

Document: GC 34/L.9
Agenda: 12
Date: 21 January 2011
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Progress report on implementation of the performance-based allocation system

Note to Governors

Focal points:

Technical questions:

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

Dispatch of documentation:

Liam F. Chicca
Governing Bodies Officer
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2462
e-mail: l.chicca@ifad.org

Governing Council — Thirty-fourth Session
Rome, 19-20 February 2011

For: **Information**

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 approach the performance-based allocation required by the Lending Policies and Criteria in a more systematic way and along the lines of the approach found at other international financial institutions (IFIs), and adopt a performance-based allocation system (PBAS). Authority was delegated to the Executive Board to develop the details of the system's design and implementation.
2. Several other development finance institutions use a PBAS, including: the African Development Bank (AfDB), 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 these IFIs implement a system that assesses both performance and need, and together with IFAD, meet annually to review issues and progress.
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 2010-2012 period, which coincides with the Eighth Replenishment period. The Report of the Consultation on the Seventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources¹ confirmed that the uniform system of allocation across the IFAD lending programme as a whole would become effective 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 II contains the 2010 country scores by region and the country allocations for the Eighth Replenishment (2010-2012), indicating both the annual country allocations for 2010 and 2011 and the updated, indicative country allocations for 2012. In order to improve the management of allocations in the three-year period, amounts for countries that are expected to use only part of their potential allocation have been capped at the expected level of financing.
5. Annex III presents details of the rural development sector framework assessments for 2010, 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.

II. Adjustments to the PBAS

6. After these systems were introduced, it was recognized by all practitioners that adjustments and improvements were needed. At its April 2006 session, the Executive Board agreed that:
 - (a) In line with the Agreement Establishing IFAD, the resources of the Fund would continue to be used with "due regard to a fair geographic distribution". Moreover, with the application of a uniform system of allocation as from 2007, IFAD would, in line with the decisions reached during the Seventh

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).

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) The weight of 0.45 was regarded as a "point of balance" where population still carried significant influence as a determinant of "needs" in the formula but at the same time allowed performance and GNI per capita to have a strong role. It was therefore agreed that the formula would be modified accordingly to reflect a revised weight of population at 0.45.
- (c) 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.

III. PBAS working group

- 7. After April 2006, a working group was convened to develop a broader understanding of evolving issues in PBAS implementation. In the Report of the Consultation on the Eighth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources approved by the Governing Council in February 2009, the Board was requested to mandate the PBAS working group to continue its functions and, as well, to review the practices of other IFIs and identify ways to improve the system. Possible areas for examination include: the relative weight of different elements of the PBAS formula, the current level of minimum and maximum allocations and the possible need for exceptional allocations for particularly vulnerable countries, in addition to the current support extended to post-conflict countries. The reallocation approaches of other IFIs also needed to be examined. The working group met in March, July and November 2010 under the new Chairperson, Dr Yaya O. Olaniran, Nigeria. Minutes of these meetings are attached (see annex I).

IV. Multilateral development bank/IFI PBAS technical meeting

- 8. The Asian Development Bank hosted the sixth PBAS technical meeting in August 2010 (IFAD hosted the meeting in 2008). In summarizing the status of PBAS implementation, participants agreed that the current PBAS is generally working well. Representatives of AfDB reported that during recent replenishment discussions, the AfDB deputies noted that the PBAS is "the bedrock of concessional resource allocations" with 90 per cent of the Bank's allocations directly or indirectly linked to the PBAS. Other institutions noted that exceptions account for less than 20 per cent of the allocation of concessional resources and that measures are being considered to strengthen assistance to fragile and small states. While such systems support strong performers, they also take into account the important needs aspect of borrowing countries that, despite poor performance, require assistance.
- 9. IDA representatives indicated that the IDA Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) recently conducted an evaluation of the country policy and institutional assessment (CPIA) and confirmed its usefulness as a broad indicator of aid effectiveness. According to the evaluation, the CPIA ratings generally are reliable and the review process helps guard against potential bias. At the same time, IEG recommended that some of the indicators should be revised. IDA management is currently undertaking a thorough review of the CPIA, cognizant of the need to reflect new developments while at the same time maintaining stability and taking into consideration its potential impact on aid volatility. IFAD, together with the other multilateral development banks (MDBs), will be consulted on the CPIA revision.
- 10. The IEG also discussed approaches used in country eligibility classification and the way in which the policy on graduation from one lending term to another varies across institutions. Some MDBs have adopted distinctive graduation policies while

others (such as AfDB) rely on their normal credit policies in differentiating assistance treatment across different country groups. Along with the graduation policy, some institutions have suggested imposing a country-specific cap on the amount of concessional resources for blend countries and applying lending terms that are less concessional to such countries. In relation to the key issue of graduation from concessional resources eligibility, some MDBs phase out concessional resource allocations while phasing in non-concessional resources over a prescribed period of time. With regard to cessation of lending, in general, countries “self-graduate” from MDB financing, i.e. they no longer apply for financing from either concessional or market windows, and in some cases have reapplied for financing after a number of dormant years.

V. Application of the PBAS in 2010

11. The first year of the 2010-2012 allocation period, 2010, also coincides with the Eighth Replenishment period and, with the increase in resources available, it has not been necessary to delineate specific “active” countries. Regional divisions have therefore identified countries based on planned project activities, and allocations under country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) and the PBAS have been made accordingly. However, in order to continue to manage allocations over the three-year period, countries that are expected to use only part of their potential allocation have been capped at the expected level of financing. This should further reduce the need for reallocations and provide better planning parameters for other countries.
12. On this basis, following the PBAS methodology, final country scores and allocations have been assigned annually and combined with the provisional figures for subsequent years in the allocation period to provide an overall country allocation for the three-year allocation period. The scores provided for 2010 were final (as they are based on the 2009 country scores) and the allocations for 2011 and 2012 were provisional.² With the move to uniform allocations, the data have been subject to interregional review and benchmarking to ensure consistency in assessments and, as a result, the scoring approach of the rural sector performance assessment indicators has been improved. In this regard, the Latin America and the Caribbean Division worked closely with the Regional Unit for Technical Assistance on the 2009 rural sector performance assessment indicators to assess and compare scores throughout the region.

VI. The updating of the 2010 country scores and 2011 country allocations

13. In the fourth quarter of 2010, updated data on performance (both portfolio and rural sector performance) became available and the process of updating country scores for 2010 began. The updated data is reflected in the final 2010 country scores and 2011 country allocations, tabled at the December Executive Board and attached to this document as annex II, and subsequently disclosed in accordance with the procedures agreed for disclosure of PBAS information on the IFAD website (www.ifad.org/operations/pbas). As in the previous allocation period, the allocations provided for 2010 and 2011 are final, as they are based on the 2009 and 2010 country scores. The allocations for 2012 remain provisional, and subject to change in line with changes in the annual country scores.

² The provisional allocations are by nature indicative and subject to changes in annual performance (based on assessment of projects at risk, rural sector performance and the IDA Resource Allocation Index), population and GNI per capita. Where appropriate, weighted averages have been used to reduce statistical variance over time.

Executive Board PBAS Working Group: Minutes of 2010 meetings

A. Minutes of the fifth meeting, 19 March 2010, IFAD, Rome

Members:

Present: Nigeria – Dr Yaya O. Olaniran, Chairperson (audio-link); United States – Liza Morris and Prya Ghandi (video-link); Mexico – Diego Alonso Simancas Gutierrez; Burkina Faso – Jacques Zida; France – Claude Torre; Sweden – Amalia Garcia-Tharn; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) – Gladys Francisca Urbaneja Durán
Absent: Italy; Pakistan

Secretariat: P. Ciocca; B. Baldwin; T. Rice

1. IFAD welcomed the members of the Working Group and confirmed the membership. The WG unanimously elected Dr Yaya O. Olaniran as Chair.
2. After the introductions, the meeting began with an overview of the PBAS by Mr Baldwin, together with a PowerPoint presentation. Participants raised questions about the formula concerning the weights associated with the needs variables of GNI and rural population, and the proportions associated with performance variables such as the IDA Resource Allocation Index (IRAI) and IFAD's rural sector performance assessment. Further background information was requested. A comparative table of PBAS approaches used by other MDBs was provided.
3. Areas for further work and analysis included:
 - A more diagrammatic approach to data analysis that would include a distribution curve of performance/needs against allocations and show, where possible, change over time;
 - Variations in GNI per capita and effects on allocations;
 - The analysis and inclusion of IFAD portfolio data.
4. The meeting also began discussion on the approach and methodology of the rural sector performance assessment, scoring and influence on final allocations, etc. It was agreed that these issues would be examined further at the next meeting.
5. 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 noted that it may be necessary to have another meeting in December before the Executive Board.

B. Minutes of the sixth meeting, 19 July 2010, IFAD, Rome

Members:

Present: Nigeria – Dr Yaya O. Olaniran, Chairperson; United States – Liza Morris (video-link); Mexico – Diego Alonso Simancas Gutierrez; Burkina Faso – Jacques Zida and Lompo Jamano; Italy – Stefano Marguccio; Venezuela – Gladys Francisca Urbaneja Durán

Absent: France; Sweden; Pakistan

Secretariat: P. Ciocca; B. Baldwin; T. Rice

Observers: Argentina – María del Carmen Squeff; Guatemala – Ileana Rivera De Angotti; Brazil – Bruna Magalhães Da Motta.

1. The Chair welcomed the members of the Working Group and confirmed the agenda, noting a change in the order.
2. The meeting began with a presentation, as requested by the Group, of the diagrammatic analysis of the various components of the formula and their relationship to one another. The analysis included rural population related to allocations, the effect of GNI per capita, the Rural Sector Assessment Programme and the portfolio indices, and projects at risk. A final slide, not directly related to the PBAS, centred on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in particular MDG 1, eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, and an assessment by the United Nations MDG monitoring group of the progress towards achieving the MDGs. Participants welcomed the analysis, but suggested further analyses and indices and raised several issues as to the use of national GNI figures, why there were clear 'outliers' and, importantly, how to support countries that were not performing well but still needed IFAD assistance. In further discussion, the importance was raised of IFAD supporting the development effectiveness agenda, and how this strikes a balance between the needs and performance variables of the PBAS. The performance of individual countries was reviewed and the reallocation process explained. It was clarified that contributions by Member States to IFAD through Replenishment do not enter into the PBAS calculation. Further discussions reflected on the variation in the formula attributable to GNI and the analyses of allocations per capita.
3. The second agenda item focused on the update of PBAS discussions at the IDA and AfDB ongoing replenishments. From the AfDB perspective, at their most recent meeting in Côte d'Ivoire, the PBAS was described by the chairman as the bedrock of the allocation system within the AfDB. The AfDB has developed a special window in its allocation framework for support to arrears clearance and to fragile states. At the IDA meeting in Bamako last month delegates confirmed their support for the PBAS in its current form and several emphasized that they did not wish to see any changes in the system as it was being implemented, with the exception of a more flexible approach to how IDA dealt with post-conflict countries. The WG noted the status in other IFIs and particularly the development of processes to assist fragile states. The Secretariat responded that they would further review how the other IFIs were addressing this and report back. A further discussion clarified how reallocations and supplementary financing could provide additional funding when needed in particular country cases.
4. The final agenda item was an update on the use and application of the rural sector performance assessment in 2009 in the Latin America and Caribbean region. The presentation showed how the rural sector performance has been carried out and its implications for work beyond the PBAS. It included the various scores on the rural sector performance in the Latin America region, and how it has been used to promote policy dialogue.

5. The Chair asked the Secretariat if any of the topics would be further investigated before the next meeting, possibly in November, before the December Executive Board. The Secretariat noted three areas that have been discussed that can be followed up on: (i) a series of analyses and graphs/tables illustrating per capita scenarios; (ii) the conclusions of the IDA and AfDB replenishments with particular regard to fragile states; and (iii) how other indices can be used in PBAS systems. The Chair, in closing the meeting, thanked the participants and presenters, and noted that the PBAS can improve the lot of our clientele. He also observed that in the last three and a half years a lot of work has gone into improving the PBAS and, therefore, its integrity. He noted that in achieving the diversities that bring us to consensus, we will not satisfy everybody every time but, as we improve on the PBAS and work hard on it, we will make progress.

C. Minutes of the Seventh Meeting, 16 November 2010, IFAD, Rome

Members

Present: Nigeria – Dr Yaya O. Olaniran, Chairperson; United States – Liza Morris (video-link); France – Raphaëlle Simeoni Mexico – Diego Alonso Simancas Gutiérrez; Burkina Faso – Jacques Zida and Jean-Baptiste Kambire; Italy – Stefano Marguccio; Pakistan – Khalid Mehboob; Sweden – Amalia Garcia-Thörn and Henrik Holmström; Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela – Gladys Francisca Urbaneja Durán
Absent: none

Secretariat: B. Baldwin; T. Rice.

Observers: Argentina – Agustín Zimmermann; Guatemala – Ileana Rivera De Angotti

1. The Chair welcomed the members of the Working Group (WG) and confirmed the agenda, noting a change in the order of the agenda.
2. The meeting began with a presentation, as requested by the Group, on three topics: the analysis of the per capita allocations; the PBAS discussions that have been happening during the World Bank and African Development Bank (AfDB) replenishments; and the use of the other indices in the PBAS systems. With regard to per capita allocations, the presentation noted that as the performance scores become weaker, the per capita allocation begins to decline, which is what is expected in a performance-based allocation. It does not mean that countries that have poor performance are not getting allocations because the importance of the population and GNI per capita ensures that countries with rural populations, with low GNI per capita, receive allocations, but that the country performance score, the performance part of the PBAS formula, is responsive to the formula and is changing the per capita allocations.
3. Participants raised several questions concerning the approach and analysis, including the possibility of doing a similar analysis based on needs, the comparison between the periods shown (2007-2009 and 2010-2012), the differentiation of countries and the details of the Rural Sector Performance assessment used to provide the basis for the analysis. It was clarified that the lines for the Seventh and the Eighth Replenishments are not linear because some countries have moved between quintiles in terms of their allocation period because of performance changes. Secondly, it was clarified that below the annual PBAS allocation of US\$4.50 per capita threshold there is no differentiation between the types of countries and Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Viet Nam, which are the highly concessional countries and, at the same time Indonesia, Turkey and Mexico all come under the annual PBAS allocation of US\$4.50 per capita. That is, there is no middle-income country differentiation process, the process of analysis is "country-neutral". It was also noted that the rural sector performance has less of a dispersion because the rural sector performance scores themselves tend to be less dispersed.
4. The second agenda item gave an update of PBAS discussions at the recent International Development Association (IDA)/AfDB Replenishments. It was reported that the AfDB described the PBAS as the "bedrock" of their allocation mechanism noting that needs are reflected in the formula but also the importance of the fragile states facility to AfDB. It was noted that IDA has a post-conflict allocation process (as does IFAD) and is considering opening a crisis response window as part of the IDA 16 discussions. The issue was also discussed of how countries move through the various lending levels within the AfDB and IDA, particularly moving from highly concessional to what is known in the AfDB as blend: when a country can take the lending resources of the AfDB and blend it with the concessional resources of the African Development Fund (ADF), or in the case of the World Bank, when a country

moves from IDA eligibility into International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) eligibility. The extent to which those institutions need to consider leveraging resources outside the performance-based allocation process has also been raised: for example, AfDB's idea of further developing public/private partnerships to leverage additional resources to supplement the limited amounts of the performance-based resources that were available for their membership. The members of the WG discussed the role of "set-asides"; the level and source of cofinancing for IFAD programmes. It was requested that the Secretariat provide the next meeting with tables on the extent and nature of cofinancing.

5. The meeting then discussed the use of other indices in the PBAS. AfDB is going to carry out further research and will be looking at the use of other indices during the mid-term review of ADF XII. IDA has focused on looking at two particular indices, one that is known as the economic vulnerability index and a second one called the human asset index. Increasing the "needs" variables has the effect of diminishing impact of performance in sub-Saharan and allocations go down while the Asian allocation increases. The meeting noted the approach of IDB and the Caribbean Development Bank to using other indices and discussed the various possibilities under the scenarios provided, noting that these changes were indicative and that it would be important to be clear as to what sort of results would be obtained with such proposals when applied because possibly these may produce the opposite result of what was intended.
6. Finally, participants discussed the overall objectives of the WG, and noted that it was an advisory group to gain information, but also to look at the implementation of the PBAS at IFAD and in doing that, look at the comparisons with the other institutions. The annual report for the PBAS that is given annually to the Board in December includes an attachment of all of the summaries of the meetings of the WG during the year. The WG asked that the Terms of Reference be attached (see below).

PBAS WORKING GROUP

Terms of Reference

The Report of the Consultation on the Seventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources approved by the Governing Council noted that "the Executive Board may establish a working group to review the relevant issues of the existing system". The eighty-seventh session of the Executive Board held in April 2006 agreed to the suggestion to convene a working group.

The purpose of the Group is to develop 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 similar 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 Group, representing the three Lists, will establish a work programme and schedule of meetings with technical support given by the Secretariat.

In addition, following the Consultation on the Eighth Replenishment, it was agreed that the PBAS Working Group would review and assess how the IFAD PBAS could benefit from the evolving best practices of other IFIs, including the issues identified above, and report appropriately to the Executive Board.

Allocation period 2010-2012
2010 country scores and 2011 annual allocations

Country	Country needs		Country performance					2010 allocation	2011 allocation	2012 allocation	Total country allocation 2010 to 2012
	GNI per capita 2009	Rural Population 2009	IRAI 2009	Rural sector performance 2010	PAR 2010	Country performance rating	Final country score				
West and Central Africa											
Benin	750	5 218 031	3.57	4.16	5	4.44	3 970	6 567 208	9 539 866	11 469 913	27 576 987
Burkina Faso	510	12 608 693	3.73	4.31	4	3.98	5 230	10 526 777	12 251 282	14 729 911	37 507 970
Cameroon	1 170	8 281 082	3.21	3.77	4	3.74	3 100	5 105 398	7 638 641	9 184 030	21 928 068
Cape Verde	3 010	200 422	4.16	4.98	6	5.17	878	1 682 471	2 164 033	2 601 843	6 448 348
Central African Republic	450	2 709 160	2.50	2.97	4	3.06	1 599	2 429 481	3 841 666	4 618 888	10 890 035
Chad	610	8 164 802	2.53	3.02	3	2.91	2 201	4 764 849	5 290 229	6 360 515	16 415 593
Congo	1 830	1 409 922	2.74	3.32	5	3.79	1 286	2 831 680	3 169 165	3 810 326	9 811 171
Côte d'Ivoire	1 060	10 655 525	2.66	3.01	5	3.67	3 434	5 298 657	8 043 439	9 670 754	23 012 850
Democratic Republic of the Congo	160	43 190 523	2.73	3.15	3	3.15	7 623	17 240 916	17 857 375	21 470 206	56 568 496
Equatorial Guinea ^a	12 420	408 875		3.17	4	3.31	-	66 667	66 667	66 667	200 000
Gabon	7 370	213 520		3.26	5	4.02	-	0	0	0	0
Gambia (The)	440	728 808	3.23	4.02	6	4.56	1 970	3 672 803	4 614 096	5 547 601	13 834 501
Ghana	700	11 737 467	3.89	4.08	5	4.30	5 447	12 061 284	13 421 249	16 136 529	41 619 063
Guinea	370	6 552 726	2.98	3.25	3	3.00	2 403	5 400 548	5 629 341	6 768 246	17 798 134
Guinea-Bissau	510	1 128 811	2.55	3.10	5	3.65	1 487	2 328 854	3 482 849	4 187 485	9 999 188
Liberia	160	1 549 561		3.05	5	3.90	2 616	2 701 173	6 446 347	7 750 521	16 898 041
Mali	680	8 750 667	3.66	3.82	5	4.20	4 599	8 468 827	11 333 478	13 626 377	33 428 683
Mauritania	960	1 934 890	3.33	3.97	6	4.55	2 510	4 644 187	6 031 918	7 252 259	17 928 364
Niger	340	12 748 887	3.30	3.69	4	3.69	4 989	8 884 117	12 292 703	14 779 664	35 956 484
Nigeria	1 140	78 787 952	3.44	3.63	6	4.42	12 040	22 131 592	29 667 627	35 669 744	87 468 963
Sao Tome and Principe	1 140	62 856	2.98	3.22	6	4.14	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Senegal	1 030	71 89 633	3.62	4.17	6	4.63	4 611	8 027 222	11 363 086	13 661 974	33 052 282
Sierra Leone	340	35 27 255	3.11	3.66	5	4.05	3 384	5 707 050	8 132 428	9 777 732	23 617 210
Togo	440	37 92 465	2.68	3.02	4	3.12	1 939	3 590 127	4 541 401	5 460 199	13 591 726
Sub total West and Central Africa							77 315	145 131 888	187 818 885	225 601 383	558 552 146

^a Allocation capped

Country	Country needs		Country performance					2010 allocation	2011 allocation	2012 allocation	Total country allocation 2010 to 2012
	GNI per capita 2009	Rural Population 2009	IRAI 2009	Rural sector performance 2010	PAR 2010	Country performance rating	Final country score				
East and Southern Africa											
Angola	3 490	7 842 996	2.73	3.17	3	3.02	1 507	3 096 576	3 714 203	4 465 631	11 276 410
Botswana	6 240	773 283		4.32	4	3.96	788	1 514 834	1 941 853	2 334 713	5 791 400
Burundi	150	7 414 874	3.02	3.42	5	3.93	5 437	9 849 652	12 736 720	15 313 561	37 899 934
Comoros ^a	870	473 628	2.34	3.17	3	2.91	559	688 519	725 482	873 376	2 287 377
Eritrea	303	3 999 773	2.34	3.42	6	4.11	3 785	6 700 139	8 865 204	10 658 776	26 224 119
Ethiopia	330	68 496 053	3.35	4.06	5	4.25	14 207	32 286 900	34 143 052	41 050 666	107 480 619
Kenya	770	31 085 374	3.58	4.28	5	4.46	8 905	13 688 628	21 942 904	26 382 216	62 013 749
Lesotho	1 030	1 525 800	3.51	3.89	4	3.71	1 474	3 177 751	3 542 492	4 259 187	10 979 430
Madagascar	425	13 764 996	3.66	3.88	5	4.33	6 746	12 511 772	16 622 720	19 985 696	49 120 188
Malawi	280	12 317 578	3.41	3.84	5	4.19	6 674	10 529 351	16 038 878	19 283 765	45 851 994
Mauritius ^a	7 240	732 801		5.03	4	4.58	992	1 608 960	1 302 546	1 568 211	4 479 717
Mozambique	440	14 281 461	3.68	4.01	3	3.73	5 032	10 590 647	12 400 226	14 908 940	37 899 813
Namibia	4 290	1 358 698						-	-	-	-
Rwanda	460	8 136 058	3.68	4.50	5	4.44	5 484	10 808 811	13 179 383	15 845 755	39 833 950
Seychelles ^a	8 480	39 746						66 667	66 667	66 667	200 000
South Africa ^a	5 770	19 126 490		4.33	4	3.96	3 411	4 156 001	5 226 052	6 291 411	15 673 463
Swaziland ^a	2 350	886 095		3.68	4	3.95	1 064	855 879	1 475 391	1 776 302	4 107 572
United Republic of Tanzania	500	32 384 393	3.84	4.61	5	4.42	9 895	24 212 782	24 383 143	29 316 145	77 912 071
Uganda	460	28 411 789	3.88	4.22	5	4.53	10 007	17 000 267	24 658 450	29 647 151	71 305 867
Zambia	970	8 335 551	3.51	3.75	4	3.93	3 600	5 911 938	8 871 408	10 666 200	25 449 546
Zimbabwe ^a	316	7 786 667	1.40	2.06	4	2.43	1 772	53 060	66 674	80 266	200 000
Subtotal East and Southern Africa							91 340	169 309 134	211 903 447	254 774 636	635 987 216

^a Allocation capped

Country	Country needs		Country performance					2010 allocation	2011 allocation	2012 allocation	Total country allocation 2010 to 2012
	GNI per capita 2009	Rural Population 2009	IRAI 2009	Rural sector performance 2010	PAR 2010	Country performance rating	Final country score				
Asia and the Pacific											
Afghanistan	374	22 524 899	2.59	2.94	5	3.43	5 454	7 889 475	12 776 862	15 361 824	36 028 162
Bangladesh	590	117 415 388	3.53	3.88	4	3.99	13 825	29 975 184	34 067 574	40 959 853	105 002 611
Bhutan	2 020	448 805	3.87	4.12	6	4.73	1 165	2 331 387	2 871 515	3 452 456	8 655 358
Cambodia	650	11 521 530	3.29	3.57	6	4.36	5 680	10 816 573	13 650 329	16 411 980	40 878 881
China	3 590	745 617 600		4.30	6	4.52	-	37 600 000	47 000 000	56 400 000	141 000 000
Cook Islands ^a	34 126	2 987		3.52	4	3.46	-	133 333	133 333	133 333	400 000
Fiji ^a	3 950	400 152		3.43	4	3.46	501	233 333	211 750	254 916	700 000
India	1 180	810 823 000	3.81	4.00	3	3.44	-	37 600 000	47 000 000	56 400 000	141 000 000
Indonesia	2 230	109 049 272		3.80	5	4.11	10 153	27 008 851	25 017 486	30 078 824	82 105 161
Iran (Islamic Republic of) ^a	4 530	22 614 796		1.00	4	2.09	1 090	106 120	133 348	160 532	400 000
Kazakhstan ^a	6 740	6 613 835		1.00	4	2.09	567	53 060	66 674	80 266	200 000
Kiribati	1 890	54 984	3.02	3.41	4	3.36	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Democratic People's Republic of Korea ^a	561	8 835 683		3.15	6	4.39	-	106 120	-	-	106 120
Republic of Korea	19 830	8 926 028		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Kyrgyzstan	870	3 382 253	3.73	3.69	5	4.16	2 762	4 166 461	6 638 682	7 981 780	18 786 922
Lao People's Democratic Republic	880	4 295 364	3.28	3.57	4	3.66	2 379	4 689 707	5 572 543	6 699 957	16 962 206
Malaysia ^a	7 230	7 888 763		4.68	4	4.16	2 387	53 060	66 674	80 266	200 000
Maldives ^a	3 870	188 195	3.43	3.49	3	3.38	-	832 000	832 000	832 000	2 496 000
Marshall Islands ^a	3 060	17 429		3.45	4	3.47	-	133 333	133 333	133 333	400 000
Mongolia	1 630	1 139 434	3.28	3.63	6	4.39	1 611	3 043 245	3 968 662	4 771 570	11 783 477
Myanmar ^a	585	33 393 202		2.28	4	2.82	3 920	4 881 512	6 139 459	7 391 021	18 411 993
Nepal	440	24 133 140	3.31	3.55	3	3.31	5 023	10 132 085	12 072 652	14 515 117	36 719 853
Niue ^a	5 400	826		3.40	4	3.44	-	66 667	66 667	66 667	200 000
Pakistan	1 020	107 629 006	3.25	3.61	4	3.68	9 834	18 636 240	24 232 431	29 134 942	72 003 613
Papua New Guinea	1 180	5 889 293	3.25	3.28	4	3.35	2 135	4 134 354	5 260 664	6 324 960	15 719 978
Philippines	1 790	31 586 997		4.05	5	4.51	7 414	13 273 117	18 267 875	21 963 685	53 504 678
Samoa ^a	2 840	137 354	3.99	3.81	4	3.74	-	66 667	1 466 667	1 466 666	3 000 000
Solomon Islands	910	427 535	2.76	2.91	4	3.08	592	1 129 516	1 423 465	1 711 452	4 264 434
Sri Lanka	1 990	17 237 652	3.44	3.90	3	3.39	3 105	5 383 859	7 649 951	9 197 628	22 231 438
Tajikistan	700	5 111 274	3.17	3.50	2	3.07	1 908	4 814 842	4 470 239	5 374 639	14 659 719
Thailand ^a	3 760	44 954 659		4.65	4	4.14	6 094	212 240	266 697	321 064	800 000
Timor Leste	2 488	819 588	2.81	3.00	4	3.14	638	1 282 864	1 495 417	1 797 963	4 576 243
Tonga ^a	3 260	77 934	3.19	3.47	4	3.43	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Viet Nam	1 010	62 562 128	3.82	4.18	3	3.83	8 401	18 287 657	20 701 715	24 889 921	63 879 294
Subtotal Asia and the Pacific							96 640	251 072 862	305 654 663	366 348 616	923 076 141

^a Allocation capped

Country	Country needs		Country performance				2010 allocation	2011 allocation	2012 allocation	Total country allocation 2010 to 2012	
	GNI per capita 2009	Rural Population 2009	IRAI 2009	Rural sector performance 2010	PAR 2010	Country performance rating					Final country score
Latin America and the Caribbean											
Antigua And Barbuda	12 070	60 987		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	
Argentina	7 570	3 141 557		4.54	2	3.51	1 111	1 861 553	2 736 986	3 290 712	7 889 251
Barbados	29 844	152 704		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	
Belize	8 071	159 203		3.53	4	3.52	-	-	-	-	
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	1 620	3 349 427	3.78	3.89	5	4.29	2 507	4 549 712	6 177 999	7 427 883	18 155 594
Brazil	8 040	27 045 238		4.86	6	5.36	6 704	13 034 230	16 520 351	19 862 617	49 417 198
Chile	9 420	1 914 246		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	
Colombia	4 930	11 506 247		3.84	6	4.79	4 115	8 290 535	10 140 391	12 191 914	30 622 840
Costa Rica	6 230	1 658 494		-	6	2.49	-	-	-	-	
Cuba	11 895	2 724 857		-	4	1.53	-	-	-	-	
Dominica ^a	4 870	18 944	3.85	1.00	4	2.45	-	66 667	66 667	66 667	200 000
Dominican Republic	4 510	3 051 262		4.23	4	3.95	1 579	3 878 030	3 890 218	4 677 256	12 445 505
Ecuador	3 920	4 599 823		4.30	4	4.08	2 095	5 929 006	5 161 549	6 205 792	17 296 347
El Salvador	3 370	2 403 590		4.29	6	5.04	2 477	4 686 205	6 104 850	7 339 934	18 130 988
Grenada	5 550	71 795	3.72	4.29	3	3.65	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Guatemala	2 620	7 148 132		4.12	4	4.07	2 807	4 776 526	6 916 669	8 315 994	20 009 189
Guyana ^a	1 467	545 644	3.44	3.98	5	4.23	1 102	614 576	1 638 637	1 972 831	4 226 044
Haiti	662	5 194 890	2.86	3.67	5	3.83	3 048	4 857 536	7 139 458	8 583 884	20 580 878
Honduras	1 820	3 856 935	3.68	3.79	5	4.19	2 472	5 309 071	6 090 551	7 322 743	18 722 366
Jamaica	4 990	1 256 226		4.28	4	3.94	1 024	1 943 374	2 523 913	3 034 531	7 501 819
Mexico	8 920	24 172 026		4.30	3	3.64	2 871	5 161 312	7 074 691	8 505 986	20 741 989
Nicaragua	1 000	2 468 255	3.75	3.81	6	4.56	2 788	5 042 456	6 701 533	8 057 347	19 801 336
Panama	6 710	898 013		4.14	1	2.85	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Paraguay ^a	2 270	2 482 427		3.91	6	4.74	2 455	2 652 996	3 336 663	4 016 860	10 006 518
Peru	4 150	8 311 992		4.33	6	5.06	4 149	8 036 850	10 223 873	12 292 285	30 553 008
Saint Kitts and Nevis	10 100	33 545		1.00	4	3.73	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Lucia	5 170	124 044	3.88	1.00	4	2.45	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5 110	57 422	3.83	1.00	4	3.99	-	-	-	-	-
Suriname	4 815	128 584		3.91	4	3.97	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Trinidad and Tobago	16 490	1 157 073		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Uruguay	9 360	254 215		4.60	6	5.25	-	-	-	-	-
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	10 150	1 799 546		4.43	4	3.92	999	2 497 327	2 461 309	2 959 261	7 917 897
Subtotal Latin America and the Caribbean							44 303	86 187 962	107 906 309	129 124 496	323 218 766

^a Allocation capped

Country	Country needs		Country performance					2010 allocation	2011 allocation	2012 allocation	Total country allocation 2010 to 2012
	GNI per capita 2009	Rural Population 2009	IRAI 2009	Rural sector performance 2010	PAR 2010	Country performance rating	Final country score				
Near East and North Africa											
Albania	3 950	1 660 935		4.33	6	5.06	2 036	4 177 591	5 016 532	6 031 437	15 225 560
Algeria ^a	4 420	11 913 313		1.00	4	2.09	822	53 060	66 674	80 266	200 000
Armenia	3 100	1 116 645	4.37	4.66	6	5.07	1 815	3 711 283	4 471 334	5 375 939	13 558 556
Azerbaijan	4 840	4 209 659	3.83	4.17	6	4.74	2 580	5 350 293	6 356 616	7 642 635	19 349 544
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4 700	1 957 868	3.68	4.16	6	4.71	1 815	3 652 981	4 471 227	5 375 810	13 500 019
Croatia	13 810	1 881 828		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Cyprus	..	260 440		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Djibouti	1 280	106 297	3.12	3.52	5	3.78	-	1 000 000	1 000 000	1 000 000	3 000 000
Egypt	2 070	47 508 853		4.59	6	5.21	11 440	22 848 370	28 188 671	33 891 577	84 928 618
Gaza and the West Bank	3 422	1 132 101		1.00	5	2.79	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	2 530	2 010 025	4.42	4.24	4	4.15	1 670	2 806 381	4 115 093	4 947 625	11 869 099
Iraq	2 210	10 550 586		3.57	4	3.54	2 646	4 922 309	6 520 730	7 839 952	19 282 991
Jordan	3 740	1 313 802		-	6	2.54	-	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	7 970	545 683		4.46	4	4.04	659	1 226 986	1 623 618	1 952 096	4 802 700
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	12 020	1 430 359		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4 400	665 850		1.00	4	2.14	-	-	-	-	-
Malta	..	22 901		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Republic of Moldova	1 590	2 108 772	3.81	4.50	6	4.89	2 651	5 261 071	6 533 616	7 855 445	19 650 133
Morocco	2 790	13 961 567		4.19	4	4.20	3 978	7 865 382	9 802 470	11 785 628	29 453 480
Oman	..	806 391		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Romania	8 330	9 792 239		1.00	4	2.09	-	-	-	-	-
Somalia	622	5 757 521		-	4	1.53	-	-	-	-	-
Sudan	1 220	23 537 292	2.48	3.53	3	3.21	3 614	7 410 343	8 465 398	10 178 083	26 053 824
Syrian Arab Republic	2 410	9 584 324		4.50	5	4.80	4 565	7 540 041	11 249 215	13 525 066	32 314 322
Tunisia	3 720	3 453 158		4.38	6	5.09	2 904	5 537 940	7 155 413	8 603 039	21 296 391
Turkey	8 730	23 088 126		4.48	5	4.62	4 544	8 397 315	11 197 764	13 463 206	33 058 284
Yemen	1 060	16 218 475	3.19	3.94	4	3.81	4 475	8 536 810	10 482 324	12 603 065	31 622 199
Subtotal Near East and North Africa							52 213	100 298 155	126 716 696	152 150 869	379 165 721
IFAD Total							361 810	752 000 000	940 000 000	1 128 000 000	2 820 000 000

^a Allocation capped

2010 rural sector performance assessments

Table 1: West and Central Africa

RSP Indicator	Benin	Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Cape Verde	Central African Republic	Chad	Dem. Rep. of the Congo	Congo	Côte d'Ivoire	Equatorial Guinea	Gabon	Gambia (The)	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Liberia
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations																
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.38	5.00	4.25	6.00	3.38	3.63	4.50	4.00	3.25	2.95	3.88	4.70	4.25	4.50	3.50	3.25
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.63	5.13	4.25	5.25	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.13	3.13	3.90	4.00	4.00	2.00	3.23
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology																
B (i) Access to land	3.13	3.65	3.88	4.00	4.25	3.38	2.75	3.00	2.75	3.19	3.00	3.90	3.63	2.75	3.75	2.95
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.50	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.09	4.00	4.00	3.50	2.25	2.50	2.83
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.50	4.67	4.15	4.33	2.80	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.33	4.00	3.33	3.67	3.00	2.87
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets																
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.75	3.90	3.25	4.88	3.00	3.13	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.11	4.00	4.18	4.75	3.00	1.75	2.88
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.27	4.33	4.00	4.33	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.33	3.17	2.40	2.00	4.07	4.17	3.67	3.33	3.57
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.50	4.67	3.83	5.00	2.50	2.83	3.00	3.33	3.25	3.00	3.00	4.63	4.83	3.00	3.00	2.97
D. Gender Issues																
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.50	4.38	4.30	5.38	2.75	3.00	3.25	3.25	3.26	3.31	4.00	3.95	4.50	3.50	4.00	3.00
D (ii) Women representatives	4.50	4.17	3.50	4.83	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.67	3.00	3.07	4.00	4.57	4.67	3.67	4.33	3.10
E. Public resource management and accountability																
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.75	4.50	3.63	5.25	2.50	2.75	3.25	3.00	2.88	3.28	2.00	3.53	4.13	2.50	3.25	2.75
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.00	3.00	2.20	5.00	2.75	2.50	2.50	3.25	2.58	3.00	2.80	2.88	3.25	2.50	2.75	3.25
Average of all indicators	4.16	4.31	3.77	4.98	2.97	3.02	3.15	3.32	3.01	3.17	3.26	4.02	4.08	3.25	3.10	3.05

Table 1: West and Central Africa (continued)

RSP Indicator	Mali	Mauritania	Niger	Nigeria	Senegal	Sao Tome	Sierra Leone	Togo	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations									
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.25	4.50	4.63	4.00	4.88	4.05	4.00	3.13	4.12
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.50	4.25	3.88	3.58	4.30	3.30	3.88	3.00	3.74
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology									
B (i) Access to land	2.88	3.25	3.00	3.23	3.63	3.15	3.13	2.88	3.29
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.88	4.50	3.25	3.75	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.54
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.17	4.33	4.00	3.33	4.15	2.85	4.00	3.00	3.58
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets									
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.00	3.25	3.75	4.18	4.25	2.80	3.75	3.38	3.43
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.00	3.00	3.67	3.77	4.67	2.90	4.40	2.93	3.49
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.17	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.58	3.45	4.00	3.20	3.72
D. Gender Issues									
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.13	5.00	3.88	3.80	3.81	3.60	3.50	3.00	3.79
D (ii) Women representatives	3.67	5.00	3.33	3.07	4.33	3.50	3.67	2.83	3.71
E. Public resource management and accountability									
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	3.25	4.25	3.15	4.00	2.75	3.75	3.38	3.39
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.25	3.25	2.70	3.25	3.50	3.30	3.75	2.95	3.13
Average of all indicators	3.82	3.97	3.69	3.63	4.17	3.22	3.73	3.01	3.58

Table 2: East and Southern Africa

RSP Indicator	Angola	Botswana	Burundi	Comoros	Eritrea	Ethiopia	Kenya	Lesotho	Madagascar	Malawi	Mauritius	Mozambique	Rwanda
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations													
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	3.25	4.50	3.88	3.25	3.75	3.88	4.75	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.00
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.75	4.00	3.00	3.25	3.75	4.00	4.25	3.75	2.75	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.50
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology													
B (i) Access to land	2.75	4.25	3.50	3.50	5.00	3.75	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.75	4.75	4.00	4.50
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	2.25	3.75	3.00	2.75	3.50	4.00	4.25	2.50	4.00	3.75	4.50	3.75	4.50
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	3.33	3.33	3.17	2.50	3.33	4.33	4.00	3.33	4.33	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.33
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets													
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.25	3.75	3.75	4.25	2.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.50	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.25
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.00	4.33	3.33	3.00	2.00	4.17	5.00	4.00	3.67	3.33	5.33	4.00	4.33
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.00	3.67	2.67	2.67	3.00	3.67	4.33	3.33	4.33	3.67	6.00	3.67	4.33
D. Gender Issues													
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.75	5.50	3.00	3.00	3.75	4.50	4.75	5.50	4.50	4.50	6.00	4.50	5.00
D (ii) Women representatives	4.00	5.00	3.33	3.67	4.00	3.67	4.33	5.00	4.00	4.67	5.33	3.67	5.00
E. Public resource management and accountability													
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.00	5.00	4.38	3.25	3.50	5.25	3.75	3.75	3.50	3.75	5.50	4.00	4.75
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.75	4.75	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.75	4.00	3.25	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.50
Average of all indicators	3.17	4.32	3.42	3.17	3.42	4.06	4.28	3.89	3.88	3.84	5.03	4.01	4.50

Table 2: East and Southern Africa (continued)

RSP Indicator	South Africa	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 ROs	4.25	3.50	4.75	4.25	3.75	2.50	3.97
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.00	3.50	4.50	4.00	3.75	1.00	3.67
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology							
B (i) Access to land	4.00	2.50	4.25	4.50	3.50	2.00	3.76
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.00	3.50	5.00	3.50	3.50	2.50	3.61
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	3.67	1.67	3.65
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets							
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	2.00	3.80
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.67	3.67	4.67	4.33	4.00	1.67	3.82
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.00	3.33	3.67	4.00	4.00	2.67	3.68
D. Gender Issues							
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	5.00	4.25	5.25	4.50	4.75	2.75	4.46
D (ii) Women representatives	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.67	3.33	3.00	4.28
E. Public resource management and accountability							
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.75	4.25	4.75	4.50	3.25	1.50	4.02
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.25	3.50	1.50	3.79
Average of all indicators	4.33	3.68	4.61	4.22	3.75	2.06	3.88

Table 3: Asia and the Pacific

RSP Indicator	Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Bhutan	Cambodia	China	Cook Islands	Fiji	India	Indonesia	Kiribati	Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	Kyrgyz Republic	Lao People's Dem. Rep.	Malaysia	Maldives
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations															
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	3.75	4.13	4.38	3.50	4.25	3.75	2.63	4.50	4.00	3.50	2.25	3.75	3.75	4.50	3.25
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.00	3.63	3.33	2.75	4.25	3.75	3.00	3.88	3.50	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.00	2.75
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology															
B (i) Access to land	3.00	3.25	5.13	3.50	4.25	3.38	3.38	3.63	4.00	3.13	3.75	3.75	3.50	5.00	2.50
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.50	3.75	3.25	3.50	4.50	2.75	2.25	3.75	3.50	3.38	2.25	3.00	3.25	4.50	3.50
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	3.00	3.83	4.00	3.00	4.00	2.67	3.67	4.00	3.33	3.67	2.67	3.67	3.33	4.67	3.00
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets															
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.25	4.63	2.25	4.00	4.50	3.00	3.75	4.25	3.75	2.63	2.00	3.50	3.67	5.50	3.63
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.17	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.17	4.00	3.67	2.83	2.33	3.67	3.67	5.67	4.00
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.33	3.83	3.33	4.00	4.67	2.83	3.83	3.67	3.33	2.33	2.33	3.67	2.67	4.33	3.33
D. Gender Issues															
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	2.75	5.50	5.38	4.50	5.25	5.67	4.63	4.25	5.25	5.00	5.50	4.25	4.00	5.00	5.25
D (ii) Women representatives	1.00	3.83	4.00	3.33	3.67	4.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.83	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.00	3.50
E. Public resource management and accountability															
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	2.50	3.50	5.75	3.50	4.25	3.00	3.25	4.38	3.50	3.25	2.75	3.50	3.25	4.50	3.75
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.25	4.00	3.75	2.63	3.75	3.75	3.88	3.50	3.25	3.25	4.50	3.38
Average of all indicators	2.94	3.88	4.12	3.57	4.30	3.52	3.43	4.00	3.80	3.41	3.15	3.69	3.57	4.68	3.49

Table 3: Asia and the Pacific (continued)

RSP Indicator	Marshall Islands	Mongolia	Myanmar	Nepal	Niue	Pakistan	Papua New Guinea	Philippines	Samoa	Solomon Islands	Sri Lanka	Tajikistan	Thailand	Timor-Leste	Tonga
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations															
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	3.75	4.00	2.50	3.88	3.75	3.75	3.70	5.00	3.63	3.25	4.25	3.50	4.50	3.25	4.00
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.75	3.50	2.00	2.88	3.75	3.75	3.63	4.25	3.50	2.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	2.25	3.50
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology															
B (i) Access to land	4.00	3.50	2.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.75	2.50	3.50	3.00	4.50	2.50	2.63
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.25	3.00	2.75	3.50	3.00	3.50	2.50	4.25	3.63	2.50	3.25	3.50	4.75	2.50	3.75
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	2.33	3.00	2.67	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.67	3.00	3.67	3.00	3.33	2.67	4.33	3.00	3.67
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets															
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	2.50	4.00	2.00	3.75	2.50	4.00	3.25	4.13	3.88	2.50	4.00	3.75	4.67	2.75	2.88
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.83	4.00	2.00	3.83	3.50	4.00	3.67	3.83	4.17	3.00	3.67	4.00	5.67	3.17	4.00
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.33	2.67	2.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.33	3.33	3.00	4.00	2.67	5.00	2.67	3.33
D. Gender Issues															
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.50	5.75	4.25	4.13	4.25	3.63	3.38	5.50	5.00	3.50	5.50	5.00	5.00	4.25	5.13
D (ii) Women representatives	3.00	3.33	1.33	3.67	3.00	3.33	2.33	4.33	3.67	3.00	4.33	3.67	4.33	3.67	3.17
E. Public resource management and accountability															
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.50	3.50	1.75	3.88	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.63	3.38	3.75	3.75	4.25	3.00	2.88
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.63	3.25	1.50	2.63	3.50	3.38	2.63	3.75	3.88	2.75	3.25	3.00	4.75	3.00	2.75
Average of all indicators	3.45	3.63	2.28	3.55	3.40	3.61	3.28	4.05	3.81	2.91	3.90	3.50	4.65	3.00	3.47

Table 3: Asia and the Pacific (continued)

RSP Indicator	Viet Nam	Regional Average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations		
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.50	3.78
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	3.88	3.49
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology		
B (i) Access to land	3.75	3.50
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.50	3.38
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.00	3.41
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets		
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.63	3.52
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.00	3.77
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.83	3.43
D. Gender Issues		
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	5.25	4.72
D (ii) Women representatives	4.67	3.60
E. Public resource management and accountability		
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	3.54
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.13	3.38
Average of all indicators	4.18	3.63

Table 4: Latin America and the Caribbean

RSP Indicator	Argentina	Belize	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Brazil	Colombia	Dominican Republic	Ecuador	El Salvador	Grenada	Guatemala	Guyana	Haiti	Honduras	Jamaica	Mexico
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations															
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.81	4.00	4.63	5.75	3.84	4.25	4.59	4.75	4.19	4.00	3.81	4.18	3.75	4.06	4.31
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.88	3.58	4.31	5.00	3.38	4.50	4.23	4.19	4.25	3.75	4.06	3.94	3.94	4.44	4.44
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology															
B (i) Access to land	4.38	3.25	3.81	4.38	3.31	4.00	3.80	3.75	4.25	3.75	4.25	3.06	3.44	3.89	4.56
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.25	2.94	3.28	3.88	3.40	3.94	3.85	3.63	3.69	3.88	4.00	4.06	3.50	4.50	4.00
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.67	3.33	2.75	4.33	3.80	4.00	4.31	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.08	3.50	3.83	3.83
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets															
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.88	3.94	4.00	5.13	3.44	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.00	4.13	3.63	4.13	3.75	3.75	4.50
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.25	3.58	3.05	4.83	4.53	3.83	3.98	4.50	4.08	4.67	3.67	3.67	4.17	4.67	4.42
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.33	3.50	3.80	4.33	3.93	4.67	4.01	4.17	4.25	4.83	4.00	3.50	3.58	4.00	3.83
D. Gender Issues															
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	5.50	4.75	4.56	6.00	5.05	4.88	5.25	5.00	5.13	5.00	4.31	3.88	4.13	5.50	5.00
D (ii) Women representatives	4.50	3.33	4.33	5.33	4.50	4.17	4.70	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.17	3.50	4.00	4.75	3.83
E. Public resource management and accountability															
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.50	3.00	4.15	4.88	3.95	4.13	4.38	4.63	4.19	3.75	4.00	3.44	3.75	3.88	4.63
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.50	3.19	4.05	4.50	3.00	3.88	3.98	4.38	4.44	4.00	3.81	3.63	3.94	4.06	4.25
Average of all indicators	4.54	3.53	3.89	4.86	3.84	4.23	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.12	3.98	3.67	3.79	4.28	4.30

Table 4: Latin America and the Caribbean (continued)

RSP Indicator	Nicaragua	Panama	Paraguay	Peru	Suriname	Uruguay	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	4.44	4.31	4.00	4.95	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.41
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.06	3.38	4.25	3.70	4.00	5.13	4.75	4.19
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology								
B (i) Access to land	3.69	4.00	3.75	4.15	4.00	4.25	4.25	3.91
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.31	4.25	4.00	4.15	4.50	3.75	3.88	3.85
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	3.83	3.92	3.50	3.93	3.67	4.33	4.33	3.85
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets								
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.63	3.94	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.88	3.88	4.10
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	3.83	4.67	4.17	5.00	3.33	5.00	4.67	4.21
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	3.50	4.33	3.83	4.20	3.00	4.17	4.17	4.00
D. Gender Issues								
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.95	4.88	4.00	4.60	5.00	5.75	5.25	4.88
D (ii) Women representatives	3.67	4.00	3.83	4.20	3.67	4.00	5.00	4.20
E. Public resource management and accountability								
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.94	4.13	3.63	4.30	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.08
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.88	3.88	4.00	4.30	3.25	4.75	4.00	3.98
Average of all indicators	3.81	4.14	3.91	4.33	3.91	4.60	4.43	4.14

Table 5: Near East and North Africa

RSP Indicator	Albania	Armenia	Azerbaijan	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Djibouti	Egypt	Georgia	Iraq	Lebanon	Republic of Moldova	Morocco	Sudan	Syrian Arab Republic	Tunisia	Turkey
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations															
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.50	5.00	4.25	4.50	3.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	3.75	4.13	4.25	4.25
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.50	4.25	4.00	4.50	3.00	4.50	4.00	3.88	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.75
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology															
B (i) Access to land	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.25	3.50	5.00	4.75	3.88	4.25	4.75	4.25	3.38	4.38	4.25	4.75
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	4.25	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.75	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.25	3.75	4.75	4.63	5.00
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	2.33	4.17	3.67	3.33	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.33	4.17	3.50	4.67
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets															
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.88	4.75	3.50	4.75	4.50	5.00	3.75	4.25	3.63	3.75
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	3.83	4.67	4.67	4.33	3.50	4.67	5.00	5.00
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.33	5.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	2.67	4.67	4.33	4.33	3.50	4.50	5.33	4.67
D. Gender Issues															
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	4.50	5.50	5.00	4.25	4.50	4.25	4.75	3.88	5.50	5.75	3.75	3.75	4.75	5.50	4.50
D (ii) Women representatives	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.50	4.00	3.67	4.67	5.00	3.50	3.83	5.00	4.00	3.67
E. Public resource management and accountability															
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.13	3.25	4.63	3.75	4.00	4.75	4.25	4.38	2.88	5.38	4.50	4.75
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.88	4.00	2.75	4.00	4.25	3.88	3.00	3.75	4.00	4.00
Average of all indicators	4.33	4.66	4.17	4.16	3.52	4.59	4.24	3.57	4.46	4.50	4.19	3.53	4.50	4.38	4.48

Table 5: Near East and North Africa (continued)

RSP Indicator	Yemen	Regional average
A. Strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organizations		
A (i) Policy and legal framework for ROs	4.50	4.35
A (ii) Dialogue between government and ROs	4.00	4.09
B. Improving equitable access to productive natural resources and technology		
B (i) Access to land	4.50	4.40
B (ii) Access to water for agriculture	3.75	4.26
B (iii) Access to agric research and extension services	4.00	3.78
C. Increasing access to financial services and markets		
C (i) Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	4.00	4.28
C (ii) Investment climate for rural business	4.50	4.43
C (iii) Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.33	4.25
D. Gender Issues		
D (i) Access to education in rural areas	3.50	4.60
D (ii) Women representatives	3.00	4.05
E. Public resource management and accountability		
E (i) Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	4.00	4.20
E (ii) Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.25	3.73
Average of all indicators	3.94	4.20