Development Partner Profile

International Fund for Agricultural Development

Summary

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

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

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

1. India (5%, 279.9)
2. China (4%, 244.4)
3. Nigeria (4%, 239.9)
4. Ethiopia (4%, 216.7)
5. Bangladesh (4%, 215.8)
6. Vietnam (3%, 177.5)
7. Pakistan (3%, 168.1)
8. Brazil (3%, 160.3)
9. Burkina Faso (3%, 146.7)
10. Tanzania (2%, 138.7)

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

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

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

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Insufficient data

Source: AidData’s 2004-2013 Core Database

Insufficient data
How do in-country stakeholders perceive the International Fund for Agricultural Development's performance?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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