

a

IFAD
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
Governing Council – Twenty-Eighth Session
Rome, 16-17 February 2005

2004 PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE
PERFORMANCE-BASED ALLOCATION SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE 2004 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROCESS..... 2

III. RESULTS OF THE FIRST PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND ALLOCATION CYCLE..... 3

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 4

2004 PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE-BASED ALLOCATION SYSTEM

Results of the First Annual Performance Assessment and Resource Allocation Cycle

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this information paper is to provide the Governing Council with the 2004 annual progress report on the implementation of the performance-based allocation system (PBAS) in IFAD, following last year's 2003 progress report (document GC 27/L.6).

2. At its Twenty-Sixth Session in February 2003, the Governing Council approved the establishment in IFAD of a performance-based allocation system as had been recommended by the Consultation on the Sixth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources in its report to the Governing Council "Enabling the Rural Poor to Overcome their Poverty" (document GC 26/L4). The Governing Council further decided to delegate to the Executive Board the authority to develop the details for the design and implementation of the PBAS. The structure and operation of a PBAS for IFAD was approved by the Executive Board at its Seventy-Ninth Session in September 2003 by way of document EB 2003/79/R.2/Rev.1 (hereafter "EB 79/R.2"). The PBAS introduces an approach to allocate IFAD's loan and country grant resources to country programmes on the basis of country performance (the broad policy framework, rural development policy and portfolio performance), population and per capita gross national income (GNI). These annual allocation exercises operate in the context of three-year cycles, administered within a six-year time frame. In the year immediately preceding the first year of the three-year cycle, an assessment exercise determines ex ante allocations to be committed over the following three years. Within each cycle, IFAD will review 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 the policy and institutional framework. This allows the Fund to produce concrete performance assessments and allocations by September and December each year. Within the framework of these PBAS allocations, commitments will be made in the context of the annual programmes of work approved by the Executive Board.

3. The first allocation exercise covers the period 2005-2007, and the first PBAS performance assessments were produced by the end of the second quarter of 2004. The calculation of ex ante allocations was completed in time to allow presentation to the Executive Board in September 2004 of a planned programme of work for 2005 within the framework of the PBAS. The Board subsequently approved the 2005 PBAS-based programme of work in its December 2004 session. The programme of work approved in 2004 for activities in 2005 involves the application of the PBAS within the framework of regional allocations adopted by the Executive Board in 1999.

4. The system remains subject to continuing evolution in the light of experience, as it is recognized that the design of the system will be finalized only after these processes have been in operation for some time. The proposed programme of work for 2006, which will be presented to the Executive Board in September 2005, will reflect the experience of applying the PBAS within the system of regional allocations and will extend the PBAS as a uniform system of comparison and allocation across the lending programme as a whole. It will take into account the need both to reflect priorities with regard to the regional distribution of development assistance and to maintain at least a two-thirds share of its lending programme on highly concessional terms. The September 2005 report to the Executive Board will also reflect IFAD's review and recommendations regarding the

methodological aspects of the PBAS, based on the experience in implementing the system for one year, as well as on the basis of lessons from other institutions in implementing their PBAS. Relevant issues include factors such as the weight of the population, the broad framework ratings for non-highly concessional borrowers, rural performance assessments for post-conflict countries and countries affected by other crises, the minimum and maximum allocations, the volatility in portfolio at risk ratings and the management of allocations in a multi-year context. In reviewing the programme of work for 2006, the Executive Board will consider whether the system and its resulting allocations effectively satisfy development goals with regard to regional priorities and whether the operation of the PBAS within the framework of regional allocations should be maintained.

II. THE 2004 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

5. Between December 2003 (when the rural-sector-policy performance criteria were approved by the Executive Board) and December 2004, a number of activities were undertaken to secure the above time-bound deliverables. They include:

- development of a country-performance assessment methodology, as well as the respective guidelines and scoring forms; and the institution-wide adoption of this methodology;
- actual performance assessments by the respective country teams, consisting of the country programme manager and the regional economist, under the responsibility of the director of the regional division;
- review of the country performance assessments within the regional divisions through peer review; and review of the outcomes of the performance assessments by the PBAS operational contact group, the PBAS operational management group and senior management;
- consultations with countries on the issues covered in the rural-development-policy performance assessment. These have taken a variety of forms, for instance consultations with: governments in the context of the country strategic opportunities paper (COSOP) process (e.g. the COSOP for Paraguay) or other country-programme development missions; and government officials (e.g. government officials concerned with IFAD both in the capitals as well as through the missions in Rome). Given the time constraint, the consultation process has not been as comprehensive as intended and will be systematized for the next annual cycle;
- presentation of the preliminary results of the first cycle of assessments to the September 2004 session of the Executive Board (document EB 2004/82/R.30);
- further country consultations. In its September session the Board noted that the process of country consultations had not yet been completed and requested that IFAD management not disclose the country scores until data verification and country consultations had been completed. The Board also requested that such consultations and data verification (and any corrections thereto) be completed in time for consideration at the December 2004 session. There was also a request for the detailed components of the country scores: population, per capita gross national income, the country performance rating (explicitly disclosing the country policy and institutional assessment [CPIA] rating of the World Bank, the rural sector performance rating and the portfolio-at-risk rating), as well as the aggregate country scores; and
- presentation of the final results of the 2004 cycle of assessments, as well as the resulting country allocations, to the December 2004 session of the Executive Board (document EB 2004/83/R.10 and its Add.1).

III. RESULTS OF THE FIRST PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND ALLOCATION CYCLE

6. Attachments I and II provide the results of the 2004 assessment cycle, as follows:

- (a) **Attachment I** provides the outcome, for each regional division, of the first country performance assessment and resource-allocation cycle. It gives the 2004 country scores (the column before last) and their conversion into annual United States dollar resource allocations (last column), based on the methodology prescribed in EB 79/R.2 and the related conference-room paper EB 2003/79/C.R.P. 3. The annual allocations per country and per regional division have been made within the 1999 approved regional lending shares.
- (b) **Attachment II** consists of the details of the rural development sector framework assessments, in line with document EB 2003/80/R.3 which provides the criteria for such assessments. These assessments constitute the basis for the rural sector performance score in the total performance rating used for the country score and country allocation, reflected in attachment I.

7. Attachment I is the operational document which translates the 2004 PBAS assessments into annual country allocations (in United States dollars) within a medium-term programme framework, with a total annual programme of loans and country-specific grants of USD 475 million (within the framework of a programme of work of USD 500 million), and taking into account the agreement reached at the Board's September 2004 session, as reflected in the closing statement of the Chairman, whereby:

- (a) The long list of all eligible countries would be translated into a lending programme framework and especially into annual country allocations, by deferring countries for which no IFAD lending or country grants are currently foreseen during the next six years to the next allocation cycle. The countries that are being deferred to the next allocation cycle are countries that have not indicated a current demand for IFAD loans, as well as countries for which loans or country grants have been approved in recent years but have no immediate demand for additional loans (e.g. the Pacific Island Countries, for which the December 2004 Executive Board approved a grant for a poverty reduction programme).
- (b) Projects that have reached advanced stages in their project cycle and in government approval and resource planning processes, and for which the loan amount exceeds the PBAS country allocation, would be considered with the current loan amounts by the Board in April 2005. Resources for these loan amounts in excess of the PBAS allocation would be made available without affecting the resources available for higher performing countries, using the resources unallocated in 2005.
- (c) The actual allocations for small-island developing states and other countries with extremely small populations would be handled pragmatically, at the time of the decision to lend.

8. The country allocations are not to be understood as entitlements; they constitute a framework for resource allocation. The conversion of the allocations into actual commitments will continue to depend on the strategic value added of IFAD in each country and the availability of appropriate investment opportunities. Actual lending decisions will be consistent with IFAD's financial rules and regulations, such as the non-eligibility for new borrowing by countries in arrears. In this regard, and for illustrative purposes only, please see the Status Report on Principal and Interest Payments (document EB 2004/83/INF.5) for details of borrowers currently in arrears. There are countries that will not take up their allocations within a three-year cycle – either because the available amount is

impractically small, or because no country programmes could be developed within the respective time frame. In accordance with paragraph 30 of EB 79/R.2, provisions would be made for carry-over of unused country allocations to successive allocation periods, subject to utilization plans agreed between IFAD and the governments concerned.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9. This report provides an overview of the progress made in implementing the PBAS within IFAD and, as required by paragraph 44 of EB 79/R.2, discloses the resulting 2004 country scores and related annual country allocations. The Governing Council is invited to take note of this information on the 2004 country scores and the annual country allocations presented in Attachments I and II.

2004 COUNTRY SCORES AND 2005 ALLOCATIONS

Table 1.1: Western and Central Africa Division – all eligible countries

Country	GNI per capita (USD) 2002	Total population 2002	CPIA rating 2003 quintile averages	Rural sector total country score	PAR rating	Total country performance rating	Total country score	Country allocations
Benin	380	6552000	<i>3.59</i>	<i>3.95</i>	<i>5</i>	4.25	528 679	4 127 919
Burkina Faso	250	11831000	<i>3.59</i>	<i>3.83</i>	<i>5</i>	4.19	890 335	6 951 725
Cameroon	550	15769000	<i>3.34</i>	<i>3.42</i>	<i>2</i>	2.91	436 219	3 405 988
Cape Verde	1 250	458000	<i>3.69</i>	<i>4.07</i>	<i>5</i>	4.32	55 206	1 000 000
Central African Republic	250	3820000	<i>2.58</i>	<i>2.25</i>		2.35	120 162	1 000 000
Chad	210	8341000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>3.29</i>	<i>2</i>	2.78	315 837	2 466 051
Congo	610	3657000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>2.96</i>		2.97	148 854	1 162 250
Côte d'Ivoire	620	16513000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>3.08</i>	<i>2</i>	2.69	375 504	2 931 930
D.R. Congo	100	51580000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>2.42</i>		2.60	1 300 326	10 152 924
Equatorial Guinea	930	482000		<i>2.88</i>		2.88	27 380	1 000 000
Gabon	3 060	1315000		<i>2.75</i>		2.75	39 485	1 000 000
Gambia, The	270	1389000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>3.65</i>	<i>5</i>	3.99	159 112	1 242 344
Ghana	270	20271000	<i>3.59</i>	<i>3.89</i>	<i>4</i>	3.87	1 115 755	8 711 801
Guinea	410	7744000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>3.60</i>	<i>4</i>	3.62	427 981	3 341 672
Guinea-Bissau	130	1447000	<i>2.58</i>	<i>2.42</i>		2.47	75 193	1 000 000
Liberia	140	3295000		<i>2.00</i>		2.00	89 933	1 000 000
Mali	240	11374000	<i>3.59</i>	<i>3.77</i>	<i>3</i>	3.46	596 743	4 659 357
Mauritania	280	2785000	<i>3.69</i>	<i>3.68</i>	<i>5</i>	4.14	285 941	2 232 619
Niger	180	11425000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>3.53</i>	<i>3</i>	3.24	562 854	4 394 757
Nigeria	300	132785000	<i>2.58</i>	<i>3.47</i>	<i>2</i>	2.78	2 290 448	17 883 778
Sao Tome and Principe	300	154000	<i>2.58</i>	<i>3.71</i>		3.36	21 103	1 000 000
Senegal	470	10007000	<i>3.69</i>	<i>3.85</i>	<i>3</i>	3.52	473 096	3 693 927
Sierra Leone	140	5235000	<i>3.01</i>	<i>2.64</i>	<i>2</i>	2.49	197 386	1 541 185
Togo	270	4760000	<i>2.58</i>	<i>2.75</i>		2.70	182 957	1 428 524
							10 716 489	87 328 750

Table 1.2: Eastern and Southern Africa Division – all eligible countries

Country	GNI per capita (USD) 2002	Total population 2002	CPIA rating 2003 quintile averages	Rural sector total country score	PAR rating	Total country performance rating	Total country score	Country allocations
Angola	710	13121000	2.58	2.37	2	2.28	220 338	1 197 982
Botswana	3 010	1712000		4.16		4.16	110 592	
Burundi	100	7071000	2.58	3.08	4	3.30	472 338	2 568 114
Comoros	390	586000	2.58	3.19	5	3.70	65 363	1 000 000
Eritrea	190	4297000	3.01	3.80	5	4.06	419 473	2 280 684
Ethiopia	100	67218000	3.34	4.06	5	4.25	4 233 358	23 750 000
Kenya	360	31345000	3.34	4.29	2	3.30	1 046 162	5 688 009
Lesotho	550	1777000	3.34	3.27	2	2.84	80 937	1 000 000
Madagascar	230	16437000	3.59	3.85	5	4.20	1 168 389	6 352 563
Malawi	160	10743000	3.34	3.68	2	3.02	482 663	2 624 249
Mauritius	3 860	1212000		4.10	5	4.49	93 603	
Mozambique	200	18438000	3.34	3.75	4	3.76	1 055 102	5 736 618
Namibia	1 790	1985000		3.75	5	4.30	150 010	
Rwanda	230	8163000	3.59	4.04	3	3.59	504 412	2 742 502
Seychelles	6 780	84000		3.95		3.95	8 494	
South Africa	2 500	45345000		3.51		3.51	962 771	5 234 611
Swaziland	1 240	1088000		2.88		2.88	46 960	1 000 000
Tanzania, United Republic of	290	35181000	3.69	4.42	5	4.48	2 216 926	12 053 485
Uganda	240	24600000	3.69	4.59	5	4.55	1 840 937	10 009 224
Zambia	340	10244000	3.34	3.70	3	3.38	482 225	2 621 872
Zimbabwe	480	13001000	2.58	2.67	2	2.42	270 154	1 468 837
							15 931 208	87 328 750

ATTACHMENT I

Table 1.3: Asia and the Pacific Division – all eligible countries

Country	GNI per capita (USD) 2002	Total population 2002	CPIA rating 2003 quintile averages	Rural sector total country score	PAR rating	Total country performance rating	Total country score	Country allocations
Afghanistan	200	27997000		2.95		2.95	893 195	3 016 991
Bangladesh	380	135684000	3.59	3.73	5	4.15	4 899 795	16 550 297
Bhutan	600	851000	3.69	4.25	5	4.40	109 724	1 000 000
Cambodia	300	12487000	3.01	3.85	5	4.08	841 553	2 842 558
Cook Islands	4 270	22000		1.00		1.00	223	
China	960	1280400000		4.33	4	4.18	21 296 244	23 750 000
D.P.R. Korea	760	22489000		2.58	5	3.64	823 838	2 782 722
Fiji	2 130	823000		1.00		1.00	4 022	
India	470	1048641000	3.69	3.89	3	3.54	15 664 007	23 750 000
Indonesia	710	211716000	3.59	3.86	3	3.51	4 177 600	14 110 900
Iran	1 720	65540000		3.35		3.35	1 272 678	4 298 790
Kazakhstan	1 520	14875000		3.78		3.78	546 877	1 847 217
Kyrgyzstan	290	5004000	3.34	3.99	5	4.21	455 018	1 536 938
Laos	310	5530000	2.58	3.77	5	3.96	426 716	1 000 000
Malaysia	3 540	24305000		4.33		4.33	842 685	
Maldives	2 170	287000	3.69	3.54	5	4.08	30 230	1 000 000
Mongolia	430	2449000	3.34	4.00	5	4.22	241 819	1 000 000
Myanmar	220	48786000		2.55		2.55	983 443	3 321 829
Nepal	230	24125000	3.59	3.72	5	4.14	1 516 173	5 121 258
Pakistan	420	144902000	3.59	3.82	3	3.49	3 545 394	11 975 465
Papua New Guinea	530	5378000	2.58	3.72		3.37	264 380	1 000 000
Philippines	1 030	79944000		4.26	5	4.58	3 136 210	10 593 342
Republic of Korea	9 930	47640000		1.00		1.00	57 444	
Sri Lanka	850	18968000	3.69	3.99	5	4.28	976 304	3 297 714
Tajikistan	180	6265000	3.01	3.42		3.29	370 976	1 000 000
Thailand	2 000	61613000		4.27		4.27	1 895 921	
Timor-Leste	520	780000		3.49		3.49	67 038	
Tonga	1 440	101000	3.01 ^a	3.01		3.01	8 333	
Samoa	1 430	176000	3.69 ^a	3.69		3.69	19 026	
Solomon Islands	580	443000	2.58 ^a	2.58		2.58	23 291	1 000 000
Viet Nam	430	80424000	3.69	3.97	5	4.27	3 405 068	11 501 479
Kiribati ^b							9 189	
Uzbekistan ^b							512 291	
							69 316 707	147 297 500

^a Provisional rural assessment score equal to CPIA rating.

^b In the process of becoming a Member State.

ATTACHMENT I

Table 1.4: Latin America and the Caribbean Division – all eligible countries

Country	GNI per capita (USD) 2002	Total population 2002	CPIA rating 2003 quintile averages	Rural sector total country score	PAR rating	Total country performance rating	Total country score	Country allocations
Antigua and Barbuda	9 720	69000		4.13		4.13	7 296	1 000 000
Argentina	4 220	36480000		4.09	5	4.49	1 173 213	4 672 088
Barbados	8 790	269000		4.59		4.59	25 674	1 000 000
Belize	2 970	253000		3.63	2	2.91	12 984	1 000 000
Bolivia	900	8809000	3.59	4.01	4	3.92	453 854	1 807 384
Brazil	2 830	174485000		4.26	5	4.59	4 375 745	17 425 545
Chile	4 250	15589000		4.61	5	4.78	702 244	2 796 547
Colombia	1 820	43733000		4.01	5	4.44	1 624 383	6 468 784
Costa Rica	4 070	3942000		4.59	5	4.77	251 672	1 002 235
Cuba	1 170	11263000		4.14		4.14	569 858	2 269 349
Dominica	3 000	72000		4.13	5	4.51	12 068	1 000 000
Dominican Republic	2 140	8613000		3.86	5	4.36	443 990	1 768 105
Ecuador	1 490	12818000		4.02	5	4.45	681 560	2 714 178
El Salvador	2 110	6417000		4.31	5	4.61	400 035	1 593 061
Grenada	3 530	102000		4.13	5	4.51	15 047	1 000 000
Guatemala	1 760	11992000		3.85	5	4.35	595 865	2 372 915
Guyana	860	766000	3.34	3.73	2	3.05	44 379	1 000 000
Haiti	440	8286000	2.58	3.30	4	3.40	389 657	1 551 734
Honduras	930	6797000	3.69	3.89	3	3.54	301 712	1 201 509
Jamaica	2 690	2617000		4.13		4.13	153 731	1 000 000
Mexico	5 920	100819000		4.16	5	4.53	2 351 889	9 365 933
Nicaragua	710	5342000	3.69	3.95	5	4.27	391 974	1 560 961
Panama	4 020	2940000		4.03	2	3.14	88 103	1 000 000
Paraguay	1 170	5510000		3.12	2	2.63	134 400	1 000 000
Peru	2 020	26749000		4.08	5	4.48	1 113 626	4 434 795
Saint Christopher and Nevis	6 540	46000		4.17		4.17	6 064	1 000 000
Saint Lucia	3 750	160000		4.17	5	4.53	20 990	1 000 000
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2 820	117000		4.13		4.13	14 772	1 000 000
Suriname	1 940	433000		3.63		3.63	33 573	1 000 000
Trinidad and Tobago	6 750	1304000		4.17		4.17	73 911	1 000 000
Uruguay	4 340	3361000		4.56	5	4.75	218 618	1 000 000
Venezuela	4 080	25090000		3.30	5	4.04	725 052	2 887 377
							17 407 939	80 892 500

ATTACHMENT I

Table 1.5: Near East and North Africa Division – all eligible countries

Country	GNI per capita (USD) 2002	Total population 2002	CPIA rating 2003 quintile averages	Rural sector total country score	PAR rating	Total country performance rating	Total country score	Country allocations
Albania	1 450	3150000	3.34	4.16	5	4.29	223 049	1 173 190
Algeria	1 720	31320000		3.87		3.87	971 748	5 111 181
Armenia	790	3068000	3.69	4.51	5	4.52	282 342	1 485 058
Azerbaijan	710	8172000	3.59	3.67	3	3.42	346 221	1 821 048
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 310	4112000		4.40	5	4.66	330 117	1 736 342
Croatia	4 540	4465000		4.76		4.76	268 632	
Cyprus	12 320	765000		1.00		1.00	2 455	
Djibouti	850	693000	3.01	3.73		3.51	54 805	1 000 000
Egypt	1 470	66372000		3.88	4	3.93	1 834 559	9 649 375
Gaza and the West Bank	1 110	3231000		4.14	2	3.20	135 343	1 000 000
Georgia	650	5177000	3.34	4.18	3	3.60	278 408	1 464 367
Iraq	2 170	24174000		1.00		1.00	50 512	1 000 000
Jordan	1 760	5171000		4.23	5	4.57	349 158	1 836 497
Lebanon	3 990	4441000		4.21	3	3.68	165 062	1 000 000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 206	5448000		1.00		1.00	14 986	
Malta	9 260	397000		1.00		1.00	1 612	
Morocco	1 170	29641000		3.76	4	3.86	1 024 771	5 390 071
Oman	7 830	2538000		1.00		1.00	6 760	
Republic of Moldova	460	4255000	3.34	4.02	5	4.23	361 373	1 900 742
Romania	1 870	22300000		4.10	2	3.18	499 021	2 624 738
Somalia	130	9319000		4.15		4.15	862 141	4 534 670
Sudan	370	32791000	2.58	3.60	5	3.88	1 490 683	7 840 664
Syria	1 130	16986000		3.71	5	4.28	834 285	4 388 157
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	1 710	2038000		4.49	3	3.84	123 466	1 000 000
Tunisia	1 990	9781000		4.16	4	4.09	438 404	2 305 909
Turkey	2 490	69626000		3.95	5	4.41	2 095 626	11 022 529
Yemen	490	18601000	3.59	3.54	2	3.01	545 263	2 867 961
							13 590 803	72 152 500
IFAD								475 000 000

2004 RURAL SECTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

Table 2.1: Western and Central Africa Division												
	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Cape Verde	Central African Republic	Chad	Congo	Côte d'Ivoire	D.R. Congo	Equatorial Guinea	Gabon	Gambia
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.75
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	3.70
Access to land	3.80	3.70	3.00	3.20	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.30
Access to water for agriculture	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.86	2.00	3.50	4.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.30
Access to agricultural research and extension services	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	2.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.75	2.00	3.50	2.50	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.75
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.75
Access to education in rural areas	4.00	3.20	4.00	5.00	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.30
Representation	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.38	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.70
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.80	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.60
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.80	4.00	3.00	4.11	2.00	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.60
Average	3.95	3.83	3.42	4.07	2.25	3.29	2.96	3.08	2.42	2.88	2.75	3.65

ATTACHMENT II

Table 2.1: Western and Central Africa Division (con't)

	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Liberia	Mali	Mauritania	Niger	Nigeria	Sao Tome and Principe	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Togo
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.80	3.80	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.80	3.40	3.40	4.00	4.50	2.90	2.50
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.00	3.70	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.80	4.20	5.00	2.70	2.00
Access to land	3.80	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.50	3.60	3.20	3.20	4.00	3.50	2.80	3.00
Access to water for agriculture	3.70	4.00	2.00	2.00	3.30	3.25	3.30	3.50	3.80	3.60	2.70	2.75
Access to agricultural research and extension services	4.00	3.50	2.00	2.00	3.50	3.20	3.30	3.50	3.75	4.00	2.60	3.00
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.00	3.60	1.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.25	3.00	3.50	2.50	3.00
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.00	3.60	3.00	2.00	3.70	4.00	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.00	2.40	2.50
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.70	3.80	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.75	3.75	3.30	3.50	3.80	2.60	3.00
Access to education in rural areas	3.70	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.50	3.67	3.70	3.70	2.00	3.00	2.70	3.00
Representation	4.00	3.50	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.70	3.80	3.70	3.50	2.50	3.00
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	3.30	2.00	2.00	3.70	3.67	3.30	3.20	4.75	4.00	2.70	2.50
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.00	3.40	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.20	3.80	3.75	2.60	2.75
Average	3.89	3.60	2.42	2.00	3.77	3.68	3.53	3.47	3.71	3.85	2.64	2.75

ATTACHMENT II

Table 2.2: Eastern and Southern Africa Division

	Angola	Botswana	Burundi	Comoros	Eritrea	Ethiopia	Kenya	Lesotho	Madagascar	Malawi	Mauritius
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	2.8	3.8	3.4	3.2	3.6	4	4.6	3.4	4.2	3.4	4.2
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	1.25	5	2.5	2.5	4.25	4	4.75	3	3.25	3.25	4.25
Access to land	2	4	2.8	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.8
Access to water for agriculture	1.57	3.43	2.86	3	3.57	4	3.57	2.43	3.71	3.71	3.57
Access to agricultural research and extension services	2	2.5	3	2.75	3.5	3.75	4.25	3.5	3.5	3.75	2.75
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	2.5	2.75	2.75	3.5	3	4.75	4.75	2	4.75	3	4
Investment climate for rural businesses	3	4	3.25	3.25	3	4	4.25	3.75	3.75	3.5	4.75
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3	4.5	3	3.5	3.25	3.75	3.75	3.5	4.25	3.25	3.5
Access to education in rural areas	3.33	6	3	3.33	3.67	3.67	5	4	4.33	5.33	6
Representation	3.25	5.5	4.25	3.75	5	4	4.75	3.75	3.75	4.5	4.5
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	2	4.33	3.33	2.83	4.5	5.33	4	3.33	4	3.5	4
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	1.78	4.11	2.78	3.11	4.67	4.11	4	3.33	3.44	3.78	3.89
Average	2.37	4.16	3.08	3.19	3.8	4.06	4.29	3.27	3.85	3.68	4.1

Table 2.2: Eastern and Southern Africa Division (con't)

	Mozambique	Namibia	Rwanda	Seychelles	South Africa	Swaziland	Tanzania, United Rep. of	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.6	3.6	3.8	4.2	3.2	3.8	4.6	4.4	3.6	2.4
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.5	3.25	4.25	3.75	2.5	1.5	4.25	4.75	3.5	2.25
Access to land	4.4	3	3.2	3.8	3.4	2.4	4.8	4.2	3.4	2.4
Access to water for agriculture	2.71	3.29	3.71	3.43	3.71	2.29	4.29	3.29	3.14	2.86
Access to agricultural research and extension services	4	3	2.75	5	3.25	2.25	4	5	3.5	3
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.75	3	4	3.5	2.75	3.25	4.75	4.75	3.75	2.5
Investment climate for rural businesses	4	4	4.5	3.25	3.5	2.25	4	4	4	2.5
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4	4	4.5	3	4.25	2.75	4.25	4.5	4	2.75
Access to education in rural areas	3.33	5.67	4.33	6	4.33	4.67	4.67	6	4.67	3
Representation	3.25	5	5	5.5	4	4.25	5.5	5.5	4.25	3.75
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.67	3.5	3.67	3.5	3.67	2	4	4.5	3.33	1.83
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.78	3.67	4.78	2.33	3.56	3.11	3.89	4.22	3.22	2.78
Average	3.75	3.75	4.04	3.94	3.51	2.88	4.42	4.59	3.7	2.67

Table 2.3: Asia and the Pacific Division

	Policy and legal framework for rural organizations.	Dialogue between government and rural organizations	Access to land	Access to water for agriculture	Access to agricultural research and extension services	Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	Investment climate for rural businesses	Access to agricultural input and produce markets	Access to education in rural areas	Representation	Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	Average
Afghanistan	3.33	3.50	2.20	2.50	3.00	2.67	3.33	3.25	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.67	2.95
Bangladesh	4.20	3.00	3.40	3.43	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.67	4.25	3.33	2.78	3.73
Bhutan	4.00	3.75	4.60	4.29	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.33	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.25
Cambodia	4.00	4.00	3.60	3.43	3.25	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.25	3.83	3.56	3.85
China	4.60	4.50	4.80	3.57	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.67	4.22	4.33
D.P.R. Korea	2.20	1.75	2.60	2.29	2.50	2.50	1.75	2.00	4.00	3.50	3.33	2.56	2.58
India	4.40	3.75	3.80	3.57	3.75	3.75	4.50	3.50	4.00	4.25	3.83	3.56	3.89
Indonesia	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.71	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.75	4.33	4.50	4.33	3.44	3.86
Iran	3.80	3.00	3.00	3.29	2.25	3.33	3.50	3.25	4.00	3.75	3.75	3.33	3.35
Kazakhstan	4.20	4.00	3.60	2.83	3.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.78	5.00	3.60	3.80	3.78
Kyrgyzstan	3.80	3.75	4.20	3.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	5.33	5.00	3.83	3.44	3.99
Laos	3.60	4.00	3.60	3.43	3.25	3.50	3.25	4.25	4.33	4.25	4.00	3.78	3.77
Malaysia	4.75	4.33	4.33	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.75	6.00	4.50	4.50	3.00	4.33
Maldives	3.20	2.75	3.00	3.54	2.50	3.75	3.75	2.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.44	3.54
Mongolia	3.60	4.25	3.80	3.14	4.00	4.75	4.00	3.75	4.33	5.25	3.67	3.44	4.00
Myanmar	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.40	2.67	2.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	2.50	2.50	2.55
Nepal	3.40	3.00	3.80	3.43	3.50	3.50	4.25	4.25	3.67	4.50	3.67	3.67	3.72
Pakistan	4.40	4.25	2.80	3.14	3.50	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.67	4.50	4.17	3.89	3.82
Papua New Guinea	3.72	3.72	3.80	3.00	4.00	3.72	4.75	4.33	3.00	3.72	4.00	2.89	3.72
Philippines	4.60	4.50	4.20	3.86	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.67	4.75	3.67	3.89	4.26
Sri Lanka	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.86	3.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.99
Tajikistan	3.60	2.75	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.75	3.00	3.50	4.33	4.50	3.67	3.44	3.42
Thailand	5.00	3.75	4.00	3.57	4.00	3.67	5.00	4.67	4.33	4.75	4.17	4.33	4.27
Timor-Leste	4.00	4.00	3.33	2.33	3.49	3.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	3.75	4.00	3.33	3.49
Viet Nam	4.00	3.25	3.40	3.14	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.25	5.00	4.50	4.33	4.22	3.97

9

a
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

ATTACHMENT II

	Antigua and Barbuda	Argentina	Barbados	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Cuba	Dominica
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.00	3.80	4.60	3.80	4.60	5.00	4.60	4.20	4.60	4.40	4.00
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.25	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.50	5.00	4.50	3.25	4.50	3.50	4.25
Access to land	4.00	4.00	4.60	2.90	3.80	4.00	4.50	3.60	4.60	3.80	4.00
Access to water for agriculture	4.00	3.71	4.14	3.00	3.43	3.79	4.43	3.43	4.14	4.43	4.00
Access to agricultural research and extension services	4.00	3.88	4.38	3.00	3.00	3.88	4.50	3.50	4.38	4.50	4.00
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.00	3.50	4.50	3.50	4.75	4.38	4.50	3.50	4.25	3.50	4.00
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.88	4.25	3.63	5.00	5.00	4.88	3.00	4.00
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.00	4.50	5.00	3.38	4.00	3.88	4.88	4.00	5.00	3.50	4.00
Access to education in rural areas	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Representation	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.13	4.25	4.75	4.25	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.25
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.58	3.67	4.25	4.67	4.00	4.50	4.83	4.00
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.00	4.11	4.33	3.61	3.83	3.94	4.50	4.11	4.33	4.22	4.00
Average	4.13	4.09	4.55	3.63	4.01	4.26	4.61	4.01	4.56	4.14	4.13

	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Grenada	Guatemala	Guyana	Haiti	Honduras	Jamaica	Mexico	Nicaragua
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.70	4.80	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.60	4.00	3.90	4.50
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.25	3.75	3.00	3.50	3.63	4.25	4.00	3.63
Access to land	3.60	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.40	3.80	3.00	3.60	4.00	4.00	3.40
Access to water for agriculture	3.79	3.71	3.57	4.00	3.36	4.14	4.00	3.64	4.00	3.71	3.79
Access to agricultural research and extension services	4.00	3.00	4.25	4.00	3.25	3.63	3.00	4.38	4.00	3.88	4.00
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.63	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.13	4.00	3.75	4.25
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.00	4.25	4.75	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.00	4.13	4.00	4.75	3.75
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.13	4.25	4.00	4.00	4.25	3.75	3.38	4.13	4.00	4.75	3.75
Access to education in rural areas	3.83	3.83	5.00	5.00	3.83	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.67
Representation	4.25	4.25	5.00	4.25	4.00	4.25	3.63	4.75	4.25	4.25	4.75
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.67	3.83	4.17	4.00	3.83	3.50	3.17	4.08	4.00	4.50	4.08
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.72	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.00	3.44	2.89	3.61	4.00	4.11	3.67
Average	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.13	3.85	3.73	3.30	3.89	4.13	4.16	4.02

Table 2.4: Latin America and the Caribbean Division (con't)

	Panama	Paraguay	Peru	Saint Christopher and Nevis	Saint Lucia	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Suriname	Trinidad and Tobago	Uruguay	Venezuela
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.20	3.10	4.60	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.80	4.00	4.70	3.40
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.25	3.00	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.25	3.00	4.25	4.63	3.00
Access to land	4.40	2.90	4.20	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.30	4.00	4.60	3.20
Access to water for agriculture	4.00	3.57	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.43	4.00	4.14	2.43
Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.50	2.75	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.25	4.00	4.00	2.50
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.50	2.75	4.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.38	4.00	4.75	3.25
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.25	3.38	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.75	4.50	4.50	3.25
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.25	3.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.63	4.00	4.75	2.75
Access to education in rural areas	4.00	3.83	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
Representation	4.38	3.50	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.13	4.25	4.75	4.50
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	3.58	3.83	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.42
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.67	2.06	3.78	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.94	4.00	4.44	3.22
Average	4.03	3.12	4.08	4.17	4.17	4.13	3.63	4.17	4.56	3.30

ATTACHMENT II

Table 2.5: Near East and North Africa Division

	Albania	Algeria	Armenia	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Croatia	Djibouti	Egypt	Georgia	Jordan	Lebanon
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.20	3.80	4.60	3.60	3.80	4.40	3.60	3.60	4.00	4.20	4.40
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.75	4.25	4.25	3.25	3.75	4.00	3.25	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.75
Access to land	3.80	3.40	4.80	4.40	5.00	5.20	3.60	4.80	5.00	3.80	4.60
Access to water for agriculture	3.57	3.00	4.14	3.43	3.86	4.71	3.14	4.14	3.71	4.29	3.14
Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.50	3.00	3.75	3.25	3.25	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.25	3.00
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.75	4.00	5.25	3.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	3.25	3.75	4.25	4.00
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.25	4.50	4.50	3.50	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	5.00	5.00
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.50	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.75	5.25
Access to education in rural areas	5.33	4.00	6.00	4.33	6.00	6.00	3.67	3.67	6.00	4.67	6.00
Representation	4.50	4.00	4.25	4.00	5.25	5.25	4.75	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.25
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	4.67	4.33	3.67	4.17	4.50	3.83	4.00	4.17	4.67	3.17
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.78	3.78	3.78	3.11	4.00	4.11	3.44	3.56	3.78	3.89	4.00
Average	4.16	3.87	4.51	3.67	4.40	4.76	3.73	3.88	4.18	4.23	4.21

Table 2.5: Near East and North Africa Division (con't)

	Morocco	Gaza and the West Bank	Republic of Moldova	Romania	Somalia	Sudan	Syria	The Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	Tunisia	Turkey	Yemen
Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.00	4.60	3.80	4.20	5.20	3.80	3.80	4.20	3.60	3.20	3.80
Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.75	4.00	3.25	4.00	5.00	3.75	3.50	4.25	3.75	3.75	3.75
Access to land	3.60	3.60	4.40	4.60	4.40	3.60	3.80	4.60	3.80	3.80	3.80
Access to water for agriculture	3.86	3.71	3.00	3.43	4.14	3.14	3.14	3.71	4.00	4.57	3.29
Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.25	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.25	3.75	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.75	4.00
Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.00	4.50	4.75	3.75	4.25	3.50	3.00	5.00	3.50	3.00	3.25
Investment climate for rural businesses	4.00	4.25	3.75	3.75	4.50	3.75	4.00	4.75	4.75	4.75	3.75
Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.25	4.25	3.75	3.75	4.75	5.50	4.50	3.25
Access to education in rural areas	3.00	4.67	6.00	6.00	3.33	3.33	4.67	6.00	5.33	4.33	3.33
Representation	4.00	4.25	4.75	4.75	3.75	3.50	4.00	4.75	3.50	3.75	3.50
Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.83	3.83	3.67	4.00	3.67	3.83	4.33	4.33	4.83	4.17	3.50
Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.78	4.22	3.11	3.44	4.11	3.44	3.56	4.00	3.89	3.78	3.22
Average	3.76	4.14	3.94	4.10	4.15	3.60	3.71	4.49	4.16	3.95	3.54