**Host Country Profile**

**Afghanistan**

**Summary**

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Afghanistan. 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. Respondents working in Afghanistan evaluated the degree to which Afghanistan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=100), provided useful advice (n=79), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=57). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Who are Afghanistan's top development partners?**

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $59 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>Multilateral</th>
<th>Non-DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

**How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Afghanistan?**

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
<td>5 = extremely influential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = not at all useful</td>
<td>5 = extremely useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
<td>5 = extremely helpful</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

---

**Average Development Partner Performance in Afghanistan**

**Average Development Partner Performance across all countries**

---

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Afghanistan?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda** (total DPs evaluated = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation** (total DPs evaluated = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Afghanistan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

Citation
Host Country Profile

Albania

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Albania. 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. Respondents working in Albania evaluated the degree to which Albania’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=24), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=21). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Albania's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $6 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Albania?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Albania

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Albania?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 13)

- **European Union**
- **International Monetary Fund**
- **World Bank**

### Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 11)

- **World Bank**
- **European Union**
- **International Monetary Fund**

### Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 5)

- **European Union**
- **World Bank**
- **United States**

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Albania

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- **Infrastructure**
- **Funding**
- **Human Capital**
- **Physical Security**
- **Corruption**

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Albania. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
**Algeria**

**Summary**

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Algeria. 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. Respondents working in Algeria evaluated the degree to which Algeria’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Algeria's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Algeria?

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

- Economic: 0
- Governance: 1
- Social & Environmental: 2

**Provides useful advice**

- Economic: 3
- Governance: 3
- Social & Environmental: 3

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

- Economic: 4
- Governance: 4
- Social & Environmental: 4

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Algeria?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?

---

**Citation**

Angola

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Angola. 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. Respondents working in Angola evaluated the degree to which Angola’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=28), provided useful advice (n=12), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Angola's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $6 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions (USD $ billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Angola?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<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

Average Development Partner Performance in Angola

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Angola? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Angola. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Armenia Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Armenia. 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. Respondents working in Armenia evaluated the degree to which Armenia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=52), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=12). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Armenia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Armenia?

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Armenia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Armenia

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most???

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure Environment</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Armenia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Azerbaijan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Azerbaijan. 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. Respondents working in Azerbaijan evaluated the degree to which Azerbaijan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=18), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Azerbaijan's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Azerbaijan?

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Azerbaijan

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

**The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Azerbaijan?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 13)**

- United States: 4
- World Bank: 3
- International Monetary Fund: 2

**Provides useful advice**

- World Bank: 3
- Turkey: 2
- Germany: 1

**Helpful in implementation**

- World Bank: 4
- Germany: 3

---

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Implementation: 4
- Human Capital: 4
- Service Delivery: 3
- Information: 2
- Leadership: 2

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Azerbaijan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

Bangladesh

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Bangladesh. 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. Respondents working in Bangladesh evaluated the degree to which Bangladesh’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=41), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=21). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Bangladesh’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $36 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Bangladesh?

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- **Provides useful advice**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Bangladesh? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who are Bangladesh’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (USD $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Bangladesh. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

Host Country Profile

Belize

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Belize. 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. Respondents working in Belize evaluated the degree to which Belize’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=25), provided useful advice (n=21), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=16). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Belize's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total financial contributions (USD $509 million total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC 79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral 19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC 1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Belize?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</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
Host Country Profile
Belize

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Belize. 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. Respondents working in Belize evaluated the degree to which Belize's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=25), provided useful advice (n=21), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=16). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Belize's top development partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (USD $509 million total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC Multilateral</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC Multilateral</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partners</th>
<th>How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Belize?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Development Bank</td>
<td>Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Influence the Policy Agenda</th>
<th>Provides Useful Advice</th>
<th>Helpful in Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Belize

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Influence the Policy Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Belize. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Benin

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Benin. 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. Respondents working in Benin evaluated the degree to which Benin's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=27), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Benin's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $7 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Benin?

Average Development Partner Performance in Benin

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Benin?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Bar chart showing influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 15)]

Denmark, European Union, World Bank

![Bar chart showing provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 10)]

France, Japan, United States

![Bar chart showing helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 4)]

World Bank, United States, United Nations Development Program

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

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Benin

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Bar chart showing types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Benin]

Implementation, Vested Interests, De Jure Environment, Informality, Consultation

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Benin. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Bhutan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Bhutan. 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. Respondents working in Bhutan evaluated the degree to which Bhutan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=22), provided useful advice (n=23), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=17). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Bhutan's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (USD $2 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Bhutan?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Bhutan</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance across all countries</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Bhutan</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance across all countries</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Bhutan</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance across all countries</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Bhutan?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Bhutan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Bolivia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Bolivia. 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. Respondents working in Bolivia evaluated the degree to which Bolivia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=27), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Bolivia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $15 billion total)

[Bar chart showing distribution of contributions]

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Bolivia?

[Graphs showing performance across different policy areas]

Average Development Partner Performance in Bolivia
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Bolivia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 19)

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 9)

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 0)

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

---

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Bolivia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Bosnia and Herzegovina. 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. Respondents working in Bosnia and Herzegovina evaluated the degree to which Bosnia and Herzegovina’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=33), provided useful advice (n=25), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Bosnia and Herzegovina’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $9 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions (USD $7 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev’t</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina?

Average Development Partner Performance in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Bosnia and Herzegovina? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Advice Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Implementation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Bosnia and Herzegovina

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Botswana

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Botswana. 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. Respondents working in Botswana evaluated the degree to which Botswana's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=13), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=10). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Botswana’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $5 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Botswana?

Average Development Partner Performance in Botswana

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Botswana?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda
(total DPs evaluated = 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Helpful in implementation
(total DPs evaluated = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

-----

Average Performance of all development partners in Botswana

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

### Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure Environment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Botswana. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Brazil

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in 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. Respondents working in Brazil evaluated the degree to which Brazil’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=27), provided useful advice (n=27), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=19). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Brazil’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $58 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Brazil?

Average Development Partner Performance in Brazil

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Brazil? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Brazil. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

---

**Average Performance of all development partners in Brazil**

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

Bulgaria

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Bulgaria. 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. Respondents working in Bulgaria evaluated the degree to which Bulgaria's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=24), provided useful advice (n=16), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=16). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Bulgaria's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total financial contributions by donor type (USD $4 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Bulgaria?

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Bulgaria

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

** The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Bulgaria? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Bulgaria. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Burkina Faso

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Burkina Faso. 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. Respondents working in Burkina Faso evaluated the degree to which Burkina Faso’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=41), provided useful advice (n=28), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=26). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Burkina Faso's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions (USD $8 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1,800 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1,600 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,200 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,000 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>600 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>600 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>400 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>400 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>200 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>200 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Burkina Faso?

- **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.

Average Development Partner Performance in Burkina Faso
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Burkina Faso?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 14)

- World Bank
- Netherlands
- European Union

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 13)

- Denmark
- United Nations
- World Bank

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 12)

- Canada
- Germany
- International Monetary Fund

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- De Jure
- Incentives
- Service Delivery
- Implementation
- Human Capital

---

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Burkina Faso. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Burundi
Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Burundi. 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. Respondents working in Burundi evaluated the degree to which Burundi’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=31), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=19). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Burundi's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $7 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Burundi?

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Burundi
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Host Country Profile
Burundi

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Burundi. 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. Respondents working in Burundi evaluated the degree to which Burundi’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=31), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=19).

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

Who are Burundi’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type
(USD $7 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>Non-DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Burundi?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 16)

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 14)

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 15)

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Burundi

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

Coordination
Funding
Information
Service Delivery
Corruption

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

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Cambodia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Cambodia. 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. Respondents working in Cambodia evaluated the degree to which Cambodia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=64), provided useful advice (n=31), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=30). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Cambodia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $9 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Cambodia?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Cambodia

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Cambodia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Cambodia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Cameroon
Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Cameroon. 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. Respondents working in Cameroon evaluated the degree to which Cameroon’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=23), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=10). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Cameroon's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $12 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Cameroon?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Economic: 3
- Governance: 3
- Social & Environmental: 3

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

- Economic: 3
- Governance: 3
- Social & Environmental: 3

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Economic: 3
- Governance: 3
- Social & Environmental: 3

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Cameroon

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Cameroon?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

Cape Verde

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Cape Verde. 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. Respondents working in Cape Verde evaluated the degree to which Cape Verde’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=14), provided useful advice (n=11), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Cape Verde's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $3 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Cape Verde?

Average Development Partner Performance in Cape Verde

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Cape Verde?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing influences on the policy agenda, useful advice, and implementation help by development partners in Cape Verde]

**Average Performance of all development partners in Cape Verde**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing the influence of development partners on various types of problems in Cape Verde]

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Cape Verde. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Central African Republic

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in the Central African Republic. 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. Respondents working in the Central African Republic evaluated the degree to which the Central African Republic’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=22), provided useful advice (n=10), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=10). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are the Central African Republic's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $3 billion total)

- European Union: 59.7%
- Non-DAC: 39.1%
- Multilateral: 9.2%

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in the Central African Republic?

- Influences the policy agenda (0-5)
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- Provides useful advice** (1-5)
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- Helpful in implementation (0-5)
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

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

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in the Central African Republic?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing development partners rated most highly in the Central African Republic](image1)

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing types of problems most influenced by development partners](image2)

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in the Central African Republic. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Chad

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Chad. 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. Respondents working in Chad evaluated the degree to which Chad’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=14), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Chad's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $5 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Chad?

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Chad
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Chad?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Chad. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Colombia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Colombia. 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. Respondents working in Colombia evaluated the degree to which Colombia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=31), provided useful advice (n=17), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Colombia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*  
(USD $45 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Colombia?

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Colombia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda** (total DPs evaluated = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation** (total DPs evaluated = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Colombia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

---

Citation
**Comoros**

**Summary**

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Comoros. 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. Respondents working in Comoros evaluated the degree to which Comoros' development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=17), provided useful advice (n=16), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Who are Comoros' top development partners?**

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $795 million total)

- **57.4%** DAC
- **38.3%** Multilateral
- **4.3%** Non-DAC

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

**How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Comoros?**

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- **Provides useful advice**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

**Average Development Partner Performance in Comoros**

**Average Development Partner Performance across all countries**

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Comoros? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 12)**

- International Monetary Fund
- World Bank
- United Nations Development Program

- Average Performance of all development partners in Comoros

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

**Provides useful advice**

- United Nations
- International Monetary Fund
- United Nations Development Program

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

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 7)**

- World Bank
- African Development Bank
- International Monetary Fund

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Corruption
- Implementation
- Funding
- Infrastructure
- Leadership

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Comoros. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Congo

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Congo. 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. Respondents working in Congo evaluated the degree to which Congo’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=7), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Congo's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>Multilateral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Congo?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</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

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Congo

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Congo?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Congo. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Côte d'Ivoire

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Côte d'Ivoire. 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. Respondents working in Côte d’Ivoire evaluated the degree to which Côte d’Ivoire’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=22), provided useful advice (n=10), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=7). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Côte d'Ivoire's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $14 billion total)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Côte d'Ivoire?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

---

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Average Development Partner Performance in Côte d'Ivoire

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Côte d’Ivoire?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Côte d’Ivoire. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Democratic Republic of Congo

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in the Democratic Republic of Congo. 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. Respondents working in the Democratic Republic of Congo evaluated the degree to which the Democratic Republic of Congo's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=37), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are the Democratic Republic of Congo's top development partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $29 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in the Democratic Republic of Congo?

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

Citation

Host Country Profile
Democratic Republic of Congo

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in the Democratic Republic of Congo. 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. Respondents working in the Democratic Republic of Congo evaluated the degree to which their country's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=37), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are the Democratic Republic of Congo's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

---

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in the Democratic Republic of Congo? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

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

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

Djibouti

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Djibouti. 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. Respondents working in Djibouti evaluated the degree to which Djibouti’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=14), provided useful advice (n=9), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Djibouti’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $2 billion total)

- France: 48.4%
- European Union: 6.3%
- Japan: 45.3%

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Djibouti?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Influencces 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>Economic</td>
<td>Average Development Partner Performance in Djibouti</td>
<td>Average Development Partner Performance across all countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
<td>1 = not at all useful</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>5 = extremely influential</td>
<td>5 = extremely useful</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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Djibouti? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Djibouti. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in the Dominican Republic. 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. Respondents working in the Dominican Republic evaluated the degree to which the Dominican Republic’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=41), provided useful advice (n=31), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=31). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are the Dominican Republic’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Development Finance (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Development Corporation</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Dev't</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in the Dominican Republic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</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>Economic</td>
<td>Average Development Partner Performance in the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Average Development Partner Performance across all countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in the Dominican Republic? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in the Dominican Republic. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
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Ecuador
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Ecuador. 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. Respondents working in Ecuador evaluated the degree to which Ecuador’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=22), provided useful advice (n=18), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Ecuador’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $12 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Ecuador?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance in Ecuador</th>
<th>Average Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
<td>0 = not at all influential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance in Ecuador</th>
<th>Average Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0 = not at all useful</td>
<td>0 = not at all useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0 = not at all useful</td>
<td>0 = not at all useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>0 = not at all useful</td>
<td>0 = not at all useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance in Ecuador</th>
<th>Average Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>0 = not at all helpful</td>
<td>0 = not at all 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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Ecuador?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Ecuador

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Interests</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Ecuador. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Egypt. 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. Respondents working in Egypt evaluated the degree to which Egypt’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=23), provided useful advice (n=21), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Egypt's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $39 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Development Finance (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Egypt?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Average Performance of all development partners in Egypt

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

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Egypt. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Egypt?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 17)

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 17)

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 7)

Average Performance of all development partners in Egypt

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Egypt. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in El Salvador. 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. Respondents working in El Salvador evaluated the degree to which El Salvador’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=38), provided useful advice (n=24), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=19). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are El Salvador’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

DAC Multilateral Non-DAC

59.4% 39.9%

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in El Salvador?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in El Salvador? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in El Salvador

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

**Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in El Salvador. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Ethiopia. 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. Respondents working in Ethiopia evaluated the degree to which Ethiopia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=34), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=15). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Ethiopia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $34 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Ethiopia?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Ethiopia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 17)

- International Monetary Fund
- World Bank
- European Union

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 12)

- World Bank
- African Development Bank
- United Nations Development Program

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 11)

- International Monetary Fund
- European Union
- African Development Bank

---

**Average Performance of all development partners in Ethiopia**

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

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Service Delivery
- Corruption
- Human Capital
- Funding
- Leadership

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Ethiopia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

---

Citation
**Fiji**

**Summary**

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Fiji. 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. Respondents working in Fiji evaluated the degree to which Fiji’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=15), provided useful advice (n=6), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=5). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Who are Fiji's top development partners?**

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $949 million total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

**How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Fiji?**

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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Fiji? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing influences on policy agenda](image1)

**Influences the policy agenda** (total DPs evaluated = 11)

- International Monetary Fund
- United Nations Development Program
- United Nations

![Graph showing provides useful advice](image2)

**Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 2)

- Australia
- Japan

**Average Performance of all development partners in Fiji**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing types of problems](image3)

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Information
- Physical Security
- De Jure Environment
- Service Delivery
- Infrastructure

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Fiji. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Gambia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Gambia. 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. Respondents working in Gambia evaluated the degree to which Gambia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=24), provided useful advice (n=20), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=14). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Gambia’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $1 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Gambia?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Gambia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 15)

- International Monetary Fund
- World Bank
- African Development Bank

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 13)

- Japan
- United Nations Childrens Fund
- United Kingdom

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 6)

- United Nations Development Program
- African Development Bank
- United Nations

---

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

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Implementation
- Human Capital
- Infrastructure
- Funding
- Information

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Gambia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

---
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Georgia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Georgia. 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. Respondents working in Georgia evaluated the degree to which Georgia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=63), provided useful advice (n=48), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=37). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Georgia's top development partners?

![Pie chart showing distribution of financial contributions by donor type]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (USD $8 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Georgia?

![Bar charts showing influence and usefulness of advice across different policy areas]

Average Development Partner Performance in Georgia

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

*** The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Georgia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Georgia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Ghana

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Ghana. 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. Respondents working in Ghana evaluated the degree to which Ghana’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=48), provided useful advice (n=33), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=25). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Ghana's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $19 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Ghana?

Average Development Partner Performance in Ghana

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

*Citatio

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Ghana?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Ghana. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Guatemala

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Guatemala. 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. Respondents working in Guatemala evaluated the degree to which Guatemala's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=38), provided useful advice (n=32), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=26). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Guatemala's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $8 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions (USD $ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Guatemala?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Guatemala

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Guatemala?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 16)

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 17)

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 11)

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Guatemala

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Guatemala. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Guinea

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Guinea. 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. Respondents working in Guinea evaluated the degree to which Guinea’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=16), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Guinea’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Guinea?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environ</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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Guinea?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Chart](chart1.png)

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 12)**

- International Monetary Fund
- World Bank
- Canada

- Average Performance of all development partners in Guinea

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

**Provides useful advice**

- International Monetary Fund
- United States
- European Union

- Average Performance of all development partners in Guinea

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

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 3)**

- World Bank
- International Monetary Fund
- African Development Bank

- Average Performance of all development partners in Guinea

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?**

- Leadership
- Information
- Service Delivery
- Coordination
- De Jure Environment

- Average Performance of all development partners in Guinea

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

Citation
Guinea-Bissau

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Guinea-Bissau. 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. Respondents working in Guinea-Bissau evaluated the degree to which Guinea-Bissau’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=23), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Guinea-Bissau’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Guinea-Bissau?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Guinea-Bissau?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Bar charts showing the performance of development partners in Guinea-Bissau.](chart.png)

**Average Performance of all development partners in Guinea-Bissau**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Bar charts showing the types of problems influenced by development partners in Guinea-Bissau.](chart2.png)

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Guinea-Bissau. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.*

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

Citation

Host Country Profile

Guyana

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Guyana. 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. Respondents working in Guyana evaluated the degree to which Guyana’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=23), provided useful advice (n=12), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Guyana's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions (USD $2 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Guyana?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Guyana? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Guyana. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Haiti

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Haiti. 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. Respondents working in Haiti evaluated the degree to which Haiti’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=59), provided useful advice (n=38), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=32). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Haiti's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions (USD $15 billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Haiti?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice**

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

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

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

Haiti

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Haiti. 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. Respondents working in Haiti evaluated the degree to which Haiti's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=59), provided useful advice (n=38), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=32). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Haiti's top development partners?
Total financial contributions by donor type (USD $15 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

DAC
Multilateral
Non-DAC

31.6%
67.9%

Total financial contributions by donor type (USD $13 billion total)

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Haiti?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 17)

1 = not at all useful
5 = extremely useful

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

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

0 = not at all helpful
5 = extremely helpful

Average Development Partner Performance in Haiti
Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Haiti? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 19)

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 17)

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 12)

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

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Haiti. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Honduras

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Honduras. 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. Respondents working in Honduras evaluated the degree to which Honduras’ development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=33), provided useful advice (n=24), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=17). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Honduras’ top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $8 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Honduras?

Average Development Partner Performance in Honduras

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Honduras?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Honduras. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
India
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in 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. Respondents working in India evaluated the degree to which India’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=9), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are India’s top development partners?
Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $98 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.
Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in India?
Influences the policy agenda (0-5)
Provides useful advice** (1-5)
Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Average Development Partner Performance in India
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

** The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in India? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 9)

- International Monetary Fund
- World Bank
- Asian Development Bank

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 3)

- Japan
- World Bank
- United Nations Development Program

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 0)

- Insufficient data

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

Average Performance of all development partners in India

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Bureaucracy
- Vested Interests
- Service Delivery
- Human Capital
- Coordination

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in India. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Indonesia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Indonesia. 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. Respondents working in Indonesia evaluated the degree to which Indonesia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=71), provided useful advice (n=41), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=33). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Indonesia’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $62 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Indonesia?

Average Development Partner Performance in Indonesia

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

** The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Indonesia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

Iraq
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Iraq. 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. Respondents working in Iraq evaluated the degree to which Iraq’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=46), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=15). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Iraq’s top development partners?
Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $83 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Iraq?

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Iraq? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United Nations Development Program</th>
<th>United Nations</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>World Bank</th>
<th>United Nations</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>World Bank</th>
<th>United Nations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Physical Security</th>
<th>Bureaucracy</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Iraq. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.***

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

Citation
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Jamaica. 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. Respondents working in Jamaica evaluated the degree to which Jamaica’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=26), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Jamaica’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $3 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Jamaica?

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
**Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Jamaica?**
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

---

**Citation**
Jordan
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Jordan. 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. Respondents working in Jordan evaluated the degree to which Jordan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=59), provided useful advice (n=56), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=40). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Jordan's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (USD $17 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Jordan?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Fund for Economic and Social Dev't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Fund for Economic and Social Dev't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Fund for Economic and Social Dev't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td></td>
<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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Jordan? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 22)**

- **International Monetary Fund**
- **United States**
- **World Bank**

**Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 24)

- **World Bank**
- **International Monetary Fund**
- **United States**

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 12)**

- **Germany**
- **United Nations Childrens Fund**
- **International Monetary Fund**

---

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- **Physical Security**
- **Coordination**
- **Implementation**
- **Bureaucracy**
- **Infrastructure**

---

**Citation**

Host Country Profile

Kenya

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Kenya. 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. Respondents working in Kenya evaluated the degree to which Kenya’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=44), provided useful advice (n=26), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=23). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Kenya’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $28 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Kenya?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance across all countries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Kenya?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Kenya. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Kiribati

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Kiribati. 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. Respondents working in Kiribati evaluated the degree to which Kiribati’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=11), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=10). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Kiribati’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $607 million total)

- DAC: 28.7%
- Multilateral: 4.3%
- Non-DAC: 67%

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Kiribati?

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Kiribati?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 7)</th>
<th>Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 7)</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Kiribati

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Physical Security</th>
<th>Human Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Kiribati. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Kosovo

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Kosovo. 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. Respondents working in Kosovo evaluated the degree to which Kosovo’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=55), provided useful advice (n=30), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=27). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Kosovo’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $3 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Kosovo?

Average Development Partner Performance in Kosovo

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Kosovo?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 18)

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 15)

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 7)

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

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Kosovo. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Kyrgyzstan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Kyrgyzstan. 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. Respondents working in Kyrgyzstan evaluated the degree to which Kyrgyzstan's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=36), provided useful advice (n=21), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Kyrgyzstan's top development partners?

**Total financial contributions by donor type***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Kyrgyzstan?

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Development Partner Performance in Kyrgyzstan

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Kyrgyzstan? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Chart showing influences the policy agenda](image)

![Chart showing provides useful advice](image)

![Chart showing helpful in implementation](image)

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Insufficient data chart](image)

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Kyrgyzstan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Laos

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Laos. 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. Respondents working in Laos evaluated the degree to which Laos’ development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=19), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=5). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Laos’ top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions (USD $ billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Laos?

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Laos? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 15)**

- China: 4
- Sweden: 3
- Asian Development Bank: 3

**Provides useful advice**

- World Bank: 4
- United Nations Development Program: 4
- United Nations: 3

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 1)**

- Japan: 5

---

**Average Performance of all development partners in Laos**

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

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Corruption: 4
- Infrastructure: 3
- Implementation: 3
- Service Delivery: 2
- Human Capital: 1

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Laos. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

---

Citation
Lesotho Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Lesotho. 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. Respondents working in Lesotho evaluated the degree to which Lesotho’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=9), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Lesotho's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $2 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Organization</th>
<th>Development Finance (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Bank for Economic Dev't in Africa</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Lesotho?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Lesotho?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Average Performance of all development partners in Lesotho**

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

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Lesotho. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Liberia
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Liberia. 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. Respondents working in Liberia evaluated the degree to which Liberia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=75), provided useful advice (n=52), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=46). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Liberia’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $9 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Liberia?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Average Development Partner Performance in Liberia

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Liberia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing influences the policy agenda](Image)

**Average Performance of all development partners in Liberia**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing which types of problems influence the agenda](Image)

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Liberia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Macedonia

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Macedonia. 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. Respondents working in Macedonia evaluated the degree to which Macedonia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=40), provided useful advice (n=26), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=26). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Macedonia's top development partners?

Who are Macedonia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (USD $4 billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Macedonia?

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Macedonia?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</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
Host Country Profile
Macedonia

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Macedonia. 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. Respondents working in Macedonia evaluated the degree to which Macedonia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=40), provided useful advice (n=26), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=26). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Macedonia’s top development partners?

**Total financial contributions by donor type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (USD $4 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Macedonia?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 20)

- European Union
- World Bank
- United States

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 19)

- International Monetary Fund
- World Bank
- United Nations Childrens Fund

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 15)

- Japan
- Switzerland
- Sweden

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Bureaucracy
- Leadership
- Vested Interests
- Corruption
- Implementation

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Macedonia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Madagascar

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Madagascar. 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. Respondents working in Madagascar evaluated the degree to which Madagascar’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=58), provided useful advice (n=41), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=40). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Madagascar’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $10 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Madagascar?

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Host Country Profile
Madagascar

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Madagascar. 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. Respondents working in Madagascar evaluated the degree to which Madagascar’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=58), provided useful advice (n=41), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=40). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Madagascar’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (USD $10 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Madagascar?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Influences the policy agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Provides useful advice**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Helpful in implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Interests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Madagascar. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Malawi
Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Malawi. 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. Respondents working in Malawi evaluated the degree to which Malawi’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=59), provided useful advice (n=48), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=39). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Malawi’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $10 billion total)

- United States: 46.4%
- European Union: 52.4%
- World Bank: 4.9%
- United Kingdom: 3.7%
- Norway: 3.5%
- African Development Bank: 2.9%
- Japan: 2.6%
- Germany: 2.3%
- Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria: 0.7%
- International Monetary Fund: 0.4%

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Malawi?

- In Influences the policy agenda (0-5):
  - Economic: 1.9
  - Governance: 1.9
  - Social & Environmental: 1.9

- In Provides useful advice** (1-5):
  - Economic: 3.9
  - Governance: 3.9
  - Social & Environmental: 3.9

- In Helpful in implementation (0-5):
  - Economic: 3.9
  - Governance: 3.9
  - Social & Environmental: 3.9

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Malawi
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Malawi?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 18)

- **World Bank**: 4.5
- **International Monetary Fund**: 4.0
- **European Union**: 3.5

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

### Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 15)

- **Norway**: 4.5
- **World Bank**: 5.0
- **Germany**: 4.0

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

### Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 14)

- **International Monetary Fund**: 4.5
- **United Kingdom**: 5.0
- **World Bank**: 4.0

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- **Incentives**: 4.5
- **Implementation**: 4.0
- **Service Delivery**: 3.5
- **Corruption**: 3.0
- **De Jure Environment**: 2.5

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Malawi. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Maldives
Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Maldives. 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. Respondents working in Maldives evaluated the degree to which Maldives' development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=10), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Maldives' top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $913 million total)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

DAC
Multilateral
Non-DAC
52.7%
12.6%
34.7%

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Maldives?

Average Development Partner Performance in Maldives

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Maldives? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Maldives. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Mali

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Mali. 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. Respondents working in Mali evaluated the degree to which Mali’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=35), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Mali’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $13 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Mali?

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Mali

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Mali? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 17)

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 15)

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 8)

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

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Mali. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

Citation
Host Country Profile

Marshall Islands

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in the Marshall Islands. 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. Respondents working in the Marshall Islands evaluated the degree to which the Marshall Islands’ development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=10), provided useful advice (n=7), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=5). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are the Marshall Islands’ top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $783 million total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in the Marshall Islands?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</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

Average Development Partner Performance in the Marshall Islands

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Average Performance of all development partners in the Marshall Islands

Source:

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in the Marshall Islands? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in the Marshall Islands. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Mauritania

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Mauritania. 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. Respondents working in Mauritania evaluated the degree to which Mauritania’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=17), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=17). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Mauritania’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $5 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Mauritania?

Average Development Partner Performance in Mauritania

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Mauritania? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 15)

- International Monetary Fund
- United Nations Development Program
- World Bank

### Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 12)

- Germany
- United Nations Development Program
- United Nations Childrens Fund

### Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 10)

- International Monetary Fund
- United Nations Development Program
- World Bank

---

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

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Vested Interests
- Leadership
- Service Delivery
- Human Capital
- Funding

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Mauritania. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

Moldova

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Moldova. 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. Respondents working in Moldova evaluated the degree to which Moldova’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=56), provided useful advice (n=28), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=28). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Moldova's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Moldova?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation

(0-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Moldova

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Moldova? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Influences the policy agenda](image1)

![Provides useful advice](image2)

![Helpful in implementation](image3)

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Types of problems影响](image4)

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Moldova. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Mongolia
Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Mongolia. 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. Respondents working in Mongolia evaluated the degree to which Mongolia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=27), provided useful advice (n=18), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=15). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Mongolia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type
(USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Mongolia?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Development Partner Performance in Mongolia</th>
<th>Average Development Partner Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Development Partner Performance in Mongolia</th>
<th>Average Development Partner Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Development Partner Performance in Mongolia</th>
<th>Average Development Partner Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>4</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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Mongolia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Mongolia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Montenegro

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Montenegro. 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. Respondents working in Montenegro evaluated the degree to which Montenegro’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=22), provided useful advice (n=11), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=9). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Montenegro’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $1 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Montenegro?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Montenegro?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 10)**

- European Union: 4.0
- World Bank: 4.0
- United States: 3.8

**Provides useful advice**

- World Bank: 4.3
- United States: 4.2
- European Union: 4.0

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 2)**

- European Union: 4.5
- United States: 4.0

---

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?**

- Service Delivery: 4.0
- Corruption: 3.8
- Implementation: 3.8
- Informality: 3.7
- Funding: 3.7

---

**Citation**

Host Country Profile

Morocco

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Morocco. 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. Respondents working in Morocco evaluated the degree to which Morocco's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=34), provided useful advice (n=29), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=23). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Morocco's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $34 billion total)

- **DAC** (54.8%)
- **Multilateral** (4.3%)
- **Non-DAC** (40.9%)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Morocco?

- **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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Morocco?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Morocco. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Mozambique

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Mozambique. 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. Respondents working in Mozambique evaluated the degree to which Mozambique’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=30), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=20). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Mozambique’s top development partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total financial contributions by donor type*</th>
<th>(USD $22 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Mozambique?

<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>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential
1 = not at all useful
5 = extremely useful

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Mozambique? 
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Diagram showing comparative performance of development partners in Mozambique]

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Diagram showing types of problems influenced by development partners]

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Mozambique. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Myanmar

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Myanmar. 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. Respondents working in Myanmar evaluated the degree to which Myanmar’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=26), provided useful advice (n=17), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Myanmar’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

*When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Myanmar?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Myanmar? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Myanmar. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
**Namibia Summary**

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Namibia. 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. Respondents working in Namibia evaluated the degree to which Namibia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=25), provided useful advice (n=18), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Who are Namibia's top development partners?**

*Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $3 billion total)

- **DAC**: 33.7%
- **Multilateral**: 65.7%
- **Non-DAC**: 0.6%

*When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.*

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

**How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Namibia?**

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- **Provides useful advice** (1-5)
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

- **Helpful in implementation** (0-5)
  - Economic
  - Governance
  - Social & Environmental

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

**Average Development Partner Performance**

- **Average Development Partner Performance in Namibia**
- **Average Development Partner Performance across all countries**

* **The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.**
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Namibia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Namibia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Nepal

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Nepal. 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. Respondents working in Nepal evaluated the degree to which Nepal’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=46), provided useful advice (n=28), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=26). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Nepal’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $11 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Nepal?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**
(1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Nepal

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Nepal? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing influences on policy agenda](image)

![Graph showing usefulness of advice](image)

![Graph showing helpfulness in implementation](image)

**Average Performance of all development partners in Nepal**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?

![Graph showing types of problems](image)

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Nepal. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.***

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

Nicaragua

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Nicaragua. 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. Respondents working in Nicaragua evaluated the degree to which Nicaragua’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=30), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=14). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Nicaragua's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $8 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Nicaragua?

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Nicaragua?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing development partners' performance](image)

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Nicaragua

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing types of problems](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Nicaragua. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Niger

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Niger. 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. Respondents working in Niger evaluated the degree to which Niger’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=37), provided useful advice (n=26), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=22). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Niger's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $8 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Niger?

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Niger?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Niger. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Nigeria
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Nigeria. 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. Respondents working in Nigeria evaluated the degree to which Nigeria’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=46), provided useful advice (n=29), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=24). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Nigeria's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $47 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Nigeria?

Average Development Partner Performance in Nigeria
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Nigeria?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Average Performance of all development partners in Nigeria**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?

**Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>Average Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure Environment</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Nigeria. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Pakistan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Pakistan. 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. Respondents working in Pakistan evaluated the degree to which Pakistan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=33), provided useful advice (n=21), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=16). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Pakistan's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $49 billion total)

- DAC: 57.5%
- Multilateral: 40.2%
- Non-DAC: 2% (When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

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

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Pakistan?

Average Development Partner Performance in Pakistan
Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Pakistan? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing development partners' performance](image)

**Influences the policy agenda**
- International Monetary Fund
- Asian Development Bank
- United Kingdom

**Provides useful advice**
- United Nations Childrens Fund
- World Bank
- United Nations

**Helpful in implementation**
- Asian Development Bank
- United Nations
- United Nations Childrens Fund

Average Performance of all development partners in Pakistan

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing problem types](image)

- Incentives
- Human Capital
- Bureaucracy
- De Jure
- Environment
- Vested Interests

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Pakistan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Palestine

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Palestine. 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. Respondents working in Palestine evaluated the degree to which Palestine’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=38), provided useful advice (n=35), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=24). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Palestine’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $19 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Palestine?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Palestine? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 22)

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 22)

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 11)

Average Performance of all development partners in Palestine

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Palestine. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Papua New Guinea

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Papua New Guinea. 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. Respondents working in Papua New Guinea evaluated the degree to which Papua New Guinea's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=11), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=7). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Papua New Guinea's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $7 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Papua New Guinea?

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

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Papua New Guinea?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Papua New Guinea. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Paraguay Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Paraguay. 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. Respondents working in Paraguay evaluated the degree to which Paraguay’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=34), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=20). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Paraguay’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $3 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Development Corporation</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Dev't</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Paraguay?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Development Corporation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Dev't</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Development Corporation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Dev't</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Development Corporation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Dev't</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Paraguay? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterAmerican Development Bank</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Paraguay

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Interests</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Paraguay. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

Host Country Profile

Peru

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Peru. 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. Respondents working in Peru evaluated the degree to which Peru’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=39), provided useful advice (n=29), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=25). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Peru’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $27 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (USD $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andean Development Corporation</td>
<td>7.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>5.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>3.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1.0 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.5 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>0.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0.1 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Peru?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance Evaluation</th>
<th>Average Performance in Peru</th>
<th>Average Performance across all countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Peru? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 20)

- **World Bank**
- **InterAmerican Development Bank**
- **International Monetary Fund**

### Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 20)

- **United Nations Childrens Fund**
- **United Nations Development Program**
- **European Union**

### Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 9)

- **Spain**
- **Canada**
- **World Bank**

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Peru

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

### Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- **Leadership**
- **Physical Security**
- **Bureaucracy**
- **De Jure Environment**
- **Service Delivery**

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Peru. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.*

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

Citation

Host Country Profile

Philippines

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Philippines. 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. Respondents working in Philippines evaluated the degree to which Philippines' development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=60), provided useful advice (n=35), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=24). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Philippines' top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Philippines?

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Philippines

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Philippines?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Average Performance of all development partners in Philippines**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Philippines. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Romania

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Romania. 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. Respondents working in Romania evaluated the degree to which Romania's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=19), provided useful advice (n=17), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=14). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Romania's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type
(USD $18 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Romania?

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Romania? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Romania. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Rwanda

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Rwanda. 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. Respondents working in Rwanda evaluated the degree to which Rwanda's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=21). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Rwanda's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $10 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Rwanda?

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.

Average Development Partner Performance in Rwanda

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Rwanda?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Rwanda. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Samoa

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Samoa. 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. Respondents working in Samoa evaluated the degree to which Samoa's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=18), provided useful advice (n=15), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=12). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Samoa's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $1 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Samoa?

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Samoa? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Samoa. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Sao Tome and Principe

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Sao Tome and Principe. 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. Respondents working in Sao Tome and Principe evaluated the degree to which Sao Tome and Principe’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=5), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=5). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Sao Tome and Principe’s top development partners?

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Sao Tome and Principe?

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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Sao Tome and Principe? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice (total DPs evaluated = 0)**

Insufficient data

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 0)**

Insufficient data

---

Average Performance of all development partners in Sao Tome and Principe

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Jure Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Interests</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Sao Tome and Principe. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

---

Citation

Host Country Profile

Senegal

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Senegal. 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. Respondents working in Senegal evaluated the degree to which Senegal's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=36), provided useful advice (n=18), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=18). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Senegal's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $13 billion total)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Senegal?

Average Development Partner Performance in Senegal

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Senegal?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Senegal. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

AIDDATA
A Research Lab at William & Mary
Serbia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Serbia. 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. Respondents working in Serbia evaluated the degree to which Serbia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=25), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Serbia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $15 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Recons and Dev't</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Serbia?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

0 = not at all influential
5 = extremely influential

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

0 = not at all useful
5 = extremely useful

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Serbia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Serbia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Sierra Leone

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Sierra Leone. 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. Respondents working in Sierra Leone evaluated the degree to which Sierra Leone's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=29), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Sierra Leone's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Financial Contributions (USD $ billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Dev't</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total financial contributions by donor type (USD $3 billion total)

- **United Kingdom**: 5.0
- **European Union**: 3.6
- **World Bank**: 2.9
- **African Development Bank**: 2.5
- **Japan**: 2.0
- **United States**: 1.3
- **Germany**: 1.2
- **Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria**: 1.0
- **Ireland**: 0.8
- **International Fund for Agricultural Dev't**: 0.5

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

Development Finance (Millions USD)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Sierra Leone?

- **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

Average Development Partner Performance in Sierra Leone

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Sierra Leone. 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. Respondents working in Sierra Leone evaluated the degree to which Sierra Leone’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=29), provided useful advice (n=13), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Who are Sierra Leone’s top development partners?**

Total financial contributions by donor type*

![Bar chart showing total financial contributions by donor type in USD $5 billion total.](chart)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

**DAC Multilateral Non-DAC**

3.6% 50.8% 45.6%

**Total financial contributions by donor type**

![Bar chart showing total financial contributions by donor type in USD $3 billion total.](chart)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

**How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Sierra Leone?**

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

![Bar chart showing how development partners influence the policy agenda.](chart)

Provides useful advice**

![Bar chart showing how development partners provide useful advice.](chart)

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

![Bar chart showing how development partners are helpful in implementation.](chart)

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

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

**Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Sierra Leone? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?**

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice (total DPs evaluated = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>usefulness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>helpful Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Bar chart showing which types of problems development partners influence most.](chart)

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Sierra Leone. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

**Citation**

Host Country Profile

Solomon Islands

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in the Solomon Islands. 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. Respondents working in the Solomon Islands evaluated the degree to which the Solomon Islands’ development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=15), provided useful advice (n=15), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are the Solomon Islands’ top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $4 billion total)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in the Solomon Islands?

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

Citation
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in the Solomon Islands?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in the Solomon Islands. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Somalia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Somalia. 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. Respondents working in Somalia evaluated the degree to which Somalia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=23), provided useful advice (n=9), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Somalia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $6 billion total)

- **DAC**
- **Multilateral**
- **Non-DAC**

Total financial contributions by donor type

(USD $5 billion total)

- **United States**
- **European Union**
- **United Kingdom**
- **United Nations**
- **Sweden**
- **Canada**
- **Japan**
- **Denmark**
- **Norway**
- **Sweden**
- **Germany**

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Somalia?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- **Economic**
- **Governance**
- **Social & Environmental**

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

- **Economic**
- **Governance**
- **Social & Environmental**

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- **Economic**
- **Governance**
- **Social & Environmental**

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Somalia

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Somalia?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Somalia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

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

South Africa

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in 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. Respondents working in South Africa evaluated the degree to which South Africa's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=27), provided useful advice (n=17), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are South Africa's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $22 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in South Africa?

Average Development Partner Performance in South Africa

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in South Africa?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most???

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

South Sudan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in South Sudan. 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. Respondents working in South Sudan evaluated the degree to which South Sudan's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=16), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are South Sudan's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $5 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in South Sudan?

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.

Average Development Partner Performance in South Sudan

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in South Sudan?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?**

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in South Sudan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Sri Lanka

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Sri Lanka. 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. Respondents working in Sri Lanka evaluated the degree to which Sri Lanka's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=19), provided useful advice (n=10), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Sri Lanka's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $16 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Sri Lanka?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Performance (0-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Sri Lanka?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Sri Lanka

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Sri Lanka. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Sudan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Sudan. 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. Respondents working in Sudan evaluated the degree to which Sudan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=32), provided useful advice (n=24), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=19). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Sudan’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $21 billion total)

- United States: 68.9%
- European Union: 26.5%
- Arab Fund for Economic and Social Dev’t: 4.6%

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Sudan?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice**

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Sudan

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Sudan?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Sudan

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problem</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Interests</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Jure Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Sudan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Suriname

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Suriname. 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. Respondents working in Suriname evaluated the degree to which Suriname’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=18), provided useful advice (n=15), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Suriname’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $983 million total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Suriname?

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Suriname?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 7)

- Inter-American Development Bank
- United States
- Netherlands

Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 4)

- United Nations
- Inter-American Development Bank
- United Nations Development Program

Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 2)

- Inter-American Development Bank
- United Nations Development Program

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

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

- Corruption
- Human Capital
- Information
- De Jure Environment
- Implementation

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Suriname. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Swaziland

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Swaziland. 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. Respondents working in Swaziland evaluated the degree to which Swaziland's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=11), provided useful advice (n=7), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=7). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Swaziland's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $1 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Financial Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Dev't</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Bank for Economic Dev’t in Africa</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Swaziland?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Swaziland?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insufficient data</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Performance of all development partners in Swaziland

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Capital</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Physical Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Swaziland. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Syria

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Syria. 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. Respondents working in Syria evaluated the degree to which Syria’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=28), provided useful advice (n=17), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=11). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Syria’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $7 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Syria?

Average Development Partner Performance in Syria

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Syria? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Program</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Program</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Program</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?

**Implementation**

- Service Delivery (4)
- De Jure Environment (3)
- Bureaucracy (2)
- Human Capital (1)
- Environment (0)

---

Citation

Host Country Profile

Tajikistan

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Tajikistan. 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. Respondents working in Tajikistan evaluated the degree to which Tajikistan’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=28), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Tajikistan's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Tajikistan?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Economic: 2
Governance: 3
Social & Environmental: 2

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

Economic: 3
Governance: 3
Social & Environmental: 3

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Economic: 4
Governance: 4
Social & Environmental: 4

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Tajikistan

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Tajikistan?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Tajikistan. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Tanzania

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Tanzania. 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. Respondents working in Tanzania evaluated the degree to which Tanzania’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=35), provided useful advice (n=22), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=22). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Tanzania’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $31 billion total)

![Bar chart showing total financial contributions by donor type.]

DAC: 41.1%

Multilateral: 57.2%

Non-DAC: 1.7%

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Tanzania?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice**

(1-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

Economic

Governance

Social & Environmental

Average Development Partner Performance in Tanzania

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Tanzania?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Usefulness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Helpfulness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Interests</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Tanzania. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Thailand

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Thailand. 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. Respondents working in Thailand evaluated the degree to which Thailand's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=15), provided useful advice (n=12), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=7). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Thailand's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Total Contributions (USD $8 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Thailand?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Thailand</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Thailand</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Performance in Thailand</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Thailand?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing development partner performance](image)

**Average Performance of all development partners in Thailand**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Bar chart showing types of problems](image)

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Thailand. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Timor-Leste

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Timor-Leste. 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. Respondents working in Timor-Leste evaluated the degree to which Timor-Leste’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=39), provided useful advice (n=21), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=15). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Timor-Leste’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $3 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Timor-Leste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Average Performance of all development partners in Timor-Leste</th>
<th>Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Timor-Leste?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil, United Nations Development Program, United Nations, Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia, European Union, Japan, United Nations, Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank, Australia, European Union, Japan, United Nations, Development Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Timor-Leste. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Timor-Leste?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Timor-Leste. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Togo. 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. Respondents working in Togo evaluated the degree to which Togo’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=21), provided useful advice (n=12), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=12). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Togo’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $4 billion total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions (Millions USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Togo?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Provides useful advice** (1-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

- Economic
- Governance
- Social & Environmental

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Togo? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Average Performance of all development partners in Togo

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Togo. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Tonga. 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. Respondents working in Tonga evaluated the degree to which Tonga’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=12), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Tonga's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $659 million total)

- Australia: 22.7%
- New Zealand: 76.4%
- Japan: 0.9%
- World Bank: 2.3%
- European Union: 1.7%
- Asian Development Bank: 0.6%
- United States: 0.4%
- United Arab Emirates: 0.1%
- Global Environment Facility: 0.1%
- International Fund for Agricultural Dev’t: 0.1%

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Tonga?

- **Influences the policy agenda (0-5)**
  - Economic: 1
  - Governance: 1
  - Social & Environmental: 1

- **Provides useful advice**
  - Economic: 4
  - Governance: 4
  - Social & Environmental: 4

- **Helpful in implementation (0-5)**
  - Economic: 5
  - Governance: 5
  - Social & Environmental: 5

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

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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Tonga?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

![Graph showing development partners' performance in Tonga]

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

![Graph showing types of problems influenced by development partners in Tonga]
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Tunisia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Tunisia. 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. Respondents working in Tunisia evaluated the degree to which Tunisia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=27), provided useful advice (n=19), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=17). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Tunisia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

Total financial contributions by donor type (USD $17 billion total)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Tunisia?

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Tunisia? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Tunisia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in 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. Respondents working in Turkey evaluated the degree to which Turkey’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=28), provided useful advice (n=26), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=22). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Turkey's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $56 billion total)

![Chart showing the total financial contributions by donor type.]

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Turkey?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

Provides useful advice**

Helpful in implementation

(0-5)

![Charts showing the performance of development partners in different policy areas.]

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Turkey? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Turkey. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Tuvalu

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Tuvalu. 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. Respondents working in Tuvalu evaluated the degree to which Tuvalu's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=11), provided useful advice (n=12), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Tuvalu's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contributions (USD $258 million total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Tuvalu?

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Tuvalu

Source: AidData's 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Tuvalu?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Tuvalu. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Host Country Profile

Uganda

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Uganda. 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. Respondents working in Uganda evaluated the degree to which Uganda's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=44), provided useful advice (n=26), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=21). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Uganda’s top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $19 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Uganda?

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

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

Average Development Partner Performance in Uganda

Average Development Partner Performance across all countries
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Uganda? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

### Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 19)

- **World Bank**: 4.5
- **Denmark**: 4.0
- **International Monetary Fund**: 3.5

### Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 16)

- **United Nations Childrens Fund**: 4.5
- **International Monetary Fund**: 4.0
- **Denmark**: 3.5

### Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 13)

- **International Monetary Fund**: 4.5
- **World Bank**: 4.0
- **Denmark**: 3.5

---

### Which types of problems do development partners influence most?**

- **Leadership**: 4.5
- **Implementation**: 4.0
- **Human Capital**: 3.5
- **Consultation**: 3.0
- **Service Delivery**: 2.0

---

Citation
Host Country Profile

Ukraine

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Ukraine. 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. Respondents working in Ukraine evaluated the degree to which Ukraine’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=23), provided useful advice (n=10), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=8). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Ukraine's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

(USD $32 billion total)

- DAC: 87.3%
- Multilateral: 12.5%
- Non-DAC: 0%

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Development Finance (Millions USD)

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Ukraine?

- 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

Citation

Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Ukraine? And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Performance of all development partners in Ukraine**

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

**Human Capital**

**Leadership**

**Funding**

**Bureaucracy**

**De Jure Environment**

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Ukraine. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

Vanuatu
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Vanuatu. 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. Respondents working in Vanuatu evaluated the degree to which Vanuatu’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=29), provided useful advice (n=18), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=15). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Vanuatu's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>Contributions ($ billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DAC</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Vanuatu?

Influences the policy agenda (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Partner Performance in Vanuatu</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Partner Performance across all countries</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Provides useful advice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Partner Performance in Vanuatu</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Partner Performance across all countries</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Helpful in implementation (0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Partner Performance in Vanuatu</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Partner Performance across all countries</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citation
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Vanuatu?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

**Influences the policy agenda**
(total DPs evaluated = 14)

New Zealand | Australia | European Union
---|---|---
4 | 4 | 3

**Provides useful advice**
(total DPs evaluated = 13)

World Bank | International Monetary Fund | United Nations Childrens Fund
---|---|---
5 | 4 | 1

**Helpful in implementation**
(total DPs evaluated = 9)

United Nations Development Program | Australia | New Zealand
---|---|---
4 | 3 | 2

---

**Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

Infrastructure | Vested Interests | Leadership | De Jure | Environment | Service Delivery
---|---|---|---|---|---
3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Vanuatu. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

---

Citation
**Vietnam**

**Summary**

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Vietnam. 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. Respondents working in Vietnam evaluated the degree to which Vietnam’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=16), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

**Who are Vietnam’s top development partners?**

![Total financial contributions by donor type*](chart)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

**How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Vietnam?**

![Average Development Partner Performance in Vietnam](chart)

**Source:** AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Host Country Profile

Vietnam

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Vietnam. 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. Respondents working in Vietnam evaluated the degree to which Vietnam's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=16), provided useful advice (n=8), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=6). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Vietnam's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*(USD $57 billion total)

* When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

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

Average Performance of all development partners in Vietnam

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?**

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Vietnam. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation

Host Country Profile

Yemen

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Yemen. 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. Respondents working in Yemen evaluated the degree to which Yemen's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=53), provided useful advice (n=33), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=30). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Yemen's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $10 billion total)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

Who are Yemen's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type
(USD $8 billion total)

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Yemen?

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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Yemen?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Yemen. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Zambia

Summary

This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Zambia. 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. Respondents working in Zambia evaluated the degree to which Zambia’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=48), provided useful advice (n=33), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=29). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Zambia's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type* (USD $15 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Zambia?

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

Source: AidData’s 2014 Reform Efforts Survey, Q14, Q21, Q25
Host Country Profile
Zambia

Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Zambia. 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. Respondents working in Zambia evaluated the degree to which Zambia's development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=48), provided useful advice (n=33), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=29). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Zambia's top development partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total financial contributions by donor type*</th>
<th>(USD $15 billion total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When a donor type's contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData's 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Zambia?

**Influences the policy agenda (total DPs evaluated = 21)**

**Provides useful advice** (total DPs evaluated = 16)

**Helpful in implementation (total DPs evaluated = 11)**

Average Performance of all development partners in Zambia

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

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

***The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Zambia. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation
Zimbabwe
Summary
This profile showcases different dimensions of performance and the distribution of development finance in Zimbabwe. 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. Respondents working in Zimbabwe evaluated the degree to which Zimbabwe’s development partners influenced the policy agenda (n=29), provided useful advice (n=14), and how helpful the development partners were in implementation (n=13). The 2004-2013 Core Database represents the most comprehensive dataset tracking international development finance.

Who are Zimbabwe's top development partners?

Total financial contributions by donor type*
(USD $6 billion total)

* When a donor type’s contributions are less than 0.1%, they are not represented in this figure.

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

How are development partners performing in different policy areas in Zimbabwe?

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
Which development partners were rated most highly by survey participants in Zimbabwe?
And how do they compare against the average of all development partners?

Which types of problems do development partners influence most?***

*** The graph displays the types of problems where development partners were most influential in influencing the policy agenda in Zimbabwe. Respondents identified a total of 16 types of problems.

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

Citation