

Document: GC 31/L.8
Agenda: 12
Date: 16 January 2008
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system

Governing Council — Thirty-first Session
Rome, 13-14 February 2008

For: **Information**

Note to Governors

This document is submitted for the information of the Governing Council

To make the best use of time available at Governing Council sessions, Governors are invited to contact the following focal point with any technical questions about this document before the session:

Brian Baldwin

Senior Operations Management Adviser

telephone: +39 06 5459 2377

e-mail: b.baldwin@ifad.org

Queries regarding the dispatch of documentation for this session should be addressed to:

Deirdre McGrenra

Governing Bodies Officer

telephone: +39 06 5459 2374

e-mail: d.mcgrenra@ifad.org

Progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system

I. Introduction

1. At its twenty-sixth session, held in February 2003, the Governing Council approved the establishment in IFAD of a performance-based allocation system (PBAS), delegating authority to the Executive Board to develop the details of the system's design and implementation.
2. 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 2005-2007. The current exercise covers the 2007-2009 period, the same period as the Seventh Replenishment. The report of the Consultation on the Seventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources¹ confirmed the uniform system of allocation across the IFAD lending programme as a whole would become effective in 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. Revisions to the PBAS methodology

3. Pursuant to the discussions of the Executive Board at its April 2006 session, the Board agreed as follows:
 - (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".
 - (b) IFAD would continue to implement the PBAS on the basis of a three-year lending/allocation framework and plan allocations to the list of active borrowers. This would be done in the light of an expanding programme of work, and the Board would be kept informed of country scores, allocations and the changes that occur as these are updated.
 - (c) 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 gross national income (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.
 - (d) There was broad agreement that, given IFAD's specific focus on rural poverty, the use of rural population would respond better to IFAD's mandate. In this regard it was agreed that the concept of rural population would be applied no later than in the 2008 work programme.
 - (e) Having agreed to these principles and decisions, the Board further agreed to the suggestion to convene a working group, as referred to in the Consultation report approved by the Governing Council, to develop a broader understanding of evolving issues in PBAS implementation.

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.

III. PBAS working group

4. 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.”

The working group met in February, April and September 2007 to review the PBAS issues, both technical and methodological, including the amendments being introduced as a result of the approval of the Debt Sustainability Framework by the Executive Board; the introduction of rural population in place of total population; and the issues being discussed and reviewed with other international financial institutions (IFIs) implementing the PBAS. The minutes of the meetings are attached as an annex.

IV. Application of the PBAS in 2007

5. During 2006, the regional divisions identified the “active”³ countries for 2007-2009. On this basis, final country scores and allocations were made for 2007 and provisional figures for 2008 and 2009, giving an overall country allocation for the three-year allocation period. The figures for 2008 and 2009 were indicative and subject to changes in annual performance (based on assessment of projects at risk, rural sector performance, and the resource allocation index of the International Development Association [IDA]), population and GNI per capita. All loans and country-specific grants presented to the Executive Board for approval in 2007 are within a country’s PBAS allocation. In terms of the overall programme of work in 2007, it is projected that about 96 per cent of the resources available for commitment would be allocated according to PBAS guidelines. The share of IFAD resources for sub-Saharan Africa is estimated to be 43 per cent (subject to the final list of projects to be submitted to the Executive Board). Countries that have minimum allocations have been able to utilize their share from two allocation periods up to a maximum of US\$6.0 million per country. In line with the implementation of the Debt Sustainability Framework, those countries assessed as **not** at risk of future debt distress (classified as “green”) and therefore continuing to be eligible to receive loans from IFAD, have received slightly higher allocations.
6. In 2007, there has been no requirement for reallocations between countries. However, in developing the PBAS within IFAD, the Executive Board recognized that there would be situations in which it would not be possible to deliver commitments

² List A: France, Italy, Sweden and the United States of America
List B: Nigeria, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
sub-List C1: Mali
sub-List C2: India
sub-List C3: Mexico

³ “Active” countries are those Member States where IFAD expects to have lending or country-grant operations in the 2007-2009 allocation period.

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 the results-based country strategic opportunities programmes. In such cases, the unused allocation would be reabsorbed into the allocable resource pool⁴ for redistribution through the prevailing PBAS allocation system (document EB 2003/79/R.2/Rev.1, paragraph 40). As the implementation of the PBAS continues in the next two years of the allocation period, this will continue to be monitored to ensure the integrity of performance-based allocation throughout the process.

V. The updating of the 2007 country scores and 2008 country allocations

7. As noted above, the “firm” country allocations for 2007 were based on the country scores calculated at end-2006. This, together with the indicative scores for 2008 and 2009, allowed the country allocations for the 2007-2009 allocation period to be determined. Similarly, as updated data on performance (both portfolio and rural sector performance) has become available the process of updating country scores has been undertaken. With the move to uniform allocations, the data has been subject to interregional review and benchmarking to ensure consistency in assessments. Where appropriate, weighted averages have been used to reduce statistical variance over time. In line with the decision of the Executive Board in April 2006, as reflected in the minutes,⁵ given IFAD’s specific focus on rural poverty, it was agreed that the concept of rural population would be applied. Therefore, the latest rural population figures, as available through the World Bank, have been used for 2008 and 2009 (indicative) country scores. A further refinement introduced in 2006 is the use of individual country policy and institutional assessment scores as disclosed by the World Bank, rather than average scores based on quintiles of countries.
8. The updated data will be reflected in the final 2007 country scores and 2008 country allocations, which will be tabled at the December Executive Board and subsequently disclosed in accordance with the procedures agreed for disclosure of PBAS information on the IFAD website (www.ifad.org/operations/pbas).

⁴ 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.

⁵ Document EB/87 Minutes.

PBAS Executive Board Working Group Minutes of 2007 meetings

1. Executive Board PBAS Working Group: Minutes of the first meeting, 27 February 2007, IFAD Rome

Members: India - Ramalingam Parasuram, Chairperson; Mexico - Vladimir Lara; Sweden - Ann Uustalu; France - Vincent Perrin; United States - Carol Kramer-LeBlanc. Absent: Italy, Nigeria, Mali and Venezuela.

1. The members were welcomed by the Chairman who outlined the purpose of the meeting, to discuss and understand the basics of the PBAS, to identify outstanding issues and to establish a timeframe for the group's work and meeting modalities.
2. Members agreed that they would use the group to understand and inform themselves (and colleagues) on PBAS issues, both technical and political and to straighten out concerns. Some issues may need referring back to the Executive Board, others may remain within the group and, finally, some issues may have a longer time frame and be linked to issues being discussed by other IFIs. It was discussed and agreed that if there were issues to be raised to the EB it would be likely that this would initially be reviewed in September for discussion in December when it could be considered as part of the PBAS annual review, which the Secretariat is required to present annually.
3. The Secretariat (represented by Mr Baldwin) presented an overview of the PBAS implementation to date, the current status, the issues being discussed and reviewed with other PBAS practitioners and the current IFAD issues that needed to be further examined. In particular, this concerned the issue of the adoption of rural population where initial discussions with the World Bank indicate that the comparability and definition of rural population data may pose issues for its inclusion in the formula as previously recommended. It was also pointed out that ongoing Replenishment discussions at IDA and AfDB will raise issues of simplification of the system, reducing excessive variability in portfolio assessments and how to address fragile states.
4. In the subsequent discussion it was confirmed that none of the other IFIs intend to use rural population in the formula and that, as a technical issue, this topic would need the technical support of the Secretariat for the working group to have a substantive discussion. The Secretariat will continue its investigation on this and keep the group informed. Several technical questions were raised and answered by the Secretariat. The members agreed that the group could not deal with all questions and that the issues should be categorised into issues that were technical and which required technical support from the Secretariat (including the use of other indicators) and those issues which would have a slightly longer time frame & be linked to the discussions in other IFIs.
5. In conclusion the Chairperson requested that members engage with their Lists to identify other issues that the group should consider. As a next step, the group would meet in the morning of Thursday, 19 April, after the Executive Board, to review all issues received from Lists, categorise them and establish a time frame for action, where needed, by the group. To the extent possible, the Secretariat would provide further feedback on the issue of rural population.

2. Executive Board PBAS Working Group: Minutes of the second meeting, 19 April 2007, IFAD Rome

Members: India – Ramalingam Parasuram, Chairperson; Mexico – Vladimir Hernandez Lara, Víctor Daniel Flores Fuentes; Sweden – Ann Uustalu; United States – Liza Morris, Carol Kramer-LeBlanc; Italy – Augusto Zodda; Nigeria – Yaya O. Olaniran; Mali – Modibo Mahamane Touré; and Venezuela – Mariella Mancini. Absent: France (Vincent Perrin).
Observers: Brazil – Felipe Haddock Lobo Goulart; Guatemala – Ileana Rivera De Angotti;

1. The members were welcomed by the Chairman to the second meeting of the Working Group (minutes of first meeting attached) and requested the Secretariat to give a short overview of the PBAS in IFAD as there were several members of the Group who had not seen the presentation that was made at the first meeting. The Chairman also noted that, while lists had been requested to identify specific issues, none had been received so the meeting was an opportunity to consider suggestions and ideas for further review.
2. The Secretariat (represented by Mr Baldwin) presented a PowerPoint/overview of the:
 - PBAS implementation to date;
 - the current status;
 - the amendments being introduced as a result of the approval of the Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) by the Executive Board;
 - the issues being discussed and reviewed with other PBAS practitioners; and
 - the current IFAD issues that needed to be further examined.
3. The working group initiated a discussion during the presentation concerning the methodology used for the DSF and the classification of red, yellow and green countries, and the alignment of approaches with the other practitioners of the DSF. The Secretariat confirmed that IFAD was in regular contact with both the World Bank and African Development Bank concerning alignment of country classifications and the approaches used. The Working Group also discussed how the change in the weight of population (approved by the Board in December 2006) had the intention to reduce the variations in country allocations due to size of population but, nevertheless, still retain the importance of this criteria as a 'need' factor. The Secretariat also gave a résumé of how the 'post-conflict' countries were treated under the PBAS and explained that IFAD followed the World Bank guidelines in this respect and provided increased allocations to such countries. The examples of Eritrea at the December 2006 Board and Sierra Leone at the April 2007 Board were given of how this approach was being applied by IFAD.
4. To further aid the working group in the understanding of the PBAS methodology, as reviewed in the initial presentation, the analysis of country level applications, based on the information already provided to the Executive Board (and subsequently disclosed), is attached for information.
5. The Working Group had a substantive discussion concerning the issues raised on the possible adoption of rural population rather than the, current, total population. The Secretariat had summarised discussions with the World Bank which indicated that the comparability and definition of rural population data may pose issues for its inclusion in the formula as previously recommended. The Working Group acknowledged the validity of using rural population (and if possible rural income) but also recognised the potential limitations imposed by data availability, accuracy and comparability.

6. The Working Group agreed together with the Secretariat that the Secretariat would further review the issues concerning rural population, including:
 - discussions with the World Bank and the UN regarding definitional terms;
 - actual sources of rural population and the issues of available censuses to see whether or not those censuses give the sort of information required; and
 - Provide various scenarios concerning rural population (and also the overall weight of total population and per capita income and the impact of the ceilings on several Asian countries).
7. The Working Group would, on the basis of information to be provided by the Secretariat, would next meet (possibly late June or July) to take this issue further with a view to presenting the Group's conclusions as part of the Annual Report on PBAS to be presented to the EB in December.

3. Executive Board PBAS Working Group: Minutes of the third meeting, 13 September 2007, IFAD Rome

Members: Present: India – Ramalingam Parasuram, Chairperson; France – Marc Trouyet; United States – Liza Morris, Andrew Velthaus; Nigeria – Yaya O. Olaniran; and Mali – Modibo Mahamane Touré. Absent: Mexico; Italy; Sweden; Venezuela. Observers: Brazil – Felipe Haddock Lobo Goulart;

1. The members were welcomed by the Chairman to the third meeting of the Working Group. The Chair raised the issues of the intended duration of the Working Group and at what point the Group would report back to the Executive Board. He then introduced the agenda item: the discussion and review of the use of rural population in the formula.
2. The Secretariat (represented by Mr Baldwin and Ms Rice PMD/PD) presented a Power Point presentation: "Review of the use of Rural Population in the PBAS formula". This included a review of data sources: their comprehensiveness, timeliness and comparability; the methodological issues concerning the definition of 'rural'; and, the effect of application on country scores & allocation.
3. The group then discussed the issues surrounding the use of rural population in the PBAS formula, its importance in the mandate of IFAD. While there was an appreciation of the methodological issues and concerns there was nevertheless sufficient data, available from the World Bank, to apply rural population to the formula.
4. It was also noted that the Executive Board had agreed at its April 2007 session to apply rural population to the formula and that the role of the Working Group had been to review the data sources and methodological implications. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the 2007 revision of scores and 2008 allocations (and 2009 indicative allocations) would be based on the use of rural population. The Working Group agreed that it would not be appropriate to apply this to the 2007 allocations or for projects already approved by the Board or to be approved in December 2007.
5. It was agreed that a Report on the meetings of the Working Group would be contained in the regular annual report to be presented to the December Executive Board. The Secretariat informed the Working Group that the minutes and presentations provided to the Group would be available on a restricted access part of the PBAS section of IFAD's website: www.ifad.org/operations/pbas.

Allocation period 2007-2009

2007 country scores and 2008 annual allocations

Active borrowers

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Active borrowers				
	GNI per capita 2005	Rural population 2005	IRAI 2006	Rural sector performance	PAR 2007	Total country performance rating	Total country score	2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
Western and Central Africa											
BENIN	510	5 054 873	3.58	3.99	4.0	4.26	3 970	6 232 440	5 977 197	6 572 162	18 781 800
BURKINA FASO	400	10 807 141	3.69	3.83	4.0	3.97	5 145	6 779 811	7 746 943	8 518 068	23 044 822
CAMEROON	1 000	7 410 126	3.22	3.42	4.0	3.58	2 815	4 406 829	4 345 519	4 778 069	13 530 417
CAPE VERDE	1 930	216 407	4.09	4.39	6.0	4.90	910	1 315 632	1 404 795	1 544 627	4 265 055
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	350	2 503 403	2.39	2.39		2.39	1 002	1 258 146	1 470 035	1 616 362	4 344 543
CHAD	400	7 282 451	2.75	3.14	6.0	3.99	4 369	5 914 820	6 411 226	7 049 394	19 375 439
CONGO	950	1 591 564	2.77	3.25	6.0	4.04	1 820	2 949 981	2 671 608	2 937 537	8 559 126
CÔTE D'IVOIRE	870	9 984 627	2.45	2.45	4.0	2.57	1 720	2 143 795	2 524 265	2 775 528	7 443 588
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO	120	39 075 597	2.84	3.04	5.0	3.16	7 880	8 296 317	11 564 144	12 715 230	32 575 691
GABON	5 010	226 950		2.83		2.83	245	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
GAMBIA (THE)	290	699 373	3.08	3.65	6.0	4.36	1 964	2 777 282	2 883 042	3 170 018	8 830 342
GHANA	450	11 542 884	3.93	3.69	4.0	4.20	5 760	10 057 500	8 891 750	9 776 828	28 726 078
GUINEA	420	6 299 406	2.94	3.47	4.0	3.83	3 719	5 493 515	5 458 487	6 001 820	16 953 822
GUINEA-BISSAU	180	1 116 786	2.59	3.07		2.92	1 229	1 500 740	1 803 631	1 983 163	5 287 534
MALI	380	9 395 299	3.68	3.77	6.0	4.29	5 723	6 831 579	8 834 966	9 714 391	25 380 935
MAURITANIA	580	1 828 970	3.28	3.78	6.0	4.46	2 661	3 509 901	4 006 011	4 404 766	11 920 679
NIGER	240	11 612 205	3.30	3.57	3.0	3.28	4 131	3 595 460	6 219 728	6 838 834	16 654 022
NIGERIA	560	68 132 369	3.23	3.47	5.0	3.78	9 843	13 124 325	15 196 367	16 709 001	45 029 694
SENEGAL	700	6 808 372	3.67	3.80	3.0	3.74	3 227	4 717 804	4 982 398	5 478 342	15 178 545
SIERRA LEONE	220	3 276 608	3.09	3.32	5.0	3.34	2 471	2 146 890	3 720 348	4 090 669	9 957 907
Total	20						70 603	94 052 768	107 112 463	117 674 809	318 840 040

Active borrowers

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Total country performance rating	Total country score	Active borrowers			Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
	GNI per capita 2005	Rural population 2005	IRAI 2006	Rural sector performance	PAR 2007	2007 allocation			2008 allocation	2009 allocation		
Eastern and Southern Africa												
ANGOLA	1 410	7 444 630	2.65	2.99	3.0	2.93	1 728	2 636 540	2 668 346	2 933 951	8 238 836	
BOTSWANA	5 590	751 858		4.32		4.32	949	1 544 070	1 465 841	1 611 750	4 621 662	
BURUNDI	100	6 792 764	2.99	3.20	6.0	3.83	5 491	5 628 332	8 059 136	8 861 335	22 548 802	
COMOROS	650	378 308	2.35	3.48		3.13	629	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000	
ETHIOPIA	160	59 855 040	3.39	4.10	6.0	4.62	18 984	22 663 585	28 583 725	31 428 925	82 676 235	
KENYA	540	27 164 788	3.65	4.29	4.0	3.89	6 935	7 399 223	10 705 846	11 771 497	29 876 566	
LESOTHO	950	1 459 147	3.53	3.93	6.0	4.58	2 240	2 647 951	3 372 366	3 708 048	9 728 365	
MADAGASCAR	290	13 619 534	3.58	4.04	6.0	4.63	8 446	9 828 340	13 039 341	14 337 266	37 204 947	
MALAWI	160	10 667 898	3.39	3.64	5.0	3.72	5 652	5 096 934	8 509 866	9 356 931	22 963 731	
MAURITIUS	5 250	716 114		4.10	4.0	3.49	616	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000	
MOZAMBIQUE	310	12 963 953	3.52	3.81	4.0	4.17	6 575	9 797 757	10 150 016	11 160 341	31 108 114	
RWANDA	230	7 293 416	3.63	4.17	3.0	3.83	4 616	6 188 867	6 773 949	7 448 223	20 411 039	
SWAZILAND	2 280	858 429		2.95	5.0	3.28	727	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000	
UGANDA	280	25 185 384	3.88	4.60	4.0	4.60	11 065	14 335 091	17 082 703	18 783 101	50 200 896	
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA	340	29 053 237	3.94	4.44	6.0	4.89	12 703	14 964 289	19 611 724	21 563 859	56 139 872	
ZAMBIA	500	7 584 497	3.40	3.80	3.0	3.65	3 512	5 893 220	5 421 438	5 961 083	17 275 740	
ZIMBABWE	350	8 339 111	1.77	2.21	3.0	1.63	799	1 063 649	1 233 726	1 356 530	3 653 906	
Total	17						91 668	112 687 847	139 678 024	153 282 841	405 648 712	

Active borrowers

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Active borrowers				
	GNI per capita 2005	Rural population 2005	IRAI 2006	Rural sector performance	PAR 2007	Total country performance rating	Total country score	2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
Asia and the Pacific											
AFGHANISTAN ^b	200	23 024 377	2.61	2.92		2.82	4 354	5 014 121	6 390 530	7 026 638	18 431 289
BANGLADESH	470	106 224 885	3.43	3.99	6.0	4.33	16 510	17 600 725	25 488 496	28 025 600	71 114 821
CAMBODIA	430	11 299 024	3.17	3.95	5.0	4.13	5 584	4 952 398	8 408 300	9 245 256	22 605 954
CHINA	1 740	777 482 000		4.21	4.0	4.12	26 280	28 250 000	30 750 000	33 750 000	92 750 000
INDIA	730	780 437 679	3.81	4.06	4.0	3.99	30 735	28 250 000	30 750 000	33 750 000	92 750 000
INDONESIA	1 280	114 469 602	3.68	3.77	6.0	4.53	14 516	21 483 496	22 409 561	24 640 190	68 533 247
KYRGYZSTAN	450	3 302 127	3.60	3.88	6.0	4.57	3 887	4 888 345	5 704 204	6 271 996	16 864 546
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	430	4 703 771	3.08	3.64	6.0	4.04	3 606	3 905 401	5 292 005	5 818 767	15 016 173
MALDIVES	2 320	231 755	3.60	3.54	5.0	3.54	468	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
MONGOLIA	690	1 105 882	3.38	3.84	6.0	4.50	2 076	3 313 012	3 126 155	3 437 330	9 876 497
NEPAL	270	22 845 674	3.42	3.62	4.0	3.43	5 961	4 904 895	8 748 093	9 618 871	23 271 859
PAKISTAN	690	101 407 572	3.62	3.75	3.0	3.63	10 323	14 271 749	15 937 106	17 523 473	47 732 328
PAPUA NEW GUINEA ^b	560	5 098 262	3.14	3.45		3.35	2 412	1 921 736	3 724 399	4 095 123	9 741 258
PHILIPPINES	1 320	30 979 320		4.41	6.0	4.80	8 978	13 958 556	13 859 932	15 239 538	43 058 026
SOLOMON ISLANDS	620	396 526	2.78	3.11		3.01	598	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
SRI LANKA	1 160	16 661 951	3.55	4.00	4.0	4.26	5 521	7 490 290	8 523 554	9 371 981	25 385 825
TAJIKISTAN	330	4 899 756	3.34	3.52		3.46	2 881	3 478 837	4 228 371	4 649 260	12 356 468
VIET NAM	620	61 175 584	3.85	4.33	3.0	4.29	11 778	18 071 685	18 182 290	19 992 140	56 246 115
Total	18						156 469	183 755 246	213 522 997	234 456 161	631 734 405

Active borrowers

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Active borrowers				
	GNI per capita 2005	Rural population 2005	IRAI 2006	Rural sector performance	PAR 2007	Total country performance rating	Total country score	2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
Latin American and the Caribbean											
BELIZE	3 570	150 861		3.72		2.44	165	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
BOLIVIA	1 010	3 287 161	3.73	4.00	6.0	4.65	3 281	5 574 494	5 065 925	5 570 183	16 210 603
BRAZIL	3 550	29 451 976		4.50	6.0	5.16	7 908	20 153 094	12 207 721	13 422 868	45 783 683
COLOMBIA	2 290	12 448 867		4.09	6.0	4.93	5 467	10 990 253	8 440 564	9 280 730	28 711 547
COSTA RICA	4 700	1 657 328		4.42	6.0	5.11	1 984	3 116 764	3 063 056	3 367 950	9 547 771
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	2 460	2 953 109		4.19	6.0	4.98	2 873	4 930 713	4 435 501	4 877 007	14 243 222
ECUADOR	2 620	4 920 973		4.14		4.14	2 463	4 286 776	3 802 263	4 180 737	12 269 776
EL SALVADOR	2 450	2 766 142		4.35	6.0	5.07	2 895	4 455 566	4 470 108	4 915 059	13 840 733
GUATEMALA	2 400	6 652 303		3.96	6.0	4.86	3 960	5 626 908	6 113 796	6 722 358	18 463 062
GUYANA	1 020	539 375	3.42	3.73	5.0	3.41	782	1 000 000	1 177 117	1 294 286	3 471 403
HONDURAS	1 120	3 854 527	3.88	3.71	5.0	3.74	2 224	2 169 297	3 433 135	3 774 867	9 377 299
MEXICO	7 310	24 741 392		4.01	3.0	4.22	4 097	12 048 680	6 324 560	6 954 102	25 327 343
NICARAGUA	950	2 111 218	3.75	3.81	5.0	4.07	2 098	2 379 212	3 158 604	3 473 008	9 010 824
PANAMA	4 630	943 599		4.01	3.0	3.70	809	1 757 887	1 249 415	1 373 781	4 381 082
PARAGUAY	1 040	2 447 940		3.68		2.33	717	1 125 847	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 125 847
PERU	2 650	7 663 299		4.29	6.0	5.04	4 435	8 654 979	6 846 235	7 527 703	23 028 917
VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)	4 820	1 754 082		4.30	6.0	5.04	1 971	7 120 711	3 042 920	3 345 810	13 509 441
Total	17						48 129	96 391 181	74 830 921	82 080 450	253 302 551

Active borrowers

Country	Country needs ^a		Country performance				Active borrowers				
	GNI per capita 2005	Rural population 2005	IRAI 2006	Rural sector performance	PAR 2007	Total country performance rating	Total country score	2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
Near East and North Africa											
ALBANIA	2 570	1 708 804	3.74	4.44	6.0	4.85	2 105	2 778 746	3 250 453	3 574 000	9 603 198
ARMENIA	1 470	1 082 856	4.31	4.62	6.0	5.04	2 130	3 754 371	3 287 845	3 615 114	10 657 329
AZERBAIJAN	1 240	4 068 180	3.70	4.25	6.0	4.75	3 589	5 224 646	5 540 688	6 092 203	16 857 537
BOSNIA AND HERZOGOVINA	2 700	2 121 541	3.67	4.65	6.0	4.93	2 367	3 448 270	3 653 476	4 017 140	11 118 886
DJIBOUTI	1 010	110 238	3.06	3.70	5.0	3.40	380	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
EGYPT	1 260	42 346 810		4.06	6.0	4.60	9 621	11 702 091	14 852 864	16 331 305	42 886 260
GEORGIA	1 320	2 138 765	4.12	4.05	1.0	3.24	1 230	2 058 521	1 898 322	2 087 279	6 044 122
IRAQ ^b	2 170	9 535 180		1.00		1.00	203	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
JORDAN	2 460	968 721		4.18	4.0	4.14	1 204	3 363 814	1 859 075	2 044 126	7 267 016
LEBANON	6 320	479 294		4.17		3.92	620	2 608 480	1 000 000	1 000 000	4 608 480
MOLDOVA	930	2 241 663	3.65	4.17	6.0	4.71	2 890	4 107 787	4 461 226	4 905 292	13 474 304
MOROCCO	1 740	12 459 418		4.14	4.0	4.08	4 013	5 743 274	6 196 046	6 812 795	18 752 115
SUDAN	640	21 449 903	2.53	3.85	4.0	3.74	5 551	8 502 113	8 147 194	8 958 159	25 607 466
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	1 380	9 407 431		4.04	4.0	4.37	4 307	7 382 208	6 649 507	7 311 393	21 343 107
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	2 830	632 593		4.55	6.0	5.18	1 502	2 744 224	2 318 116	2 548 860	7 611 200
TUNISIA	2 880	3 480 063		4.40	6.0	4.79	2 754	4 434 276	4 251 760	4 674 977	13 361 013
TURKEY	4 750	23 565 255		4.22	1.0	2.90	2 103	3 215 898	3 247 091	3 570 304	10 033 294
YEMEN	600	15 248 574	3.25	3.90	5.0	3.73	4 810	5 044 240	7 241 935	7 962 791	20 248 966
Total	18						51 379	78 112 958	79 855 596	87 505 739	245 474 293
Total	90						418 248	565 000 000	615 000 000	675 000 000	1 855 000 000

^a World Development Indicators, 2007^b GNI 2005 not available

2007 rural sector performance assessments

Table 1: Western and Central Africa

Indicators	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Cape Verde	Central African Republic ^a	Chad	Dem. Rep. of the Congo	Congo	Côte d'Ivoire ^a	Gabon	Gambia (The)	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Mali	Mauritania	Niger	Nigeria	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																					
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.11	4.60	3.71	4.60		3.60	3.80	3.25		3.00	4.20	3.64	3.92	3.40	3.92	3.41	3.60	3.71	4.00	3.80	3.79
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.57	4.14	3.58	4.50		3.25	2.62	2.46		2.00	3.68	3.13	4.12	2.00	4.46	3.19	3.00	2.53	3.88	3.75	3.38
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																					
B (i) Access to land	2.92	2.76	3.20	3.70		3.60	3.40	3.74		3.00	3.78	3.50	3.50	3.20	3.03	3.83	2.80	2.70	3.70	2.80	3.29
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.10	3.29	3.25	4.29		3.29	3.14	2.38		4.00	3.30	3.14	3.09	3.00	3.06	3.34	2.86	3.12	3.86	2.57	3.23
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.65	3.45	3.37	4.13		2.75	2.25	2.22		2.00	3.15	3.25	3.71	3.00	3.57	3.19	3.25	3.37	3.88	2.75	3.16
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																					
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.57	4.37	3.58	4.00		3.50	3.25	3.94		4.00	4.47	4.30	4.12	2.00	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.79	3.75	3.75	3.90
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.57	4.37	4.00	4.50		3.25	3.50	4.19		2.00	3.68	3.63	3.50	3.25	4.46	4.26	4.25	3.79	3.79	3.25	3.79
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.34	3.91	3.37	4.00		3.25	3.00	3.20		2.00	3.68	4.13	3.50	3.25	3.79	3.99	3.50	4.21	3.69	3.75	3.59
D. Gender Issues																					
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.93	3.68	3.08	5.00		2.67	2.83	3.94		4.00	3.86	4.67	3.30	4.00	3.57	3.91	4.00	4.21	3.75	3.00	3.74
D (ii) Women representatives	3.88	3.68	3.37	4.75		3.00	3.25	3.20		4.00	4.20	4.25	2.89	4.25	3.12	4.25	4.25	3.79	4.25	3.50	3.77
E. Public resource management and accountability																					
E (i) Allocation & management of public resources for rural development	4.02	3.99	3.23	4.58		2.67	2.66	3.12		2.00	2.97	3.33	2.51	2.83	4.01	3.91	3.83	3.23	3.83	3.33	3.34
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.20	3.68	3.27	4.67		2.89	2.80	3.33		2.00	2.81	3.33	3.50	2.67	4.06	3.78	3.22	3.18	3.22	3.56	3.34
All indicators	3.99	3.83	3.42	4.39	2.39	3.14	3.04	3.25	2.45	2.83	3.65	3.69	3.47	3.07	3.77	3.78	3.57	3.47	3.80	3.32	3.42

^a Detailed field assessments not possible. IRAI scores used.

Table 2: Eastern and Southern Africa

Indicators	Angola	Botswana	Burundi	Comoros	Ethiopia	Kenya	Lesotho	Madagascar	Malawi	Mauritius	Mozambique	Rwanda	Swaziland	United Rep. of Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																		
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.60	4.00	3.80	3.40	4.00	4.60	4.00	4.40	3.60	4.20	4.00	4.00	3.40	4.60	4.60	3.60	2.00	3.87
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.00	5.00	3.00	2.75	4.00	4.75	3.75	3.50	3.25	4.25	3.75	4.25	2.75	4.50	4.75	3.50	1.50	3.66
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																		
B (i) Access to land	2.80	4.20	3.20	3.60	3.20	3.80	3.60	3.40	3.60	3.80	3.80	4.00	2.20	4.00	3.80	3.40	1.80	3.42
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	2.00	4.14	3.00	3.29	4.00	3.57	3.00	3.71	3.71	3.57	2.86	4.00	2.43	4.57	3.57	3.43	2.57	3.38
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.25	2.75	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.25	3.75	4.50	3.25	2.75	3.50	3.50	2.25	4.00	4.50	3.50	2.75	3.44
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																		
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	2.75	2.75	3.00	3.75	4.75	4.75	3.25	4.25	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.25	4.50	4.50	4.00	1.75	3.65
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.00	4.25	3.25	3.50	4.00	4.25	3.50	4.75	2.75	4.75	4.00	4.50	2.25	4.00	4.75	4.00	1.50	3.71
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.00	4.25	3.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.75	4.25	3.50	3.50	4.25	4.00	2.75	4.00	4.50	4.00	2.25	3.68
D. Gender Issues																		
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.67	6.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	5.00	6.00	4.00	5.33	6.00	3.33	5.00	3.67	5.33	5.67	4.67	2.67	4.53
D (ii) Women representatives	4.00	5.50	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.75	5.00	3.75	4.50	4.50	3.75	4.75	4.00	5.50	5.50	4.25	3.50	4.41
E. Public resource management and accountability																		
E (i) Allocation & management of public resources for rural development	2.50	4.50	3.33	3.17	5.33	4.00	3.67	4.50	3.67	4.00	4.50	4.33	3.00	4.33	4.67	4.00	1.50	3.82
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.33	4.44	3.11	3.56	4.22	4.00	3.89	3.44	3.56	3.89	4.00	4.00	3.44	4.00	4.44	3.22	2.78	3.67
All indicators	2.99	4.32	3.20	3.48	4.10	4.29	3.93	4.04	3.64	4.10	3.81	4.17	2.95	4.44	4.60	3.80	2.21	3.77

Table 3: Asia and the Pacific

Indicators	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Cambodia	China	India	Indonesia	Kyrgyzstan	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Maldives	Mongolia	Nepal	Pakistan	Papua New Guinea	Philippines	Solomon Islands	Sri Lanka	Tajikistan	Viet Nam	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																			
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.60	4.80	3.80	4.20	4.20	3.80	3.80	3.60	3.20	3.80	3.60	3.80	3.80	5.20	3.50	4.00	3.60	4.60	3.94
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	2.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.00	3.00	2.75	3.75	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	2.67	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.76
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																			
B (i) Access to land	2.00	3.20	4.20	4.20	4.00	3.00	4.20	3.60	3.00	3.20	3.60	3.40	3.00	4.60	3.40	3.00	3.00	4.20	3.49
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	2.71	3.57	3.43	3.71	3.86	3.57	3.00	3.29		3.43	3.57	3.14	2.00	4.14	2.50	3.86	3.00	3.71	3.32
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	2.75	3.75	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.25	3.75	3.25	2.50	3.75	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	2.33	3.25	2.50	3.25	3.24
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																			
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.25	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.25	3.75	4.75	4.00	4.75	3.50	5.00	2.50	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.93
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.75	3.75	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.75	3.75	3.25	3.75	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	4.50	3.00	4.50	3.95
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.25	4.00	3.75	4.25	4.00	3.25	4.00	4.25	2.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.75	3.81
D. Gender Issues																			
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	2.33	5.00	4.17	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.33	5.00	4.33	3.67	3.33	4.00	5.67	3.67	4.33	4.33	5.00	4.23
D (ii) Women representatives	2.75	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.25	5.00	4.50	4.25	3.75	3.75	4.75	4.50	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.36
E. Public resource management and accountability																			
E (i) Allocation & management of public resources for rural development	3.33	3.67	4.17	4.67	4.00	3.83	3.83	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.83	4.00	3.33	3.67	2.50	4.00	3.67	4.67	3.81
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.78	3.33	3.44	4.11	3.44	3.67	3.44	3.67	3.44	3.11	3.22	3.78	3.00	3.89	2.40	4.00	3.33	4.22	3.46
All indicators	2.92	3.99	3.95	4.21	4.06	3.77	3.88	3.64	3.54	3.84	3.62	3.75	3.45	4.41	3.11	4.00	3.52	4.33	3.78

Table 4: Latin America and the Caribbean

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Belize</i>	<i>Bolivia</i>	<i>Brazil</i>	<i>Colombia</i>	<i>Costa Rica</i>	<i>Dominican Republic</i>	<i>Ecuador</i>	<i>El Salvador</i>	<i>Guatemala</i>	<i>Guyana</i>	<i>Honduras</i>	<i>Mexico</i>	<i>Nicaragua</i>	<i>Panama</i>	<i>Paraguay</i>	<i>Peru</i>	<i>Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)</i>	<i>Regional average</i>
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																		
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	3.80	4.50	5.40	4.20	4.20	4.00	4.50	4.40	3.94	3.60	3.80	4.00	4.20	4.00	3.80	5.16	4.40	4.23
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.50	4.50	4.88	3.38	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.00	3.75	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.88	3.88	3.58	4.75	4.00
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																		
B (i) Access to land	3.20	4.00	4.10	3.70	4.10	3.70	3.60	3.70	3.30	4.40	3.25	3.90	3.30	4.00	3.30	4.16	4.20	3.76
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.00	3.50	3.71	3.50	4.07	3.93	3.71	3.86	3.43	4.00	3.18	3.36	2.96	4.00	3.07	4.00	3.57	3.58
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.75	3.50	4.25	3.75	4.31	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.43	3.25	3.69	3.63	3.93	3.75	3.25	3.88	4.25	3.80
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																		
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.75	4.13	4.38	3.60	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.13	3.25	3.38	3.88	3.80	3.75	3.88	4.48	3.75	3.97
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.00	3.50	3.75	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.38	3.50	3.88	4.25	3.81	4.75	4.00	4.75	4.50	4.18
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.25	3.75	4.38	4.30	4.63	4.50	4.00	4.25	5.00	4.00	3.88	4.13	3.94	4.25	3.88	4.68	3.75	4.15
D. Gender Issues																		
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	5.00	4.50	5.33	5.00	5.50	4.67	4.50	5.50	3.83	3.67	4.08	4.17	3.60	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.51
D (ii) Women representatives	4.50	4.50	5.50	4.50	5.13	5.00	4.50	4.88	4.50	4.00	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.30	5.00	4.61
E. Public resource management and accountability																		
E (i) Allocation & management of public resources for rural development	3.33	3.67	4.42	4.07	4.46	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.96	4.00	3.63	4.25	4.13	3.83	3.58	4.08	4.33	4.01
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.56	4.00	3.89	4.09	4.12	3.94	4.00	4.22	3.94	3.33	3.61	4.06	3.56	3.50	3.22	4.11	4.11	3.84
All indicators	3.72	4.00	4.50	4.09	4.42	4.19	4.14	4.35	3.96	3.73	3.71	4.01	3.81	4.01	3.68	4.29	4.30	4.05

Table 5: Near East and North Africa

Indicators	Albania	Armenia	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Djibouti	Egypt	Georgia	Iraq ^a	Jordan	Lebanon	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Moldova	Morocco	Sudan	Syrian Arab Republic	Tunisia	Turkey	Yemen	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																			
A (i) Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.40	4.60	3.80	4.80	3.60	3.80	3.60		4.00	4.20	4.40	3.80	4.80	4.40	3.60	4.00	3.80	4.60	4.13
A (ii) Dialogue between government and rural organizations	4.00	4.50	3.50	4.50	3.25	3.70	3.25		4.00	3.75	4.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.25	4.00	3.90
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																			
B (i) Access to land	4.40	4.80	4.80	5.00	3.60	4.80	5.40		4.00	4.20	4.60	4.60	4.20	3.80	3.80	4.20	4.00	4.20	4.38
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.86	4.29	4.71	4.00	3.00	4.14	3.71		4.29	3.14	3.71	3.14	4.14	3.00	4.00	4.57	4.57	4.43	3.92
B (iii) Access to agricultural research and extension services	3.75	3.75	3.25	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00		3.25	3.00	3.75	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.75	4.00	3.56
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																			
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.75	5.25	4.50	5.00	4.75	3.88	4.25		3.75	4.00	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.34
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.00		4.50	5.00	4.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.75	4.75	3.00	4.35
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.75	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.50	3.50		5.00	5.25	5.00	3.75	4.50	4.00	4.13	5.50	4.50	4.75	4.55
D. Gender Issues																			
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.67	6.00	5.00	6.00	3.67	3.67	6.00		4.67	6.00	6.00	6.00	3.67	3.00	4.67	5.67	4.67	3.00	4.85
D (ii) Women representatives	4.75	4.25	4.25	5.25	4.25	4.13	4.50		4.00	4.25	4.75	4.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.25	4.00	3.50	4.27
E. Public resource management and accountability																			
E (i) Allocation & management of public resources for rural development	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.33	3.83	3.92	3.83		4.67	3.33	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.17	4.75	4.83	4.50	4.17	4.25
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.33	4.11	3.89	3.67	3.44	3.72	3.56		4.00	3.89	4.00	3.22	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.00	4.11	3.11	3.79
All indicators	4.44	4.62	4.25	4.65	3.70	4.06	4.05		4.18	4.17	4.55	4.17	4.14	3.85	4.04	4.40	4.22	3.90	4.20

^a Detailed field assessments not possible.

