Development Partner Profile

African Development Bank

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the African Development Bank. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the African Development Bank’s influenced the policy agenda (n=657), provided useful advice (n=443), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=315). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the African Development Bank’s Development Finance go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Partner Countries</th>
<th>Distribution of the African Development Bank’s Development Finance, 2004-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. South Africa (9%, 4890.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Morocco (9%, 4688.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Egypt (6%, 3458.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ethiopia (5%, 2561.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DRC (5%, 2447.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nigeria (4%, 2245.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tunisia (4%, 2219.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Botswana (4%, 2013.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tanzania (3%, 1805.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kenya (3%, 1741.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the African Development Bank performing the best?

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
- **Provides useful advice* (1-5)**
- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the African Development Bank's performance?

2.4

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.4 to the African Development Bank's agenda-setting influence, 0.4 above the average country.

3.3

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the African Development Bank's usefulness of advice.

3.2

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to the African Development Bank's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

The African Development Bank's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

**The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems and policy reform implementation.

The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Andean Development Corporation

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Andean Development Corporation. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Andean Development Corporation’s influenced the policy agenda (n=54), provided useful advice (n=44), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Andean Development Corporation’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Peru (17%, 11035.7)
2. Colombia (15%, 9838.1)
3. Brazil (14%, 8947.6)
4. Argentina (11%, 6723.9)
5. Ecuador (10%, 6649.1)
6. Bolivia (10%, 6337.8)
7. Venezuela (9%, 5955)
8. Uruguay (4%, 2610.4)
9. Panama (4%, 2232.2)
10. Costa Rica (1%, 448.4)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the Andean Development Corporation’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

In which countries is the Andean Development Corporation performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Andean Development Corporation's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.1 to the Andean Development Corporation’s agenda-setting influence, 0.1 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.3 to the Andean Development Corporation’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to the Andean Development Corporation’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Andean Development Corporation's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence
- 0 = no influence at all
- 5 = maximum influence

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
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Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa
Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's influenced the policy agenda (n=85), provided useful advice (n=59), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=21). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)
1. Senegal (6%, 116.3)
2. Tanzania (6%, 104.5)
3. Mozambique (5%, 98.4)
4. Kenya (5%, 94.8)
5. Ethiopia (4%, 81.5)
6. Malawi (4%, 72.3)
7. Burkina Faso (4%, 71.6)
8. Mali (4%, 71)
9. Côte d'Ivoire (4%, 68)
10. Uganda (3%, 64.9)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database


Insufficient data

In which countries is the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)
Provides useful advice (1-5)
Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.3 to the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's agenda-setting influence, 0.6 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.4 to the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.9 to the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Arab Monetary Fund

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Arab Monetary Fund. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Arab Monetary Fund’s influenced the policy agenda (n=46), provided useful advice (n=29), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=10). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Arab Monetary Fund’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distribution of Arab Monetary Fund’s Development Finance, 2004-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</td>
<td>(millions of USD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insufficient data

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Arab Monetary Fund performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Arab Monetary Fund's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.7 to Arab Monetary Fund's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 below the average country.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to Arab Monetary Fund's usefulness of advice.

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to Arab Monetary Fund's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Arab Monetary Fund's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Asian Development Bank

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Asian Development Bank. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Asian Development Bank’s influenced the policy agenda (n=548), provided useful advice (n=338), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=240). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Asian Development Bank’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

1. China (15%, 10967)
2. Pakistan (13%, 9269.8)
3. Vietnam (11%, 7964)
4. India (11%, 7944.2)
5. Bangladesh (9%, 6653.9)
6. Indonesia (8%, 5616.7)
7. Philippines (5%, 3659.6)
8. Sri Lanka (4%, 3073.1)
9. Afghanistan (3%, 2489.2)
10. Uzbekistan (3%, 2132.9)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the Asian Development Bank’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

(1-5)

In which countries is the Asian Development Bank performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Asian Development Bank's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.7 to the Asian Development Bank's agenda-setting influence, 0.7 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to the Asian Development Bank's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to the Asian Development Bank's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Asian Development Bank's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Survey respondents gave an average score of 3.4 to the Asian Development Bank's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to the Asian Development Bank's agenda-setting influence, 0.7 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to the Asian Development Bank's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.
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Australia Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Australia. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Australia’s influenced the policy agenda (n=562), provided useful advice (n=313), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=160). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Australia’s Development Finance go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Partner Countries</th>
<th>Distribution of Australia’s Development Finance, 2004-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</td>
<td>(millions of USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Indonesia (14%, 5272.8)</td>
<td>5272.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Papua New Guinea (13%, 4861.2)</td>
<td>4861.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Solomon Islands (7%, 2478.1)</td>
<td>2478.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Philippines (4%, 1667.5)</td>
<td>1667.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Iraq (4%, 1660.7)</td>
<td>1660.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Afghanistan (3%, 1151.4)</td>
<td>1151.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vietnam (3%, 1109.1)</td>
<td>1109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timor-Leste (3%, 1010)</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bangladesh (2%, 636.1)</td>
<td>636.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pakistan (2%, 591.6)</td>
<td>591.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Australia performing the best?

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
- **Provides useful advice* (1-5)**
- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.**

**Source:** AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

### How do in-country stakeholders perceive Australia's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

![Bar chart showing Australia's and the average development partner's influence on the policy agenda.](Image)

- **Australia:** 1.5
- **Average Development Partner:** 2.3

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.5 to Australia's agenda-setting influence, 0.4 below the average country.

**Provides useful advice***

![Bar chart showing Australia's and the average development partner's usefulness of advice.](Image)

- **Australia:** 2.9
- **Average Development Partner:** 3.6

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to Australia's usefulness of advice. *The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.***

**Helpful in implementation**

![Bar chart showing Australia's and the average development partner's helpfulness in implementation.](Image)

- **Australia:** 2.9
- **Average Development Partner:** 3.7

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.9 to Australia's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

**Source:** AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

### Australia's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

![Graph showing the distribution of development finance and influence by policy area.](Image)

- **Economic policy**
- **Social and environmental policy**
- **Governance policy**

**Policy Domain**

**Agenda-setting influence**

![Circle graph showing the level of agenda-setting influence.](Image)

- **0** = no influence at all
- **5** = maximum influence

- **Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)**

- **Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**Source:** AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

### Citation

Development Partner Profile

Austria

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Austria. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Austria’s influenced the policy agenda (n=89), provided useful advice (n=56), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=24). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Austria’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Iraq (27%, 2657.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cameroon (6%, 601.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. China (5%, 482.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nigeria (4%, 376.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Serbia (3%, 323.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bosnia and Herzegovina (3%, 306.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Turkey (3%, 297.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vietnam (2%, 153.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. DRC (1%, 146.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uganda (1%, 134.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Austria’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

(millions of USD)

In which countries is Austria performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Austria's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.8 to Austria's agenda-setting influence, 0.2 below the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.6 to Austria's usefulness of advice.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to Austria's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

*Austria's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.6 to Austria's usefulness of advice. The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Austria's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Austria's influenced the policy agenda (n=89), provided useful advice (n=56), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation.

Leaders evaluated the degree to which private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25.

Policy Domain

- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Austria's influenced the policy agenda (n=89), provided useful advice (n=56), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation.

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation

Belgium
Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Belgium. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Belgium’s influenced the policy agenda (n=201), provided useful advice (n=131), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=63). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Belgium's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. DRC (15%, 2793)
2. Iraq (5%, 965.4)
3. Burundi (4%, 681.7)
4. Rwanda (3%, 604.9)
5. Nigeria (2%, 449.9)
6. Côte d’Ivoire (2%, 421.1)
7. Vietnam (2%, 355.5)
8. Niger (2%, 295)
9. Palestine (2%, 294.3)
10. Mozambique (2%, 287.1)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Belgium performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Belgium's performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences the policy agenda</th>
<th>Provides useful advice*</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belgium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average Development Partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.7 to Belgium's agenda-setting influence, 2.8 to Belgium's usefulness of advice, and 3.1 to Belgium's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Belgium's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

** The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Belgium's performance?

- **Economic policy**: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
- **Social and environmental policy**: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development
- **Governance policy**: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation
Brazil
Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Brazil. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Brazil’s influenced the policy agenda (n=227), provided useful advice (n=153), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=37). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Brazil's Development Finance go?
Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)
1. Mozambique (32%, 62.3)
2. Haiti (9%, 18)
3. Sao Tome and Principe (9%, 16.8)
4. Timor-Leste (7%, 14)
5. Guinea-Bissau (6%, 12)
6. Cape Verde (5%, 10.3)
7. Angola (4%, 8.4)
8. Paraguay (2%, 4.5)
9. Algeria (2%, 4.3)
10. Senegal (2%, 3.6)

Distribution of Brazil’s Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Brazil performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Williamsburg, VA: AidData.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Brazil’s performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.5 to Brazil’s agenda-setting influence, 0.5 below the average country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences the policy agenda</th>
<th>Provides useful advice*</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Average Development Partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to Brazil’s usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to Brazil’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Brazil’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
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Canada

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Canada. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Canada’s influenced the policy agenda (n=927), provided useful advice (n=484), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=219). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Canada's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2,288.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1,880.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1,063.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1,022.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1,021.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>962.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>961.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>784.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>688.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Canada’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Canada performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (0-5)</th>
<th>Provides useful advice* (1-5)</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Canada’s performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.7 to Canada’s agenda-setting influence, 0.3 below the average country.

**Provides useful advice**

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to Canada’s usefulness of advice.

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.9 to Canada’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Canada’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Caribbean Development Bank

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Caribbean Development Bank. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Caribbean Development Bank’s influenced the policy agenda (n=47), provided useful advice (n=36), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=17). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Caribbean Development Bank's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Jamaica (30%, 353.6)
2. St. Lucia (9%, 100.3)
3. St.Vincent & Grenadines (8%, 95.2)
4. Belize (8%, 93.6)
5. Grenada (8%, 90.7)
6. Barbados (6%, 74.7)
7. Antigua & Barbuda (5%, 56.6)
8. St. Kitts & Nevis (5%, 56.1)
9. Dominica (4%, 45.9)
10. Anguilla (3%, 34.8)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the Caribbean Development Bank's Development Finance, 2004-2013

(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the Caribbean Development Bank performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Belize

Jamaica

Guyana

Haiti

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Jamaica

Haiti

Belize

Guyana

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Caribbean Development Bank's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.5 to the Caribbean Development Bank’s agenda-setting influence, 0.6 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 4.0 to the Caribbean Development Bank’s usefulness of advice.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to the Caribbean Development Bank’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

The Caribbean Development Bank's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Level of usefulness of advice (1-5)

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Central American Bank for Economic Integration

Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Central American Bank for Economic Integration. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Central American Bank for Economic Integration’s influenced the policy agenda, provided useful advice, and how helpful this development partner was in implementation. The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Central American Bank for Economic Integration's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

Distribution of Central American Bank for Economic Integration's Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

Insufficient data

In which countries is Central American Bank for Economic Integration performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Central American Bank for Economic Integration's performance?

1.5

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.5 to Central American Bank for Economic Integration's agenda-setting influence, 0.5 below the average country.

2.3

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.3 to Central American Bank for Economic Integration's usefulness of advice.

2.9

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.9 to Central American Bank for Economic Integration's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Central American Bank for Economic Integration's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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China Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of China. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which China’s influenced the policy agenda (n=480), provided useful advice (n=370), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=103). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does China's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(In millions USD by % of development finance)

Insufficient data
Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of China’s Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Insufficient data
Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is China performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive China’s performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

1.6

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.6 to China’s agenda-setting influence, 0.4 below the average country.

**Provides useful advice**

2.6

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to China’s usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

**Helpful in implementation**

2.7

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to China’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

China’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

**Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

---

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0= no influence at all
5= maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Denmark

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Denmark. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Denmark's influenced the policy agenda (n=144), provided useful advice (n=81), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=56). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Denmark's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Tanzania (6%, 1265.8)
2. Mozambique (5%, 899.7)
3. Kenya (4%, 814)
4. Ghana (4%, 786.4)
5. Vietnam (4%, 748.7)
6. Uganda (4%, 737.5)
7. Afghanistan (3%, 653.8)
8. Bangladesh (3%, 626.9)
9. Burkina Faso (3%, 503.2)
10. Benin (2%, 425.6)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Denmark's Development Finance, 2004-2013

(millions of USD)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Denmark performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Denmark's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.3 to Denmark's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to Denmark's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to Denmark's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Denmark’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.
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**European Bank for Reconstruction and Development**

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development’s influenced the policy agenda (n=227), provided useful advice (n=119), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=57). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Russia (27%, 9124)
2. Ukraine (12%, 3985.5)
3. Kazakhstan (7%, 2295.8)
4. Romania (6%, 1929.5)
5. Poland (4%, 1292)
6. Turkey (4%, 1200.9)
7. Azerbaijan (3%, 1161.3)
8. Serbia and Montenegro (3%, 1160.4)
9. Bulgaria (3%, 1093.6)
10. Bosnia and Herzegovina (3%, 1056.1)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (0-5)</th>
<th>Provides useful advice* (1-5)</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.4 to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's agenda-setting influence, 0.5 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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**European Union**

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the European Union. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the European Union’s influenced the policy agenda (n=1982), provided useful advice (n=1154), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=833). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the European Union's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount (in USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Turkey</td>
<td>21,675.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Serbia</td>
<td>6,423.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Morocco</td>
<td>5,174.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Egypt</td>
<td>4,393.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Palestine</td>
<td>4,143.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ukraine</td>
<td>3,866.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Afghanistan</td>
<td>3,650.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tunisia</td>
<td>3,430.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. DRC</td>
<td>2,780.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2,729.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the European Union's Development Finance, 2004-2013

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

In which countries is the European Union performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = not influential</td>
<td>5 = extremely influential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = not at all useful</td>
<td>5 = extremely useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = not helpful</td>
<td>5 = extremely helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the European Union's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 3.0 to the European Union's agenda-setting influence, 1.0 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the European Union's usefulness of advice.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to the European Union's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The European Union's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain

- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0= no influence at all
5= maximum influence

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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**Development Partner Profile**

**Finland**

**Summary**

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Finland. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Finland’s influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Where does Finland’s Development Finance go?**

**Top Partner Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>6%, 617.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>4%, 417.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4%, 381.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4%, 352.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3%, 314.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3%, 292.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>3%, 292.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>3%, 274.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2%, 187.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2%, 163.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database*

**Distribution of Finland’s Development Finance, 2004-2013**

**In which countries is Finland performing the best?**

**Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**

- Zambia

**Provides useful advice* (1-5)**

- Zambia

**Helpful in implementation (0-5)**

**Insufficient data**

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.*

*Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25*
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Finland's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Average Development Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.6 to Finland's agenda-setting influence, 0.4 below the average country.

Provides useful advice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Average Development Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.8 to Finland's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Helpful in implementation

Insufficient data

Finland's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic policy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental policy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance policy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda-setting influence

Insufficient data

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Development Partner Profile

France Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of France. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which France’s influenced the policy agenda (n=1023), provided useful advice (n=556), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=259). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does France’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries (in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Morocco (6%, 6594)
2. Côte d'Ivoire (5%, 4760.7)
3. Nigeria (4%, 4618.3)
4. Congo (4%, 3831.8)
5. Cameroon (3%, 3510.6)
6. China (3%, 3397.5)
7. Senegal (3%, 3104.5)
8. Tunisia (3%, 3044.8)
9. Iraq (3%, 2931.5)
10. Vietnam (3%, 2737.8)

Distribution of France’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is France performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive France's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.7 to France's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to France's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to France's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

France's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Development Partner Profile

Germany Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Germany. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Germany’s influenced the policy agenda (n=1386), provided useful advice (n=809), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=435). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Germany's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD by % of development finance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7% (8310.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>6% (7552.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5% (6108.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3% (3914.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3% (3839.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2% (2570.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2% (2330.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2% (2011.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2% (1983.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2% (1983.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Germany's Development Finance, 2004-2013

In which countries is Germany performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Germany's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.1 to Germany's agenda-setting influence, 0.1 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.1 to Germany's usefulness of advice. *The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to Germany's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Germany's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0= no influence at all
5= maximum influence

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation
Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization’s influenced the policy agenda (n=16), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=15). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>619.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>332.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>298.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>279.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>224.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>193.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>156.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>147.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>139.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

In which countries is the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization performing the best?

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
  - Insufficient data

- **Provides useful advice (1-5)**
  - Insufficient data

- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**
  - Insufficient data

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.9 to the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's agenda-setting influence, 0.9 above the average country.

**Provides useful advice**

Survey respondents gave a score of 4.0 to the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.9 to the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Insufficient data</th>
<th>Agenda-setting influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic policy</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental policy</td>
<td>Social and environmental policy</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance policy</td>
<td>Governance policy</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

**The Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area**

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

**Governance:** land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

**Economic:** macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

**Environment & Social:** health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.**

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation

Global Environment Facility

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Global Environment Facility. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Global Environment Facility’s influenced the policy agenda (n=85), provided useful advice (n=63), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=26). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Global Environment Facility’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. China (8%, 690.3)
2. India (4%, 382.1)
3. Brazil (4%, 352.3)
4. Mexico (3%, 311.1)
5. Russia (2%, 145.9)
6. Indonesia (2%, 140.9)
7. South Africa (1%, 128.2)
8. Egypt (1%, 127.2)
9. Philippines (1%, 123.8)
10. Vietnam (1%, 114.7)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the Global Environment Facility performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Global Environment Facility’s performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.6 to the Global Environment Facility's agenda-setting influence, 0.7 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to the Global Environment Facility’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to the Global Environment Facility’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Global Environment Facility's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

- **Influences the policy agenda**: The Global Environment Facility has a score of 2.6 compared to an average of 1.9 for development partners.
- **Provides useful advice**: The Global Environment Facility has a score of 3.2 compared to an average of 2.5 for development partners.
- **Helpful in implementation**: The Global Environment Facility has a score of 3.5 compared to an average of 3.0 for development partners.

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

**Policy Domain**
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

**Agenda-setting influence**

- 0 = no influence at all
- 5 = maximum influence

Goverance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**Source**: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
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Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s influenced the policy agenda (n=114), provided useful advice (n=61), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=36). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD by % of development finance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nigeria</td>
<td>7%, 1527.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tanzania</td>
<td>6%, 1323.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. India</td>
<td>5%, 1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rwanda</td>
<td>5%, 964.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ethiopia</td>
<td>4%, 869.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DRC</td>
<td>3%, 717.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. China</td>
<td>3%, 664.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Zambia</td>
<td>3%, 640.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. South Africa</td>
<td>3%, 552.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2%, 529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (in millions USD)

In which countries is the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Moldova
- Myanmar
- Belize
- Cambodia
- Guyana

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

- Belize
- Georgia

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.7 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s agenda-setting influence, 0.7 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.9 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.7 to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
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Greece

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Greece. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Greece's influenced the policy agenda (n=29), provided useful advice (n=15), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=0). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Greece's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Albania (19%, 406.2)
2. Serbia (11%, 236.2)
3. Afghanistan (5%, 98.6)
4. Egypt (3%, 66.4)
5. Palestine (3%, 57.6)
6. Bosnia and Herzegovina (2%, 51.7)
7. Turkey (2%, 50.6)
8. Lebanon (2%, 36.6)
9. Syria (2%, 36.2)
10. Kosovo (2%, 34.1)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Greece's Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

Where does Greece's Development Finance go?

In which countries is Greece performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Greece's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.0 to Greece's agenda-setting influence, 0.9 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 1.7 to Greece's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Greece's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

* The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Development Partner Profile

India Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of India. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which India’s influenced the policy agenda (n=237), provided useful advice (n=182), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=41). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does India’s Development Finance go?

### Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD by % of development finance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>708.7 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>608.1 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>386.6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>289.8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>214.8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>112.7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>108.2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>105 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>104.4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>66.6 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

### Distribution of India’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

![Map showing distribution of India’s Development Finance](image)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is India performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (0-5)</th>
<th>Provides useful advice* (1-5)</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive India's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

1.4

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.4 to India's agenda-setting influence, 0.6 below the average country.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

**Provides useful advice**

2.8

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to India's usefulness of advice.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

**Helpful in implementation**

2.6

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to India's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

India's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

![Graph showing the level of usefulness of advice by policy domain](image)

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Goverance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomc management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation
InterAmerican Development Bank Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the InterAmerican Development Bank. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the InterAmerican Development Bank’s influenced the policy agenda (n=321), provided useful advice (n=231), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=163). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the InterAmerican Development Bank's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)
1. Brazil (20%, 11814.4)
2. Argentina (13%, 7863.5)
3. Mexico (11%, 6424.6)
4. Colombia (8%, 4763.9)
5. Peru (6%, 3609.3)
6. Costa Rica (4%, 2129.4)
7. Ecuador (3%, 1591.4)
8. Uruguay (3%, 1528.5)
9. Bolivia (3%, 1516.2)
10. Haiti (2%, 1443.9)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the InterAmerican Development Bank's Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the InterAmerican Development Bank performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)
Evaluation of impact on policy agenda

Provides useful advice*
Evaluation of usefulness of advice

Helpful in implementation (0-5)
Evaluation of usefulness in implementation

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the InterAmerican Development Bank's performance?

### Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 3.1 to the InterAmerican Development Bank's agenda-setting influence, 1.2 above the average country.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

### Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the InterAmerican Development Bank's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

### Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to the InterAmerican Development Bank's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The InterAmerican Development Bank's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

**Agenda-setting influence**

- 0 = no influence at all
- 5 = maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.**

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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International Fund for Agricultural Development

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the International Fund for Agricultural Development. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s influenced the policy agenda (n=50), provided useful advice (n=38), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the International Fund for Agricultural Development's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD by % of development finance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>India (5%, 279.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>China (4%, 244.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nigeria (4%, 239.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ethiopia (4%, 216.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bangladesh (4%, 215.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Vietnam (3%, 177.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pakistan (3%, 168.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Brazil (3%, 160.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Burkina Faso (3%, 146.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Tanzania (2%, 138.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

In which countries is the International Fund for Agricultural Development performing the best?

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
  - Madagascar
  - Insufficient data

- **Provides useful advice (1-5)**
  - Insufficient data

- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**
  - Insufficient data

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s performance?

2.1 Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.1 to the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s agenda-setting influence, 0.1 above the average country.

3.0 Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s usefulness of advice.

3.5 Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The International Fund for Agricultural Development’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Insufficient data

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation
International Monetary Fund
Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the International Monetary Fund. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the International Monetary Fund’s influenced the policy agenda (n=999), provided useful advice (n=642), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=437). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the International Monetary Fund’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)
1. Mexico (23%, 44556.9)
2. Poland (16%, 31554.5)
3. Greece (9%, 18459.9)
4. Portugal (8%, 15121.7)
5. Ukraine (7%, 14631.3)
6. Ireland (7%, 13594.3)
7. Romania (5%, 10359.7)
8. Colombia (5%, 9399.7)
9. Hungary (4%, 6993.4)
10. Turkey (3%, 5483.7)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the International Monetary Fund’s Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

In which countries is the International Monetary Fund performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the International Monetary Fund's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 3.1 to the International Monetary Fund’s agenda-setting influence, 1.1 above the average country.

**Provides useful advice***

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.6 to the International Monetary Fund's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.8 to the International Monetary Fund's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

### The International Monetary Fund's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

- **Policy Domain**
  - Economic policy
  - Social and environmental policy
  - Governance policy

- **Agenda-setting influence**
  - 0= no influence at all
  - 5= maximum influence

### Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

- Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
- Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
- Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Development Partner Profile

Iran

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Iran. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Iran’s influenced the policy agenda (n=57), provided useful advice (n=48), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=3). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Iran’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

Distribution of Iran’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

Insufficient data

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Iran performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Afghanistan

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential

1 = not at all useful
5 = extremely useful

0 = not at all helpful
5 = extremely helpful

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Iran's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 0.8 to Iran’s agenda-setting influence, 1.1 below the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.2 to Iran's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Iran’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Ireland

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Ireland. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Ireland’s influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Ireland's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries  
(In millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Mozambique (9%, 570.4)  
2. Uganda (9%, 528.3)  
3. Ethiopia (8%, 493.7)  
4. Tanzania (7%, 454.8)  
5. Zambia (5%, 297.1)  
6. Malawi (3%, 168.8)  
7. Vietnam (2%, 152.2)  
8. Sudan (2%, 147)  
9. South Africa (2%, 140.6)  
10. Lesotho (2%, 138.3)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Ireland performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Agenda-setting Influence</th>
<th>Useful Advice</th>
<th>Helpful in Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0 = no influence at all</td>
<td>1 = not at all useful</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1 = maximum influence</td>
<td>5 = extremely useful</td>
<td>5 = extremely helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Ireland's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.3 to Ireland's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to Ireland's usefulness of advice.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 4.1 to Ireland's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Ireland's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Insufficient data

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Islamic Development Bank
Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Islamic Development Bank. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Islamic Development Bank’s influenced the policy agenda (n=212), provided useful advice (n=168), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=65). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Islamic Development Bank's Development Finance go?
Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Indonesia (8%, 621.1)
2. Morocco (8%, 607.5)
3. Turkey (7%, 524.3)
4. Uzbekistan (7%, 504.4)
5. Iran (5%, 357.4)
6. Egypt (4%, 325.3)
7. Uganda (4%, 293.3)
8. Senegal (4%, 275.6)
9. Burkina Faso (3%, 248)
10. Iraq (3%, 242.8)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the Islamic Development Bank's Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the Islamic Development Bank performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda
(0-5)

Provides useful advice*
(1-5)

Helpful in implementation
(0-5)

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Insufficient data

Insufficient data

Insufficient data

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential
1 = not at all useful
5 = extremely useful
0 = not at all helpful
5 = extremely helpful
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Islamic Development Bank's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.6 to the Islamic Development Bank's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to the Islamic Development Bank's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.1 to the Islamic Development Bank's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The Islamic Development Bank's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Citation
**Development Partner Profile**

**Japan**

**Summary**

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Japan. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s *2014 Reform Efforts Survey* and *2004-2013 Core Database*. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Japan’s influenced the policy agenda (n=1235), provided useful advice (n=808), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=384). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Where does Japan's Development Finance go?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Partner Countries</th>
<th>Distribution of Japan's Development Finance, 2004-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</td>
<td>(millions of USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. India (13%, 24329.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vietnam (9%, 15826.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Iraq (8%, 13911)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indonesia (7%, 12925.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Philippines (4%, 7730.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. China (4%, 7525)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bangladesh (3%, 5979.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Myanmar (2%, 4447.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sri Lanka (2%, 4225.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Afghanistan (2%, 4124.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

**In which countries is Japan performing the best?**

**Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**

- Ghana
- Vietnam
- Marshall Islands
- Laos
- Myanmar
- Belize
- Mongolia
- Mozambique
- Palestine
- Côte d’Ivoire

**Provides useful advice* (1-5)**

- Serbia
- Gambia
- Fiji
- Tanzania
- Benin
- Nigeria
- Kyrgyzstan
- Jamaica
- Vietnam
- Mauritania

**Helpful in implementation (0-5)**

- Macedonia
- Mongolia
- Laos
- Madagascar
- Bhutan
- Paraguay
- Philippines
- Tonga
- Morocco
- Ghana

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Japan's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.8 to Japan's agenda-setting influence, 0.1 below the average country.

**Provides useful advice**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to Japan's usefulness of advice.

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.1 to Japan's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Japan’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

**Policy Domain**

- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

**Agenda-setting influence**

0= no influence at all
5= maximum influence

Goverance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.**

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Kuwait

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Kuwait. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Kuwait influenced the policy agenda (n=137), provided useful advice (n=114), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=28). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Kuwait's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1272.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>808.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>440.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>290.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>262.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>224.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>209.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>201.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>198.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Kuwait's Development Finance, 2004-2013

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.*

In which countries is Kuwait performing the best?

**Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**

- Mongolia
- Yemen
- Sudan
- Afghanistan
- Togo
- Jordan
- Liberia

**Provides useful advice* (1-5)**

- Sudan
- Mongolia
- Yemen
- Togo
- Jordan
- Morocco

**Helpful in implementation (0-5)**

Insufficient data

*0 = not at all helpful
1 = not at all useful
5 = extremely helpful

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Kuwait's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.0 to Kuwait's agenda-setting influence, 0.9 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.3 to Kuwait's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.4 to Kuwait's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Kuwait's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Luxembourg

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Luxembourg. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Luxembourg’s influenced the policy agenda (n=34), provided useful advice (n=15), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Luxembourg’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of Development Finance</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>191.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>186.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>181.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>165.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>145.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>134.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>112.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>107.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Luxembourg’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

Distribution (millions of USD)

In which countries is Luxembourg performing the best?

- Influences the policy agenda (0-5)
  - Laos
  - El Salvador
  - Kosovo

- Provides useful advice* (1-5)
  - El Salvador

- Helpful in implementation (0-5)
  - Insufficient data

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Luxembourg's performance?

2.6

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.6 to Luxembourg's agenda-setting influence, 0.6 above the average country.

3.7

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.7 to Luxembourg's usefulness of advice.

3.2

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to Luxembourg's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Luxembourg's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0= no influence at all
5= maximum influence

Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Netherlands

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the Netherlands. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the Netherlands' influenced the policy agenda (n=234), provided useful advice (n=107), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=71). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the Netherlands' Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Top Partner Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic management</td>
<td>1. Indonesia (3%, 1665)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>2. Afghanistan (2%, 1327.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business regulatory environment</td>
<td>3. Sudan (2%, 1270.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>4. Ghana (2%, 1084.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>5. Bangladesh (2%, 953.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; mining</td>
<td>6. Mozambique (2%, 922.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>7. Ethiopia (2%, 892.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, credit &amp; banking</td>
<td>8. Tanzania (1%, 785.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>9. DRC (1%, 746.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>10. Mali (1%, 700.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the Netherlands performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Macedonia
- Yemen
- Bangladesh

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

- Macedonia
- Yemen
- Bangladesh

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Burundi
- Macedonia
- Bangladesh
- Yemen

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the Netherlands' performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.3 to the Netherlands' agenda-setting influence, 0.3 above the average country.

**Provides useful advice***

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to the Netherlands' usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the Netherlands' helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey; Q14, Q21, Q25

The Netherlands' Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

**Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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New Zealand

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of New Zealand. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which New Zealand’s influenced the policy agenda (n=61), provided useful advice (n=49), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=37). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does New Zealand's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>314.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>228.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>173.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>164.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>143.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is New Zealand performing the best?

- Influences the policy agenda (0-5):
  - Solomon Islands: 4.8
  - Vanuatu: 4.6
  - Tuvalu: 4.3
  - Samoa: 4.0
  - Tonga: 3.5

- Provides useful advice* (1-5):
  - Samoa: 4.8
  - Tuvalu: 4.6
  - Tonga: 4.3
  - Vanuatu: 4.0
  - Solomon Islands: 3.5

- Helpful in implementation (0-5):
  - Tonga: 5.0
  - Vanuatu: 4.8
  - Solomon Islands: 4.6
  - Samoa: 4.0
  - Tuvalu: 3.5

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive New Zealand's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.3 to New Zealand's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 above the average country.

---

**Provides useful advice**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to New Zealand's usefulness of advice.

---

**Helpful in implementation**

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to New Zealand's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

---

New Zealand’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

---

New Zealand's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

**Policy Domain**

- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

**Agenda-setting influence**

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

---

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

---

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

---
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Norway Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Norway. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Norway’s influenced the policy agenda (n=215), provided useful advice (n=99), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=62). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Norway's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Afghanistan (4%, 1494.2)
2. Tanzania (4%, 1473.7)
3. Palestine (3%, 1167.4)
4. Sudan (3%, 1157.4)
5. Brazil (3%, 1007.7)
6. Malawi (2%, 895.8)
7. Mozambique (2%, 887.2)
8. Uganda (2%, 857.8)
9. Zambia (2%, 766.5)
10. Somalia (2%, 577)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Norway’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

In which countries is Norway performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Zambia
- Malawi
- Timor-Leste
- Palestine
- Montenegro
- Uganda
- Kosovo
- Serbia
- Georgia
- Tanzania

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

- Malawi
- Macedonia
- Kosovo
- Nepal
- Timor-Leste
- Palestine

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Macedonia
- Malawi
- Nepal

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Norway’s performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.1 to Norway’s agenda-setting influence, 0.1 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to Norway’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to Norway’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Norway’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to Norway’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to Norway’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Development Partner Profile

OPEC Fund for International Development

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the OPEC Fund for International Development. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the OPEC Fund for International Development’s influenced the policy agenda (n=134), provided useful advice (n=107), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the OPEC Fund for International Development’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Egypt (5%, 383.1)
2. Morocco (3%, 227.8)
3. Turkey (3%, 224.2)
4. Pakistan (3%, 223.8)
5. Bangladesh (3%, 200.1)
6. Tunisia (2%, 189.6)
7. Paraguay (2%, 164.3)
8. Colombia (2%, 156.1)
9. Yemen (2%, 156.1)
10. Bosnia and Herzegovina (2%, 154.1)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Where does the OPEC Fund for International Development’s Development Finance go?

Distribution of the OPEC Fund for International Development’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is the OPEC Fund for International Development performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the OPEC Fund for International Development's performance?

1.3

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.3 to the OPEC Fund for International Development's agenda-setting influence, 0.7 below the average country.

2.2

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.2 to the OPEC Fund for International Development's usefulness of advice.

2.7

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to the OPEC Fund for International Development's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

The OPEC Fund for International Development's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q1-4, Q21
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Portugal Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Portugal. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Portugal's influenced the policy agenda (n=68), provided useful advice (n=35), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=21). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Portugal's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Development Finance (in millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1097.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1013.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>686.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>340.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>223.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>182.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>145.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Portugal performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (0-5)</th>
<th>Provides useful advice* (1-5)</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Portugal's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

2.3

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.3 to Portugal's agenda-setting influence, 0.3 above the average country.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Provides useful advice*

2.9

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.9 to Portugal's usefulness of advice.*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Helpful in implementation

2.8

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to Portugal's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Portugal's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Mix of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environmental & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Saudi Arabia

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Saudi Arabia. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Saudi Arabia’s influenced the policy agenda (n=121), provided useful advice (n=85), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Saudi Arabia’s Development Finance go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Partner Countries</th>
<th>Distribution of Saudi Arabia’s Development Finance, 2004-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. China (13%, 361.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yemen (9%, 246.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syria (5%, 149.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Morocco (5%, 132.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pakistan (4%, 127.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jordan (4%, 123.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mauritania (4%, 114.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sudan (4%, 105.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Algeria (4%, 101.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sri Lanka (3%, 86.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Saudi Arabia performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (0-5)</th>
<th>Provides useful advice* (1-5)</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Insufficient data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Saudi Arabia's performance?

1.1
Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.1 to Saudi Arabia’s agenda-setting influence, 0.9 below the average country.

2.6
Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to Saudi Arabia’s usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

2.5
Survey respondents gave a score of 2.5 to Saudi Arabia’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Saudi Arabia's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence
- 0= no influence at all
- 5= maximum influence

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
**South Africa**

**Summary**

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of South Africa. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which South Africa’s influenced the policy agenda (n=140), provided useful advice (n=85), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=19). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Where does South Africa's Development Finance go?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Partner Countries</th>
<th>Distribution of South Africa's Development Finance, 2004-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(in millions USD by % of development finance)</td>
<td>(millions of USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— DRC (35%, 69.6)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Zimbabwe (20%, 40)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Guinea (14%, 27.8)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Lesotho (6%, 12.7)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Comoros (3%, 6.7)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Liberia (3%, 6.2)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Sudan (3%, 6.1)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Uganda (2%, 4.8)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Seychelles (2%, 4.6)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Burundi (2%, 4.3)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

**In which countries is South Africa performing the best?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Agenda-setting influence</th>
<th>Usefulness of advice*</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— Economic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Social and environmental</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Governance</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive South Africa’s performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.6 to South Africa’s agenda-setting influence, 0.3 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to South Africa’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.5 to South Africa’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

South Africa’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to South Africa’s agenda-setting influence, 0.3 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to South Africa’s usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.5 to South Africa’s helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, agriculture & rural development

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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South Korea
Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of South Korea. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which South Korea’s influenced the policy agenda (n=190), provided useful advice (n=151), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=65). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does South Korea’s Development Finance go?
Top Partner Countries
(In millions USD by % of development finance)
1. China (16%, 4068.7)
2. Vietnam (15%, 3849)
3. Indonesia (8%, 1997.5)
4. Philippines (4%, 1141.7)
5. Madagascar (4%, 1093.3)
6. India (3%, 839)
7. Mexico (3%, 726.6)
8. Bangladesh (3%, 675.9)
9. Oman (2%, 631.4)
10. Cambodia (2%, 577.1)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is South Korea performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive South Korea's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.2 to South Korea's agenda-setting influence, 0.2 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to South Korea's usefulness of advice.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to South Korea's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

South Korea's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Spain Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Spain. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Spain’s influenced the policy agenda (n=344), provided useful advice (n=200), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=99). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Spain's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Guatemala (4%, 1132.4)
2. Morocco (3%, 1055.9)
3. Nicaragua (3%, 937.6)
4. Peru (3%, 862.6)
5. Tunisia (2%, 749.8)
6. Iraq (2%, 748.5)
7. Colombia (2%, 672.5)
8. Bolivia (2%, 648.6)
9. Honduras (2%, 632.2)
10. El Salvador (2%, 610.5)

Distribution of Spain's Development Finance, 2004-2013

(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Spain performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Spain's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.0 to Spain's agenda-setting influence, equal to the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to Spain's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.9 to Spain's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Spain's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Sweden

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Sweden. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Sweden’s influenced the policy agenda (n=284), provided useful advice (n=148), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=89). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Sweden’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1216.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>914.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>865.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>712.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>628.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>615.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>593.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>552.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>424.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Sweden’s Development Finance, 2004-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1216.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Sweden performing the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Influence (0-5)</th>
<th>Usefulness (1-5)</th>
<th>Helpfulness (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Sweden's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.4 to Sweden's agenda-setting influence, 0.4 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to Sweden's usefulness of advice.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to Sweden's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Sweden’s Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

- **Policy Domain**
  - Economic policy
  - Social and environmental policy
  - Governance policy

- **Agenda-setting influence**
  - 0= no influence at all
  - 5= maximum influence

- **Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

  Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

  Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

  Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

  **The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.**

  **Source:** AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Switzerland

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Switzerland. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Switzerland’s influenced the policy agenda (n=185), provided useful advice (n=87), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=44). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Switzerland's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)
1. Serbia (2%, 528.2)
2. Mozambique (2%, 402.2)
3. Iraq (2%, 398.5)
4. Nepal (2%, 388.4)
5. Tanzania (2%, 363.8)
6. Burkina Faso (1%, 330.1)
7. Kosovo (1%, 321.4)
8. Bangladesh (1%, 311)
9. Vietnam (1%, 295.9)
10. Bolivia (1%, 288.5)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Switzerland's Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Where does Switzerland's Development Finance go?

Switzerland's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy
Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

In which countries is Switzerland performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Switzerland's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.2 to Switzerland's agenda-setting influence, 0.2 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.5 to Switzerland's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.0 to Switzerland's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Switzerland's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain
- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Turkey Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Turkey. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Turkey’s influenced the policy agenda (n=251), provided useful advice (n=173), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=31). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Turkey’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

Insufficient data
Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Turkey’s Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Insufficient data
Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Turkey performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Serbia
Mongolia
Syria
Azerbaijan
Kyrgyzstan
Turkmenistan
Macedonia
Sudan
Kosovo
Afghanistan

Macedonia
Kosovo
Azerbaijan
Mongolia
Sudan
Kyrgyzstan
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Palestine
Georgia
Afghanistan

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential

1 = not at all useful
5 = extremely useful

0 = not at all helpful
5 = extremely helpful

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Turkey's performance?

1.4
Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.4 to Turkey's agenda-setting influence, 0.6 below the average country.

2.8
Survey respondents gave a score of 2.8 to Turkey's usefulness of advice.

2.7
Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to Turkey's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Turkey's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

![Diagram](https://example.com/diagram.png)

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the United Arab Emirates. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the United Arab Emirates’ influenced the policy agenda (n=98), provided useful advice (n=74), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the United Arab Emirates’ Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Country</th>
<th>% of Development Finance</th>
<th>Amount in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6196.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2550.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>940.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>616.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>573.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>364.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>341.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>290.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the United Arab Emirates’ Development Finance, 2004-2013

In which countries is the United Arab Emirates performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Usefulness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Helpfulness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the United Arab Emirates' performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.0 to the United Arab Emirates' agenda-setting influence, 1 below the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.4 to the United Arab Emirates' usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 2.6 to the United Arab Emirates' helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

The United Arab Emirates' Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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United Kingdom Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the United Kingdom. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the United Kingdom’s influenced the policy agenda (n=1295), provided useful advice (n=672), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=385). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the United Kingdom’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries (in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Nigeria (10%, 7346.3)
2. India (8%, 5972.8)
3. Bangladesh (4%, 2908.3)
4. Afghanistan (4%, 2636.8)
5. Iraq (4%, 2572.6)
6. Pakistan (3%, 2401.4)
7. Tanzania (3%, 2316.6)
8. Ethiopia (3%, 2185.4)
9. DRC (2%, 1756.6)
10. Ghana (2%, 1565.6)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the United Kingdom’s Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

In which countries is the United Kingdom performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the United Kingdom's performance?

Influences the policy agenda

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.0 to the United Kingdom's agenda-setting influence, equal to the average country.

Provides useful advice*

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.1 to the United Kingdom's usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Helpful in implementation

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.1 to the United Kingdom's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The United Kingdom's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain

- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Development Partner Profile

United Nations Childrens Fund

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the United Nations Childrens Fund. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the United Nations Childrens Fund influenced the policy agenda (n=1041), provided useful advice (n=621), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=361). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the United Nations Childrens Fund's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Development Finance (millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>476.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>462.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>416.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>393.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>313.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>197.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>194.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>192.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>178.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>178.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database


In which countries is the United Nations Childrens Fund performing the best?

- Influences the policy agenda (0-5)
- Provides useful advice* (1-5)
- Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the United Nations Childrens Fund's performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.4 to the United Nations Childrens Fund's agenda-setting influence, 0.4 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.6 to the United Nations Childrens Fund's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to the United Nations Childrens Fund's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

The United Nations Childrens Fund's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Policy Domain

- Economic policy
- Social and environmental policy
- Governance policy

Agenda-setting influence

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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United Nations Development Program

Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the United Nations Development Program. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the United Nations Development Program’s influenced the policy agenda (n=1892), provided useful advice (n=1227), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=772). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the United Nations Development Program's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Finance (millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In which countries is the United Nations Development Program performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the United Nations Development Program's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.6 to the United Nations Development Program's agenda-setting influence, 0.6 above the average country.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.6 to the United Nations Development Program's usefulness of advice.

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the United Nations Development Program's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The United Nations Development Program's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Governing: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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Development Partner Profile

United Nations Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the United Nations. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the United Nations’ influenced the policy agenda (n=1527), provided useful advice (n=918), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=493). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the United Nations' Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Palestine (12%, 1017.1)
2. Jordan (5%, 436)
3. Lebanon (3%, 253.7)
4. India (2%, 150.2)
5. Syria (2%, 148.7)
6. DRC (2%, 143.1)
7. Uganda (1%, 101.5)
8. Sudan (1%, 97.3)
9. Nigeria (1%, 92.8)
10. Pakistan (1%, 87.2)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the United Nations' Development Finance, 2004-2013 (millions of USD)

In which countries is the United Nations performing the best?

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the United Nations' performance?

**Influences the policy agenda**
- The United Nations: 2.6
- Average Development Partner: 1.0

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.6 to the United Nations' agenda-setting influence, 0.6 above the average country.

**Provides useful advice**
- The United Nations: 3.4
- Average Development Partner: 2.0

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.4 to the United Nations' usefulness of advice.

**Helpful in implementation**
- The United Nations: 3.3
- Average Development Partner: 2.0

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.3 to the United Nations' helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

The United Nations' Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

- **Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)**
- **Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Level of Usefulness of Advice</th>
<th>Log of Development Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic policy</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental policy</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance policy</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.**

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21
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United States Summary

This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the United States. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the United States’ influenced the policy agenda (n=2195), provided useful advice (n=1239), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=799). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the United States’ Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. Iraq (13%, 38116.6)
2. Afghanistan (9%, 26220.5)
3. Pakistan (3%, 9194.2)
4. Ethiopia (2%, 7247.5)
5. Colombia (2%, 6816.5)
6. Sudan (2%, 6692)
7. Kenya (2%, 6457.3)
8. Jordan (2%, 5751.4)
9. Palestine (2%, 5719.5)
10. Haiti (2%, 5216.3)

Distribution of the United States’ Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

In which countries is the United States performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the United States' performance?

Influences the policy agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Influence (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Development Partner</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave an average score of 2.5 to the United States' agenda-setting influence, 0.5 above the average country.

Provides useful advice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Usefulness of Advice (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Development Partner</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to the United States' usefulness of advice.

*The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

Helpful in implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Helpfulness in Policy Reform Implementation (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Development Partner</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents gave a score of 3.2 to the United States' helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

The United States' Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Domain</th>
<th>Level of Usefulness of Advice (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda-setting influence

0 = no influence at all
5 = maximum influence

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation
Development Partner Profile

Venezuela
Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of Venezuela. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which Venezuela’s influenced the policy agenda (n=45), provided useful advice (n=38), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does Venezuela's Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

Insufficient data
Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of Venezuela's Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

In which countries is Venezuela performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Dominican Republic
Belize
Haiti

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Belize
Haiti

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Insufficient data

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Governance:
land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic:
macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social:
health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive Venezuela's performance?

1.5
Survey respondents gave an average score of 1.5 to Venezuela's agenda-setting influence, 0.5 below the average country.

2.5
Survey respondents gave a score of 2.5 to Venezuela's usefulness of advice.

2.7
Survey respondents gave a score of 2.7 to Venezuela's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

Venezuela's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management

Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking

Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

** The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21

Citation
Development Partner Profile

World Bank Summary
This development partner profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance of the World Bank. The information below was compiled from two sources: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey and 2004-2013 Core Database. The 2014 Reform Efforts Survey asked public, private, and civil society leaders in 126 low- and middle-income countries questions about the most pressing problems they face, their top policy priorities, and how aid agencies can partner with them most effectively. Leaders evaluated the degree to which the World Bank’s influenced the policy agenda (n=2174), provided useful advice (n=1486), and how helpful this development partner was in implementation (n=1208). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Where does the World Bank’s Development Finance go?

Top Partner Countries
(in millions USD by % of development finance)

1. India (12%, 44332.6)
2. Brazil (7%, 26195.2)
3. Indonesia (6%, 22434.4)
4. Mexico (5%, 20225.7)
5. China (5%, 19717.6)
6. Turkey (5%, 18645.4)
7. Vietnam (4%, 15594.5)
8. Pakistan (3%, 12059.4)
9. Argentina (3%, 10974.9)
10. Bangladesh (3%, 9876.9)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Distribution of the World Bank’s Development Finance, 2004-2013
(millions of USD)

In which countries is the World Bank performing the best?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Lesotho
Ghana
Sierra Leone
Mali
Tajikistan
Moldova
Uganda
Tunisia
Guinea-Bissau
Côte d’Ivoire

Provides useful advice* (1-5)

Serbia
Sierra Leone
Lesotho
Tanzania
Rwanda
Cape Verde
El Salvador
Vanuatu
Albania
Laos

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Guinea
Romania
Moldova
Sri Lanka
Philippines
Tanzania
Sierra Leone
DRC
Jamaica
Rwanda

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

* The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the World Bank's performance?

Survey respondents gave an average score of 3.2 to the World Bank's agenda-setting influence, 1.2 above the average country. Survey respondents gave a score of 3.7 to the World Bank's usefulness of advice. Survey respondents gave a score of 3.6 to the World Bank's helpfulness in policy reform implementation.

**The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.**

The World Bank's Useful Advice, Amount of Development Finance, and Influence by Policy Area

Log of Development Finance (USD in millions)**

Governance: land, decentralization, anti-corruption & transparency, democracy, public administration, justice & security, tax, customs, and public expenditure management
Economic: macroeconomic management, trade, business regulatory environment, investment, labor, energy & mining, infrastructure, and finance, credit & banking
Environment & Social: health, education, family & gender, social protection & welfare, environmental protection, and agriculture & rural development

**The amount of development finance is log-transformed to account for skewed distribution of aid across sectors.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database and 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25