

Document:	<u>GC 32/L.12/Rev.1</u>
Agenda:	<u>15</u>
Date:	<u>18 February 2009</u>
Distribution:	<u>Public</u>
Original:	<u>English</u>

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system

Governing Council — Thirty-second Session
Rome, 18-19 February 2009

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 endorsed the view that the Executive Board would henceforth apply the performance-based allocation required under the Lending Policies and Criteria in a more systematic way, along the lines of the approaches found at other international financial institutions (IFIs), and adopt a performance-based allocation system (PBAS). Authority was delegated to the Executive Board to develop the details of the system's design and implementation.
2. Several other development finance institutions use performance-based allocation systems, including the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Caribbean Development Bank, the Global Environment Facility, the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association (IDA) of the World Bank. All systems assess both performance and need. A comparative table of the approaches adopted by the seven major institutions, including IFAD, is attached as annex I.
3. 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 period 2007-2009, which coincides with the Seventh Replenishment. The report of the Consultation on the Seventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources¹ confirmed that the uniform system of allocation across the IFAD lending programme as a whole would become effective 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.
4. Annex IV contains the 2008 country scores by region, the annual country allocations for 2009 and the updated country allocations for the 2007-2009 allocation period, which include unused resources redistributed through the PBAS allocation system. Haiti and Liberia have been added and Botswana, the Central African Republic and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia removed.
5. Annex V presents details of the rural development sector framework assessments for 2008, in line with the criteria for such assessments set out in document EB 2003/80/R.3. These assessments form the basis for the rural sector performance score in the total performance rating used for the country score and country allocation.

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

II. Adjustments to the PBAS

6. Since these systems were introduced, it has been recognized by all practitioners that adjustments and improvements would be needed. At its April 2006 session, the Executive Board agreed that:
 - (i) 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."
 - (ii) 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.
 - (iii) There was broad agreement that, given IFAD's specific focus on rural poverty, the use of rural population (rather than total population) would respond better to IFAD's mandate. In this regard it was agreed that the concept of rural population would be applied as of the 2008 work programme.
7. The Board further agreed to convene a working group to develop a broader understanding of evolving issues in PBAS implementation.

III. PBAS Working Group

8. The working group,² chaired by an Executive Board member, met in February and September 2008 to review technical and methodological issues, including those being discussed and reviewed with other IFIs implementing similar systems. The minutes of the meetings are attached as annex II.
9. The Report of the Consultation on the Eighth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources requested that the Executive Board mandate the PBAS Working Group to continue its functions and, as well, to review the practices of other IFIs and identify improvements to the system. Possible areas for examination include: the relative weight of different elements of the PBAS formula, the current level of minimum and maximum allocations and the possible need for exceptional allocations for particularly vulnerable countries, in addition to the current support for post-conflict countries. The reallocation approaches of other IFIs should also be examined.

IV. Application of the PBAS in 2008

10. The practice introduced for the 2007-2009 allocation period was to include only those countries designated as "active" for new commitments where IFAD expected to have lending or Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grant operations in 2007-2009. In this way, 90 countries were identified as potentially requiring financing.³ This has facilitated more reliable and higher country allocations (only nine countries received the minimum allocation), and should reduce the extent of reallocations required when countries do not use their allocations. On this basis, final allocations

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

³ "Active" refers only to new financing commitments and does not refer to the level or status of ongoing portfolios.

for 2007 and provisional figures for 2008 and 2009 were arrived at, 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 an assessment of projects at risk, rural sector performance and the IDA resource allocation index), as well as population and GNI per capita.

11. This process was repeated in September/October 2007 (for the 2007 country scores and 2008 final allocations) as updated data on portfolio and rural sector performance became available. Where appropriate, weighted averages have been used to reduce statistical variance over time. With the move to uniform allocations, the data have been subject to interregional review and benchmarking to ensure consistency in assessments and, as a result, the scoring approach for rural sector performance assessment indicators has been improved.
12. All loans and country-specific grants presented to the Executive Board for approval in 2008 have been within a country's PBAS allocation. In line with DSF implementation, 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 PBAS allocations. The DSF classification of active countries for 2009 is attached as annex III.

V. Updating of 2008 country scores and 2009 country allocations

13. As noted above, the final country allocations for 2008 were based on the country scores calculated at end-2007. In the fourth quarter of 2008, as data on portfolio and rural sector performance has become available, country scores have been updated. The updated data will be reflected in the final 2008 country scores and 2009 country allocations, tabled at the Executive Board session held in December 2008 and subsequently disclosed in accordance with the procedures agreed for disclosure of PBAS information on the IFAD website (www.ifad.org/operations/pbas).
14. In 2007 and 2008, the first two years of the allocation period, no reallocations between countries have been required. This is similar to the situation in other agencies that have adopted such systems. However, in developing the PBAS within IFAD, the Executive Board recognized that it might not be possible to deliver commitments against ex ante country allocations within the allocation period. This might occur, for example, owing to a lack of demand for IFAD loans or the absence of opportunities to engage in operations in priority activities as identified in results-based country strategic opportunities programmes. In such cases, the unused allocation would be reabsorbed into the allocable resource pool⁴⁴ for redistribution through the prevailing PBAS allocation system (document EB 2003/79/R.2/Rev.1, paragraph 40). In 2009, therefore, all unused resources from the 2007-09 allocation period have been treated as part of the allocable pool of resources for the final year of the allocation period. The unused resources have been allocated according to the PBAS methodology.
15. The PBAS Working Group, at its September meeting, discussed the possibility that it might be necessary in 2009 – the final year of the allocation period – to grant one or two new countries eligibility. This would be done without affecting the balance of overall country allocations (by removing a country or countries with similar country scores), to facilitate their entry into the pipeline of projects for Executive Board approval in 2009. The allocations for 2009, tabled at the Executive Board session in December 2008 (and attached to this document), therefore included Haiti and Liberia.

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.

Comparison of Performance-based Allocation Systems

I. OVERVIEW OF MAIN MULTILATERAL CONCESSIONAL FUNDS

Table 1.1: Basic Facts: Concessional Funds, Costs of Borrowing, Eligibility Criteria, and Number of Countries Served

Institution	Fund	Founded	Replen. phase	Cost of borrowing	Number of countries eligible or with access ^a			Country eligibility criterion
					Concess.	Blend ^b	Total	
African Development Bank (AfDB)	African Development Fund	1973	AfDF-11	50 years to pay, 10 years grace, interest free, 0.75% p.a. service charge; and 0.5% commitment fee on undisbursed credits	38	2	40	AfDB Credit Policy, 1995. AfDB uses IDA's country classification in Africa until such time that AfDB develops its own new credit policy
Asian Development Bank (AsDB)	Asian Development Fund	1973	AsDF 9	32 year maturity, 8 years grace, 1% during grace, 1.5% thereafter	17	12	29	AsDB's Graduation Policy, 2008
Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)	Special Development Fund	1984	SDF 6		1	18**	19	All member countries (Group 1 has limited access)
European Union, Africa Caribbean & Pacific Program	European Development Fund							
Global Environmental Facility (GEF)	GEF Trust Fund	1991	GEF-4	Primarily grants, provision for non-grant instruments	160	0	160	Guidance from global environmental conventions, and/or eligibility to either borrow from World Bank or receive technical assistance from UNDP
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	MODE 1: T 200. Intermediate Financing Facility (IFF)	1982	1998 to present	Existing IFF portfolio receives annual subsidies up to 3.62%. For the parallel loan structure: 20% in 40-year FSO bullet loans with 25bp interest rate, and 80% in single-currency-facility adjustable rate OC loans with a 30-year term and 5½ years grace period.	0	5	5	Limited to Suriname, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay.
	MODE 2: Post-2007. Intermediate Financing Facility (IFF)	2008	2008	Previous IFF countries can access concessional funds (from the Fund for Special Operations) up to 20% of each loan, the other 80% being ordinary capital at ordinary interest rates and conditions.	0	5	5	Limited to Suriname, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay.
Inter-American Development Bank	Fund for Special Operations (FSO)	1961	Agreement 1998	Fixed at 0.25% annually, collected twice annually, 40 years maturity, 39 years grace period, single payment of principal in year 40.		5	5	Five countries (Bolivia, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras and Nicaragua (+ small amount to the Caribbean Development Bank))
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	IFAD	1977	Eighth	<i>Ordinary terms:</i> Maturity 15 to 18 years, 3 year grace period, variable LIBOR SDR composite <i>Intermediate terms:</i> Maturity 20 years, 5 year grace period, one-half of rate for ordinary terms <i>Highly concessional:</i> 0.75% annually, 40 years maturity, 10 years grace period.	Highly concessional, intermediate and ordinary terms		121	All member countries
World Bank Group (IDA)	International Development Association	1961	IDA15	35-40 years to pay, 10 years grace, interest free	66	15	78 + Kosovo	Countries with GNP per capita <\$1095 in FY09

^a In some funds, there are countries that are technically eligible but in practice do not have borrowing access to resources.

^b Blend borrowers can access both concessional funds and ordinary capital resources in one loan.

II. THE ALLOCATION FORMULAE

Table 2.1: Allocation Formulae

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

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

Table 2.2: Weights of Policy and Institutional Performance and Country Portfolio Ratings in the Resource Allocation Formula

Institution	Weight in the 'Country performance rating' of:		Basis of portfolio performance rating	Extra weight to governance?
	Policy and institutional performance	Portfolio performance		
AfDB	26%	16%	Projects at risk	
AsDB	85%	15%	Projects at risk	
CDB*	70%	30%	All active projects: performance scores based on OECD/DAC project performance criteria**	
EU (ACP)*	80%	20%	Resource utilization rate	
GEF	90%	10%	Development objectives and implementation progress ratings for GEF portfolio and ICR ratings of World Bank environment related projects	
IDB (FSO)	70%	30%	Based on the percentage of undisbursed balances represented by projects classified as "problem" or "on alert" in the Bank's portfolio monitoring system. The variables are measured on a scale ranging from 1 to 6, being 6 the highest performance level.	
IFAD		35%	Actual problem projects and projects at risk (5 of 11 flags up)	
IDA	92%	8%**	Actual problem projects	

Note: * The European Union (EDF ACP) and the Caribbean Development Bank (SDF) are not quite comparable with the others in this table, because additional factors in their formulae, not shown here, modify the effective weight of the performance components. ** At different times the World Bank IDA has given portfolio performance different weights – zero, 7%, 10% and 20%.

Table 2.3: Transformation of '% Projects at Risk' into 'Portfolio Performance Rating'

Rating	AfDB	AsDB ^a (illustrative)	CDB	EU (ACP)	GEF	IFAD	IDA	IDB
6.0					Not applicable	0%, 2 or more years		Ratio of undisbursed \$ in problematic or on-alert projects as percentage of total undisbursed amount in all current projects in the country.
5.5								
5.0	0; portfolio size>5		0-19%			0%		
4.5	0; portfolio size<5	0-3%					0%	
4.0	0% to 20%	4-6%	20-39%			1% to 34%	1-4%	
3.5	21% to 40%	7-14%					5-15%	
3.0	41% to 60%	15-29%	40-59%			35 to 67%	16-26%	
2.5	61% to 80%	30-100%					27-67%	
2.0	46% to 70%		60-79%			68 to 100%	68-100%	
1.5	>100% for 2 years or more							
1.0			80-100%		100% 2 years or more			

^aADB, Policy on Performance-Based Allocation for Asian Development Fund Resources, R20-01, 20 Feb. 2001, Appendix 2 Page 2.

Table 2.4: Criteria for Assessing Country Policy and Institutional Performance (IRAI/CPIA)

	<i>AfDF</i>	<i>AsDF</i>	<i>CDB</i>	<i>IDB (FSO and IFF)</i>	<i>IDA*</i>	<i>GEF</i>	<i>IFAD</i>
I. Criteria for CPIA Assessment							
<i>Macroeconomic Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal policy General macroeconomic performance Macroeconomic & external debt management capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macroeconomic management Fiscal policy Debt policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macroeconomic management Fiscal policy Debt policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macroeconomic imbalances (fiscal & monetary policies) Management of external debt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Macroeconomic management Fiscal policy Debt policy 		Same as IDA
<i>Structural & Social Policies</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Integration & Trade Financial sector Business regulatory environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trade Financial sector Business regulatory environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trade policy Financial sector Business regulatory environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trade & commercial policy Banking & financial sector stability Policies & institutions for environmental stability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trade policy Financial sector Business regulatory environment 	Policies & institutions for environmental sustainability as in IDA	Same as IDA
<i>Policies for social inclusion/ equity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equality Equity of public resource use Building human capital Social protection and labour Environmental policy & regulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equality Equity of public resource use Building human resources Social protection and labor Policies and institutions for environmental sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equity Equity of public resource use Building human resources Social protection & labour Policies and institutions for environmental sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equality, indigenous & other minorities inclusion issues Building human resources & social protection Monitoring & analysis of poverty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equity Equity of public resource use Building human resources Social protection & labour Policies and institutions for environmental sustainability 		Same as IDA
<i>Governance & Public Sector Performance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property rights & rule-based governance Quality of budgetary & financial management Efficiency of revenue mobilization Quality of public administration Transparency, accountability & Corruption in the public sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property rights and rule-based governance Quality of budgetary and financial management Efficiency of revenue mobilization Quality of public administration Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property rights & rule-based governance Quality of budgetary & financial management Efficiency of revenue mobilization Quality of public administration Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property rights, governance & private sector development Transparency & accountability in the public sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property rights & rule-based governance Quality of budgetary & financial management Efficiency of revenue mobilization Quality of public administration Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector 	Same as IDA	Same as IDA

II. Weight in CPIA							
	<i>AfDF</i>	<i>AsDF</i>	<i>CDB</i>	<i>IDB</i>	<i>IDA*</i>	<i>GEF</i>	<i>IFAD</i>
<i>Macroeconomic Management</i>	33.33%	11.7%	25%	15%	25%		Same as IDA
<i>Structural and Social Policies</i>	33.33%	11.7%	15%	20%	25%		Same as IDA
<i>Policies for social Inclusion and equity</i>	33.33%	11.7%	25%	35%	25%	70%	Same as IDA
<i>Governance and Public Sector Performance</i>	100% (separated from 3 CPIA clusters) 33.33%	50.0%	25%	30%	25%	20%	Same as IDA
III. CPIA Scoring Process							
<i>Frequency of performance scoring</i>	Annual	Annual	Biennial	Two-year period	Annual	Same as IDA	Same as IDA
<i>Benchmarking</i>	Yes	No	Yes. Joint with World Bank for two or three Caribbean countries each year.	No	Yes, typically about 20 countries per year are scored first as benchmarks		
<i>Written substantiation</i>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		

Note: * GEF only uses the policies and institutions for environmental sustainability from IDA. IFAD uses the same criteria as IDA.

III. EXTRA-FORMULA CONSIDERATIONS

Table 3.1 Special Allocations, Allocation Constraints, and Allocations Management

	<i>AfDB</i>	<i>AsDB</i>	<i>CDB</i>	<i>EU ACP</i>	<i>GEF</i>	<i>IDB</i>	<i>IFAD</i>	<i>IDA</i>
Constraints on Allocation								
Minimum allocations?	Yes, SDR 5 million	No, but not zero	No. Zero is possible.	No, but not zero.	\$1 million in each focal area	No, but not zero	US\$ 1 million	SDR 4.5 million for 3 years
Separate \$ pool for special group of countries?	No	Yes. 4.5% of commitment authority for Pacific COUNTRIES.	Yes. Group 4: Guyana and Haiti			No. The Intermediate Financing Facility (for middle-income countries) was discontinued in 2007 and replaced with blending provisions (max. 20% FSO funds).	No	
Allocation caps? (ceilings)	Yes, 10% cap for countries with large populations	Soft cap. Blend countries with PBA shares above 14% will receive only half of the share above that threshold.			(1) Biodiversity, 10% of total resources. No country affected. (2) Climate Change 15% of total resources. Only China affected.		Capped allocations at 5% of cycle	Capped allocations to two credit worthy blend countries below IDA's operational cutoff: India, Pakistan
General reserve		No			No specific provision, administratively managed	\$100M	No	No
Special Allocations								
Small country preference?	Yes, minimum allocation	Yes. Weight on population in PBA formula biased toward small countries.			Yes, minimum allocation	Yes, performance \$ "pot" gives advantages to small countries	Yes, minimum allocations	Yes, minimum allocation of SDR 1.5 million per year, which benefits small countries
Different allocation rules for post-conflict/fragile states?	Yes, topping up allocation for fragile states after their PBA	Yes, for eligible countries			No	NO	Yes, for eligible countries	Yes, for eligible countries
Definition of post-conflict/fragile countries	Yes	Post-conflict countries refer to countries that are emerging from a situation of violent, protracted conflict			No			Post-conflict: A country which has experienced a recent, intense conflict as measured by: (a) extent of human casualties caused by the conflict, or (b) proportion of population that is either internally displaced or in exile, and/or (c) extent of physical destruction. Re-engaging: countries reengaging after a prolonged period of disengagement, accumulation of sizeable arrears, and/or partial collapse of state.

	<i>AfDB</i>	<i>AsDB</i>	<i>CDB</i>	<i>EU ACP</i>	<i>GEF</i>	<i>IDB</i>	<i>IFAD</i>	<i>IDA</i>
Duration/ pattern of assistance for post conflict/ fragile states?	6 years	In accordance with IDA framework	Haiti joined CDB in 2005. Not included in formula allocations. Fixed allocation.		No			Post-conflict: 10 years, of which the last 6 yrs are gradual phase down to PBA level. Re-engaging: 5 years, of which the last 3 yrs are phase-down
Set aside for emergency/disaster response?	6 years	Softer loan terms	Yes, \$10M	Envelope B (about 20% of ACP funds)	No	General reserve can be used		No
Set aside for priority action areas, like AIDS	Yes: 17.5% for regional projects & 7.5% for fragile states	No	Yes		No	No		No
Debt Sustainability and Grants								
DSF adopted for determining grants and credits?	Yes	Yes			n/a	The appropriate degree of concessionality for each eligible country is derived from the debt distress indicators (DSA).	Same as IDA	Yes, a country's risk of debt distress (as determined through a DSA) determines the credit-grant mix
Modified volume discount, percentage and methodology	Yes	20% discount, all available for hard term facility			n/a		Grant allocations subject to 5% upfront volumen reduction	Grant allocations subject to a 20% upfront volume reduction, of which 11% is an incentive-related discount while 9% is a charges-related discount
MDRI netting out applied in allocation?					n/a	No		Yes
Regional (multi-country) Projects								
Set aside for regional projects (% replenishment, and \$ value)	17.5% of ADF-11 replenishment; SDR 953 million	10% OF ADF commitment authority	2001 (\$15M)		5% of available resources (\$50 million for biodiversity and \$50 million for climate change)	No	No	Yes, about 4% of IDA15 (SDR1.2 billion) set aside for regional projects or SDR400 million per year, of which roughly 80% goes to Africa
Criteria for regional projects	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country borrower must have access to ADF; Project cannot have component activities in a country with ADF arrears; Project concept must demonstrate consistency with the Regional Cooperation Strategy, OM on Regional Cooperation, national poverty reduction 			Based on extent of spill-over benefits			Criteria: (i) at least three countries participating, (ii) evidence of cross-border benefits, (iii) country and regional ownership, (iv) coherence with regional strategy and (v) potential to contribute to policy harmonization

	<i>AfDB</i>	<i>AsDB</i>	<i>CDB</i>	<i>EU ACP</i>	<i>GEF</i>	<i>IDB</i>	<i>IFAD</i>	<i>IDA</i>
		strategies, and country partnership strategies and country operations business plans; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project benefits must include more than one country; and Country ownership demonstrated through partial financing from country's PBA						
Country contributions required? If so, how much?	Yes; 1/3 of project cost in country, with ceiling of 10% if country's PBA is below SDR 20m	Of the total ADF financing, 2/3 will come from the sub-regional pool and 1/3 from PBA. The required contributions from biennial PBA will be subject to a 20% ceiling, beyond which contribution from country PBA will not be mandatory.			Yes	No		A participating country must contribute one-third of the regional project costs, with a cumulative ceiling on country contribution at 20 percent of its annual allocation.

Allocation Periods and Reallocation

Period covered by a single allocation	3 years	Biennial with midterm review	Four years		Four years with a reallocation after two years	Two years	Three years	One year
Any limits on front-loading and back-loading?	Yes, 50% firm for Y1, and can front load up to 50% of Y2. In Y2 can backload 100% of Y1 is not used	Share in biennial allocation for countries with allocation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ≥\$40m – 62.5% <\$40m and population ≥ 1 million – 100% <\$40m and population < 1 million – 175% 			Maximum access in the first two years of the four-year cycle is 50%.		No	Limited front loading (of up to 30 percent) of allocations in the first two years allowed; small countries and capped blend countries can frontload higher percentages. No limits on backloading in the first two years.
Any reallocations among countries? Any limits on reallocation?	Yes, reallocation in 3 rd year of non-used resources. Use PBA to allocate to all others	Towards end of replenishment period, unused allocation will be reallocated according to PBA			Reallocation after two years. If a country has an individual allocation in the first half of the replenishment period it is guaranteed an individual allocation in the second half (rather than being in the "pool" of countries).	No carry-overs and reallocations. Any unused FSO resources available from the two-years allocations will be added to the resources available for the next two-years period.	Yes, reallocations in third year	In year 3 of the replenishment cycle funds can be reallocated on a case-by-case basis, but only from lesser-performing to better-performing countries

	<i>AfDB</i>	<i>AsDB</i>	<i>CDB</i>	<i>EU ACP</i>	<i>GEF</i>	<i>IDB</i>	<i>IFAD</i>	<i>IDA</i>
Conditional approvals when insufficient commitment authority remains at end of allocation period?	Yes	Yes	Yes		No specific policy provision	Yes	N/a	Not applicable
Borrowing or carryover of allocations across replenishment periods					No	Limited provision for carry-over of projects under active consideration into the first six months of a new replenishment period	Yes, minimum allocation countries only	No

IV: DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

Table 4.1: Disclosure of Country Performance Scores and Allocation

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Disclosure practices</i>				<i>Allocation disclosed?</i>
	<i>Overall CPR/CPIA score disclosed</i>	<i>CPR/ CPIA criteria scores disclosed</i>	<i>CPR/ CPIA score justification disclosed</i>	<i>CPR/ CPIA posted on website</i>	
African Development Bank	Yes				
Asian Development Bank	Actual scores	Yes	No	Yes	Only to the Board
Caribbean Development Bank	Actual score	Yes	No	No	
European Commission (ACP)					
Global Environmental Facility (GEF)	Inferable from allocations and Benefits index	No	No		Yes
Inter-American Development Bank	Actual score	No	No	Yes	
International Fund for Agricultural Development	Actual score	Actual score	No	Yes	Yes, posted on Internet as Board document
World Bank (IDA)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, disclosed to the Board of IDA for information only starting from end-FY09

Executive Board PBAS Working Group: Minutes of the fourth and fifth meetings

A. Minutes of the fourth meeting, 28 February 2008, IFAD, Rome

Members:

Present: India – Ramalingam Parasuram, Chairperson; France – Clarisse Paolini; Italy – Augusto Zodda; Mali – Mohammed al Moustapha Cissé; Mexico – Diego Alonso Simancas Gutiérrez; Nigeria – Yaya O. Olaniran; United States – Liza Morris, Andrew Velthaus

Absent: Sweden; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Observers: Argentina – María del Carmen Squeeff; Brazil – José Antonio Marcondes De Carvalho, Felipe Haddock Lobo Goulart; Cameroon – Médi MOUNGUI; Ecuador – Geoconda Galán Castelo; Guatemala – Ileana Rivera De Angotti

Secretariat: B. Baldwin; T. Rice; E. Murguía; U. Demirag

1. The Chairperson welcomed both the members of the Working Group (WG) and the observers. The Chair, following agreement on the agenda noted that there had been some good meetings in 2007 following the initiation of the WG by the Board in April 2006 and that these meetings had been reported to the Board in December 2007. The Chair noted that the Board had observed that the WG should continue to meet with the same objectives of improvement of understanding of the issues surrounding the PBAS in IFAD.
2. The Secretariat presented a Power Point presentation outlining the key features of the PBAS in IFAD and the decisions taken since the inception of the approach. The WG then had a discussion concerning the presentation and the PBAs in general.
3. During the course of the discussion, several of the WG reiterated that the mandate of the WG was 'fact finding' and a broader understanding of PBAS, in keeping with the terms of reference given by the Board. Issues concerning evaluation of the PBAS would need to be tabled to the Evaluation committee of the Board and proposals to modify the PBAs would need to be brought by the members themselves to the Board, rather than the WG.
4. The WG discussed the introduction of rural population into the PBAs formula (after the Executive Board of April 2006) and reviewed the effect on allocations at country level. Several members and observers expressed concern that the allocations to countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) had been reduced since the introduction of rural population. The WG also discussed the issues concerning definition of rural population, income distribution and the data sources used by IFAD. It was discussed that rural population is usually calculated at country level in conjunction with the overall population analysis and the determination of urban populations. The World Bank use their in-country staff to review and where necessary validate total population (as it is central to IDA lending terms) and subsequently publish rural populations. IFAD uses the data as provided by the World Bank. The need for continued study was emphasised and it was explained that the Universidad Nacional de La Plata in Argentina was carrying out a World Bank funded study (World Bank's LAC poverty group) into the issues of rural population and rural income. The Secretariat will follow up with the University.
5. The changes in country allocations in LAC and the overall lending to the region were discussed. Allocations for LAC have varied with the introduction of rural population, some have increased but several have decreased, if only marginally. A review of regional lending, in the context of a growing overall IFAD lending programme, presented by the Secretariat noted the need to continue to develop a strong pipeline of projects & programmes for funding in LAC. The need to consider reallocation within regions was also raised and it was noted that, with the decisions

taken by the Governing Council, regional allocations were no longer applied beginning with the 2007 work programme.

6. The WG noted the continued collaboration with other IFIs, in the spirit of the Paris Declaration, in the implementation of PBAS and the proposal for IFAD to host the MDB/IFI annual technical meeting in early April; to which the members of the WG would be invited as observers. The WG noted the use by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) of indicators that were part of the rural sector performance assessment. Much of the analysis done in relation to the rural sector performance assessment in Central America is done by the Regional Unit for Technical Assistance (RUTA), based in Costa Rica. In this regard the Secretariat informed the WG that it intended to hold a 2-3 day workshop with RUTA to review how RUTA had been operationalising the surveys in –country and discuss the findings and issues arising. It was also proposed to use such a workshop to give an overview of the design and implementation of the PBAS in the region, in Spanish, to a wider, operational audience. It was intended to include both Central American countries but also other countries from LAC. The Secretariat would give further details of the workshop (proposed for late June 2008) at a later date.
7. The WG agreed that the next meeting of the WG would be after that workshop and would include a report of the event and the issues raised.
8. The WG discussed the request by the Executive Board in December 2007 for a progress report by the WG to be tabled to the April 2008 Executive Board. This would be an ‘information’ item and will give a report on the meetings of the WG in 2007 and 2008 (to date), the issues raised and the views expressed. This will also include a summary of the MDB/IFI technical meeting.
9. In closing the meeting the Chair confirmed that the next meeting would be after the Costa Rica workshop. He also expressed the intent for moving ahead in the discussions. This can be achieved by reducing the need to ask and review some of the basic issues which have been deliberated upon in earlier meetings. From the next meeting onwards it would be desirable to discuss specific issues. The chair also requested members to notify him & the Secretariat of issues they wishes to be tabled for discussion by the WG.
10. 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.

B. Minutes of fifth meeting, 12 September 2008, IFAD, Rome

Members:

Present: India – Ramalingam Parasuram, Chairperson; Italy – Augusto Zodda; Mexico – Diego Alonso Simancas Gutiérrez; Sweden – Amalia Garcia-Tharn; United States – Liza Morris

Absent: France; Mali; Nigeria; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Observers: Argentina - María del Carmen Squeff; Brazil – José Antonio Marcondes De Carvalho, Felipe Haddock Lobo Goulart; Cameroon – Médi MOUNGUI; Denmark – Christina Wix Wagner

Secretariat: K. Nwanze; K. Cleaver; B. Baldwin; T. Rice

1. The Chairperson welcomed both the members of the Working Group (WG) and the observers. The Chair indicated that the meeting's objectives were to: review PBAS in other institutions, exchange views on issues of concern, and establish topics for future work of the group. The discussion might also provide perspectives for the forthcoming paper which the Management will present to the next session of the Replenishment Consultation in October.
2. After the introductions, the meeting requested a point of clarification on the use of a term: active countries. The Secretariat explained that, with about 130 eligible borrowing countries and some 33 loans and DSF grants being approved by the Executive Board each year, there have always been countries that have not received new loans every year, or even over a longer period. With the introduction of PBAS in 2005, 119 countries were identified as potentially requiring financing during the 2005-2007 allocation period. Given their number, many of those countries subsequently received low allocations, including 36 that received the minimum allocation of US\$1.0 million per year. Moreover, unused allocations subsequently needed to be reallocated. Given the number and amounts of such reallocations, this made country-level programming difficult. Therefore, the practice introduced for the 2007-2009 allocation period included only those countries designated as active, for new commitments where IFAD expected to have lending or DSF grant operations in 2007-2009. This identified 90 countries as potentially requiring financing and has facilitated more reliable and higher allocations at country level (only nine countries received the minimum allocation). The Secretariat also informed the meeting that as we are now approaching the third and final year of the allocation period one of the topics that the Secretariat is examining is how, without upsetting the balance of the allocations of all the other countries, introduce potentially one or two specific countries into the allocation period 2007-2009 to be part of the pipeline of projects for Board approval in 2009.
3. The Secretariat began the meeting with a short presentation of the PBAS system in IFAD and included the distribution of a comparative table of how different institutions have developed and implemented PBAS approaches. This was followed by two further presentations, Mr Ken Watson, a PBAS consultant for the Asian Development Bank, the Caribbean Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and most recently, part of the team carrying out an evaluation of the PBAS system in GEF. He presented an overview of the features of the PBAS systems of all the agencies. This was followed by Mr Philip Quarcoo, recently retired from the African Development Bank to describe some of the specific features of the PBAS system in the African Development Bank. Following the presentations there were a series of questions and responses which focussed on the balance, or trade-off, between how adaptable and 'flexible' the PBA systems were to dealing with changing circumstances of recipient countries and the need for predictable and rules-based approach. The following topics were discussed:
4. **The formula:** While the IDA formula is one which most organisations have harmonised around the formulas have evolved over recent years to reflect specific institutional issues. The case of the weight given to population in IFAD was one

such example and while the basic coefficients of the formula have remained unchanged, changes in weights and implanting methodology has been relatively frequent in order to emphasis usefulness and accuracy in implementation.

5. **Fragile States and Emergency Response:** The meeting reviewed the different approaches to dealing with post-conflict, fragile states, emergencies and countries in especially vulnerable situations. Institutions had a variety of responses ranging from the post-conflict facility at the World Bank to the small island facility at Asian Development Bank and the fragile state facility at African Development Bank. The disaster relief ('vulnerability') support offered by the Caribbean Development Bank was also highlighted. This was identified as an area of further research and analysis.
6. **Allocations and Re-allocations:** The meeting reviewed how the different institutions carry out re-allocations of funds, usually in the third, and last, year of the Allocation Period. While IFAD's operational guidelines allow for such reallocations there was a useful exchange of views on different approaches used, principally by the World Bank and African Development Bank, and this was also identified as an area of further research and analysis.
7. In closing the meeting and thanking the participants and presenters the Chair indicated that the issues raised, and the role of the Working Group, would constitute a substantial part of the forthcoming Replenishment paper. The chair also considered that it may be appropriate to have a further meeting in December, before the Executive Board.

Debt sustainability analysis for 2009 programme of work (“active” countries only)

<i>Region</i>	<i>Green (100% loan)</i>		<i>Yellow(50%loan/50%grant)</i>	<i>Red (100% grant)</i>	
Western and Central Africa	Cameroon Cape Verde Gabon Ghana	Mali Nigeria Senegal	Benin Burkina Faso Mauritania Niger Sierra Leone	Chad Congo (Republic of the) Côte d'Ivoire Democratic Republic of the Congo Gambia (The)	Guinea Guinea-Bissau Liberia Togo
Eastern and Southern Africa	Angola Botswana Kenya Madagascar Mauritius Mozambique	Swaziland Uganda United Republic of Tanzania Zambia	Ethiopia Lesotho Malawi	Burundi Comoros Rwanda Zimbabwe	
Asia and the Pacific	Bangladesh China India Indonesia Maldives Mongolia	Pakistan Papua New Guinea Philippines Sri Lanka Viet Nam	Bhutan Cambodia Kyrgyzstan Nepal	Afghanistan Lao People's Democratic Republic Solomon Islands Tajikistan	
Latin America and the Caribbean	Belize Bolivia Brazil Colombia Costa Rica Dominican Republic Ecuador El Salvador	Grenada Honduras Mexico Panama Paraguay Peru Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Guyana Nicaragua	Haiti	
Near East and North Africa	Albania Armenia Azerbaijan Bosnia and Herzegovina Egypt Georgia Iraq Jordan	Lebanon Republic of Moldova Morocco Syrian Arab Republic The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Tunisia Turkey		Djibouti Sudan Yemen	

Allocation period 2007–2009 2008 country scores and 2009 annual allocations

Country	Country needs		Country performance				Total country score	Active borrowers			Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
	GNI per capita 2006	Rural Population 2006	IRAI 2007	Rural sector performance 2008	PAR 2008	Country performance score		2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	
Western and Central Africa											
BENIN	530	5 211 995	3.57	3.94	4	4.03	3 560	6 232 440	5 977 197	5 790 363	18 000 000
BURKINA FASO	440	11 673 461	3.69	3.93	5	4.15	5 704	6 779 811	7 746 943	13 059 968	27 586 723
CAMEROON	990	8 095 010	3.23	3.98	4	3.66	3 071	4 406 829	4 345 519	4 979 651	13 732 000
CAPE VERDE	2 130	217 589	4.16	5.06	6	5.21	1 008	1 315 632	1 404 795	1 529 572	4 250 000
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	350	2 636 503	2.50	-	-	0.77	-	1 258 146	1 470 035	(2 728 182)	-
CHAD	450	7 771 576	2.58	2.99	5	3.44	3 234	5 914 820	6 411 226	7 218 123	19 544 169
CONGO	1 569	1 454 322	2.66	3.19	6	4.07	1 560	2 949 981	2 671 608	3 481 241	9 102 830
CÔTE D'IVOIRE	880	10 319 737	2.55	2.71	3	2.89	2 190	2 143 795	2 524 265	4 887 500	9 555 560
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO	130	40 801 209	2.84	3.39	3	3.11	7 602	8 296 317	11 564 144	3 469 539	23 330 000
GABON	5 360	208 683	-	2.83	-	2.83	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
GAMBIA (THE)	290	752 688	3.23	3.68	6	4.40	2 071	2 777 282	2 883 042	3 192 437	8 852 761
GHANA	510	11 840 145	3.95	4.00	5	4.31	5 948	10 057 500	8 891 750	13 964 547	32 913 797
GUINEA	400	6 109 260	3.01	3.47	4	3.70	3 472	5 493 515	5 458 487	7 748 752	18 700 754
GUINEA-BISSAU	190	1 157 136	2.59	3.13	-	2.96	1 264	1 500 740	1 803 631	1 377 629	4 682 000
LIBERIA	130	1 475 233	-	2.39	-	2.39	1 009	-	-	2 251 978	2 251 978
MALI	460	8 250 998	3.71	3.92	5	4.08	4 662	6 831 579	8 834 966	10 944 278	26 610 822
MAURITANIA	760	1 807 922	3.38	3.89	6	4.53	2 551	3 509 901	4 006 011	5 842 014	13 357 927
NIGER	270	11 401 479	3.30	3.82	4	3.71	5 084	3 595 460	6 219 728	6 184 812	16 000 000
NIGERIA	620	73 807 176	3.40	3.32	5	4.03	11 304	13 124 325	15 196 367	14 837 307	43 158 000
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE	800	63 850	2.98	-	6	2.70	-	-	-	-	-
SENEGAL	760	7 018 939	3.73	3.91	4	3.97	3 622	4 717 804	4 982 398	5 459 797	15 160 000
SIERRA LEONE	240	3 362 922	3.09	3.64	4	3.52	2 717	2 146 890	3 720 348	6 220 486	12 087 724
Total							71 633	94 052 768	107 112 463	120 711 815	321 877 046

Country	Country needs		Country performance				Total country score	Active borrowers			Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
	GNI per capita 2006	Rural Population 2006	IRAI 2007	Rural sector performance 2008	PAR 2008	Country performance score		2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	
Eastern and Southern Africa											
ANGOLA	1 970	7 622 866	2.73	3.04	4	3.32	2 063	2 636 540	2 668 346	3 095 114	8 400 000
BOTSWANA	5 570	777 455	-	4.38	-	4.38	-	1 544 070	1 465 841	(3 009 912)	-
BURUNDI	100	7 329 609	3.02	3.42	4	3.54	4 870	5 628 332	8 059 136	10 868 464	24 555 932
COMOROS	660	382 399	2.39	3.17	-	2.93	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
ERITREA	190	3 761 199	2.43	3.65	5	3.91	-	-	-	-	-
ETHIOPIA	170	64 593 329	3.42	4.35	6	4.74	20 358	22 663 585	28 583 725	40 354 292	91 601 601
KENYA	580	28 877 257	3.63	4.15	4	4.10	7 781	7 399 223	10 705 846	12 724 931	30 830 000
LESOTHO	980	1 616 258	3.53	3.89	6	4.56	2 308	2 647 951	3 372 366	2 867 683	8 888 000
MADAGASCAR	280	13 970 750	3.68	4.10	5	4.33	7 521	9 828 340	13 039 341	17 657 598	40 525 279
MALAWI	230	11 174 125	3.41	3.87	5	4.21	6 749	5 096 934	8 509 866	3 095 200	16 702 000
MAURITIUS	5 430	720 975	-	5.03	4	4.76	1 140	1 000 000	1 000 000	2 677 216	4 677 216
MOZAMBIQUE	310	13 572 722	3.61	3.92	5	4.20	6 821	9 797 757	10 150 016	11 287 227	31 235 000
RWANDA	250	7 550 571	3.66	4.32	4	4.15	5 380	6 188 867	6 773 949	8 787 184	21 750 000
SWAZILAND	2 400	860 491	-	3.77	5	4.26	1 217	1 000 000	1 000 000	2 857 831	4 857 831
UGANDA	300	26 089 517	3.88	4.28	4	4.24	9 402	14 335 091	17 082 703	22 072 408	53 490 203
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA	350	29 736 083	3.88	4.60	6	4.94	13 034	14 964 289	19 611 724	22 020 144	56 596 157
ZAMBIA	630	7 586 129	3.48	3.71	4	3.91	3 798	5 893 220	5 421 438	5 855 343	17 170 000
ZIMBABWE	131	8 415 775	1.65	2.27	1	1.56	942	1 063 649	1 233 726	1 466 625	3 764 000
Total							93 384	112 687 847	139 678 024	165 677 348	418 043 219

Country	Country needs		Country performance				Total country score	Active borrowers			Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
	GNI per capita 2006	Rural Population 2006	IRAI 2007	Rural sector performance 2008	PAR 2008	Country performance score		2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	
Asia and the Pacific											
AFGHANISTAN	319	20 014 448	2.50	2.90	-	2.78	3 528	5 014 121	6 390 530	7 874 557	19 279 209
BANGLADESH	450	116 150 733	3.48	4.01	6	4.42	18 103	17 600 725	25 488 496	28 591 778	71 681 000
CAMBODIA	490	11 311 860	3.21	3.63	6	4.24	5 695	4 952 398	8 408 300	9 653 302	23 014 000
CHINA	2 000	770 025 245	-	4.31	5	4.39	-	28 250 000	30 750 000	33 750 000	92 750 000
INDIA	820	788 187 877	3.85	3.77	4	3.69	-	28 250 000	30 750 000	33 750 000	92 750 000
INDONESIA	1 420	113 260 541	-	3.80	6	4.76	15 552	21 483 496	22 409 561	24 836 443	68 729 500
KYRGYZSTAN	500	3 325 021	3.67	3.83	5	4.14	3 117	4 888 345	5 704 204	7 136 971	17 729 521
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	500	4 549 928	3.14	3.60	5	3.82	3 062	3 905 401	5 292 005	6 833 303	16 030 709
MALDIVES	3 010	209 904	3.56	3.16	3	3.15	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
MONGOLIA	1 000	1 115 020	3.41	3.68	6	4.44	1 843	3 313 012	3 126 155	(3 439 167)	3 000 000
NEPAL	320	23 141 348	3.44	3.68	3	3.43	5 730	4 904 895	8 748 093	8 347 012	22 000 000
PAKISTAN	800	102 842 519	3.58	3.65	4	3.65	10 103	14 271 749	15 937 106	23 718 483	53 927 338
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	740	5 363 223	3.32	3.24	-	3.27	-	1 921 736	3 724 399	(3 946 135)	1 700 000
PHILIPPINES	1 390	31 538 013	-	4.38	4	4.21	6 891	13 958 556	13 859 932	16 178 265	43 996 753
SOLOMON ISLANDS	690	400 189	2.73	2.86	-	2.82	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
SRI LANKA	1 310	16 883 214	-	3.90	3	3.68	4 022	7 490 290	8 523 554	9 443 254	25 457 098
TAJIKISTAN	390	5 006 437	3.24	3.82	-	3.64	3 088	3 478 837	4 228 371	4 592 792	12 300 000
VIET NAM	700	61 499 843	3.79	4.64	5	4.46	12 347	18 071 685	18 182 290	20 496 025	56 750 000
Total							93 081	183 755 246	213 522 997	229 816 884	627 095 127

Country	Country needs		Country performance				Active borrowers				
	GNI per capita 2006	Rural Population 2006	IRAI 2007	Rural sector performance 2008	PAR 2008	Country performance score	Total country score	2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation	Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
Latin America and the Caribbean											
BELIZE	3 740	153 211	-	3.68	1	2.33	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
BOLIVIA	1 100	3 305 649	3.73	3.93	5	4.09	-	5 574 494	5 065 925	(2 640 419)	8 000 000
BRAZIL	4 710	29 042 146	-	4.62	6	5.22	7 514	20 153 094	12 207 721	17 641 594	50 002 409
COLOMBIA	3 120	12 300 782	-	4.19	6	4.98	-	10 990 253	8 440 564	(6 430 817)	13 000 000
COSTA RICA	4 980	1 661 855	-	4.49	5	4.62	1 603	3 116 764	3 063 056	3 763 023	9 942 843
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	2 910	3 120 922	-	4.19	6	4.98	2 825	4 930 713	4 435 501	4 633 785	14 000 000
ECUADOR	2 910	4 847 773	-	4.22	4	3.90	2 116	4 286 776	3 802 263	4 968 825	13 057 863
EL SALVADOR	2 680	2 698 165	-	4.27	6	5.03	2 750	4 455 566	4 470 108	6 455 562	15 381 236
GUATEMALA	2 590	6 819 155	-	3.96	5	4.20	2 933	5 626 908	6 113 796	6 886 993	18 627 698
GUYANA	1 150	530 205	3.42	3.75	3	3.35	726	1 000 000	1 177 117	1 661 590	3 838 707
HAITI	430	5 718 576	2.86	3.60	3	3.24	2 537	-	-	5 661 259	5 661 259
HONDURAS	1 270	3 696 192	3.84	3.68	5	4.14	2 589	2 169 297	3 433 135	3 782 568	9 385 000
MEXICO	7 830	24 742 151	-	4.08	3	3.65	3 006	12 048 680	6 324 560	7 057 542	25 430 783
NICARAGUA	930	2 247 246	3.75	4.01	5	4.44	2 578	2 379 212	3 158 604	3 490 185	9 028 000
PANAMA	5 000	933 661	-	4.09	3	3.48	-	1 757 887	1 249 415	1 000 000	4 007 302
PARAGUAY	1 410	2 460 544	-	3.75	4	3.64	1 627	1 125 847	1 000 000	1 684 153	3 810 000
PERU	2 980	7 498 575	-	4.35	6	5.07	4 318	8 654 979	6 846 235	7 534 786	23 036 000
VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)	6 070	1 702 318	-	4.34	6	5.06	1 850	7 120 711	3 042 920	4 343 937	14 507 568
Total							38 973	96 391 181	74 830 921	72 494 565	243 716 666

Country	Country needs		Country performance				Total country score	Active borrowers				Total country allocation 2007 to 2009
	GNI per capita 2006	Rural Population 2006	IRAI 2007	Rural sector performance 2008	PAR 2008	Country performance score		2007 allocation	2008 allocation	2009 allocation		
Near East and North Africa												
ALBANIA	2 930	1 708 523	-	4.51	6	5.16	2 312	2 778 746	3 250 453	3 570 802	9 600 000	
ARMENIA	1 920	1 082 836	4.35	5.17	6	5.30	2 203	3 754 371	3 287 845	5 171 535	12 213 751	
AZERBAIJAN	1 840	4 108 146	3.77	4.33	6	4.80	3 334	5 224 646	5 540 688	7 828 326	18 593 659	
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	3 230	2 109 265	3.68	4.50	6	4.86	2 199	3 448 270	3 653 476	5 161 501	12 263 247	
DJIBOUTI	1 060	110 499	3.08	3.46	5	3.82	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000	
EGYPT	1 360	42 289 736	-	4.19	6	4.77	10 108	11 702 091	14 852 864	16 245 045	42 800 000	
GEORGIA	1 580	2 114 532	4.26	4.44	2	3.38	1 270	2 058 521	1 898 322	2 083 157	6 040 000	
IRAQ	1 646	9 452 538	-	-	-	-	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	(815 000)	1 185 000	
JORDAN	2 650	962 435	-	4.27	5	4.46	1 365	3 363 814	1 859 075	2 247 110	7 470 000	
LEBANON	5 580	538 544	-	4.24	-	4.24	790	2 608 480	1 000 000	1 191 520	4 800 000	
MOROCCO	2 160	12 399 899	-	4.19	5	4.33	4 276	5 743 274	6 196 046	7 167 680	19 107 000	
REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	1 080	2 032 869	3.78	4.44	6	4.86	2 838	4 107 787	4 461 226	4 668 988	13 238 000	
SUDAN	800	21 991 004	2.51	2.79	4	3.23	3 945	8 502 113	8 147 194	8 805 484	25 454 791	
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC	1 560	9 544 637	-	4.19	5	4.50	4 463	7 382 208	6 649 507	6 273 286	20 305 000	
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	3 070	619 466	-	4.56	6	5.19	-	2 744 224	2 318 116	(5 062 341)	-	
TUNISIA	2 970	3 475 964	-	4.38	6	4.87	2 822	4 434 276	4 251 760	6 625 139	15 311 174	
TURKEY	5 400	23 527 140	-	4.42	3	3.80	3 498	3 215 898	3 247 091	6 037 011	12 500 000	
YEMEN	760	15 708 068	3.23	3.92	4	3.84	4 867	5 044 240	7 241 935	8 100 145	20 386 319	
Total							50 290	78 112 958	79 855 596	86 299 388	244 267 942	
IFAD Total							347 360	565 000 000	615 000 000	675 000 000	1 855 000 000	

2008 rural development sector framework performance assessments

Table 1: Western and Central Africa

Indicators	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Cape Verde	Central African Republic	Chad	Dem. Rep. of the Congo	Congo	Côte d'Ivoire	Gabon	Gambia (The)	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Liberia	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 (ROs)	4.13	4.83	5.25	5.63	-	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.25	3.00	4.23	4.13	4.00	3.50	2.50	4.15	4.75	4.50	3.80	4.56	3.50	4.03
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.50	4.14	4.25	5.25	-	3.25	2.88	3.25	3.38	2.00	3.70	3.75	4.00	2.00	2.50	4.50	4.00	3.25	2.55	4.38	3.75	3.32
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																						
B (i) Access to land	3.13	2.88	4.00	4.00	-	3.75	3.25	4.00	2.75	3.00	3.95	3.63	3.75	3.75	2.00	2.98	3.00	3.00	2.73	3.38	3.00	3.24
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.25	3.91	3.75	5.13	-	3.00	3.25	3.13	2.75	4.00	3.45	3.63	2.75	2.50	2.00	3.60	3.50	3.00	2.95	4.00	3.00	3.16
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	3.83	3.99	3.67	4.17	-	2.67	2.50	3.17	2.67	2.00	3.20	3.33	3.67	3.00	2.00	4.20	3.33	3.67	3.10	4.00	3.67	3.14
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																						
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.75	4.37	4.25	5.00	-	3.25	4.00	3.06	3.00	4.00	3.88	4.75	3.25	1.75	2.00	4.28	4.25	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.53
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.17	4.29	3.67	5.00	-	2.67	3.50	2.97	2.67	2.00	3.87	4.00	3.00	3.33	2.67	4.50	4.00	4.33	3.77	4.17	4.33	3.49
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.33	3.68	3.33	5.00	-	3.00	3.50	3.17	3.00	2.00	3.87	4.83	3.33	3.33	2.00	3.90	3.00	4.00	3.97	3.42	4.00	3.39
D. Gender Issues																						
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.38	3.76	4.25	5.50	-	2.75	3.75	3.16	2.25	4.00	3.95	4.63	3.00	4.00	3.58	4.75	4.00	3.80	4.00	3.50	3.63	
D (ii) Women representatives	4.33	3.99	4.33	5.33	-	2.33	4.00	4.00	2.33	4.00	4.57	4.50	3.67	4.33	3.00	3.30	4.33	4.33	3.07	3.50	3.67	3.68
E. Public resource management and accountability																						
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.63	4.60	3.50	5.13	-	2.75	3.25	2.73	2.25	2.00	3.40	3.63	3.75	3.25	2.00	3.83	3.75	4.25	3.15	3.81	3.75	3.22
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.88	2.76	3.50	5.63	-	2.50	2.75	2.68	2.25	2.00	2.10	3.25	3.50	2.75	3.00	4.28	4.00	3.75	3.25	3.94	3.75	3.11
Average of all indicators	3.94	3.93	3.98	5.06	-	2.99	3.39	3.19	2.71	2.83	3.68	4.00	3.47	3.13	2.39	3.92	3.89	3.82	3.32	3.91	3.64	3.39

Table 2: Eastern and Southern Africa

Indicators	Angola	Botswana	Burundi	Comoros	Ethiopia	Eritrea	Kenya	Lesotho	Madagascar	Malawi	Mauritius	Mozambique	Rwanda	Swaziland	Uganda	United Rep. of Tanzania	Zambia	Zimbabwe	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																			
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	3.25	4.25	3.88	3.25	4.13	3.75	4.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.25	4.00	3.75	4.50	4.50	3.75	1.75	3.90
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.25	4.25	3.00	3.25	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.25	3.50	4.00	4.75	3.50	1.25	3.71
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																			
B (i) Access to land	2.75	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.75	4.75	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.75	4.75	4.00	4.25	3.25	4.00	4.50	3.25	2.00	3.72
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	2.25	4.00	3.00	2.75	4.00	3.25	4.25	2.50	4.00	3.75	4.50	2.75	4.25	4.00	3.75	5.00	3.50	2.75	3.57
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	3.33	3.67	3.17	2.50	4.50	3.33	3.67	3.33	4.67	3.33	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.00	4.67	5.00	3.67	2.00	3.62
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																			
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	2.75	3.63	3.75	4.25	5.00	2.75	4.25	4.00	4.25	3.75	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.00	4.00	2.50	3.90
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.00	4.67	3.33	3.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	3.33	5.33	4.33	4.67	3.00	4.67	4.33	4.00	2.00	3.93
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	2.67	3.67	2.67	2.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.33	4.33	3.67	6.00	3.67	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.33	4.00	2.67	3.63
D. Gender Issues																			
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.75	5.50	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.75	4.75	5.50	4.25	5.00	6.00	4.25	4.75	3.75	4.50	5.25	4.75	2.75	4.39
D (ii) Women representatives	4.00	5.00	3.33	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.33	5.00	3.33	4.33	5.33	3.67	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	3.33	3.33	4.20
E. Public resource management and accountability																			
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.25	5.00	4.38	3.25	5.25	3.75	3.50	3.75	4.25	3.50	5.50	4.50	4.75	4.00	4.00	4.75	3.25	1.75	4.02
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.25	4.88	4.00	3.00	4.75	4.75	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.75	3.50	2.50	4.02
Average of all indicators	3.04	4.38	3.42	3.17	4.35	3.65	4.15	3.89	4.10	3.87	5.03	3.92	4.32	3.77	4.28	4.60	3.71	2.27	3.88

Table 3: Asia and the Pacific

Indicators	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Cambodia	China	India	Indonesia	Kyrgyzstan	Lao People's Dem. Rep.	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 ROs	3.75	4.75	3.50	4.25	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.75	3.25	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.38	5.00	3.13	4.00	4.75	5.25	3.93
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.00	4.50	2.50	4.00	3.25	3.50	4.00	4.50	2.75	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.13	4.50	2.75	3.75	4.25	5.25	3.70
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																			
B (i) Access to land	2.25	3.25	3.75	4.25	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	2.75	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.88	4.00	3.50	3.25	2.75	4.50	3.59
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	2.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.50	2.63	3.00	3.50	3.25	2.75	4.25	2.63	3.00	3.75	4.75	3.44
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	2.33	3.67	3.00	4.33	4.33	3.33	3.67	3.33	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.33	2.83	4.00	2.50	3.00	3.33	4.33	3.36
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																			
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.50	4.50	4.25	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.75	3.63	4.75	2.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.87
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.83	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.81
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	2.67	3.67	4.00	4.67	3.33	3.33	4.00	2.67	2.67	3.33	3.67	4.00	2.67	4.00	2.50	4.00	3.33	4.00	3.49
D. Gender Issues																			
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	2.25	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.00	5.25	4.25	4.00	4.88	5.75	3.75	3.50	3.63	5.75	3.63	5.75	5.25	5.75	4.69
D (ii) Women representatives	2.33	4.00	3.33	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.67	4.00	3.00	3.33	4.67	2.67	3.17	4.33	2.17	5.33	3.67	5.33	3.98
E. Public resource management and accountability																			
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.50	3.75	3.50	4.50	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.00	3.50	4.25	3.50	3.38	4.00	3.25	3.50	3.75	4.50	3.69
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.50	3.25	3.25	4.00	3.50	3.75	3.25	3.25	3.13	3.00	2.75	3.50	2.50	4.00	2.75	3.50	3.25	4.00	3.33
Average of all indicators	2.90	4.01	3.63	4.31	3.77	3.80	3.83	3.60	3.16	3.68	3.68	3.65	3.24	4.38	2.86	3.90	3.82	4.64	3.74

Table 4: Latin America and the Caribbean

Indicators	Belize	Bolivia	Brazil	Colombia	Costa Rica	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Guatemala	Haiti	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Paraguay	Peru	Venezuela (Bolivarian Rep. of)	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																		
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.00	4.50	5.50	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	5.13	4.50	4.26
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.50	4.00	4.88	3.38	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.94	3.75	4.00	4.13	4.00	4.13	3.75	4.75	4.08
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																		
B (i) Access to land	3.25	3.75	4.13	3.75	4.13	3.75	3.63	3.75	3.38	3.06	3.38	4.00	3.81	4.00	3.25	4.00	4.13	3.77
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.00	3.63	3.88	3.50	4.00	3.88	3.75	3.75	3.50	4.13	3.25	3.50	3.25	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.63	3.69
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	3.67	3.50	4.50	3.67	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	3.92	3.83	3.33	4.00	4.33	3.79
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																		
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.75	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.13	4.13	3.38	4.13	3.88	3.88	3.88	4.63	3.88	4.03
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.00	3.50	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.75	3.83	4.33	3.92	4.67	4.17	4.83	4.67	4.23
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.33	3.50	4.33	4.17	4.67	4.67	4.00	4.33	4.67	3.67	3.67	4.17	4.17	4.17	3.83	4.67	4.17	4.11
D. Gender Issues																		
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	5.00	4.50	6.00	6.00	6.00	4.75	5.00	5.25	4.25	3.25	4.25	4.63	3.88	4.63	4.25	4.63	5.00	4.83
D (ii) Women representatives	4.00	4.50	5.33	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.83	4.00	4.50	4.17	3.83	4.17	5.00	4.35
E. Public resource management and accountability																		
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.00	3.88	4.38	4.38	4.63	4.00	4.38	4.25	4.00	3.31	3.63	4.00	4.13	3.88	3.50	4.25	4.00	3.97
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.63	3.88	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.88	3.88	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.75	4.50	4.00	3.88	3.38	4.13	4.00	3.99
Average of all indicators	3.68	3.93	4.62	4.19	4.49	4.19	4.22	4.27	3.96	3.60	3.68	4.08	4.01	4.09	3.75	4.35	4.34	4.09

Table 5: Near East and North Africa

Indicators	Albania	Armenia	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Djibouti	Egypt	Georgia	Iraq	Jordan	Lebanon	T. F. Yug. Rep. of Macedonia	Morocco	Republic of Moldova	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 ROs	4.50	5.50	4.25	4.75	3.50	4.00	4.50	-	4.25	4.25	4.75	5.00	4.50	3.50	3.63	4.25	4.25	4.75	4.10
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.25	4.75	4.00	4.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	-	4.00	3.75	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.25	3.88	4.00	4.75	4.00	3.77
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																			
B (i) Access to land	4.75	5.25	4.75	5.00	3.50	5.25	5.25	-	5.00	4.25	4.50	4.25	5.00	2.50	4.25	4.25	4.75	4.50	4.25
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.00	5.25	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.75	3.75	-	4.50	3.50	3.75	4.25	4.00	2.50	4.50	4.63	5.00	4.25	3.98
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	2.33	4.00	3.33	-	3.67	3.50	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.00	3.67	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.45
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																			
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	5.00	6.00	4.50	4.25	3.25	4.00	4.75	-	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	2.75	3.75	3.63	3.75	4.00	3.89
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.67	4.67	-	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.50	2.67	4.33	5.00	5.00	3.67	4.17
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.67	5.67	4.33	5.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	-	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.33	4.33	2.33	4.33	5.33	4.67	4.33	4.17
D. Gender Issues																			
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.75	6.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	3.63	6.00	-	5.50	6.00	6.00	3.75	5.00	3.50	4.63	5.50	4.50	3.50	4.59
D (ii) Women representatives	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.67	3.67	4.17	4.33	-	3.33	4.33	4.33	3.50	5.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.80
E. Public resource management and accountability																			
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.75	5.50	4.00	4.00	3.25	4.00	4.75	-	4.25	3.50	4.75	4.38	4.50	2.00	5.13	4.50	4.75	3.75	3.94
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.38	4.00	-	3.75	4.50	4.00	3.88	4.00	2.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.25	3.56
Average of all indicators	4.51	5.17	4.33	4.50	3.46	4.19	4.44	-	4.27	4.24	4.56	4.19	4.44	2.79	4.19	4.38	4.42	3.92	3.97

