

Document:	<u>EB 2018/125/R.4/Add.1</u>
Agenda:	<u>3(c)</u>
Date:	<u>3 December 2018</u>
Distribution:	<u>Public</u>
Original:	<u>English</u>

E



Investing in rural people

Progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system

Addendum

Executive Board — 125th Session
Rome, 12-14 December 2018

For: Information

Progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system

Addendum

- The Executive Board is invited to take note of the attached additional information relating to the progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system (PBAS) for both IFAD11 and IFAD10. Background is also provided for the recommendation under part V of document EB 2018/125/R.4 for the Board to approve differentiated percentages of financing for countries eligible for the Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF).¹

I. Implementation of the PBAS in IFAD11 (2019-2021)

- During the Consultation on the Eleventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD11), a number of commitments were made in relation to the allocation of the Fund's resources to ensure the highest possible level of efficiency and an increased focus on the poorest countries. Country selectivity was introduced based on agreed criteria aimed at increasing the likelihood of initial allocations being taken up. Commitments were also made on the share of core resources to be allocated to various country groupings. The application of the country selectivity criteria reduced the number of countries from about 100 to 80, thus focusing IFAD's core resources on low-income countries (LICs) and lower-middle-income countries (LMICs). The allocations are in line with the IFAD11 commitments (see table 1).

Table 1

IFAD11 allocation commitments (percentage of core resources)

<i>Share of core resources</i>	<i>IFAD11 share of core resources</i>	<i>Commitment</i>
Africa	62%	50%
Sub-Saharan Africa	59%	45%
LICs and LMICs	90%	90%
UMICs	10%	10%
MFS countries	29%	25-30%
Highly concessional terms	65%	66%

- Annex I contains the country allocations for the IFAD11 period (2019-2021). Table 2 provides the allocations, aggregated by region.

Table 2

IFAD11 allocation, by region

<i>Regional division</i>	<i>US\$ million</i>	<i>Percentage of total resources</i>
APR	928.37	28
ESA	911.40	27
LAC	251.37	8
NEN	406.85	12
WCA	827.00	25
Total	3 325.00	100

- For the 80 countries selected for IFAD11, the PBAS allocations were derived using the formula approved by the Executive Board in September 2017. For five countries (table 3), Management has proposed capping the allocations derived from the formula based on the following rationale: (i) a technical economic analysis of

¹ IFAD's 2019 Results-based Programme of Work and Regular and Capital Budgets, the IOE Results-based Work Programme and Budget for 2019 and Indicative Plan for 2020-2021, and the HIPC and PBAS Progress Reports.

the country's debt related to concessional and non-concessional resources; and/or (ii) concerns about absorption capacity based on previous uptake of IFAD lending or ongoing crises or conflicts. In line with the PBAS guidelines, minimum and maximum allocations have also been applied.

5. The IFAD11 allocation based on the new formula described above, combined with the historical proportions of DSF financing allocated to countries in high and medium debt distress, would have resulted in 24.6 per cent of total resources going to eligible countries in the form of DSF grants, in accordance with the DSF arrangement approved by the Executive Board in 2007.² However, this is significantly higher than the 16.7 per cent foreseen by Management in the IFAD11 financial framework, which was intended to help ensure IFAD's financial sustainability. In large part, this increase in the share of DSF grants is the result of concentrating on a smaller set of countries, coupled with the fundamental driver in the change in the PBAS formula to focus on LICs and LMICs.
6. Therefore, in order to comply with the DSF proportion of 16.7 per cent established in the IFAD11 financial framework – which is critical to ensuring the Fund's long-term financial sustainability – Management proposes adjusting the share of DSF-related grant resources allocated to eligible countries while maintaining their overall IFAD11 allocations. The proposal comprises two adjustments to the percentages of grant financing provided to countries eligible for the DSF: (i) countries previously eligible for 100 per cent financing in the form of a grant will now receive 80 per cent as a grant with the remaining 20 per cent of their allocation available on highly concessional terms; and (ii) countries previously eligible for 50 per cent of financing as a grant and 50 per cent as highly concessional loans will now receive 27 per cent of their financing as a grant and 73 per cent as highly concessional loans. It should be noted that IFAD has considered the current debt burden and sustainability of countries in debt distress, as classified by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, in setting the aforementioned proportions. Through this application of proportional DSF grant financing, the IFAD11 allocations will lead to a total DSF grant portion of the total PoLG equivalent to 17 per cent.³ Annex I also reflects this adjustment to the IFAD11 allocations by region and country.
7. It should be noted that the arrangements foreseen in the 2007 DSF document referred to above had called for fixed grant percentages of 0 per cent, 50 per cent and 100 per cent for countries in low, medium and high debt distress. That said, the DSF document also indicated that IFAD should consider the trends and experiences of other IFIs. In this respect, it is noted that active discussions are under way at other IFIs to apply varying percentages to countries in debt distress. In the light of the above, and in particular due to its commitments for the IFAD11 financial framework, Management is proposing to vary these original percentages to be able to honour its IFAD11 commitments. Should countries eligible for the DSF not wish to avail themselves of the highly concessional portion of the allocation (shown in the penultimate column in annex I), these resources will be reallocated as provided for in the PBAS methodology. IFAD11 commitments foresee reallocation of a maximum of 10 per cent of the PBAS resources; Management will strive to preserve these limits, noting that they are dependent on country uptake of their allocations and in particular the factors noted above.
8. The approach described above enables IFAD to maintain the country allocation amounts that are derived from the transparent application of the IFAD11 PBAS formula, while maintaining the assumptions underlying the IFAD11 financial framework, thereby preserving the long-term financial sustainability of the Fund. In

² EB 2007/90/R.2.

³ The above adjustment for DSF financing pertains to IFAD11 PBAS, and so is not applicable for remaining resources available under IFAD10 allocations which maintain the current proportion of DSF eligibility.

addition to the PBAS allocations, annex I also presents all the variables used to calculate the 2018 PBAS country scores.

Table 3

Proposed IFAD11 capped allocations (US\$)

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>IFAD10 Allocations</i>	<i>IFAD10 Utilization</i>	<i>Formula-based scenario</i>	<i>Capped amount</i>
APR	Afghanistan	25 000 000	25 000 000	67 333 572	50 000 000
APR	Viet Nam	86 476 565	43 000 000	78 619 044	43 000 000
ESA	Tanzania (United Republic of)	58 800 245	0	86 703 334	58 800 000
NEN	Tajikistan	24 580 981	30 660 000	39 335 992	25 000 000
NEN	Yemen	32 113 980	0	21 417 009	10 000 000

9. Annex II presents details of the rural sector performance assessments (RSPA) for 2018, in line with the criteria for such assessments set out in document EB 2017/121/R.3. These assessments form the basis for the rural sector performance score used in the calculation of the country performance rating. Such rating is then used as a variable to calculate the country performance score and PBAS country allocation.

II. Implementation of the PBAS in IFAD10 (2016-2018)

10. The IFAD10 cycle concludes at the end of 2018. Since December 2015, when Management first presented the PBAS allocations for IFAD10 to the Executive Board, 18 countries have exited the cycle. These countries are: the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Vanuatu, Botswana, Mauritius, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, South Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Armenia, Yemen, Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Congo, Gambia, and Guinea-Bissau.
11. During IFAD10, Management applied capping based on countries' absorption capacity and portfolio performance. Countries that were capped during IFAD10 were: Afghanistan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Islamic Republic of Iran, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Nigeria.
12. For the first time, during IFAD10, Management undertook a total of four reallocation exercises, starting in the second year of the cycle (2017) in keeping with the recommendations of the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's performance-based allocation system. Overall, the amount reallocated is US\$455.1 million, which corresponds to 15 per cent of the financing distributed through the PBAS (US\$3.04 billion). This reallocated amount was calculated based on the financing assigned to countries that exited the cycle, in addition to residual amounts from project approvals and cancelled projects.
13. The distribution of reallocated funds by regional division and income category is provided in table 4. The West and Central Africa Division benefited from the highest share of reallocated funds, followed by the East and Southern Africa Division. As regards classification by income, lower-middle-income countries (LMICs) received 54 per cent of resources reallocated, followed by low-income countries (LICs), which received 32 per cent. Overall, LICs and LMICs received 86 per cent of reallocated resources.

Table 4

Funds reallocated in IFAD10 by region and income category

<i>Regional division</i>	<i>US\$ amount</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Income category</i>	<i>US\$ amount</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
APR	105.3	23%	LICs	145.8	32%
ESA	134.2	29%	LMICs	243.9	54%
LAC	53.7	12%	UMICs	65.4	14%
NEN	24.7	5%	Total	455.1	100%
WCA	137.2	30%			
Total	455.1	100%			

14. Table 5 shows the amount of resources reallocated or released by region over the course of IFAD10, expressed as a percentage of the respective regional allocation in the first year. Significantly, LAC released about 16 per cent of the financing it received. Conversely, by the end of the cycle, WCA had absorbed an additional 12 per cent of resources, compared to the amount allocated in year 1.

Table 5

Share of resources used at the end of the IFAD10 period compared to initial IFAD10 allocation

<i>Regional division</i>	<i>Net financing received (+) or released (-) at end-IFAD10 as % of IFAD10 allocations in year</i>
APR	3
ESA	2%
LAC	-16%
NEN	-1%
WCA	12%

15. At the end of IFAD10, after reallocating funds and taking into account agreed over-programming, the total amount of resources distributed stands at US\$3.08 billion. This exceeds the initial PBAS allocation (US\$3.04 billion) by US\$44.0 million, the amount overprogrammed and distributed by Management in line with the PBAS methodology.
16. Table 6 shows the distribution of core resources by income category, lending terms and geographical region. By the final year of the cycle, the share of core resources for LMICs reached 92 per cent, an increase from 89 per cent in the initial allocation. By financing terms, countries borrowing on highly concessional terms received 66 per cent, and countries in sub-Saharan Africa received 53 per cent of core resources.

Table 6
PBAS IFAD10: Distribution of core resources, by country income category

	<i>Year 1</i>	<i>Year 3</i>
Income Category		
LIC + LMIC	89%	92%
LIC	38%	39%
LMIC	51%	53%
UMIC	11%	8%
Total	100%	100%
Lending terms		
Highly concessional	62%	66%
DSF	9%	9%
DSF/Highly concessional	16%	19%
Highly concessional	38%	38%
Blend	21%	21%
Ordinary	17%	12%
Total	100%	100%
Africa		
Sub-Saharan Africa	49%	53%
Other Africa	3%	2%

2018 PBAS country scores and IFAD11 allocations for 2019-2021

Table 1
Asia and the Pacific

Country	IFAD11 PBAS formula variables					Lending terms and DSF eligibility				IFAD11 allocation			
	GNIpc 2017 (US\$) ¹	Rural population 2017	IVI score (2019- 2021)	RSPA score 2018	PAD score 2018	Income category classification ²	Lending terms	Maturity premium category ³	Grant portion ^{4,**}	Initial DSF allocations for eligible HC countries**	Highly concessional	Additional HC allocation	Total IFAD11 allocation
Afghanistan ^{5,11}	570	25 734 438	1.73	3.10	4.19	LIC	HC		100%	40 000 000	-	10 000 000	50 000 000
Bangladesh ^{6,7,11}	1 470	105 734 447	1.49	3.74	5.96	LMIC	B		0%	-	-	-	119 702 882
Bhutan ^{7,8,11}	2 720	483 799	1.46	4.16	5.77	LMIC	HC		0%	-	-	-	11 281 031
Cambodia ^{9,11}	1 230	12 615 435	1.54	3.75	5.93	LMIC	HC		0%	-	-	-	54 395 170
China	8 690	583 630 703	1.32	4.17	5.83	UMIC	O	Standard	0%	-	-	-	134 995 532
India ¹⁰	1 820	890 086 071	1.50	4.12	5.94	LMIC	O	Exemption	0%	-	-	-	166 250 000
Indonesia	3 540	118 328 856	1.33	3.97	5.43	LMIC	O	Discount	0%	-	-	-	84 355 555
Kiribati ^{5,11}	2780	64 481	1.69	3.28	4.69	LMIC	HC		100%	3 600 000	-	900 000	4 500 000
Lao People's Democratic Republic ^{6,11}	2 270	4 069 015	1.42	3.42	2.05	LMIC	B		0%	-	-	-	13 237 685
Maldives ⁸	9 570	229 051	1.38	3.15	5.12	UMIC	HC		50%	1 215 000	1 215 000	2 070 000	4 500 000
Nepal ¹¹	790	23 624 810	1.54	3.75	5.93	LIC	HC		0%	-	-	-	78 848 934
Pakistan	1 580	118 800 621	1.56	3.46	5.06	LMIC	B		0%	-	-	-	111 546 237
Samoa ⁸	4100	159 450	1.42	3.92		UMIC	HC		100%	3 600 000	-	900 000	4 500 000
Sri Lanka ¹⁰	3 840	17 482 221	1.45	3.56	5.93	LMIC	O	Exemption	0%	-	-	-	42 758 466
Tonga ⁸	4 010	82 205	1.35	3.60	5.53	UMIC	HC		100%	3 600 000	-	900 000	4 500 000
Viet Nam ¹⁰	2 170	62 217 124	1.39	3.82	5.96	LMIC	O	Exemption	0%	-	-	-	43 000 000
Total Asia and the Pacific										52 015 000	1 215 000	14 770 000	928 371 492
Total IFAD													3 325 000 000

* Per 2007 DSF implementation formula EB/2007/90/R.2

** For countries eligible for 100% grants, column shows grant at 80% of total allocation. For countries eligible for 50% grants, column shows grants at 27% of total allocation.

Acronyms: GNIpc = gross national income per capita; IVI = IFAD Vulnerability Index; RSPA = rural sector performance assessment; PAD = portfolio and disbursement measure; DSF = Debt Sustainability Framework; HC = highly concessional; O = ordinary; B = blend; LIC = low-income country; LMIC = lower-middle-income country; MIC = middle-income country; UMIC = upper-middle-income country.

Table 2
East and Southern Africa

Country	IFAD11 PBAS formula variables					Lending terms and DSF eligibility				IFAD11 allocation			
	GNIpc 2017 (US\$) ¹	Rural population 2017	IVI score (2019-2021)	RSPA score 2018	PAD score 2018	Income category classification ²	Lending terms	Maturity premium category ³	Grant portion ^{4,*}	Initial DSF allocations for eligible HC countries**	Highly concessional	Additional HC allocation	Total IFAD11 allocation
Angola ^{10,11}	3 330	16 209 154	1.56	3.29	3.26	LMIC	O	Exemption	0%				29 754 999
Burundi ^{5,11}	290	9 488 071	1.60	3.22	5.46	LIC	HC		100%	50 923 901		12 730 975	63 654 876
Comoros ^{5,8,11}	760	581 613	1.45	2.95		LIC	HC		50%	2 532 607	2 532 607	4 314 813	9 380 027
Eritrea ^{5,11}	1 083	5 085 602	1.78	1.93	5.88	LIC	HC		100%	29 663 801		7 415 950	37 079 751
Ethiopia ¹¹	740	83 568 162	1.56	3.47	5.96	LIC	HC		50%	35 097 317	35 097 317	59 795 430	129 990 064
Kenya ⁷	1 440	36 532 381	1.51	3.91	5.63	LMIC	B		0%				76 810 020
Lesotho ^{7,11}	1 280	1 599 696	1.31	3.54	4.52	LMIC	B		0%				16 199 036
Madagascar ¹¹	400	16 269 226	1.66	3.43	5.93	LIC	HC		50%	22 545 624	22 545 624	38 411 062	83 502 309
Malawi ¹¹	320	15 521 896	1.60	3.53	5.88	LIC	HC		50%	22 621 646	22 621 646	38 540 582	83 783 874
Mozambique ^{5,11}	420	19 932 709	1.67	3.64	5.64	LIC	HC		100%	68 290 974		17 072 744	85 363 718
Rwanda ¹¹	720	8 456 641	1.54	4.06	5.94	LIC	HC		0%				54 471 273
South Sudan ⁵	546	10 152 625	1.00	1.87	1.00	LIC	HC		100%	7 893 591		1 973 398	9 866 989
United Republic of Tanzania ¹¹	905.24	38 384 531	1.56	3.66	5.63	LIC	HC		0%				58 800 000
Uganda ¹¹	600	35 664 553	1.59	3.73	5.64	LIC	HC		0%				99 567 042
Zambia ^{6,7,11}	1 300	9 941 946	1.45	3.69	4.49	LMIC	B		0%				37 491 586
Zimbabwe ⁵	910	11 206 118	1.63	3.26	3.01	LIC	HC		0%				35 687 318
Total East and Southern Africa										239 569 462	82 797 194	180 254 953	911 402 884
Total IFAD													3 325 000 000

* Per 2007 DSF implementation formula EB/2007/90/R.2

** For countries eligible for 100% grants, column shows grant at 80% of total allocation. For countries eligible for 50% grants, column shows grants at 27% of total allocation.

Table 3
Latin America and the Caribbean

Country	IFAD11 PBAS formula variables					Lending terms and DSF eligibility				IFAD11 allocation			
	GNIpc 2017 (US\$) ¹	Rural population 2017	IVI score (2019- 2021)	RSPA score 2018	PAD score 2018	Income category classification ²	Lending terms	Maturity premium category	Grant portion*	Initial DSF allocation for eligible HC countries**	Highly concessional	Additional HC allocation	Total IFAD11 allocation
Argentina	13 040	3 528 402	1.32	4.12	4.71	HIC	O	Standard	0%				13 131 915
Bolivia (Plurinational State of) ¹⁰	3 130	3 392 510	1.42	4.04	5.91	LMIC	O	Exemption	0%				23 601 282
Brazil	8 580	28 940 383	1.18	4.16	5.74	UMIC	O	Standard	0%				35 659 394
Cuba	7 709	2 607 012	1.37	3.76	5.77	UMIC	O	Standard	0%				15 501 417
Dominican Republic	6 630	2 083 737	1.33	3.78	4.68	UMIC	O	Discount	0%				12 375 596
Ecuador	5 890	5 949 039	1.33	4.13	5.86	UMIC	O	Discount	0%				23 468 778
Guatemala	4 060	8 035 267	1.32	3.99	1.00	UMIC	O	Discount	0%				11 339 549
Guyana ^{6,8}	4 460	553 960	1.32	3.60	3.96	UMIC	HC		0%				7 023 078
Haiti ^{5,11}	760	4 295 527	1.61	3.25	3.01	LIC	HC		100%	19 048 111		4 762 028	23 810 139
Mexico	8 610	26 111 648	1.31	4.31	5.87	UMIC	O	Standard	0%				38 452 817
Nicaragua ⁶	2130	2 521 789	1.45	3.67	5.92	LMIC	B		0%				23 035 434
Peru	5970	6 679 806	1.28	4.29	5.89	UMIC	O	Discount	0%				23 968 777
Total Latin America and Caribbean										19 048 111		4 762 028	251 368 178
Total IFAD													3 325 000 000

* Per 2007 DSF implementation formula EB/2007/90/R.2

** For countries eligible for 100% grants, column shows grant at 80% of total allocation. For countries eligible for 50% grants, column shows grants at 27% of total allocation.

Table 4
Near East, North Africa and Europe

Country	IFAD11 PBAS formula variables					Lending terms and DSF eligibility				IFAD11 allocation			
	GNI/pc 2017 (US\$) ¹	Rural population 2017	IVI score (2019- 2021)	RSPA score 2018	PAD score 2018	Income category classification ²	Lending terms	Maturity premium category	Grant portion [*]	Initial DSF allocation for eligible HC countries ^{**}	Highly concessional	Additional HC allocation	Total IFAD11 allocation
Djibouti ^{5,6,8,11}	1 880	215 102	1.60	3.17	3.71	LMIC	HC		0%				6 617 006
Egypt	3 010	55 283 371	1.50	3.60	4.78	LMIC	O	Discount	0%				64 534 943
Iraq ⁵	4 770	11 588 406	1.62	3.42		UMIC	O	Exemption	0%				25 561 898
Jordan	3 980	1 540 054	1.37	3.76	5.85	UMIC	O	Discount	0%				15 087 638
Kyrgyzstan	1 130	3 968 092	1.43	3.77	5.88	LMIC	HC		50%	8 519 700	8 519 700	14 515 044	31 554 443
Morocco	2 863	13 876 964	1.38	4.04	4.97	LMIC	O	Discount	0%				36 691 376
Republic of Moldova	2 180	1 944 979	1.41	4.31	5.87	LMIC	B		0%				20 750 972
Sudan ^{5,11}	2 379	26 659 987	1.74	3.03	5.95	LMIC	HC		100%	50 355 702		12 588 926	62 944 628
Syrian Arab Republic ⁵	1 178	7 588 024	1.73	2.34	1.00	LIC	HC		0%				14 211 460
Tajikistan	990	6 510 975	1.49	3.45	5.90	LIC	HC		50%	6 750 000	6 750 000	11 500 000	25 000 000
Tunisia	3 500	3 775 734	1.44	3.91	5.87	LMIC	O	Discount	0%				23 897 146
Turkey	10 930	20 700 601	1.34	3.80	3.04	UMIC	O	Standard	0%				21 000 368
Uzbekistan	1 980	20 527 007	1.36	3.24	5.77	LMIC	B		0%				49 000 572
Yemen ^{5,11}	935	18 145 527	1.69	2.79	1.00	LIC	HC		100%	8 000 000		2 000 000	10 000 000
Total Near East, North Africa and Europe										73 625 402	15 269 700	40 603 969	406 852 451
Total IFAD													3 325 000 000

* Per 2007 DSF implementation formula EB/2007/90/R.2

** For countries eligible for 100% grants, column shows grant at 80% of total allocation. For countries eligible for 50% grants, column shows grants at 27% of total allocation.

Table 5
West and Central Africa

Country	IFAD11 PBAS formula variables					Lending terms and DSF eligibility				IFAD11 allocation			
	GNIpc 2017 (US\$) ¹	Rural population 2017	IVI score (2019-2021)	RSPA score 2018	PAD score 2018	Income category classification ²	Lending terms	Maturity premium category	Grant portion*	Initial DSF allocations for eligible HC countries**	Highly concessional	Additional HC allocation	Total IFAD11 allocation
Benin ¹¹	800	6 163 729	1.52	3.59	3.37	LIC	HC		50%	7 901 243	7 901 243	13 461 377	29 263 862
Burkina Faso ¹¹	610	13 145 355	1.57	3.89	5.90	LIC	HC		0%				68 155 269
Cameroon ⁷	1 360	10 706 554	1.48	3.50	5.92	LMIC	B		0%				46 970 628
Central African Republic ^{5,11}	390	2 765 350	1.56	2.83	5.76	LIC	HC		100%	28 263 280		7 065 820	35 329 100
Chad ^{5,11}	630	11 505 477	1.70	2.98	5.87	LIC	HC		100%	49 346 650		12 336 663	61 683 313
Congo ⁵	1360	1 777 502	1.57	2.98	1.00	LMIC	B		0%				7 991 611
Democratic Republic of the Congo ^{5,11}	450	45 926 997	1.54	2.74	1.00	LIC	HC		50%	9 852 510	9 852 510	16 785 758	36 490 778
Côte D'Ivoire ^{5,6}	1 540	10 800 231	1.38	3.78	1.32	LMIC	B		0%				18 389 535
Gabon	6 610	252 130	1.40	3.25	5.49	UMIC	O	Discount	0%				5 956 671
Gambia (The) ^{5,11}	450	823 633	1.53	3.19	5.88	LIC	HC		100%	17 016 190		4 254 047	21 270 237
Ghana ⁶	1490	12 884 884	1.38	4.01	5.62	LMIC	B		0%				46 045 375
Guinea ¹¹	820	7 865 573	1.55	3.38	2.95	LIC	HC		50%	7 951 993	7 951 993	13 547 840	29 451 826
Guinea-Bissau ^{5,11}	660	915 118	1.46	3.04	5.78	LIC	HC		50%	5 181 139	5 181 139	8 827 126	19 189 405
Liberia ^{5,11}	380	2 342 057	1.50	3.12	5.90	LIC	HC		50%	9 191 311	9 191 311	15 659 271	34 041 892
Mali ⁵	770	10 857 998	1.58	3.59	5.40	LIC	HC		50%	14 486 933	14 486 933	24 681 442	53 655 308
Mauritania ¹¹	1100	1 723 120	1.58	3.46	5.87	LMIC	HC		100%	18 957 581		4 739 395	23 696 976
Niger ¹¹	360	17 331 576	1.67	3.41	5.94	LIC	HC		50%	23 864 625	23 864 625	40 658 250	88 387 501
Nigeria	2080	96 582 747	1.46	3.54	4.87	LMIC	B		0%				87 465 926
Sao Tome and Principe ^{8,11}	1 770	69 116	1.48	3.56	5.81	LMIC	HC		100%	4 264 041		1 066 010	5 330 051
Senegal ¹¹	950	8 809 111	1.59	3.68	5.93	LIC	HC		0%				51 863 209
Sierra Leone ¹¹	510	4 480 898	1.47	3.35	5.89	LIC	HC		50%	11 022 943	11 022 943	18 779 829	40 825 715
Togo ^{5,11}	610	4 603 369	1.61	3.33	1.00	LIC	HC		50%	4 198 717	4 198 717	7 153 370	15 550 805
Total West and Central Africa										211 499 156	93 651 415	189 016 198	827 004 994
Total IFAD													3 325 000 000

* Per 2007 DSF implementation formula EB/2007/90/R.2

** For countries eligible for 100% grants, column shows grant at 80% of total allocation. For countries eligible for 50% grants, column shows grants at 27% of total allocation.

Footnotes

1. As per the World Bank Atlas methodology, available at <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.CD>.
 2. As per World Bank Country and Lending Groups, available at <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups>.
 3. Reclassifications to a lower maturity premium category will be effective from the following calendar year, while reclassifications to a higher maturity premium category will be effective in the first calendar year of the next replenishment period. This is subject to the approval of maturity premium differentiation by the Executive Board as per document EB 2018/125/R.45.
 4. The grant portion for countries eligible for highly concessional terms is determined through the DSF. Eligibility for grants through the DSF may change during the calendar year.
 5. The country is classified as a Fragile and Conflict-affected Situation Country as per the World Bank Harmonized List. Countries eligible for ordinary terms are exempt from the maturity premium increase (this is subject to the approval of maturity premium differentiation by the Executive Board as per document EB 2018/125/R.45).
 6. The country's GNIpc has been above the IFAD operational cut-off for more than two years, but not considered creditworthy for ordinary terms financing. Unless also classified as a Small State Economy and therefore eligible for highly concessional terms, it receives financing on blend terms.
 7. The country's lending terms have changed from highly concessional to blend from this replenishment period; the country will transition to the new lending terms with the phasing-out/phasing-in mechanism, if approved by the Executive Board as per documents EB 2018/125/R.7 and EB 2018/125/R.8.
 8. The country is classified as a Small State Economy. If the country would normally be eligible for blend terms, it instead receives IFAD financing on highly concessional terms. If the country is eligible for ordinary terms, it is exempt from the maturity premium increase (this is subject to the approval of maturity premium differentiation by the Executive Board as per document EB 2018/125/R.45).
 9. The country's GNIpc has been above the IFAD operational cut-off for one or two years, therefore still eligible for highly concessional terms at IFAD.
 10. The country became eligible for ordinary term loan financing in IFAD9 or IFAD10, therefore exempt from the maturity premium increase. This is subject to the approval of maturity premium differentiation by the Executive Board as per document EB 2018/125/R.45.
 11. The country is classified as a Least Developed Country as per the United Nations classification, available at www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/least-developed-country-category.html.
-

2018 Rural Sector Performance Assessment (RSPA) scores

Table 1
Asia and the Pacific

RSPA indicator	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Cambodia	China	India	Indonesia	Kiribati	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Maldives	Nepal	Pakistan	Samoa	Sri Lanka	Tonga	Viet Nam
1. Policies and legal framework for rural organizations (ROs) and rural people																
(1.1) Policies and framework for rural development and rural poverty alleviation	3.6	4.2	4.4	3.1	4.7	4.2	3.9	3.5	4.3	2.6	4.0	4.2	4.7	4.2	4.0	4.2
(1.2) Legal frameworks for and autonomy of rural people's organizations	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.4	4.9	4.4	3.0	2.3	3.0	4.4	3.5	3.9	4.4	3.5	3.3
(1.3) Representation and influence of ROs and rural people	1.8	3.3	4.2	4.2	3.4	4.7	3.9	4.2	3.4	3.9	4.2	4.2	3.3	3.6	3.4	4.2
2. Rural governance, transparency and public administration																
(2.1) Quality and transparency of allocation of resources for rural development	1.9	3.4	5.0	3.2	4.5	4.4	3.8	2.5	2.1	2.5	3.2	3.2	4.0	2.9	3.5	3.2
(2.2) Accountability, transparency and corruption	2.0	2.9	4.6	2.3	2.7	4.4	4.0	3.5	2.2	2.5	3.2	3.2	4.0	3.7	3.5	2.7
3. Natural resources and environmental policies and practices																
(3.1) Environmental assessment policies and grievance mechanisms	3.4	3.6	4.8	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.6	4.5	4.2	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.8
(3.2) National climate change policies	3.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.6	4.1	4.0	4.6	4.1	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.3	2.7	3.9	3.8
(3.3) Access to land	1.3	3.4	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.2	4.9	3.5	3.8	3.0	3.2	3.6	4.0	2.7	3.9	3.2
(3.4) Access to water	2.7	4.0	5.2	3.5	4.5	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.1	4.7	4.2	3.2	4.2	3.5	4.3	4.4
4. Financial policy, access to services and markets																
(4.1) Access to and use of rural financial services	3.2	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.8	4.6	2.7	2.5	1.9	3.0	4.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.5	2.7
(4.2) Investment Climate for Rural Business	3.1	2.8	3.8	2.8	4.4	4.0	4.3	2.2	1.9	3.2	3.1	3.8	2.6	3.5	3.3	3.4
(4.3) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.0	2.5	4.4	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.0	4.2	3.7	3.2	3.6	2.7	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.7
(4.4) Access to extension services	3.5	5.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	5.0	4.8	2.4	4.7	2.4	3.8	3.3	4.6	4.4	3.9	2.9
5. Nutrition and gender equality																
(5.1) Nutrition policy framework and	4.2	4.5	4.9	4.6	5.1	4.4	4.9	3.6	4.5	2.8	4.2	3.1	4.1	4.8	2.5	4.8

RSPA indicator	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Cambodia	China	India	Indonesia	Kiribati	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Maldives	Nepal	Pakistan	Samoa	Sri Lanka	Tonga	Viet Nam
outcomes																
(5.2) Policy framework for gender equality	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.9	4.8	3.4	4.0	2.5	3.8	3.0	2.8	3.5	3.9	2.8	3.0	4.4
6. Macroeconomic policies and conditions for rural development																
(6.1) Monetary and exchange rate policies	4.0	4.6	3.2	4.0	4.8	4.4	4.2	3.0	4.3	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.6	3.5	4.7
(6.2) Fiscal Policy and Taxation	3.5	3.5	4.7	4.0	3.7	2.8	3.6	3.0	3.5	2.5	4.2	3.3	4.5	3.0	3.5	3.8
(6.3) Debt Policy	2.4	4.9	3.5	4.3	4.8	4.3	3.3	2.5	3.2	2.5	4.3	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.5	4.1
(6.4) Trade Policy	4.1	3.2	2.5	3.8	4.5	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3
Average of all indicators	3.1	3.7	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.8

Table 2

East and Southern Africa

RSPA indicator	Angola	Burundi	Comoros	Eritrea	Ethiopia	Kenya	Lesotho	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Rwanda	South Sudan	United Republic of Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe
1. Policies and legal framework for rural organizations (ROs) and rural people																
(1.1) Policies and framework for rural development and rural poverty alleviation	3.7	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.4	4.5	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.8	4.3	2.0	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.8
(1.2) Legal frameworks for and autonomy of rural people's organizations	2.7	3.2	4.0	1.6	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.5	3.9	3.8	1.0	4.2	4.1	4.7	3.1
(1.3) Representation and influence of ROs and rural people	4.2	2.0	2.6	1.0	3.9	5.0	3.4	4.2	5.0	4.2	3.9	2.6	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.5
2. Rural governance, transparency and public administration																
(2.1) Quality and transparency of allocation of resources for rural development	2.6	2.1	2.5	1.4	3.1	3.1	4.1	2.2	2.4	3.2	3.7	1.0	1.5	3.4	4.2	1.9
(2.2) Accountability, transparency and corruption	2.3	1.8	2.5	1.5	2.3	3.0	4.2	3.5	3.6	3.3	4.9	1.5	3.6	2.6	3.2	1.9
3. Natural resources and environmental policies and practices																
(3.1) Environmental assessment policies and grievance mechanisms	4.3	2.9	2.0	1.3	4.0	4.8	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.9	3.9	1.2	4.7	4.0	4.1	3.0
(3.2) National climate change policies	4.4	4.2	4.7	2.4	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.9	4.5	4.4	4.0	3.4
(3.3) Access to land	3.5	3.2	3.0	1.8	2.9	4.4	4.4	4.9	3.5	3.8	4.1	2.1	4.1	3.6	2.6	3.7
(3.4) Access to water	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.9	4.4	4.3	3.4	4.2	3.5	4.7	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.1	3.4
4. Financial policy, access to services and markets																
(4.1) Access to and use of rural financial services	2.4	3.1	2.5	1.0	2.9	4.6	2.6	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	1.3	3.2	4.2	4.5	3.3
(4.2) Investment Climate for Rural Business	2.6	2.2	2.7	2.0	3.6	2.5	2.2	2.8	2.6	2.6	4.0	1.6	3.9	3.0	3.8	3.3
(4.3) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.4	4.2	3.2	3.9	3.5	3.5	2.7	2.4	3.1	4.0	3.8	2.0	3.7	3.0	2.0	3.7
(4.4) Access to extension services	3.6	4.8	2.4	1.0	4.7	4.8	3.8	2.7	4.9	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.6	4.4	5.1	3.9
5. Nutrition and gender equality																
(5.1) Nutrition policy framework and outcomes	2.9	3.8	2.0	2.0	4.4	4.4	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.2	3.9	1.0	4.1	4.7	3.6	4.2
(5.2) Policy framework for gender equality	4.2	4.4	3.0	2.5	4.2	3.7	3.1	2.9	2.5	4.3	5.0	2.0	4.0	4.1	3.2	4.2
6. Macroeconomic policies and conditions for rural development																
(6.1) Monetary and exchange rate policies	3.3	2.3	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.6	3.2	3.7	2.7	3.1	3.8	1.0	3.7	3.3	3.7	2.8
(6.2) Fiscal Policy and Taxation	4.0	3.4	2.5	1.9	3.8	3.3	4.0	3.5	2.8	2.8	3.9	1.0	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.3
(6.3) Debt Policy	2.6	3.1	3.0	1.6	3.1	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.7	2.8	4.2	1.0	4.0	4.1	3.8	2.5
(6.4) Trade Policy	2.8	3.3	3.5	1.5	2.2	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.9	2.9	2.0	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.0
Average of all indicators	3.3	3.2	3.0	1.9	3.5	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	1.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3

Table 3
Latin America and the Caribbean

RSPA indicator	Argentina	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Brazil	Cuba	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	Guatemala	Guyana	Haiti	Mexico	Nicaragua	Peru
1. Policies and legal framework for rural organizations (ROs) and rural people												
(1.1) Policies and framework for rural development and rural poverty alleviation	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.1	4.4	3.8	3.4	4.4	4.0	3.5
(1.2) Legal frameworks for and autonomy of rural people's organizations	4.5	4.8	5.1	3.3	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.9	4.0	4.6	4.3	4.9
(1.3) Representation and influence of ROs and rural people	4.2	5.0	4.2	3.4	2.3	5.0	4.2	3.6	1.8	4.7	3.4	4.2
2. Rural governance, transparency and public administration												
(2.1) Quality and transparency of allocation of resources for rural development	3.6	4.0	4.1	3.5	2.6	3.8	3.8	2.2	2.4	3.3	3.8	3.6
(2.2) Accountability, transparency and corruption	4.7	3.5	4.1	2.9	3.9	3.8	2.7	4.7	2.6	3.9	3.2	3.9
3. Natural resources and environmental policies and practices												
(3.1) Environmental assessment policies and grievance mechanisms	4.2	4.7	5.1	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.9	3.1	3.7	4.1	2.8	4.4
(3.2) National climate change policies	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.2	3.6	4.2	4.1	3.5	4.1	3.4	4.0
(3.3) Access to land	4.8	4.6	5.0	3.3	3.4	5.0	4.4	3.2	3.9	4.7	3.4	4.8
(3.4) Access to water	3.6	3.0	3.9	4.9	3.7	4.8	3.1	4.6	2.7	3.9	3.5	4.2
4. Financial policy, access to services and markets												
(4.1) Access to and use of rural financial services	3.6	3.5	3.9	2.8	2.8	3.4	4.2	2.1	3.5	4.2	3.2	4.4
(4.2) Investment Climate for Rural Business	4.1	3.0	4.0	3.1	4.0	2.4	3.4	2.6	2.6	4.2	3.4	4.0
(4.3) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.7	3.7	3.6	2.2	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.9	2.6	3.9
(4.4) Access to extension services	5.0	4.7	5.1	4.4	4.1	5.1	4.7	2.9	4.0	5.1	3.8	4.7
5. Nutrition and gender equality												
(5.1) Nutrition policy framework and outcomes	4.4	4.2	5.1	4.0	3.9	4.8	4.5	3.1	3.6	5.3	4.8	5.2
(5.2) Policy framework for gender equality	5.0	5.1	4.2	5.4	4.4	4.9	3.8	4.1	3.4	4.9	4.6	4.2
6. Macroeconomic policies and conditions for rural development												
(6.1) Monetary and exchange rate policies	2.9	3.6	3.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.1	3.1	3.8	4.1	4.6
(6.2) Fiscal Policy and Taxation	3.4	4.2	3.8	4.4	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.9	3.4	4.3	3.7	4.2
(6.3) Debt Policy	3.3	3.6	2.7	3.3	3.4	2.8	3.6	4.0	3.0	4.3	4.0	4.1
(6.4) Trade Policy	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.9	4.3	3.8	4.8
Average of all indicators	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.3	4.3	3.7	4.3

Table 4
Near East, North Africa and Europe

RSPA indicator	Djibouti	Egypt	Iraq	Jordan	Kyrgyzstan	Republic of Moldova	Morocco	Sudan	Syrian Arab Republic	Tajikistan	Tunisia	Turkey	Uzbekistan	Yemen
1. Policies and legal framework for rural organizations (ROs) and rural people														
(1.1) Policies and framework for rural development and rural poverty alleviation	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.8	5.1	4.5	3.5	2.4	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.4	1.8
(1.2) Legal frameworks for and autonomy of rural people's organizations	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	4.8	4.1	2.7	1.3	3.0	4.5	3.2	2.6	2.7
(1.3) Representation and influence of ROs and rural people	1.0	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.9	4.7	4.2	3.1	2.6	3.6	3.4	3.9	2.8	3.9
2. Rural governance, transparency and public administration														
(2.1) Quality and transparency of allocation of resources for rural development	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.2	1.3	1.3	2.8	2.6	2.1	1.3
(2.2) Accountability, transparency and corruption	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.7	2.9	3.8	3.5	3.0	1.3	1.8	4.2	3.3	1.6	1.5
3. Natural resources and environmental policies and practices														
(3.1) Environmental assessment policies and grievance mechanisms	3.9	4.4	4.0	2.9	4.3	4.9	4.4	3.0	2.5	3.7	3.3	4.2	3.4	4.1
(3.2) National climate change policies	4.5	4.1	3.6	4.6	2.6	4.5	4.7	3.9	1.9	3.2	4.4	3.9	4.0	2.1
(3.3) Access to land	3.0	3.7	2.7	3.5	4.8	5.0	4.8	3.0	2.0	4.5	4.1	3.3	3.2	3.6
(3.4) Access to water	4.1	4.6	4.1	4.0	4.6	4.5	4.9	3.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.0
4. Financial policy, access to services and markets														
(4.1) Access to and use of rural financial services	1.4	3.2	1.9	4.2	4.4	2.8	3.6	2.6	1.9	4.4	3.2	4.0	2.5	1.9
(4.2) Investment Climate for Rural Business	3.1	3.8	3.2	3.7	2.2	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.2	2.1	4.4	4.4	3.3	3.2
(4.3) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	1.9	3.6	3.7	3.4	4.2	4.9	3.6	3.0	3.2	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.5
(4.4) Access to extension services	4.1	3.3	2.8	4.0	3.5	4.7	3.7	3.1	4.0	2.7	4.7	4.6	2.7	3.8
5. Nutrition and gender equality														
(5.1) Nutrition policy framework and outcomes	3.2	3.8	4.4	4.6	5.1	4.8	5.3	4.2	1.8	3.8	5.0	3.9	3.7	2.7
(5.2) Policy framework for gender equality	3.2	3.1	3.8	3.5	3.1	4.8	4.1	2.8	2.1	4.3	3.6	3.3	3.3	2.0
6. Macroeconomic policies and conditions for rural development														
(6.1) Monetary and exchange rate policies	4.1	3.5	4.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	4.0	2.4	1.9	3.5	3.2	3.6	4.0	2.6
(6.2) Fiscal Policy and Taxation	3.9	3.1	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.5	3.8	2.9	1.7	3.8	3.8	4.1	4.2	2.9
(6.3) Debt Policy	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.7	1.6	2.7	3.4	3.4	3.5	4.0	2.8
(6.4) Trade Policy	2.9	3.7	2.7	4.3	4.4	4.5	3.7	2.4	2.2	3.7	3.5	4.6	2.2	3.6
Average of all indicators	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.0	2.3	3.5	3.9	3.8	3.2	2.8

Table 5
West and Central Africa

RSPA indicator	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Central African Rep	Chad	Congo	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Côte d'Ivoire	Gabon	Gambia (The)	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Liberia	Mali	Mauritania	Niger	Nigeria	Sao Tome and Principe	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Togo
1. Policies and legal framework for rural organizations (ROs) and rural people																						
(1.1) Policies and framework for rural development and rural poverty alleviation	3.1	2.9	3.8	3.1	2.9	4.6	3.3	4.6	4.8	3.6	4.2	3.9	3.2	3.6	3.9	4.2	3.4	3.5	4.2	3.4	3.8	3.6
(1.2) Legal frameworks for and autonomy of rural people's organizations	3.3	3.1	3.3	2.1	2.7	2.9	2.7	4.3	3.0	3.3	4.5	3.8	2.5	2.8	3.5	4.1	3.2	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.0
(1.3) Representation and influence of ROs and rural people	4.7	5.0	5.0	3.9	3.4	1.5	1.0	3.5	1.0	4.2	4.2	1.8	3.6	2.0	3.6	2.6	4.2	3.6	3.4	3.8	2.3	3.6
2. Rural governance, transparency and public administration																						
(2.1) Quality and transparency of allocation of resources for rural development	3.4	4.1	2.6	1.6	2.9	2.9	2.0	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.8	3.6	2.0	1.6	4.0	3.5	4.2	2.5	4.1	3.2	3.3	3.4
(2.2) Accountability, transparency and corruption	4.2	3.7	2.4	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.5	3.2	2.5	2.8	4.8	2.3	1.5	3.3	3.2	2.6	3.2	3.0	4.6	4.4	3.7	3.1
3. Natural resources and environmental policies and practices																						
(3.1) Environmental assessment policies and grievance mechanisms	3.5	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.8	3.2	3.7	4.5	3.6	4.0	4.7	3.9	2.5	4.4	3.9	3.9	3.0	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.7
(3.2) National climate change policies	2.7	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	3.6	2.7	3.9	3.7	2.9	4.5	4.7	4.5	3.1	4.2	4.6	3.9	2.6	4.0	4.1	3.8	4.3
(3.3) Access to land	3.9	3.8	2.4	2.7	2.4	4.1	2.4	4.5	2.9	3.2	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.9	3.2	3.8	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.9	3.3
(3.4) Access to water	3.9	3.6	3.1	3.5	4.2	3.1	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.7	4.0	3.1	3.4	2.5	3.6	3.9	3.3	3.7	4.7	4.2	3.5	3.0
4. Financial policy, access to services and markets																						
(4.1) Access to and use of rural financial services	2.9	3.0	1.9	1.8	1.4	2.1	3.1	2.7	2.5	2.3	4.2	2.8	2.0	3.5	2.6	1.5	2.6	3.9	1.7	3.3	3.2	3.1
(4.2) Investment Climate for Rural Business	3.7	3.8	3.5	2.1	3.1	1.6	1.8	3.2	3.0	3.3	4.1	3.1	3.5	2.5	4.3	1.8	1.8	3.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	3.8

RSPA indicator	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Central African Rep	Chad	Congo	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Côte d'Ivoire	Gabon	Gambia (The)	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Liberia	Mali	Mauritania	Niger	Nigeria	Sao Tome and Principe	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Togo
(4.3) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	2.9	4.1	4.2	3.3	4.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.1	3.4	4.0	2.3	3.5	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.5	3.5	4.0
(4.4) Access to extension services	4.4	4.8	3.8	1.7	2.4	1.7	2.9	4.1	3.3	2.5	5.1	4.3	1.7	4.8	1.7	5.3	3.8	4.4	3.2	2.8	5.0	1.8
5. Nutrition and gender equality																						
(5.1) Nutrition policy framework and outcomes	4.0	4.4	4.3	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.8	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.6	3.7	4.0	2.3	3.8	4.2	3.3	4.5	3.9	4.3	4.0	3.5
(5.2) Policy framework for gender equality	3.1	2.8	3.8	3.0	2.7	3.4	1.7	3.2	2.2	2.6	3.4	3.4	3.5	2.9	2.5	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.3	4.3	2.6	3.7
6. Macroeconomic policies and conditions for rural development																						
(6.1) Monetary and exchange rate policies	3.5	4.4	4.5	3.7	3.1	3.6	2.9	4.4	4.2	2.6	3.6	2.5	3.0	2.8	4.4	2.8	3.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	2.7	3.2
(6.2) Fiscal Policy and Taxation	3.2	3.8	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.5	4.1	3.5	3.7	3.6	2.9	4.1	3.5	3.5	3.3
(6.3) Debt Policy	4.0	4.2	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.9	4.3	3.8	3.4	2.5	3.6	3.8	2.5	3.7	4.5	3.2	3.9	4.6	3.3	3.8	3.7	2.8
(6.4) Trade Policy	4.0	4.0	2.2	2.9	2.2	3.6	2.6	4.1	3.3	2.8	3.4	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.2	2.9
Average of all indicators	3.6	3.9	3.5	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.8	3.2	3.2	4.0	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.3