

Document: EB 2014/111/INF.6
Date: 11 March 2014
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Investing in rural people

Overview of the performance-based allocation system

Note to Executive Board representatives

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Brian Baldwin
Senior Operations Management Officer
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2377
e-mail: b.baldwin@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

Deirdre McGrenra
Head, Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

Executive Board — 111th Session
Rome, 8-9 April 2014

For: Information

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Adjustments to the PBAS	1
III. PBAS working group	2
IV. Countries included in allocation periods	2
V. Application of PBAS formula	3
VI. Post-conflict and fragile states	4
VII. Application of the PBAS in 2014	4
VIII. The updating of the 2013 country scores and 2014 country allocations	5

Annex

I. Allocation period 2013-2015 - 2013 country scores and annual allocations	6
II. 2013 rural sector performance assessments	11

Appendix

A comparative table of MDB/IFI performance-based allocation systems

Overview of the performance-based allocation system

I. Introduction

1. At its twenty-sixth session held in February 2003, the Governing Council endorsed the view that the Executive Board would henceforth approach the allocation system required by the Lending Policies and Criteria in a more systematic way and along the lines of the approach found at other international financial institutions (IFIs), and adopt a performance-based allocation system (PBAS). Authority was delegated to the Executive Board to develop the details of the system's design and implementation.
2. The objectives of a PBAS are to:
 - Have a transparent rules-based approach to resource allocation;
 - Provide a performance incentive for member countries, particularly in regard to the quality of policies and institutions in the rural sector; and
 - Allocate resources according to need when countries perform equally well.
3. Several other development financial institutions use a PBAS, including: the African Development Bank (AfDB), the Asian Development Bank (AsDB), the Caribbean Development Bank, the Global Environment Facility, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the International Development Association (IDA) of the World Bank. All these IFIs implement a system that assesses both performance and need and, together with IFAD, meet annually to review issues and progress.
4. The PBAS is based on annual allocation exercises that operate in the context of three-year cycles, or "allocation periods". Within each cycle, IFAD reviews the ex ante allocations annually to reflect the results of the annual country performance assessments, as these capture significant changes in country needs and/or achievements in the sphere of policy and institutional frameworks. The first allocation exercise covered the period 2005-2006, and thereafter the Consultation/Replenishment periods. The current exercise covers the period 2013-2015, which coincides with the Ninth Replenishment period. The Report of the Consultation on the Seventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources¹ confirmed that the uniform system of allocation across the IFAD lending programme as a whole would become effective for the 2007 programme of work (i.e. the first year of the Seventh Replenishment period), and that fixed regional allocations would no longer apply.

II. Adjustments to the PBAS

5. After these systems were introduced, it was recognized by all practitioners that adjustments and improvements were needed. At its April 2006 session, the Executive Board agreed that:
 - (a) In line with the Agreement Establishing IFAD, the resources of the Fund would continue to be used with "due regard to a fair geographic distribution". Moreover, with the application of a uniform system of allocation as from 2007, IFAD would, in line with the decisions reached during the Seventh Replenishment, "continue to direct at least the current percentage share of resources to sub-Saharan Africa, provided that the performance of individual countries warrants it".

¹ IFAD's Contribution to Reaching the Millennium Development Goals: Report of the Consultation on the Seventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (2007-2009) (document GC 29/L.4).

- (b) The weight of 0.45 was regarded as a “point of balance” where population still carried significant influence as a determinant of “needs” in the formula but at the same time allowed performance and GNI per capita to have a strong role. It was therefore agreed that the formula would be modified accordingly to reflect a revised weight of population at 0.45, which had previously been set at 0.75 which made population the overwhelming determinant of country allocations.
- (c) There was broad agreement that, given IFAD’s specific focus on rural poverty, the use of rural population (rather than total population) would better reflect IFAD’s mandate. In this regard, it was agreed that the rural population would be applied in PBAS from the 2008 work programme.

III. PBAS working group

6. After April 2006, a working group of the Executive Board was convened to develop a broader understanding of evolving issues in PBAS implementation.
7. Under the chairpersonship of an Executive Board member, the terms of reference of the working group² were agreed with the aim of:
- “Developing a broader understanding of evolving issues in PBAS implementation including:
- modifications of elements of the formula, including performance assessments, and the weights of population and income, while maintaining the overall weight of performance;
 - the experience and lessons learned from other agencies implementing PBAS initiatives;
 - the data to be used for rural population;
 - the implementation of the PBAS for concessional and non-concessional borrowers; and
 - other potential indicators of poverty such as nutrition and per capita rural income levels.”
8. In the Report of the Consultation on the Eighth Replenishment of IFAD’s Resources approved by the Governing Council in February 2009, the Board was requested to mandate the PBAS working group to continue its functions and, as well, to review the practices of other IFIs and identify ways to improve the system. Possible areas for examination include: the relative weight of different elements of the PBAS formula, the current level of minimum and maximum allocations and the possible need for exceptional allocations for particularly vulnerable countries, in addition to the support extended to post-conflict countries.

IV. Countries included in allocation periods

9. Since its inception in 2005, the number of countries included in each PBAS period has shown slight variations. The main rationale for this is to ensure that countries included in the PBAS process receive a sufficient amount to allow for an effective level of intervention by IFAD. The following summarizes the countries included, together with the number receiving a minimum allocation:
- **2005-2007:** 119 countries (36 minimum allocation);

² As at April 2014, the Working Group includes:
 List A: France, Italy, Sweden and the United States of America
 List B: Nigeria and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
 sub-List C1: Mauritius
 sub-List C2: Turkey (2013), Republic of Korea (2014)
 sub-List C3: Mexico

- **2007-2009:** 90 “active”³ countries (9 minimum allocation);
- **2010-2012:** 113 countries (11 minimum allocation); and
- **2013-2015:** 99 countries (5 minimum allocation)

V. Application of PBAS formula

10. IFAD is similar to best practices in other IFIs and funds that use a PBAS. The variables that are common to almost all IFI formulae are:
 - Needs variables (rural population and GNI/capita)
 - Performance variables (including rural sector performance)
11. AfDB, AsDB, IDB, IDA and IFAD use GNI per capita and population as a measure of needs, due to its mandate, IFAD uses rural population.⁴
12. With regard to the country performance score, this is derived from three variables:
 - IDA Resource Allocation Index (IRAI) with a weight of 20 per cent.
 - Rural Sector Performance (RSP) with a weight of 45 per cent.
 - Projects at Risk (PAR) with a weight of 35 per cent.
13. The slightly greater weight given to the rural sector performance framework compared to portfolio-level implementation reflects the crucial role played by the former in project sustainability and replicability – key IFAD objectives.
14. The IFAD formula is, therefore:

$$RuralPOP^{0.45} \times GNIPC^{0.25} \times [0.2IRAI + 0.35PAR + 0.45RSP]^{2.0}$$
15. Table 1 below shows how the PBAS formula is used to derive the country score.
16. The rural sector performance score (RSP), with its rural sector clusters and indicators is a unique feature of IFAD’s performance-based allocation system. This is an assessment of country performance in establishing a policy and institutional framework conducive to sustained rural poverty reduction. These include the following clusters and indicators:

A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations

- (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations
- (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations

B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology

- (i) Access to land
- (ii) Access to water for agriculture
- (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services

C. Increasing access to financial services and markets

- (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development
- (ii) Investment climate for rural businesses
- (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets

³ “Active” countries: where IFAD expected to have new lending or Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grant operations in 2007-2009.

⁴ The appendix gives an overview of all other multilateral development banks/IFI PBASs.

D. Gender issues

- (i) Access to education in rural areas
- (ii) Representation

E. Public resource management and accountability

- (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development
- (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas

Table 1
Derivation of country scores 2013

Country	Rural population ^{0.45}		GNI per capita ^{-0.25}		IRAI		PAR		Rural sector performance		Country score
Lao PDR	4 136 120 ^{+0.45}	X	1 130 ^{-0.25}	X	[(0.2 x 3.36) + (0.35 x 1.9) + (0.45 x 3.59)] ^{+2.0}	=					1 427
Lesotho	1 588 917 ^{+0.45}	X	1 220 ^{-0.25}	X	[(0.2 x 3.43) + (0.35 x 5.1) + (0.45 x 3.99)] ^{+2.0}	=					1 900
Nicaragua	2 491 379 ^{+0.45}	X	1 170 ^{-0.25}	X	[(0.2 x 3.68) + (0.35 x 4.9) + (0.45 x 3.92)] ^{+2.0}	=					2 295
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 940 915 ^{+0.45}	X	4 780 ^{-0.25}	X	[(0.2 x 3.64) + (0.35 x 6.0) + (0.45 x 4.08)] ^{+2.0}	=					1 766
Liberia	2 139 335 ^{+0.45}	X	240 ^{-0.25}	X	[(0.2 x 3.03) + (0.35 x 5.8) + (0.45 x 3.04)] ^{+2.0}	=					2 877

17. Table 2 below shows how the country score is used to define the country allocation, as a proportion of the total programme of loans and DSF grants.

Table 2
PBAS allocation process

Country	Country score	x	2013-2015 envelope (US\$)	÷	Sum of final country scores	=	2013-2015 country allocation (US\$)
Lao PDR	1 427	x	2 353 200 000	÷	318 882	=	9 771 619
Lesotho	1 900	x	2 353 200 000	÷	318 882	=	13 355 874
Nicaragua	2 295	x	2 353 200 000	÷	318 882	=	16 129 418
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 766	x	2 353 200 000	÷	318 882	=	12 727 693
Liberia	2 877	x	2 353 200 000	÷	318 882	=	20 729 808

Notes: Allocation envelope does not include maximum or minimum allocation countries, equivalent to US\$274.8 million making the PBAS allocation for 2013-2015 US\$2.628 billion. Allocations take into account DSF redistribution and capped allocations.

VI. Post-conflict and fragile states

18. IFAD has adopted IDA guidelines for post-conflict and crisis-affected countries (including natural disasters) to deliver an allocation methodology that is in line with PBAS methodology. This results in allocations above normal levels (up to 100 per cent) for a specific period.

VII. Application of the PBAS in 2014

19. The 2013-2015 allocation periods coincide with the Ninth Replenishment period and it has not been necessary to delineate specific "active" countries. Regional divisions have therefore identified countries based on planned project activities, and allocations under country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) and the PBAS allocations have been made accordingly to 98 member countries. However, in order to continue to manage allocations over the three-year period, countries that are expected to use only part of their potential allocation have been capped at the

expected level of financing. This should further reduce the need for reallocations in 2015 and provide better planning parameters for other countries.

20. On this basis, following the PBAS methodology, final country scores and allocations have been assigned annually and combined with the provisional figures for subsequent years in the allocation period to provide an overall country allocation for the three-year allocation period. The scores provided for 2014 were final (as they are based on the 2013 country scores) and the allocations for 2015 are provisional.⁵ With the move to uniform allocations, the data have been subject to interregional review and benchmarking to ensure consistency in assessments and, as a result, the scoring approach of the rural sector performance assessment indicators has been improved. In this regard, the Latin America and the Caribbean Division worked closely with the Regional Unit for Technical Assistance (RUTA) in Costa Rica on the 2011 rural sector performance assessment indicators to assess and compare scores throughout the region.

VIII. The updating of the 2013 country scores and 2014 country allocations

21. In the fourth quarter of 2013, updated data on portfolio and rural sector performance became available and the process of updating country scores for 2014 began. The updated data are reflected in the final 2013 country scores and 2014 country allocations, which were tabled at the December 2013 Executive Board, approved by the Governing Council in February 2014 and subsequently disclosed in accordance with the procedures agreed for disclosure of PBAS information on the IFAD website (www.ifad.org/operations/pbas).
22. In 2013 and 2014, the first two years of the allocation period, no reallocations between countries have been needed. The same is true in other agencies having adopted a PBAS. However, in developing the PBAS for IFAD, the Executive Board recognized that situations could arise in which it would not be possible to deliver commitments against ex ante country allocations within the allocation period – owing, for example, to a lack of demand for IFAD loans or the absence of opportunities to engage in operations in priority activities as identified in results-based COSOPs. In such cases, the unused allocation would be reabsorbed into the allocable resource pool⁶ for redistribution through the prevailing PBAS (document EB 2003/79/R.2/Rev.1, paragraph 40). In 2015, therefore, all unused PBA resources from the 2013-2015 allocation periods will be treated as part of the allocable pool of resources for the final year of the allocation period. The unused resources will be allocated according to the PBA methodology.
23. Annex I contains the 2013 country scores by region and the country allocations for the Ninth Replenishment (2013-2015), indicating the annual country allocations for 2013, 2014 and 2015. In order to improve the management of allocations in the three-year period, amounts for countries that are expected to use only part of their potential allocation have been capped at the expected level of financing.
24. Annex II presents details of the rural development sector framework assessments for 2013, in line with the criteria for such assessments set out in document EB 2003/80/R.3. These 2013 assessments form the basis for the rural sector performance score in the total performance rating used for the 2013 country score and 2014 country allocation.

⁵ The provisional allocations are by nature indicative and subject to changes in annual performance (based on assessment of projects at risk, rural sector performance and the IDA Resource Allocation Index), population and GNI per capita. Where appropriate, weighted averages have been used to reduce statistical variance over time.

⁶ The concept of the pool as a source of funds for reallocation was also noted in the section on reallocation of uncommitted resources in document EB 2003/79/C.R.P.3.

Allocation period 2013-2015 2013 country scores and annual allocations

Table 1
Asia and the Pacific

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Final country score	2013 annual allocation	2014 annual allocation	2015 annual allocation	2013 to 2015 allocation
	GNI per capita 2012 ^a	Rural population 2012	IRAI 2012 ^b	Rural sector performance 2013	PAR 2013 ^c	Country performance rating					
Afghanistan	578	22 709 774	2.68	3.20	6	4.07	6 916	17 064 407	15 729 701	15 729 701	48 523 810
Bangladesh	840	110 009 445	3.28	3.80	6	4.40	14 918	33 453 639	35 693 935	35 693 935	104 841 510
Bhutan	2 420	472 239	3.68	4.14	6	4.70	1 127	2 863 365	2 695 546	2 695 546	8 254 458
Cambodia	880	11 863 177	3.45	3.63	4	3.62	3 667	9 098 059	8 774 990	8 774 990	26 648 038
China	5 680	651 364 560		4.32	4	4.36	-	43 800 000	43 710 763	43 710 763	131 221 526
Fiji	4 200	414 388		3.32	4	3.40	484	1 202 923	1 158 713	1 158 713	3 520 348
India	1 530	845 151 713	3.70	4.05	4	3.89	-	43 800 000	43 710 763	43 710 763	131 221 526
Indonesia	3 420	119 858 489		3.88	4	3.98	8 939	18 021 440	21 389 030	21 389 030	60 799 500
Kiribati	2 260	56 373	2.88	3.37	4	3.32	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1 260	4 298 268	3.40	3.59	3	3.24	1 702	3 257 206	3 971 474	3 971 474	11 200 154
Myanmar	550	35 257 099		3.06	4	3.25	5 443	12 302 957	13 023 115	13 023 115	38 349 186
Nepal	700	22 711 529	3.27	3.56	4	3.69	5 406	13 945 026	12 615 218	12 615 218	39 175 462
Pakistan	1 260	113 678 524	3.07	3.74	4	3.63	9 320	21 724 297	22 300 345	22 300 345	66 324 987
Papua New Guinea	1 790	6 265 945	3.30	3.26	6	4.15	3 038	7 453 849	7 268 374	7 268 374	21 990 596
Philippines	2 470	49 201 307		4.19	4	4.28	7 533	20 818 498	18 025 502	18 025 502	56 869 502
Solomon Islands	1 130	434 647	2.96	3.04	4	3.36	671	1 420 987	1 565 642	1 565 642	4 552 270
Sri Lanka	2 920	17 235 745	3.54	3.89	4	3.72	3 397	9 510 132	8 128 428	8 128 428	25 766 987
Thailand ^d	5 210	43 750 320		4.60	4	4.12	5 481	266 667	266 667	266 667	800 000
Timor-Leste	3 670	862 543	3.02	3.06	4	3.38	689	1 577 331	1 647 553	1 647 553	4 872 436
Viet Nam	1 400	60 653 020	3.75	4.23	4	3.88	7 810	17 520 389	18 687 118	18 687 118	54 894 626
Total Asia and the Pacific								280 101 170	281 362 876	281 362 876	842 826 922

^a World Development Indicators, World Bank website, October 2013. GNI estimated based on 2010 GDP/capita (United Nations Statistical office) re-stated to GNI using regional ratio and inflated by OECD deflator for: Argentina, Cook Islands, Cuba, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Libya, Myanmar, Niue, Oman, Somalia, and the Syrian Arab Republic. GNI estimate for Niue based on Government of New Zealand data.

^b International Development Association Resource Allocation Index.

^c Portfolio at risk.

^d Allocation capped.

Table 2
East and Southern Africa

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Final country score	2013 annual allocation	2014 annual allocation	2015 annual allocation	2013 to 2015 allocation
	GNI per capita 2012 ^a	Rural population 2012	IRAI 2012 ^b	Rural sector performance 2013	PAR 2013 ^c	Country performance rating					
Angola	4 580	8 347 740	2.67	3.18	3	3.01	1 439	2 249 329	3 442 242	3 442 242	9 133 813
Burundi	240	8 745 038	3.24	3.70	6	4.41	6 578	13 302 800	14 960 296	14 960 296	43 223 392
Comoros	840	515 402	2.78	3.22	3	2.95	602	1 562 877	1 368 933	1 368 933	4 300 742
Ethiopia	410	75 878 287	3.44	4.14	4	3.95	12 196	28 511 890	29 183 106	29 183 106	86 878 101
Kenya	850	32 643 797	3.86	4.22	5	4.25	8 034	18 905 032	19 224 236	19 224 236	57 353 504
Lesotho	1 380	1 470 945	3.48	3.94	4	3.97	1 543	4 451 958	3 601 256	3 601 256	11 654 469
Madagascar	430	14 890 819	3.04	3.93	6	4.48	7 438	17 837 321	17 796 466	17 796 466	53 430 253
Malawi	320	13 385 592	3.16	3.83	4	3.75	5 365	13 278 127	12 519 760	12 519 760	38 317 647
Mauritius	8 570	751 423		5.03	1	3.27	490	1 250 044	1 171 578	1 171 578	3 593 199
Mozambique	510	17 271 080	3.73	3.98	4	3.83	5 578	12 480 458	13 015 313	13 015 313	38 511 084
Rwanda	568	9 231 734	3.84	4.66	6	4.90	6 689	14 139 554	15 607 985	15 607 985	45 355 525
Seychelles	11 640	40 370		4.44	4	4.03	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
South Africa	7 610	19 233 051		4.10	4	3.84	2 987	7 336 413	7 146 867	7 146 867	21 630 148
South Sudan	650	8 859 635	2.12	3.22	3	2.78	2 048	3 470 311	4 778 346	4 778 346	13 027 003
Swaziland	2 860	969 455		3.97	5	4.38	1 295	2 617 455	3 099 698	3 099 698	8 816 852
Uganda	440	30 530 522	3.72	4.18	5	4.72	11 376	22 241 413	29 004 949	29 004 949	80 251 311
United Republic of Tanzania	570	34 783 330	3.75	4.17	4	3.99	8 077	17 250 883	19 327 304	19 327 304	55 905 492
Zambia	1 350	8 500 543	3.46	3.87	4	3.76	3 066	8 838 736	7 336 175	7 336 175	23 511 085
Total East and Southern Africa								190 724 602	203 584 509	203 584 509	597 893 619

^a World Development Indicators, World Bank website, October 2013. GNI estimated based on 2010 GDP/capita (United Nations Statistical office) re-stated to GNI using regional ratio and inflated by OECD deflator for: Argentina, Cook Islands, Cuba, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Libya, Myanmar, Niue, Oman, Somalia, and the Syrian Arab Republic. GNI estimate for Niue based on Government of New Zealand data.

^b International Development Association Resource Allocation Index.

^c Portfolio at risk.

^d Allocation capped.

Table 3
Latin America and the Caribbean

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Final country score	2013 annual allocation	2014 annual allocation	2015 annual allocation	2013 to 2015 allocation
	GNI per capita 2012 ^a	Rural population 2012	IRA/ 2012 ^b	Rural sector performance 2013	PAR 2013 ^c	Country performance rating					
Argentina	9 851	3 023 751		4.72	5	4.97	2 045	4 119 948	4 894 144	4 894 144	13 908 235
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	2 220	3 440 283	3.63	4.09	5	4.17	2 219	5 274 455	5 308 346	5 308 346	15 891 147
Brazil	11 630	30 053 874		4.97	6	5.42	6 563	16 144 466	15 704 094	15 704 094	47 552 653
Colombia	6 990	11 656 291		4.14	6	4.95	4 059	10 059 916	9 712 194	9 712 194	29 484 303
Cuba	5 471	2 798 466		4.42	4	4.02	1 493	3 573 709	3 572 735	3 572 735	10 719 179
Ecuador	5 200	4 960 096		4.64	4	4.31	2 259	5 089 839	5 404 527	5 404 527	15 898 893
El Salvador	3 580	2 188 546		4.38	4	4.21	1 636	4 298 441	3 914 325	3 914 325	12 127 090
Guatemala	3 140	7 505 699		4.19	3	3.67	2 231	5 982 844	5 338 780	5 338 780	16 660 404
Guyana	3 410	568 776	3.33	4.06	6	4.59	1 073	2 534 733	2 568 318	2 568 318	7 671 369
Haiti	760	4 615 313	2.90	3.67	4	3.56	2 410	6 628 236	5 480 492	5 480 492	17 589 220
Honduras	2 070	3 751 671	3.49	3.85	4	3.80	1 941	4 764 333	4 645 062	4 645 062	14 054 457
Jamaica	5 140	1 297 577		4.30	4	3.95	1 037	2 512 748	2 482 412	2 482 412	7 477 572
Mexico ^d	9 600	26 119 249		4.33	5	4.67	4 785	5 843 283	5 843 283	5 843 283	17 529 850
Nicaragua	1 650	2 524 868	3.71	3.92	5	4.36	2 267	5 376 473	5 290 022	5 290 022	15 956 517
Paraguay	3 290	2 512 067		4.02	6	4.89	2 391	5 881 974	5 721 018	5 721 018	17 324 011
Peru	5 880	6 724 164		4.38	6	5.09	3 493	8 512 146	8 357 293	8 357 293	25 226 732
Saint Lucia	6 530	150 178	3.78	3.94	4	3.75	335	1 000 000	0	0	1 000 000
Trinidad and Tobago	14 400	1 150 476		4.03	4	3.80	703	1 678 390	1 682 677	1 682 677	5 043 744
Uruguay	13 510	250 060		4.60	4	4.16	432	0	1 000 000	1 000 000	2 000 000
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) ^d	12 500	1 888 469		4.53	4	4.43	1 238	2 539 336	2 539 336	2 539 336	7 618 009
Total Latin America and the Caribbean								101 815 269	99 459 058	99 459 058	300 733 385

^a World Development Indicators, World Bank website, October 2013. GNI estimated based on 2010 GDP/capita (United Nations Statistical office) re-stated to GNI using regional ratio and inflated by OECD deflator for: Argentina, Cook Islands, Cuba, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Libya, Myanmar, Niue, Oman, Somalia, and the Syrian Arab Republic. GNI estimate for Niue based on Government of New Zealand data.

^b International Development Association Resource Allocation Index.

^c Portfolio at risk.

^d Allocation capped.

Table 4
Near East, North Africa and Europe

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Final country score	2013 annual allocation	2014 annual allocation	2015 annual allocation	2013 to 2015 allocation
	GNI per capita 2012 ^a	Rural population 2012	IRA/ 2012 ^b	Rural sector performance 2013	PAR 2013 ^c	Country performance rating					
Armenia	3 720	1 064 012	4.13	4.81	5	4.74	1 482	4 266 750	3 546 429	3 546 429	11 359 609
Azerbaijan	6 030	4 287 211		4.05	5	4.42	2 140	5 485 410	5 121 014	5 121 014	15 727 438
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4 650	1 962 467	3.64	4.05	6	4.65	1 778	4 242 564	4 253 435	4 253 435	12 749 434
Djibouti	1 252	196 336	3.09	3.72	5	4.08	673	1 371 423	1 609 332	1 609 332	4 590 087
Egypt	3 000	45 444 639		4.31	5	4.61	8 014	26 264 537	19 176 447	19 176 447	64 617 430
Georgia	3 280	2 121 466	4.44	4.70	5	4.72	2 069	4 598 688	4 950 024	4 950 024	14 498 735
Iraq	5 870	10 922 952		3.70	4	3.62	2 195	6 514 113	5 251 261	5 251 261	17 016 634
Jordan	4 720	1 077 181		4.40	2	3.48	758	2 711 917	1 814 687	1 814 687	6 341 291
Kyrgyzstan	990	3 601 839	3.59	3.76	6	4.51	3 236	7 421 791	7 550 829	7 550 829	22 523 448
Lebanon	9 190	559 324		4.39	3	3.69	537	1 226 592	1 285 264	1 285 264	3 797 120
Morocco	2 950	13 852 056		4.56	4	4.19	3 887	7 977 310	9 301 359	9 301 359	26 580 029
Republic of Moldova	2 250	1 837 606	3.82	4.39	6	4.84	2 240	5 556 463	5 359 900	5 359 900	16 276 263
Sudan	1 450	24 777 161	2.32	3.58	4	3.47	4 153	8 772 447	9 444 286	9 444 286	27 661 018
Syrian Arab Republic ^d	2 734	9 751 694		-	3	1.36	-	333 333	333 333	333 333	1 000 000
Tajikistan	860	5 877 958	3.38	3.32	3	3.08	1 947	3 026 723	4 427 183	4 427 183	11 881 089
Tunisia	4 150	3 607 186		4.48	6	5.14	2 944	7 110 375	7 043 729	7 043 729	21 197 833
Turkey ^d	10 830	20 473 673		4.95	4	4.67	4 162	4 806 718	4 806 718	4 806 718	14 420 155
Uzbekistan	1 720	18 970 236	3.38	3.20	4	3.34	3 268	8 265 500	7 820 535	7 820 535	23 906 570
Yemen	1 270	16 003 154	2.99	3.90	4	3.82	4 277	8 911 880	9 726 602	9 726 602	28 365 083
Total Near East, North Africa and Europe								118 864 535	112 822 365	112 822 365	344 509 265

^a World Development Indicators, World Bank website, October 2013. GNI estimated based on 2010 GDP/capita (United Nations Statistical office) re-stated to GNI using regional ratio and inflated by OECD deflator for: Argentina, Cook Islands, Cuba, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Libya, Myanmar, Niue, Oman, Somalia, and the Syrian Arab Republic. GNI estimate for Niue based on Government of New Zealand data.

^b International Development Association Resource Allocation Index.

^c Portfolio at risk.

^d Allocation capped.

Table 5
West and Central Africa

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Final country score	2013 annual allocation	2014 annual allocation	2015 annual allocation	2013 to 2015 allocation
	GNI per capita 2012 ^a	Rural population 2012	IRA/ 2012 ^b	Rural sector performance 2013	PAR 2013 ^c	Country performance rating					
Benin	750	5 471 683	3.47	3.94	4	3.80	2 964	8 472 775	7 093 218	7 093 218	22 659 212
Burkina Faso	670	11 958 128	3.77	3.98	3	3.59	3 887	9 661 338	9 069 637	9 069 637	27 800 613
Cameroon	1 170	10 273 039	3.23	3.68	4	3.70	3 345	7 987 112	8 003 167	8 003 167	23 993 446
Cabo Verde	3 810	181 326	3.92	4.74	6	5.02	745	1 862 957	1 782 310	1 782 310	5 427 577
Central African Republic	490	2 744 440	2.71	2.41	4	2.88	1 396	3 871 084	3 257 647	3 257 647	10 386 379
Chad	740	9 719 560	2.51	3.06	4	3.38	3 058	5 750 928	6 954 180	6 954 180	19 659 288
Congo	2 550	1 558 051	3.00	3.41	5	3.71	1 184	2 540 612	2 832 431	2 832 431	8 205 475
Côte d'Ivoire	1 220	9 522 564	3.07	2.92	4	3.33	2 586	8 884 294	6 034 821	6 034 821	20 953 935
Democratic Republic of the Congo ^d	220	42 819 352	2.71	3.61	2	2.83	5 659	12 300 642	12 300 642	12 300 642	36 901 926
Gambia (The)	510	756 599	3.35	4.29	6	4.70	2 055	4 483 524	4 796 222	4 796 222	14 075 969
Ghana	1 550	12 043 540	3.80	4.14	6	4.65	5 298	11 782 474	12 677 288	12 677 288	37 137 050
Guinea	460	7 335 227	2.97	2.99	6	4.07	4 402	7 710 439	10 273 185	10 273 185	28 256 808
Guinea-Bissau	550	922 030	2.62	2.54	6	3.77	1 416	3 355 277	3 304 222	3 304 222	9 963 721
Liberia	370	2 155 417	3.06	3.35	6	4.22	2 873	6 909 936	6 875 317	6 875 317	20 660 569
Mali	660	9 569 473	3.38	3.94	4	3.68	3 693	11 137 965	8 618 591	8 618 591	28 375 146
Mauritania	1 110	2 209 734	3.23	3.66	5	4.01	1 990	4 869 463	4 644 181	4 644 181	14 157 825
Niger	370	14 048 049	3.48	3.50	6	4.30	6 945	14 341 377	16 205 573	16 205 573	46 752 523
Nigeria	1 430	84 029 583	3.53	3.88	5	4.20	10 562	29 495 460	25 272 162	25 272 162	80 039 784
Sao Tome and Principe	1 320	69 009	3.05	3.37	6	4.23	446	1 000 000	1 014 958	1 014 958	3 029 915
Senegal	1 040	7 842 005	3.82	4.17	6	4.74	5 014	11 562 125	11 996 119	11 996 119	35 554 364
Sierra Leone	580	3 609 023	3.27	3.79	6	4.46	3 619	9 538 724	8 444 443	8 444 443	26 427 609
Togo	500	4 084 936	2.97	2.98	6	3.96	3 137	6 975 917	7 320 877	7 320 877	21 617 671
Total West and Central Africa								184 494 424	178 771 192	178 771 192	542 036 808
Total IFAD								876 000 000	876 000 000	876 000 000	2 628 000 000

^a World Development Indicators, World Bank website, October 2013. GNI estimated based on 2010 GDP/capita (United Nations Statistical office) re-stated to GNI using regional ratio and inflated by OECD deflator for: Argentina, Cook Islands, Cuba, Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Libya, Myanmar, Niue, Oman, Somalia, and the Syrian Arab Republic. GNI estimate for Niue based on Government of New Zealand data.

^b International Development Association Resource Allocation Index.

^c Portfolio at risk.

^d Allocation capped.

2013 rural sector performance assessments

Table 1
Asia and the Pacific

RSP Indicator	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Cambodia	China	Fiji	India	Indonesia	Kiribati	Laos	Myanmar	Nepal	Pakistan	Papua New Guinea	Philippines	Solomon Islands	Sri Lanka	Thailand	Timor-Leste	Viet Nam	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																					
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.81	4.06	4.44	3.75	4.50	3.00	4.50	4.06	3.25	4.00	3.50	3.88	3.69	3.69	4.56	3.25	3.75	5.25	3.25	4.56	3.94
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.56	3.81	3.69	3.50	4.50	3.75	3.88	3.63	3.75	4.00	3.38	3.13	3.69	3.63	4.56	3.25	3.63	4.50	3.00	4.06	3.74
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																					
B (i) Access to land	3.00	3.25	5.13	3.63	4.19	3.63	3.75	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.38	3.50	3.38	3.50	4.00	2.50	3.56	4.75	2.56	3.88	3.60
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.13	3.75	3.63	3.50	4.44	2.50	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.00	3.56	3.50	2.75	4.19	3.13	3.13	4.25	2.44	4.38	3.49
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.42	3.50	4.25	3.00	4.08	3.33	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.33	2.75	3.33	4.08	3.67	3.83	3.00	3.67	4.50	3.58	4.33	3.62
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																					
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.50	4.13	3.00	4.00	4.19	3.75	4.25	3.94	3.13	3.25	3.13	3.88	4.69	3.50	4.56	2.50	4.00	5.00	2.69	3.75	3.74
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.92	3.83	3.67	3.67	4.17	3.67	4.00	3.75	3.33	3.67	3.33	3.83	3.75	3.50	4.08	3.00	4.08	5.00	2.75	4.00	3.75
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.33	3.92	3.33	4.00	4.83	3.00	3.67	3.50	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.33	3.75	3.17	3.50	3.00	4.08	5.00	2.67	3.83	3.53
D. Gender Issues																					
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	2.75	5.25	4.88	4.50	5.31	4.50	4.25	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.88	3.88	3.00	5.19	3.50	5.44	5.25	4.31	5.25	4.42
D (ii) Women representatives	2.33	3.33	4.08	3.33	3.67	3.00	4.33	4.00	3.83	4.00	1.83	3.75	3.42	2.67	4.67	3.00	4.50	3.33	3.67	4.67	3.57
E. Public resource management and accountability																					
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	2.81	3.63	4.63	3.50	4.25	2.75	4.38	3.69	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.75	3.75	3.50	3.88	3.38	3.31	4.63	2.75	4.00	3.60
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.81	3.13	5.00	3.19	3.75	3.00	3.88	3.88	3.50	3.06	2.69	2.88	3.38	2.50	3.31	3.00	3.56	3.75	3.06	4.00	3.37
Average of all indicators	3.20	3.80	4.14	3.63	4.32	3.32	4.05	3.88	3.37	3.59	3.06	3.56	3.74	3.26	4.19	3.04	3.89	4.60	3.06	4.23	3.70

Table 2
East and Southern Africa

RSP Indicator	Angola	Burundi	Comoros	Ethiopia	Kenya	Lesotho	Madagascar	Malawi	Mauritius	Mozambique	Rwanda	Seychelles	South Africa	South Sudan	Swaziland	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																			
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.25	4.75	3.00	4.00	4.75	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.25	3.50	4.25	4.50	4.25	3.75	4.13
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.25	3.25	3.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	3.75	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	3.75	4.50	4.25	4.00	3.92
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																			
B (i) Access to land	2.75	3.75	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.75	4.75	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.75	4.25	4.75	3.50	3.94
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	2.25	3.75	3.00	4.00	4.25	2.75	4.25	3.75	4.50	3.75	4.75	4.25	4.00	3.00	4.25	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.75
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.33	3.33	2.67	4.00	4.33	3.67	4.33	3.67	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.33	3.33	4.00	3.33	4.33	4.00	4.00	3.85
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																			
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.50	3.25	4.25	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.75	5.00	3.25	4.50	3.50	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.94
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.33	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.33	3.33	5.33	3.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.67	4.00	3.33	3.33	3.33	6.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	3.67	2.67	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.82
D. Gender Issues																			
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.75	3.25	3.00	4.50	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.25	6.00	4.00	5.00	5.25	4.00	3.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.38
D (ii) Women representatives	3.75	3.25	3.00	4.50	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.25	6.00	4.00	5.00	5.25	4.00	3.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.38
E. Public resource management and accountability																			
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.00	4.38	3.25	4.25	4.00	3.75	3.00	4.00	5.50	4.00	4.75	4.50	4.25	3.25	3.75	4.00	4.25	3.25	3.95
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.75	3.50	3.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.88
Average of all indicators	3.18	3.70	3.22	4.14	4.22	3.94	3.93	3.83	5.03	3.98	4.66	4.44	4.10	3.22	3.97	4.17	4.18	3.87	3.99

Table 3
Latin America and the Caribbean

RSP Indicator	Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Colombia	Cuba	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Guyana	Haiti	Honduras	Jamaica	Mexico	Nicaragua	Paraguay	Peru	Trinidad and Tobago	Uruguay	Venezuela	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																				
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	5.19	4.75	5.75	4.31	4.25	5.00	4.88	4.19	3.94	4.00	3.88	4.13	4.25	4.56	4.31	4.69	4.38	4.75	5.00	4.51
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	5.13	4.56	5.19	4.00	4.00	4.81	4.38	4.19	4.13	3.88	4.25	4.44	4.50	4.06	4.31	4.13	4.13	5.12	4.75	4.34
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																				
B (i) Access to land	4.38	4.25	4.44	3.75	4.25	4.13	3.81	3.75	4.25	3.13	3.38	4.06	4.63	3.69	3.88	4.44	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.03
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.63	3.64	4.19	4.06	4.00	4.00	3.69	3.88	4.19	3.88	3.56	4.44	4.00	3.44	4.00	4.44	3.63	3.75	4.00	3.94
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	5.00	2.83	4.58	3.50	5.33	4.50	4.33	3.75	4.17	3.00	3.50	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.83	3.83	3.83	4.33	4.50	4.01
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																				
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.94	4.00	5.13	3.88	3.75	5.25	4.50	4.13	3.88	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.38	4.00	4.13	4.63	3.88	4.87	4.00	4.15
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.50	3.38	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.33	4.58	4.67	3.67	3.50	4.17	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.17	4.83	3.92	5.00	4.00	4.26
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.33	3.80	4.50	3.92	4.00	4.42	4.25	4.67	4.17	3.50	3.67	4.17	3.92	3.58	3.83	4.33	3.83	4.16	4.50	4.08
D. Gender Issues																				
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	5.63	4.81	6.00	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.06	5.00	4.31	4.13	4.13	5.50	5.25	4.00	4.00	4.75	4.25	5.75	5.63	4.90
D (ii) Women representatives	4.75	4.58	5.33	4.67	4.00	4.83	4.00	4.17	4.25	3.92	4.00	4.75	3.67	3.83	4.08	4.17	3.67	4.00	5.00	4.32
E. Public resource management and accountability																				
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.63	4.25	5.13	4.38	4.75	4.69	4.56	3.88	4.00	3.63	3.75	3.94	4.69	3.81	3.69	4.19	5.00	4.50	4.25	4.25
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.50	4.19	4.63	3.19	4.75	4.44	4.50	4.00	3.81	3.50	4.00	3.63	4.25	3.94	4.00	4.13	3.81	4.75	4.38	4.10
Average of all indicators	4.72	4.09	4.97	4.14	4.42	4.64	4.38	4.19	4.06	3.67	3.85	4.30	4.33	3.92	4.02	4.38	4.03	4.60	4.53	4.24

Table 4
Near East, North Africa and Europe

RSP Indicator	Armenia	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Djibouti	Egypt	Georgia	Iraq	Jordan	Kyrgyzstan	Lebanon	Moldova	Morocco	Sudan	Syrian Arab Republic	Tajikistan	Tunisia	Turkey	Uzbekistan	Yemen	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																				
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	5.00	3.50	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.75	4.00	4.50	3.88	4.00	4.25	5.13	3.88	-	3.00	4.50	5.25	2.50	4.50	3.97
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.50	3.75	4.25	3.25	4.25	4.25	3.88	4.00	4.25	3.88	4.00	5.00	3.38	-	2.75	4.50	5.75	3.00	4.50	3.85
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																				
B (i) Access to land	5.00	4.75	4.00	3.75	5.00	4.50	3.88	4.75	3.75	3.75	4.50	4.25	3.63	-	3.00	4.25	5.00	3.00	4.50	3.96
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.25	4.00	3.50	4.25	3.25	4.50	4.00	4.50	3.88	-	3.50	4.63	5.00	3.50	3.75	3.83
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	5.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	4.67	3.67	3.33	4.33	3.67	4.83	4.00	4.50	3.67	-	2.67	3.50	5.00	3.33	4.00	3.73
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																				
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	5.50	5.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.13	4.25	5.00	4.00	-	3.75	3.75	4.25	3.00	4.00	3.95
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	5.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.33	3.83	5.00	4.33	4.83	4.50	4.50	3.50	-	3.33	5.00	5.67	2.67	4.00	4.11
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	5.00	3.67	3.83	4.00	3.67	4.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.33	4.17	4.50	4.00	-	2.67	5.00	5.00	3.33	4.33	3.85
D. Gender Issues																				
D (i) Access to education in rural areas																				
D (ii) Women representatives	5.50	5.00	4.25	4.00	3.75	5.50	3.88	5.50	5.00	5.50	5.50	4.13	3.50	-	5.00	5.50	4.50	4.25	2.75	4.37
E. Public resource management and accountability																				
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.50	4.50	4.00	2.75	4.50	4.75	4.13	3.50	3.25	4.50	4.25	4.75	3.00	-	3.50	4.75	5.00	3.75	3.50	3.84
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.50	3.25	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	3.88	4.00	3.25	3.88	4.25	4.50	3.00	-	3.00	4.38	5.00	2.75	4.00	3.64
Average of all indicators	4.81	4.05	4.05	3.72	4.31	4.70	3.70	4.40	3.76	4.39	4.39	4.56	3.58	-	3.32	4.48	4.95	3.20	3.90	3.91

Table 5
West and Central Africa

RSP Indicator	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Cabo Verde	Central African Republic	Chad	Congo Rep.	Côte d'Ivoire	DR Congo	Gambia, The	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Liberia	Mali	Mauritania	Niger	Nigeria	Sao Tome and Principe	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Togo	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																							
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.38	5.00	4.25	6.00	2.75	3.25	4.00	3.25	4.50	4.80	4.00	4.50	3.50	3.25	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.75	4.88	4.00	3.25	4.21
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.63	5.00	4.25	5.25	2.38	3.13	3.50	3.00	4.63	4.15	3.75	4.00	2.00	3.19	4.50	4.25	3.88	4.00	3.93	4.30	3.75	3.50	3.86
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																							
B (i) Access to land	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	2.00	2.63	3.38	2.50	3.50	4.30	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.88	3.38	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.14	3.63	3.00	2.50	3.11
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.00	4.25	4.00	5.50	2.63	3.75	3.50	3.00	3.88	4.60	4.50	2.25	2.50	2.81	4.00	4.00	3.25	3.75	2.50	4.00	3.63	3.00	3.60
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	4.50	4.50	4.08	4.33	3.00	3.17	3.17	3.00	3.50	4.30	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.17	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.54	4.15	4.00	3.00	3.69
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																							
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.25	3.00	3.25	4.00	2.50	3.38	3.00	3.00	3.25	4.50	4.25	2.50	2.50	2.81	3.50	2.63	3.00	4.50	2.50	4.25	4.13	2.50	3.28
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.33	2.00	2.67	3.50	3.00	2.67	3.90	4.33	2.50	2.50	4.58	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.03	4.67	3.83	3.00	3.41
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.00	4.50	3.83	5.00	2.50	3.33	3.67	3.25	3.75	4.38	4.33	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.17	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.44	4.58	3.67	3.00	3.73
D. Gender Issues																							
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.50	3.50	4.31	4.50	2.50	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.75	5.00	5.00	3.50	2.50	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.81	4.25	3.50	3.72
D (ii) Women representatives	4.50	3.50	3.50	4.50	2.50	3.00	3.67	2.50	3.67	4.75	4.00	3.00	2.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.33	4.33	4.00	3.00	3.56
E. Public resource management and accountability																							
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.50	4.00	3.63	4.50	2.38	2.88	3.00	2.50	3.25	3.95	3.75	3.00	2.50	2.75	3.75	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.31	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.38
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.50	3.50	2.00	5.00	1.75	2.50	3.25	2.50	3.00	2.85	3.75	2.00	2.00	4.25	4.38	3.00	3.75	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.75	2.50	3.18
Average of all indicators	3.94	3.98	3.68	4.74	2.41	3.06	3.41	2.92	3.61	4.29	4.14	2.99	2.54	3.35	3.94	3.66	3.50	3.88	3.37	4.17	3.79	2.98	3.56

A comparative table of multilateral development banks/IFI performance-based allocation systems

Institution	Began PBA	Allocation Formula			Result	Min. Alloc.	Ceiling
		Needs Factors		Performance Factors			
AfDB	1999	$POP^{1.0} \times GNPPC^{-0.125}$	x	$[(0.26CPIA_{A-C} + 0.58CPIA_D + 0.16PORT)]^{4.0}$	= allocation share weight	SDR 5 million	
AsDB	2001	$POP^{0.6} \times GNPPC^{-0.25}$	x	$[(ES_CPIA^{0.7} \times PORT^{-0.3}) \times GOV]^{2.0}$	= allocation share weight	None	The largest ADF borrowers are subject to a ceiling.
CDB	2000	$LogPOP \times GNPPC^{0.9} \times VUL^{2.0}$	x	$[0.7CPIA + 0.3PORT]^{2.0}$	= allocation share weight		Haiti is subject to a fixed ceiling and does not get a formula-based allocation.
EU (ACP)		$LogPOP \times 0.2GNPPC^{-1.0} \times 0.2HDI^{-1.0} \times DEBT \times VUL$			= allocation share weight		
GEF	2006	GBI ^{0.8} (The Global benefits Index is calculated separately for the two focal areas: The GBI for Biodiversity is 0.8 x TERRESTRIAL BIODIVERSITY + 0.2 MARINE BIODIVERSITY (Terrestrial Biodiversity is defined as 0.55 x represented species + 0.20 x threatened species + 0.15 x represented eco-regions + 0.10 * threatened eco-regions; and Marine Biodiversity is defined as represented marine species The GBI for Climate change is defined as Baseline GHG emissions X carbon intensity adjustment factor.)	x	$[0.2CPIA + 0.10PORT + 0.70CEPIA]$ (The World Bank CPIA scores are used, with 0.7 weight to environmental criteria and 0.2 weight to "broad framework indicator" (governance). Portfolio performance, PORT, is judged on ten years of GEF and World Bank environmental projects.)	= allocation share weight for each focal area	\$1 million for each focal area	
IDB (IFF)	2002 to 2008 (IFF discontinued after 2007)	$(0.133FUND) \left(\frac{POP}{\sum POP} \right) + (0.133FUND) \left(\frac{1}{\sum GNPPC} \right) + (0.133FUND) \left(\frac{DEBT}{\sum DEBT} \right)$	+	$(0.6FUND) \times \left[\frac{0.7CIPE + 0.3PORT}{\sum (0.7CIPE + 0.3PORT)} \right]$	= 50% \$allocation (Component I)		
IDB (FSO)	2002 (current formula 2007)	$Pop^{0.50} \times GNIPC^{-1}$	x	$[0.3PORT + 0.7CIPE]^{2.0}$	= 50% \$allocation (Component II)		US\$25 Million per year
		$(0.22FUND) \left(\frac{POP}{\sum POP} \right) + (0.133FUND) \left(\frac{1}{\sum GNPPC} \right)$	+	$(0.6FUND) \times \left[\frac{0.7CIPE + 0.3PORT}{\sum (0.7CIPE + 0.3PORT)} \right]$	= 50% \$allocation (Component I)		US\$54 Million per year
IFAD	2005	Rural $POP^{0.45} \times GNIPC^{-0.25}$	x	$[0.2CPIA + 0.35PORT + 0.45RuralCPIA]^{2.0}$	= allocation share weight	\$1 million	5% of total allocated
World Bank (IDA)	1977	$POP^{1.0} \times GNPPC^{-0.125}$	x	$[0.24CPIA_{A-C} + 0.68CPIA_D + 0.08PORT]^{5.0}$	= allocation share weight	SDR 4.5 million per country per replenishment	SDR 19.8 per capita

Note: Variables: CIPE= Country Institutional and Policy Evaluation (IDB); CPIA = Country Policy and Institutional Assessment; DEBT = Debt service ratio; ES_CPIA= Economic and Social Performance Criteria in CPIA (for ADB); FSO=Fund for Special Operations (IDB); Fund= Size of IFF and FSO Envelope; GOV= Average of the five criteria in the "public sector management cluster" for ADF; average of the six criteria in the Governance and Public Sector Performance for AfDF; average of the five criteria in the public sector management cluster (Cluster D) for IDA; GNPPC = GNP per capita; Log = logarithm; HDI = Human Development Index; PCEF= Post-conflict Enhancement Factor (AfDB); POP = Population; PORT= Portfolio rating; RuralCPIA= Performance rating on policies and institutions for rural development (IFAD); VUL = Country Vulnerability (EU ACP).