**Development Partner Profile**

**European Bank for Reconstruction and Development**

**Summary**

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

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

**Top Partner Countries**

(in millions USD by % of development finance)

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

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

(millions of USD)

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The usefulness of advice scale ranged from 1 to 5.

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

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

- **Influences the policy agenda**
- **Provides useful advice**
- **Helpful in implementation**

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

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

Agenda-setting influence:

0= no influence at all
5= maximum influence

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

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