



POSITIVE PEACE REPORT 2024

- Results
- Trends
- Positive Peace & Societal Resilience
- Positive Peace and Future Peace Trajectory





Quantifying Peace and its Benefits

The Institute for Economics & Peace (IEP) is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit think tank dedicated to shifting the world's focus to peace as a positive, achievable, and tangible measure of human well-being and progress.

IEP achieves its goals by developing new conceptual frameworks to define peacefulness; providing metrics for measuring peace; and uncovering the relationships between business, peace and prosperity as well as promoting a better understanding of the cultural, economic and political factors that create peace.

IEP is headquartered in Sydney, with offices in New York, Brussels, The Hague, Mexico City and Nairobi. It works with a wide range of partners internationally and collaborates with intergovernmental organisations on measuring and communicating the economic value of peace.

For more information visit www.economicsandpeace.org

Please cite this report as:

Institute for Economics & Peace. Positive Peace Report 2024: Analysing the factors that build, predict and sustain peace, Sydney, March 2024. Available from: <http://visionofhumanity.org/resources> (accessed Date Month Year).

Contents

	Executive Summary	2
1	Results	4
	Why Positive Peace is Transformational?	4
	Positive Peace Index: Results	6
	Key Findings	7
	Global Changes in Positive Peace in the Past Decade	12
	Special Section: The US, China, India, The EU and Russia	27
2	Trends	33
	Trends in Positive Peace	34
	Positive Peace Trend: 2013–2019	34
	Recent Positive Peace Trend: 2019–2022	36
	Positive Peace and Post-pandemic Recovery	39
3	Positive Peace and Societal Resilience	41
	Positive Peace and Economic Resilience	42
	Positive Peace and Environmental Resilience	46
4	Positive Peace and Future Peace Trajectory	51
	Positive Peace Deficits as a Predictor of Violence	52
	Positive and Negative Peace Dynamical System Model	55
5	Implementing Positive Peace	59
	Our Approach	59
	Positive Peace Trainings	60
	Rotary-IEP Positive Peace Activator Programs	65
6	The Halo Framework: A Systems-based Approach to Analysing Societies	66
	What is Systems?	66
	What is Halo?	66
	Conceptual Building Blocks for Systems Analysis	67
	Appendix A: Positive Peace Index Methodology	73
	Appendix B: Positive Peace Index Rankings	76
	Endnotes	80

Executive Summary

Peace is more than the absence of violence. Positive Peace describes *the attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies*. It is conceptually related to many aspects of social development and can be used in multiple contexts. In addition to being a transformative concept, it is also a social good. When combined with systems thinking Positive Peace is a transformational concept as it envisages new ways of understanding how societies operate and how to develop thriving communities.

Toward this end, the Institute for Economics & Peace (IEP) developed the Positive Peace Index (PPI), a statistically derived measure of the factors that create flourishing societies, which is based on eight Pillars of Positive Peace. The concept of Positive Peace as well as general PPI results, including rankings and changes over time, are the focus of this report.

The same factors that create lasting peace also lead to many other positive outcomes to which societies aspire. Therefore, Positive Peace describes an optimal environment for human potential to flourish. For example, countries with higher levels of Positive Peace:

- are more resilient,
- are associated with robust and thriving economies,
- have better performance on ecological measures,
- higher levels of wellbeing and happiness,
- stronger measures of social cohesion,
- greater satisfaction with living standards and more.

All these qualities are systemically linked and are a byproduct of the quality of the system. Such societies are less encumbered by the costs and wastage of violence or political instability, have higher productivity, better access to information and are not heavily weighed down by corruption or ineffective governments, to name some.

Social systems that operate with higher degrees of Positive Peace are more resilient and capable of offering more effective protection to their citizens against adverse shocks, whether political, environmental or economic, they recover faster and are more likely to put in place coping strategies to be better prepared for future shocks. High-resilience societies are also more likely to take advantage of positive disruptions or opportunities arising from the creation of new economic paradigms and technological innovation.

Positive Peace can be used as a predictor of future substantial falls in peace many years in advance, thereby giving the international community forewarnings and time to act. Through the modelling of the relationship between the PPI and the actual peace of a country, as measured through the Global Peace Index (GPI), it is possible to predict large falls in peace. IEP's Positive Peace deficit model shows that 90 per cent of the countries predicted to fall substantially in peace did so.

Additionally, countries with a surplus of Positive Peace generally record substantial improvements in peace in the subsequent decade. This underscores the importance of Positive Peace as a gauge of societal resilience and the

predictive role it plays in assessing future societal development. It is also important for business, as countries with higher Positive Peace have superior economic performance than ones with lower Positive Peace. GDP per capita in countries that improved in the PPI outgrew that of their peers by 34 per cent over the past decade.

Other measures of economic prosperity are also higher among countries that are improving their Positive Peace scores. Household consumption grew more than twice as fast as elsewhere, inflation was twice less volatile, and foreign direct investment and international trade growth was substantially higher. For the industrial, service and agricultural sectors, economic value-added growth among PPI improvers outgrew that of deteriorators by one percentage point per year on average or higher since 2009.

Globally, Positive Peace has strengthened over the past decade, with the PPI score improving by one per cent since 2013. However, the decade-long trend in Positive Peace was not marked by consistent improvement, but rather by two distinct periods, one prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and one following it. From 2013 to 2019, Positive Peace improved by 1.5 per cent, but between 2019 and 2022 it fell by more than 0.5 percent.

Improvements in Positive Peace generally happen gradually due to the system-wide nature of change. A total of 108 countries – or 66 per cent of the 163 countries assessed in the PPI – improved their scores over the past decade.

Much of this improvement came in the form of greater access to technologies, especially in the information and communication areas. There has been an increase in equitable life expectancy, and a substantial rise in the number of people accessing information technologies. These developments are captured in the Structures domain of Positive Peace, which improved by five per cent since 2013.

However, these advancements have been partially offset by a deterioration in social attitudes, captured by the *Attitudes* domain, which deteriorated by 1.3 per cent over the last decade. Fifty-five per cent of countries have deteriorated in this domain since 2013. There have been deteriorations in the level of trust in governments, grievances between groups, press freedoms, conflict between elites, and misinformation. Some of the countries in which this domain deteriorated most in the past decade are Brazil, Venezuela, the United States, Yemen, Poland and Türkiye.

The *Institutions* domain, which gauges the effectiveness, transparency and reliability of the formal and informal organisations that manage societies, recorded a slight deterioration in the decade. There were deteriorations in some key measures including trade freedom and government openness and transparency.

Since 2019, there has been a reversal of the gains in Positive Peace recorded in the 2013-2019 period. Ninety-six countries experienced a decline. Notably, the Americas has seen the greatest backsliding in Positive Peace since 2019. Most of the countries in North, South, and Central America saw their scores deteriorate across a range of indicators, though North America experienced the greatest decline of all.

The pandemic played a role in this global deterioration, affecting all regions. Significant declines occurred in indicators such as life expectancy, as well as reductions in the international exchange and freedom of movement as a result of stricter border controls and other measures taken to slow the spread of the virus.

Five of the eight Pillars of Positive Peace posted improvements since 2013. *Free Flow of Information* posted the largest improvement – more than 8 per cent – on the back of more widespread access to information technologies. *Equitable Distribution of Resources* and *Acceptance of the Rights of Others* also posted large improvements. The improvements in *High Levels of Human Capital* and *Sound Business Environment* were relatively marginal, reflecting weak outcomes in youth employment, and regulatory quality.

The three Pillars of Positive Peace to record deteriorations since 2013 were *Good Relations with Neighbours*, *Well-Functioning Government* and *Low Levels of Corruption* which deteriorated by 3.3, 1.2 and one per cent respectively.

Despite COVID-19 causing deteriorations in Positive Peace for many countries, this report reveals that countries entering the pandemic with very high and high levels of Positive Peace experienced more rapid recoveries. These countries displayed greater resilience in mitigating the pandemic's adverse impacts on life expectancy, business prosperity, trade and investment. This finding confirms the predictive strength of Positive Peace as a measure of a country's overall resilience.

This research also incorporates systems thinking, which provides a more accurate understanding of how societies operate and develop over time. Developments in Positive Peace precede societal changes in peacefulness and human development, either for better or worse. Stimuli and shocks have cascading effects, due to the feedback loops contained within societal systems, pushing them into virtuous or vicious cycles. However, these cycles can be understood, planned and moulded to produce the best social outcomes. Positive Peace provides a roadmap of the things societies need to change, to either consolidate virtuous cycles or break vicious ones and be more resilient to future shocks.

This report also includes a final section outlining practical examples of how IEP's Positive Peace framework has been operationalised. This work is developed through IEP's extensive partnership program, its Ambassador Program and workshops.



In 2023 there were Positive Peace activities in over 75 countries.

The section also includes a description of a framework for identifying the key attributes of societal systems and methodically studying their relationships, leading to a better understanding of systems and their dynamics. The Halo framework is at the core of IEP's process to apply systems thinking to understanding and measuring the interrelated factors that lead to peace, development, and societal resilience.

Taken together, the findings in this report have important implications for building and sustaining peace.

- There are no quick and easy solutions. Building and sustaining societal development requires a large number of society-wide improvements progressing in concert with one another over long periods of time,
- Resilience should be the priority. Through focusing on the factors that are most critical, it is possible to build resilience in cost-effective ways,
- Stopping or averting conflict is not an end in itself. As Positive Peace progresses, it enables an environment where human potential may more easily flourish.

Without a deeper understanding of how societies operate, it will not be possible to solve humanity's major global challenges. Positive Peace provides a unique framework from which to manage human affairs and relate to the broader ecosystems upon which we depend. Positive Peace in many ways is a facilitator, making it easier for workers to produce, businesses to sell, entrepreneurs and scientists to innovate and governments to serve the interests of the people.

1 | RESULTS

WHY POSITIVE PEACE IS TRANSFORMATIONAL

Positive Peace is a transformational concept because it shifts the focus away from the negative to the positive by describing the necessary conditions for peace and society to flourish. Due to its systemic nature, improvements in Positive Peace not only strengthen peace, but are also associated with many other desirable outcomes for society, such as higher GDP growth, better measures of wellbeing, higher levels of resilience and more harmonious societies. Importantly, it provides a theory of social change, explaining how societies transform and evolve. Positive Peace describes an optimal environment under which human potential can flourish.

A parallel can be drawn with medical science. The discipline of pathology has led to numerous breakthroughs in our understanding of how to treat and cure disease. However, it was only when medical science turned its focus to the study of healthy human beings that we understood what was needed to do to stay healthy: physical exercise, a good mental disposition, a balanced diet and a sense of purpose. This could only be learned by studying what was working. In the same way, the study of conflict is different from the study of peace, producing very different insights. Understanding what creates sustainable peace cannot be found in the study of violence alone.

Humanity is nearing a tipping point and facing challenges unparalleled in its short history. Many of these problems are global in nature, such as climate change, ever decreasing biodiversity, depletion of the earth's freshwater, and overpopulation. Such global challenges call for global solutions and require cooperation on a scale unprecedented in human history. In a hyper-connected world, the sources of many of these challenges are multidimensional, increasingly complex and span national borders. For this reason, finding solutions requires fundamentally new ways of thinking.

Peace is the prerequisite for the survival of humanity in the 21st century. Without peace, it will not be possible to achieve the levels of trust, cooperation and inclusiveness necessary to solve these challenges, let alone empower international institutions and organisations necessary to address them. In the past, peace may have been the domain of the altruistic, but in the current interconnected and highly mobile global society it is clearly in everyone's self-interest.

Positive Peace provides a framework to understand and address

the many complex challenges the world faces. It is transformational in that it is a cross-cutting facilitator of progress, making it easier for businesses to sell, entrepreneurs and scientists to innovate, individuals to produce and governments to effectively regulate.

Positive Peace is systemic and understanding systems thinking is required to grasp it in its entirety. Systems thinking originated in the study of organisms and has been extended into sociology. A system is a set of parts that interact to achieve a desired purpose/function or intent where the system is more than the sum of its parts.

Systems thinking can also assist in understanding the way countries function and evolve. When combined with Positive Peace, it provides new ways of conceptualising and explaining societal change. Since a system is more than the sum of its parts it cannot be understood merely by breaking it down and analysing its constituent parts. Positive Peace consists of eight Pillars, but each of these Pillars does not correlate with peace as strongly as the sum of all components. This highlights that the whole is more than the simple sum of its components.

Such an approach contrasts with the traditional notion of linear causality, which dominates decision making today: identify a problem, decide upon its causes and tackle them in isolation. Without a fuller understanding of the underlying system dynamics, the linear approach is often ineffective and creates unintended consequences. The failure to solve some of society's fundamental challenges is a testimony to this. Systems thinking opens new ways of understanding countries and how they evolve. In systems, relationships and flows are more important than events. Events or problems represent the outcomes of the relationships and flows. This is why it is important to look at the multidimensional concept of Positive Peace as a holistic, systemic framework.

Positive Peace defines the goals that a system needs to evolve too. Interventions should incrementally nudge the system towards ever higher levels of Positive Peace, rather than creating radical change, which is disruptive, disorienting and can create unease and resentment. To his end IEP has developed the Halo approach to mapping and exploring the dynamics of societal systems.

Importantly, viewing countries as systems provides a framework for understanding the relationships between humanity and the broader systems, such as the atmosphere and biosphere, with which we intersect with and depend upon. Systems are self-regulating and self-modifying and operate on two levels: first as a collection of interconnected subsystems and second as part of the larger systems surrounding it. Understanding these interdependencies is essential to meeting the global challenges of our age.

Different countries have different aims, or intent. Societies also have both formal and informal rules, referred to as encoded norms, which govern social behaviour, and serve to maintain the system in a stable state. They regulate inputs, creating feedback loops. This can be observed in many societal processes, such as when a government stimulates the economy in response to a drop in GDP or deploys more policing resources when there is a rise in crime. Each country's system will be unique, with different social norms and governance, although following the same general principles.

With the diversity in intent and encoded norms, any two countries may react differently to the same stimulus. Tipping points also occur within systems due to lagged and non-linear relationships. IEP's research uncovers evidence of tipping points in relation to peace and corruption and peace and per capita income, to name just two examples. In the past, societies have been investigated through the lens of linear causality; in the future, embracing these holistic, systemic approaches will enhance our ability to navigate an age of unprecedented challenges.

Seen in this light, Positive Peace and systems thinking comprise an overarching framework for understanding and achieving progress not only in the level of global peacefulness, but in many other interrelated areas, including better economic progress, better ecological performance, happiness, stronger development and social advancement. All of these factors have a robust statistical relationship with Positive Peace.

Positive Peace provides the optimal environment for human potential to flourish.

POSITIVE PEACE INDEX: RESULTS

The Positive Peace Index (PPI) measures the level of societal resilience of 163 countries, covering 99.7 per cent of the world's population. The PPI is the most comprehensive global, quantitative approach to defining and measuring the factors that create peaceful societies. This body of work provides an actionable platform for development, policy makers, business and other stakeholders who are interested in improving their societies. Not only does Positive Peace improve peacefulness it can also help improve many other social factors, including governance, economic development, well-being and ecological performance. It stands as one of the few holistic and empirical studies to identify the positive factors that create and sustain peaceful societies.

The Global Peace Index (GPI) is an inverted measure of peace, that is, scores close to 1 indicate lower levels of violence and scores close to 5 indicating greater levels of violence. To preserve consistency with the GPI, the PPI is also constructed such that lower scores indicate better socio-economic development, and higher scores indicate less development.

IEP takes a systems approach to peace, drawing on recent research into systems, especially societal systems. In order to construct the PPI, IEP analysed over 24,700 different data series, indices and attitudinal survey variables in conjunction with current thinking about the drivers of violent conflict, resilience and peacefulness.

The result is an eight-part taxonomy of the factors associated with peaceful societies. These eight areas, known as the Pillars of Positive Peace, were derived from the datasets that had the strongest correlation with internal peacefulness, as measured by the Global Peace Index, an index that defines peace as “absence of violence or the fear of violence”. The PPI measures the eight Pillars using three indicators for each. The indicators represent the best available globally comparable data with the strongest statistically significant relationship to levels of peace. The 24 indicators that make up the PPI are listed in Table 1.1.



Key Findings

- Between 2013 and 2022, more countries have improved in Positive Peace than have deteriorated, with 108 registering improvements and 55 registering deteriorations.
- These improvements were mainly driven by improvements in the following Positive Peace Pillars: *Free Flow of Information, Equitable Distribution of Resources, Acceptance of the Rights of Others, and High Levels of Human Capital.*
- The three Pillars of Positive Peace to record deteriorations since 2013 were *Good Relations with Neighbours, Well-Functioning Government and Low Levels of Corruption.*
- *Sound Business Environment* recorded the smallest improvement, remaining almost unchanged.
- Positive Peace improved by 1 per cent globally from 2013 to 2022.
- The global PPI improved every year without interruption from 2013 to 2019. It experienced a noticeable decline in 2020, primarily attributed to the impact of COVID-19 and the global economic downturn resulting from pandemic-related policy measures. The global PPI has not yet recovered to its pre-pandemic level.
- Six out of the nine world regions improved in Positive Peace from 2013 to 2022, with North America, South America and MENA being the exceptions.
- Russia and Eurasia, South Asia, and Asia-Pacific had the largest regional improvements. All countries in these three regions recorded improvements in their PPI scores, except for Russia and Afghanistan, of which both recorded a two per cent deterioration, and Myanmar, Belarus and Kyrgyz Republic, which remained nearly unchanged.
- Improvements in the PPI are mainly due to the *Structures* domain of Positive Peace, which has substantially improved since 2013.
- In contrast, the *Attitudes* domain deteriorated by 1.3 per cent globally from 2013 to 2022. Eighty-nine out of 163 countries deteriorated in this domain, reflecting increased polarisation of views on political and economic administration matters, as well as a deterioration in the quality of information disseminated to the public.
- The *Institutions* domain also deteriorated globally from 2013 to 2022, though by only 0.5 per cent.
- The largest improvements in Positive Peace occurred in Uzbekistan, Armenia, The Gambia, Taiwan and Ireland.
- The largest deteriorations in Positive Peace occurred in Brazil, Lebanon, Venezuela, Yemen and The United States.



TABLE 1.1

Indicators in the Positive Peace Index


The following 24 indicators have been selected in the Positive Peace Index as a result of showing the strongest relationships with the absence of violence and fear of violence.

Pillar	Domain	Indicator	Description	Source	Correlation coefficient (to the GPI)
Low Levels of Corruption	Institutions	Control of Corruption	Control of Corruption captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.78
	Attitudes	Factionalised Elites	Measures the fragmentation of ruling elites and state institutions along ethnic, class, clan, racial or religious lines.	Fragile States Index	0.70
	Institutions	Public Sector Theft	Assesses perceptions of how often public sector employees steal, embezzle or misappropriate public funds or other state resources.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.70
Sound Business Environment	Institutions	Regulatory Quality	Captures perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.76
	Institutions	Financial Institutions Index	Part of the financial development index, this indicator measures the quality of the financial institutions, including the depth of the financial sector and the access to financial products.	International Monetary Fund	0.54
	Structures	GDP per capita	GDP per capita (constant 2015 US\$) is gross domestic product divided by midyear population.	World Bank	0.61
Well-Functioning Government	Institutions	Government Openness and Transparency	Assesses to what extent the Government operations can be legally influenced by citizens and are open to scrutiny from society.	Freedom House	0.64
	Institutions	Government Effectiveness: Estimate	Government Effectiveness captures perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.80
	Institutions	Rule of Law: Estimate	Rule of Law captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.83
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Attitudes	Gender Inequality	The Gender Inequality Index (GII) reflects women's disadvantage in three dimensions: reproductive health, political empowerment, and the labour market.	United Nations Development Programme	0.71
	Attitudes	Group Grievance	The Group Grievance Indicator focuses on divisions and schisms between different groups in society – particularly divisions based on social or political characteristics – and their role in access to services or resources, and inclusion in the political process.	Fragile States Index	0.61
	Attitudes	Exclusion by Socio-Economic Group	Exclusion involves denying individuals access to services or participation in governed spaces based on their identity or belonging to a particular group.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.73


Pillar	Domain	Indicator	Description	Source	Correlation coefficient (to the GPI)
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Structures	Inequality-adjusted life expectancy index	Measures the overall life expectancy of a population accounting for the disparity between the average life expectancy of the rich and that of the poor. The smaller the difference the higher the equality and that is a reflection of the equality of access to the health system.	United Nations Development Programme	0.61
	Institutions	Education and income inequality	Measured by Government dissemination of false information domestically: How often governments disseminate false or misleading information.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.61
	Attitudes	Equality of Opportunity	Assesses whether individuals enjoy equality of opportunity and freedom from economic exploitation.	Freedom House	0.67
Free Flow of Information	Structures	Freedom of the Press	A composite measure of the degree of print, broadcast and internet freedom.	Reporters Without Borders (RSF)	0.50
	Attitudes	Quality of Information	Measured by Government dissemination of false information domestically: How often governments disseminate false or misleading information.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.61
	Structures	Telecom infrastructure index (internet, mobile, broadband)	A composite index of internet users and mobile phone and broadband subscribers per 100 inhabitants	UN E-Government Knowledgebase	0.64
Good Relations with Neighbours	Attitudes	Law to Support Equal Treatment of Population Segments	This is a measure of how population segments interrelate with their domestic neighbours. It assesses whether laws, policies, and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population.	Freedom House	0.68
	Structures	International Tourism	Number of tourists (Number of arrivals per 100,000 population) who travel to a country (staying at least one night) other than that in which they have their usual residence.	World Tourism Organization	0.43
	Institutions	Freedom to trade internationally	Measures barriers to free trade such as tariffs regulations black market exchange rate and control of movement of capital and people	Economic Freedom of the World Dataset	0.64
High Levels of Human Capital	Structures	Share of youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)	Proportion of people between 15 and 24 years of age that are not employed and are not in education or training.	International Labour Organization	0.60
	Structures	Researchers in R&D	The number of researchers engaged in Research & Development (R&D), expressed as per one million population.	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	0.65
	Structures	Healthy life expectancy (HALE)	Average number of years that a newborn can expect to live in full health.	United Nations World Population Prospects	0.66

2024 POSITIVE PEACE INDEX


A SNAPSHOT OF THE GLOBAL LEVELS OF POSITIVE PEACE



THE STATE OF POSITIVE PEACE



RANK	COUNTRY	SCORE	CHANGE	RANK	COUNTRY	SCORE	CHANGE	RANK	COUNTRY	SCORE	CHANGE
1	Finland	1.438	↔	30	Chile	2.285	↓ 4	57	Botswana	2.89	↓ 4
2	Denmark	1.44	↔	31	Latvia	2.321	↑ 4	58	Kuwait	2.917	↓ 4
3	Norway	1.455	↑ 1	32	Taiwan	2.329	↑ 6	59	Serbia	2.924	↓ 1
4	Sweden	1.465	↓ 1	33	Slovakia	2.34	↓ 1	60	Moldova	2.975	↑ 5
5	Switzerland	1.496	↔	34	Croatia	2.381	↔	61	Bhutan	2.993	↑ 15
6	Ireland	1.586	↑ 2	35	Greece	2.394	↓ 2	62	Oman	3.011	↓ 1
7	New Zealand	1.655	↑ 5	36	Israel	2.402	↑ 3	63	Tunisia	3.025	↓ 3
8	Iceland	1.676	↓ 2	37	Poland	2.417	↓ 10	64	Thailand	3.032	↑ 8
9	Netherlands	1.698	↓ 2	38	Costa Rica	2.422	↓ 1	65	Ghana	3.053	↓ 1
10	Australia	1.731	↔	39	Hungary	2.495	↓ 3	66	Ukraine	3.062	↑ 11
11	Germany	1.744	↔	40	United Arab Emirates	2.518	↑ 1	67	China	3.085	↑ 20
12	Canada	1.749	↓ 3	41	Mauritius	2.614	↓ 1	68	South Africa	3.092	↓ 1
13	Japan	1.777	↑ 4	42	Romania	2.644	↔	69	Peru	3.111	↓ 3
14	Singapore	1.789	↔	43	Bulgaria	2.657	↑ 1	70	Bahrain	3.115	↓ 2
15	Belgium	1.845	↔	44	Trinidad & Tobago	2.688	↑ 3	71	Kazakhstan	3.117	↑ 14
16	France	1.894	↑ 2	45	Kosovo	2.691	↑ 1	72	Brazil	3.123	↓ 27
17	Austria	1.901	↓ 4	46	Malaysia	2.738	↑ 3	73	Bosnia & Herzegovina	3.124	↓ 2
18	Portugal	1.94	↑ 1	47	Qatar	2.739	↑ 1	74	Dominican Republic	3.137	↑ 18
19	South Korea	1.969	↑ 2	48	Montenegro	2.743	↓ 5	75	Namibia	3.14	↓ 13
20	United Kingdom	1.977	↓ 4	49	Georgia	2.748	↑ 6	76	Saudi Arabia	3.143	↑ 7
21	Slovenia	2.022	↑ 1	50	Jamaica	2.748	↔	77	Vietnam	3.161	↑ 3
22	Estonia	2.066	↑ 1	51	Argentina	2.752	↑ 1	78	Colombia	3.169	↓ 3
23	Czechia	2.109	↑ 2	52	Albania	2.805	↑ 4	79	Jordan	3.176	↓ 6
24	Lithuania	2.159	↑ 4	53	Panama	2.823	↓ 2	80	Senegal	3.187	↓ 1
25	Uruguay	2.161	↑ 4	54	Armenia	2.826	↑ 16	81	Indonesia	3.203	↑ 10
26	Spain	2.181	↓ 2	55	North Macedonia	2.841	↑ 4	82	Guyana	3.217	↔
27	United States	2.181	↓ 7	56	Mongolia	2.872	↑ 1	83	Belarus	3.218	↓ 5



RANK	COUNTRY	SCORE	CHANGE	RANK	COUNTRY	SCORE	CHANGE	RANK	COUNTRY	SCORE	CHANGE
84	● Ecuador	3.223	↑ 2	112	● Sierra Leone	3.532	↑ 13	140	● Zimbabwe	3.806	↑ 4
85	● Mexico	3.227	↓ 16	113	● Nepal	3.546	↑ 6	141	● Myanmar (Burma)	3.825	↔
86	● Paraguay	3.235	↑ 9	114	● Gabon	3.55	↓ 2	142	● Mauritania	3.844	↑ 1
87	● India	3.246	↑ 3	115	● Côte d'Ivoire	3.556	↑ 22	143	● Guinea-Bissau	3.875	↑ 4
88	● Sri Lanka	3.25	↑ 13	116	● Madagascar	3.562	↑ 10	144	● Iraq	3.88	↑ 9
89	● El Salvador	3.284	↓ 15	117	● Laos	3.564	↓ 1	145	● Libya	3.894	↓ 28
90	● Benin	3.293	↑ 9	118	● Togo	3.572	↑ 9	146	● Nigeria	3.913	↑ 2
91	● Turkey	3.295	↓ 28	119	● Cambodia	3.576	↑ 5	147	● Congo - Brazzaville	3.933	↓ 5
92	● Timor-Leste	3.314	↑ 13	120	● Papua New Guinea	3.591	↓ 5	148	● Burundi	3.937	↓ 3
93	● Russia	3.319	↓ 12	121	● Nicaragua	3.594	↓ 28	149	● Cameroon	3.938	↑ 3
94	● Bolivia	3.327	↓ 6	122	● Mozambique	3.599	↓ 12	150	● Guinea	3.95	↔
95	● Morocco	3.329	↑ 2	123	● Egypt	3.621	↑ 6	151	● Haiti	3.953	↓ 5
96	● Philippines	3.332	↓ 2	124	● Iran	3.628	↓ 3	152	● Venezuela	3.973	↓ 34
97	● Palestinian Territories	3.345	↓ 13	125	● Bangladesh	3.634	↑ 13	153	● Sudan	4.062	↑ 7
98	● Uzbekistan	3.351	↑ 33	126	● Eswatini	3.637	↓ 3	154	● Equatorial Guinea	4.085	↑ 1
99	● Cuba	3.359	↑ 5	127	● Lebanon	3.638	↓ 38	155	● Afghanistan	4.128	↓ 1
100	● Tanzania	3.367	↓ 4	128	● Pakistan	3.641	↑ 12	156	● Eritrea	4.16	↔
101	● Kyrgyzstan	3.392	↓ 3	129	● Guatemala	3.665	↓ 15	157	● Syria	4.161	↔
102	● Algeria	3.406	↑ 4	130	● Uganda	3.674	↓ 10	158	● Congo - Kinshasa	4.169	↔
103	● Lesotho	3.424	↓ 3	131	● Tajikistan	3.677	↓ 1	159	● Chad	4.257	↑ 3
104	● Azerbaijan	3.428	↑ 4	132	● Turkmenistan	3.687	↑ 2	160	● Central African Republic	4.32	↑ 1
105	● Malawi	3.444	↑ 6	133	● Liberia	3.7	↓ 11	161	● Somalia	4.334	↑ 2
106	● Zambia	3.446	↓ 3	134	● Niger	3.703	↓ 6	162	● Yemen	4.385	↓ 11
107	● Honduras	3.447	↓ 5	135	● Djibouti	3.708	↔	163	● South Sudan	4.4	↓ 4
108	● Gambia	3.455	↑ 24	136	● Mali	3.738	↓ 3				
109	● Kenya	3.461	↑ 4	137	● North Korea	3.746	↓ 1				
110	● Rwanda	3.49	↓ 1	138	● Angola	3.771	↑ 11				
111	● Burkina Faso	3.516	↓ 4	139	● Ethiopia	3.785	↔				

Global changes in Positive Peace in the past decade

The global score for the PPI has improved by one per cent in the past decade, with 108 countries improving in Positive Peace and 55 countries deteriorating. The score is calculated by taking the average country score for the 163 countries included in the index.


Figure 1.1 highlights the global trend in Positive Peace. Changes in Positive Peace tend to occur gradually, and it may take many years for the benefits to show because institution-building and changes in social norms are long-term processes. As such, even slight changes in global Positive Peace can be considered important.

Positive Peace improved almost continuously between 2013 and 2019, largely as a result of technological and economic development. 2020 was the first year in which the global PPI score deteriorated, which was then followed by smaller deteriorations in 2021 and 2022. The 2020 drop was mainly due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting global economic downturn caused by pandemic-related policy measures. The global PPI has not yet fully recovered to its pre-pandemic level.

FIGURE 1.1

Cumulative improvement in Positive Peace over the past decade

The global average Positive Peace score had improved by one per cent over the 2013-2022 period.



Source: IEP

Changes in the domains attitudes, institutions and structures

Although Positive Peace has improved overall in the past decade, the changes for each of the three domains vary considerably. While the *Structures* domain has been improving each year and by a total of five per cent since 2013, the *Attitudes* domain has deteriorated almost every year, declining by 1.3 per cent since 2013. The *Institutions* domain has deteriorated slightly, by 0.5 per cent.

Table 1.1 classifies the 24 indicators in the PPI into one of these three domains using the following typology:


- **Attitudes:** indicators that assess how members of a society view and relate to one another.
- **Institutions:** indicators that measure the effectiveness, transparency and inclusiveness of administrative organisations.
- **Structures:** indicators that gauge the technological, scientific and economic foundations that support social development.

Using this classification, Figure 1.2 shows that the overall improvement in the PPI since 2013 has largely been driven by structural improvements. *Telcom infrastructure index*, *inequality-adjusted life expectancy* and *researchers in R&D* have improved rapidly. However, the attitudinal indicators have been deteriorating. The indicators showing the deepest deteriorations are *quality of information* and *factionalised elites*.

FIGURE 1.2

Changes in the Attitudes, Institutions and Structures of Positive Peace, 2013–2022

Globally, the improvement in PPI over the past decade was largely driven by structural improvements. Institutional functioning has slightly deteriorated over the period, while attitudes have deteriorated noticeably.



Source: IEP


Changes in Positive Peace Pillars

Figure 1.3 shows the percentage change from 2013 to 2022 for all eight Pillars of Positive Peace. These scores reflect gradual changes within complex social systems and typically do not fluctuate drastically from year to year. As such, since 2013, the average Pillar score has changed by just 1.3 per cent, and no Pillar score has changed by more than five per cent, with the exception of *Free Flow of Information*. The slow-moving nature of Positive Peace calls for long-term planning and sustained investment to improve the Pillars.

FIGURE 1.3

Changes in the Pillars of Peace, 2013–2022

Five of the eight Pillars have improved over the past decade. Good Relations with Neighbours deteriorated by 3.3 per cent and Well-Functioning Government deteriorated by 1.2 per cent over the period.



Source: IEP

Changes in Positive Peace indicators


Eleven out of the total 24 indicators used in the PPI recorded improvements from 2013 to 2022. Moreover, the average improvement among indicators was greater than the average deterioration, leading to an overall improvement in Positive Peace over the decade.

The indicators that showed the most substantial improvements were those related to the *Structures* domain, including *telecom infrastructure index* and *inequality-adjusted life expectancy*. (Figure 1.4). On the other hand, in the *Attitudes* domain, the *quality of information* indicator recorded the steepest deterioration.

FIGURE 1.4

Change in PPI indicators, 2013–2022

The telecom infrastructure index indicator recorded the largest improvement, while the indicators which recorded the largest deteriorations were *quality of information*, and *freedom to trade*.



Source: IEP

Regional changes in the past decade

Most geographical regions of the world recorded improvements in their PPI scores since 2013, except for North America, South America and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), as shown in Figure 1.5. The largest improvements occurred in Russia and Eurasia, Asia-Pacific, and South Asia, improving respectively by 3.3 per cent, 2.9 per cent and 2.9 per cent. The improvement in Russia and Eurasia occurred despite deteriorations in Russia and Belarus, especially in the last four years. The improvement in South Asia was mainly driven by improvements in Bhutan and Sri Lanka.


The deterioration in MENA was marginal. Overall, 12 of the 20 countries in this region improved in Positive Peace over the period. However, the deteriorations recorded in Syria, Yemen, Lebanon and Libya were substantial and offset the PPI gains elsewhere in the region.

The region which recorded the largest deterioration in its PPI score from 2013 to 2022 was North America. With a deterioration of six per cent over the period, North America recorded by far the largest change in score of any region. However, this region consists only of two countries – Canada and the United States – and as such, a greater variability in the average regional score is to be expected.

FIGURE 1.5

Change in average regional scores, 2013–2022

North America was the only region to record a substantial deterioration in Positive Peace over the past decade. South America and MENA registered smaller declines, while all other regions improved.



Source: IEP

Largest regional deterioration and largest regional improvement

North America’s overall Positive Peace score has deteriorated by six per cent since 2013. This was due to a substantial deterioration in the Positive Peace score of the United States, while Canada recorded a smaller deterioration. *Low Levels of Corruption* showed a distinct deterioration, worsening by 19.7

per cent since 2013. The United States’ *fractionalised elites, quality of information, government openness and transparency* and *law to support equal treatment of population segments* indicator scores also deteriorated by at least 50 per cent each, reflecting increasing political polarisation and opacity in government. More information on the United States can be found in the special section, ‘The US, China, the EU and Russia’ below.

TABLE 1.2

Regional scores, North America, 2013–2022

Both Canada and the US recorded a deterioration in Positive Peace.

Regional Rank	Country	Overall Score in 2022	Change in score from 2013 to 2022*	Global Rank in 2022
1	Canada	1.749	0.03	12
2	United States	2.181	0.18	27
Regional Average		1.965	0.11	

* a negative change is an improvement in Positive Peace.

Source: IEP

The Russia and Eurasia region improved its average Positive Peace score by 3.3 per cent. All Pillars improved in the region. The Pillars with the largest improvements were *Free Flow of Information* and *Low Levels of Corruption*. Uzbekistan, Armenia, and Georgia posted strong improvements in their scores (Table 1.3). Russia was the only country in the region to record a deterioration in Positive Peace in the past decade, while Belarus and the Kyrgyz Republic remained unchanged, however Belarus has recorded the largest deterioration globally since 2019, falling by 8 per cent, while Russia deteriorated by 4 per cent in the same period.

Russia’s largest deteriorations in the ten years to 2022 occurred in the *Equitable Distribution of Resources* and *Free Flow of Information* Pillars. Notably, Russia’s *equality of opportunity* and *quality of information* indicators have decreased by more than 20 per cent.

TABLE 1.3

Regional scores, Russia and Eurasia, 2013–2022

All countries with the exception of Russia recorded improvements in Positive Peace.

Regional Rank	Country	Overall Score in 2022	Change in score from 2013 to 2022*	Global Rank in 2022
1	Georgia	2.748	-0.06	49
2	Armenia	2.826	-0.09	54
3	Moldova	2.975	-0.03	60
4	Ukraine	3.062	-0.05	66
5	Kazakhstan	3.117	-0.05	71
6	Belarus	3.218	0.00	83
7	Russia	3.319	0.02	93
8	Uzbekistan	3.351	-0.10	98
9	Kyrgyz Republic	3.392	0.00	101
10	Azerbaijan	3.428	-0.01	104
11	Tajikistan	3.677	-0.01	131
12	Turkmenistan	3.687	-0.01	132
	REGIONAL AVERAGE	3.233	-0.03	

* a negative change is an improvement in Positive peace.

Source: IEP

Results by income level and government type

As a measure of societal development, Positive Peace is highly correlated with a country's income level. Income influences and is influenced by all of the factors of Positive Peace. Countries with higher levels of per capita income are also more resilient as they have more resources, societal cohesion and internal organisational skills to protect their citizens from and recover after shocks.


This section uses the World Bank classification of income type, which groups countries into four tiers of per capita gross national income (GNI): high income, upper-middle income, lower-middle income, and low income. High-income countries tend to be the most peaceful and low-income countries tend to be the least peaceful (Figure 1.6).

The countries at the top of the PPI are all high-income countries. Positive Peace can often act as a driver of economic prosperity while economic prosperity also acts as a driver of peace, highlighting how societies develop systemically through continuous feedback loops.

FIGURE 1.6

Positive Peace by income group, 2022

High-income countries have the highest levels of Positive Peace.



Source: IEP


Government type has a statistically strong relationship with Positive Peace as well. Globally, there are 24 full democracies, 48 flawed democracies, 36 hybrid regimes and 59 authoritarian regimes. Indicators of democracy do not measure the transparency and representativeness of elections directly, but rather countries' democratic structures, such as separation of powers and effectiveness of courts. Full democracies tend to score better on the PPI, while authoritarian regimes usually record poorer scores (Figure 1.7). These results reflect the important role that the systemic influence of Positive Peace plays on effective government.

There are rare exceptions to this trend, with a few authoritarian regimes, flawed and hybrid democracies scoring well in Positive Peace. However, only two authoritarian regimes are in the top 50 countries on Positive Peace, while the top ten countries are all full democracies.

FIGURE 1.7

Positive Peace by government type, 2022

Full democracies have the highest levels of Positive Peace, as measured by the PPI.



Source: IEP

FIVE LARGEST IMPROVEMENTS AND DETERIORATIONS IN POSITIVE PEACE

The majority of countries in the PPI — 108 out of 163 countries, or 66.3 per cent — posted an improvement in Positive Peace from 2013 to 2022. This was driven by an average global improvement of five per cent in the *Structures* domain, especially reflecting the spread of technology and increases in life expectancy. Almost 95 per cent of countries improved in this domain.

However, the *Attitudes* domain deteriorated by 1.3 per cent. Within the *Attitudes* domain, there were some troubling trends, with *quality of information* and *factionalised elites* deteriorating by 6.6 per cent and 4.1 per cent, respectively. The *Institutions* domain also recorded a deterioration, though by only 0.5 per cent.


When looking at *Attitudes*, the proportion of countries that improved in this domain was only 45.4 per cent. The *Attitudes* indicator *quality of information* improved in only 36.2 per cent of countries and *factionalised elites* improved in only 16 per cent. Two other indicators of the *Attitudes* domain — *equality of opportunity* and *exclusion by socio-economic group* — also deteriorated, while a third — *law to support equal treatment of population segments* — recorded no change. The deterioration in this domain is indicative of a global rise in polarisation of countries’ social and political debates and an increasing intolerance of dissenting views. However, group grievances did improve in 118 countries compared to deteriorating in only 45 countries.

Progress in Positive Peace typically advances slowly. Countries may show little change in a single year, meaning Positive Peace changes should be measured over longer periods of time. This is important as true gains in Positive Peace tend to be long-lasting and self-perpetuating. This section presents the countries that have demonstrated the largest changes, positively or negatively, since 2013 (Figure 1.8). Note that a reduction in score indicates an improvement in Positive Peace.

The countries that experienced the largest improvements in their PPI scores between 2013 and 2022 were Uzbekistan, Armenia, The Gambia, Taiwan and Ireland, each improving by seven per cent or more. Two of the most improved countries are in the Russia and Eurasia region, one is in sub-Saharan Africa, one is in the Asia Pacific region, and one is in South Asia.

Brazil, Lebanon, Venezuela, Yemen and the United States are the countries with the largest deteriorations. Two of the largest deteriorating countries are in South America, two are in MENA, and one is in North America.

FIGURE 1.8
Largest changes in Positive Peace, 2013-2022
Uzbekistan and Armenia recorded the largest improvements in Positive Peace, while Brazil recorded the largest deterioration.



Source: IEP

FIVE LARGEST IMPROVEMENTS IN POSITIVE PEACE

Uzbekistan

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013–2022:

-0.369
to 3.351 from 3.720


CHANGE IN RANK, 2013–2022:

↑33
to 98 from 131

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Uzbekistan

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	4.07	2.36	-1.70
Well-Functioning Government	Government openness and transparency	5.00	4.00	-1.00
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Equality of opportunity	5.00	4.00	-1.00
High Levels of Human Capital	Researchers in R&D	4.77	4.81	0.04
Low Levels of Corruption	Factionalised elites	4.43	4.47	0.04
Low Levels of Corruption	Public sector theft	3.74	3.85	0.15

Trend in the PPI score, Uzbekistan, 2013–2022



Uzbekistan recorded the largest percentage improvement in Positive Peace of all countries in the past decade. The country's score improved by 0.369 points from 2013 to 2022, or 9.9 per cent. The country improved in all domains and Pillars of Positive Peace, with particularly large changes recorded in *Free Flow of Information*, *Well-Functioning Government* and *Equitable Distribution of Resources*.

While substantive, these improvements come off a relatively low base, with Uzbekistan still ranking 98th out of the 163 countries assessed in the PPI.

Most of the country's progress in societal resilience took place from 2015 onwards. Around that time, Uzbekistan implemented deep administrative reforms, effectively ending the last remains of post-Soviet isolationism. The country liberalised its exchange rate regime, began easing visa requirements and announced a series of tax changes aimed at attracting international investors. There was also a program for reducing state intervention in the economy and in private affairs.

There has been some progress in combating corruption, especially with the passing of the "On Anti-Corruption" legal framework. This was put in place in 2003 and has been gradually implemented and enhanced ever since. Despite this, levels of corruption remain high, with the country ranking 133rd in the Low Levels of Corruption Pillar.

The social, economic and international relations reforms have driven large improvements in the country's telecom infrastructure index, youth not in employment, *education and training (NEET)* and *international tourism* indicators. There have also been substantial improvements in the areas of *government openness and transparency*, *regulatory quality* and *group grievance*.

FIVE LARGEST IMPROVEMENTS IN POSITIVE PEACE

Armenia

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013-2022:

-0.288

to 2.826 from 3.114

CHANGE IN RANK, 2013-2022:


↑16

to 54 from 70

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Armenia

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
High Levels of Human Capital	Youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)	3.58	2.35	-1.22
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	3.44	2.22	-1.22
Low Levels of Corruption	Public sector theft	3.66	2.63	-1.03
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Education and income inequality	1.37	1.48	0.11
High Levels of Human Capital	Healthy life expectancy (HALE)	2.07	2.24	0.16
Well-Functioning Government	Government effectiveness	2.88	3.16	0.28

Trend in the PPI score, Armenia, 2013-2022



The Armenian PPI score improved by 9.2 per cent since 2013, placing the country as the second highest ranking in the Russia and Eurasia region. All domains of Positive Peace improved in the country in the past decade.

All Pillars recorded substantial improvements in Armenia, with the exception of *Good Relations with Neighbours*, which deteriorated by 0.8 per cent. *Free Flow of Information*, *Acceptance of the Rights of Others* and *Low Levels of Corruption* all recorded improvements of over 15 per cent.

The largest improvement was in information access, with Armenia's *telecom infrastructure index* indicator improving by 35.4 per cent since 2013. This, coupled with a 3.3 per cent improvement in the *quality of information* indicator, resulted in the overall improvement in the *Free Flow of Information* Pillar. Freedom House reported that “there were no major restrictions on press freedom during the 2018 parliamentary election campaign,” and that independent media outlets provide a diversity of perspectives in the country.

There has been progress in combatting corruption in the country, as Armenia has recently established a Corruption Prevention Commission and adopted new laws to reform its anti-corruption institutional framework.² These initiatives are contributing factors to the 14.9 per cent improvement seen in the *control of corruption* indicator from 2013 to 2022.

The current conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh has resulted in 80 per cent of Armenians fleeing the region. This conflict is likely to place further stress on Armenia and may make it difficult to maintain its current levels of improvements in Positive Peace.³

FIVE LARGEST IMPROVEMENTS IN POSITIVE PEACE

The Gambia

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013–2022:

-0.266
to 3.455 from 3.721


CHANGE IN RANK, 2013–2022:

↑24
to 108 from 132

Largest changes in Positive Peace in The Gambia

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Free Flow of Information	Quality of information	3.73	2.34	-1.40
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	4.41	3.19	-1.21
Well-Functioning Government	Government openness and transparency	5.00	4.00	-1.00
Low Levels of Corruption	Factionalised elites	3.59	3.99	0.40
Sound Business Environment	Regulatory quality	3.20	3.62	0.41
Good Relations with Neighbours	Freedom to Trade Internationally	1.79	2.31	0.51

Trend in the PPI score, The Gambia, 2013–2022



The Gambia has improved its Positive Peace score by 7.1 per cent since 2013, based on improvements in all domains. The country recorded improvements in six of the eight Pillars, with particularly large changes recorded in *Free Flow of Information*, *Acceptance of the Rights of Others* and *Well-Functioning Government*.

However, this progress comes off a relatively low base, with The Gambia remaining near the bottom of the ‘medium Positive Peace’ classification. The country holds the 108th position in the global PPI rankings. Over the past decade, the *factionalised elites* indicator and the *freedom to trade internationally* indicator have deteriorated by 29 per cent and 11 per cent, respectively.

Following former President Jammeh’s 22-year reign, President Barrow was elected in 2016, transitioning The Gambia from an autocratic regime to a multiparty republic.⁴ Under Barrow’s administration, attention has been directed towards improvements in academic freedom, the judiciary and the online environment.⁵

For example, in 2021 the National Assembly of The Gambia passed the Access to Information Bill, which recognises access to information as a legal right.⁶ Furthermore, the Gambia has demonstrated efforts to expand internet access and modernise its economy, as can be seen with the 2018–2028 “Information and Communication Technologies for Development Policy” plans.⁷ These initiatives are contributing factors to the 29.7 per cent improvement in the *Free Flow of Information* Pillar and the 27.5 per cent improvement in the *telecom infrastructure index* indicator.

FIVE LARGEST IMPROVEMENTS IN POSITIVE PEACE

Taiwan

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013-2022:

-0.170
to 2.329 from 2.500


CHANGE IN RANK, 2013-2022:

↑6
to 32 from 38

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Taiwan

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Well-Functioning Government	Government openness and transparency	2.00	1.00	-1.00
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	3.43	2.45	-0.99
Low Levels of Corruption	Control of corruption	2.62	2.13	-0.49
Low Levels of Corruption	Factionalised elites	3.32	3.42	0.10
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Exclusion by socio-economic group	1.10	1.23	0.12
Good Relations with Neighbours	Freedom to Trade Internationally	1.99	2.47	0.49

Trend in the PPI score, Taiwan, 2013-2022



Taiwan recorded the largest percentage improvement in Positive Peace in the Asia-Pacific region, to now rank 32nd on the global PPI. The country improved in all domains of Positive Peace and in all but one of the Pillars of Positive Peace. *Good Relations with Neighbours* was the only Pillar to deteriorate, by 7.3 per cent, which in part can be accredited to escalating tensions with China.

The *Well-Functioning Government* Pillar recorded the largest improvement, improving by 22.5 per cent over the past decade. This improvement was largely driven by a 50 per cent improvement in the *government openness and transparency* indicator. For example, Taiwan's successful COVID-19 response displayed good and efficient governance, with an emphasis on transparency.⁸ In addition, Taiwan's government has demonstrated a will to bring civil society closer to the law-making process. In 2016, it launched the online discussion platform, vTaiwan, providing a space for the public to engage with policymakers on legislation.⁹

Furthermore, advancements in tackling disinformation and improving the speed and quality of internet access have driven large improvements in the country's *Free Flow of Information* Pillar and *telecom infrastructure index* indicator.¹⁰

The Positive Peace score for Ireland has improved by 6.7 per cent

FIVE LARGEST IMPROVEMENTS IN POSITIVE PEACE


Ireland

CHANGE IN OVERALL
SCORE, 2013–2022:**-0.113**
to 1.586 from 1.700CHANGE IN RANK,
2013–2022:**↑4**
to 7 from 11

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Ireland

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Sound Business Environment	GDP per capita	3.11	1.00	-2.11
High Levels of Human Capital	Youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)	1.94	1.38	-0.56
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	2.18	1.68	-0.50
Free Flow of Information	Quality of information	1.37	1.65	0.27
Sound Business Environment	Financial institutions index	2.17	2.46	0.30
Good Relations with Neighbours	Freedom to Trade Internationally	1.36	1.73	0.37

Trend in the PPI score, Ireland, 2013–2022



since 2013. The country is ranked seventh on the global PPI, climbing four places in the past decade, from an already high base.

The country recorded substantial improvements in the *Structures* domain, improving by 19.1 per cent. *Attitudes* also improved by 3.1 per cent, while *Institutions* deteriorated by 4.6 per cent.

Ireland showed significant improvements in the *Sound Business Environment* Pillar, recording a 26.3 per cent improvement since 2013, largely bolstered by improvements in the *GDP per capita* indicator, which improved by 67.9 per cent over the decade. Ireland is highly attractive to multinational corporations, as it has low tax rates and is the only remaining member of the European Union to speak English as its primary language. The country's GDP per capita is therefore significantly skewed by large foreign firms that shift assets and even their headquarters into Ireland. Irish statisticians and economists have therefore developed the modified Gross National Income, or GNI, to compensate for this skew.¹¹

The country also saw significant improvements in the *Acceptance of the Rights of Others* Pillar, particularly on the *group grievance* and *gender inequality* indicators, which improved by 26.9 and 15.2 per cent, respectively.

Though five Pillars have improved, three deteriorated: *Good Relations with Neighbours*, *Low Levels of Corruption* and *Well-Functioning Government*. However, each of these Pillars deteriorated by less than five per cent.

FIVE LARGEST DETERIORATIONS IN POSITIVE PEACE

Brazil

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013–2022:

0.323
to 3.123 from 2.800


CHANGE IN RANK, 2013–2022:

↓27
to 72 from 45

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Brazil

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Free Flow of Information	Quality of information	2.12	4.42	2.30
Well-Functioning Government	Government openness and transparency	2.00	3.00	1.00
Good Relations with Neighbours	Law to support equal treatment of population segments	2.00	3.00	1.00
Sound Business Environment	Financial institutions index	2.52	2.36	-0.16
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Gender inequality	3.14	2.87	-0.27
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	3.13	2.27	-0.86

Trend in the PPI score, Brazil, 2013–2022



Since 2013, Brazil has recorded the largest deterioration in Positive Peace of any country in the index. The PPI score for Brazil deteriorated by 0.323 index points. All Pillars of Positive Peace have deteriorated, as did the Attitudes and Institutions domains, by 35 and nine per cent, respectively.

The Pillar with the largest deterioration was *Free Flow of Information*, which deteriorated by 19 per cent over the past decade. This was largely driven by a 109 per cent deterioration in the *quality of information* indicator. This deterioration coincides with the rise of political campaigns that have used misinformation in recent years. Notably, there has been an increase in attacks on Brazil's election system, which has undermined confidence the validity and integrity of Brazil's democratic processes and institutions.¹²

In addition, Brazil's *Well-Functioning Government* Pillar has deteriorated by 16.2 per cent since 2013, which was driven by a 50 per cent deterioration in the *government openness and transparency* indicator. In 2019, the government modified the 2011 Freedom of Information Act, which allowed for information to be designated as classified without proper justification.¹³ Moreover, during the COVID-19 pandemic, there were accusations of misuse of public funds as well as of dissemination of false and harmful information on guidelines, lockdowns and treatments.¹⁴

FIVE LARGEST DETERIORATIONS IN POSITIVE PEACE

Lebanon

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013-2022:

0.30

to 3.638 from 3.308

CHANGE IN RANK, 2013-2022:


↓38

to 127 from 89

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Lebanon

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Good Relations with Neighbours	Freedom to Trade Internationally	2.02	3.77	1.75
Well-Functioning Government	Government openness and transparency	4.00	5.00	1.00
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Equality of opportunity	3.00	4.00	1.00
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Gender inequality	3.21	3.08	-0.13
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Group grievance	4.38	4.18	-0.21
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	3.38	3.03	-0.35

Trend in the PPI score, Lebanon, 2013-2022



The PPI score for Lebanon has deteriorated ten per cent since 2013, with a 17.2 per cent deterioration in the *Institutions* domain and a 9.9 deterioration in the *Attitudes* domain. While the *Structures* domain did see an improvement over the period, it was of a comparatively minor 0.1 per cent.

All Pillars deteriorated in the 2013-2022 period. Of the 24 indicators, 14 deteriorated, seven improved and three remained the same. The biggest deterioration was in the *freedom to trade internationally* indicator, with an 87 per cent deterioration. Lebanon's biggest improvement was in the *telecom infrastructure index* indicator, which improved by 10.4 per cent.

Lebanon's deterioration has taken place largely since 2019, following the development of a devastating socioeconomic crisis, resulting in major inflation and much of the country lacking access to basic goods and services. At the same time, a political crisis worsened as anti-government street protests toppled the government in 2019.¹⁵ Then, in 2020, an explosion in the port of Lebanon's capital city, Beirut, resulted in over 200 casualties as well as sparked further anti-government protests.¹⁶

In 2021, it was estimated that 78 per cent of the country's population lived in poverty.¹⁷ The country also hosts an estimated 1.5 million Syrian refugees and half a million Palestinian refugees, making it one of the countries with the largest number of refugees per capita. As a result, the country has seen major deteriorations in the *Well-Functioning Government*, *Good Relations with Neighbours*, and *Equitable Distribution of Resources* Pillars.

FIVE LARGEST DETERIORATIONS IN POSITIVE PEACE

Venezuela

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013-2022:

0.359
to 3.973 from 3.615


CHANGE IN RANK, 2013-2022:

↓38
to 152 from 114

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Venezuela

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Equality of opportunity	3.00	5.00	2.00
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Exclusion by socio-economic group	2.27	3.70	1.43
High Levels of Human Capital	Youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)	2.14	3.15	1.02
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	3.60	3.43	-0.17
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Education and income inequality	2.17	1.91	-0.26
Good Relations with Neighbours	Freedom to Trade Internationally	3.94	2.60	-1.34

Trend in the PPI score, Venezuela, 2013-2022



Positive Peace in Venezuela has deteriorated by 9.9 per cent since 2013, with all three domains deteriorating. The *Attitudes* domain deteriorated by 20.8 per cent, the *Institutions* domain by 5.2 per cent and the *Structures* domain by 6.2 per cent.

Political and socioeconomic crises have beset Venezuela for over a decade, and all Pillars of Positive Peace, excluding *Good Relations with Neighbours*, have recorded substantial deteriorations since 2013. The *Equitable Distribution of Resources* indicator has deteriorated by 29.2 per cent, as poverty and inequality have risen sharply. A 2021 study by the Andrés Bello Catholic University in Caracas found that three in every four Venezuelans now face extreme poverty.¹⁸

The past decade has been marked by hyperinflation, severe food shortages and democratic backsliding. The uncertainty and the collapse of governance and rule of law saw 7.7 million Venezuelans flee the country as a result of the crisis.¹⁹ Against that backdrop, the *Well-Functioning Government* Pillar of Positive Peace has deteriorated by 16.1 per cent since 2013.

FIVE LARGEST DETERIORATIONS IN POSITIVE PEACE


Yemen

CHANGE IN OVERALL
SCORE, 2013–2022:**0.395**
to 4.385 from 3.990CHANGE IN RANK,
2013–2022:**↓11**
to 162 from 151

Largest changes in Positive Peace in Yemen

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Free Flow of Information	Quality of information	2.95	4.18	1.23
Sound Business Environment	Regulatory quality	3.50	4.57	1.06
Well-Functioning Government	Government openness and transparency	4.00	5.00	1.00
High Levels of Human Capital	Researchers in R&D	4.70	4.64	-0.06
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	4.50	4.33	-0.17
Free Flow of Information	Freedom of the press	3.56	3.38	-0.19

Trend in the PPI score, Yemen, 2013–2022



Source: IEP

Yemen's Positive Peace score has deteriorated by 9.9 per cent since 2013, largely reflecting a 12.7 per cent deterioration in the *Attitudes* domain and a 15 per cent deterioration in the *Institutions* domain. The *Structures* domain improved by a comparatively moderate 0.5 per cent. Yemen, which already ranked poorly in the 2013 PPI, shed an additional 11 places to rank 162nd out of the 163 counties.

All Pillars of Positive Peace deteriorated in the country over the 2013–2022 period.

Yemen's deterioration in Positive Peace was largely caused by its prolonged civil war. The country has been split by a north-south divide that led to a civil war in 1994, and then subsequently to another armed conflict between the government and Houthi rebels in 2009. This escalated to a full civil war in 2014.

Yemen's social and political systems remain extremely fragile. The civil war that started nine years ago has left the country's economic infrastructure destroyed and resources depleted, with the UN in 2019 describing the humanitarian crisis in the country as the "worst in the world."

The UN estimates that 21.6 million Yemenis, or 70 per cent of the population, need humanitarian assistance. Roughly 17 million people, or more than half of Yemen's population, are food insecure and 400,000 children are suffering from severe malnutrition. Over 4.5 million Yemenis have been internally displaced; this corresponds to 14 per cent of the overall population.²⁰

FIVE LARGEST DETERIORATIONS IN POSITIVE PEACE

United States

CHANGE IN OVERALL SCORE, 2013-2022:

0.183

to 2.181 from 1.999

CHANGE IN RANK, 2013-2022:


↓7

to 27 from 20

Largest changes in Positive Peace in United States

Pillar	Indicator	Value in 2013	Value in 2022	Change
Low Levels of Corruption	Factionalised elites	2.32	3.81	1.49
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Group grievance	2.61	3.68	1.07
Good Relations with Neighbours	Law to support equal treatment of population segments	2.00	3.00	1.00
Sound Business Environment	GDP per capita	2.78	2.45	-0.33
High Levels of Human Capital	Researchers in R&D	3.12	2.79	-0.34
Free Flow of Information	Telecom infrastructure index (internet/mobile/broadband)	2.03	1.44	-0.59

Trend in the PPI score, United States, 2013-2022



The United States have seen a 9.1 per cent deterioration in Positive Peace in the past decade, driven by a 33.9 per cent deterioration in the *Attitudes* domain, along with more modest, of 3.7 per cent deterioration in the *Institutions* domain. The *Structures* domain improved by 6.3 per cent, but not enough to offset the major deterioration in *Attitudes*.

Five of the eight Positive Peace Pillars saw deteriorations over the past decade, with a major deterioration occurring in the *Low Levels of Corruption* Pillar, at 30.5 per cent. This is largely due to the steady decline in *factionalised elites* since 2013, with a deterioration of 64.5 per cent. The country has seen growing tensions between political factions, much of it culminating during the 2020 presidential election, in which then-President Donald Trump and his supporters refused to acknowledge his loss. These tensions escalated on January 6, 2021, when a mob seeking to overturn the results of the election stormed the US Capitol building during a joint session of Congress.²¹

Other indicators that have experienced deteriorations include *quality of information*, *law to support equal treatment of population segments*, and *group grievance*, showing increasing divisions and fragmentation across numerous levels of society.

SPECIAL SECTION: THE US, CHINA, INDIA, THE EU AND RUSSIA

This analysis covers the United States, China, India, the European Union (EU) and Russia, as the world's leading powers. The EU has been included as a block due to the interconnected nature of Europe's economies and foreign relations.

What is striking is that the levels of Positive Peace for these countries tend to be much higher than their levels of actual peace as recorded by the Global Peace Index. This is especially the case for Russia, and the US, because these countries maintain large military forces and are involved in external conflicts which detract from their GPI rankings. However, they have relatively high levels of domestic socio-economic development. These large Positive Peace surpluses are unlikely to change. Countries with strong geopolitical ambitions maintain large militaries with which to pursue strategic goals.

TABLE 1.4

PPI and GPI rankings, 2022

The four powerful countries listed all have Positive Peace surpluses.

Regional Rank	Country	PPI Ranking 2022	GPI Ranking 2022
1	China	67	85
2	Russia	93	160
3	India	87	134
4	United States	27	128
5	Europe (average of countries in region)	35	32

Source: IEP

United States

The US has experienced a substantial deterioration in its PPI score in the past decade, with the deteriorating trend beginning in 2016 (Figure 1.9). From 2013 to 2022, the country's PPI Overall Score deteriorated by 9.1 per cent. However, the country is still ranked highly on overall levels of Positive Peace, at 27th compared to 128th on the GPI.

The decline in PPI was driven by deteriorations in the *Attitudes* and *Institutions* domains of Positive Peace. The other domain, *Structures*, recorded a slight improvement. As shown in Figure 1.10, the biggest deterioration was in the *factionalised elites* indicator – the fragmentation of ruling elites, their inability to compromise and to fight amongst themselves. This indicator deteriorated by 64.5 per cent, and is part of the *Low Levels of Corruption* Pillar and contributing to it deteriorating by 30.5 per cent between 2013 and 2022, a large change for a developed nation.

The *quality of information* indicator has deteriorated by 57.5 per cent since 2013. This highlights the weakening trust in information disseminated by the state, members of society, and

the media. The indicator is one of three that forms the *Free Flow of Information* Pillar, which deteriorated by 4.9 per cent over the past decade.


Exclusion by socio-economic group and *group grievance* also deteriorated markedly. These findings reflect the increased divisions between dissenting political groups and the radicalisation of views on personal freedoms, immigration and foreign relations. Deteriorations in these indicators have been disproportionately large relative to movements recorded for all other indicators of Positive Peace for the country.

However, there were some bright spots with the Pillars *Equitable Distribution of Resources*, *High levels of Human Capital* and *Sound Business Environment* all recording strong improvements, especially *Sound Business Environment* which improved by eight per cent.

FIGURE 1.9

Changes in Attitudes, Institutions and Structures in the PPI, United States, 2013–2022

Positive Peace deteriorated in the US from 2016 on the back of poorer scores for institutional and attitude indicators offsetting improvements in *structures*.




Source: IEP

FIGURE 1.10

Percentage changes in Positive Peace indicators, United States, 2013–2022

Positive Peace deteriorated in the US from 2015 on the back to worsening institutional and attitude indicators.



Source: IEP

China

China has improved in its PPI score by 6.4 per cent since 2013, broadly in line with other developing countries. China is now ranked 67th on the Positive Peace Index, compared to 85th on the GPI.


To a large extent, the improvement reflects advances in the economy, health and physical infrastructure, which make up the *Structures* domain of Positive Peace (Figure 1.11). Accordingly, China posted strong improvements in its *Free Flow of Information* and *Acceptance of the Rights of Others* Pillars, which improved by 15.6 and 11.4 per cent, respectively. All Pillars recorded improvements since 2013, although some – especially *Free Flow of Information*, *Good Relations with Neighbours* and *Sound Business Environment* – come off low bases.

In 2013, China introduced its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), an expansive series of infrastructure projects connecting China to countries across Asia, Africa, and Europe. The initiative has signed more than 200 cooperation agreements with various countries and international organizations.²² Since the introduction of the BRI, the country has seen improvements in various socioeconomic indicators such as the *telecom infrastructure index*, *financial institutions index* and *government effectiveness* indicators have had the largest improvements since 2013 (Figure 1.12). On the other hand, China has seen deteriorations in the *freedom of the press* and *government openness and transparency* indicators.

FIGURE 1.11

Change in Attitudes, Institutions and Structures in the PPI, China, 2013–2022

Improvements in indicators of social structures – economic, health and physical infrastructure – have offset deteriorations caused by recent worsening scores for *Institutions* indicators.




Source: IEP

FIGURE 1.12

Percentage change in Positive Peace indicators, China, 2013–2022

Improvements reflecting economic prosperity and physical infrastructure development contrast with the deterioration in the *quality of information* disseminated within the country.



Source: IEP

European Union

The average Positive Peace score in Europe improved by two per cent over the past decade, as shown in Figure 1.13, largely reflecting improvements in the *Structures* domain. This was influenced by continued economic development, especially in some southern and eastern countries, following the European debt crisis of the early 2010s. Economic development has been particularly strong in countries like Latvia and North Macedonia. There has also been substantial growth in internet usage and in gender equality (Figure 1.14).

The *Attitudes* and *Institutions* domains deteriorated across the region, at 3.1 per cent and 0.9 per cent, respectively.

In line with global trends, the *quality of information* indicator deteriorated by an average of 7.4 per cent among European countries, particularly as certain right-wing and left-wing political groups used the internet to disseminate disinformation. *Freedom of the press* has also been curtailed in some countries, with a deterioration of 29.8 per cent across the region.

Economic inequality has increased, albeit at rates below those recorded in other regions of the world.²³ This has contributed to greater social tensions and a radicalisation of the political debate — as captured by the *factionalised elites* indicator.

Türkiye was the European country to post the largest deterioration. The country's PPI score has deteriorated by 7.8 per cent since 2013, largely driven by the *Well-Functioning Government* and *Low Levels of Corruption* Pillars. In 2016, the country experienced a failed military coup that greatly destabilised society and exacerbated sectarian tensions. This contributed to a financial crisis from 2018 onwards that further depleted societal resilience.

Positive Peace also deteriorated in Poland, with the country's PPI score deteriorating by 7.1 per cent since 2013. The country

saw significant deteriorations in *Free Flow of Information*, *Well-Functioning Government* and *Good Relations with Neighbours* Pillars.

All Nordic countries recorded improvements in Positive Peace, except for Iceland. Norway recorded a 4.9 per cent improvement in its score, largely driven by large improvements in the *telecom infrastructure index*, *quality of information*, and *researchers in R&D*. Finland, Denmark, and Sweden each recorded improvements as well, at 1.6, 2.5 and 2.2 per cent, respectively.

FIGURE 1.13

Change in Attitudes, Institutions and Structures in the PPI, Europe, 2013–2022

Improvements in the economy of southern and eastern European countries have contributed to favourable structural outcomes for the region. In contrast, *Attitudes* deteriorated markedly.





FIGURE 1.14

Percentage change in Positive Peace indicators, Europe, 2013–2022

Improvements in Structure indicators were partially offset by worsening political radicalisation and *quality of information*, but substantial increases in *telecom infrastructure index* resulted in a net improvement of Positive Peace.



Source: IEP

Russia

Russia recorded a 1.8 per cent deterioration in its PPI score from 2013 to 2022. This saw the country fall 12 places over the period to rank 93rd in the PPI. This compares with a rank of 160th in the GPI.

The *Structures* and *Institutions* domains improved, albeit by just 1.7 and 1.2 per cent, respectively. The greatest improvements were recorded in the *telecom infrastructure index*, *gender inequality*, and *inequality-adjusted life expectancy* indicators.

However, the *Attitudes* domain deteriorated by 8.3 per cent, especially in the past two years (Figure 1.15). This was largely driven by a deterioration in the *quality of information* indicator which recorded a 21.6 per cent deterioration over the 2013-2022 period (Figure 1.16). Russia has employed an array of methods to restrict and control the dissemination of information. Notably, Russian disinformation has increased since its full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022.²⁴

The country was seriously affected by the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, with the Ruble losing two-thirds of its value and unemployment rising from six per cent in 2007 to 8.3 per cent by the end of 2009. The economic downturn was a trigger for a political crisis that saw mass protests on the streets of Moscow and other cities from 2011 to 2012.

The economy has been affected by the many Western sanctions placed on the country in response to its invasion of Ukraine. Russia used internal capital control measures to prevent economic collapse, but increasingly finds itself isolated and economically dependent on China.

FIGURE 1.15

Change in Attitudes, Institutions and Structures in the PPI, Russia, 2013–2022

The deterioration in Russia's *Attitudes* domain has to some extent been offset by improvements in *Structures*.





FIGURE 1.16

Percentage change in Positive Peace indicators, Russia, 2013–2022

Russia has seen strong improvements in internet usage, the quality of financial institutions and life expectancy, but these have been more than offset by deteriorations in *equality of opportunity*, *quality of information* and *exclusion by socio-economic group* indicators.



India

India has improved in its PPI score by 2.3 per cent since 2013. India is now ranked 87th on the Positive Peace Index, compared to 90th in 2013. India's Positive Peace ranking is significantly higher compared to its GPI ranking of 134th.

Largely, this improvement can be attributed to progress in health and physical infrastructure, constituting the *Structures* domain of Positive Peace (Figure 1.17). India showed significant improvements in all the pillars except *Low Levels of Corruption* and *High Levels of Human Capital* which experienced declines of 1.6 and 1.2 per cent, respectively. The decline in the latter was primarily due to a reduction in life expectancy resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic.


In several indicators other than *telecom infrastructure index*, India astonishingly improved by close to or more than ten per cent (Figure 1.18). They include *inequality-adjusted life expectancy*, *financial institution index*, *government effectiveness*, *regulatory quality* and *gender inequality*. These improvements are reflected in India's gain in the *Institutions* domain, which is the best performer among the three domains.

The *quality of information* indicator has deteriorated by 27.5 per cent since 2013 which underscores the declining confidence in information distributed by the government, individuals within society, and the media. The indicator is one of three that forms the *Free Flow of Information* Pillar, the other two being *telecom infrastructure index* and *freedom of the press*. Overall, improvements in *telecom infrastructure index* more than offset deteriorations in the other two indicators over the 2013-2022 period.

FIGURE 1.18

Percentage change in Positive Peace indicators, India, 2013–2022

India like many developing countries saw strong improvements in internet usage, life expectancy and the quality of financial institutions. On the other hand, *quality of information*, *exclusion by socio-economic groups* and *freedom of the press* are among the indicators that declined substantially over the 2013-2022 period.




Source: IEP

Exclusion by socio-economic group also declined substantially over the period which indicate a growing rift between opposing political factions and the radicalisation of views on personal freedoms.

FIGURE 1.17

Change in Attitudes, Institutions and Structures in the PPI, India, 2013–2022

Positive Peace improved by more than two per cent between 2013 and 2022, mostly driven by strong improvements in the *Institutions* and *Structures* domains. The *Attitudes* domain deteriorated by four per cent over the same period.



Source: IEP

2 | TRENDS

Key Findings

- In the past decade, the global PPI has been marked by two distinctive trends, with consistent improvements recorded each year from 2013 to 2019 and consistent deteriorations recorded each year from 2019 to 2022.
- The largest deterioration in Positive Peace came with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, when the global score declined by almost 0.5 per cent over the previous year. This change in trend is associated with the economic, social and health impacts of the pandemic and the policy measures aimed at slowing the virus's spread.
- In the years following the pandemic, countries with higher levels of Positive Peace experienced a global resurgence in Positive Peace, with the higher the level of Positive Peace the faster the recovery.
- The new global trend of deterioration slowed in 2021, with the index remaining almost unchanged in 2022. However, it has not recovered to its pre-pandemic level.
- Between 2013 and 2019, more countries improved in Positive Peace than deteriorated, with 126 registering improvements and 37 registering deteriorations. However, between 2019 and 2022, only 67 countries improved while 96 deteriorated.
- The improvements from 2013 to 2019 were mainly driven by improvements in the following Positive Peace Pillars: *Free Flow of Information, Equitable Distribution of Resources and High Levels of Human Capital*. Six Pillars improved, while two deteriorated.
- The two Pillars of Positive Peace to record deteriorations from 2013 to 2019 were *Low Levels of Corruption* and *Well-Functioning Government*.
- *Sound Business Environment* and *Good Relations with Neighbours* recorded the smallest improvements from 2013 to 2019, remaining almost unchanged.
- From 2019 to 2022, only four Positive Peace Pillars recorded minor improvements: *Acceptance of the Rights of Others, Equitable Distribution of Resources, Free Flow of Information* and *Sound Business Environment*.
- Positive Peace improved by 1.6 per cent globally from 2013 to 2019. From 2019 to 2022, it deteriorated by 0.6 per cent, highlighting that changes occur slowly.
- Eight out of the nine world regions improved in Positive Peace from 2013 to 2019, with North America being the only exception.
- Asia Pacific, Russia and Eurasia, and South Asia had the largest regional improvements from 2013 to 2019. All countries in these regions recorded improvements in their PPI scores, except Tajikistan and North Korea, which remained unchanged.
- Every region in the world recorded a deterioration from 2019 to 2022, with the largest change occurring in North America.
- Improvements in the PPI were mainly due to the *Structures* domain of Positive Peace, which improved by 5.1 per cent from 2013 to 2019.
- In contrast, the *Attitudes* domain deteriorated from 2013 to 2019. Eighty-six out of 163 countries deteriorated in this domain, reflecting increased polarisation of views on political and economic matters, as well as a deterioration in the quality of information disseminated to the public.
- The *Institutions* domain improved globally from 2013 to 2019, though by only 0.5 per cent.
- Every Positive Peace domain deteriorated in the 2019 to 2022 period, with the largest change in the *Institutions* domain.
- Since 2019, the largest deteriorations in Positive Peace have occurred in Myanmar, Belarus, Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, and Nicaragua.
- Countries with higher levels of Positive Peace have demonstrated greater resilience in recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic. The rebound in Positive Peace after the onset of the pandemic was more prevalent in countries with high and very high levels of Positive Peace.
- Recovery from the economic slump associated with COVID-19 was more prevalent among very high and high Positive Peace countries.
- The drop in life expectancy due to COVID-19 was significant in the 2019-2020 period. Recovery from this decline was more pronounced in countries with very high levels of Positive Peace.
- Recovery from trade and foreign direct investment declines during the pandemic was more widespread among countries with higher levels of Positive Peace.

Trends in Positive Peace

Over the past decade, the Positive Peace trend has exhibited two clear patterns. From 2013 to 2019, there was a consistent upward trajectory, resulting in a cumulative improvement of 1.6 per cent in global Positive Peace. This positive shift was predominantly fuelled by the worldwide advancements in the availability of information technologies for the masses, followed by substantial gains in life expectancy. However, since 2019, a discernible downturn has taken place, with each subsequent year experiencing a decline in Positive Peace until 2022. The most substantial drop occurred between 2019 and 2020.


This recent decline in Positive Peace can be largely attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the associated policy measures implemented to address it. Countries with higher Positive Peace levels exhibited a quicker and more robust recovery in the post-pandemic years. This outcome can be directly linked to the higher levels of societal and economic resilience. This section examines these two contrasting trends of the past decade and the dynamics of post-pandemic recovery.

Positive Peace trend: 2013–2019

Between 2013 and 2019, Positive Peace experienced nearly exponential growth, with each year's improvement equalling or surpassing the previous year's. This trend peaked in 2019, when the average global level of Positive Peace was 1.6 per cent higher than it was in 2013 (Figure 2.1).

FIGURE 2.1
Cumulative improvement in Positive Peace, 2013–2019

The global average Positive Peace improved each year between 2013 and 2019.



Source: IEP


Changes in attitudes, institutions and structures

Although from 2013 to 2019 progress in Positive Peace was consistent from year to year, the changes for each of the three underlying domains varied considerably. While the *Structures* domain improved each year and by a total of five per cent since 2013, the *Attitudes* domain deteriorated almost every year, declining by 0.8 per cent over the period. The *Institutions* domain improved only slightly, by 0.5 per cent.

Figure 1.2 shows that the overall improvement in the PPI from 2013 to 2019 was largely driven by structural improvements. *Telecom infrastructure index*, *researchers in R&D* and *inequality-adjusted life expectancy* generally improved rapidly over the period. Globally, institutional effectiveness also improved, albeit at a much slower pace than structural factors. However, the attitudinal indicators generally deteriorated. The indicators showing the largest deteriorations were *quality of information* and *factionalised elites*.

FIGURE 2.2
Changes in the attitudes, institutions and structures of Positive Peace, 2013–2019

The improvement in PPI from 2013 to 2019 was largely driven by structural improvements globally. Institutional functioning slightly improved over the period, while attitudes deteriorated noticeably.



Source: IEP


Changes in Positive Peace Pillars and indicators

Figure 2.3 shows the percentage change from 2013 to 2019 for all eight Pillars of Positive Peace. These scores reflect gradual changes within complex social systems and typically do not fluctuate drastically from year to year. As such, between 2013 and 2019, the average Pillar score changed by just 1.8 per cent, and no Pillar score changed by more than three per cent, with the exception of *Free Flow of Information*. The slow-moving nature of Positive Peace calls for long-term planning and sustained investment to improve the Pillars.

FIGURE 2.3

Changes in the Pillars of Peace, 2013–2019

Six of the eight Pillars improved over the 2013-2019 period. *Low Levels of Corruption* deteriorated slightly, and *Well-Functioning Government* barely changed over the period.



Source: IEP


Twelve out of the total 24 indicators used in the PPI recorded improvements from 2013 to 2019, as shown in Figure 2.4. The average improvement among indicators was greater than the average deterioration, leading to an overall improvement in Positive Peace over the period.

The indicators that showed the most substantial improvements were those related to the *Structures* domain. Some examples are *telecom infrastructure index*, *inequality-adjusted life expectancy* and *researchers in R&D*. On the other hand, in the *Attitudes* domain, the *quality of information* and *factionalised elites* indicators recorded among the largest deteriorations.

FIGURE 2.4

Change in PPI indicators, 2013–2019

The *telecom infrastructure index* indicator recorded by far the largest improvement, while the *quality of information*, *freedom of the press*, and *factionalised elites* indicators recorded the largest deteriorations.



Source: IEP

Regional trends

All geographic regions of the world recorded improvements in their PPI scores from 2013 to 2019, except for North America (Figure 2.5). The largest improvements occurred in Russia and Eurasia, Asia-Pacific, and South Asia, each improving by more than three per cent.

The improvement in the Middle East and North Africa was marginal. Overall, 14 of the 20 countries in this region improved in Positive Peace over the period. However, the deteriorations recorded by Yemen, Lebanon and Libya were substantial and almost offset the PPI gains elsewhere in the region.

The only region in the world to record a deterioration in its PPI score from 2013 to 2019 was North America, with a deterioration of three per cent over the period. However, this region consists only of two countries – Canada and the United States – and as such, greater variability in the average regional score is to be expected.


Recent Positive Peace trend: 2019–2022

Despite the global improvement in Positive Peace during most of the 2010s, since 2019 the average Positive Peace score has deteriorated by 0.6 per cent globally. This decline is primarily due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the policy responses to it. All three Positive Peace domains experienced a decline from 2019 to 2022, with the *Institutions* domain deteriorating the most, by nearly one per cent.

This trend is observable in both the average global score and the number of countries deteriorating over multiyear intervals. As shown in Figure 2.6, there has been a recent uptick in the number of deteriorations in Positive Peace. The data reveals a significant shift in trends, with the number of countries deteriorating in Positive Peace dropping to 30 over the three-year span from 2016 to 2019, following a period of hovering around 60. However, country deteriorations surged to 96 countries in the 2019-2022 period.

FIGURE 2.5
Change in average regional scores, 2013–2019

North America was the only region to record a deterioration in Positive Peace over the period.




Source: IEP

FIGURE 2.6

Positive Peace deteriorations over three-year intervals, 2009–2022

The number of deteriorations in Positive Peace hit its lowest point in the 2016-2019 period. However, it has steadily increased since then, peaking in the 2019-2022 period.



Source: IEP

Regional trends

Positive Peace declined in all regions of the world during the 2019-2022 period. As shown in Figure 2.7, the deterioration exceeded one per cent in North, South, and Central America. The Americas seem to have been the part of the world most affected by the pandemic.

In South America, the virus's rapid spread strained healthcare systems, causing high infection rates and significant mortality, particularly in countries like Brazil and Peru. Economic consequences were severe, with lockdowns reducing economic activities which then led to job losses and increased poverty.

In North America, the United States and Canada also grappled with high caseloads, but their responses differed. The US experienced considerable political and social divisions in managing the crisis, while Canada's response was generally more coordinated and consistent.² Central America faced economic vulnerabilities and healthcare challenges, with countries like Mexico and Guatemala having to deal with limited healthcare resources and declines in life expectancy. Overall, the pandemic exposed and exacerbated socio-economic disparities in all the three regions of the Americas.


Table 2.1 shows the 20 countries with the largest deteriorations in Positive Peace between 2019 and 2022. Seven out of the worst 20 are from South America or Central America and the Caribbean. Unsurprisingly, *healthy life expectancy* was the

indicator with the largest decline in the two regions, closely followed by *freedom to trade internationally*. Overall, out of the 25 countries in North, Central and South America included in the PPI, only five experienced an improvement in Positive Peace during the 2019-2022 period.

FIGURE 2.7

Post-pandemic change in average regional scores, 2019–2022

While all regions deteriorated in the 2019-2022 period, the three regions in the Americas recorded the largest declines, each deteriorating by more than one per cent.



Source: IEP

TABLE 2.1

Twenty largest deteriorations in Positive Peace, 2019–2022

Seven countries from Latin America were among the countries with largest deteriorations in Positive Peace since 2019.

Regional Rank	Country	2022	2019	Change	Change (%)	Rank Change
1	Myanmar	3.83	3.60	6%	6%	15
2	Belarus	3.22	2.99	8%	8%	19
3	Afghanistan	4.13	3.96	4%	4%	4
4	Burkina Faso	3.52	3.35	5%	5%	12
5	Nicaragua	3.59	3.44	5%	5%	16
6	Lebanon	3.64	3.48	4%	4%	18
7	Kyrgyz Republic	3.39	3.26	4%	4%	12
8	Russia	3.32	3.20	4%	4%	11
9	Peru	3.11	2.99	4%	4%	7
10	Brazil	3.12	3.00	4%	4%	7
11	Ethiopia	3.78	3.68	3%	3%	7
12	Spain	2.18	2.08	5%	5%	3
13	El Salvador	3.28	3.19	3%	3%	8
14	Panama	2.82	2.74	3%	3%	3
15	Mauritius	2.61	2.53	3%	3%	0
16	Iran	3.63	3.54	2%	2%	10
17	Netherlands	1.70	1.62	5%	5%	3
18	Argentina	2.75	2.68	3%	3%	6
19	Jordan	3.18	3.11	2%	2%	6
20	Guatemala	3.66	3.60	2%	2%	2


Source: IEP

Changes in Positive Peace Pillars and indicators

Among the eight Pillars, the most significant deteriorations occurred in *Good Relations with Neighbours*, down 3.8 per cent, and *High Levels of Human Capital*, down 1.6 per cent (Figure 2.8). The deterioration in the *Institutions* domain and these two Pillars can be mainly attributed to the decline in *freedom to trade internationally* and *healthy life expectancy* (Figure 2.9).

FIGURE 2.8
Post-pandemic changes in the Pillars of Positive Peace, 2019–2022

Four of the eight Pillars improved from 2019 to 2022, with most of the deteriorations much larger than the improvements.



Source: IEP


The pandemic had a profound and multifaceted impact on international trade. The global trade landscape was disrupted as countries implemented lockdowns and travel restrictions, causing supply chain interruptions and decreased demand for goods and services. This was captured by an 8.8 per cent decline in the *freedom to trade internationally* indicator over the 2019-2022 period.

Trade volumes and international cooperation were adversely affected as countries focused on securing essential medical supplies and protecting domestic industries. Some sectors faced significant declines, such as tourism and aviation. Trade as percentage of GDP declined by four percentage points, from 56 to 52 per cent, while exports of goods and services in constant terms dropped from more than US\$24 trillion to US\$22 trillion, according to the World Bank data.

The pandemic constituted a severe global health crisis, resulting in at least a one-year reduction in the average global life expectancy, as reported by the United Nations World Population Prospects.¹ Based on the *healthy life expectancy* indicator, the decline was even more significant, as it showed a more than six per cent drop during the period from 2019 to 2022.

FIGURE 2.9
Post-pandemic change in PPI indicators, 2019–2022

Freedom to trade internationally and *healthy life expectancy* declined by more than eight and six per cent, respectively.



Positive Peace and post-pandemic recovery

The pandemic was not only a global public health crisis. It also had significant negative impacts on society, politics, and the economy. It led to global supply chain disruptions, crippling international trade. Economic activities and investments were undermined as a result of an economic recession and increased uncertainties that ensued. The negative consequences of the pandemic can be attributed to both the health impacts of the virus itself and the policy responses implemented to contain it. In the 2019-2020 period, Positive Peace witnessed a deterioration of 0.5 per cent, the first year of deterioration in more than a decade.

During the first year of the pandemic, a deterioration in Positive Peace was observed in 112 out of the 163 countries included in the PPI. It declined across all regions, except for Asia-Pacific, where there was a negligible improvement.


However, in the years following the pandemic, countries ranked more highly on the PPI tended to rebound from their losses in Positive Peace more quickly than the rest of the world. Figure 2.10 illustrates the recovery of Positive Peace in countries with different levels of Positive Peace.

The graph demonstrates that over 60 per cent of very high Positive Peace countries fully recovered from their 2019-2020 declines. High Positive Peace countries followed, with a recovery rate of just under 50 per cent, while medium and low Positive Peace countries had progressively lower rates of recovery. This finding underscores the strong association between the level of Positive Peace and societal resilience.

FIGURE 2.10

Post-2020 Positive Peace recovery

A higher share of countries with very high and high Positive Peace managed to bounce back from their 2019-2020 declines in Positive Peace.



Source: IEP

Global economic output, measured in constant terms, contracted by three per cent as a direct consequence of the pandemic. Furthermore, per capita income recorded a decline of four per cent globally between 2019 and 2020.


Subsequently, the global economy did experience a rebound from the recession, with stronger recoveries occurring in

countries with higher Positive Peace scores. This mirrored the improvements in Positive Peace, highlighting that as countries improve in Positive Peace so do their economies. Countries with very high levels of Positive Peace exhibited the highest rate of recovery, with over 80 per cent of them successfully recovering from the 2020 recession (Figure 2.11). This contrasts with recovery rates of under 50 per cent for countries at medium and low levels of Positive Peace.

FIGURE 2.11

Post-2020 GDP per capita recovery

A larger proportion of very high and high Positive Peace countries managed to recover from the 2020 economic recession, in contrast to countries with medium and low levels of Positive Peace.



Source: IEP; World Bank


The COVID-19 pandemic marked the most severe global health crisis since the Spanish Flu pandemic over a century ago. It resulted in the loss of millions of lives and subsequently led to a decline in average global life expectancy, dropping from 73 years to 72 years, as reported by the United Nations World Population Prospects.³ Some countries, such as Cuba and Mexico, experienced a staggering decrease of four years in life expectancy.

Following the peak of the pandemic, several countries have shown signs of recovering from their declines in life expectancy. However, it is important to acknowledge that complete recovery will require more time and sustained effort. Nonetheless, countries categorised as having very high Positive Peace outperform their less peaceful counterparts. Figure 2.12 shows over 45 per cent of these countries have already begun regaining what they lost in terms of life expectancy during the pandemic.

FIGURE 2.12

Post-2020 life expectancy recovery

Nearly half of the countries with very high levels of Positive Peace have begun to recover from the pandemic-related declines in life expectancy, far more than any other grouping.



Source: IEP; WHO


Foreign direct investment and trade also recorded significant declines as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. During the first year of the pandemic, global trade dropped by more than ten per cent, while foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows dropped by over 20 per cent.

In recovering from these substantial declines in trade and FDI inflows, countries with higher Positive Peace scores significantly outperformed their lower Positive Peace counterparts. Very high and high Positive Peace countries led the way, with recovery rates for FDI exceeding 70 per cent, as shown in Figure 2.13. In contrast, medium and low Positive Peace countries had poorer results, with less than half of them managing to regain what they had lost during the pandemic. As for trade, the recovery rate of low Positive Peace countries was noticeably lower than those of the other three categories, as shown in Figure 2.14.

FIGURE 2.13

Post-2020 foreign direct investment recovery

Countries with higher levels of Positive Peace were more likely to recover their capacity to attract foreign direct investment (FDI) to pre-pandemic levels.




Source: IEP; World Bank

FIGURE 2.14

Post-2020 trade recovery

A higher percentage of countries with stronger Positive Peace were able to bounce back from the declines in trade triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic.



Source: IEP; World Bank

3 | Positive Peace and Societal Resilience

Key Findings:

- Positive Peace correlates strongly with a broad spectrum of societal resilience measures, such as economic, environmental, and social wellbeing indicators.
- The Positive Peace Index (PPI) can be used to select portfolios of countries that consistently outperform global GDP growth. From 2009 to 2022, the per capita GDP of countries that improved in the PPI grew twice as fast as those that deteriorated.
- On average, a one index-point improvement in PPI score is associated with a five- to tenfold rise in GDP per capita.
- Inflation rates in countries where Positive Peace deteriorated were at least twice as volatile as countries where it improved.
- From 2009 to 2022, household consumption in countries where Positive Peace improved grew two times faster than where it deteriorated.
- Countries where Positive Peace improved outperformed the countries where it deteriorated in terms of growth of value added to the key sectors of the economy, namely industry, services, and agriculture.
- Countries recording improvements in Positive Peace are more attractive to foreign investors, with foreign direct investment (FDI) growing robustly since 2009. This contrasts with a contraction in FDI in countries where Positive Peace deteriorated.
- Between 2009 and 2022, international trade grew at a much faster rate in countries where Positive Peace improved.
- Positive Peace is strongly associated with measures of environmental resilience. Countries with higher Positive Peace demonstrate superior performance in environmental sustainability and mitigating environmental threats.
- Citizens in countries with higher levels of Positive Peace report higher levels of happiness and satisfaction with life than those in lower Positive Peace countries.
- The gender gap in youth unemployment and workforce participation is smaller in countries that improved in Positive Peace.
- Countries with high Positive Peace nurture healthier societies. A wide range of health outcomes, such as mortality, malnourishment and socio-economic equality in life expectancy, are strongly associated with Positive Peace.

Societal resilience refers to a country's ability to effectively adapt, withstand, and recover from various challenges, shocks, and disruptions while maintaining its essential functions and safeguarding social wellbeing.

Previous research has demonstrated that there is a direct link between high levels of Positive Peace and favourable social and economic outcomes. High Positive Peace countries tend to outperform low Positive Peace countries in terms of a wide range societal resilience measures. This is also true across time: countries that improve in Positive Peace over the years are more likely to become more resilient than comparable countries.

High Positive Peace countries tend to outperform their counterparts on many macroeconomic, health, environmental and societal wellbeing measures that directly and indirectly

reflect societal resilience. Therefore, Positive Peace can be seen as describing an optimal environment for human potential to flourish. This section discusses the PPI as an empirical gauge of societal resilience.

At a superficial level, it may seem self-evident that countries with higher levels of Positive Peace exhibit greater levels of societal resilience. However, comparing the PPI with other measures of societal resilience allows for the quantification of the differences and similarities between countries that at first glance may have comparable levels of socio-economic development. It also helps shed light on how gaps can be reduced and shared strengths can be leveraged to promote the non-violent resolution of grievances and the achievement of higher degrees of development and wellbeing.

POSITIVE PEACE AND ECONOMIC RESILIENCE

This section contains a compilation of some of the key benefits of Positive Peace, especially in relation to its economic value for business and governance.

Income and economic growth


Countries that improve in Positive Peace consistently outperform comparable countries in real GDP growth. By choosing countries that advance in Positive Peace in a given year and mapping their real GDP growth in the subsequent years, investment analysts can build an annually rebalanced portfolio of countries which consistently outperform the rest of the world, as shown in Figure 3.1.

Higher levels of Positive Peace are associated with greater per capita income (Figure 3.2). This is because the factors that create a robust *business environment* are the same factors that create highly peaceful societies. These factors include lower levels of corruption, better governance, a free flow of information through society, and higher levels of human capital.

FIGURE 3.1

Cumulative Change in combined economic output since 2009

In 2021, the segment of the global economy composed of countries that improved in Positive Peace was 59 per cent larger than it was in 2009, while the segment of the world that deteriorated in Positive Peace recorded an increase of only 27 per cent.




Source: World Bank, IEP

FIGURE 3.2

Positive Peace and GDP per capita, 2022

Positive Peace is highly correlated with higher per capita income.



Source: World Bank, IEP

There is also a clear relationship between developments in Positive Peace and growth in per capita income across time. From 2009 to 2022, per capita GDP in countries that recorded improvements in the PPI rose by more than two per cent annually, as shown in Figure 3.3. This compares with less than one per cent for countries in which Positive Peace deteriorated.

Volatility of inflation


The volatility of inflation is an impediment to economic development. It makes it difficult to forecast future prices and demand for goods and services, prompting firms to cut back on investment as well as employment. It also tends to prompt households to reduce consumption.

Countries that improved in Positive Peace from 2009 to 2022 experienced substantially less volatile inflation rates over this period (Figure 3.4). Over the period of analysis, the volatility of inflation rates in countries where Positive Peace deteriorated was almost four percentage points higher than in those countries where it improved.

FIGURE 3.3

Positive Peace and GDP per capita growth, 2009–2022

Countries that improved in Positive Peace recorded a 2.1 per cent median annual growth rate, more than double that of the countries that deteriorated in Positive Peace.




Source: IEP; World Bank

FIGURE 3.4

Volatility of inflation rates by Positive Peace outcome, 2009–2022

Countries in which Positive Peace deteriorated experienced inflation rates that were almost twice as volatile as those in countries with improved Positive Peace.



Source: IEP; World Bank

FIGURE 3.5

Changes in household consumption by Positive Peace, 2009–2022

In countries where Positive Peace improved, household consumption rose at a rate almost twice as high as in countries where it deteriorated.



Source: IEP; World Bank

Household consumption and business activities

Household consumption is particularly responsive to improvements in Positive Peace. Among countries that recorded such improvements, the average annual growth in household consumption from 2009 to 2022 was nearly three per cent, twice the rate for countries in which Positive Peace deteriorated (Figure 3.5). This confirms previous IEP findings that consumption is a key component of how socio-economic systems respond to improvements in peacefulness.

The business sector is responsible for almost all the production of goods and services in most economies. A gauge of activity in


this sector is gross value added (GVA), which measures the value of all goods and services produced, minus the variable costs of producing them.

The GVA of the industry sector (which includes construction) is most responsive to improvements in Positive Peace. Growth in this sector’s GVA was over three per cent per year among countries in which Positive Peace improved. This is double the 1.6 per cent growth in countries where Positive Peace deteriorated (Figure 3.6). Similarly, the agricultural sector is strongly associated with Positive Peace improvements. The differential in GVA growth in the service sector between countries that improved in Positive Peace and those that deteriorated is smaller but still positive.

FIGURE 3.6

Changes in business gross value added by Positive Peace outcome, 2009–2022

Industry and agriculture were the sectors most responsive to improvements in Positive Peace. Their value added in countries improving in Positive Peace grew almost twice as fast as in countries deteriorating in Positive Peace.



Source: WORLD BANK, IEP

Trade and investment

Countries that consistently improve in Positive Peace are more attractive to foreign direct investment (FDI) because of:

- greater economic returns;
- improved governmental transparency and efficiency;
- enhanced rule of law, protection of private property and enforcement of contracts; and
- cheaper and less burdensome dispute, compensation and remediation procedures.

From 2009 to 2022, FDI inflows for countries improving in Positive Peace rose at an annual rate of 2.2 per cent, contrasting with a decline of more than 0.5 per cent for countries in which Positive Peace decreased (Figure 3.7). Similarly, trade growth, both imports and exports, is larger among countries with improved performance in the PPI (Figure 3.7). Exports of goods and services, on average, increased by over three per cent annually in countries that improved in Positive Peace, compared


to 1.5 per cent in countries that deteriorated. The difference in imports is also substantial. The average annual increase in imports of goods and services in countries that improved in Positive Peace was almost one per cent higher than in countries that deteriorated in Positive Peace over the 2009-2022 period.

As discussed above, countries that progress in Positive Peace have more robust internal activity, which boosts demand for foreign goods and services. Accordingly, imports among Positive Peace improvers grew almost one percentage point faster than in other countries over the past decade. Positive Peace also benefits the export sector, as firms are more agile, less weighed-down by inefficient regulation, and are not held back by socio-political disruptions. Trade and openness to foreign investment are therefore two critical channels through which societal resilience generates strong economic performance.

FIGURE 3.7

Changes in FDI and trade by Positive Peace outcome, 2009–2022

Countries with improved Positive Peace far outpaced their deteriorating peers in terms of growth in trade and FDI inflow.



Source: WORLD BANK, IEP

POSITIVE PEACE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESILIENCE

Positive Peace provides a theory of change and describes the necessary background conditions that lead to improvements in environmental, social, and governance (ESG) measures. Most analysts gauge the environmental component of ESG through the impact of environmental conditions on human activity and living standards. For example, instead of assessing a country only by the amount of carbon dioxide emitted or the number of animal species threatened, analysts use indicators such as the proportion of the population with access to clean water or the level of outdoor air pollution affecting citizens.


The impact of environmental conditions on living standards is influenced by the *Attitudes, Institutions and Structures* of Positive Peace. For example, urban air quality is affected by economic activity, but also by society's ability to design and enforce pollution control measures. Just as all environmental, social and governance indicators are shown to be interdependent in most financial analyses, they are in the same way conceptually linked to Positive Peace.

Positive Peace is indeed a reliable predictor of favourable outcomes in social infrastructure factors commonly seen as representing environmental performance. The correlation coefficient between the Yale Environmental Performance Index and the PPI is -0.79 (Figure 3.8). Higher levels of Positive Peace correspond to higher environmental performance scores, and vice versa.

FIGURE 3.8

Positive Peace and environmental performance, 2022

Countries with better environmental performance scores tend to record stronger Positive Peace outcomes.



Source: Yale Environmental Performance Index, IEP


The Ecological Threat Report (ETR), developed by IEP, is a comprehensive, data-driven analysis of threats relating to food insecurity, water risk, demographic pressures, and natural hazards. All scores for each of these threats are banded on a scale of 1-5, from very low risk to extremely high risk. As shown

in Figure 3.9, countries with high resilience to ecological threats – that is, low-risk countries – tend to record more favourable Positive Peace outcomes. There is a strong correlation ($r=0.83$) between a country's PPI score and its ETR score.

FIGURE 3.9

Positive Peace and ecological threat score, 2022

Countries that score well in Ecological Threat Report tend to record more better Positive Peace outcomes.



Source: IEP

POSITIVE PEACE AND SOCIETAL WELLBEING

Countries with higher levels of societal resilience are also those with greater degrees of societal wellbeing. A resilient society can shield its population from social, economic, public health and environmental shocks. It is also more effective in implementing post-shock recoveries. This means that citizens are not overly weighed down by concerns about survival, unemployment, excessive poverty, or public health hazards. These residents have a wider choice of socio-economic activities through which to seek personal fulfilment. Positive Peace is highly correlated with measures of life satisfaction, happiness, human development, gender parity in education and employment, and public health.


Food security and human development

Positive Peace is a robust predictor of the level of human development within a society. Higher levels of Positive Peace are associated with higher average scores in the Human Development Index (Figure 3.10). This connection is unsurprising, given that Positive Peace encompasses a holistic approach to societal

wellbeing. When a society actively fosters Positive Peace, it encourages the flourishing of its citizens, fostering an environment conducive to education, economic prosperity, and health. Positive Peace acts as a catalyst for societal wellbeing and progress, emphasising the interdependence of peace and social development.


Countries that prioritise Positive Peace not only experience higher levels of human development but also excel in providing comprehensive safety and security to their citizens, including in relation to food security. As illustrated in Figure 3.11, higher Positive Peace is associated with higher levels of food security, underscoring how societies characterised by social harmony and equitable resource distribution are better equipped to ensure access to sufficient and nutritious food.

FIGURE 3.10
Human Development and Positive Peace, 2022
 Higher Positive Peace is associated with higher levels of human development, which captures education, life expectancy and economic development.



Source: IEP; UNDP

FIGURE 3.11
Food Security and Positive Peace, 2022
 Higher Positive Peace countries on average enjoy higher levels of food security.




Source: IEP; EIU

Life satisfaction and happiness

Measures of life satisfaction also show better outcomes among high Positive Peace countries. Among OECD countries, satisfaction with life correlates with the PPI, with a coefficient of - 0.81 (Figure 3.12). Residents in OECD countries reported a level of satisfaction with life that is broadly proportional with these countries' levels of Positive Peace. On one end, Japan, South Korea, and Portugal appear to be the exceptions, having comparatively low levels of life satisfaction for their high levels of societal resilience (Box 3.1). On the other end, people in Mexico and Brazil display a level of fulfilment and contentment that is disproportional to the country's standing in the PPI (Box 3.2).

FIGURE 3.12
OECD life satisfaction and Positive Peace, 2022
 Countries with higher levels of reported life satisfaction tend to have higher levels of Positive Peace.



Source: IEP, Sustainable Governance Indicators

BOX 3.1

Cultural influences on attitudes in Japan

For cultural and historical reasons, the Japanese tend to report lower levels of satisfaction with life than people in countries with comparable levels of development. As shown in Figure 3.12, Japan has a PPI score of 1.78 in 2022, broadly aligned with Austria, France, Belgium and Germany. But its citizens report relatively low levels of satisfaction with life.


Loneliness and isolation are widespread in Japan, especially among men. Japanese culture imposes heavy work and schooling burden on citizens, to the point that death by exhaustion or suicide, linked to overwork, has its own cultural designation: *karoshi*. There were 15.4 suicides per 100,000 people in Japan in 2022 according to OECD Data.¹ This is a high rate in comparison to other similarly developed countries, although it is still lower than South Korea's 24.1 suicides per 100,000 people.

There is also a relatively common practice whereby some people in Japan withdraw from society and do not leave their homes, sometimes for many years. This practice is known as *hikikomori*, and a government survey estimated a total of 542,000 people – or 1.6 per cent of the population – were living in these conditions. *Hikikomori* is attributed to the high societal expectations for individuals to excel at work and school.

The OECD results are consistent with Gallup's satisfaction with living standard survey results. Respondents in countries displaying greater levels of societal resilience expressed higher levels of satisfaction with their standard of living than those countries with lower societal resilience (Figure 3.13).

FIGURE 3.13
Satisfaction with standard of living and Positive Peace, 2022

Countries with higher levels of Positive Peace report greater satisfaction with living standards.



Source: IEP, Gallup

BOX 3.2

Cultural influences on attitudes in Mexico

Mexico presents a mirror-image to that of Japan. The country's PPI score in 2022 was 3.26, among the lowest levels of societal resilience in the OECD. Yet, Mexicans reported a degree of life satisfaction close to the middle of the OECD range.

A survey by the Pew Research Center found Mexicans to be the happiest people on the globe among 43 countries assessed in 2014.² Seventy-nine per cent of Mexicans reported feeling satisfied with life, the highest proportion in the survey. The Economist stated this result showed a "fraying link between happiness and income." The same report showed that advanced countries like Germany, France, Japan, and the US had median life satisfaction levels around 53 per cent.

Some features of the Mexican culture may help to explain the comparatively higher level of contentment among the country's population. Firstly, Mexicans tend to rank religious beliefs highly among their personal and societal values. Religious people tend to enjoy a greater level of fulfilment and contentment – or resignation when facing difficulties – than non-religious people. Secondly, Mexicans also highly value family interactions, including among extended family. Interactions with extended family members creates a strong support network upon which individuals can rely in times of difficulty. The effects of lack of trust in governments and official support institutions may therefore be partly compensated for by access to tightly knit personal support networks.

According to the World Happiness Report, people in high Positive Peace countries also report higher levels of happiness.³ The relationship between happiness and Positive Peace exhibits greater strength than the relationship with life satisfaction, particularly across societies characterised by high levels of Positive Peace, as shown in Figure 3.14.

FIGURE 3.14
Happiness and Positive Peace, 2022

Countries with higher levels of Positive Peace report higher levels of happiness.



Source: World Happiness Report, IEP

Gender gap

Positive Peace is a strong predictor of the size of the gender gap. Empirical evidence suggest that peace can contribute positively to narrowing these gaps. Education plays a pivotal role in reducing gender disparities in various aspects of life. Societies enjoying high levels of Positive Peace are more likely to invest in education, including girls' education.

High Positive Peace countries tend to have more stable economies, providing increased economic opportunities for women. Women are more likely to participate in the workforce, access formal employment, and pursue entrepreneurship when there is economic stability and security.

Furthermore, Positive Peace fosters an environment conducive to legal and political empowerment. Women have greater opportunities to participate in political processes and engage in legal and policy advocacy. This can lead to legal reforms that promote gender equality, such as changes in laws related to marriage, inheritance, and property rights.⁴


Positive Peace seems to serve as a reliable predictor of relative success in addressing the gender gap in employment and workforce participation. As Figure 3.15 and Figure 3.16 illustrate, countries that improved in Positive Peace experience less gender disparity in youth unemployment and in labour force participation.

The gender gap in youth unemployment is, on average, lower in societies that made improvements in Positive Peace in the 2009-2022 period. This trend is also observed in labour force participation, though the differential between Positive Peace improvers and deteriorators is not as large. Historically, both young men and older men have generally had higher rates of workforce participation and employment.

FIGURE 3.15

Gender gap in youth unemployment and Positive Peace, 2022

Gender disparities in youth unemployment tend to be lower in countries with improved Positive Peace.



Source: ILO, IEP

FIGURE 3.16

Gender gap in labour force participation and Positive Peace, 2022

The gender gap in labour force participation is smaller on average in countries where Positive Peace is improving.



Source: IEP; ILO

Health outcomes

Positive Peace can have profound implications for a wide range of health outcomes, such as mortality, malnourishment, and inequality in life expectancy. Individuals in high Positive Peace countries are supported to live longer, healthier lives through better social and health services, norms and institutions that foster safety and subjective feelings of security, less precarious and stressful financial conditions, and reliable access to adequate amounts of nutritious food. Consequently, mortality rates from both violent and non-violent causes tend to be lower in such societies.


Countries with improved Positive Peace enjoy a higher rate of growth in various economic sectors, including agriculture, ensuring higher levels of food security. Increased food security, in turn, directly and indirectly mitigates the risk of malnutrition and mortality.

Furthermore, Positive Peace contributes to a more equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, thereby reducing inequality in life expectancy. In peaceful societies, there is often more equitable access to public services such as healthcare services, resulting in diminished disparities in health outcomes across different socio-economic groups. Moreover, the social cohesion and trust prevalent in societies with high Positive Peace promote fairness in resource allocation, helping to narrow the gap in life expectancy between the rich and poor. As such, higher Positive Peace is strongly linked to lower infant and adult mortality (Figure 3.17 and Figure 3.18), malnourishment (Figure 3.19), and inequality in life expectancy rates (Figure 3.20). Efforts to promote Positive Peace can have far-reaching positive effects on public health and the overall wellbeing of a society.

FIGURE 3.17

Infant mortality and Positive Peace, 2022

Lower levels of Positive Peace are strongly associated with high infant mortality rates.




Source: IEP, WHO

FIGURE 3.18

Adult mortality and Positive Peace, 2022

Countries with higher levels of Positive Peace enjoy lower levels of adult mortality.



Source: IEP, WHO

FIGURE 3.19

Malnourishment and Positive Peace, 2022

Malnourishment is strongly associated with lack of Positive Peace.




Source: IEP, WHO

FIGURE 3.20

Inequality in life expectancy and Positive Peace, 2022

Countries with higher levels of Positive Peace are more equal across socio-economic groups in terms of life expectancy.



Source: IEP, UNDP

4 | Positive Peace and Future Peace Trajectory

Key Findings

- Ninety per cent of the countries with the largest Positive Peace deficits in 2009 had substantial deteriorations in peace in the years since.
- On average, Positive Peace deficit countries that recorded increases in violence recorded a 11 per cent deterioration in their GPI internal peace scores from 2009 to 2023. This is compared to a four per cent deterioration for the median country in the GPI.
- Countries that had a Positive Peace surplus in 2009 on average improved their GPI internal peace scores by 5.5 per cent, compared to an average global deterioration of 4.5 per cent.
- A dynamical systems model that traces a country's historical trends along the dimensions of GPI internal peace and Positive Peace can predict its future peace trajectory with reasonable accuracy.
- There are two states – known as attractor planes – into which countries tend to gravitate with regard to peace. 'Sustainable Peace' is the plane characterised by very high levels of both negative and Positive Peace, while the 'Conflict Trap' is the plane of very low levels of negative and Positive Peace.
- In 2009, Georgia and Venezuela had comparable levels of internal peace and Positive Peace, though Georgia had a slight Positive Peace surplus while Venezuela had a slight deficit. As predicted by the model, their trajectories have taken opposite courses in the years since, with Georgia recording substantial improvements in peacefulness and Venezuela recording major deteriorations.
- The dynamical system model was able to predict, five years in advance, substantial deteriorations in internal peace in Gabon, Burkina Faso, and Niger – countries where a recent string of coups have occurred.

POSITIVE PEACE DEFICITS AS A PREDICTOR OF VIOLENCE

Comparing changes in the PPI with the GPI over time highlights that improvements in Positive Peace generally precede improvements on the GPI and vice versa.

Countries that have a higher rank on the GPI than in Positive Peace, as measured in the PPI, are said to have a 'Positive Peace deficit'. This is where a country records a higher level of peacefulness than can be sustained by its level of socio-economic development. Most countries found to be in deficit subsequently record increasing levels of violence. Similarly, if a country has a higher Positive Peace score than its GPI rank then it is considered to have a 'Positive Peace surplus' and is more likely to improve its ranking on the GPI.

For the period from 2009 to 2023 90 per cent of the countries with the largest Positive Peace deficits recorded substantial falls in peace, while 53 per cent of countries with substantial Positive Peace surpluses recorded improvements over the same period. If the Americas were excluded, then the model would have yielded a higher percentage of improvements at 80 per cent. Additionally, of the Positive Peace surplus countries that did improve on the GPI, the average improvement was large. Of those countries the average improvement was 5.5 per cent, compared to an overall deterioration in the GPI internal peace of 4.5 per cent. Given the strong statistical connection between the improvements in the macro-economic environment and peace, these countries would most likely provide superior financial returns for investors.

Positive Peace is an excellent measure of societal resilience and as such is a good indicator of future changes in peace, because when countries have higher peace than their socio-economic indicators suggest, then shocks, whether internal or external, are more likely to have a severe impact on the societal system, resulting in violence or conflict. Similarly, countries with the inverse, Positive Peace surpluses and more likely to improve their peacefulness over time because the societal system has the inbuilt systemic dynamics to reduce violence and conflict within the country. As peace is strongly associated with superior economic performance, these countries are likely to represent good opportunities for future investment.

Figure 4.1 shows that most countries with large deteriorations in the GPI from 2009 to 2023 had Positive Peace deficits. The diagram in the figure plots the changes in the position of countries on both the PPI and GPI from 2009 to 2023. The red arrows represent the changes in countries that deteriorated on the GPI. Nearly all countries that deteriorated on the GPI also deteriorated on the PPI. Countries high in both Positive Peace and the GPI cluster towards the bottom left-hand side of the graphic, while countries that are poor in Positive Peace and on the GPI cluster towards the top right-hand side.

Expanding on Figure 4.1, countries can be grouped into these three categories:

- **Positive Peace deficit:** when countries rank at least 20 places higher on the GPI than the PPI.
- **Positive Peace surplus:** when countries rank at least 20 places lower on the GPI than the PPI.
- **Stable:** countries have a rank difference between the GPI and PPI of less than 20 places.

Countries in Positive Peace deficit are those with a level of socio-economic resilience that is inferior to and incompatible with the country's actual peacefulness. Positive Peace deficit countries are sometimes ruled by strict regimes that suppress individual freedoms and socio-economic development, but which maintain artificially high levels of peace by forcefully imposing social order. This state of peacefulness is fragile because underlying social tensions and grievances may be simply smothered instead of being heard and resolved. Once there is any weakness in the government or security apparatus, the situation can often deteriorate into violence as a result of protests, civil unrest or inter-group tensions eventually flaring up.


One illustration of this process is Libya, which in 2009 held a PPI rank of 115, or 57 places behind its GPI placing of 58. During the early 2010s, Libya witnessed significant political and social changes. The country experienced the Libyan Revolution of 2011 as part of the broader Arab Spring movement. This period was marked by country-wide protests, violent unrest, and the eventual fall of the Libyan government. These events led to the rise of various groups within the country, including the National Transitional Council and anti-Gaddafi forces, as they competed for control amidst the ongoing turmoil. The aftermath of these events had a lasting impact on Libya's political landscape, leading to an extended period of instability and conflict within the country. Since 2014, the Libyan civil war has featured competing factions, international interference, and a divided nation. From 2009 to 2023, Libya's GPI internal peace score deteriorated by 46 per cent, and its GPI ranking fell by 53 places.

In some unusual cases, countries have Positive Peace deficits because their societies are relatively non-violent, but still lack a greater degree of economic and technological development. Countries such as Bhutan, the Gambia and Bangladesh are possible examples for this category. Despite substantial Positive Peace deficits in 2009, Bhutan's internal peace scores improved noticeably over the 2009-2023 period and Bangladesh's and the Gambia's remained almost unchanged.

FIGURE 4.1

Largest deteriorations in the Global Peace Index, 2009–2023

The higher the GPI rank is in relation to Positive Peace, the more likely a deterioration in peace. A Positive Peace deficit is where the GPI rank is much higher than the PPI rank.



Source: IEP

However, in most cases the peacefulness enjoyed by countries with Positive Peace deficits will deteriorate over time. Like Libya, these countries lack the socio-economic resilience that would allow them to absorb negative shocks without falling back into turmoil and violence. These countries generally lack the social infrastructure – such as representative governments, transparent and accessible legal systems, free press and other factors – that would allow internal groups to resolve their grievances through non-violent means.

Of the 30 countries with highest Positive Peace deficits in 2009, 27 or 90 per cent recorded deteriorations in the GPI internal peace score by 2023. This is shown in Table 4.1. Many of the most extreme examples of countries collapsing into violence

over the 2009-2023 period – countries such as Syria, Libya, Yemen, Timor-Leste, Egypt, Burkina Faso and others – were deficit countries in 2009.

TABLE 4.1

Positive Peace deficits in 2009 and changes in the GPI from 2009 to 2023

Of the 30 countries with highest Positive Peace deficit in 2009, 27 – or 90 per cent – recorded deteriorations in peace in the 2009-2023 period.

Country	PPI Rank 2009	GPI Internal Peace Rank 2009	Positive Peace Deficit 2009	Change in GPI Internal Peace 2009–2023 (%)	Change in GPI Internal Peace 2009–2023
Equatorial Guinea	154	68	86	6.6	Deterioration
Laos	133	48	85	7.5	Deterioration
Angola	146	66	80	6.4	Deterioration
Sierra Leone	127	59	68	1.8	Deterioration
Rwanda	124	62	62	4.4	Deterioration
Burkina Faso	102	44	58	75.5	Deterioration
Gambia	129	72	57	-0.8	Improvement
Libya	115	58	57	53.8	Deterioration
Egypt	116	60	56	25.3	Deterioration
Eritrea	153	100	53	4.5	Deterioration
Timor-Leste	108	55	53	1.9	Deterioration
Indonesia	93	45	48	7.4	Deterioration
Myanmar (Burma)	155	107	48	36.3	Deterioration
Syria	132	84	48	69.4	Deterioration
Vietnam	84	39	45	0.7	Deterioration
Madagascar	122	78	44	0.4	Deterioration
Eswatini	130	86	44	19	Deterioration
Togo	125	81	44	11.9	Deterioration
Bhutan	77	34	43	-11.3	Improvement
Malawi	107	65	42	8	Deterioration
Djibouti	123	82	41	14.4	Deterioration
Azerbaijan	114	74	40	1.9	Deterioration
Haiti	145	108	37	27.1	Deterioration
Zambia	101	67	34	4.2	Deterioration
Bangladesh	135	103	32	-0.9	Improvement
Liberia	119	87	32	2.3	Deterioration
Kuwait	50	19	31	17	Deterioration
Nepal	120	90	30	1.3	Deterioration
Morocco	99	70	29	2.1	Deterioration
Bosnia & Herzegovina	70	42	28	8	Deterioration
Papua New Guinea	117	89	28	10.6	Deterioration

Source: IEP

It is not just the proportion of deteriorations that is higher among deficit countries. The extent of such deteriorations is also materially greater for deficit countries than any other category. Deficit countries that fell into further violence from 2009 to 2023 saw their GPI internal peace scores deteriorate by 11 per cent (Figure 4.1). This compares to a four per cent deterioration for the median country.

Taken together, the proportion of deteriorations among deficit countries and the size of such deteriorations show that the Positive Peace deficit model is a good predictor of future deteriorations in peace.

The Positive Peace deficit model can be seen as one tool, among others, that stakeholders and supranational agencies could use to anticipate and prepare for possible increases in violence in the future. Table 4.2 displays the 30 countries in Positive Peace with the largest deficits in 2023. It is possible that most of these countries will experience higher levels of violence over the next decade or so.

Of particular concern, Eritrea combines a large Positive Peace deficit with a long-deteriorating trend in the PPI since at least 2009. The country saw its PPI overall score deteriorate by two per cent over the 2009-2023 period and recorded deteriorations in five out of the eight Pillars of Positive Peace.

Over the past five years, other countries recorded substantial PPI deteriorations, which reversed previous gains earlier in the 2009-2023 period. This is the case for Equatorial Guinea, Azerbaijan, Qatar, Bangladesh, Turkmenistan, China, Morocco, Vietnam, Laos and Indonesia. These countries are also at higher risks of increases in violence.

Positive and negative peace dynamical system model

These findings indicate that future levels of peace in any country depend on the interplay between the levels of Positive Peace and negative peace. Certain combinations of Positive and negative peace appear to be more stable than others, while some specific configurations have historically been unstable. Countries that rank near the boundaries between stability and instability are susceptible to tipping points where small disturbances can lead to radically different peace trajectories.

The eight Pillars of Peace represent a system of factors that interact to create and sustain peaceful societies. However, the efficacy of these Pillars depends on the context of violence in which they operate. For example, Europe – currently the most peaceful region in the world – has highly evolved and developed effective Positive Peace mechanisms to address grievances. However, this is the result of centuries of development with slippages into violence. Violence and Positive Peace co-evolve and as such operate as a system.

By tracking changes in the GPI and the PPI for all countries over the 2009-2023 period, it is possible to build a dynamical systems model of peace transitions. Figure 4.2 shows the outputs of this model.

TABLE 4.2

Countries with Positive Peace deficits in 2023

Countries in this list are more likely to experience increasing levels of violence over the next decade


Country	PPI Rank 2022	GPI Rank 2022	Positive Peace Deficit 2022
Equatorial Guinea	154	73	81
Angola	138	72	66
Laos	117	57	60
Eritrea	156	101	55
Liberia	133	81	52
Sierra Leone	112	61	51
Madagascar	116	66	50
Cambodia	119	71	48
Guinea-Bissau	143	96	47
Gambia	108	62	46
Rwanda	110	65	45
Bangladesh	125	86	39
Bhutan	61	23	38
Zambia	106	68	38
Azerbaijan	104	67	37
Timor-Leste	92	56	36
Vietnam	77	42	35
Jordan	79	47	32
Congo - Brazzaville	147	116	31
Djibouti	135	104	31
Morocco	95	64	31
Nepal	113	83	30
Malawi	105	77	28
Indonesia	81	54	27
Senegal	80	53	27
Turkmenistan	132	105	27
Qatar	47	21	26
China	67	43	24
Tanzania	100	76	24
Guinea	150	127	23

Source: IEP

FIGURE 4.2

IEP dynamical system of GPI and PPI trajectories

Based on empirical evidence, negative and Positive Peace change more rapidly depending on starting levels in the PPI and GPI.



Source: IEP

The diagram has areas of red and blue. The arrows highlight the likely shifts over time based on the historical performance of the countries from 2009 to 2023. Red areas represent combinations of Positive and negative peace that have been historically unstable, leading to large future deteriorations in the GPI score. In 2009, Syria, Libya, and Egypt were all in this region and have since had large deteriorations in the GPI. Countries in the blue-coloured region on a given year have tended to have subsequent improvements in the GPI. Areas of yellow have shown relatively little movement over the period. The large yellow area in the bottom-left of the figure represents states where the combinations of high Positive Peace and negative peace tend to be more stable. In systems theory there is a concept known as attractor basins. This is where a country arrives at a position from which it is hard to change. Both the combinations of high PPI and GPI scores and low GPI and PPI scores are attractor basins.

This can be seen as a ‘Sustainable Peace’ region, characterised by institutional stability and societal wellbeing. Conversely, the top-right corner represents states with low levels of both negative and Positive Peace. This region can be called the ‘Conflict Trap’.

This graphic is commonly known as a *phase plane* and is a representation of potential transitions between states of a system. There are areas of stability where the system operates with little change over the period. These are represented by the yellow areas with very short arrows, signifying that they are the attractor basins. As countries approach these regions they tend towards periods of stability. Areas of rapid change – represented by long arrows – are referred to as transition regions. Points on the boundary between attractor basins and transition regions are highly sensitive, with even small fluctuations sometimes leading to widely different development paths.

In the phase plane above, the regions labelled Sustainable Peace and Conflict Trap act as attractor basins for countries. Countries can fall into the Conflict Trap region rapidly. The historical data, however, suggests that through strengthening Positive Peace, countries over time tend towards the Sustainable Peace region. In the period of analysis, no country in the Sustainable Peace region has seen a large deterioration in the GPI. There are also large areas, coloured yellow, where change is gradual. These are large areas, reflecting that change of countries in these regions has been small over the period of analysis. If the analysis were repeated for multiple decades or even centuries, the areas with the least change would likely concentrate around the Sustainable Peace and Conflict Trap regions.

By using historical data to build this phase-plane model, IEP’s approach is empirically derived and does not need to make assumptions about how individual components of the system behave.

Standard dynamical systems modelling relies on assumptions on how individual components of the system behave. This approach to modelling is useful in the study of engineering or biological systems, where researchers can isolate individual components and understand how they behave. Unfortunately, this approach is impossible in the study of social systems because individual components cannot be analysed in isolation without arbitrary assumptions on how different components interact with each other.

Tipping points in the positive and negative peace dynamical system model

IEP’s dynamical model highlights the non-linear behaviour of complex systems. Small differences in the initial conditions of two countries can have large impacts on a country’s future pathway towards peace.


Figure 4.3 indicates that countries in the Positive Peace deficit region can work towards sustainable peace by improving Positive Peace. However, they are also at risk of deteriorating into a Conflict Trap. Countries that improve in Positive Peace at different rates in this region may have large divergences from each other. This is highlighted in Figure 4.3, which shows the divergence in the actual historical paths of Egypt and Syria. While both countries were very close in both PPI and GPI in 2009, their trajectories since have been very different. In this comparison, Syria in 2008 could be thought of as on the verge of a *tipping point* towards a Conflict Trap. In 2009, Egypt scored much better than Syria in *Well-Functioning Government, Low Levels of Corruption* and *Sound Business Environment*.

Tipping points can also be beneficial to a country. Figure 4.4 shows how countries can overtake peers in developing in peacefulness and wellbeing. In 2009, Venezuela was more peaceful than Georgia in terms of internal peace. However, Georgia had stronger Positive Peace. The larger reserves of Positive Peace placed Georgia closer to the region of the phase plane map in which improvements in the GPI are generally produced. By 2023, Venezuela had substantially deteriorated in the GPI while Georgia had substantially improved. In the Global Peace Index Report 2023, Georgia was ranked 94th, while Venezuela received a dismal ranking of 140 out of 163 countries.

FIGURE 4.3

Tipping points in Positive Peace deficit region

Tipping points in the negative and Positive Peace system can result in countries that are relatively close to each other on the PPI and GPI experiencing widely diverging trajectories.




Source: IEP

FIGURE 4.4

Tipping points in the Positive Peace surplus region

Despite starting at a lower level of peacefulness in 2009, Georgia had become significantly more peaceful than Venezuela by 2023.



Source: IEP

This also highlights the significance of shocks to a country. A shock can push a country from a current trajectory into another region of the phase plane. If any country experienced a shock that pushed it closer to the Positive Peace deficit region, it could alter its path from one tending toward Sustainable Peace to one tending toward a Conflict Trap.

Systems dynamics model and prediction of most recent coups in Africa


In the last three years, sub-Saharan Africa has witnessed a notable increase in coup attempts. Among numerous efforts, there have been eight that have resulted in the successful seizure of power since 2020.² In 2022 alone, Burkina Faso experienced two coups, while Gabon and Niger have each experienced one in 2023. It is worth noting that, historically, these three countries have exhibited low levels of Positive Peace, although they did not necessarily suffer from high levels of internal violence.

Looking back to 2017, these three countries were situated within or near the Positive Peace deficit area on the phase plane map, an area known for being susceptible to a significant decline in internal peace (Figure 4.5). This estimation, based on data from 2009 to 2017, predicted a deterioration in internal peace for Burkina Faso, Gabon, and Niger in the years to come. The arrows on the map represent the actual decline in internal peace from 2017 to 2023. It is evident that the phase plane mapping of these countries was highly predictive of the real outcomes, though the real deteriorations in internal peace in Burkina Faso and Niger have been much more substantial than in the deterioration that has taken place in Gabon.

FIGURE 4.5

Prediction of 2022–2023 military coups in Africa

Using data from 2009 to 2017, the model accurately predicts a significant deterioration in internal peace within three countries that would later experience military coups in the 2022-2023 period.



Source: IEP

5 | Implementing Positive Peace

IEP's approach to peacebuilding is characterised by its positive, future-oriented process, supported by a comprehensive systems-based framework. The Positive Peace approach, adaptable at both national and local levels, has proven effective across a wide array of communities with diverse ethnic, cultural, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds, highlighting its worldwide applicability. This global relevance and take-up have been facilitated by allowing users to tailor the Positive Peace framework according to their unique contexts and needs.

IEP offers a broad spectrum of training programs that have been rolled out in 150 countries. These programs range from comprehensive in-person and online trainings to short online courses and educational materials, each targeting specific audiences.

A diverse array of organisations collaborate with IEP to fulfill their objectives through IEP's joint training programs. Some examples include integrating peacebuilding into development and humanitarian efforts, enhancing the capacity of policymakers to craft and execute systemic peace and development policies, advancing conflict mitigation and cohesion initiatives, and fortifying peace leadership. The duration of these trainings varies, typically lasting from two days to two weeks. In 2023, face-to-face training sessions took place in over thirty countries, including programs for reintegrating FARC combatants in Colombia, establishing inter-faith peace initiatives in Northern Iraq, and developing global peace leaders through the Rotary Activator Program.

IEP's data-driven approach ensures non-political and culturally sensitive engagement, offering a neutral starting point for devising solutions. Recent instances of its application span a wide array of groups, including:

- police forces,
- local government officials,
- military personnel,
- universities,
- healthcare providers,
- development organisations,
- faith leaders and communities,
- indigenous populations,
- agricultural sectors,
- communities grappling with violence and extreme poverty, and diaspora groups.

OUR APPROACH

The Positive Peace framework is characterised by five key attributes:

- Empirically based
- Adaptable
- Rooted in systems thinking
- Focused on leveraging strengths
- Oriented towards finding solutions

This framework is built on rigorous statistical analysis, which guarantees its objectivity and independence from political biases or personal opinions. Together with the customisable nature of our training, this enables the application of Positive Peace to be flexible, and to meet the needs of a diverse array of stakeholders.

Unlike traditional peacebuilding methods that often emphasise conflict analysis, IEP's Positive Peace approach is forward looking, solutions orientated and advocates for a participant-driven systemic analysis encompassing economic, governance, social, and informational factors. Instead of concentrating solely on a community's challenges, Positive Peace aims to identify and utilise the community's strengths to address weaknesses.

The practice of Positive Peace involves engaging stakeholders in crafting actionable strategies for establishing systemic peace. It recognises the limited value of suggesting actions outside one's control, guiding participants to structure actions in a way that fosters realistic and impactful systemic change.


Development organisations offer an excellent example of the multi-layered utility of the Positive Peace framework. These organisations are adept at designing and implementing humanitarian and development aid programs. By incorporating IEP's Positive Peace framework, such organisations can weave peace solutions into their core objectives, as the framework can orient the activities of the project. For instance, a project aimed at boosting agricultural productivity can use the eight Pillars of Positive Peace to frame the activities of the project. The project thereby incorporates peace and utilises a systemic approach.

As shown in Figure 5.1, the application of the Positive Peace framework helps projects to advance along the conflict sensitivity continuum by bolstering systemic changes toward sustaining peace.

FIGURE 5.1

Positive Peace and the conflict sensitivity continuum

The Positive Peace framework helps projects go beyond the



avoidance of harm to promote systemic change for peace.

POSITIVE PEACE TRAININGS

Positive Peace training programs empower stakeholders with IEP's research, enabling them to devise practical and tangible actions that foster and maintain peaceful and resilient communities. Our curriculum facilitates this by guiding participants in conducting systemic analyses, designing projects and policies, and strengthening leadership skills.

IEP collaborates with organisations, governments, NGOs, and companies globally to offer training that includes one or more of the following themes:

- **Project Design** to design a social impact project or to accelerate progress of an existing project.
- **Policy Design** to increase inclusive cooperation and the implementation of systems-thinking in policy.
- **Shared Language and Dialogue** to increase stakeholder engagement, create a common language around strengths and weaknesses, and a common approach for local development.
- **Leadership Development** using a train-the-trainer approach focused on understanding the Positive Peace framework and improving the ability of participants to instruct others on the model.

IEP's trainings are customisable to fit the local context and language, accommodate different group sizes, or integrate additional content aligned with Positive Peace principles.

Activating through Partnerships

IEP has established partnerships with entities such as multilateral organisations, international and local NGOs, civil society groups, community organisations, universities, and governments. These collaborations enable IEP and its partners to offer tools and insights for transformative action at local, national, and international levels. By engaging with a wide

range of partners IEP continuously improves its offerings and expands its applicability.

IEP's approach to creating impact is outlined in Figure 5.2.

The case studies below offer detailed examples of how the Positive Peace framework has been tailored and implemented, resulting in quantifiable benefits for communities around the globe.

Examples of Positive Peace projects

Positive Peace in the Philippines: Effective systemic transformation

The Paquibato district in Davao City, Philippines, has long been affected by violence due to conflicts with communist insurgents aiming to topple the government. This district, accounting for nearly one-third of Davao City's land area, has a population where many adults report having known nothing but conflict since the 1960s, turmoil escalated with the imposition of martial law in response to insurgent activities.

In 2019, the Davao City mayor, Sara Duterte, formed the Davao City Advisory Committee on Peace and Development to promote peacebuilding in the region. This initiative involved extensive consultations with the 14 local barangays (villages) to understand the depth of the community's struggles with hunger and fear. In response to these findings, the committee initiated an emergency plan to address these pressing issues, which led to the creation of the Peace 911 program, aimed at fostering peace and development in the area.

Implementation

Peace 911 adopted IEP's Positive Peace framework, initially tackling the pressing issue of hunger by delivering basic services directly to local villages. Every two weeks, a caravan delivered services to the 14 barangays, featuring representatives from various city agencies responsible for health, agriculture, legal services, social services, education, cooperatives, civil registry, land transportation, and more. Collaborating with local officials, these agencies played a pivotal role in promoting the Positive Peace Pillar *Equitable Distribution of Resources* within the community.

The initiative also organised container gardening training for women, empowering them to grow organic vegetables for their families and generate additional income by selling surplus produce to neighbours. This effort not only enhanced the region's *High Levels of Human Capital* and *Sound Business Environment* Pillars of Positive Peace but also spurred economic development and bolstered human capital.

A key feature of the Peace 911 project was the establishment of a telephone hotline, enabling residents to seek assistance or

FIGURE 5.2

IEP's approach to creating impact

IEP transforms data into action through the implementation of Positive Peace together with partners.

Creating agents of change

Through our research, communications and training, the following stakeholders are enabled to use IEP's research to design systemic peace at the international, national and local-level:

- Multilateral organisations and corporations
- International humanitarian, development and non-governmental organisations
- Governments, policymakers, security forces, private-sector
- Local government leaders, police forces, community leaders, faith leaders, youth, civil society, local business leaders.
- Individuals

Driving an evolution in peace

The creation of Positive Peace politics, projects, dialogues and leadership, results in immediate and long-term benefits.

IMMEDIATE

- A positive shift in the way individuals and organisations think about peace
- Increased levels of social cohesion, cooperation and productivity
- Understanding of the systemic nature of how societies operate
- Understanding how to create higher levels of peace, development and resilience

LONG-TERM

- Human potential flourishes
- Societies improve their levels of resilience to internal and external shocks
- Reductions in grievances and violent conflicts
- The economy thrives
- Better development outcomes

information, thus promoting the *Free Flow of Information*. Interestingly, this simple communication tool also provided a safe channel for 92 New People's Army (NPA) insurgents to disengage from violence and surrender to the authorities, highlighting an unexpected yet impactful benefit of the project.

Results

Within just nine months of implementing the Peace 911 project, the military announced that Paquibato was free from violent insurgent activities. In early 2019, Davao City Mayor Sara Duterte declared the emergency in Paquibato district over, bringing peace to an area that had been afflicted by violent conflict for over four decades. The eight Pillars of Positive Peace were translated into Cebuano/Bisaya, the local language, serving as the conceptual foundation for subsequent local projects. Now, every barangay hall prominently displays the eight Pillars of Peace. Mayor Duterte also revealed plans to extend Peace 911 to an additional 18 barangays across five districts of the city, increasing the total to 32 barangays.

Furthermore, IEP has entered a multi-year agreement with the Department of Interior and Local Government's Local Government Academy to implement Positive Peace as a framework for local government policy across the country.

Positive Peace in Uganda: Sustainable impacts

In 2016, IEP collaborated with the International Peace and Security Institute and various Rotary clubs to provide Positive Peace training to Rotaractors. Among the participants was Jude Kakuba, a Rotarian from Uganda, who had dedicated two years to enhancing literacy levels at a rural school two hours drive from the capital of Kampala. At that point, only 30 per cent of the students were obtaining acceptable grades.

By applying the Pillars of Positive Peace, Mr. Kakuba managed to revamp his Kakuba Literacy Project, significantly boosting its effectiveness and progress.

Implementation

The project aimed to enhance student conditions, increase enrolment rates, and boost academic performance. Under Mr. Kakuba's leadership, the school community evaluated each of the Pillars, pinpointing their strengths and challenges in every area. Based on this assessment, projects were crafted to tackle these challenges and amplify existing strengths.

The initiatives resulting from this process included:

- **Well-Functioning Government:** Engaging local community leaders in planning and execution fostered full participation from community members. A committee comprising local stakeholders was established to oversee the project.
- **Equitable Distribution of Resources:** School supplies were distributed fairly, without regard to a student's financial capacity or academic performance.
- **Good Relations with Neighbours:** To address community tensions and student hunger, the school planted fruit trees and vegetables, and introduced a porridge lunch for students. This not only improved academic performance by enhancing nutrition and concentration but also increased attendance as parents knew their children would receive a meal.
- **High Levels of Human Capital:** Challenges like lack of school materials and illness were addressed by supplying educational materials and medical services, thereby attracting more students, fostering creativity, and ensuring community health. This boosted student productivity and punctuality.
- **Acceptance of the Rights of Others:** To combat the monthly attendance drop among girls, sanitary pads were provided regularly, alongside hygiene training, which helped increase female student enrolment.
- **Low Levels of Corruption:** A transparency committee was created to oversee funds and donations, ensuring accountability. Donated items were clearly marked as gifts to the community, promoting ownership and transparency, and ensuring access to donated items at no cost.
- **Sound Business Environment:** The construction of new classrooms utilised local materials and labour, benefiting local household incomes.
- **Free Flow of Information:** Collaboration with a local radio station, broadcasting in the local language, enhanced project visibility and community updates. This facilitated community engagement in the project and ensured effective monitoring and supervision of activities.

Results

In the first two years of the program, the school saw significant improvements in literacy, attendance, and overall academic performance, as shown in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1

Changes in Local School Enrolment following the Kakuba Literacy Project

Enrolment	Before Implementation of Project	After Implementation of Project	Increase (%)
Boys	126	356	182.5
Girls	201	449	123.4
Total	327	805	146.2

Five years into the project, there was consistent year-on-year improvement in students' academic performance, as shown in Table 5.2.

TABLE 5.2

Kakuba Literacy project student outcomes, 2016–2020

Year	% students receiving a passing score in school
2016	30%
2017	45%
2018	62%
2019	76%
2020	88%

Additionally, the broader community has maintained the use of the Positive Peace framework in the planning and development of new projects.

Positive Peace in Jalisco State, Mexico: Nudging the System

The state of Jalisco, Mexico, has seen fluctuating levels of peace and security over the past decade, with a notable peak in violence in 2018. Since then, according to the 2023 Mexico Peace Index, Jalisco's peacefulness has shown year-on-year improvement. Despite this progress, the state continues to face significant challenges with disappearances, homicides, and violent crimes. Positive Peace principles have been applied in various peace initiatives in the state since 2019.

Implementation

In collaboration with the Secretary of Planning and Citizen Participation (SPPC), the aim has been to restore trust between the public and government institutions. IEP and the SPPC have conducted over 300 Positive Peace training sessions, reaching almost a thousand participants, including public officials, academics, members of civil society, students, and local leaders.

Through comprehensive policy consultations across the state, the SPPC has developed policies and programs grounded in the eight Pillars of Positive Peace. The framework has guided stakeholder discussions, leading to the implementation of the following policies:

- **Free Flow of Information:** Enhancing transparency and public access to information has been a key focus for the administration. Initiatives have been launched, including mobile apps offering open data, participatory budgeting processes, and widespread dissemination of information about government operations.
- **Good Relations with Neighbours:** The SPCP has established neighbourhood networks throughout the state to foster community cohesion and encourage stronger collaborative ties among community members.
- **Acceptance of the Rights of Others:** Jalisco has distinguished itself as the first Mexican state to enact a Culture of Peace Law (*Ley de Cultura de Paz*). This legislation spearheads efforts to combat discrimination and elevate the visibility of vulnerable populations such as youth, individuals with disabilities, indigenous communities, migrants, and victims of violence.

- **Equitable Distribution of Resources:** The state has prioritised the equitable distribution and access to basic services, emphasising holistic well-being. This includes transitioning from traditional public security policing to a more inclusive model of citizen security.

Results

Despite facing significant security and justice challenges, Jalisco has seen notable progress and promising opportunities for cross-sector collaboration.

Positive Peace trainings have played a key role in fostering inclusive peace processes across all societal levels. As we continue to evaluate the outcomes in 2024, the influence of Positive Peace on the system is evident. Advancements in Jalisco include:

- The introduction of a new citizen security model advocating for shared responsibility and collaborative peacebuilding in the state;
- The establishment of the Network of Peacebuilding Police;
- The enactment of Mexico's first State Law on Culture of Peace by the Local Congress of Jalisco in April 2021;
- The subsequent development and rollout of the State Program for a Culture of Peace;
- The creation of 50 public mediation centres by the Alternative Justice of the State of Jalisco, providing citizens a platform to resolve various disputes without intermediaries and free of charge.

These developments demonstrate how stakeholders across Jalisco have leveraged the Positive Peace framework to initiate systemic changes and achieve sustainable outcomes.

Further illustrating the framework's versatility, recent Positive Peace training initiatives have spanned diverse contexts, including cross-border health system resilience in Israel and Palestine, peacebuilding efforts by police in Uganda, and youth social cohesion projects in Australia.

Education Programs

At the core of IEP's mission is a strong dedication to fostering peace through education and the spread of knowledge. IEP presents unique educational offerings: the free online Positive Peace Academy, designed to provide learners with comprehensive understanding of the Positive Peace framework and its practical applications; the IEP Ambassador Program, a selective six-week online course aimed at empowering individuals to become certified leaders in peace initiatives; and collaborations with academic institutions to co-create innovative courses and certifications in peace studies.

IEP Peace Academies

The IEP Positive Peace Academy offers free online peace education accessible to the general public, professionals in the field, and those looking to deepen their knowledge of IEP's offerings. This course equips participants with the tools to foster peace at both the grassroots and institutional levels.

Through five modules, learners explore the history of peace

studies and the pivotal role of Positive Peace in maintaining societal harmony. The Academy also provides in-depth insights into some of IEP's key publications, including the Global Peace Index, the Positive Peace Report, the Ecological Threat Register, the Global Terrorism Index, and research on COVID-19 and peace.

As of 2024, IEP has educated nearly 90,000 individuals globally through the Peace Academy.

IEP Ambassador Program

Launched in 2016, the IEP Ambassador Program has successfully trained over 4,500 individuals from more than 150 countries, providing them with the tools and understanding needed to implement and advocate for Positive Peace using IEP's research, data, and methodologies. Participants of this program join a global network of leaders committed to revolutionising how peace is perceived and achieved worldwide.

The program's growing popularity is evident, with a 250% increase in applications from 2023 to 2024.

Participants, supported by IEP's team and the worldwide community of IEP Ambassadors, carry out Positive Peace projects, workshops, and presentations across the globe. Notable initiatives include empowering refugees in Uganda, leveraging AI for peacebuilding in Nigeria, and working on the caste systems in Nepal, showcasing the program's impact and its potential for future contributions to global peace.

This self-guided program comprises three online modules, completed over six weeks with expert instruction. It appeals to a wide audience, including policymakers, business leaders, civil society representatives, academics, and practitioners, enabling individuals to integrate Positive Peace into their professional activities and promote peace on both local and international stages.

The objectives of the program are:

1. **Global Peace Network Development:** To develop a worldwide network of leaders and peacebuilders equipped to tackle the complex challenges of peace with expertise.
2. **Data-Driven Empowerment:** To equip participants with a deep understanding of IEP's research, enabling them to incorporate data-driven insights into effective peacebuilding efforts.
3. **Leadership Skills:** To improve participants' ability to analyse and disseminate peace research findings, engaging both in local contexts and through IEP's global networking platforms.
4. **Societal Strengths in Peacebuilding:** To introduce a method that capitalises on societal strengths for peacebuilding, advocating for a significant shift away from traditional conflict-centric approaches towards lasting peace.

IEP's data from 2022-2023 highlights the program's broad impact, showing that the influence of a single graduate impacts an average of 109 people during the program, not accounting for their further contributions after completing the program.

Customised Programs

The flexibility of the online IEP Ambassador Program and IEP Peace Academy allows the Institute to customise its offerings to meet the unique needs and contexts of diverse communities, both through online platforms and in-person interactions.

Academies

IEP, in collaboration with strategic partner Rotary International, has developed the specialised Rotary Positive Peace Academy. This program equips Rotary members with strategies and tools to foster and maintain peace at the community level. The Rotary Positive Peace Academy condenses IEP's research into accessible lessons, rooted in the Institute's evidence-based approach to peace and conflict studies. Participants expand their understanding and discover practical ways to apply a Positive Peace perspective to Rotary's Peace and Conflict Resolution efforts.

In a similar vein, the partnership with Religions for Peace led to the creation of the Religions and Peace Academy. This academy emphasises a holistic view of peace, the value of interfaith collaboration as a peacebuilding tool, and more.

Customised Ambassador Program in Ethiopia

The Ethiopian IEP Ambassador Program was a uniquely tailored initiative, developed in partnership with the Rotary Club of Addis Ababa West and the Ethiopian Reconciliation Commission. Launched in February 2021, in response to the conflict in Ethiopia's Tigray region that began in November 2020, the program aimed to address the ensuing humanitarian crisis and mass displacement. Drawing a wide range of participants, including youth, local Rotarians, business leaders, artists, entrepreneurs, and members of the Ethiopian Reconciliation Commission, the program showcased the potential for tailored peacebuilding education in crisis situations. Over a thousand people were trained during the program.

Facilitation

IEP conducted this program online, focusing on introducing the concepts of Positive Peace and the practical aspects of implementing the Positive Peace framework. The training, spread across three webinars, offered comprehensive insights into IEP's research and methodologies, alongside strategies for effectively sharing peace research findings. Participants were supported with a detailed Positive Peace resource pack and guidance on project development.

Outputs

The first online workshop drew more than 350 participants from Ethiopia. To conclude the program, participants applied what they had learned by launching projects that incorporated Positive Peace principles within their communities. The program saw the submission of over 130 peace projects and presentations by its participants.

Project examples include the establishment of a 'Positive Peace Association,' which provides a network for Ethiopian Ambassadors to collaborate and advance their Positive Peace initiatives. Membership to the Association requires presenting a

Certificate of Completion from the IEP Ambassador Program, resulting in a strong network of people with a central framework for which to design and carry-out peacebuilding initiatives.

Other efforts included translating Positive Peace materials into local Ethiopian languages to improve reach, especially in rural areas. One project was led by a teacher who adopted the eight Pillars to enhance his school's community spirit. For example, under the *Well-Functioning Government* Pillar, the school issued ID cards to students to better track attendance for academic and extracurricular activities, helping to support students who were frequently absent. Additionally, inspired by the *High Levels of Human Capital* Pillar, a 'knowledge sharing club' was created to promote peer learning, encouraging students to share ideas and questions with each other and their teachers.

Academic Programs

Positive Peace, alongside the extensive peace research conducted by IEP, has become a fundamental part of university curricula around the world, enhanced by a range of educational initiatives like workshops, webinars, and seminars available to academic institutions globally.

IEP works closely with these institutions, aiming to provide students with the capabilities to explore and establish structural, systemic peace. Incorporated into thousands of university courses worldwide, IEP collaborates with educational bodies to offer a variety of learning opportunities, such as micro-credential courses, professional development programs, and specialised Bachelor's and Master's degree curricula.

A prime example of such collaboration is with Rotary International, where IEP plays a significant role in the Rotary Peace Centres located in seven universities across the globe. Specifically, the Rotary Peace Center at Makerere University in Uganda runs a professional development certificate program that addresses regional peace, incorporating the Positive Peace framework. This program is enhanced by a five-day workshop led by IEP's Nairobi office and supported by online modules from IEP's offices in Sydney and Brussels.

IEP's partnerships extend to prestigious institutions including Stanford University, Oxford University, Harvard University, Northeastern University, the University of Hiroshima, Deakin University, Blanquerna University, and more. These collaborations foster educational experiences that merge evidence-based strategies with practical applications.

ROTARY-IEP POSITIVE PEACE ACTIVATOR PROGRAM

The Rotary-IEP Positive Peace Activator Program stands as a cornerstone educational and training effort within the partnership. This program empowers participants with knowledge and resources, enabling them to actively champion peace and collaborate within a global network of like-minded peacebuilders.

Launched in January 2020 and set to continue until 2025, this selective program aims to educate active Rotarians, Rotaractors, Rotary Peace Fellows, and other Rotary affiliates in specific regions on how they can harness the IEP Positive Peace framework to build peace through Rotary. After completing 20-hour training course, Activators embark on a two-year commitment to share their knowledge and skills. Thus far, Activators in their two-year commitment phase have conducted over 900 Positive Peace activities across the globe.

To date, the program has trained over 200 Activators across North America, Latin America, Europe, Asia, and Africa, with plans to expand into the Middle East, North Africa, and Oceania for future cohorts.

IEP's Global Impact

IEP is at the forefront of redefining the landscape of global peace efforts through the Positive Peace framework, trainings, and strategic partnerships. By leveraging a data-backed approach, IEP is pioneering a paradigm in peace, development and resilience-building that is being recognised and applied globally. This approach is proving effective across various political, cultural, and social settings, highlighting its versatility and relevance in tackling today's complex challenges. The growing adoption of this framework reflects a practical and adaptable strategy for addressing the ever-evolving challenges of our world.

6 | The Halo framework: A systems-based approach to analysing societies

One of the emerging areas of research in IEP is the application of systems thinking to help explain the way societies' function. Halo is the term used to describe this body of work.

As with other social phenomena, peace arises out of the dynamic interaction of a wide array of societal forces and patterns of collective behaviour. Both measuring and building peace necessitate an approach that explains the complex interplay of these social dynamics. Because of this, IEP is increasingly engaged in advancing its analytic work in the domain of systems thinking, specifically through the *Halo* framework.

Positive Peace and Halo are complementary but have different uses for understanding and applying systems thinking to societal challenges. Positive Peace provides a measurement platform and actionable approach that can be used by any level of society to understand and alter societal systems, whereas Halo provides the theoretical understanding of how societal systems operate and how to map and model system dynamics over time and under different conditions. For a more complete understanding of the relationship of Positive Peace and Halo, refer to IEP's *Halo and Systems Thinking* report.

What is Systems Thinking?

Systems thinking represents a potent framework for analysing complex phenomena, offering a means to understand the networks of relationships within systems. Derived from the study of biological, ecological, and mechanical systems, the approach has been employed in fields ranging from business management to public health, from manufacturing logistics to urban planning, though for social systems, systems thinking is still in its early stages of development.

The strength of systems thinking lies in its capacity to reveal patterns, interdependencies, and feedback loops, and thereby model outcomes based on systemic interactions. It offers a particularly useful approach for understanding how changes in one part of a system can have flow-on effects throughout the system, allowing for better decision-making and policymaking.

This is facilitated by understanding that such systems have momentum and direction. They can be described as moving in virtuous or vicious cycles, with stimuli and shocks having cascading effects and social feedback loops amplifying the

drivers of either progression or deterioration. By recognising the dynamics that lock systems into such cycles, the cycles can be redirected, either through small-scale nudges or larger-scale reforms, to produce better social outcomes.

Systems thinking is central to IEP's conception of Halo and Positive Peace. It represents a holistic approach to understanding and solving complex problems by assessing them in terms of interconnected wholes, rather than breaking them down into isolated components. It is a way of analysing the world which entails focusing on the connections between the relationships and flows of the components of the system to understand the dynamics of the whole.

What is Halo?

Recognising the great promise of systems thinking, IEP is dedicated to advancing this approach in the analysis of societal systems. IEP employs the term Halo in reference to its efforts to apply systems thinking across a wide range of projects and analyses. The term Halo is used to capture the ways in which a systems-based approach *encircles and illuminates* IEP's body of work on the functioning of societies, particularly in relation to the analysis of social progress, including peacefulness, development, and societal resilience. Central to the Halo approach is the mapping of human systems, with the view of discovering their dynamic evolution and developing a practical approach to defining change.

Much in the same way that the operations of the human body cannot be perceived directly, but rather through measurements such as heart rate, temperature, and blood pressure, the operations of societies also cannot be perceived directly. Therefore, the word Halo was selected to indicate that the data and values that emanate from a societal system sheds light on its underlying functioning.

To date there are few holistic frameworks that explain how societal systems operate, and fewer that can be implemented. Halo helps fill this gap, providing a unique and practical theory of social change. With Halo, IEP draws on its robust experience in employing data to measure multifaceted social dynamics to bolster the evidence base for social systems analysis.

The Halo Process

In addition to this broad conception of Halo, IEP has also developed the *Halo process* as a methodology to map and assess the functioning of specific systems within societies. Drawing on the direct knowledge of stakeholders from within these systems as well as available quantitative data on the systems, the Halo process combines workshoping and computer-based modelling to evaluate system dynamics, with the view of testing assumptions, potential interventions, and resilience to changes.

The Halo process has been designed to be both practicable and comprehensive, allowing for the modelling and analysis of the behaviours and processes of specific components and subsystems while ultimately focusing on the overarching dynamics of the totality of a system. The process takes a building block approach, which enables users to mix and match different steps depending on their preferences, the type of analysis being undertaken and the level of detail it requires.

One of the challenges with most approaches to analysing systems are that they are resource intensive and present difficulties in rendering actionable insights. Therefore, rather than studying complex systems in their entirety, researchers and stakeholders often seek to assess or address the dynamics of specific components. While breaking down and evaluating systems based on their parts can make analysis more manageable and exact, such an approach can also result in a fragmented perspective. This approach may obscure the true drivers and outcomes as well as unintended flow-on effects of potential interventions. The Halo approach combined with Positive Peace, therefore, aims to produce insights and relevant interventions in view of the entirety of a system.

The process involves mapping and gathering data, through which a system's interactions and flows are captured, simulated, and probed using a combination of stakeholder analysis and systems dynamics software. This process allows for the identification of the factors that create stability or instability within societal systems.

The strength of the Halo process is that it brings together and harmonises five key pathways to achieving a better understanding of social systems and to finding solutions to problems within them:

- 1. Identification:** The process begins by clearly defining the question that the analysis will aim to answer, without which the process can become too wide ranging, leading to over-complication and the inability to produce practical outcomes.
- 2. Deliberation:** Drawing on stakeholders' direct knowledge of a system, the process is grounded in a structured exercise of collective reflection and mapping of the bounds, key components, and connections within the system. This includes the identification of subsystems within it.
- 3. Theory:** Deliberations are guided by the Halo conceptualisation of how societal systems function and operate.

4. Numbers: Before and during the deliberative process, hard data and informed best estimates are generated about the stocks, flows, and conditional relationships within a system.

5. Modelling: Based on the system mapping and figures settled on during theory-guided deliberations, the techniques of system dynamics modelling are employed to test assumptions, refine understanding of the relationships within the system, and simulate the impacts of potential interventions and unforeseen shocks.

In view of the depth of complexity and inherent unpredictability of human societies, IEP understands the limitations in extracting hard or immutable *facts* from social analysis of this kind. Therefore, its principal objective with Halo is understand the key relationships that foster societal wellbeing and to glean actionable *insights* for the construction of more prosperous, resilient and peaceful societies.

Conceptual building blocks for systems analysis

This section represents a summary of the key conceptual building blocks for engaging in the Halo process. It provides short definitions and explanations of constructs and ideas from systems thinking necessary to develop a schematic representation or model of a societal system within the Halo framework. For examples of how to use Halo to perform a systems mapping exercise, refer to the *Halo and Systems Thinking* report.

System Bounds

Systems have boundaries. These boundaries can be described according to a geographic area or social grouping. For example, a system can be defined by a geographic area, such as a country, a state, or a forest. These types of geographic boundaries are the easiest to define. It is more difficult if the system is an ethnic group or a societal function. Social functions include the education system, military, policing, or a local health system. It is best to approach these as simplistically as possible at first. Some questions that help are: what are the subsystems which lie within the system, and what are the legal frameworks affecting the system? For example, the health system consists of hospitals, doctors, pharmacists, government health departments, psychologists, etc. For the analysis, it may not consist of alternative medicines, aged care homes or psychic healers. Sometimes it is helpful to stipulate what is not included in a system, as it makes for a simpler analysis.

Often relations and flows can be confused as systems, for example a conflict is an exchange between two or more systemic groups. A conflict is not a social system, but a series of relationships and flows between systems.

Subsystems

Systems do not exist in a vacuum, as they form parts of larger systems. For example, states are systems that form part of a larger national system. However, they also include systems, such as education, policing, business associations and others.

Identifying the core systems, or subsystems, within the greater system provides the basis for understanding its dynamics.

To determine the importance of a system, consider the number of people within it, the number of people affected by the system, the amount of money revolving within it, the number of relationships or the extent of the laws or regulations prevailing in or governing the system.

Interrelated Systems

Systems interact with other systems. This could be an adjacent country, or district. It could be another ethnic group or an area of governance. For instance, the military, the police, the judiciary, and border control can all be seen as systems that interact with one another to achieve a certain objective. Another example could be a school which interacts with families, the education department, and local leaders to improve literacy rates in a community.

Direction or Momentum within a System

Momentum is important as it helps explain the changing dynamics of the system or subsystem, including emergence, runaway feedback loops, decay, and positive functions. The data can be assessed individually or grouped. By grouping the data, the momentum of the overall system or subsystem can be ascertained. An example of this would be the Positive Peace Index, as it measures national systems and can be used to determine the momentum of a country, either towards or away from higher levels of functioning.

It is also beneficial to compare measures of a system to those of its neighbours. This gives insight into a system's relative strengths and weaknesses, as neighbouring systems should be the most similar. For example, countries on a given continent would likely be more comparable to each other than to countries on the other side of the world, and schools in the same district would likely be more comparable than those on different sides of the country.

Momentum is an important concept for systems analysis because it facilitates the extrapolation or forecasting of future states the system may find itself in. If those states are undesirable – according to the intent of the system – interventions should be designed to slow down and possibly invert the system's momentum in that area. Where the extrapolated future state is desirable, programs can be developed to reinforce a specific momentum and take advantage of it to nudge its subsystems into higher states of development.

Path Dependencies

Systems are path dependent. This means that the way a system will develop in the future from a given state depends on the path taken to reach that state. Path dependency can be understood as the influence that a social system's history, memory, and cultural values exert on the future development of that society. These influences are expressed in the encoded norms within the system.

Encoded Norms

Encoded norms refer to the formal and informal rules within a society which govern collective behaviour, often helping to maintain the system in a stable state. They are sometimes codified in laws, rules, or regulations. By determining how the people and institutions within a society respond to internal and external stimuli, encoded norms serve to establish tolerance thresholds for different social phenomena. This can be observed in many societal processes, such as when a government stimulates the economy in response to a drop in GDP or deploys more policing resources when there is a rise in crime. Each country's system will be unique, with different social norms and governance patterns, even when they follow the same general principles.

Isolating the main encoded norms within a system and the bounds within which they operate provides an understanding of the mechanisms that hold the system together. The encoded norms can sometimes be very subtle and difficult to quantify and therefore it is important to focus on the important ones.

Homeostasis States

All systems seek a steady state, which is a state of minimal change in the system's components, stocks, and flows. In the same way the human body seeks to maintain a core temperature, or regular heart beat societal systems also seek stability. Encoded norms are crucial in maintaining a steady state as they determine the corrective actions when inputs are outside acceptable bounds determined by the encoded norms. Systems also have a tendency to grow. The steady state can be one in which the system achieves growth; however, homeostasis can also cause stagnation. This can vary by subsystem.

Feedback Loops

A feedback loop is a key concept that refers to the dynamics within a system whereby an output is fed back into the system to alter, accelerate or dampen the input, thereby influencing future output. There are two main types of feedback loops: reinforcing and balancing.

Reinforcing feedback loops serve to amplify the effect of the input, potentially leading to exponential growth or decline within the system. If determinantal to the system, then they are referred to as runaway feedback loops. A reinforcing feedback loop might be population growth. As healthcare improves so does life expectancy, leading to a higher population. If unchecked, such growth can become a runaway feedback loop, leading to environmental degradation, more competition for resources and heightened conflict. Emergent properties within a system gain traction through reinforcing feedback loops. An example would be the emergence of the social media, where individuals gain positive feedback from associates, causing them to increase their usage of the technology. Sometimes there may be multiple steps in a reinforcing feedback loop. As more people use social media, more internet bandwidth is required, which in turn drives faster and cheaper services, thereby causing an even greater uptake of social media.

On the other hand, balancing feedback loops are those in which

the outputs mitigate the effect of the inputs. In these cases, an initial change or perturbation will trigger responses that work to offset the deviation from a desired state, preventing the system from veering too far from equilibrium. In the case of population growth, a balancing agent might be the adoption of a new technology, birth control, to bring the population back to manageable size. Other examples of balancing feedback loops are companies hiring more staff as their work expands, more arrests and jails being built as crime increases, interest rates increasing as inflation exceeds a certain threshold, or electoral boundaries changing as an area's population and demographics change.

Tipping Points

A tipping point refers to a permanent and irreversible change in the state of a system. Tipping points are thresholds beyond which non-linear change occurs within a system and its dynamics are substantially reconfigured. These changes can happen quickly and can be dramatic, resulting in new or restructured relationships within the system.

It is hard to predict the timing of tipping points. Often an input can cause little change within a system until a particular moment, after which small inputs can cause substantial changes. For example, levels of corruption and per capita income exhibit tipping points. Changes in corruption only have a small effect on the overall peace until a certain point is past, after which small changes have large impacts.

Tipping points can be positive, when they lead to higher levels of societal resilience, or they may be negative, resulting in degraded systems. Identifying past tipping points can give insight into the dynamics which created the current system. Identifying exactly when a system may go through a future tipping point is extremely difficult. Therefore, understanding past system tipping points may shed light on possible future ones.

Often negative tipping points occur when a shock on a system breaks its resilience, causing the system to reconfigure. Examples are food shortages leading to conflict or increases in international interest rates causing a country's debt to become unserviceable and its currency to collapse. Positive tipping points can occur when per capita income passes a certain level, because of improvements in governance and business efficiency leading to a period of rapid economic expansion. Another example would be the take-up of a new technology, such as social media, leading to an expansion of human interactions and connectivity.

System Resilience and Adaptability

System resilience and system adaptability are two key concepts that address the ability of a system to respond to and navigate through disturbances or changes. System resilience refers to the reactive capacity of a system to absorb shocks, disruptions, or changes and still maintain its essential functions and structure. Resilient systems often feature redundancy, flexibility, and the ability to self-organise in response to challenges, ensuring they can absorb disturbances and continue to function effectively. System adaptability, on the other hand, focuses on a system's capability to proactively adjust and modify itself. In response to

changing conditions, adaptable systems learn and evolve to enhance their performance by reconfiguring structures, processes, and functions. A highly adaptable system manages change, using it as an opportunity for improvement and innovation, continually adjusting to ensure its relevance and effectiveness over time.

There are two methods for measuring resilience and adaptability. The first is an analysis of past shocks that the system has suffered and the speed with which the system recovered back to a steady state. The second is a data-driven approach based around the Positive Peace framework which is an accurate measure of resilience. Societies with greater resilience will more easily absorb the effects of shocks and recover more quickly in its aftermath.

Efficiency and Redundancy

Efficiency means that a system produces a maximum output with the minimum number of components and with the lowest level of resources. Redundancy means a system has excess capacity, or not fully used components or resources. In most cases, efficiency and redundancy are antagonistic concepts.

Efficient systems produce the highest level of output with the minimum costs and use of resources. However, if a component or subsystem is stressed or fails, the lack of alternate paths or capacity means the system may become degraded or even incapacitated.

Building redundancies in a system reduces the expected losses from failures. However, this comes at a cost to efficiency. Systems with redundancies tend to be those with the highest levels of resilience, as they are capable of absorbing shocks. However, too much redundancy may mean the system is uncompetitive.

Redundancies can be constructed in two different ways. Redundancy of components means the system has unused, or only partially used, components. For example, a factory may operate with two computers instead of one – if one breaks down the other takes over, thereby creating a failsafe environment. Another example is an over-capacity in the health system to deal with any spikes in hospitalisation rates.

Redundancy of relationships takes place when two or more components are linked by a larger number of connections than strictly necessary. An example is when two cities are interconnected through various highways instead of just one.

Money Flows

Money flows represent the movement of financial resources within a system. Understanding these flows is critical as they shape the behaviour of the system elements, impacting relationships and feedback loops. They also help reveal the power dynamics within a system, as identifying the distribution and control of financial resources is crucial to understanding which actors and subsystems have the most impact on decision-making processes. In a national economy, money flows through various sectors, such as households, businesses, and government, are fundamental to the functioning of the society.

Flows of money within a system often give an idea of the size of subsystems or the importance of encoded norms. If the amount of money is growing over time, the system may be in a virtuous cycle of development. Conversely, rising monetary power may also be an indication of an imbalance. An example would be special interest groups that are subsidised by the taxpayer, which increases their ability to garner political influence which they use to secure additional government funding and concessions. Increases in the size of money stocks can also be a sign of emergence.

Functioning and Potential

System functioning refers to the dynamic processes, interactions, and behaviours shaping a system's operation. It captures how components work together to achieve common goals, emphasising interdependencies and feedback loops. For instance, in a transportation system, it involves vehicle flow, traffic patterns, and infrastructure responsiveness.

System potential describes how functioning could be altered with a change of inputs or a modification of goals. As such, it expresses a system's capacity for either future enhancement or future degradation. With regard to its capacity for advancement, it denotes the untapped capabilities inherent to a system that could be realised with, for example, additional resources or investment. In the case of a healthcare system, its potential for enhancement might entail going beyond existing practices of caring for patients to promote innovations to improve healthcare delivery or to address emerging health challenges.

With regard to a system's capacity for deterioration, potential refers to how system functioning could be undermined as a result of overwhelming shocks or a steady decline in resources, among other possible challenges. For instance, a society's potential for conflict and unrest might be realised if underlying tensions are not addressed, leading to a degradation of social cohesion.

System Purpose and Intent

While system functioning and potential refer to what a system does or could do, its purpose is what it is meant to achieve, while its intent is revealed through the outcomes it produces. Purpose and intent often overlap substantially, and in some circumstances it can be difficult to distinguish one from the other.

System purpose refers to the function that the system is meant to achieve, and there may be more than a single purpose. For example, the purposes of a business that builds reliable, cost-efficient solar farms may be to build a profitable company and also to help to reverse climate change.

For its part, system intent refers to the underlying motivations, objectives, or values that are not explicitly stated, but are inferred from the system's observed behaviour and patterns of action. Intent can be discerned from the systemic dynamics, cultural norms, and habitual practices within the system. For example, a healthcare system's outward purpose may be to provide accessible healthcare to a community within a government budgetary framework, emphasising a commitment to patient wellbeing. However, the intent may be revealed

through cost-cutting measures and decisions prioritising profit over patient outcomes. While the stated purpose highlights patient-centric care, the observed practices suggest financial considerations taking precedence. Another example of the similarities and differences between purpose and intent might be an educational system for the development of knowledge and skills in students. The system purpose may be to provide students with a clear level of academic achievement for entering the workforce, while the intent of the system may be to make a work environment conducive for teachers, for example, by minimising class hours.

In contrast, in highly congruent or transparent systems, purpose and intent may be the same or very similar.

Causality in Systems

Identifying causality within a system is about understanding the influences that lead it to behave in certain ways. However, in systems, cause and effect become entwined. A mutual feedback loop is an excellent example of this.

Functions, events and emergence properties influence each other, causing changes in each. Therefore, differentiating between cause and effect loses its usefulness. This way of thinking avoids the pitfalls and failures of the old cause/effect approach whereby an intervention is targeted at the presumed cause of a problem or vulnerability. Understanding mutual causality leads to a deeper perspective on agency, feedback loops, connections, and relationships, which are all fundamental parts of systems mapping. Constructive change occurs through stimulating many points simultaneously or progressively over time.

Stocks, Flows and Transformations

Stocks, flows, and transformations are fundamental concepts that help describe and analyse the dynamics of a system. Stocks represent the accumulations or reservoirs of elements within the system, often denoting the quantity of a particular resource or state variable at a given point in time. Examples of stocks could be the number of people in a country, the balance in a bank account, the amount of grain in storage or the number of persons incarcerated.

Flows are movements between stocks, capturing the rate of change in stocks over time. Examples could be money transfers, the movement of a prisoner to the workforce or immigrants entering a country.

In many instances, the nature of the elements accumulated in stocks or moving through flows remain unchanged. That means within a closed system what is stocked or what is flowing remains the same across time. For instance, money can be stored in a safe or be transacted between persons, without losing or changing its attributes. However, in practice, systems usually are not closed and have some flows that originate outside of the system. An example may be foreign direct investment into a country or the migration of people.

Transformations refer to the processes or activities that alter the state or composition of elements within a system. For example, materials and electricity could flow into a factory and undergo a

transformation to become a machine, or a stock of food could undergo a process of rot and become unusable even if there has been no outflow from storage.

Stocks, flows, and transformations work together to characterise the structure and behaviour of complex systems. The interactions among these components are often governed by feedback loops and contribute to the dynamic nature of systems. They are essential for understanding how systems respond to changes, adapt to their environment, and achieve or maintain equilibrium.

Emergent Properties

A system evolves through time and its current properties do not fully describe its future dynamics. Finding new emerging properties is important in understanding the trajectory of the system. The speed at which properties of the system accelerate is good way of identifying emergence. Looking at a system's stocks, how they may increase in size over time, where they are flowing, and what transformations are occurring among elements along the way can all give insight into a system's emergent properties. This can be seen through increases in money, the number of people employed, the rate of development of new technologies, or increases in the rule and regulations governing an aspect of society.

Non-Linearity of Effects

The effect of one part of a system on another is not always linear. Relationships may change depending on the state of development of the system. For example, for low peace countries, improvements in peace lead to small increases in worker productivity. However, as countries progress in peace, further reductions in violence lead to ever higher increases in worker productivity. This non-linear relationship has been discussed in IEP's Business and Peace Report 2024.

Attractor Planes

Attractor planes represent stable states or conditions toward which a system tends to evolve. Once in an attractor plane, it is difficult for a system to move out of it. These states act as points of attraction, and the system may exhibit stability when it converges toward these attractors. Between attractor planes, changes in the state of systems tend to be larger and more chaotic. In an ecological context, a stable population size or a balanced ecosystem structure can be considered an attractor plane.

Understanding attractor planes provides insights into the long-term behaviour and stability of a system, highlighting the factors that influence its trajectory and equilibrium. In a societal context, an attractor plane can be characterised by either positive or negative social conditions.

In the context of peace and conflict, analysis of the Global Peace Index (GPI) and the Positive Peace Index (PPI) has revealed two attractor planes, as discussed in Section 4 of this report. One is called Sustainable Peace and is the state where countries have high rankings in both the GPI and the PPI. None of the countries in the Sustainable Peace area of the GPI-PPI phase plane have had a substantial decline in their levels of peace in

the 17 years of the GPI, despite shocks to their systems. The other attractor plane is the Conflict Trap, defined as low rankings in both the GPI and the PPI. Countries in this plane find it difficult to improve their societal resilience because of the losses incurred by high levels of violence and the ensuing destruction of their societal structures. Given their degraded levels of societal resilience, countries in the Conflict Trap region tend to find it difficult to exit this plane without external assistance.

Archetypes

Archetypes are common reinforcing themes or patterns of interactions that are seen in many systems. They serve as mental models that can be applied to different contexts to identify and address common challenges. The number of archetypes varies depending on who is defining them, but generally there are seven to ten. Examples are 'limits to growth', 'seeking the wrong goals' and 'exponential success'. The value in identifying the archetypes in a system is that they provide shortcuts for the analysis and help in finding solutions. Some examples of archetypes are:

- *Limits to growth.* All systems have limited resources they can consume, after which the system will be impacted negatively.
- *Exponential success.* This is a runaway feedback loop where success increases exponentially, eventually dominating the system and potentially causing its demise.
- *Seeking the wrong goal.* This is related to the purpose or intent of the system. If the goal is inadequate, inappropriate or dangerous its pursuit will damage the system.
- *Rule breaking.* Rules are often set up to regulate and maintain the homeostasis through encoded norms. When rules which regulate society break down the result will be changes in the system's internal structure. This can be positive but more often is destructive.
- *Escalation.* This can be defined as one-upping. Think of two groups competing for shrinking resources, escalating wars, or politicians competing for the highest spending for the popular vote.
- *The tragedy of the commons.* This is where a common resource gets utilised by agents who will aim at maximising their own benefit from a commonly shared resource. If the resource gets over-utilised, then it can lead to rule breaking and escalation.

Static and Dynamic Modelling

Static modelling analyses the system at a given point in time, while dynamic modelling uses many iterations of data over a period of time. Static models are useful when insufficient time series data is available for analysis. It is also useful for providing a snapshot early in the analysis that is simpler and easier to understand before building up the dynamic model.

To understand dynamic models, it is often necessary to use a system dynamics simulation modelling software package. This

allows analysts to input data on the components of a system, including stocks, encoded norms and more. This allows the analysis to view changes over time to better assess the way the system has evolved and the impact of changes over time. These packages also allow for changing the parameters of the stocks and flows and encoded norms to model different scenarios, allowing for a fuller understanding of the possible outcomes that interventions may cause.

Analysis through Positive Peace

Positive Peace has been derived empirically to provide a holistic expression of a healthy societal system and as such it can be used in this process as a check on the extent to which the system has been analysed systemically. Once a model has been derived, each of items can be classified as belonging to a Pillar of Positive Peace. If the analysis is weak in a particular Pillar or Pillars, then there may be a flaw in the analysis.

In addition, Positive Peace as a multifaceted societal objective represents an excellent approach for analysing which interventions may be best for altering the system and their likely ripple effects. It allows for an approach that will consider multiple stimuli, rather than a small number which may have limited effect.

Gathering the Relevant Data on the System

While not a conceptual component of systems analysis, understanding what data is available in relation to a given system is important, as the comprehensiveness of the data will affect the approach to the analysis. Some systems may have an abundance of readily available data, while in others it may be lacking. In some cases, more data may need to be collected or estimated before a constructive analysis can begin, as insufficient data may prevent the identification of substantive insights into the dynamics of the system.

Moreover, in some cases the fact that certain elements or subsystems are richer in data than others may reflect a higher level of importance within a system, as resources have been dedicated to measuring them. As such, identifying data availability across a system can help determine the most promising areas for deeper analysis.

Searching for relevant data and the development of new datasets can also be a reiterative process undertaken throughout the analysis. As new insights arise, gaps in the data may also arise.

Where accurate and consistent data is available, a system may be characterised by a set of statistical indicators that could constitute the foundation for the analysis. However, it is often the case that statistical data for the specific system or subsystem is not produced and values and figures need to be estimated indirectly through proxy data or via qualitative or subject matter expert assessments.

For instance, IEP has curated a set of approximately 400 indicators grouped by specific systemic areas based around Positive Peace to assess the level of societal resilience and development in a country. These indicators can also be compared across similar or neighbouring countries, states, or communities to provide deeper insights. They can be broken down further and can be grouped under IEP's v to better analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the overall system.

A | Positive Peace Index Methodology

The Positive Peace Index (PPI) is the first statistically derived index measuring Positive Peace according to the definition “the attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies.” The PPI is similar to the Global Peace Index (GPI) in that it is a composite index built to gauge a multidimensional concept. It covers the same set of 163 countries included in the GPI, covering over 99 per cent of the world’s population. The key objective is to devise a measurement system that is simple, intuitive, auditable, comparable across countries and consistent over time.

IEP takes a systems approach to peace, drawing on recent body of research on the topic. In order to construct the PPI, IEP analysed over 24,700 different data series, indices and attitudinal surveys in conjunction with current thinking about the drivers of violent conflict, resilience and peacefulness. The result is an eight-part taxonomy of the factors associated with peaceful societies. The eight domains, or Pillars of Positive Peace, were derived from the data series that had the strongest correlation with internal peacefulness as measured by the GPI, an index that defines peace as “absence of violence or the fear of violence”. Each of the eight PPI Pillars is measured by three indicators. These represent the best available globally-comparable data with the strongest statistically significant relationship to levels of peace within a country. The 24 indicators that make up the PPI are listed in table A.1.

For the 2023 report, PPI indicators were further classified in three groups: Attitudes, Institutions and Structures.

Attitudes indicators measure social views, tensions or perceptions.

Institutions indicators represent the impact that formal and informal institutions of a society exert on peacefulness, social wellbeing and the economy.

Structures indicators assess the underpinning of the socio-economic system, such as poverty and equality, or are the result of aggregate activity, such as GDP. Usually, these are the indicators that measure infrastructure or socio-economic development.

The 2023 PPI uses a set of indicators that has been updated from previous reports. This new set provides a more representative picture of recent social dynamics. In addition, it was chosen to reduce missing data, both over time and by country. To maximise conceptual relevance and data completeness, the period of analysis was restricted to 2013–2022, unless otherwise stated. Remaining instances of missing data were resolved through statistical imputation methods. The indicators are weighted proportionally to their correlation coefficient against the GPI.

TABLE A.1

Indicators in the Positive Peace Index

The following 24 indicators have been selected in the Positive Peace Index as a result of showing the strongest relationships with the absence of violence and fear of violence.

Pillar	Domain	Indicator	Description	Source	Correlation coefficient (to the GPI)
Low Levels of Corruption	Institutions	Control of Corruption	Control of Corruption captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.78
	Attitudes	Factionalised Elites	Measures the fragmentation of ruling elites and state institutions along ethnic, class, clan, racial or religious lines.	Fragile States Index	0.70
	Institutions	Public Sector Theft	Assesses perceptions of how often public sector employees steal, embezzle or misappropriate public funds or other state resources.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.70
Sound Business Environment	Institutions	Regulatory Quality	Captures perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.76
	Institutions	Financial Institutions Index	Part of the financial development index, this indicator measures the quality of the financial institutions, including the depth of the financial sector and the access to financial products.	International Monetary Fund	0.54
	Structures	GDP per capita	GDP per capita (constant 2015 US\$) is gross domestic product divided by midyear population.	World Bank	0.61
Well-Functioning Government	Institutions	Government Openness and Transparency	Assesses to what extent the Government operations can be legally influenced by citizens and are open to scrutiny from society.	Freedom House	0.64
	Institutions	Government Effectiveness: Estimate	Government Effectiveness captures perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.80
	Institutions	Rule of Law: Estimate	Rule of Law captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.	Worldwide Governance Indicators	0.83
Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Attitudes	Gender Inequality	The Gender Inequality Index (GII) reflects women's disadvantage in three dimensions: reproductive health, political empowerment, and the labour market.	United Nations Development Programme	0.71
	Attitudes	Group Grievance	The Group Grievance Indicator focuses on divisions and schisms between different groups in society – particularly divisions based on social or political characteristics – and their role in access to services or resources, and inclusion in the political process.	Fragile States Index	0.61
	Attitudes	Exclusion by Socio-Economic Group	Exclusion involves denying individuals access to services or participation in governed spaces based on their identity or belonging to a particular group.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.73

Pillar	Domain	Indicator	Description	Source	Correlation coefficient (to the GPI)
Equitable Distribution of Resources	Structures	Inequality-adjusted life expectancy index	Measures the overall life expectancy of a population accounting for the disparity between the average life expectancy of the rich and that of the poor. The smaller the difference the higher the equality and that is a reflection of the equality of access to the health system.	United Nations Development Programme	0.61
	Institutions	Education and income inequality	Measured by Government dissemination of false information domestically: How often governments disseminate false or misleading information.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.61
	Attitudes	Equality of Opportunity	Assesses whether individuals enjoy equality of opportunity and freedom from economic exploitation.	Freedom House	0.67
Free Flow of Information	Structures	Freedom of the Press	A composite measure of the degree of print, broadcast and internet freedom.	Reporters Without Borders (RSF)	0.50
	Attitudes	Quality of Information	Measured by Government dissemination of false information domestically: How often governments disseminate false or misleading information.	Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)	0.61
	Structures	Telecom infrastructure index (internet, mobile, broadband)	A composite index of internet users and mobile phone and broadband subscribers per 100 inhabitants	UN E-Government Knowledgebase	0.64
Good Relations with Neighbours	Attitudes	Law to Support Equal Treatment of Population Segments	This is a measure of how population segments interrelate with their domestic neighbours. It assesses whether laws, policies, and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population.	Freedom House	0.68
	Structures	International Tourism	Number of tourists (Number of arrivals per 100,000 population) who travel to a country (staying at least one night) other than that in which they have their usual residence.	World Tourism Organization	0.43
	Institutions	Freedom to trade internationally	Measures barriers to free trade such as tariffs regulations black market exchange rate and control of movement of capital and people	Economic Freedom of the World Dataset	0.64
High Levels of Human Capital	Structures	Share of youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)	Proportion of people between 15 and 24 years of age that are not employed and are not in education or training.	International Labour Organization	0.60
	Structures	Researchers in R&D	The number of researchers engaged in Research & Development (R&D), expressed as per one million population.	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	0.65
	Structures	Healthy life expectancy (HALE)	Average number of years that a newborn can expect to live in full health.	United Nations World Population Prospects	0.66

B | Positive Peace Index Rankings

TABLE B.1
Results of the 2024 Positive Peace Index

Country	Rank	PPI Overall Score	Well-Functioning Government	Low Levels of Corruption	Sound Business Environment	Equitable Distribution of Resources	Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Free Flow of Information	High Levels of Human Capital	Good Relations with Neighbours
Finland	1	1.44	1.13	1.22	2.2	1.06	1.05	1.34	1.41	2.26
Denmark	2	1.44	1.16	1.09	2.04	1.07	1.39	1.16	1.38	2.38
Norway	3	1.45	1.2	1.23	1.84	1.07	1.39	1.26	1.47	2.3
Sweden	4	1.46	1.32	1.38	2.04	1.11	1.27	1.21	1.25	2.21
Switzerland	5	1.5	1.19	1.28	1.35	1.5	1.29	1.24	1.69	2.6
Ireland	6	1.59	1.43	1.49	1.65	1.1	1.22	1.61	1.82	2.49
New Zealand	7	1.65	1.39	1.23	2.31	1.18	1.54	1.43	1.73	2.59
Iceland	8	1.68	1.6	1.47	2.39	1.39	1.14	1.43	1.53	2.59
Netherlands	9	1.7	1.57	1.63	2.18	1.5	1.45	1.25	1.59	2.5
Australia	10	1.73	1.67	1.42	1.73	1.53	1.47	1.67	1.86	2.64
Germany	11	1.74	1.46	1.55	2.22	1.48	1.53	1.47	1.76	2.63
Canada	12	1.75	1.37	1.57	2.08	1.2	1.61	1.77	1.93	2.62
Japan	13	1.78	1.45	1.75	2.18	1.54	1.36	1.87	1.57	2.67
Singapore	14	1.79	1.66	1.64	1.76	1.73	1.34	2.12	1.38	2.89
Belgium	15	1.85	1.61	1.94	2.42	1.5	1.57	1.52	1.67	2.61
France	16	1.89	1.58	1.69	2.34	1.58	2.04	1.67	1.88	2.48
Austria	17	1.9	1.61	2.14	2.41	1.51	1.56	1.76	1.79	2.5
Portugal	18	1.94	1.71	2.07	2.9	1.66	1.43	1.52	1.78	2.53
South Korea	19	1.97	2.15	2.31	2.41	1.6	1.53	1.64	1.32	2.77
United Kingdom	20	1.98	1.53	2.08	2.05	1.57	2.17	1.88	1.95	2.67
Slovenia	21	2.02	1.69	2.01	3.19	1.39	1.54	1.93	1.87	2.69
Estonia	22	2.07	1.5	2.28	3.08	1.49	2.01	1.52	2.22	2.49
Czech Republic	23	2.11	1.96	2.75	2.95	1.4	1.75	1.5	2.1	2.39
Lithuania	24	2.16	1.98	2.14	3.29	1.58	1.54	1.62	2.3	2.91
Uruguay	25	2.16	1.88	1.98	3.35	1.75	1.79	1.52	2.81	2.26
Spain	26	2.18	2.09	2.59	2.6	1.74	2.01	1.69	2.11	2.57
United States	27	2.18	1.8	2.66	1.83	1.7	2.43	1.92	2.09	3.05
Italy	28	2.22	2.46	2.66	2.68	1.68	1.58	1.82	2.29	2.53
Cyprus	29	2.26	1.95	3.15	2.94	1.56	1.87	1.68	2.45	2.37
Chile	30	2.28	1.89	1.96	3.08	1.87	2.06	2.09	2.74	2.72
Latvia	31	2.32	2.08	2.52	3.33	1.56	2.2	1.45	2.56	2.85
Taiwan	32	2.33	1.52	2.62	2.91	1.98	2.15	2.11	2.58	2.91
Slovakia	33	2.34	2.27	2.77	3.33	1.45	2.13	1.79	2.38	2.51
Croatia	34	2.38	2.38	2.8	3.25	1.52	1.87	2	2.51	2.68
Greece	35	2.39	2.69	2.72	3.22	1.67	1.77	1.99	2.09	2.94

Country	Rank	PPI Overall Score	Well-Functioning Government	Low Levels of Corruption	Sound Business Environment	Equitable Distribution of Resources	Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Free Flow of Information	High Levels of Human Capital	Good Relations with Neighbours
Israel	36	2.4	1.97	2.89	2.54	2.04	2.14	2.01	2.62	3.05
Poland	37	2.42	2.7	2.49	3.17	1.51	1.89	2.35	2.3	2.92
Costa Rica	38	2.42	2.15	2.5	3.55	1.97	1.84	1.89	2.88	2.65
Hungary	39	2.49	2.57	2.88	3.28	1.49	1.98	2.66	2.2	2.87
United Arab Emirates	40	2.52	2.81	2.17	2.73	2.52	1.87	2.42	2.37	3.35
Mauritius	41	2.61	2.12	2.42	3.12	2.4	2.58	2.51	3.22	2.67
Romania	42	2.64	2.56	3.02	3.62	1.68	2.71	1.98	2.93	2.53
Bulgaria	43	2.66	2.7	3.1	3.48	2.09	2.02	2.17	2.66	2.99
Trinidad and Tobago	44	2.69	2.63	2.84	3.61	1.92	2.18	2.11	2.96	3.25
Kosovo	45	2.69	2.6	2.97	3.4	1.96	2.21	2.73	2.67	3
Malaysia	46	2.74	2.46	3.13	2.95	2.5	2.45	2.3	2.6	3.57
Qatar	47	2.74	2.58	2.76	2.45	2.48	2.53	2.43	2.93	3.85
Montenegro	48	2.74	2.95	3.13	3.43	1.58	2.54	2.47	3	2.72
Georgia	49	2.75	2.4	3.14	3.42	2.11	2.53	2.46	2.99	2.94
Jamaica	50	2.75	2.86	2.59	3.63	1.96	2.07	1.92	3.26	3.74
Argentina	51	2.75	2.9	2.75	3.86	1.86	2.35	2.05	2.78	3.44
Albania	52	2.8	3.01	3.47	3.84	2.08	2.11	2.7	2.56	2.53
Panama	53	2.82	2.96	2.85	3.37	2.52	2.99	2.22	2.96	2.61
Armenia	54	2.83	3.03	3.12	3.78	2.02	2.33	2.52	2.67	3.06
Macedonia	55	2.84	2.7	3.5	3.69	2.05	2.18	2.58	2.92	3.06
Mongolia	56	2.87	2.86	3.41	3.82	2.2	2.39	2.25	3.04	2.89
Botswana	57	2.89	2.67	2.45	3.49	2.89	2.49	2.3	3.81	3.13
Kuwait	58	2.92	2.86	3.39	3.35	2.68	2.38	2.43	3.01	3.19
Serbia	59	2.92	2.94	3.76	3.79	2.01	2.29	2.61	2.66	3.23
Moldova	60	2.97	3.44	3.58	3.89	1.97	2.24	2.22	3.04	3.23
Bhutan	61	2.99	2.21	2.64	4.03	2.92	3.05	2.85	3.1	3.35
Oman	62	3.01	3.4	3.21	3.41	2.55	2.37	2.42	3.2	3.46
Tunisia	63	3.02	2.95	3.39	4	2.49	2.54	2.45	2.96	3.39
Thailand	64	3.03	3.1	3.97	3.21	2.23	3.13	2.66	2.52	3.24
Ghana	65	3.05	2.72	3.32	4.04	3.02	2.39	2.15	3.47	3.36
Ukraine	66	3.06	3.54	3.67	4.04	1.87	2.44	2.42	3.04	3.3
China	67	3.08	3.23	3.3	3.36	2.23	2.69	3.25	2.62	4.03
South Africa	68	3.09	2.61	3.48	3.41	3.12	2.98	2.1	3.64	3.38
Peru	69	3.11	3.17	3.52	3.64	2.35	3.28	2.61	3.14	3.04
Bahrain	70	3.11	3.13	3.39	3.12	2.51	3.18	2.91	2.98	3.66
Kazakhstan	71	3.12	3.63	3.56	3.64	1.93	2.67	2.8	2.92	3.65
Brazil	72	3.12	3.16	3.29	3.34	2.62	3.17	3.04	3.01	3.32
Bosnia and Herzegovina	73	3.12	3.61	4	3.87	2.14	2.49	2.58	2.93	3.14
Dominican Republic	74	3.14	2.95	3.5	3.84	2.61	3.18	2.21	3.21	3.52
Namibia	75	3.14	2.8	2.78	3.65	3.21	3.02	2.51	3.78	3.49
Saudi Arabia	76	3.14	3.27	3.37	3.29	2.61	3.16	2.88	2.89	3.63
Viet Nam	77	3.16	3.18	3.44	3.82	2.69	2.54	3.1	2.82	3.72
Colombia	78	3.17	2.8	3.46	3.57	2.54	3.56	2.83	3.19	3.38
Jordan	79	3.18	3.08	3.22	3.69	2.63	3.34	3.06	3.22	3.15
Senegal	80	3.19	2.75	3.19	4.15	3.04	3.02	2.56	3.49	3.35
Indonesia	81	3.2	2.89	3.67	3.62	2.44	3.48	2.55	3.29	3.64
Guyana	82	3.22	3.13	3.15	3.98	2.48	2.86	2.99	3.8	3.37
Belarus	83	3.22	4.07	3.66	4.24	2.17	1.95	2.92	2.73	3.88

Appendices

Country	Rank	PPI Overall Score	Well-Functioning Government	Low Levels of Corruption	Sound Business Environment	Equitable Distribution of Resources	Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Free Flow of Information	High Levels of Human Capital	Good Relations with Neighbours
Ecuador	84	3.22	3.1	3.76	4.2	2.41	3.12	2.74	3.01	3.36
Mexico	85	3.23	3.28	3.55	3.67	2.41	3.32	2.96	3.11	3.44
Paraguay	86	3.24	3.29	3.83	3.98	2.47	3.22	2.52	3.16	3.23
India	87	3.25	2.59	3.62	3.59	2.81	3.37	3.25	3.42	3.37
Sri Lanka	88	3.25	2.94	3.66	3.96	2.16	3.4	3.01	3.02	3.83
El Salvador	89	3.28	3.57	3.34	3.98	2.46	3.49	2.89	3.25	3.16
Benin	90	3.29	3.18	3	4.18	3.53	2.96	2.69	3.83	3.02
Turkey	91	3.29	3.65	3.89	3.41	2.58	3.13	3.16	2.82	3.57
Timor-Leste	92	3.31	3.47	3.47	4.32	2.93	3.17	2.81	3.1	3.14
Russia	93	3.32	3.54	4.03	3.62	2.33	3.05	3.17	2.68	4.03
Bolivia	94	3.33	3.52	3.89	4.15	2.66	2.77	2.97	3.23	3.32
Morocco	95	3.33	3.31	3.56	3.78	3.12	3.35	2.75	3.03	3.7
Philippines	96	3.33	3.11	3.69	3.69	2.48	3.54	3.23	3.17	3.7
Palestine	97	3.35	3.68	4.07	3.78	2.81	2.78	2.5	3.17	3.81
Uzbekistan	98	3.35	3.55	4.1	4.02	2.43	2.74	3.03	3	3.83
Cuba	99	3.36	3.68	3.78	4.23	2.58	2.14	3.75	3.09	3.61
Tanzania	100	3.37	3.56	3.14	4.29	2.85	2.89	3.27	3.24	3.73
Kyrgyz Republic	101	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.21	2.44	3.51	2.61	2.53	3.52
Algeria	102	3.41	3.66	3.62	4.37	2.88	3.06	2.95	2.9	3.75
Lesotho	103	3.42	3.33	3.56	4.26	3.17	2.75	3	4.07	3.25
Azerbaijan	104	3.43	3.61	3.96	3.94	2.39	3.34	3.37	2.78	3.95
Malawi	105	3.44	2.95	3.88	4.34	2.93	3.28	3.15	3.44	3.59
Zambia	106	3.45	3.36	3.36	4.14	3.53	3.34	2.89	3.71	3.22
Honduras	107	3.45	3.5	3.91	4.08	2.62	3.16	3.06	3.43	3.72
The Gambia	108	3.46	3.52	3.53	4.37	3.47	2.84	2.62	3.66	3.62
Kenya	109	3.46	3.15	3.88	4.14	2.92	3.47	2.94	3.45	3.69
Rwanda	110	3.49	3.07	3.4	4.02	3.22	3.96	3.23	3.5	3.55
Burkina Faso	111	3.52	3.85	3.4	4.2	3.22	3.01	2.64	3.97	3.79
Sierra Leone	112	3.53	3.24	3.65	4.42	3.48	3.21	3.08	3.78	3.41
Nepal	113	3.55	3.62	3.88	4.14	3.15	3.32	2.88	3.51	3.79
Gabon	114	3.55	3.95	3.8	4.24	3.09	3.07	2.8	3.52	3.83
Cote d'Ivoire	115	3.56	3.56	3.88	4.09	3.42	3.57	2.72	3.62	3.48
Madagascar	116	3.56	3.5	3.9	4.35	3.37	3.55	3.27	3.1	3.38
Laos	117	3.56	3.6	3.87	4.26	3.22	3.35	3.53	2.99	3.66
Togo	118	3.57	3.3	3.72	4.19	3.23	3.56	3.18	3.59	3.82
Cambodia	119	3.58	3.62	4.22	4.17	2.92	3.65	3.32	2.98	3.58
Papua New Guinea	120	3.59	3.71	3.96	4.24	3.04	3.79	2.89	3.66	3.25
Nicaragua	121	3.59	3.9	4.22	4.29	2.61	3.35	3.58	3.12	3.52
Mozambique	122	3.6	3.49	3.66	4.27	3.31	3.54	3.41	3.75	3.34
Egypt	123	3.62	3.42	4.03	3.96	3.24	3.84	3.37	3.25	3.83
Iran	124	3.63	4.05	4.17	4.1	2.49	3.57	3.2	2.97	4.31
Bangladesh	125	3.63	3.31	4.41	4.17	2.73	3.96	3.22	3.24	3.92
Swaziland	126	3.64	3.89	3.68	4.16	3.45	2.87	3.24	3.92	3.88
Lebanon	127	3.64	4.22	4.29	4.04	2.56	3.6	3.03	2.99	4.14
Pakistan	128	3.64	3.25	3.96	4.15	3.52	3.54	3.38	3.56	3.8
Guatemala	129	3.66	3.78	4.01	3.99	3.2	4.1	3.17	3.42	3.48
Uganda	130	3.67	3.49	4.12	4.22	3.22	3.83	3.49	3.35	3.58
Tajikistan	131	3.68	4.05	4.25	4.37	2.66	3.62	3.62	3.03	3.66

Country	Rank	PPI Overall Score	Well-Functioning Government	Low Levels of Corruption	Sound Business Environment	Equitable Distribution of Resources	Acceptance of the Rights of Others	Free Flow of Information	High Levels of Human Capital	Good Relations with Neighbours
Turkmenistan	132	3.69	4.23	4.23	4.65	3.24	2.56	4.17	2.57	3.77
Liberia	133	3.7	3.63	4.05	4.32	3.26	3.58	3.45	3.9	3.32
Niger	134	3.7	3.24	3.96	4.32	3.44	3.51	3.36	4.4	3.4
Djibouti	135	3.71	4.05	3.72	4.29	3.68	3.25	3.64	3.41	3.58
Mali	136	3.74	3.86	3.89	4.25	3.68	3.96	2.57	3.79	3.77
North Korea	137	3.75	4.47	4.45	4.17	2.71	2.91	4.53	2.62	3.97
Angola	138	3.77	4.11	3.59	4.22	3.95	3.99	3.21	3.53	3.46
Ethiopia	139	3.78	3.59	3.84	4.37	3.33	3.92	3.58	3.33	4.35
Zimbabwe	140	3.81	3.98	4.4	4.46	3.19	3.14	3.59	3.76	3.81
Myanmar	141	3.83	4.37	3.97	4.42	2.96	3.95	3.28	3.27	4.22
Mauritania	142	3.84	3.64	4.12	4.37	3.86	4.22	2.84	3.84	3.76
Guinea-Bissau	143	3.88	4.37	4.46	4.5	3.86	3.41	3.14	3.63	3.4
Iraq	144	3.88	4.15	4.4	4.13	2.89	4.03	3.39	3.5	4.4
Libya	145	3.89	4.57	4.3	4.59	3.11	3.1	3.64	3.15	4.6
Nigeria	146	3.91	3.5	4.32	4.21	3.99	4.21	2.93	4.1	3.99
Republic of the Congo	147	3.93	4.31	3.95	4.5	3.23	4.22	3.42	3.46	4.24
Burundi	148	3.94	4.3	4.22	4.33	3.48	3.85	3.62	3.34	4.24
Cameroon	149	3.94	3.82	4.38	4.38	3.65	4.16	3.28	3.47	4.28
Guinea	150	3.95	3.84	4.36	4.39	3.85	4.15	3.19	3.84	3.85
Haiti	151	3.95	4.26	4.23	4.51	4.26	4	3.41	3.42	3.38
Venezuela	152	3.97	4.77	4.71	4.5	3.04	3.57	3.68	3.47	3.73
Sudan	153	4.06	4.36	4.1	4.55	4.04	4.06	3.49	3.61	4.2
Equatorial Guinea	154	4.09	4.22	4.22	4.59	4	3.82	3.94	3.7	4.17
Afghanistan	155	4.13	4.57	3.98	4.31	3.43	4.51	3.65	4.25	4.19
Eritrea	156	4.16	4.49	4.1	4.84	3.72	3.95	4.47	3.5	4.17
Syria	157	4.16	4.67	4.7	4.6	3.29	3.91	4.02	3.25	4.71
Democratic Republic of the Congo	158	4.17	4.54	4.57	4.61	3.56	4.32	3.53	3.8	4.23
Chad	159	4.26	4.34	4.66	4.48	3.97	4.39	3.67	4.12	4.3
Central African Republic	160	4.32	4.51	4.34	4.64	4.48	4.48	3.83	3.92	4.29
Somalia	161	4.33	4.83	4.66	4.62	4.31	4.16	3.84	4.14	3.94
Yemen	162	4.38	4.75	4.63	4.71	3.98	4.82	4.02	3.77	4.23
South Sudan	163	4.4	4.85	4.56	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.18	3.89	4.17

ENDNOTES

SECTION 1

- 1 Freedom House. (2020) Armenia: Freedom in the World 2019 Country Report. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/armenia/freedom-world/2019>.
- 2 Council of Europe. (2021) Armenian Corruption Prevention Commission staff better equipped to analyse public officials' asset and interest declarations. Economic Crime and Cooperation Division. Available at: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/corruption/-/staff-of-the-corruption-prevention-commission-better-equipped-to-analyse-asset-and-interest-declarations-of-armenian-public-officials>.
- 3 Al Jazeera. (2023) More than 80 percent of ethnic Armenians flee Nagorno-Karabakh. Available at: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/9/30/more-than-80-percent-of-nagorno-karabakhs-people-have-fled-armenia-govt>.
- 4 World Bank. (2023) The World Bank in the Gambia. Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/gambia/overview>.
- 5 Freedom House. (2023) The Gambia: Freedom in the World 2023 Country Report. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/gambia/freedom-world/2023>.
- 6 United Nations Democracy Fund. (2021) New legislation makes history in Gambia. Available at: <https://www.un.org/democracyfund/news/new-legislation-makes-history-gambia>.
- 7 Government of the Gambia. (2021) The Gambia ICT for Development Policy (ICT4D) 2018-2028. Government - Policy Repository. Available at: <https://dspd.forte-data.com/f/caa6bc07-5bad-11ec-9b31-029254d29bb1>.
- 8 Chen, S.C. (2021) Taiwan's experience in fighting covid-19. Nature News. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41590-021-00908-2>.
- 9 Miller, C. (2020) How Taiwan's 'Civic Hackers' helped find a new way to run the country. The Guardian. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/sep/27/taiwan-civic-hackers-polis-consensus-social-media-platform>.
- 10 Wang, J. (2022) Taiwan is ground zero for disinformation—here's how it's fighting back. The Wall Street Journal. Available at: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/taiwans-defenses-against-information-warfare-gain-attention-11661419802>.
- 11 Pogatchnik, S. (2021) Multinationals make Ireland's GDP growth 'clearly misleading'. POLITICO. Available at: <https://www.politico.eu/article/ireland-gdp-growth-multinationals-misleading/>.
- 12 Nicas, J., Milhorange, F. and Ionova, A. (2022) How Bolsonaro built the myth of stolen elections in Brazil. The New York Times. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2022/10/25/world/americas/brazil-bolsonaro-misinformation.html>.
- 13 Freedom House. (2022) Brazil: Freedom in the World 2022 Country Report. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/brazil/freedom-world/2022>.
- 14 Freedom House. (2022) Brazil: Freedom in the World 2022 Country Report. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/brazil/freedom-world/2022>.
- 15 Santora, M. and Hubbard, B. (2021) Clashes in Beirut: Beirut news: Sectarian gun battles leave six dead. The New York Times. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/10/14/world/beirut-lebanon-clashes>.
- 16 BBC News. (2020) Beirut explosion: Anti-government protests break out in City. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-53688975>.
- 17 Human Rights Watch. (2022) World Report 2022: Rights trends in Lebanon. Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2022/country-chapters/lebanon>.
- 18 BBC News. (2021) Venezuela crisis: Three in four in extreme poverty, study says. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-58743253>.
- 19 UNHCR Australia. (2023) Venezuela situation. Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/au/emergencies/venezuela-situation>.
- 20 IDMC. (2023) Country Profile: Yemen. Available at: <https://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/yemen>.
- 21 The Washington Post. (2023) The Jan. 6 insurrection. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/january-6-capitol-riot/>.
- 22 Feingold, S. (2023) China's belt and road initiative turns 10. Here's what to know. World Economic Forum. Available at: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/11/china-belt-road-initiative-trade-bri-silk-road/>.
- 23 Diamond, P. et al. (2017). Inequality in Europe: Social Europe Dossier. Social Europe, Hans Boeckler Stiftung, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. Available at: <https://www.socialeurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Inequality-in-Europe-final.pdf>.
- 24 OECD (2022). War in Ukraine: The policy challenges. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/ukraine-hub/en/>.

SECTION 2

- 1 The Economist. (2022) The pandemic's true death toll. Available at: <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/coronavirus-excess-deaths-estimates>.
- 2 Karabel, J. (2022) U.S. failed on covid-19. Canada shows it didn't have to be that way. Time. Available at: <https://time.com/6180309/covid-19-us-canada-differences/>.
- 3 The Economist. (2022) The pandemic's true death toll. Available at: <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/coronavirus-excess-deaths-estimates>.

SECTION 3

- 1 OECD. (2023) Health status: Suicide rates. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/suicide-rates/indicator/english_a82f3459-en.
- 2 Macias, A. (2014) Mexicans are the happiest people in a new global survey. Business Insider. Available at: <https://www.businessinsider.com/heres-how-happy-43-countries-are-2014-10>.
- 3 Helliwell, J.F., et al. (2023) The World Happiness Report 2023. Available at: <https://worldhappiness.report/>.
- 4 Sever, C. (2022) Legal gender equality as a catalyst for convergence. IMF. Available at: <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2022/07/28/Legal-Gender-Equality-as-a-Catalyst-for-Convergence-521468>.

SECTION 4

- 1 IEP. (2019) Global Peace Index 2019. Vision of Humanity. Available at: <https://www.economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/GPI-2019web-1.pdf>.
- 2 Reuters. (2023) Recent coups in West and Central Africa. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/recent-coups-west-central-africa-2023-08-30/>.

Our research analyses peace and its economic value.



We develop global and national indices, calculate the economic impact of violence, analyse country level risk and have developed an empirical framework for Positive Peace that provides a roadmap to overcome adversity and conflict, helping to build and sustain lasting peace.

Download our latest reports and research briefs for free at:
[visionofhumanity.org/resources](https://www.visionofhumanity.org/resources)





FOR MORE INFORMATION

INFO@ECONOMICSANDPEACE.ORG

EXPLORE OUR WORK

WWW.ECONOMICSANDPEACE.ORG AND

WWW.VISIONOFHUMANITY.ORG



GlobalPeaceIndex



@GlobPeaceIndex


IEP is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit think tank dedicated to shifting the world's focus to peace as a positive, achievable, and tangible measure of human well-being and progress.

IEP is headquartered in Sydney, with offices in New York, Brussels, The Hague, Mexico City and Nairobi. It works with a wide range of partners internationally and collaborates with intergovernmental organisations on measuring and communicating the economic value of peace.

The Institute for Economics & Peace is a registered charitable research institute in Australia as a Deductible Gift Recipient. IEP USA is a 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization.

MARCH 2024 / IEP REPORT 93

ISBN 978-0-6451494-8-7



9 780645 149487 >