README File for Reproducibility Package for
Supporting Access to Justice in South Sudan - A 2024 JUPITER Assessment
Erica Bosio & Virginia Upegui Caro

Contents

Overview

The report "Supporting Access to Justice in South Sudan: A 2024 JUPITER Assessment" (hereinafter, the "JUPITER report") contains analysis based on data from various sources, including administrative data provided by the Judiciary of South Sudan, budget data from the Government of South Sudan, surveys conducted by World Bank Group (WBG) staff, a cross-country judicial budget dataset developed by the authors for a previous paper, comparative caseload statistics from selected countries in Africa, and public reports and databases that are referenced for each exhibit. The analysis performed on this data is done with Excel, except for the comparative analysis of cross-country judicial budgets, which is done with Stata (Figure 9).

This document is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the data sources and their availability. Section 3 provides instructions for replicators for each exhibit. Section 4 outlines the computational requirements. Section 5 describes the code for Figure 9 and provides the mapping between the code and the exhibit. Section 6 explains the folder structure.

Data Availability

The following table outlines the availability of the data for each exhibit, in order of appearance in the report. Figures 1ES, 1, 2, and 3 of the report are infographics and do not present analysis of data, so are not included in the table.

Exhibit	Data Source	Location	Provided	Availability
Table 1	Deng, 2013[1]	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 4	List of Judges and Duty Stations	\Data\Raw\Data Provided by Judiciary (June 2024)	For reproducibility verification only	CONFIDENTIAL

---

[1] Deng, D. K. 2013. *Challenges of accountability: An assessment of dispute resolution processes in rural South Sudan*. Juba: South Sudan Law Society.

Exhibit	Data Source	Location	Provided	Availability
	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Subnational Population Estimates	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 5	Surveys of Court Users	\Data\Raw\Scanned User Surveys (June 2024)	For reproducibility verification only	CONFIDENTIAL
Figure 6	List of Judges and Duty Stations	\Data\Raw\Data Provided by Judiciary (June 2024)	For reproducibility verification only	CONFIDENTIAL
Table 2	Salary scales in South Sudan Budget Book FY 2022 – 2023	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 7	South Sudan Budget Book FY 2018-2019	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan Budget Book FY 2019-2020	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan Budget Book FY 2020-2021	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan Budget Book FY 2021-2022	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan Budget Book FY 2022-2023	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan Budget Book FY 2023-2024	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 8	South Sudan Budget Execution Report Q2 2023-2024	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 9	BOOST Court Budget	\Data\Raw\boost.xlsx BOOST OPEN BUDGET PORTAL (Link) Accessed 03/04/24	YES	PUBLIC
	COFOG Court Budget	\Data\Raw\ Expenditure_by_Functions_of_Governm.xlsx IMF DATA (Link)	YES	PUBLIC

Exhibit	Data Source	Location	Provided	Availability
		Accessed 05/17/24		
	ODI Court Budget	\Data\Raw\Domestic_ Financing_Data_- _for_website.xlsx	YES	PUBLIC
		ODI GLOBAL (Link) Accessed 05/17/24		
	WB Court Budgets (National Budget Documents)	\Data\Raw\Court Budget_Percentage of GDP_v5_Updated URLs.xlsx	YES	PUBLIC
		National Budget Documents collected by WBG, references linked in ALL - Consolidated" sheet, Column N ("Source") Accessed 05/15/24		
	WEO Government Expenditure	\Data\Raw\ WEOApr2024all.xls	YES	PUBLIC
		IMF WEO DATA (Link) Accessed 05/17/24		
	WB Income and Government Expenditure	\Data\Raw\ P_Data_Extract_From _World_Development _Indicators (1).xlsx	YES	PUBLIC
		\Data\Raw\ P_Data_Extract_From _World_Development _Indicators (4).xlsx		
		WBG WDI(Link) Accessed 05/17/24		
Figure 10	Surveys of Court Users	\Data\Raw\Scanned User Surveys	For reproducibility verification only	CONFIDENTIAL
Figure 11	Caseload Statistics of Supreme Court of South Sudan	Information extracted manually by WBG during field mission (June 2024)	YES	NOT PUBLIC
Figure 12	Caseload Juba County Court	Information extracted manually by WBG	YES	NOT PUBLIC

Exhibit	Data Source	Location	Provided	Availability
		during field mission (June 2024)		
	Caseload High Court of Central Equatoria State	\Documentation\Data Provided by the Judiciary (June 2024)	YES	NOT PUBLIC
	Caseload of Court of Appeal of Greater Equatoria	Information extracted manually by WBG during field mission (June 2024)	YES	NOT PUBLIC
Figure 13	Caseload South Sudan (Juba County Court, High Court of Central Equatoria State, Court of Appeal of Greater Equatoria, and Supreme Court)	Information extracted manually by WBG during field mission (June 2024) \Data\Raw\Data Provided by the Judiciary (June 2024)	YES	NOT PUBLIC
	Kenya, Judiciary Annual Report 2022/23	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Liberia, JUPITER Report 2023	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Rwanda, Report on the Performance of the Judiciary 2022-2023	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Tanzania, Comprehensive Performance Report of the Judicial Function 2023	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Uganda, Judiciary Annual Performance Report 2022/23	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 14	Tanzania, Doing Business (DB) 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Uganda, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC

Exhibit	Data Source	Location	Provided	Availability
	Liberia, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Kenya, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Rwanda, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
Figure 15	Tanzania, Doing Business (DB) 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	South Sudan, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Uganda, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Liberia, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Kenya, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC
	Rwanda, DB 2020, Enforcing Contracts	Link Accessed 03/25/25	YES	PUBLIC

Instructions for Replication

Exhibits in Excel

The sections below present the instructions for replication of each exhibit. In the files outlined below, tab color in red indicates confidential raw data that is not allowed to redistribute, which the authors shared with the Development Impact Analytics Reproducibility Team ("DIME Analytics") only for the purposes of the internal WBG reproducibility verification under a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

Table 1.xlsx: This Excel file comprises one tab, which transcribes the results of the survey conducted for the report "Challenges of Accountability: An Assessment of Dispute Resolution Processes in Rural South Sudan" authored by David K. Deng and commissioned by the South Sudan Law Society. This report was published in March 2013.

The household survey presented in the cited report was conducted in March and April 2012 with the assistance of the South Sudan National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) to gauge people's perceptions and experiences with the justice system in rural areas of South Sudan. The goal of the survey was to gather baseline information about people's experiences with the justice system, their perceptions of

how well the system served them based on such experiences and their opinions about justice. The NBS developed a sample of 1,520 randomly selected households in six counties (Akobo, Budi, Ikotos, Nasir, Pibor, and Renk).

The table labeled as *Table 1* in the JUPITER report displays survey results from Deng (2013), showing the percentage of respondents who selected specific dispute resolution mechanisms for cases of "Homicide" (page 74), "Physical Assault" (page 75), and "Rape" (page 71). Participants indicated their preferred complaint mechanisms for resolving various types of disputes, choosing from a list of 21 options. The percentages showcased in Table 1 were not calculated by WBG staff and are shown as presented in the cited report.

Figure 4.xlsx: This Excel file comprises two tabs. The first tab, "Transcribed Data (CONFIDENTIAL)," contains the transcribed data from the "List of Judges and Duty Stations" provided by the Judiciary of South Sudan to WBG staff during the field mission conducted in June 2024 to Juba, South Sudan. This includes the name, title, duty station, and location of each judge at the various court levels.

The second tab, "Figure 4_Calculations," presents the analysis of the number of judges per inhabitant in South Sudan. Since the most recent population census for South Sudan was conducted in 2008, the calculations are based on population estimates made available by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The calculations are performed by dividing the population per state by the number of judges assigned to each state, as follows:

$$\frac{Population\ per\ state}{Number\ of\ judges}$$

Please note that OCHA population estimates do not include information for Ruweng and Pibor. Since no judges are assigned to these areas, the outcome is the same to that of Unity State, which also has no judges available for comparison against the population.

The result of the calculations were used to produce the heat map presented as *Figure 4* in the JUPITER report, which was produced with the support of the WBG Cartography Unit.

Figure 5.xlsx: This Excel file comprises two tabs. The first tab, "Coded Survey (CONFIDENTIAL)," contains the transcribed verbatim answers from the court user surveys conducted between May and June 2024 by WBG staff during a field mission to Juba, South Sudan. The WBG team surveyed 85 court users (26 female and 59 male) across different age groups (respondents' ages ranged from 19 to 75).

Court users were given a questionnaire with 12 open-ended questions related to their experience with the court system, which they had to fill in manually. These answers were transcribed verbatim into the Excel file tab "Coded Survey (CONFIDENTIAL)" and then coded by the WBG team in the same tab.

Figure 5 of the JUPITER report corresponds to the results of Question 6: "What has been the most challenging part of your interaction with the court?". The answers to this question provided by the respondents were coded into seven categories, including:
- *Cost and Attorney Fees*: Respondents who mentioned issues related to the financial costs of accessing the courts, including court and attorney fees, were included under this category.

- *Delays*: Respondents who mentioned issues related to the time it has taken the court to resolve their dispute and the existence of delays in the resolution of their case were included under this category.
- *Language Barrier*: Respondents who mentioned having issues with the procedures, documents, and court hearings being conducted in a language that is not their native language were included under this category.
- *No Challenges*: Respondents who mentioned not having any challenges during their experience with the courts were included under this category.
- *Not Enough Time with the Judge*: Respondents who mentioned having not enough time with the judge or during the hearing to present their concerns or case in detail were categorized under this category.
- *Undue Influence and Corruption*: Respondents who mentioned being affected by acts of corruption or undue influence were included in this category.
- *Unprofessional Behavior and Misconduct*: Respondents who mentioned that the judge or judicial staff did not act in a professional manner or were mistreated by the judge are included in this category.

After coding the responses, the second tab "Figure 5_Calculations" contains the calculations performed by the WBG staff based on the coded answers. The team determined the percentage of respondents for each category with the following formula:

$$Respondents\ (\%) = \frac{Number\ of\ respondents\ per\ category}{Total\ number\ of\ respondents} \times 100$$

It should be noted that one respondent was excluded from the sample because their answer could not be categorized as they did not specify a particular challenge.

Figure 6.xlsx: This Excel file comprises two tabs. The first tab, "Transcribed Data (CONFIDENTIAL)," contains the transcribed data from the "List of Judges and Duty Stations" provided by the Judiciary of South Sudan to WBG staff during the field mission conducted in June 2024 to Juba, South Sudan. This includes the name, title, duty station, and location of each judge at various court levels.

The second tab, "Figure 6_Calculations," presents the number of judges per each staffing level, based on the title of the judges presented in the transcribed data. Please note that the category Supreme Court includes the Chief Justice and the Deputy Chief Justice, who are members of the Supreme Court.

Table 2: This Excel file comprises two tabs. The firs tab transcribes the data related to the general public sector pay scale and judicial pay scale at the different staffing levels published by the Ministry of Finance and Planning of South Sudan in the [Budget Book for the Fiscal Year 2022-2023](). This includes data on the monthly salary, the monthly allowance, the housing allowances, and the total compensation of staff under each category.

Based on this information, in the tab "Table 2_Calculations," the WBG team compared the base pay (BP) and total compensation (TC) of judicial officials at the different levels with the general public sector pay scale. This was done in the column F "Pay", based on the following formulas:

$$\frac{Judicial\ Official\ BP}{Public\ Sector\ Scale\ BP} \times 100$$

$$\frac{Judicial\ Official\ TC}{Public\ Sector\ Scale\ TC} \times 100$$

In addition, the WBG team converted the BP and TC salaries at each judicial staffing level from South Sudanese Pounds (SSP) to the United States Dollars (USD) equivalent as of July 2022 and October 2024. The SSP to USD exchange rates are taken as the overall market average rate from WBG "Microdata_SSD_2023_RTFX_v01_M." Please refer to chart and select South Sudan>Market Average>Exchange rate unofficial>MA6 and search the specified periods in the dotted line.

Figure 7.xlsx: This Excel file contains a single tab labeled "Figure 7," which includes both the transcribed data from the budget books of the Government of South Sudan and the calculations performed by the WBG team. The team transcribed the data from the budget books available on the Ministry of Finance and Planning of South Sudan's website for the following fiscal periods: 2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2020-2021, 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024.

The Government budget details the amount allocated to each line institution and is further aggregated into 11 overarching functions: Accountability; Economic Functions; Education; Health; Infrastructure; Natural Resources & Rural Development; Public Administration; Rule of Law; Security; and Social & Humanitarian Affairs. The WBG team transcribed the budget amounts for each function from the "Grand Total" column in the Approved Budget table of each budget book. To conduct a comparative analysis with the expenditure allocated to the Judiciary, the team also transcribed the budget allocation to the Judiciary of South Sudan as a line institution. Subsequently, the team calculated the budget allocated to the Rule of Law excluding the Judiciary by subtracting the allocation to the Judiciary.

For the purposes of comparing expenditures, the team further aggregated the spending agencies into the following categories:
- *Economic Sector Agencies*: Includes allocations under Economic Functions, Infrastructure, and Natural Resources & Rural Development functions.
- *Judiciary*: Includes the allocation to the Judiciary of South Sudan as a line institution.
- *Public Administration Agencies:* Includes allocations under Accountability and Public Administration functions.
- *Security Agencies*: Includes allocations under the Security function.
- *Social Sector Agencies*: Includes allocations under the Education, Health, and Social & Humanitarian Affairs functions.
- *Rule of Law (excl. Judiciary) Agencies*: Includes allocations under the Rule of Law function, excluding the allocation to the Judiciary of South Sudan.

Based on the aggregate amounts of each of the categories presented above, the team calculated the share of each category as a percentage of the total government expenditure, based on the following formula:

$$Share\ of\ sector\ expenditure\ (\%) = \frac{Sectoral\ expenditure}{Total\ government\ expenditure} \times 100$$

This data is presented for the fiscal periods 2019-2020, 2020-2021, 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024 on the X-axis. Each sector is represented in a different color as a percentage of the government expenditure on the Y-axis.

Figure 8.xlsx: This Excel file contains one tab labeled "Figure 8," which includes transcribed data from the Second Quarter 2023-2024 Budget Execution Report published by the Ministry of Finance and Planning of South Sudan. Using Table A4, which corresponds to the percentage of annual budget execution rate by midyear, the WBG team transcribed the data for the 18 line institutions shown in *Figure 8*. The Y axis represents the line institutions, while the X axis shows the percentage budget execution rate as reported by the Government of South Sudan, without any calculations by WBG staff.

Figure 10: This Excel file comprises two tabs. The first tab, "Coded Survey (CONFIDENTIAL)," contains the transcribed verbatim answers from the court user surveys conducted between May and June 2024 by WBG staff during a field mission to Juba, South Sudan. The WBG team surveyed 85 court users (26 female and 59 male) across different age groups (respondents' ages ranged from 19 to 75).

Court users were given a questionnaire with 12 open-ended questions related to their experience with the court system, which they had to fill in manually. These answers were transcribed verbatim into the Excel file tab "Coded Survey (CONFIDENTIAL)" and then coded by the WBG team in the same tab.

Figure 10 of the JUPITER report corresponds to the results of Question 9: "In your view, what is the main reason for delays in the courts?". The answers to this question provided by the respondents were coded into seven categories, including:
- *Corruption and Unprofessional Conduct:* Respondents who attributed delays to corrupt practices and unprofessional conduct by judges, court staff, or the other party were included in this category.
- *Cumbersome Procedures:* Respondents who attributed delays to excessive documentation, complex legal procedures, excessive formalities, and navigating through various bureaucratic layers were included in this category.
- *I Don't Know:* Respondents who were unsure about the causes of delays were included in this category.
- *Improper Case Management and Handling of Files:* Respondents who attributed delays to the lack of capacity of judges and judicial staff to properly manage cases and handle files (e.g., lost or damaged files) were included in this category.
- *Improper Infrastructure and Lack of Resources:* Respondents who attributed delays to inadequate working conditions and the lack of resources for the judiciary (e.g., office space, infrastructure, equipment) were included in this category.
- *Issues with Counterpart:* Respondents who attributed delays to dilatory practices by the counterpart were included in this category.
- *Staffing Shortages and Inadequate Salaries:* Respondents who attributed delays to the lack of sufficient human resources at the courts and inadequate incentives for judicial staff in terms of low compensation were included in this category.

After coding the responses, the second tab "Figure 10_Calculations" contains the calculations performed by the WBG staff based on the coded answers. The team determined the percentage of respondents for each category with the following formula:

$$Respondents\ (\%) = \frac{Number\ of\ respondents\ per\ category}{Total\ number\ of\ respondents} \times 100$$

Figure 11: The Excel file includes a tab labeled "Figure 11," which presents caseload information for the Supreme Court of South Sudan collected during the field mission in June 2024 to Juba, South Sudan. As the Court's registry did not have aggregated caseload data, the WBG team manually counted cases from the physical docket books, gathering data on incoming and resolved cases for the years 2021, 2022, and 2023.

Using the collected data, the team calculated the clearance rate (CR) of the Supreme Court, representing the ratio of new cases to completed cases within the years 2021, 2022, and 2023. This calculation follows the methodology established by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice – CEPEJ, using the following formula:

$$CR(\%) = \frac{Resolved\ Cases}{Incoming\ Cases} x\ 100$$

Figure 11 illustrates a double Y axis chart, with the number of cases displayed on one side and the CR on the opposite side. The X axis denotes the reported years, specifically 2021, 2022, and 2023.

Figure 12: The Excel file comprises two tabs. The first tab "CASELOAD 2021-23" presents the caseload information for the Juba County Court, the High Court of Central Equatoria State, and the Court of Appeal of Greater Equatoria, collected during the field mission in June 2024 to Juba, South Sudan. As the County Court and the Court of Appeal registries did not have aggregated caseload data, the WBG team manually counted cases from the physical docket books, gathering data on incoming and resolved cases for the years 2021, 2022, and 2023. The High Court of Central Equatoria State presented a caseload report for criminal and civil appeals, which are included in the Data folder in the Reproducibility Package (Data\Raw\Data Provided by the Judiciary).

The second tab "Figure 12_Calculations" contains the calculation of the CR of the different courts, representing the ratio of new cases to completed cases within the years 2021, 2022, and 2023. This calculation follows the methodology established by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice – CEPEJ, using the following formula:

$$CR(\%) = \frac{Resolved\ Cases}{Incoming\ Cases} x\ 100$$

Figure 12 illustrates a double Y axis chart, with the number of cases displayed on one side and the CR on the opposite side. The X axis denotes the reported years, specifically 2021, 2022, and 2023, for the three courts represented in the figure. It is important to note that the High Court caseload aggregates both criminal and civil cases.

Figure 13: The Excel file contains two tabs. The first tab, "CASELOAD SS," provides caseload information for the Juba County Court, the High Court of Central Equatoria State, the Court of Appeal

of Greater Equatoria, and the Supreme Court of South Sudan, compiled during the field mission in June 2024 to Juba, South Sudan. Due to the absence of aggregated caseload data in court registries, the WBG team manually counted cases from physical docket books, collecting data on incoming and resolved cases for the years 2021, 2022, and 2023. The High Court of Central Equatoria State supplied a caseload report for criminal and civil appeals, which is included in the Data folder within the Reproducibility Package (Data\Raw\Data Provided by the Judiciary).

The second tab, "Figure 13_Calculations," includes comparative caseload statistics for Kenya, Liberia, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda for the latest available period (primarily 2023, with Liberia data from 2022). This data was sourced from the annual reports published by the judiciaries of each respective country and the report "Improving Access to Justice in Liberia - A 2023 JUPITER Assessment" by the authors of this report, which collected data on caseload for Liberia.[2]

Based on this data, the team calculated the CR of various courts across the different countries, including South Sudan. This calculation adheres to the methodology established by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice – CEPEJ, using the following formula:

$$CR(\%) = \frac{Resolved\ Cases}{Incoming\ Cases} x\ 100$$

Figure 13 presents the comparative CR of these countries at four court levels: Primary Court, High Court, Court of Appeal and Highest National Court.

Figure 14: This Excel file includes a tab labeled "Figure 14," which presents data from the WBG's Doing Business (DB) database under the "Enforcing Contract" indicator. Under this indicator, the WBG team searched for data related to court fees as a percentage of the claim value.

According to the DB methodology, costs are recorded as a percentage of claim value, assumed to be equivalent to 200 percent of income per capita or USD 5,000, whichever is greater. For court fees, the percentage includes all costs that the plaintiff must advance to the court.[3]

For the JUPITER report, the WBG team collected data from countries in the regions to compare with the court fees levied in South Sudan, using data from Kenya, Liberia, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda. The team transcribed the data as presented in the DB database without performing any calculations. *Figure 14* presents this information, with the Y axis representing the court fees as percentage of the claim value, and the X axis representing each country.

Figure 15: This Excel file includes a tab labeled "Figure 15," which presents data from the WBG's DB database under the "Enforcing Contract" indicator. Under this indicator, the WBG team searched for data related to attorney fees as a percentage of the claim value.

According to the DB methodology, costs are recorded as a percentage of claim value, assumed to be equivalent to 200 percent of income per capita or USD 5,000, whichever is greater. In terms of

---

[2] For details, refer to the Excel file showing the pages of transcribed data for each country.
[3] World Bank Group. n.d. *Doing Business. Enforcing Contracts Methodology.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

attorney fees, the percentage includes the average fees the plaintiff must advance to a local attorney to be represented in a case, regardless of final reimbursement.[4]

For the JUPITER report, the WBG team collected data from countries in the regions to compare with the attorney fees charged in South Sudan, using data from Kenya, Liberia, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda. The team transcribed the data as presented in the DB database without performing any calculations. *Figure 15* presents this information, with the Y axis representing the attorney fees as percentage of the claim value, and the X axis representing each country.

Exhibits in Stata

The cross-country comparative budget analysis presented in the report is produced in Stata using the code described below and the data outlined in the Data Availability section (see data for Figure 9).

New users should follow these steps to run the package successfully:
- Update the following files with your directory paths
   - main.do
   - Run the main.do file

The provided code reproduces the following exhibits:

Exhibit name	Output filename	Script	Note
Figure 9	figure 9.svg	02_analysis.do	Found in Outputs/

Computational Requirements

Software requirements

- **Microsoft 365, Excel, Version 2412**
- **Stata, Version 18**
   - kountry
   - asdoc

Runtime requirements
The do-file will run for about 2 minutes.

Code Description

00_main.do sets file paths and executes all other dofiles. Meanwhile, 01_cleaning.do loads and merges data, and 02_analysis.do generates Figure 9.

---

[4] World Bank Group. n.d. *Doing Business. Enforcing Contracts Methodology*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

[Folder Structure](#)

Code
└   00_main.do
└   01_cleaning.do
└   02_figure_9.do

Data
└   Cleaned
└   Raw

Documentation
└   README_JUPITER South Sudan 2024.pdf

Excel Figures
└   Figure 10.xlsx
└   Figure 11.xlsx
└   Figure 12.xlsx
└   Figure 13.xlsx
└   Figure 14.xlsx
└   Figure 15.xlsx
└   Figure 4.xlsx
└   Figure 5.xlsx
└   Figure 6.xlsx
└   Figure 7.xlsx
└   Figure 8.xlsx
└   Table 1.xlsx
└   Table 2.xlsx

Outputs
└   Figure 9.svg