | | 1. Yes | 2. No | READ OUT) |
| | 99. (DO NOT READ | | 2. No | 99. (DO NOT | Hard to say / |
| | OUT) Hard to say / re- | | 99. (DO NOT | READ OUT) | refuse |
| | fuse | | READ OUT) | Hard to say / | |
| | | | Hard to say / | refuse | |
| | | | refuse | | |
| Data pro- | % of "yes" responses | % of "excellent" | % of "yes" re- | % of "yes" re- | % of "yes" re- |
| cessing | | and "good" re- | sponses | sponses | sponses |
| | Base: all responses | sponses | | | |
| | | | Base: all re- | Base: all re- | Base: all re- |
| | | Base: all responses | sponses | sponses | sponses |
| Normaliza- | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive |
| tion | | | | | |

II. Data source: Statistical data

Data collection method: Desk research

| Indicator | Business support infrastructure units established with participation of the local authorities, per 10 000 businesses |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | Business support infrastructure units established with participation of the local authorities: Public information request to the city council Number of registered businesses: Statistical information, Business operation, table "Number of businesses in the cities of oblast significance and rayons" (Regional Statistical Offices) |
| Data processing | Business support infrastructure units / Number of registered businesses * 10 000 |
| Normalization | Incentive |

Sub-index 10. Support of the innovations

I. *Data source:* Businesses

Data collection method: Survey in the form of computer assisted telephone interview

| Question L1. Did you (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technologies, solutions purposes in 2018-2019? Read out [single] al. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Data processing Sw of "yes" responses Normalization L1. Did you (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technologies, solutions, service delivery, sales, or business management in 2018-2019? Read out [single] al. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Data processing Normalization L1. Did you (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) and individual entrepreneur introduced new technologies, solutions, pervocations, pervocations, pervocations optimize production, service delivery, sales, or business management in 2018-2019? Read out [single] al. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse L1. Ves 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse L2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Data processing Sw of "yes" responses Base: all responses Sw of "yes" responses Base: all responses Normalization Incentive L2. Have you (your what extent your business, quedes in technologies, solution to do put undersing tents for inventions, etc.) and development, patent lieve ten municipal authorities services met tents for inventions, etc.) and development, patent lieve ten municipal authorities services met tents for inventions, etc.) and development, patent lieve tents for inventions, etc.) for inventions, etc. private tents for inventions, etc. private production, service and development, patent lieve tents for inventions, etc.) for inventions, etc. private of patent for inventions, etc. private of the local patent for inventions etc. private of the local patent for inventions etc. private of th | Indicator | Work of research | Business innova- | Support of in- | Meeting tech- | Participation in |
|--|-----------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| Question L1. Did you (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technological companies for production purposes in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Data processing Wo of "yes" responses Data processing L2. Have you (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technological companies for production purposes in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Data processing Wo of "yes" responses L4. Are your (your company / you as an individual do you be-lieved mem unlogital authorities the local intentine unlocation of the municipal authorities support local innovation programs, allocation programs, and development in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Wo of "yes" responses Wo of "yes" responses Base: all responses L4. Are your business meads the then unlogital authorities the local involved them unvoiced in technology transfer is support to the function, services met thorities the local innovation innovation and development to support and development to support a full of the local pertise of inventions, etc.) Involved and development to support and development provided and provided into support and development to support and an articular and and an articular and | | institutions | tive activities | • | · | clusters |
| L1. Did you (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technological companies for production purposes in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse | | | | - | service needs | |
| (your company / your as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technological companies for production purposes in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 12. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / refuse Page 20. No need on the content of the content o | Question | I.1 Did you | 12 Have you | | I.A. Aro | Ara you (your |
| Data processing% of "yes" responses% of "yes" responsesAverage sponses% of "yes" responses% of "yes" responsesBase: all responsesBase: all responsesmean of all responses"fully met"Base: all responsesBase: 1-5 responsesBase: 1-5 responsesBase: all responses | Question | (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) work with any research institutions or technological companies for production purposes in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / | (your company / you as an individual entrepreneur) introduced new technologies, solutions, or products to optimize production, service delivery, sales, or business management in 2018-2019? Read out [single] 1. Yes 2. No 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / | L3. To what extent do you believe the municipal authorities support local innovation programs, allocating funding from the local budget? Rate 1 to 5 1 No support at all 2 Limited support 3 Adequate support 4 Significant support 5 Very significant support 99 (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / | your business needs in technology transfer services met (transfer of patents for inventions, knowhow, research and development, patent licensing, the expertise of inventions, etc.) Rate 1 to 5 1 Not met at all 2 Almost not met 3 Somewhat 4 Met to a significant extent 5 Fully met 97. (DO NOT READ OUT) Do not understand the question / do not know what "technology transfer" is 98. (DO NOT READ OUT) No need | company / you as an individual entrepreneur) a member of a cluster created with the initiative or support of the city government (cluster - the geographical concentration of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular area)? Read out the scale [single] 1. Yes 2. No 97. (DO NOT READ OUT) Don't understand the questions / don't know what a "cluster" is 98. (DO NOT |
| sponses sponses score – an arithmetic cant extent" and mean of all responses Base: all responses Base: all responses Base: all responses sponses | | | | | READ OUT) Hard | need 99. (DO NOT READ OUT) Hard to say / |
| Base: all responses | Data processing | % of "yes" re- | % of "yes" re- | Average | • | % of "yes" re- |
| responses sponses Base: all Base: 1-5 re-respondes sponses | | sponses | sponses | | _ | sponses |
| Base: 1-5 re- respondes sponses | | Base: all responses | Base: all responses | | , | |
| Normalization Incentive Incentive Incentive Incentive | | | | | | |
| | Normalization | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive | Incentive |