

---

# STATISTICAL APPENDICES

[APPENDICES A, B AND C](#) provide data for all of the 12 indicators measured through the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, along with data drawn from the 2006 and 2008 Surveys to facilitate comparison. The charts contained in the body of the report are based on this data.

Appendix A provides a breakdown of the data for each of the indicators on a country-by-country basis, while Appendix B covers all surveyed indicators on a donor-by-donor basis. Appendix C summarises each donor's data in a single table containing the surveyed indicators. Appendix D outlines the indicators of progress agreed in the Paris Declaration, and the means through which 2010 targets are established.



# STATISTICAL APPENDICES

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>A. COUNTRY DATA (ONE TABLE PER INDICATOR)</b> .....	111
Table A.0: Coverage of the survey: aid reported in the survey vs. Core aid reported to the DAC .....	114
Table A.1: Do countries have operational development strategies? .....	116
Table A.2a: How reliable are country public financial management systems? .....	117
Table A.2b: How reliable are country procurement systems? .....	118
Table A.3: Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic? .....	120
Table A.4: How much technical assistance is co-ordinated with country programmes? .....	122
Table A.5: How much aid for the government sector uses country systems? .....	124
Table A.6: How many PIUs are parallel to country structures? .....	126
Table A.7: Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government? ....	128
Table A.8: How much bilateral aid is untied? .....	130
Table A.9: How much aid was programme-based? .....	132
Table A.10a: How many donor missions were co-ordinated? .....	134
Table A.10b: How much country analysis was co-ordinated? .....	136
Table A.11: Do countries have monitorable performance assessment frameworks? .....	138
Table A.12: Do countries have reviews of mutual accountability? .....	139
<b>B. DONOR DATA (ONE TABLE PER INDICATOR)</b> .....	141
Table B.3: Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic? ..	144
Table B.4: How much technical assistance is co-ordinated with country programmes? .....	146
Table B.5: How much aid for the government sector uses country systems? .	148
Table B.6: How many PIUs are parallel to country structures? .....	150
Table B.7: Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government? ....	152
Table B.8: How much bilateral aid is untied? .....	154
Table B.9: How much aid was programme-based? .....	156
Table B.10a: How many donor missions were co-ordinated? .....	158
Table B.10b: How much country analysis was co-ordinated? .....	160

<b>C. DONOR DATA (ONE TABLE PER DONOR)</b> .....	163
Table C.1: African Development Bank .....	165
Table C.2: Asian Development Bank .....	166
Table C.3: Australia .....	167
Table C.4: Austria .....	168
Table C.5: Belgium .....	169
Table C.6: Canada .....	170
Table C.7: Denmark .....	171
Table C.8: EU Institutions .....	172
Table C.9: Finland .....	173
Table C.10: France .....	174
Table C.11: GAVI Alliance .....	175
Table C.12: Germany .....	176
Table C.13: Global Fund .....	177
Table C.14: IFAD .....	178
Table C.15: IMF .....	179
Table C.16: Inter-American Development Bank .....	180
Table C.17: Ireland .....	181
Table C.18: Italy .....	182
Table C.19: Japan .....	183
Table C.20: Korea .....	184
Table C.21: Luxembourg .....	185
Table C.22: Netherlands .....	186
Table C.23: New Zealand .....	187
Table C.24: Norway .....	188
Table C.25: Portugal .....	189
Table C.26: Spain .....	190
Table C.27: Sweden .....	191
Table C.28: Switzerland .....	192
Table C.29: Turkey .....	193
Table C.30: United Kingdom .....	194
Table C.31: United Nations .....	195
Table C.32: United States .....	196
Table C.33: World Bank .....	197
<b>D. PARIS DECLARATION INDICATORS OF PROGRESS</b> ...	199

# A COUNTRY DATA

## ONE TABLE PER INDICATOR

THE FOLLOWING TABLES provide the data for all 12 of the indicators on a country-by-country basis. Data are presented for the 78 countries and territories that have taken part in the 2011 Survey.

### HOW TO USE APPENDIX A

Progress over the period 2005-2010 is measured for a set of 32 countries that participated in both the 2006 Baseline Survey and the 2011 Survey. The upper part of the following tables shows the data for this group of countries. All available data for all other countries are then shown in the lower part of each table, though because not all countries participated in every round of the Survey, these data do not form a basis for accurate comparisons over time.

Table A.0 provides information on the coverage of the 2011 Survey. The amounts reported in the Survey equate to over 100% of core aid in 2009 – that is, aid programmed for spending in partner countries – which members of the Development Assistance Committee reported for 2009.

### DATA SOURCES

The tables in Appendix A draw on a number of different sources:

- Indicator 1 (operational development strategies) and Indicator 11 (results-oriented frameworks) draw on an assessment undertaken by World Bank staff on the basis of information provided by stakeholders in each partner country through a Government Questionnaire. The criteria for assessment are the same as those used in the 2006 and 2008 Surveys, and are published in World Bank (2007) *Results-based National Development Strategies: assessment and challenges ahead*, World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Indicator 2a (reliable public financial management systems) is drawn from the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA), criterion 13 (Quality of Budgetary and Financial Management).
- Indicator 2b (reliable procurement systems) is – where available – based on the OECD-DAC Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems.
- Indicator 8 (untying aid) is based on reporting by OECD-DAC members on the tying status of aid through the Creditor Reporting System.
- Data for the remaining indicators are drawn from the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, and are collected at the country level through government and donor questionnaires.

### GLOBAL INDICATORS AND AVERAGE COUNTRY RATIOS

Where indicators are calculated on the basis of data collected through questionnaires, the column headings of the tables in Appendix A are labelled to show the formula used in the calculation of each indicator. For most of these indicators, global values are the weighted averages of the country values. The average country ratio is presented under each total for reference purposes only. This is an un-weighted average of all of the individual donor-partner country calculations; *i.e.* it gives equal weight to each donor / partner country irrespective of the volume of aid involved.

Indicators 3 (aid flows are aligned on national priorities) and 7 (aid is more predictable) are notable exceptions to the approach described above. For these indicators, the individual country values presented in tables A.3 and A.7 tend to overstate the extent to which aid is captured in government budgets and accounting systems as within a given country, over- and under-estimates by different donors cancel each other out. Consistent with the methodology used in 2008, the global values presented for indicators 3 and 7 are an un-weighted average of all of the individual donor-partner country calculations. These individual calculations address the challenge presented by over- and under-estimation by inverting the numerator and denominator to ensure that the ratio presented is always less than or equal to 100%. This offers a more realistic – albeit un-weighted – indicator of progress.

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The provision of final data for indicator 8 (aid untying) by donors for 2005 and 2007 after publication of reports on the previous surveys means that the historical figures provided in table A.8 may differ from those published previously.

Southern Sudan became the Republic of South Sudan in July 2011. All data for the 2011 Survey were collected in the first half of 2011 and relate to aid activities in 2010, prior to independence. In order to avoid double counting, the calculation of global values for some indicators excludes data submitted by Southern Sudan where the country submission for the Republic of the Sudan was known to include data on activities in Southern Sudan. Where this is the case, data for Southern Sudan are shown at the end of each table for reference.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE A.0 Coverage of the Survey: Aid reported in the Survey vs. Core aid reported to the DAC

	Aid reported in the 2011 Survey (USD m)	Core aid reported to the DAC for 2009 <sup>x</sup> (USD m)	Ratio			Gross ODA reported to the DAC for 2009 <sup>y</sup> (USD m)	Ratio			Aid disbursed through other donors 2010 (USD m)
			2005	2007	2010		2005	2007	2010	
	a	b	(for reference)	(for reference)	c = a / b	d	(for reference)	(for reference)	e = a / d	
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>										
Afghanistan	5 807	5 661	95%	79%	103%	6 236	86%	73%	93%	1 186
Albania	372	402	100%	86%	93%	403	100%	85%	92%	12
Bangladesh	2 137	1 774	106%	90%	120%	1 868	103%	81%	114%	262
Benin	658	689	68%	81%	95%	697	63%	79%	94%	39
Bolivia	708	731	111%	87%	97%	741	104%	29%	96%	23
Burkina Faso	974	1 074	83%	87%	91%	1 113	78%	84%	88%	39
Burundi	595	475	62%	78%	125%	1 555	36%	59%	38%	32
Cambodia	884	733	86%	106%	121%	745	85%	104%	119%	83
Cape Verde	344	214	62%	85%	161%	216	62%	84%	159%	5
Congo, Dem. Rep.	1 644	1 824	91%	123%	90%	2 552	48%	69%	64%	103
Dominican Republic	394	199	104%	167%	198%	210	103%	158%	188%	2
Egypt	1 824	1 427	72%	90%	128%	1 556	64%	81%	117%	14
Ethiopia	3 228	3 167	99%	88%	102%	3 818	62%	77%	85%	374
Ghana	1 489	1 592	91%	95%	94%	1 645	63%	93%	91%	31
Honduras	821	454	78%	101%	181%	464	32%	25%	177%	19
Kenya	1 025	1 627	83%	55%	63%	1 991	75%	48%	51%	86
Kyrgyz Republic	370	356	63%	75%	104%	370	61%	74%	100%	7
Malawi	942	760	108%	72%	124%	770	93%	29%	122%	17
Mali	1 093	1 001	84%	89%	109%	1 031	77%	77%	106%	3
Mauritania	284	274	85%	107%	104%	289	72%	102%	98%	19
Moldova	448	260	87%	83%	173%	261	82%	80%	172%	24
Mongolia	357	417	72%	44%	86%	421	70%	44%	85%	19
Mozambique	1 854	2 003	96%	90%	93%	2 035	93%	89%	91%	26
Niger	511	436	88%	82%	117%	484	70%	76%	105%	39
Peru	1 055	646	90%	56%	163%	699	80%	52%	151%	6
Rwanda	1 096	920	105%	109%	119%	937	91%	107%	117%	31
Senegal	681	1 039	76%	78%	66%	1 065	60%	76%	64%	42
South Africa	1 222	1 111	78%	0%	110%	1 114	77%	0%	110%	1
Tanzania	2 763	2 878	94%	88%	96%	2 954	87%	66%	94%	80
Uganda	1 504	1 653	98%	83%	91%	1 791	83%	72%	84%	44
Viet Nam	3 977	4 154	94%	97%	96%	4 174	93%	96%	95%	98
Zambia	882	1 240	92%	98%	71%	1 267	37%	90%	70%	58
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>41 942</b>	<b>41 190</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>102%</b>	<b>45 474</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>2 826</b>

TABLE A.0 Coverage of the Survey: Aid reported in the Survey vs. Core aid reported to the DAC

	Aid reported in the 2011 Survey (USD m)	Core aid reported to the DAC for 2009 <sup>x</sup> (USD m)	Ratio			Gross ODA reported to the DAC for 2009 <sup>y</sup> (USD m)	Ratio			Aid disbursed through other donors 2010 (USD m)
			2005	2007	2010		2005	2007	2010	
	a	b	(for reference)	(for reference)	c = a / b	d	(for reference)	(for reference)	e = a / d	
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>										
Armenia	367	569	--	--	64%	570	--	--	64%	0
Bosnia-Herzegovina	358	430	--	--	83%	437	--	--	82%	43
Botswana	72	291	--	--	25%	292	--	--	25%	0
Cameroon	431	738	--	77%	58%	797	--	24%	54%	8
Central African Rep.	180	203	--	98%	89%	779	--	72%	23%	23
Chad	246	296	--	68%	83%	598	--	37%	41%	34
Colombia	670	1 030	--	58%	65%	1 117	--	51%	60%	140
Comoros	57	57	--	--	100%	60	--	--	95%	9
Ecuador	183	296	--	--	62%	306	--	--	60%	18
El Salvador	431	322	--	--	134%	347	--	--	124%	19
Fiji	66	72	--	--	92%	74	--	--	89%	6
Gabon	135	82	--	60%	164%	113	--	60%	119%	2
Gambia	97	141	--	--	69%	142	--	--	68%	0
Guatemala	247	424	--	--	58%	430	--	--	57%	0
Guinea-Bissau	132	151	--	--	88%	165	--	--	80%	9
Haiti	1 664	975	--	107%	171%	1 949	--	90%	85%	89
Indonesia	6 436	3 383	--	158%	190%	3 676	--	142%	175%	278
Jamaica	1 013	216	--	--	468%	218	--	--	466%	3
Jordan	583	781	--	72%	75%	812	--	63%	72%	0
Kosovo	381	767	--	--	50%	784	--	--	49%	23
Laos	426	462	--	82%	92%	472	--	82%	90%	35
Lesotho	295	144	--	--	205%	147	--	--	201%	1
Liberia	402	362	--	108%	111%	527	--	92%	76%	16
Madagascar	442	437	--	86%	101%	455	--	77%	97%	32
Morocco	1 551	1 400	--	108%	111%	1 402	--	107%	111%	6
Namibia	199	330	--	--	60%	333	--	--	60%	4
Nepal	875	901	--	96%	97%	969	--	87%	90%	27
Nigeria	2 101	1 697	--	51%	124%	1 703	--	32%	123%	31
Pakistan	2 944	2 926	--	--	101%	3 454	--	--	85%	127
Papua New Guinea	599	440	--	102%	136%	447	--	101%	134%	4
Philippines	1 899	1 137	--	160%	167%	1 212	--	157%	157%	52
Samoa	180	80	--	--	224%	83	--	--	217%	0
Sao Tome & Principe	43	31	--	--	139%	31	--	--	138%	1
Sierra Leone	451	441	--	89%	102%	450	--	26%	100%	15
Solomon Islands	203	210	--	--	97%	211	--	--	96%	205
St.Vincent & Grenadines	4	35	--	--	13%	36	--	--	13%	1
Sudan	1 293	1 035	--	97%	125%	2 330	--	39%	55%	301
Swaziland	132	67	--	--	196%	69	--	--	192%	5
Tajikistan	387	418	--	--	93%	436	--	--	89%	35
Timor-Leste	341	211	--	--	161%	216	--	--	158%	37
Togo	146	262	--	67%	56%	541	--	62%	27%	20
Tonga	54	39	--	--	138%	41	--	--	132%	7
Ukraine	566	674	--	80%	84%	675	--	80%	84%	127
Vanuatu	114	106	--	--	108%	106	--	--	108%	2
West Bank and Gaza	1 589	1 848	--	--	86%	2 569	--	--	62%	291
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>30 985</b>	<b>26 918</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>115%</b>	<b>32 580</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>2 087</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>72 927</b>	<b>68 109</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>107%</b>	<b>78 054</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>4 913</b>
For reference: Global coverage of the Survey										
Total for the Survey (77 countries)	72 927	68 109	91%	79%	107%	78 054	73%	64%	93%	
All other countries (79 countries)	--	25 732	--	--	--	29 967	--	--	--	
<b>TOTAL(z)</b>	<b>72 927</b>	<b>93 840</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>108 021</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>68%</b>	

(x): "Core aid" matches closely the definition of aid used in the Survey; it excludes debt reorganisation and humanitarian aid.

(y): "Gross ODA" includes all types of ODA reported to the DAC for the calendar year 2009.

(z): The total includes country allocable aid only; it excludes regional and global activities.

TABLE A.1 Do countries have operational development strategies?

	Indicator 1		
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>			
Afghanistan	N/A	D	C
Albania	C	C	B
Bangladesh	C	C	C
Benin	C	C	B
Bolivia	C	C	C
Burkina Faso	C	B	C
Burundi	D	C	D
Cambodia	C	C	B
Cape Verde	C	C	D
Congo, Dem. Rep.	D	D	D
Dominican Republic	N/A	N/A	D
Egypt	N/A	N/A	B
Ethiopia	C	B	B
Ghana	C	B	B
Honduras	C	C	B
Kenya	D	C	B
Kyrgyz Republic	C	C	D
Malawi	C	C	B
Mali	C	C	C
Mauritania	B	C	C
Moldova	D	C	C
Mongolia	D	C	C
Mozambique	C	C	B
Niger	C	C	C
Peru	N/A	N/A	D
Rwanda	B	B	A
Senegal	C	C	C
South Africa	N/A	N/A	B
Tanzania	B	B	A
Uganda	B	B	B
Viet Nam	B	B	B
Zambia	C	B	B

	Indicator 1		
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>			
Armenia	C	C	C
Bosnia-Herzegovina	C	C	D
Botswana	N/A	N/A	B
Cameroon	C	C	C
Central African Rep.	D	D	D
Chad	C	C	D
Colombia	N/A	N/A	B
Comoros	N/A	N/A	D
Ecuador	N/A	N/A	B
El Salvador	N/A	N/A	C
Fiji	N/A	N/A	C
Gabon	N/A	N/A	D
Gambia	D	C	C
Guatemala	N/A	N/A	D
Guinea-Bissau	E	D	D
Haiti	D	D	D
Indonesia	N/A	N/A	B
Jamaica	N/A	N/A	B
Jordan	N/A	N/A	B
Kosovo	N/A	N/A	E
Laos	C	C	B
Lesotho	C	C	C
Liberia	D	D	D
Madagascar	C	C	D
Morocco	N/A	N/A	N/A
Namibia	N/A	N/A	C
Nepal	C	C	D
Nigeria	N/A	C	B
Pakistan	C	C	B
Papua New Guinea	N/A	N/A	C
Philippines	N/A	N/A	B
Samoa	N/A	N/A	C
Sao Tome & Principe	D	D	D
Sierra Leone	D	C	C
Solomon Islands	N/A	N/A	C
St.Vincent & Grenadines	N/A	N/A	D
Sudan	D	D	B
Swaziland	N/A	N/A	D
Tajikistan	C	C	C
Timor-Leste	N/A	N/A	C
Togo	N/A	N/A	B
Tonga	N/A	N/A	D
Ukraine	N/A	N/A	D
Vanuatu	N/A	N/A	C
West Bank and Gaza	N/A	N/A	N/A
For reference:			
Southern Sudan	N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE A.2a How reliable are country public financial management systems?

	Indicator 2a		
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>			
Afghanistan	N/A	3.0	3.5
Albania	4.0	N/A	N/A
Bangladesh	3.0	3.0	3.0
Benin	4.0	3.5	3.5
Bolivia	3.5	3.5	3.5
Burkina Faso	4.0	4.0	4.5
Burundi	2.5	3.0	3.0
Cambodia	2.5	3.0	3.5
Cape Verde	3.5	4.0	4.0
Congo, Dem. Rep.	2.5	2.5	2.5
Dominican Republic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Egypt	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ethiopia	3.5	4.0	3.5
Ghana	3.5	4.0	3.5
Honduras	4.0	4.0	3.5
Kenya	3.5	3.5	3.5
Kyrgyz Republic	3.0	3.0	3.5
Malawi	3.0	3.0	3.0
Mali	4.0	3.5	3.5
Mauritania	2.0	2.5	3.0
Moldova	3.5	4.0	4.0
Mongolia	4.0	4.0	4.0
Mozambique	3.5	3.5	4.0
Niger	3.5	3.5	3.5
Peru	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rwanda	3.5	4.0	4.0
Senegal	3.5	3.5	3.5
South Africa	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tanzania	4.5	4.0	3.5
Uganda	4.0	4.0	3.5
Viet Nam	4.0	4.0	4.0
Zambia	3.0	3.5	3.5

	Indicator 2a		
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>			
Armenia	4.0	4.0	4.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina	3.5	3.5	3.5
Botswana	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cameroon	3.5	3.5	3.0
Central African Rep.	2.0	2.0	3.0
Chad	3.0	2.0	2.0
Colombia	N/A	N/A	N/A
Comoros	2.0	1.5	2.0
Ecuador	N/A	N/A	N/A
El Salvador	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fiji	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gabon	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gambia	2.5	3.0	3.5
Guatemala	N/A	N/A	N/A
Guinea-Bissau	2.5	2.5	2.5
Haiti	2.5	3.0	3.0
Indonesia	3.5	N/A	N/A
Jamaica	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jordan	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kosovo	N/A	N/A	4.0
Laos	2.5	3.0	3.5
Lesotho	3.0	3.0	3.5
Liberia	N/A	N/A	2.5
Madagascar	3.0	3.5	2.5
Morocco	N/A	N/A	N/A
Namibia	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nepal	3.5	3.5	2.5
Nigeria	3.0	3.0	3.0
Pakistan	3.5	3.5	3.5
Papua New Guinea	3.5	3.5	3.0
Philippines	N/A	N/A	N/A
Samoa	4.0	3.5	3.5
Sao Tome & Principe	3.0	3.0	3.0
Sierra Leone	3.5	3.5	3.5
Solomon Islands	3.0	2.5	2.5
St.Vincent & Grenadines	3.5	3.5	3.5
Sudan	2.5	2.0	2.0
Swaziland	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tajikistan	3.0	3.0	3.5
Timor-Leste	N/A	3.0	3.0
Togo	2.0	2.0	3.0
Tonga	2.5	2.5	3.5
Ukraine	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vanuatu	3.5	3.5	4.0
West Bank and Gaza	N/A	N/A	N/A
For reference:			
Southern Sudan	N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE A.2b: How reliable are country procurement systems?

	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating
<b>Country</b>		
Afghanistan	C	
Albania		C
Cambodia		C
Cameroon	B	
Ghana	C	
Indonesia	C	
Kosovo		B
Laos	C	
Malawi	C	
Moldova		C
Mongolia	C	
Namibia		C
Niger	B	
Philippines	C	
Rwanda	B	
Senegal	B	
Sierra Leone	B	
Tanzania	B	
Uganda	B	
Viet Nam	C	
Yemen	D	
Zambia	C	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE A.3: Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	Government's budget estimates of aid flows for 2010	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	Indicator 3			Progress
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>						
Afghanistan	1 494	5 465	55%	69%	27%	-27
Albania	286	333	32%	73%	86%	+54
Bangladesh	2 256	2 267	88%	92%	100%	+11
Benin	259	596	47%	28%	43%	-3
Bolivia	559	480	71%	83%	86%	+15
Burkina Faso	759	904	68%	92%	84%	+16
Burundi	260	503	39%	54%	52%	+12
Cambodia	821	720	79%	85%	88%	+9
Cape Verde	163	318	85%	90%	51%	-34
Congo, Dem. Rep.	2 114	1 131	81%	58%	53%	-28
Dominican Republic	430	319	62%	51%	74%	+12
Egypt	545	2 277	58%	57%	24%	-34
Ethiopia	1 277	2 651	74%	62%	48%	-26
Ghana	1 333	1 435	96%	95%	93%	-3
Honduras	308	707	50%	99%	44%	-6
Kenya	1 135	814	91%	64%	72%	-19
Kyrgyz Republic	73	299	70%	63%	24%	-45
Malawi	559	618	54%	64%	90%	+37
Mali	661	999	60%	73%	66%	+6
Mauritania	--	204	65%	57%	--	--
Moldova	421	389	70%	57%	92%	+23
Mongolia	58	305	2%	37%	19%	+17
Mozambique	1 519	1 683	83%	83%	90%	+7
Niger	370	436	99%	91%	85%	-15
Peru	663	842	46%	63%	79%	+33
Rwanda	639	898	49%	51%	71%	+22
Senegal	409	613	89%	88%	67%	-22
South Africa	0	926	71%	--	0%	-71
Tanzania	2 310	2 134	90%	84%	92%	+3
Uganda	1 132	1 088	79%	98%	96%	+17
Viet Nam	3 334	3 783	81%	80%	88%	+8
Zambia	350	670	52%	74%	52%	0
<b>Sub-Total*</b>			<b>44%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>+1.8</b>
Global weighted average	26 498	36 805	90%	90%	72%	-17.7

TABLE A.3: Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	Government's budget estimates of aid flows for 2010	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	Indicator 3			Progress
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>						
Armenia	282	336	--	--	84%	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0	273	--	--	0%	--
Botswana	65	41	--	--	63%	--
Cameroon	302	360	--	86%	84%	--
Central African Rep.	0	127	--	36%	0%	--
Chad	93	216	--	88%	43%	--
Colombia	393	491	--	22%	80%	--
Comoros	39	38	--	--	97%	--
Ecuador	96	98	--	--	98%	--
El Salvador	15	380	--	--	4%	--
Fiji	51	54	--	--	95%	--
Gabon	123	134	--	22%	92%	--
Gambia	22	67	--	--	33%	--
Guatemala	56	162	--	--	35%	--
Guinea-Bissau	44	113	--	--	39%	--
Haiti	235	1 052	--	95%	22%	--
Indonesia	6 480	6 158	--	70%	95%	--
Jamaica	0	745	--	--	0%	--
Jordan	263	435	--	60%	60%	--
Kosovo	106	301	--	0%	35%	--
Laos	387	441	--	66%	88%	--
Lesotho	136	89	--	--	66%	--
Liberia	9	160	--	0%	5%	--
Madagascar	164	357	--	87%	46%	--
Morocco	1 401	1 429	--	80%	98%	--
Namibia	49	115	--	--	43%	--
Nepal	695	710	--	74%	98%	--
Nigeria	--	1 552	--	6%	--	--
Pakistan	1 621	2 691	--	--	60%	--
Papua New Guinea	528	375	--	76%	71%	--
Philippines	444	1 729	--	51%	26%	--
Samoa	143	123	--	--	86%	--
Sao Tome & Principe	41	38	--	--	91%	--
Sierra Leone	186	356	--	54%	52%	--
Solomon Islands	34	162	--	--	21%	--
St.Vincent & Grenadines	3	4	--	--	89%	--
Sudan	352	1 007	--	85%	35%	--
Swaziland	--	123	--	--	--	--
Tajikistan	171	340	--	--	50%	--
Timor-Leste	180	220	--	--	82%	--
Togo	99	112	--	69%	89%	--
Tonga	38	34	--	--	90%	--
Ukraine	174	369	--	75%	47%	--
Vanuatu	44	83	--	--	54%	--
West Bank and Gaza	--	1 246	--	--	--	--
<b>Sub-Total *</b>			--	<b>36%</b>	<b>36%</b>	--
Global weighted average	15 567	25 446	--	67%	61%	--
<b>TOTAL *</b>			<b>44%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>41%</b>	--
Global weighted average	42 066	62 251	90%	82%	68%	--
For reference:						
Southern Sudan	--	513	--	--	--	--

(\*) Ratio is  $c = a / b$  except where government's budget estimates are greater than disbursements ( $c = b / a$ ).

TABLE A.4: How much technical assistance is coordinated with country programmes?

	Co-ordinated technical cooperation	Total technical cooperation	Indicator 4			Progress
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010/2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>						
Afghanistan	686	2 884	37%	54%	24%	-13
Albania	67	114	28%	51%	58%	+30
Bangladesh	221	407	31%	69%	54%	+24
Benin	78	96	56%	54%	82%	+25
Bolivia	82	156	80%	83%	53%	-28
Burkina Faso	56	116	3%	56%	49%	+45
Burundi	77	144	43%	41%	53%	+11
Cambodia	72	263	36%	35%	27%	-9
Cape Verde	22	54	93%	39%	40%	-53
Congo, Dem. Rep.	112	330	11%	38%	34%	+23
Dominican Republic	55	62	37%	87%	89%	+52
Egypt	253	325	76%	86%	78%	+2
Ethiopia	387	448	27%	67%	86%	+59
Ghana	125	210	40%	74%	59%	+19
Honduras	74	105	47%	84%	70%	+23
Kenya	241	571	60%	64%	42%	-18
Kyrgyz Republic	114	141	24%	74%	81%	+57
Malawi	74	112	47%	52%	66%	+19
Mali	128	208	15%	75%	62%	+47
Mauritania	36	50	19%	53%	72%	+52
Moldova	64	91	26%	29%	71%	+45
Mongolia	73	90	18%	66%	81%	+63
Mozambique	61	214	38%	27%	28%	-10
Niger	34	61	15%	50%	55%	+40
Peru	252	333	5%	66%	76%	+70
Rwanda	242	265	58%	84%	92%	+34
Senegal	133	166	18%	54%	80%	+62
South Africa	622	709	95%	--	88%	-7
Tanzania	113	432	50%	61%	26%	-23
Uganda	95	125	42%	58%	76%	+34
Viet Nam	338	573	85%	68%	59%	-26
Zambia	105	132	32%	34%	79%	+47
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>5 091</b>	<b>9 988</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>+1.9</b>
Avg. country ratio			40%	60%	57%	+16.7

TABLE A.4: How much technical assistance is coordinated with country programmes?

	Co-ordinated technical cooperation	Total technical cooperation	Indicator 4			Progress
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010/2005 (% points)
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>				--	51%	
Armenia	34	66	--	--	77%	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	56	73	--	--	84%	--
Botswana	13	16	--	30%	65%	--
Cameroon	66	100	--	37%	34%	--
Central African Rep.	5	15	--	64%	83%	--
Chad	40	49	--	41%	90%	--
Colombia	318	354	--	--	43%	--
Comoros	5	13	--	--	54%	--
Ecuador	38	70	--	--	31%	--
El Salvador	58	183	--	--	52%	--
Fiji	10	20	--	70%	53%	--
Gabon	14	26	--	--	50%	--
Gambia	9	18	--	--	68%	--
Guatemala	53	78	--	--	48%	--
Guinea-Bissau	16	33	--	65%	82%	--
Haiti	369	450	--	60%	68%	--
Indonesia	569	838	--	--	85%	--
Jamaica	37	43	--	95%	94%	--
Jordan	298	316	--	51%	5%	--
Kosovo	9	174	--	54%	74%	--
Laos	96	130	--	--	89%	--
Lesotho	67	75	--	35%	96%	--
Liberia	134	139	--	71%	77%	--
Madagascar	50	64	--	82%	82%	--
Morocco	138	167	--	--	81%	--
Namibia	63	78	--	15%	48%	--
Nepal	105	220	--	71%	40%	--
Nigeria	249	628	--	--	80%	--
Pakistan	354	441	--	25%	64%	--
Papua New Guinea	86	135	--	89%	98%	--
Philippines	326	333	--	--	77%	--
Samoa	10	13	--	--	54%	--
Sao Tome & Principe	9	17	--	22%	73%	--
Sierra Leone	89	122	--	--	86%	--
Solomon Islands	45	52	--	--	97%	--
St.Vincent & Grenadines	0	0	--	53%	59%	--
Sudan	291	497	--	--	78%	--
Swaziland	34	43	--	--	83%	--
Tajikistan	108	130	--	--	50%	--
Timor-Leste	76	154	--	29%	60%	--
Togo	13	21	--	--	37%	--
Tonga	5	13	--	35%	26%	--
Ukraine	67	257	--	--	60%	--
Vanuatu	22	36	--	--	80%	--
West Bank and Gaza	142	178		57%	67%	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>4 596</b>	<b>6 879</b>	--	<b>57%</b>	<b>67%</b>	--
Avg. country ratio			--	49%	59%	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9 687</b>	<b>16 867</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>57%</b>	--
Avg. country ratio			40%	56%	58%	--
For reference:						
Southern Sudan	27	215	--	--	13%	--

TABLE A.5: How much aid for the government sector uses country systems?

	Aid disbursed by donors for gov. sector  (USD m) a	Public financial management							Proc. systems				
		Budget execution (USD m) b	Financial reporting (USD m) c	Auditing (USDm) d	Indicator 5a			Progress 2010/2005 (% pts.)	Proc. systems (USD m) e	Indicator 5b			Progress 2010 / 2005 (% points)
					2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 avg(b,c,d) / a			2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 e / a	
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>													
Afghanistan	5 342	1 626	1 529	930	44%	48%	25%	-18	600	44%	18%	11%	-33
Albania	333	45	36	33	14%	12%	11%	-3	34	6%	10%	10%	+4
Bangladesh	1 721	915	1 211	1 229	53%	77%	65%	+12	501	48%	66%	29%	-19
Benin	596	197	161	161	52%	47%	29%	-23	238	64%	63%	40%	-24
Bolivia	480	364	117	0	26%	39%	33%	+7	187	15%	36%	39%	+24
Burkina Faso	904	480	499	458	45%	43%	53%	+8	546	60%	54%	60%	-0
Burundi	503	109	125	118	24%	33%	23%	-1	154	19%	35%	31%	+11
Cambodia	720	167	144	140	10%	14%	21%	+11	171	6%	16%	24%	+18
Cape Verde	318	95	95	87	64%	23%	29%	-35	251	53%	22%	79%	+26
Congo, Dem. Rep.	1 131	117	160	150	13%	0%	13%	-0	104	31%	1%	9%	-22
Dominican Republic	319	230	228	227	2%	49%	72%	+69	231	5%	40%	73%	+67
Egypt	1 758	971	844	767	28%	12%	49%	+21	988	25%	23%	56%	+31
Ethiopia	2 777	1 770	2 050	1 958	45%	47%	69%	+24	1 526	43%	41%	55%	+12
Ghana	1 435	934	815	856	62%	51%	60%	-2	804	52%	56%	56%	+4
Honduras	707	431	57	147	26%	55%	30%	+4	152	5%	63%	22%	+16
Kenya	888	614	354	580	47%	54%	58%	+11	336	45%	37%	38%	-7
Kyrgyz Republic	299	99	100	86	3%	13%	32%	+29	83	2%	12%	28%	+26
Malawi	752	519	542	437	55%	50%	66%	+12	463	35%	35%	62%	+27
Mali	999	333	336	297	29%	34%	32%	+3	365	45%	35%	36%	-8
Mauritania	204	69	61	57	4%	8%	31%	+26	69	20%	22%	34%	+14
Moldova	389	272	281	266	25%	41%	70%	+45	276	25%	39%	71%	+46
Mongolia	305	57	96	91	49%	17%	27%	-22	63	26%	29%	21%	-5
Mozambique	1 683	902	871	593	36%	44%	47%	+11	942	38%	54%	56%	+18
Niger	436	134	126	122	27%	26%	29%	+2	101	49%	37%	23%	-26
Peru	842	648	580	605	43%	45%	73%	+30	584	44%	51%	69%	+26
Rwanda	1 063	443	653	499	39%	42%	50%	+11	677	46%	43%	64%	+18
Senegal	613	157	219	154	23%	19%	29%	+6	236	29%	41%	38%	+9
South Africa	926	238	228	235	38%	--	25%	-13	279	44%	--	30%	-14
Tanzania	2 227	1 851	1 718	1 717	66%	71%	79%	+13	1 603	61%	69%	72%	+11
Uganda	1 051	701	555	824	60%	57%	66%	+6	454	54%	37%	43%	-11
Viet Nam	3 783	2 604	2 212	2 209	32%	63%	62%	+30	2 480	33%	59%	66%	+33
Zambia	670	336	342	359	34%	59%	52%	+17	362	44%	71%	54%	+11
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>36 172</b>	<b>18 425</b>	<b>17 343</b>	<b>16 391</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>+8.1</b>	<b>15 859</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>+4.3</b>
Avg. country ratio					32%	34%	37%	+4.8		37%	42%	41%	+3.7

TABLE A.5: How much aid for the government sector uses country systems?

	Aid disbursed by donors for gov. sector (USD m) a	Public financial management							Progress				
		Budget execution (USD m) b	Financial reporting (USD m) c	Auditing (USDm) d	Indicator 5a			Progress 2010/2005 (% pts.)	Proc. systems (USD m) e	Indicator 5b			Progress 2010 / 2005 (% points)
					2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 avg(b,c,d) / a			2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 e / a	
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>													
Armenia	336	254	91	91	--	--	43%	--	72	--	--	21%	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	273	121	118	173	--	--	50%	--	122	--	--	45%	--
Botswana	67	41	43	47	--	--	65%	--	36	--	--	53%	--
Cameroon	360	40	39	41	--	53%	11%	--	82	--	63%	23%	--
Central African Rep.	127	37	37	37	--	24%	29%	--	37	--	10%	29%	--
Chad	216	20	11	11	--	1%	7%	--	12	--	11%	5%	--
Colombia	491	56	30	24	--	9%	7%	--	19	--	4%	4%	--
Comoros	38	7	5	5	--	--	15%	--	11	--	--	30%	--
Ecuador	98	27	22	22	--	--	24%	--	50	--	--	51%	--
El Salvador	380	136	87	95	--	--	28%	--	107	--	--	28%	--
Fiji	54	25	30	18	--	--	45%	--	4	--	--	7%	--
Gabon	134	46	41	40	--	5%	32%	--	40	--	32%	30%	--
Gambia	67	8	6	10	--	--	12%	--	22	--	--	33%	--
Guatemala	162	64	32	29	--	--	26%	--	50	--	--	31%	--
Guinea-Bissau	113	17	17	17	--	--	15%	--	9	--	--	8%	--
Haiti	1 052	566	566	566	--	46%	54%	--	391	--	31%	37%	--
Indonesia	6 158	5 381	5 294	5 276	--	71%	86%	--	4 295	--	56%	70%	--
Jamaica	996	142	103	103	--	--	12%	--	106	--	--	11%	--
Jordan	435	337	297	298	--	26%	71%	--	356	--	27%	82%	--
Kosovo	301	59	63	57	--	3%	20%	--	61	--	1%	20%	--
Laos	393	166	162	151	--	31%	41%	--	150	--	16%	38%	--
Lesotho	243	105	88	88	--	--	38%	--	102	--	--	42%	--
Liberia	160	78	54	70	--	32%	42%	--	52	--	0%	32%	--
Madagascar	357	41	46	46	--	21%	12%	--	48	--	26%	13%	--
Morocco	1 429	1 239	1 229	1 211	--	79%	86%	--	1 060	--	81%	74%	--
Namibia	153	5	19	17	--	--	9%	--	21	--	--	14%	--
Nepal	769	468	489	481	--	68%	62%	--	266	--	56%	35%	--
Nigeria	1 552	512	511	508	--	0%	33%	--	558	--	0%	36%	--
Pakistan	2 461	1 868	1 882	1 753	--	--	75%	--	679	--	--	28%	--
Papua New Guinea	375	135	53	73	--	16%	23%	--	113	--	21%	30%	--
Philippines	1 729	1 302	1 130	1 321	--	68%	72%	--	1 103	--	64%	64%	--
Samoa	166	80	77	86	--	--	49%	--	85	--	--	51%	--
Sao Tome & Principe	38	3	3	3	--	--	7%	--	16	--	--	43%	--
Sierra Leone	356	77	137	179	--	20%	37%	--	76	--	38%	21%	--
Solomon Islands	162	56	53	60	--	--	35%	--	58	--	--	36%	--
St.Vincent & Grenadines	4	0	0	0	--	--	3%	--	0	--	--	0%	--
Sudan	1 007	74	74	276	--	3%	14%	--	77	--	0%	8%	--
Swaziland	123	15	0	0	--	--	4%	--	15	--	--	12%	--
Tajikistan	340	105	105	105	--	--	31%	--	104	--	--	30%	--
Timor-Leste	220	46	32	38	--	--	18%	--	32	--	--	14%	--
Togo	112	60	64	58	--	4%	54%	--	52	--	15%	47%	--
Tonga	52	24	15	19	--	--	37%	--	19	--	--	36%	--
Ukraine	369	157	70	70	--	1%	27%	--	75	--	2%	20%	--
Vanuatu	83	28	26	24	--	--	31%	--	24	--	--	29%	--
West Bank and Gaza	1 246	536	529	314	--	--	37%	--	639	--	--	51%	--
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>25 758</b>	<b>14 563</b>	<b>13 780</b>	<b>13 910</b>			<b>53%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>11 305</b>		<b>47%</b>	<b>44%</b>	
Avg. country ratio							22%	28%			22%	27%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>61 930</b>	<b>32 989</b>	<b>31 123</b>	<b>30 301</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>51%</b>		<b>27 164</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>--</b>
Avg. country ratio					32%	30%	32%			37%	36%	35%	--
For reference:													
Southern Sudan	513	0	0	136	--	--	9%	--	0	--	--	0%	--

TABLE A.6: How many PIUs are parallel to country structures?

	Indicator 6			Progress 2010/2005 (units)
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (PIUs)	
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>				
Afghanistan	28	26	28	+0
Albania	57	24	18	-39
Bangladesh	38	24	18	-20
Benin	29	58	58	+29
Bolivia	66	19	36	-30
Burkina Faso	131	102	47	-84
Burundi	37	29	84	+47
Cambodia	56	121	66	+10
Cape Verde	10	18	10	+0
Congo, Dem. Rep.	34	146	78	+44
Dominican Republic	50	36	3	-47
Egypt	100	32	16	-84
Ethiopia	103	56	49	-54
Ghana	45	16	5	-40
Honduras	52	36	47	-5
Kenya	17	21	15	-2
Kyrgyz Republic	85	88	80	-5
Malawi	69	51	26	-43
Mali	65	60	82	+17
Mauritania	23	27	84	+61
Moldova	43	59	18	-25
Mongolia	80	53	52	-28
Mozambique	40	26	5	-35
Niger	52	47	53	+1
Peru	55	79	40	-15
Rwanda	48	41	26	-22
Senegal	23	55	11	-12
South Africa	15	--	22	+7
Tanzania	56	28	18	-38
Uganda	54	55	15	-39
Viet Nam	111	58	18	-93
Zambia	24	34	30	+6
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1 696</b>	<b>1 525</b>	<b>1 158</b>	<b>-538</b>
Average	54	49	37	-17

TABLE A.6: How many PIUs are parallel to country structures?

	Indicator 6			Progress 2010/2005 (units)
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (PIUs)	
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>				
Armenia	--	--	5	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	--	--	56	--
Botswana	--	--	1	--
Cameroon	--	38	20	--
Central African Rep.	--	11	9	--
Chad	--	17	5	--
Colombia	--	38	48	--
Comoros	--	--	24	--
Ecuador	--	--	32	--
El Salvador	--	--	68	--
Fiji	--	--	7	--
Gabon	--	5	2	--
Gambia	--	--	16	--
Guatemala	--	--	12	--
Guinea-Bissau	--	--	8	--
Haiti	--	39	92	--
Indonesia	--	86	58	--
Jamaica	--	--	8	--
Jordan	--	2	92	--
Kosovo	--	107	29	--
Laos	--	25	22	--
Lesotho	--	--	12	--
Liberia	--	16	4	--
Madagascar	--	48	56	--
Morocco	--	47	15	--
Namibia	--	--	30	--
Nepal	--	106	68	--
Nigeria	--	23	20	--
Pakistan	--	--	32	--
Papua New Guinea	--	36	23	--
Philippines	--	33	9	--
Samoa	--	--	9	--
Sao Tome & Principe	--	--	5	--
Sierra Leone	--	2	3	--
Solomon Islands	--	--	17	--
St.Vincent & Grenadines	--	--	1	--
Sudan	--	105	111	--
Swaziland	--	--	3	--
Tajikistan	--	--	15	--
Timor-Leste	--	--	22	--
Togo	--	13	9	--
Tonga	--	--	2	--
Ukraine	--	46	84	--
Vanuatu	--	--	9	--
West Bank and Gaza	--	--	27	--
<b>Sub-Total</b>	--	<b>843</b>	<b>1 200</b>	--
Average	--	40	27	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1 696</b>	<b>2 368</b>	<b>2 358</b>	--
Average	54	46	31	--
For reference:				
Southern Sudan	--	--	109	--

TABLE A.7: Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	Disbursements recorded by government in 2010	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in 2010	Indicator 7					Progress	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	For reference: % of scheduled aid disbursements reported as disbursed by donors in 2010**	
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a		2010/2005 (% pts.)	(USD m) d	e = d / b (%)	e = b / d	
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>											
Afghanistan	1 494	6 392		84%	70%	23%		-60	5 342	84%	
Albania	191	342	49%		29%	56%		+7	333	97%	
Bangladesh	1 517	1 805	91%		100%	84%		-7	1 721	95%	
Benin	105	575	53%		32%	18%		-35	596		96%
Bolivia	203	480	63%		30%	42%		-21	480		100%
Burkina Faso	718	954	92%		92%	75%		-16	904	95%	
Burundi	285	591	53%		44%	48%		-4	503	85%	
Cambodia	742	821	69%		96%	90%		+21	720	88%	
Cape Verde	341	188	92%		96%	55%		-37	318		59%
Congo, Dem. Rep.	851	1 448	83%		20%	59%		-24	1 131	78%	
Dominican Republic	488	313	11%		25%	64%		+53	319		98%
Egypt	1 458	1 002	29%		79%	69%		+39	1 758		57%
Ethiopia	2 121	2 457	96%		73%	86%		-10	2 777		88%
Ghana	1 072	1 599		92%	82%	67%		-25	1 435	90%	
Honduras	432	575	72%		66%	75%		+3	707		81%
Kenya	588	1 307	44%		47%	45%		+1	888	68%	
Kyrgyz Republic	96	217	66%		64%	44%		-22	299		73%
Malawi	651	678	58%		58%	96%		+38	752		90%
Mali	396	1 180	71%		68%	34%		-37	999	85%	
Mauritania	--	263	39%		52%	--		--	204	77%	
Moldova	332	409	67%		77%	81%		+14	389	95%	
Mongolia	96	315	47%		34%	30%		-17	305	97%	
Mozambique	1 339	1 593	70%		74%	84%		+14	1 683		95%
Niger	229	316	73%		78%	72%		-1	436		73%
Peru	682	853	48%		61%	80%		+32	842	99%	
Rwanda	651	875	66%		67%	74%		+9	1 063		82%
Senegal	424	681	69%		61%	62%		-7	613	90%	
South Africa	660	710	44%		--	93%		+49	926		77%
Tanzania	2 269	2 207	70%		61%	97%		+27	2 227		99%
Uganda	906	1 226	84%		74%	74%		-10	1 051	86%	
Viet Nam	3 402	4 034	78%		70%	84%		+6	3 783	94%	
Zambia	0	883	50%		85%	0%		-50	670	76%	
<b>Sub-Total *</b>			<b>42%</b>		<b>47%</b>	<b>43%</b>		<b>+0.8</b>			
Global weighted average	24 736	37 290	72%		69%	66%		-5.6	36 172	97%	

TABLE A.7: Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	Disbursements recorded by government in 2010	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in 2010	Indicator 7					Progress	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	For reference: % of scheduled aid disbursements reported as disbursed by donors in 2010**	
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a		2010/ 2005 (% pts.)	(USD m) d	e = d / b (%)	e = b / d	
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>											
Armenia	308	387	--	--	--	80%	--	336	87%		
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0	279	--	--	--	0%	--	273	98%		
Botswana	0	80	--	--	--	0%	--	67	84%		
Cameroon	181	502	--	--	51%	36%	--	360	72%		
Central African Rep.	0	120	--	--	45%	0%	--	127		95%	
Chad	145	172	--	--	0%	84%	--	216		80%	
Colombia	450	523	--	--	0%	86%	--	491	94%		
Comoros	5	43	--	--	--	11%	--	38	89%		
Ecuador	96	107	--	--	--	90%	--	98	92%		
El Salvador	74	336	--	--	--	22%	--	380		88%	
Fiji	2	54	--	--	--	4%	--	54	99%		
Gabon	70	250	--	--	17%	28%	--	134	54%		
Gambia	6	73	--	--	--	8%	--	67	92%		
Guatemala	56	192	--	--	--	29%	--	162	84%		
Guinea-Bissau	28	128	--	--	--	22%	--	113	88%		
Haiti	1 841	806	--	--		67%		1 052		77%	
Indonesia	5 008	6 510	--	--	25%	77%	--	6 158	95%		
Jamaica	0	1 102	--	--	--	0%	--	996	90%		
Jordan	786	371	--	--	48%			435		85%	
Kosovo	55	298	--	--	3%	19%	--	301		99%	
Laos	200	398	--	--	38%	50%	--	393	99%		
Lesotho	53	209	--	--	--	25%	--	243		86%	
Liberia	9	411	--	--	0%	2%	--	160	39%		
Madagascar	208	354	--	--	79%	59%	--	357		99%	
Morocco	1 318	1 678	--	--	68%	79%	--	1 429	85%		
Namibia	0	202	--	--	--	0%	--	153	76%		
Nepal	362	664	--	--	47%	55%	--	769		86%	
Nigeria	1 510	1 391	--	--	7%			1 552		90%	
Pakistan	1 474	1 714	--	--	--	86%		2 461		70%	
Papua New Guinea	199	576	--	--	19%	35%	--	375	65%		
Philippines	423	1 601	--	--		78%		1 729		93%	
Samoa	136	161	--	--	--	84%	--	166		97%	
Sao Tome & Principe	30	42	--	--	--	71%	--	38	90%		
Sierra Leone	180	312	--	--	30%	58%	--	356		87%	
Solomon Islands	54	199	--	--	--	27%	--	162	81%		
St. Vincent & Grenadines	0	0	--	--	--	0%	--	4		5%	
Sudan	328	906	--	--	52%	36%	--	1 007		90%	
Swaziland	108	115	--	--	--	94%	--	123		93%	
Tajikistan	228	250	--	--	--	91%	--	340		73%	
Timor-Leste	8	278	--	--	--	3%	--	220	79%		
Togo	51	110	--	--	14%	46%	--	112		99%	
Tonga	38	49	--	--	--	77%	--	52		94%	
Ukraine	253	589	--	--	60%	43%	--	369	63%		
Vanuatu	77	69	--	--	--			83		83%	
West Bank and Gaza	971	1 035	--	--	--	94%	--	1 246		83%	
<b>Sub-Total *</b>			--		<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>		--			
Global weighted average	17 331	25 644	--		52%	68%		25 758	100%		
<b>TOTAL *</b>			<b>42%</b>		<b>42%</b>	<b>37%</b>					
Global weighted average	42 067	62 933	72%		63%	67%		61 930	98%		
For reference:											
Southern Sudan	0	470	--	--	--	0%	--	--			

(\*) Ratio is c = a / b except where disbursements recorded by government are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement (c = b / a).

(\*\*) Ratio is e = d / b except where disbursements by donors are greater than aid scheduled for disbursements (e = b / d).

TABLE A.8: How much bilateral aid is untied?

	Total bilateral aid as reported to the DAC	Untied aid	Share of untied aid			Progress
	(USD m)	(USD m)	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2009 (%)	2009 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>						
Afghanistan	4 338	3 592	81%	91%	83%	+1
Albania	87	56	65%	78%	64%	-1
Bangladesh	1 401	1 301	89%	89%	93%	+4
Benin	220	212	80%	95%	97%	+17
Bolivia	450	323	90%	59%	72%	-18
Burkina Faso	1 013	991	89%	87%	98%	+9
Burundi	247	222	90%	92%	90%	0
Cambodia	476	445	85%	89%	93%	+8
Cape Verde	174	72	72%	48%	41%	-31
Congo, Dem. Rep.	1 218	1 136	92%	90%	93%	+2
Dominican Republic	160	54	51%	39%	33%	-18
Egypt	568	463	81%	56%	82%	+1
Ethiopia	1 997	1 713	66%	76%	86%	+20
Ghana	785	722	91%	89%	92%	+1
Honduras	128	100	95%	52%	79%	-16
Kenya	1 624	1 468	93%	81%	90%	-3
Kyrgyz Republic	87	67	94%	83%	77%	-17
Malawi	289	255	97%	88%	88%	-9
Mali	641	566	97%	96%	88%	-9
Mauritania	44	24	84%	61%	55%	-29
Moldova	48	38	81%	81%	80%	-2
Mongolia	238	196	86%	66%	82%	-3
Mozambique	1 505	1 351	95%	93%	90%	-5
Niger	191	161	85%	76%	84%	-1
Peru	536	463	86%	70%	86%	+1
Rwanda	658	639	85%	94%	97%	+12
Senegal	386	366	94%	79%	95%	+1
South Africa	977	964	97%	97%	99%	+2
Tanzania	2 130	2 048	97%	97%	96%	-1
Uganda	982	934	93%	90%	95%	+2
Viet Nam	3 223	2 766	68%	69%	86%	+18
Zambia	621	612	99%	97%	98%	-1
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>27 440</b>	<b>24 319</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>+1.95</b>
Avg. country ratio			83%	84%	88%	+4.5

TABLE A.8: How much bilateral aid is untied?

	Total bilateral aid as reported to the DAC	Untied aid	Share of untied aid			Progress
	(USD m)	(USD m)	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2009 (%)	2009 / 2005 (% points)
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>						
Armenia	99	69	99%	45%	70%	-29
Bosnia-Herzegovina	315	277	86%	79%	88%	+2
Botswana	105	100	94%	96%	95%	+1
Cameroon	282	269	92%	98%	95%	+4
Central African Rep.	101	92	72%	83%	91%	+19
Chad	364	291	84%	77%	80%	-4
Colombia	943	442	62%	68%	47%	-15
Comoros	15	15	54%	96%	100%	+46
Ecuador	111	89	87%	76%	80%	-7
El Salvador	242	194	84%	92%	80%	-3
Fiji	32	30	65%	53%	92%	+27
Gabon	42	42	94%	98%	100%	+6
Gambia	16	9	81%	75%	55%	-25
Guatemala	265	181	76%	71%	68%	-8
Guinea-Bissau	34	29	85%	78%	86%	+1
Haiti	590	515	81%	86%	87%	+6
Indonesia	2 441	1 780	85%	94%	73%	-12
Jamaica	39	19	53%	41%	50%	-3
Jordan	770	757	97%	98%	98%	+2
Kosovo	260	153	--	--	59%	--
Laos	156	111	98%	70%	71%	-26
Lesotho	63	61	95%	73%	96%	+1
Liberia	489	450	76%	91%	92%	+16
Madagascar	106	98	92%	83%	92%	0
Morocco	922	526	87%	68%	57%	-30
Namibia	389	384	79%	89%	99%	+19
Nepal	457	440	96%	95%	96%	0
Nigeria	655	652	100%	100%	100%	0
Pakistan	2 247	1 984	84%	76%	88%	+5
Papua New Guinea	11	10	92%	95%	99%	+6
Philippines	1 154	977	68%	81%	85%	+17
Samoa	21	18	79%	96%	88%	+9
Sao Tome & Principe	5	4	94%	95%	90%	-3
Sierra Leone	203	191	84%	96%	94%	+10
Solomon Islands	91	89	96%	99%	98%	+2
St.Vincent & Grenadines	0	0	69%	99%	43%	-26
Sudan	2 092	1 848	86%	71%	88%	+3
Swaziland	25	23	91%	90%	92%	+1
Tajikistan	130	86	78%	70%	66%	-12
Timor-Leste	112	79	89%	85%	70%	-19
Togo	368	360	84%	87%	98%	+14
Tonga	12	10	83%	91%	83%	-1
Ukraine	248	145	96%	58%	58%	-38
Vanuatu	45	42	90%	90%	93%	+3
West Bank and Gaza	1 829	1 425	68%	87%	78%	+10
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>18 897</b>	<b>15 368</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>-9.13</b>
Avg. country ratio			82%	85%	88%	+6.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46 337</b>	<b>39 687</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>-2.92</b>
Avg. country ratio			82%	84%	88%	+5.4
For reference: Global coverage of the Survey						
Total for the Survey (77 countries)	46 337	39 687	89%	85%	85%	
All other countries	17 720	14 114	67%	83%	80%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>64 058</b>	<b>53 801</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>84%</b>	

TABLE A.9: How much aid was programme-based?

	Programme-based approaches			Total aid disbursed (USD m) d	Indicator 9			Progress 2010/2005 (% points)
	Budget support	Other PBAs	Total		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 e = c / d	
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	(USD m) c = a + b					
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>								
Afghanistan	1 251	891	2 142	5 807	43%	40%	37%	-6
Albania	0	82	82	372	5%	14%	22%	+17
Bangladesh	225	492	717	2 137	41%	50%	34%	-8
Benin	133	194	327	658	61%	49%	50%	-11
Bolivia	78	213	291	708	32%	40%	41%	+9
Burkina Faso	371	113	484	974	45%	57%	50%	+4
Burundi	95	195	290	595	54%	36%	49%	-5
Cambodia	11	295	307	884	24%	28%	35%	+11
Cape Verde	70	42	112	344	37%	31%	33%	-4
Congo, Dem. Rep.	111	494	605	1 644	54%	21%	37%	-17
Dominican Republic	214	20	235	394	5%	64%	60%	+55
Egypt	657	240	897	1 824	61%	49%	49%	-12
Ethiopia	0	1 968	1 968	3 228	53%	66%	61%	+8
Ghana	603	245	848	1 489	53%	69%	57%	+4
Honduras	189	171	360	821	43%	17%	44%	+1
Kenya	61	312	374	1 025	45%	30%	36%	-8
Kyrgyz Republic	39	39	78	370	12%	18%	21%	+9
Malawi	193	289	482	942	32%	42%	51%	+19
Mali	253	231	484	1 093	48%	41%	44%	-4
Mauritania	13	62	76	284	37%	35%	27%	-10
Moldova	197	32	230	448	16%	30%	51%	+35
Mongolia	54	60	114	357	29%	6%	32%	+3
Mozambique	462	476	938	1 854	46%	46%	51%	+4
Niger	99	113	212	511	31%	49%	41%	+10
Peru	332	14	346	1 055	16%	12%	33%	+17
Rwanda	369	363	732	1 096	42%	38%	67%	+25
Senegal	92	198	289	681	57%	39%	42%	-15
South Africa	169	580	748	1 222	27%	--	61%	+35
Tanzania	833	818	1 651	2 763	55%	61%	60%	+4
Uganda	372	359	732	1 504	50%	66%	49%	-1
Viet Nam	1 242	1 208	2 450	3 977	34%	58%	62%	+28
Zambia	229	167	395	882	47%	47%	45%	-2
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>9 018</b>	<b>10 976</b>	<b>19 994</b>	<b>41 942</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>+5</b>
Avg. country ratio					35%	34%	37%	+2

TABLE A.9: How much aid was programme-based?

	Programme-based approaches			Total aid disbursed (USD m) d	Indicator 9			Progress 2010/2005 (% points)
	Budget support	Other PBAs	Total		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 e = c / d	
	(USD m) a	(USD m) b	(USD m) c = a + b					
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>								
Armenia	124	62	186	367	--	--	51%	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	116	10	126	358	--	--	35%	--
Botswana	0	9	9	72	--	--	12%	--
Cameroon	41	81	122	431	--	40%	28%	--
Central African Rep.	0	0	0	180	--	34%	0%	--
Chad	0	26	26	246	--	1%	11%	--
Colombia	29	60	89	670	--	16%	13%	--
Comoros	10	0	11	57	--	--	19%	--
Ecuador	22	7	28	183	--	--	15%	--
El Salvador	67	26	93	431	--	--	22%	--
Fiji	0	3	3	66	--	--	5%	--
Gabon	10	14	24	135	--	0%	18%	--
Gambia	6	6	12	97	--	--	12%	--
Guatemala	6	5	11	247	--	--	4%	--
Guinea-Bissau	9	32	41	132	--	--	31%	--
Haiti	235	344	580	1 664	--	61%	35%	--
Indonesia	2 673	1 268	3 940	6 436	--	51%	61%	--
Jamaica	890	31	921	1 013	--	--	91%	--
Jordan	165	60	225	583	--	78%	39%	--
Kosovo	43	5	48	381	--	2%	13%	--
Laos	48	27	76	426	--	9%	18%	--
Lesotho	90	37	127	295	--	--	43%	--
Liberia	20	28	48	402	--	21%	12%	--
Madagascar	0	40	40	442	--	44%	9%	--
Morocco	538	378	916	1 551	--	70%	59%	--
Namibia	17	11	28	199	--	--	14%	--
Nepal	114	156	269	875	--	23%	31%	--
Nigeria	658	327	986	2 101	--	4%	47%	--
Pakistan	357	562	919	2 944	--	--	31%	--
Papua New Guinea	0	171	171	599	--	42%	29%	--
Philippines	753	261	1 014	1 899	--	32%	53%	--
Samoa	49	57	106	180	--	--	59%	--
Sao Tome & Principe	1	6	8	43	--	--	17%	--
Sierra Leone	68	86	154	451	--	27%	34%	--
Solomon Islands	49	31	79	203	--	--	39%	--
St.Vincent & Grenadines	0	0	0	4	--	--	1%	--
Sudan	0	17	18	1 293	--	19%	1%	--
Swaziland	0	34	34	132	--	--	25%	--
Tajikistan	29	2	30	387	--	--	8%	--
Timor-Leste	19	64	83	341	--	--	24%	--
Togo	33	18	51	146	--	39%	35%	--
Tonga	13	9	22	54	--	--	40%	--
Ukraine	33	22	54	566	--	8%	10%	--
Vanuatu	1	30	31	114	--	--	27%	--
West Bank and Gaza	536	376	912	1 589	--	--	57%	--
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>7 873</b>	<b>4 798</b>	<b>12 671</b>	<b>30 985</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>--</b>
Avg. country ratio					--	21%	25%	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16 891</b>	<b>15 774</b>	<b>32 665</b>	<b>72 927</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>45%</b>	
Avg. country ratio					35%	30%	31%	
For reference:								
Southern Sudan	0	0	0	576	--	--	0%	--

TABLE A.10a: How many donor missions were co-ordinated?

	Coordinated donor missions*	Total donor missions	Indicator 10a			Progress
	(missions) a	(missions) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>						
Afghanistan	47	786	26%	37%	6%	-20
Albania	73	414	9%	29%	18%	+8
Bangladesh	115	403	19%	20%	29%	+9
Benin	36	185	14%	25%	19%	+5
Bolivia	19	140	17%	29%	13%	-3
Burkina Faso	46	261	17%	13%	18%	+1
Burundi	36	263	24%	13%	14%	-11
Cambodia	47	251	26%	12%	19%	-7
Cape Verde	26	123	11%	43%	21%	+11
Congo, Dem. Rep.	127	579	38%	21%	22%	-16
Dominican Republic	98	230	20%	32%	42%	+23
Egypt	67	331	18%	22%	20%	+2
Ethiopia	52	210	27%	29%	25%	-2
Ghana	57	376	20%	39%	15%	-5
Honduras	117	394	22%	21%	30%	+8
Kenya	85	306	9%	48%	28%	+18
Kyrgyz Republic	44	217	23%	23%	20%	-3
Malawi	51	229	24%	22%	22%	-1
Mali	55	330	7%	15%	17%	+9
Mauritania	70	307	14%	11%	23%	+9
Moldova	44	187	20%	14%	23%	+3
Mongolia	29	295	3%	7%	10%	+7
Mozambique	42	278	46%	17%	15%	-31
Niger	24	877	21%	15%	3%	-18
Peru	42	221	11%	28%	19%	+8
Rwanda	36	82	9%	21%	44%	+35
Senegal	129	522	15%	17%	25%	+10
South Africa	662	1 276	19%	--	52%	+33
Tanzania	85	320	17%	16%	26%	+9
Uganda	55	235	17%	21%	24%	+6
Viet Nam	70	644	10%	17%	11%	+1
Zambia	65	244	15%	16%	27%	+12
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2 549</b>	<b>11 516</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>+2.3</b>

TABLE A.10a: How many donor missions were co-ordinated?

	Coordinated donor missions*	Total donor missions	Indicator 10a			Progress
	(missions) a	(missions) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>						
Armenia	18	178	--	--	10%	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	14	131	--	--	10%	--
Botswana	4	76	--	--	5%	--
Cameroon	26	221	--	26%	12%	--
Central African Rep.	29	108	--	10%	26%	--
Chad	16	131	--	18%	12%	--
Colombia	86	338	--	31%	26%	--
Comoros	10	111	--	--	9%	--
Ecuador	33	168	--	--	19%	--
El Salvador	12	97	--	--	12%	--
Fiji	29	138	--	--	21%	--
Gabon	16	141	--	5%	12%	--
Gambia	6	77	--	--	8%	--
Guatemala	46	102	--	--	45%	--
Guinea-Bissau	22	130	--	--	17%	--
Haiti	66	362	--	21%	18%	--
Indonesia	53	312	--	13%	17%	--
Jamaica	15	94	--	--	16%	--
Jordan	19	174	--	25%	11%	--
Kosovo	23	351	--	11%	7%	--
Laos	163	620	--	18%	26%	--
Lesotho	18	153	--	--	12%	--
Liberia	18	146	--	11%	12%	--
Madagascar	27	359	--	24%	7%	--
Morocco	54	277	--	12%	19%	--
Namibia	21	126	--	--	17%	--
Nepal	72	341	--	23%	21%	--
Nigeria	27	256	--	19%	11%	--
Pakistan	83	487	--	--	17%	--
Papua New Guinea	20	146	--	24%	13%	--
Philippines	51	183	--	18%	28%	--
Samoa	12	77	--	--	15%	--
Sao Tome & Principe	5	39	--	--	13%	--
Sierra Leone	26	189	--	27%	14%	--
Solomon Islands	26	149	--	--	17%	--
St.Vincent & Grenadines	1	21	--	--	3%	--
Sudan	38	307	--	15%	12%	--
Swaziland	10	54	--	--	18%	--
Tajikistan	49	222	--	--	22%	--
Timor-Leste	46	296	--	--	16%	--
Togo	20	174	--	15%	12%	--
Tonga	16	97	--	--	16%	--
Ukraine	17	203	--	11%	8%	--
Vanuatu	14	59	--	--	23%	--
West Bank and Gaza	14	278	--	--	5%	--
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1 388</b>	<b>8 699</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3 937</b>	<b>20 215</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>-0.4</b>
For reference:						
Southern Sudan	7	119	--	--	6%	--

(\*) Number of coordinated missions by country were adjusted to avoid double counting.

TABLE A.10b: How much country analysis was co-ordinated?

	Coordinated donor analytic work*	Total donor analytic work	Indicator 10b			Progress
	(analyses) a	(analyses) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010/2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>						
Afghanistan	70	200	34%	32%	35%	+1
Albania	26	99	22%	34%	26%	+3
Bangladesh	47	100	38%	42%	47%	+10
Benin	65	106	38%	44%	61%	+23
Bolivia	28	88	30%	48%	32%	+2
Burkina Faso	53	110	45%	39%	48%	+3
Burundi	22	66	55%	74%	33%	-22
Cambodia	23	65	64%	17%	35%	-30
Cape Verde	32	65	34%	64%	48%	+14
Congo, Dem. Rep.	29	80	35%	23%	36%	0
Dominican Republic	47	79	48%	62%	59%	+11
Egypt	37	96	40%	56%	38%	-2
Ethiopia	80	153	50%	70%	52%	+3
Ghana	54	129	40%	60%	42%	+2
Honduras	101	196	45%	43%	52%	+6
Kenya	77	137	32%	78%	56%	+24
Kyrgyz Republic	23	108	53%	38%	22%	-32
Malawi	41	79	60%	61%	51%	-9
Mali	44	111	30%	39%	40%	+10
Mauritania	31	61	59%	25%	50%	-9
Moldova	30	79	50%	46%	38%	-12
Mongolia	25	118	35%	32%	21%	-14
Mozambique	24	68	63%	32%	35%	-28
Niger	13	38	40%	32%	34%	-6
Peru	38	88	15%	15%	43%	+28
Rwanda	49	60	36%	42%	82%	+45
Senegal	45	83	40%	28%	54%	+14
South Africa	38	98	75%	--	39%	-36
Tanzania	60	126	38%	65%	48%	+9
Uganda	43	76	40%	54%	56%	+16
Viet Nam	62	153	24%	54%	41%	+17
Zambia	59	118	46%	46%	50%	+4
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1 411</b>	<b>3 233</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>+2.9</b>

TABLE A.10b: How much country analysis was co-ordinated?

	Coordinated donor analytic work*	Total donor analytic work	Indicator 10b			Progress
	(analyses) a	(analyses) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010/2005 (% points)
<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>						
Armenia	49	88	--	--	55%	--
Bosnia-Herzegovina	21	72	--	--	29%	--
Botswana	24	39	--	--	62%	--
Cameroon	11	28	--	49%	40%	--
Central African Rep.	14	55	--	23%	26%	--
Chad	13	31	--	35%	41%	--
Colombia	70	168	--	44%	42%	--
Comoros	4	19	--	--	20%	--
Ecuador	32	76	--	--	41%	--
El Salvador	32	80	--	--	39%	--
Fiji	14	41	--	--	33%	--
Gabon	21	46	--	37%	46%	--
Gambia	23	43	--	--	54%	--
Guatemala	10	43	--	--	23%	--
Guinea-Bissau	22	50	--	--	44%	--
Haiti	40	86	--	53%	46%	--
Indonesia	68	161	--	45%	42%	--
Jamaica	5	23	--	--	23%	--
Jordan	16	80	--	47%	20%	--
Kosovo	19	61	--	27%	31%	--
Laos	65	123	--	25%	53%	--
Lesotho	21	39	--	--	54%	--
Liberia	23	52	--	66%	43%	--
Madagascar	44	152	--	42%	29%	--
Morocco	31	70	--	25%	44%	--
Namibia	38	64	--	--	60%	--
Nepal	47	98	--	28%	47%	--
Nigeria	23	87	--	33%	26%	--
Pakistan	122	204	--	--	60%	--
Papua New Guinea	8	49	--	59%	15%	--
Philippines	77	102	--	33%	75%	--
Samoa	12	26	--	--	46%	--
Sao Tome & Principe	5	16	--	--	33%	--
Sierra Leone	20	59	--	56%	34%	--
Solomon Islands	29	53	--	--	54%	--
St. Vincent & Grenadines	0	3	--	--	0%	--
Sudan	35	94	--	45%	38%	--
Swaziland	7	29	--	--	23%	--
Tajikistan	46	91	--	--	50%	--
Timor-Leste	34	72	--	--	47%	--
Togo	46	106	--	21%	43%	--
Tonga	8	52	--	--	16%	--
Ukraine	17	62	--	40%	27%	--
Vanuatu	20	34	--	--	60%	--
West Bank and Gaza	25	88	--	--	28%	--
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1 306</b>	<b>3 115</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2 716</b>	<b>6 348</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>+2.1</b>
For reference:						
Southern Sudan	8	47	--	--	18%	--

(\*) Number of coordinated missions by country were adjusted to avoid double counting.

TABLE A.11: Do countries have monitorable performance assessment frameworks?

	Indicator 11				Indicator 11		
	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 Rating
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>				<b>All Other Countries (45)</b>			
Afghanistan	N/A	D	C	Armenia	C	C	D
Albania	D	D	C	Bosnia-Herzegovina	D	C	C
Bangladesh	D	C	C	Botswana	N/A	N/A	C
Benin	C	C	D	Cameroon	D	D	B
Bolivia	C	C	C	Central African Rep.	D	D	C
Burkina Faso	C	C	C	Chad	D	D	D
Burundi	D	D	D	Colombia	N/A	N/A	B
Cambodia	C	C	C	Comoros	N/A	N/A	D
Cape Verde	D	C	C	Ecuador	N/A	N/A	C
Congo, Dem. Rep.	D	D	C	El Salvador	N/A	N/A	C
Dominican Republic	N/A	N/A	D	Fiji	N/A	N/A	C
Egypt	N/A	N/A	B	Gabon	N/A	N/A	D
Ethiopia	C	C	B	Gambia	D	D	D
Ghana	C	C	C	Guatemala	N/A	N/A	D
Honduras	C	C	B	Guinea-Bissau	D	D	D
Kenya	C	C	B	Haiti	D	D	D
Kyrgyz Republic	C	C	C	Indonesia	N/A	N/A	B
Malawi	C	C	C	Jamaica	N/A	N/A	B
Mali	D	D	C	Jordan	N/A	N/A	C
Mauritania	C	C	C	Kosovo	N/A	N/A	E
Moldova	D	C	B	Laos	D	C	C
Mongolia	C	C	C	Lesotho	D	C	C
Mozambique	C	B	C	Liberia	D	D	C
Niger	D	D	C	Madagascar	C	C	D
Peru	N/A	N/A	C	Morocco	N/A	N/A	
Rwanda	C	C	C	Namibia	N/A	N/A	C
Senegal	C	C	C	Nepal	C	C	B
South Africa	N/A	N/A	B	Nigeria	N/A	C	C
Tanzania	B	B	B	Pakistan	C	C	B
Uganda	B	B	C	Papua New Guinea	N/A	N/A	D
Viet Nam	C	C	B	Philippines	N/A	N/A	C
Zambia	D	C	C	Samoa	N/A	N/A	C
				Sao Tome & Principe	D	D	D
				Sierra Leone	D	D	C
				Solomon Islands	N/A	N/A	C
				St. Vincent & Grenadines	N/A	N/A	D
				Sudan	N/A	D	C
				Swaziland	N/A	N/A	D
				Tajikistan	D	D	C
				Timor-Leste	N/A	N/A	D
				Togo	N/A	N/A	C
				Tonga	N/A	N/A	D
				Ukraine	N/A	N/A	B
				Vanuatu	N/A	N/A	C
				West Bank and Gaza	N/A	N/A	
				For reference:			
				Southern Sudan	N/A	N/A	N/A

TABLE A.12: Do countries have reviews of mutual accountability?

Indicator 12	
Yes (30 countries)	No (48 countries)
Albania	Afghanistan
Benin	Armenia
Cambodia	Bangladesh
Central African Rep.	Bolivia
Colombia	Bosnia-Herzegovina
Ethiopia	Botswana
Ghana	Burkina Faso
Indonesia	Burundi
Jordan	Cameroon
Kyrgyz Republic	Cape Verde
Laos	Chad
Malawi	Comoros
Mali	Congo, Dem. Rep.
Moldova	Dominican Republic
Mongolia	Ecuador
Morocco	Egypt
Mozambique	El Salvador
Nepal	Fiji
Pakistan	Gabon
Peru	Gambia
Philippines	Guatemala
Rwanda	Guinea-Bissau
Samoa	Haiti
Senegal	Honduras
St. Vincent & Grenadines	Jamaica
Tanzania	Kenya
Tonga	Kosovo
Uganda	Lesotho
Ukraine	Liberia
Viet Nam	Madagascar
	Mauritania
	Namibia
	Niger
	Nigeria
	Papua New Guinea
	Sao Tome & Principe
	Sierra Leone
	Solomon Islands
	South Africa
	Southern Sudan
	Sudan
	Swaziland
	Tajikistan
	Timor-Leste
	Togo
	Vanuatu
	West Bank and Gaza
	Zambia



# B DONOR DATA

## ONE TABLE PER INDICATOR

THE FOLLOWING TABLES present results for all surveyed indicators (indicators 3 to 10b) on a donor-by-donor basis.

Data were available for 57 donors in one or more partner countries participating in the 2011 Survey. Not all donors are listed in the tables that follow. The following criteria were applied in establishing the 33 donors that are listed in Appendix B:

- All donors that have reported over USD 100 million of aid disbursed for the government sector in at least three surveyed countries; and
- All donors who do not meet the first criterion but would like to publish their results.

### HOW TO USE APPENDIX B

As with Appendix A, progress over the period 2005-2010 is measured for a set of 32 countries that participated in both the 2006 Baseline Survey and the 2011 Survey. The upper part of the following tables shows the data by donor for this group of countries, allowing for a comparison of progress in the same set of countries between 2005 and 2010. In addition, the “global picture” for 2010, encompassing all countries which have recorded each donor’s aid in the 2011 Survey, is provided.

Donors that are not listed individually have been aggregated in rows labelled “All Other Donors”. Data for all donors are included in the individual country chapters, available online at: [www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness](http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness).

### DATA SOURCES

The tables in Appendix B draw on two different sources:

- Indicator 8 (untied aid) uses data drawn from the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS). Data is only available for DAC members reporting the tying status of aid.
- Data for all other indicators provided in Appendix B are drawn from the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, and are collected at the country level through government and donor questionnaires.

### GLOBAL INDICATORS AND AVERAGE COUNTRY RATIOS

The column headings of the tables in Appendix B are labelled to show the formula used in the calculation of each indicator. For most of these indicators, global values are the weighted averages of the country values. The average country ratio is presented under each total for reference purposes only. This is an un-weighted average of all of the individual donor-partner country calculations; *i.e.* it gives equal weight to each donor / partner country irrespective of the volume of aid involved.

Indicators 3 (aid flows are aligned on national priorities) and 7 (aid is more predictable) are notable exceptions to the approach described above. For these indicators, dividing the amounts of aid captured in governments' budget estimates by the amount of aid disbursed for the government sector (indicator 3), or the amounts captured in government accounting systems by amounts scheduled for disbursement (indicator 7) would overstate performance, as over- and under-estimates in different countries would cancel each other out. Consistent with the methodology used in 2008, the global values presented for indicators 3 and 7 are an un-weighted average of all of the individual donor-partner country calculations. These individual calculations address the challenge presented by over- and under-estimation by inverting the numerator and denominator to ensure that the ratio presented is always less than or equal to 100%. This offers a more realistic – albeit un-weighted – indicator of progress.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

TABLE B.3: Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	No. of countries 2010	Government's budget estimates of aid flows for 2010	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	Indicator 3				Progress
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b    c = b / a		2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>								
African Dev. Bank	20	1 817	1 492	59%	58%	67%		+8
Asian Dev. Bank	6	1 840	1 900	62%	86%	58%		-3
Australia	5	73	87	29%	25%	36%		+8
Austria	6	17	18	36%	43%	65%		+30
Belgium	16	272	302	42%	52%	44%		+2
Canada	22	331	429	52%	45%	39%		-12
Denmark	16	597	555	49%	65%	68%		+19
EU Institutions	32	2 558	2 820	58%	62%	61%		+3
Finland	11	133	133	35%	58%	56%		+21
France	24	622	544	45%	58%	41%		-5
GAVI Alliance	25	82	186	0%	0%	19%		+19
Germany	31	832	1 252	53%	59%	53%		0
Global Fund	30	609	1 115	38%	43%	42%		+4
IFAD	26	173	188	69%	57%	52%		-17
IMF	5	192	216	19%	4%	58%		+39
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	415	335	32%	37%	48%		+15
Ireland	9	165	167	48%	45%	60%		+12
Italy	16	214	170	18%	38%	32%		+14
Japan	32	2 038	2 768	31%	43%	43%		+12
Korea	12	142	161	11%	34%	46%		+35
Luxembourg	8	29	60	66%	44%	38%		-28
Netherlands	24	509	612	48%	60%	54%		+6
New Zealand	4	6	6	58%	25%	35%		-24
Norway	12	200	244	61%	66%	46%		-14
Portugal	2	47	249	15%	11%	19%		+4
Spain	18	117	240	42%	20%	51%		+9
Sweden	18	402	293	35%	52%	55%		+20
Switzerland	22	102	134	42%	38%	30%		-12
Turkey	6	0	95	0%	0%	0%		0
United Kingdom	19	1 295	1 226	50%	69%	48%		-2
United Nations	32	1 304	2 872	35%	40%	34%		-1
United States	32	984	6 069	33%	25%	30%		-4
World Bank	32	8 079	9 518	66%	73%	74%		+8
All other donors	--	304	349	--	--	87%		--
<b>Total *</b>				<b>44%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>46%</b>		<b>+1.8</b>
Global weighted average		26 498	36 805	90%	90%	72%		-17.7

TABLE B.3: Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	No. of countries 2010	Government's budget estimates of aid flows for 2010	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	Indicator 3			Progress
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>							
African Dev. Bank	35	2 372	2 101	--	--	59%	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	3 632	4 276	--	--	64%	--
Australia	18	679	862	--	--	48%	--
Austria	9	17	22	--	--	55%	--
Belgium	20	285	327	--	--	47%	--
Canada	36	344	524	--	--	30%	--
Denmark	24	617	605	--	--	60%	--
EU Institutions	75	3 660	4 912	--	--	51%	--
Finland	17	147	157	--	--	55%	--
France	46	1 424	1 562	--	--	42%	--
GAVI Alliance	46	93	293	--	--	11%	--
Germany	59	1 097	1 931	--	--	45%	--
Global Fund	64	736	1 437	--	--	36%	--
IFAD	44	227	301	--	--	46%	--
IMF	10	248	416	--	--	48%	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	474	965	--	--	51%	--
Ireland	14	173	187	--	--	51%	--
Italy	28	227	211	--	--	29%	--
Japan	70	4 842	6 148	--	--	40%	--
Korea	26	302	263	--	--	38%	--
Luxembourg	11	41	78	--	--	38%	--
Netherlands	33	540	669	--	--	48%	--
New Zealand	14	65	72	--	--	40%	--
Norway	20	232	362	--	--	42%	--
Portugal	5	76	316	--	--	32%	--
Spain	33	331	645	--	--	43%	--
Sweden	27	426	329	--	--	49%	--
Switzerland	35	134	209	--	--	24%	--
Turkey	12	0	129	--	--	0%	--
United Kingdom	34	1 523	1 547	--	--	42%	--
United Nations	77	1 904	4 830	--	--	31%	--
United States	61	1 738	8 365	--	--	32%	--
World Bank	76	12 635	16 546	--	--	62%	--
All other donors	--	825	654	--	--	79%	--
<b>Total *</b>				<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>--</b>
Global weighted average		42 066	62 251	90%	82%	68%	--

(\*) Baseline ratio is  $c = a / b$  except where government's budget estimates are greater than disbursements ( $c = b / a$ ).

TABLE B.4: How much technical assistance is co-ordinated with country programmes?

	No. of countries 2010	Co-ordinated technical cooperation	Total technical cooperation	Indicator 4			Progress
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010/2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>							
African Dev. Bank	20	95	138	38%	31%	68%	+30
Asian Dev. Bank	6	14	33	37%	78%	42%	+5
Australia	5	52	83	25%	36%	63%	+38
Austria	6	6	11	11%	37%	52%	+41
Belgium	16	74	112	18%	30%	66%	+48
Canada	22	81	275	39%	61%	30%	-9
Denmark	16	61	66	51%	74%	93%	+42
EU Institutions	32	179	361	36%	50%	50%	+14
Finland	11	20	35	52%	72%	56%	+4
France	24	47	92	20%	48%	51%	+31
GAVI Alliance	25	0	0	--	100%	--	--
Germany	31	370	535	39%	75%	69%	+30
Global Fund	30	0	0	--	40%	--	--
IFAD	26	9	26	72%	76%	34%	-39
IMF	5	0	1	70%	35%	0%	-70
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	29	35	25%	54%	84%	+59
Ireland	9	15	20	52%	97%	74%	+22
Italy	16	19	53	38%	73%	36%	-2
Japan	32	360	444	75%	75%	81%	+6
Korea	12	4	39	74%	79%	11%	-63
Luxembourg	8	7	16	0%	13%	46%	+46
Netherlands	24	47	85	35%	61%	55%	+20
New Zealand	4	2	5	11%	61%	47%	+36
Norway	12	8	17	79%	57%	45%	-34
Portugal	2	5	37	77%	6%	13%	-64
Spain	18	119	158	10%	45%	75%	+65
Sweden	18	28	58	64%	51%	47%	-16
Switzerland	22	48	99	20%	52%	48%	+29
Turkey	6	2	19	15%	66%	13%	-2
United Kingdom	19	178	275	61%	66%	65%	+4
United Nations	32	970	1 437	49%	62%	67%	+18
United States	32	1 715	4 648	47%	54%	37%	-11
World Bank	32	518	728	58%	85%	71%	+13
All other donors	--	9	46	--	--	20%	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>5 091</b>	<b>9 988</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>+1.9</b>
Avg. country ratio				40%	60%	57%	+16.7

TABLE B.4: How much technical assistance is co-ordinated with country programmes?

	No. of countries 2010	Co-ordinated technical cooperation	Total technical cooperation	Indicator 4			Progress
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010/2005 (% points)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>							
African Dev. Bank	35	112	163	--	--	69%	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	34	77	--	--	44%	--
Australia	18	244	412	--	--	59%	--
Austria	9	9	20	--	--	47%	--
Belgium	20	79	120	--	--	66%	--
Canada	36	109	398	--	--	27%	--
Denmark	24	66	75	--	--	88%	--
EU Institutions	75	364	733	--	--	50%	--
Finland	17	24	47	--	--	51%	--
France	46	89	155	--	--	57%	--
GAVI Alliance	46	0	0	--	--	--	--
Germany	59	623	838	--	--	74%	--
Global Fund	64	0	0	--	--	--	--
IFAD	44	15	34	--	--	43%	--
IMF	10	0	3	--	--	0%	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	41	63	--	--	65%	--
Ireland	14	17	22	--	--	76%	--
Italy	28	24	65	--	--	37%	--
Japan	70	623	778	--	--	80%	--
Korea	26	30	69	--	--	43%	--
Luxembourg	11	12	25	--	--	49%	--
Netherlands	33	60	119	--	--	51%	--
New Zealand	14	23	35	--	--	66%	--
Norway	20	19	55	--	--	35%	--
Portugal	5	24	73	--	--	32%	--
Spain	33	196	236	--	--	83%	--
Sweden	27	40	76	--	--	52%	--
Switzerland	35	82	175	--	--	47%	--
Turkey	12	9	40	--	--	23%	--
United Kingdom	34	232	597	--	--	39%	--
United Nations	77	1 885	2 693	--	--	70%	--
United States	61	3 400	6 975	--	--	49%	--
World Bank	76	1 120	1 529	--	--	73%	--
All other donors	--	83	168	--	--	49%	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>9 687</b>	<b>16 867</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>--</b>
Avg. country ratio				--	--	58%	--

TABLE B.5: How much aid for the government sectors uses country systems?

	No. of countries 2010	Aid disbursed by donors for gov. sector (USD m) a	Public financial management							Procurement				
			Budget execution (USD m) b	Financial reporting (USD m) c	Auditing (USD m) d	Indicator 5a			Progress 2010/2005 (%pts)	Proc. systems (USD m) e	Indicator 5b			Progress 2010/2005 (% points)
						2005 (for ref.)	2007 (for ref.)	2010 avg(b,c,d)/a			2005 (for ref.)	2007 (for ref.)	2010 e/a	
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>														
African Dev. Bank	20	1 528	500	663	643	33%	39%	39%	+6	498	43%	37%	33%	-11
Asian Dev. Bank	6	1 412	1 326	997	993	69%	81%	78%	+10	525	45%	59%	37%	-8
Australia	5	87	37	31	31	6%	13%	38%	+31	33	5%	16%	38%	+32
Austria	6	24	15	16	15	19%	35%	63%	+44	21	30%	44%	86%	+56
Belgium	16	297	57	44	46	24%	18%	17%	-7	132	43%	44%	44%	+1
Canada	22	442	336	338	280	42%	75%	72%	+30	340	44%	38%	77%	+33
Denmark	16	538	403	323	280	29%	53%	62%	+34	433	44%	66%	80%	+36
EU Institutions	32	2 847	1 638	1 603	1 554	41%	40%	56%	+16	1 568	42%	36%	55%	+13
Finland	11	144	100	80	70	35%	57%	58%	+23	91	50%	66%	63%	+14
France	24	581	341	309	195	27%	40%	48%	+21	455	60%	60%	78%	+19
GAVI Alliance	25	226	0	0	0	33%	30%	0%	-33	0	2%	11%	0%	-2
Germany	31	1 410	598	691	537	37%	42%	43%	+6	860	32%	59%	61%	+29
Global Fund	30	1 105	507	849	676	41%	42%	61%	+20	771	45%	43%	70%	+25
IFAD	26	195	134	144	146	44%	58%	72%	+28	167	61%	84%	85%	+24
IMF	5	216	216	216	216	79%	89%	100%	+21	122	79%	63%	56%	-23
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	335	331	31	4	54%	43%	36%	-18	48	0%	31%	14%	+14
Ireland	9	171	153	163	116	90%	79%	84%	-5	156	96%	88%	91%	-5
Italy	16	149	84	55	38	28%	18%	40%	+12	62	50%	52%	41%	-8
Japan	32	2 712	1 641	1 638	1 618	30%	63%	60%	+31	1 641	27%	62%	61%	+34
Korea	12	185	0	0	0	45%	10%	0%	-45	69	0%	5%	37%	+37
Luxembourg	8	60	4	5	0	0%	2%	5%	+5	10	0%	4%	17%	+17
Netherlands	24	594	434	425	357	70%	64%	68%	-2	487	78%	80%	82%	+4
New Zealand	4	6	2	2	2	10%	52%	34%	+24	3	14%	45%	51%	+37
Norway	12	239	203	203	183	61%	59%	82%	+21	211	69%	76%	88%	+20
Portugal	2	249	8	5	5	79%	3%	2%	-77	223	80%	4%	90%	+10
Spain	18	253	164	107	137	17%	52%	54%	+37	165	14%	57%	65%	+51
Sweden	18	284	214	207	182	47%	57%	71%	+24	216	45%	56%	76%	+31
Switzerland	22	126	57	48	39	43%	39%	38%	-5	45	49%	48%	36%	-13
Turkey	6	100	0	1	0	0%	0%	0%	0	1	85%	0%	1%	-84
United Kingdom	19	1 520	1 137	1 142	1 074	76%	78%	73%	-2	1 142	77%	69%	75%	-2
United Nations	32	3 117	1 121	1 170	539	18%	19%	30%	+13	403	7%	11%	13%	+6
United States	32	5 762	344	145	208	10%	3%	4%	-6	250	12%	5%	4%	-8
World Bank	32	8 779	6 288	5 657	6 174	43%	55%	69%	+26	4 699	42%	43%	54%	+12
All other donors	--	477	34	34	34	40%	46%	7%	-33	12	--	--	2%	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>36 172</b>	<b>18 425</b>	<b>17 343</b>	<b>16 391</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>+8.1</b>	<b>15 859</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>+4.3</b>
Avg. country ratio						32%	34%	37%	+4.8		37%	42%	41%	+3.7

TABLE B.5: How much aid for the government sectors uses country systems?

	No. of countries 2010	Aid disbursed by donors for gov. sector (USD m) a	Public financial management						Procurement					
			Budget execution (USD m) b	Financial reporting (USD m) c	Auditing (USD m) d	Indicator 5a			Progress 2010/2005 (%pts)	Proc. systems (USD m) e	Indicator 5b			Progress 2010/2005 (% points)
						2005 (for ref.)	2007 (for ref.)	2010 avg(b,c,d)/a			2005 (for ref.)	2007 (for ref.)	2010 e / a	
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>														
African Dev. Bank	35	2 140	911	1 065	1 046	--	--	47%	--	674	--	--	32%	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	3 659	3 486	3 189	3 163	--	--	90%	--	1 074	--	--	29%	--
Australia	18	859	252	171	166	--	--	23%	--	220	--	--	26%	--
Austria	9	29	15	16	15	--	--	53%	--	22	--	--	77%	--
Belgium	20	322	67	44	46	--	--	16%	--	142	--	--	44%	--
Canada	36	538	386	387	330	--	--	68%	--	341	--	--	63%	--
Denmark	24	573	423	343	291	--	--	62%	--	449	--	--	78%	--
EU Institutions	75	5 043	2 520	2 447	2 387	--	--	49%	--	2 388	--	--	47%	--
Finland	17	168	110	85	85	--	--	56%	--	101	--	--	60%	--
France	46	1 600	1 143	1 143	1 029	--	--	69%	--	1 182	--	--	74%	--
GAVI Alliance	46	333	0	0	0	--	--	0%	--	1	--	--	0%	--
Germany	59	2 085	871	1 040	845	--	--	44%	--	1 248	--	--	60%	--
Global Fund	64	1 443	536	873	714	--	--	49%	--	864	--	--	60%	--
IFAD	44	295	227	229	229	--	--	77%	--	242	--	--	82%	--
IMF	10	416	408	352	352	--	--	89%	--	135	--	--	32%	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	1 168	370	31	4	--	--	12%	--	62	--	--	5%	--
Ireland	14	191	167	169	122	--	--	80%	--	169	--	--	89%	--
Italy	28	190	97	67	49	--	--	37%	--	82	--	--	43%	--
Japan	70	6 081	4 191	4 182	4 162	--	--	69%	--	4 201	--	--	69%	--
Korea	26	286	25	32	25	--	--	10%	--	103	--	--	36%	--
Luxembourg	11	80	4	5	0	--	--	4%	--	14	--	--	17%	--
Netherlands	33	654	442	425	357	--	--	62%	--	496	--	--	76%	--
New Zealand	14	76	24	18	28	--	--	31%	--	40	--	--	53%	--
Norway	20	350	218	228	196	--	--	61%	--	232	--	--	66%	--
Portugal	5	316	8	5	5	--	--	2%	--	250	--	--	79%	--
Spain	33	657	488	379	440	--	--	66%	--	507	--	--	77%	--
Sweden	27	316	226	209	183	--	--	65%	--	225	--	--	71%	--
Switzerland	35	200	64	55	46	--	--	27%	--	59	--	--	29%	--
Turkey	12	135	0	1	0	--	--	0%	--	1	--	--	0%	--
United Kingdom	34	1 856	1 271	1 299	1 217	--	--	68%	--	1 282	--	--	69%	--
United Nations	77	5 171	1 356	1 390	737	--	--	22%	--	600	--	--	12%	--
United States	61	8 273	1 093	896	764	--	--	11%	--	1 041	--	--	13%	--
World Bank	76	15 533	11 417	10 280	11 205	--	--	71%	--	8 605	--	--	55%	--
All other donors	--	895	173	67	63	--	--	11%	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>61 930</b>	<b>32 989</b>	<b>31 123</b>	<b>30 301</b>	--	--	<b>51%</b>	--	<b>27 164</b>	--	--	<b>44%</b>	--
Avg. country ratio								32%					35%	

TABLE B.6: How many PIUs are parallel to country structures?

	No. of countries 2010	Indicator 6			Progress
		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (PIUs)	2010 / 2005 (units)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>					
African Dev. Bank	20	132	113	46	-86
Asian Dev. Bank	6	39	40	2	-37
Australia	5	27	14	8	-19
Austria	6	13	23	5	-8
Belgium	16	67	124	71	+4
Canada	22	64	36	31	-33
Denmark	16	69	38	15	-54
EU Institutions	32	189	98	55	-134
Finland	11	9	4	7	-2
France	24	63	67	25	-38
GAVI Alliance	25	0	0	0	0
Germany	31	39	26	23	-16
Global Fund	30	4	2	0	-4
IFAD	26	13	24	28	+15
IMF	5	0	0	0	+0
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	29	58	27	-2
Ireland	9	6	0	2	-4
Italy	16	27	39	16	-11
Japan	32	2	2	0	-2
Korea	12	0	11	4	+4
Luxembourg	8	1	5	10	+9
Netherlands	24	22	13	21	-1
New Zealand	4	0	0	0	0
Norway	12	2	7	4	+2
Portugal	2	1	0	0	-1
Spain	18	59	70	47	-12
Sweden	18	33	22	3	-30
Switzerland	22	54	55	51	-3
Turkey	6	0	1	37	+37
United Kingdom	19	40	17	25	-15
United Nations	32	295	283	299	+4
United States	32	187	187	180	-7
World Bank	32	216	78	44	-172
All other donors	--	13	68	72	+59
<b>Total</b>		<b>1 696</b>	<b>1 525</b>	<b>1 158</b>	<b>-538</b>
Average		37	31	21	-17

TABLE B.6: How many PIUs are parallel to country structures?

	No. of countries 2010	Indicator 6			Progress
		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 (PIUs)	2010 / 2005 (units)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>					
African Dev. Bank	35	--	--	78	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	--	--	8	--
Australia	18	--	--	62	--
Austria	9	--	--	12	--
Belgium	20	--	--	74	--
Canada	36	--	--	111	--
Denmark	24	--	--	24	--
EU Institutions	75	--	--	80	--
Finland	17	--	--	12	--
France	46	--	--	62	--
GAVI Alliance	46	--	--	0	--
Germany	59	--	--	35	--
Global Fund	64	--	--	0	--
IFAD	44	--	--	45	--
IMF	10	--	--	0	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	--	--	66	--
Ireland	14	--	--	2	--
Italy	28	--	--	29	--
Japan	70	--	--	0	--
Korea	26	--	--	11	--
Luxembourg	11	--	--	14	--
Netherlands	33	--	--	21	--
New Zealand	14	--	--	12	--
Norway	20	--	--	23	--
Portugal	5	--	--	0	--
Spain	33	--	--	51	--
Sweden	27	--	--	6	--
Switzerland	35	--	--	80	--
Turkey	12	--	--	42	--
United Kingdom	34	--	--	56	--
United Nations	77	--	--	688	--
United States	61	--	--	448	--
World Bank	76	--	--	83	--
All other donors	--	--	--	123	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>2 358</b>	<b>--</b>
Average		--	--	38	--

TABLE B.7: Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	No. of countries 2010	Disbursements recorded by government in 2010	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in 2010	Indicator 7			Progress	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	For reference: % of scheduled aid disbursements reported as disbursed by donors in 2010 **
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a	2010 / 2005 (% points)	(USD m) d	(%) e = d / b e = b / d
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>									
African Dev. Bank	20	1 279	1 707	52%	51%	59%	+7	1 528	90%
Asian Dev. Bank	6	1 317	1 682	86%	81%	60%	-25	1 412	84%
Australia	5	83	107	33%	39%	47%	+14	87	82%
Austria	6	19	23	30%	39%	60%	+30	24	96%
Belgium	16	118	339	32%	39%	30%	-2	297	87%
Canada	22	349	457	44%	51%	49%	+5	442	97%
Denmark	16	275	522	50%	50%	52%	+2	538	97%
EU Institutions	32	1 995	2 547	51%	63%	60%	+10	2 847	89%
Finland	11	115	166	33%	42%	58%	+25	144	87%
France	24	335	505	32%	46%	45%	+13	581	87%
GAVI Alliance	25	32	269	0%	11%	10%	+10	226	84%
Germany	31	715	1 381	50%	54%	50%	0	1 410	98%
Global Fund	30	713	886	36%	43%	33%	-3	1 105	80%
IFAD	26	102	253	53%	44%	34%	-19	195	77%
IMF	5	231	249	21%	5%	65%	+44	216	87%
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	286	330	95%	53%	42%	-53	335	99%
Ireland	9	140	169	63%	64%	69%	+6	171	99%
Italy	16	88	272	10%	29%	39%	+30	149	55%
Japan	32	1 869	2 637	34%	45%	44%	+10	2 712	97%
Korea	12	181	176	11%	19%	32%	+21	185	95%
Luxembourg	8	32	75	51%	34%	40%	-11	60	80%
Netherlands	24	413	811	54%	59%	39%	-15	594	73%
New Zealand	4	6	10	58%	28%	39%	-19	6	56%
Norway	12	208	251	52%	58%	58%	+6	239	95%
Portugal	2	286	154	15%	47%	48%	+33	249	62%
Spain	18	137	246	26%	30%	49%	+23	253	97%
Sweden	18	303	360	48%	56%	46%	-2	284	79%
Switzerland	22	76	161	39%	44%	32%	-8	126	78%
Turkey	6	0	30	0%	0%	0%	0	100	30%
United Kingdom	19	1 204	1 595	51%	70%	59%	+8	1 520	95%
United Nations	32	1 140	3 638	18%	30%	25%	+8	3 117	86%
United States	32	1 798	6 554	29%	37%	30%	+1	5 762	88%
World Bank	32	8 213	8 427	65%	71%	61%	-4	8 779	96%
All other donors	--	680	300	--	--	44%	--	477	63%
<b>Total*</b>				<b>42%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>+0.8</b>		
Global weighted average		24 736	37 290	72%	69%	66%	-5.6	36 172	97%

TABLE B.7: Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	No. of countries 2010	Disbursements recorded by government in 2010	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in 2010	Indicator 7			Progress	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in 2010	For reference: % of scheduled aid disbursements reported as disbursed by donors in 2010 **
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b c = b / a	2010 / 2005 (% points)	(USD m) d	(%) e = d / b e = b / d
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>									
African Dev. Bank	35	2 020	2 494	--	--	50%	--	2 140	86%
Asian Dev. Bank	20	2 755	3 099	--	--	54%	--	3 659	85%
Australia	18	402	1 126	--	--	46%	--	859	76%
Austria	9	20	28	--	--	53%	--	29	97%
Belgium	20	134	385	--	--	28%	--	322	84%
Canada	36	591	590	--	--	38%	--	538	91%
Denmark	24	285	556	--	--	48%	--	573	97%
EU Institutions	75	3 180	4 559	--	--	48%	--	5 043	90%
Finland	17	121	197	--	--	46%	--	168	85%
France	46	1 157	1 591	--	--	37%	--	1 600	99%
GAVI Alliance	46	41	402	--	--	8%	--	333	83%
Germany	59	931	1 966	--	--	40%	--	2 085	94%
Global Fund	64	830	1 171	--	--	27%	--	1 443	81%
IFAD	44	154	392	--	--	38%	--	295	75%
IMF	10	287	318	--	--	60%	--	416	76%
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	614	1 275	--	--	48%	--	1 168	92%
Ireland	14	146	176	--	--	53%	--	191	92%
Italy	28	99	296	--	--	35%	--	190	64%
Japan	70	4 102	5 961	--	--	37%	--	6 081	98%
Korea	26	229	269	--	--	20%	--	286	94%
Luxembourg	11	32	100	--	--	32%	--	80	80%
Netherlands	33	462	894	--	--	37%	--	654	73%
New Zealand	14	38	87	--	--	34%	--	76	87%
Norway	20	278	376	--	--	44%	--	350	93%
Portugal	5	304	196	--	--	48%	--	316	62%
Spain	33	563	630	--	--	45%	--	657	96%
Sweden	27	319	393	--	--	42%	--	316	80%
Switzerland	35	108	238	--	--	29%	--	200	84%
Turkey	12	3	30	--	--	0%	--	135	22%
United Kingdom	34	1 633	2 073	--	--	53%	--	1 856	90%
United Nations	77	1 703	5 915	--	--	23%	--	5 171	87%
United States	61	4 556	9 571	--	--	28%	--	8 273	86%
World Bank	76	13 096	14 834	--	--	51%	--	15 533	96%
All other donors	--	875	742	--	--	85%	--	895	83%
<b>Total *</b>				--	--	<b>37%</b>	--		
Global weighted average		42 067	62 933	--	--	67%	--	61 930	98%

(\*) Ratio is  $c = a / b$  except where disbursements recorded by government are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement ( $c = b / a$ ).

(\*\*) Ratio is  $e = d / b$  except where disbursements by donors are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement ( $e = b / d$ ).

TABLE B.8: How much bilateral aid is untied?

	No. of countries 2010	Total bilateral aid as reported to the DAC	Untied aid	Share of untied aid			Progress
		(USD m)	(USD m)	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2009 (%)	2009 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>							
African Dev. Bank	20	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian Dev. Bank	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
Australia	5	152	152	54%	99%	100%	+46
Austria	6	59	40	39%	38%	68%	+29
Belgium	16	477	433	97%	86%	91%	-7
Canada	22	465	464	79%	87%	100%	+21
Denmark	16	825	799	94%	94%	97%	+3
EU Institutions	32	--	--	--	--	--	--
Finland	11	286	249	98%	100%	87%	-11
France	24	1 301	1 126	90%	74%	87%	-3
GAVI Alliance	25	--	--	--	--	--	--
Germany	31	1 043	1 027	94%	99%	98%	+5
Global Fund	30	--	--	--	--	--	--
IFAD	26	--	--	--	--	--	--
IMF	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ireland	9	355	355	100%	100%	100%	0
Italy	16	296	142	35%	35%	48%	+13
Japan	32	4 386	4 305	89%	88%	98%	+9
Korea	12	698	327	--	21%	47%	--
Luxembourg	8	114	113	100%	100%	99%	-1
Netherlands	24	1 326	1 321	90%	94%	100%	+9
New Zealand	4	15	15	60%	100%	99%	+39
Norway	12	653	653	99%	100%	100%	+1
Portugal	2	140	14	26%	14%	10%	-15
Spain	18	705	481	75%	61%	68%	-6
Sweden	18	1 084	1 084	100%	100%	100%	0
Switzerland	22	282	277	95%	97%	98%	+3
Turkey	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
United Kingdom	19	3 436	3 436	100%	100%	100%	0
United Nations	32	--	--	--	--	--	--
United States	32	9 323	7 489	70%	79%	80%	+11
World Bank	32	--	--	--	--	--	--
All other donors	--	20	19	--	--	98%	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>27 440</b>	<b>24 319</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>+1.96</b>
Avg. country ratio				83%	84%	88%	+4.5

TABLE B.8: How much bilateral aid is untied?

	No. of countries 2010	Total bilateral aid as reported to the DAC	Untied aid	Share of untied aid			Progress
		(USD m)	(USD m)	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2009 (%)	2009 / 2005 (% points)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>							
African Dev. Bank	35	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	--	--	--	--	--	--
Australia	18	426	412	67%	99%	97%	+30
Austria	9	138	70	64%	89%	51%	-13
Belgium	20	587	538	95%	90%	92%	-4
Canada	36	651	648	77%	81%	100%	+23
Denmark	24	1 024	998	93%	94%	97%	+4
EU Institutions	75	--	--	--	--	--	--
Finland	17	421	383	98%	96%	91%	-8
France	46	2 645	2 121	95%	83%	80%	-15
GAVI Alliance	46	--	--	--	--	--	--
Germany	59	1 907	1 884	94%	99%	99%	+4
Global Fund	64	--	--	--	--	--	--
IFAD	44	--	--	--	--	--	--
IMF	10	--	--	--	--	--	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ireland	14	453	453	100%	100%	100%	0
Italy	28	473	264	66%	52%	56%	-10
Japan	70	7 462	6 866	90%	91%	92%	+2
Korea	26	1 111	492	--	20%	44%	--
Luxembourg	11	177	176	100%	100%	99%	-1
Netherlands	33	1 799	1 750	90%	96%	97%	+7
New Zealand	14	123	120	85%	99%	97%	+12
Norway	20	1 107	1 106	99%	100%	100%	+1
Portugal	5	168	39	42%	44%	23%	-19
Spain	33	1 560	1 068	78%	59%	68%	-9
Sweden	27	1 428	1 402	100%	100%	98%	-2
Switzerland	35	592	583	97%	97%	98%	+2
Turkey	12	--	--	--	--	--	--
United Kingdom	34	4 768	4 768	100%	100%	100%	0
United Nations	77	--	--	--	--	--	--
United States	61	17 284	13 517	73%	77%	78%	+5
World Bank	76	--	--	--	--	--	--
All other donors	--	34	30	--	--	89%	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>46 337</b>	<b>39 687</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>-2.92</b>
Avg. country ratio				82%	84%	88%	<b>+5.4</b>

TABLE B.9: How much aid was programme-based?

	Number of countries 2010	Programme-based approaches			Total aid disbursed (USD m) d	Indicator 9			Progress 2010/2005 (% points)
		Budget support	Other PBAs	Total		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 e = c / d	
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	(USD m) c = a + b					
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>									
African Dev. Bank	20	318	191	509	1 591	40%	32%	32%	-8
Asian Dev. Bank	6	378	389	767	1 412	23%	34%	54%	+31
Australia	5	28	35	63	282	29%	20%	22%	-6
Austria	6	8	12	20	31	36%	30%	64%	+28
Belgium	16	28	76	104	391	32%	17%	27%	-5
Canada	22	231	172	403	713	51%	56%	57%	+6
Denmark	16	193	266	459	682	58%	63%	67%	+10
EU Institutions	32	1 188	677	1 865	3 172	51%	47%	59%	+7
Finland	11	43	55	98	193	35%	58%	51%	+15
France	24	71	143	213	806	28%	31%	26%	-2
GAVI Alliance	25	0	92	92	232	18%	37%	39%	+21
Germany	31	220	489	709	1 448	20%	35%	49%	+29
Global Fund	30	5	1 100	1 105	1 303	82%	76%	85%	+2
IFAD	26	5	36	40	199	3%	34%	20%	+17
IMF	5	127	34	161	216	71%	41%	74%	+3
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	50	112	162	349	61%	55%	47%	-14
Ireland	9	64	101	165	227	64%	84%	73%	+8
Italy	16	27	24	51	210	41%	26%	24%	-16
Japan	32	179	1 429	1 608	2 797	34%	53%	58%	+23
Korea	12	0	79	79	186	0%	1%	42%	+42
Luxembourg	8	0	19	19	71	41%	31%	27%	-15
Netherlands	24	249	248	498	919	69%	71%	54%	-15
New Zealand	4	2	2	4	12	6%	48%	32%	+26
Norway	12	135	43	178	421	35%	50%	42%	+7
Portugal	2	5	96	100	255	4%	3%	39%	+36
Spain	18	27	40	67	562	14%	14%	12%	-3
Sweden	18	144	112	256	454	42%	47%	57%	+14
Switzerland	22	32	37	69	244	26%	36%	28%	+3
Turkey	6	0	16	16	107	0%	0%	15%	+15
United Kingdom	19	690	536	1 226	2 034	58%	71%	60%	+2
United Nations	32	755	1 454	2 210	3 685	30%	34%	60%	+30
United States	32	40	1 270	1 310	7 349	27%	36%	18%	-9
World Bank	32	3 641	1 544	5 185	8 785	56%	57%	59%	+3
All other donors	--	135	47	182	605	--	--	30%	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>9 018</b>	<b>10 976</b>	<b>19 994</b>	<b>41 942</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>+5</b>
Avg. country ratio						35%	34%	37%	+2

TABLE B.9: How much aid was programme-based?

	Number of countries 2010	Programme-based approaches			Total aid disbursed (USD m) d	Indicator 9			Progress
		Budget support	Other PBAs	Total		2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 e = c / d	
		(USD m) a	(USD m) b	(USD m) c = a + b					2010/2005 (% points)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>									
African Dev. Bank	35	663	193	856	2 481	--	--	35%	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	1 134	681	1 815	3 660	--	--	50%	--
Australia	18	75	202	277	1 369	--	--	20%	--
Austria	9	8	14	21	43	--	--	49%	--
Belgium	20	30	85	115	433	--	--	26%	--
Canada	36	231	230	461	927	--	--	50%	--
Denmark	24	211	277	489	753	--	--	65%	--
EU Institutions	75	1 837	1 183	3 021	5 760	--	--	52%	--
Finland	17	45	60	105	223	--	--	47%	--
France	46	625	336	961	1 905	--	--	50%	--
GAVI Alliance	46	7	110	117	339	--	--	34%	--
Germany	59	241	604	845	2 183	--	--	39%	--
Global Fund	64	5	1 329	1 334	1 844	--	--	72%	--
IFAD	44	20	56	76	301	--	--	25%	--
IMF	10	183	34	217	416	--	--	52%	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	700	251	951	1 184	--	--	80%	--
Ireland	14	64	108	172	261	--	--	66%	--
Italy	28	38	33	71	278	--	--	26%	--
Japan	70	1 170	1 916	3 086	6 211	--	--	50%	--
Korea	26	0	86	86	291	--	--	29%	--
Luxembourg	11	0	25	25	95	--	--	26%	--
Netherlands	33	260	256	517	1 081	--	--	48%	--
New Zealand	14	13	43	56	112	--	--	50%	--
Norway	20	143	81	224	639	--	--	35%	--
Portugal	5	5	121	125	332	--	--	38%	--
Spain	33	61	95	156	1 181	--	--	13%	--
Sweden	27	150	135	285	593	--	--	48%	--
Switzerland	35	34	79	114	385	--	--	30%	--
Turkey	12	0	16	16	180	--	--	9%	--
United Kingdom	34	811	599	1 410	2 704	--	--	52%	--
United Nations	77	858	1 998	2 856	6 416	--	--	45%	--
United States	61	659	1 681	2 340	11 623	--	--	20%	--
World Bank	76	6 387	2 765	9 151	15 639	--	--	59%	--
All other donors	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>		<b>16 891</b>	<b>15 774</b>	<b>32 665</b>	<b>72 927</b>	--	--	<b>45%</b>	--
Avg. country ratio						--	--	31%	--

TABLE B.10a: How many donor missions were co-ordinated?

	No. of countries 2010	Coordinated donor missions	Total donor missions	Indicator 10a			Progress
		(missions) a	(missions) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>							
African Dev. Bank	20	45	513	19%	13%	9%	-10
Asian Dev. Bank	6	40	359	5%	16%	11%	+6
Australia	5	18	33	7%	41%	55%	+48
Austria	6	5	14	15%	0%	36%	+21
Belgium	16	16	100	22%	13%	16%	-6
Canada	22	33	199	17%	14%	17%	0
Denmark	16	57	125	33%	46%	46%	+12
EU Institutions	32	152	599	34%	37%	25%	-8
Finland	11	10	29	23%	37%	34%	+12
France	24	71	417	10%	20%	17%	+7
GAVI Alliance	25	9	26	--	100%	35%	--
Germany	31	99	272	30%	35%	36%	+7
Global Fund	30	24	105	14%	15%	23%	+8
IFAD	26	65	170	54%	84%	38%	-15
IMF	5	8	38	31%	23%	21%	-10
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	143	176	47%	47%	81%	+35
Ireland	9	16	23	41%	36%	70%	+29
Italy	16	28	121	8%	13%	23%	+15
Japan	32	10	292	2%	2%	3%	+1
Korea	12	5	63	0%	15%	8%	+8
Luxembourg	8	9	32	20%	18%	28%	+8
Netherlands	24	85	164	45%	52%	52%	+7
New Zealand	4	0	10	20%	67%	0%	-20
Norway	12	22	58	59%	33%	38%	-22
Portugal	2	15	26	50%	0%	58%	+8
Spain	18	17	39	9%	23%	44%	+35
Sweden	18	35	69	32%	32%	51%	+19
Switzerland	22	36	146	31%	21%	25%	-6
Turkey	6	0	98	89%	17%	0%	-89
United Kingdom	19	70	131	42%	61%	53%	+12
United Nations	32	1 640	3 900	28%	45%	42%	+14
United States	32	60	978	28%	9%	6%	-22
World Bank	32	638	1 879	23%	32%	34%	+11

TABLE B.10a: How many donor missions were co-ordinated?

	No. of countries 2010	Coordinated donor missions	Total donor missions	Indicator 10a			Progress
		(missions) a	(missions) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>							
African Dev. Bank	35	97	717	--	--	14%	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	129	846	--	--	15%	--
Australia	18	91	192	--	--	47%	--
Austria	9	5	18	--	--	28%	--
Belgium	20	20	122	--	--	16%	--
Canada	36	48	331	--	--	15%	--
Denmark	24	67	159	--	--	42%	--
EU Institutions	75	252	1 304	--	--	19%	--
Finland	17	17	63	--	--	27%	--
France	46	124	928	--	--	13%	--
GAVI Alliance	46	12	35	--	--	34%	--
Germany	59	195	527	--	--	37%	--
Global Fund	64	34	186	--	--	18%	--
IFAD	44	109	244	--	--	45%	--
IMF	10	22	82	--	--	27%	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	244	366	--	--	67%	--
Ireland	14	21	29	--	--	72%	--
Italy	28	37	189	--	--	20%	--
Japan	70	24	509	--	--	5%	--
Korea	26	8	167	--	--	5%	--
Luxembourg	11	14	48	--	--	29%	--
Netherlands	33	95	190	--	--	50%	--
New Zealand	14	14	61	--	--	23%	--
Norway	20	27	87	--	--	31%	--
Portugal	5	17	56	--	--	30%	--
Spain	33	33	107	--	--	31%	--
Sweden	27	44	105	--	--	42%	--
Switzerland	35	57	312	--	--	18%	--
Turkey	12	31	160	--	--	19%	--
United Kingdom	34	110	256	--	--	43%	--
United Nations	77	2 420	6 452	--	--	38%	--
United States	61	95	1 456	--	--	7%	--
World Bank	76	1 017	3 555	--	--	29%	--

TABLE B.10b: How much country analysis was co-ordinated?

	No. of countries 2010	Coordinated donor analytic work	Total donor analytic work	Indicator 10b			Progress
		(analyses) a	(analyses) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>2006/2011 Survey Countries (32)</b>							
African Dev. Bank	20	35	66	55%	41%	53%	-2
Asian Dev. Bank	6	9	27	49%	15%	33%	-15
Australia	5	7	12	25%	78%	58%	+33
Austria	6	1	5	33%	53%	20%	-13
Belgium	16	14	40	33%	67%	35%	+2
Canada	22	82	121	37%	24%	68%	+31
Denmark	16	66	88	82%	88%	75%	-7
EU Institutions	32	79	134	45%	90%	59%	+14
Finland	11	13	15	63%	83%	87%	+24
France	24	27	53	41%	54%	51%	+10
GAVI Alliance	25	0	0	--	0%	--	--
Germany	31	60	100	52%	78%	60%	+8
Global Fund	30	18	83	33%	24%	22%	-12
IFAD	26	16	25	89%	78%	64%	-25
IMF	5	4	11	14%	22%	36%	+23
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	4	82	105	65%	39%	78%	+13
Ireland	9	17	21	57%	82%	81%	+24
Italy	16	13	25	22%	36%	52%	+30
Japan	32	16	28	52%	31%	57%	+5
Korea	12	3	6	--	0%	50%	--
Luxembourg	8	7	9	67%	80%	78%	+11
Netherlands	24	34	65	77%	49%	52%	-25
New Zealand	4	3	3	100%	0%	100%	0
Norway	12	9	13	80%	86%	69%	-11
Portugal	2	14	18	0%	0%	78%	+78
Spain	18	48	55	12%	42%	87%	+75
Sweden	18	46	69	34%	65%	67%	+32
Switzerland	22	22	35	61%	69%	63%	+2
Turkey	6	0	1	100%	--	0%	-100
United Kingdom	19	51	89	66%	69%	57%	-9
United Nations	32	969	1 599	60%	68%	61%	+1
United States	32	94	244	40%	37%	39%	-2
World Bank	32	71	128	47%	58%	55%	+8

TABLE B.10b: How much country analysis was co-ordinated?

	No. of countries 2010	Coordinated donor analytic work	Total donor analytic work	Indicator 10b			Progress
		(analyses) a	(analyses) b	2005 (for reference)	2007 (for reference)	2010 c = a / b	2010 / 2005 (% points)
<b>Global picture - 78 countries &amp; territories</b>							
African Dev. Bank	35	50	100	--	--	50%	--
Asian Dev. Bank	20	64	164	--	--	39%	--
Australia	18	42	89	--	--	47%	--
Austria	9	8	14	--	--	57%	--
Belgium	20	16	46	--	--	35%	--
Canada	36	91	158	--	--	58%	--
Denmark	24	68	95	--	--	72%	--
EU Institutions	75	163	285	--	--	57%	--
Finland	17	13	26	--	--	50%	--
France	46	41	140	--	--	29%	--
GAVI Alliance	46	0	0	--	--	--	--
Germany	59	112	218	--	--	51%	--
Global Fund	64	31	125	--	--	25%	--
IFAD	44	33	55	--	--	60%	--
IMF	10	25	43	--	--	58%	--
InterAmer.Dev.Bank	10	91	121	--	--	75%	--
Ireland	14	19	25	--	--	76%	--
Italy	28	18	48	--	--	38%	--
Japan	70	19	40	--	--	48%	--
Korea	26	10	20	--	--	50%	--
Luxembourg	11	10	13	--	--	77%	--
Netherlands	33	46	82	--	--	56%	--
New Zealand	14	8	13	--	--	62%	--
Norway	20	9	22	--	--	41%	--
Portugal	5	20	28	--	--	71%	--
Spain	33	62	77	--	--	81%	--
Sweden	27	53	82	--	--	65%	--
Switzerland	35	34	72	--	--	47%	--
Turkey	12	20	23	--	--	87%	--
United Kingdom	34	95	166	--	--	57%	--
United Nations	77	1 946	3 174	--	--	61%	--
United States	61	194	457	--	--	42%	--
World Bank	76	187	317	--	--	59%	--



# C DONOR DATA

## ONE TABLE PER DONOR

THE FOLLOWING TABLES present results on a donor-by-donor basis for all the indicators that are based on donor data (Indicators 3 to 10b). There is one table per donor. Data were available for 57 donors in one or more partner countries participating in the 2011 Survey. Not all donors have a table in Appendix C. The following criteria were applied in establishing the 33 donors that are shown in Appendix C:

- All donors that have reported over USD 100 million of aid disbursed for the government sector in at least three surveyed countries; and
- All donors who do not meet the first criterion but would like to publish their results.

### DATA SOURCES

The tables in Appendix C draw on two different sources:

- Indicator 8 (untied aid) uses data drawn from the OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS). Data is only available for DAC members reporting the tying status of aid.
- Data for all other indicators provided in Appendix B are drawn from the 2011 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, and are collected at the country level through government and donor questionnaires.

### ILLUSTRATIVE DONOR TARGETS FOR 2010

Under the Paris Declaration, donors and partner countries agreed to collective targets for 2010. Achieving collective targets depends on the efforts of individual donors and partner countries. The tables in Appendix C show illustrative 2010 targets for each donor, based on an arithmetic implementation of the Paris Declaration targets (Appendix D). This follows a similar logic to the targets presented for individual partner countries in the country chapters. For those indicators where the target is established in relation to the 2005 baseline (indicators 3, 5a, 6, 7 and 8), the illustrative target shown has been calculated on the basis of the donor's baseline value for each of the indicators in the group of 32 countries for which 2005 data are shown. Targets for the remaining indicators are fixed, and do not depend on the 2005 baseline (indicators 4, 9, 10a and 10b).

It is important to note that these notional targets may not be representative of a donor's global aid efforts. The survey coverage of each donor's ODA varies, as indicated at the top of each donor table. Furthermore, many donors provide part of their bilateral ODA through other donors at the country level (for example, in the context of delegated co-operation arrangements, "silent" partnerships or contributions channelled through multilateral organisations at the country level). This aid is not reflected in the table for the donor providing the funds, and the notes at the top of each table offer an indication of the amounts of aid that are not included for this reason. The targets presented in Appendix C do not prejudice individual targets that donors or partner countries may have agreed, and indeed a number of donors have established their own targets, both internationally and as part of plans formulated to support the implementation of the Paris Declaration in individual partner countries.

The target for indicator 5a (use of country PFM systems) is dependent on the quality of PFM systems in each country as assessed through indicator 2a (reliable PFM systems). The illustrative targets shown for indicator 5a are therefore a weighted average of targets calculated for each donor in each country based on the criteria agreed for the global targets (*i.e.* a one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems for those countries scoring between 3.5 and 4.5 on indicator 2a. Where a given country scores below 3.5 on indicator 2a, or where the quality of its PFM systems has not been scored, the baseline score for 5a is retained for the purpose of calculating the illustrative target).

No illustrative target is shown for indicator 5b (use of country procurement systems), as the 2010 target for donors' use of country procurement systems depends on the quality of procurement systems as assessed by indicator 2b (reliable procurement systems). Only five partner countries reported ratings for indicator 2b in 2010, presenting too small a sample for meaningful analysis.

### HOW TO USE APPENDIX C

For each indicator, the tables in Appendix C show the indicator values for a given donor calculated across the 32 countries that participated in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys. This is intended to facilitate comparison over the period 2005 to 2010. The column labelled "all countries" offers a global snapshot of performance against each indicator in 2010, drawing on data for all of the countries in which the donor took part in the 2011 Survey.

### INDICATOR VALUES AND AVERAGE COUNTRY RATIOS

For each donor, the table includes two sets of columns: indicator values and average country ratios. In most cases, indicator values are the weighted averages of the values reported for the donor in each country surveyed as shown in the tables contained in Appendix B – *i.e.* it is the aggregate value of the numerator divided by the aggregate value of the denominator (see illustrative example).

The average country ratio is an un-weighted average, *i.e.* it gives equal weight to each country irrespective of the volume of activity. This offers an indication of the variability of individual country indicators compared to the weighted average.

#### Illustrative example

##### Indicator 5b (use of country procurement systems)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Country A} &= \frac{2}{3} = 66\% & \text{Country B} &= \frac{9}{10} = 90\% \\ \text{Country C} &= \frac{16}{87} = 18\% \end{aligned}$$

##### Indicator value (weighted average)

$$\frac{2 + 9 + 16}{3 + 10 + 87} = \frac{27}{100} = 27\%$$

##### Average country ratio

$$\frac{66\% + 90\% + 18\%}{3} = 58\%$$

In this example, the indicator value is much lower than the average country ratio because of the high weight (87 out of 100 units) for Country C.

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The percentages in the header on the coverage of the survey use figures reported to the OECD-DAC, dividing 'core ODA' (gross ODA minus debt relief and humanitarian aid) to those countries that report aid from that donor in each country by total core ODA provided by the donor to all countries (excluding amounts which are not allocated by region). In this report, the coverage for the 2011 Survey is calculated using OECD-DAC data for 2009, the latest available.

TABLE C.1: AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 17 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 81% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 18 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 79% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 35 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 96% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 6.6 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	59%	58%	67%	59%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	38%	31%	68%	69%	50%	36%	47%	56%	65%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	33%	39%	39%	47%	43%	28%	39%	42%	38%
5b Use of country procurement systems	43%	37%	33%	32%	Not applicable	32%	31%	37%	30%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	132	113	46	78	44	8.3	6.3	2.3	2.2
7 Aid is more predictable	52%	51%	59%	50%	76%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	40%	32%	32%	35%	66%	37%	27%	38%	38%
10a Joint missions	19%	13%	9%	14%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	55%	41%	53%	50%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.2: ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 6 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 47% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 5 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 41% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 20 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 85% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 4.1 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	62%	86%	58%	64%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	37%	78%	42%	44%	50%	64%	72%	56%	68%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	69%	81%	78%	90%	84%	56%	54%	66%	76%
5b Use of country procurement systems	45%	59%	37%	29%	Not applicable	35%	41%	35%	40%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	39	40	2	8	13	6.5	8.0	0.3	0.4
7 Aid is more predictable	86%	81%	60%	54%	93%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	23%	34%	54%	50%	66%	27%	26%	47%	29%
10a Joint missions	5%	16%	11%	15%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	49%	15%	33%	39%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.3: AUSTRALIA

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 5 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 11% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 4 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 10% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 18 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 87% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 447.6 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	29%	25%	36%	48%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	25%	36%	63%	59%	50%	53%	63%	43%	50%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	6%	13%	38%	23%	33%	6%	15%	16%	30%
5b Use of country procurement systems	5%	16%	38%	26%	Not applicable	10%	13%	16%	32%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	27	14	8	62	9	6.8	3.5	1.6	3.4
7 Aid is more predictable	33%	39%	47%	46%	67%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	54%	99%	100%	97%	More than 54%	39%	100%	100%	100%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	29%	20%	22%	20%	66%	28%	20%	21%	24%
10a Joint missions	7%	41%	55%	47%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	25%	78%	58%	47%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.4: AUSTRIA

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 6 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 12% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 8 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 17% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 9 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 40% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 5.2 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	36%	43%	65%	55%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	11%	37%	52%	47%	50%	11%	40%	59%	51%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	19%	35%	63%	53%	31%	17%	17%	37%	25%
5b Use of country procurement systems	30%	44%	86%	77%	Not applicable	27%	28%	65%	56%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	13	23	5	12	4	2.6	2.9	0.8	1.3
7 Aid is more predictable	30%	39%	60%	53%	65%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	39%	38%	68%	51%	More than 39%	47%	64%	79%	72%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	36%	30%	64%	49%	66%	22%	25%	45%	33%
10a Joint missions	15%	0%	36%	28%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	33%	53%	20%	57%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.5: BELGIUM

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 16 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 59% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 17 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 66% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 20 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 74% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 55.8 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	42%	52%	44%	47%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	18%	30%	66%	66%	50%	26%	53%	65%	61%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	24%	18%	17%	16%	39%	29%	31%	22%	20%
5b Use of country procurement systems	43%	44%	44%	44%	Not applicable	54%	64%	51%	47%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	67	124	71	74	22	4.2	7.8	4.4	3.7
7 Aid is more predictable	32%	39%	30%	28%	66%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	97%	86%	91%	92%	More than 97%	89%	88%	94%	94%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	32%	17%	27%	26%	66%	32%	27%	23%	22%
10a Joint missions	22%	13%	16%	16%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	33%	67%	35%	35%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.6: CANADA

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 21 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 47% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 23 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 57% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 36 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 83% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 381.2 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	52%	45%	39%	30%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	39%	61%	30%	27%	50%	32%	53%	38%	34%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	42%	75%	72%	68%	67%	32%	42%	53%	43%
5b Use of country procurement systems	44%	38%	77%	63%	Not applicable	37%	59%	56%	42%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	64	36	31	111	21	3.4	1.8	1.4	3.1
7 Aid is more predictable	44%	51%	49%	38%	72%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	79%	87%	100%	100%	More than 79%	68%	80%	99%	96%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	51%	56%	57%	50%	66%	33%	34%	31%	26%
10a Joint missions	17%	14%	17%	15%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	37%	24%	68%	58%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.7: DENMARK

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 17 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 75% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 16 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 76% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 24 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 73% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 43.7 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	49%	65%	68%	60%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	51%	74%	93%	88%	50%	45%	77%	84%	72%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	29%	53%	62%	62%	49%	26%	55%	48%	39%
5b Use of country procurement systems	44%	66%	80%	78%	Not applicable	45%	69%	68%	60%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	69	38	15	24	23	4.1	2.4	0.9	1.0
7 Aid is more predictable	50%	50%	52%	48%	75%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	94%	94%	97%	97%	More than 94%	97%	97%	96%	98%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	58%	63%	67%	65%	66%	55%	62%	57%	47%
10a Joint missions	33%	46%	46%	42%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	82%	88%	75%	72%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.8: EU INSTITUTIONS

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 32 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 44% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 30 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 43% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 75 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 70% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 684.8 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	58%	62%	61%	51%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	36%	50%	50%	50%	50%	23%	56%	56%	51%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	41%	40%	56%	49%	53%	40%	40%	46%	40%
5b Use of country procurement systems	42%	36%	55%	47%	Not applicable	41%	30%	44%	37%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	189	98	55	80	63	6.1	3.3	1.7	1.1
7 Aid is more predictable	51%	63%	60%	48%	76%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	51%	47%	59%	52%	66%	47%	41%	50%	38%
10a Joint missions	34%	37%	25%	19%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	45%	90%	59%	57%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.9: FINLAND

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 10 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 53% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 9 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 58% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 17 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 78% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 38.3 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	35%	58%	56%	55%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	52%	72%	56%	51%	50%	57%	69%	49%	59%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	35%	57%	58%	56%	59%	27%	44%	42%	39%
5b Use of country procurement systems	50%	66%	63%	60%	Not applicable	40%	59%	48%	43%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	9	4	7	12	3	0.9	0.4	0.6	0.7
7 Aid is more predictable	33%	42%	58%	46%	67%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	98%	100%	87%	91%	More than 98%	95%	100%	83%	89%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	35%	58%	51%	47%	66%	36%	43%	30%	24%
10a Joint missions	23%	37%	34%	27%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	63%	83%	87%	50%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.10: FRANCE

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 24 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 25% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 20 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 22% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 46 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 45% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 76.7 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	45%	58%	41%	42%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	20%	48%	51%	57%	50%	17%	50%	48%	52%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	27%	40%	48%	69%	45%	23%	31%	35%	35%
5b Use of country procurement systems	60%	60%	78%	74%	Not applicable	52%	53%	63%	52%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	63	67	25	62	21	3.2	3.4	1.0	1.3
7 Aid is more predictable	32%	46%	45%	37%	66%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	90%	74%	87%	80%	More than 90%	87%	78%	95%	96%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	28%	31%	26%	50%	66%	19%	24%	25%	25%
10a Joint missions	10%	20%	17%	13%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	41%	54%	51%	29%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.11: GAVI ALLIANCE

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 10 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 12 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 21% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 46 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 87% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 6.7 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	0%	0%	19%	11%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	--	100%	--	--	50%	--	100%	--	--
5a Use of country public financial management systems	33%	30%	0%	0%	30%	30%	30%	0%	0%
5b Use of country procurement systems	2%	11%	0%	0%	Not applicable	7%	18%	0%	2%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7 Aid is more predictable	0%	11%	10%	8%	50%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	18%	37%	39%	34%	66%	29%	46%	32%	38%
10a Joint missions	--	100%	35%	34%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	--	0%	--	--	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.12: GERMANY

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 30 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 32% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 29 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 31% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 59 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 59% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 24.4 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	53%	59%	53%	45%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	39%	75%	69%	74%	50%	38%	73%	80%	80%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	37%	42%	43%	44%	48%	29%	36%	41%	41%
5b Use of country procurement systems	32%	59%	61%	60%	Not applicable	33%	53%	53%	49%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	39	26	23	35	13	1.4	0.9	0.7	0.6
7 Aid is more predictable	50%	54%	50%	40%	75%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	94%	99%	98%	99%	More than 94%	70%	99%	99%	99%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	20%	35%	49%	39%	66%	23%	33%	46%	33%
10a Joint missions	30%	35%	36%	37%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	52%	78%	60%	51%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.13: GLOBAL FUND

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 25 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 50% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 28 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 48% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 64 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 64% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 141.5 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	38%	43%	42%	36%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	--	40%	--	--	50%	--	40%	--	--
5a Use of country public financial management systems	41%	42%	61%	49%	53%	39%	33%	43%	31%
5b Use of country procurement systems	45%	43%	70%	60%	Not applicable	40%	45%	41%	40%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	4	2	0	0	1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0
7 Aid is more predictable	36%	43%	33%	27%	68%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	82%	76%	85%	72%	66%	75%	61%	67%	54%
10a Joint missions	14%	15%	23%	18%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	33%	24%	22%	25%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.14: IFAD

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 10 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 20% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 19 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 30% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 44 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 63% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 1.9 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	69%	57%	52%	46%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	72%	76%	34%	43%	50%	50%	74%	64%	72%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	44%	58%	72%	77%	37%	37%	41%	63%	63%
5b Use of country procurement systems	61%	84%	85%	82%	Not applicable	67%	74%	75%	69%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	13	24	28	45	4	1.6	1.3	1.1	1.0
7 Aid is more predictable	53%	44%	34%	38%	77%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	3%	34%	20%	25%	66%	11%	22%	18%	14%
10a Joint missions	54%	84%	38%	45%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	89%	78%	64%	60%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.15: IMF

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 13 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 28% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 9 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 11% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 10 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 16% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 All countries
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	19%	4%	58%	48%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	70%	35%	0%	0%	50%	56%	29%	0%	0%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	79%	89%	100%	89%	12%	46%	49%	100%	73%
5b Use of country procurement systems	79%	63%	56%	32%	Not applicable	70%	32%	20%	20%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7 Aid is more predictable	21%	5%	65%	60%	61%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	71%	41%	74%	52%	66%	79%	38%	60%	40%
10a Joint missions	31%	23%	21%	27%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	14%	22%	36%	58%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.16: INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 3 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 50% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 4 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 35% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 10 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 74% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	32%	37%	48%	51%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	25%	54%	84%	65%	50%	60%	68%	77%	53%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	54%	43%	36%	12%	69%	38%	38%	38%	26%
5b Use of country procurement systems	0%	31%	14%	5%	Not applicable	0%	35%	24%	32%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	29	58	27	66	10	14.5	14.5	6.8	6.6
7 Aid is more predictable	95%	53%	42%	48%	98%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	61%	55%	47%	80%	66%	33%	32%	25%	29%
10a Joint missions	47%	47%	81%	67%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	65%	39%	78%	75%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.17: IRELAND

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 6 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 66% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 6 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 64% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 14 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 82% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 18.0 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	48%	45%	60%	51%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	52%	97%	74%	76%	50%	47%	99%	58%	71%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	90%	79%	84%	80%	85%	90%	86%	87%	74%
5b Use of country procurement systems	96%	88%	91%	89%	Not applicable	95%	93%	92%	81%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	6	0	2	2	2	1.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
7 Aid is more predictable	63%	64%	69%	53%	82%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	64%	84%	73%	66%	66%	59%	81%	59%	45%
10a Joint missions	41%	36%	70%	72%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	57%	82%	81%	76%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.18: ITALY

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 12 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 29% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 16 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 34% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 28 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 57% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 50.1 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	18%	38%	32%	29%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	38%	73%	36%	37%	50%	42%	60%	40%	36%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	28%	18%	40%	37%	18%	32%	13%	39%	35%
5b Use of country procurement systems	50%	52%	41%	43%	Not applicable	47%	39%	43%	36%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	27	39	16	29	9	2.3	2.4	1.0	1.0
7 Aid is more predictable	10%	29%	39%	35%	55%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	35%	35%	48%	56%	More than 35%	59%	32%	29%	33%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	41%	26%	24%	26%	66%	25%	32%	42%	35%
10a Joint missions	8%	13%	23%	20%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	22%	36%	52%	38%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.19: JAPAN

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 28 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 20% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 30 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 24% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 70 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 59% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 731.6 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	31%	43%	43%	40%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	75%	75%	81%	80%	50%	37%	81%	82%	82%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	30%	63%	60%	69%	48%	16%	21%	31%	30%
5b Use of country procurement systems	27%	62%	61%	69%	Not applicable	14%	22%	31%	31%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	2	2	0	0	1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
7 Aid is more predictable	34%	45%	44%	37%	67%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	89%	88%	98%	92%	More than 89%	99%	98%	100%	99%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	34%	53%	58%	50%	66%	28%	30%	42%	41%
10a Joint missions	2%	2%	3%	5%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	52%	31%	57%	48%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.20: KOREA

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 3 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 6% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 9 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 27% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 26 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 58% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 3.4 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	11%	34%	46%	38%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	74%	79%	11%	43%	50%	50%	88%	28%	59%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	45%	10%	0%	10%	26%	33%	10%	0%	6%
5b Use of country procurement systems	0%	5%	37%	36%	Not applicable	0%	6%	8%	14%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	0	11	4	11	0	0.0	1.4	0.3	0.4
7 Aid is more predictable	11%	19%	32%	20%	56%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	21%	47%	44%	--	--	6%	61%	57%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	0%	1%	42%	29%	66%	0%	0%	18%	15%
10a Joint missions	0%	15%	8%	5%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	--	0%	50%	50%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.21: LUXEMBOURG

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 3 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 30% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 4 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 34% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 11 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 71% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 16.8 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	66%	44%	38%	38%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	0%	13%	46%	49%	50%	0%	14%	42%	46%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	0%	2%	5%	4%	20%	0%	2%	6%	4%
5b Use of country procurement systems	0%	4%	17%	17%	Not applicable	0%	4%	17%	18%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	1	5	10	14	0	0.5	1.3	1.3	1.3
7 Aid is more predictable	51%	34%	40%	32%	76%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	41%	31%	27%	26%	66%	32%	25%	21%	21%
10a Joint missions	20%	18%	28%	29%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	67%	80%	78%	77%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.22: NETHERLANDS

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 22 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 55% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 22 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 62% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 33 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 86% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 278.7 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	48%	60%	54%	48%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	35%	61%	55%	51%	50%	56%	66%	56%	50%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	70%	64%	68%	62%	74%	59%	59%	60%	46%
5b Use of country procurement systems	78%	80%	82%	76%	Not applicable	71%	74%	71%	59%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	22	13	21	21	7	1.0	0.6	0.9	0.6
7 Aid is more predictable	54%	59%	39%	37%	77%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	90%	94%	100%	97%	More than 90%	82%	93%	95%	88%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	69%	71%	54%	48%	66%	63%	58%	52%	42%
10a Joint missions	45%	52%	52%	50%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	77%	49%	52%	56%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.23: NEW ZEALAND

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 3 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 7% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 3 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 11% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 14 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 70% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 9.4 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	58%	25%	35%	40%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	11%	61%	47%	66%	50%	7%	59%	60%	66%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	10%	52%	34%	31%	35%	34%	38%	22%	22%
5b Use of country procurement systems	14%	45%	51%	53%	Not applicable	36%	27%	32%	31%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	0	0	0	12	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
7 Aid is more predictable	58%	28%	39%	34%	79%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	60%	100%	99%	97%	More than 60%	79%	100%	100%	99%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	6%	48%	32%	50%	66%	8%	48%	19%	28%
10a Joint missions	20%	67%	0%	23%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	100%	0%	100%	62%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

APPENDIX C: DONOR DATA

TABLE C.24: NORWAY

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 12 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 39% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 10 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 34% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 20 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 67% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 260.3 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	61%	66%	46%	42%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	79%	57%	45%	35%	50%	68%	44%	58%	47%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	61%	59%	82%	61%	75%	55%	57%	63%	49%
5b Use of country procurement systems	69%	76%	88%	66%	Not applicable	66%	69%	75%	57%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	2	7	4	23	1	0.2	0.7	0.3	1.2
7 Aid is more predictable	52%	58%	58%	44%	76%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	99%	100%	100%	100%	More than 99%	98%	99%	100%	100%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	35%	50%	42%	35%	66%	31%	40%	29%	24%
10a Joint missions	59%	33%	38%	31%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	80%	86%	69%	41%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.25: PORTUGAL

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 2 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 39% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 2 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 30% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 5 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 69% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	15%	11%	19%	32%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	77%	6%	13%	32%	50%	50%	4%	13%	42%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	79%	3%	2%	2%	73%	54%	6%	2%	1%
5b Use of country procurement systems	80%	4%	90%	79%	Not applicable	54%	8%	90%	58%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
7 Aid is more predictable	15%	47%	48%	48%	58%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	26%	14%	10%	23%	More than 26%	85%	88%	74%	87%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	4%	3%	39%	38%	66%	6%	5%	44%	38%
10a Joint missions	50%	0%	58%	30%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	0%	0%	78%	71%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.26: SPAIN

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 10 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 33% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 16 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 31% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 33 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 60% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 176.0 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	42%	20%	51%	43%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	10%	45%	75%	83%	50%	40%	40%	41%	67%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	17%	52%	54%	66%	38%	22%	35%	45%	43%
5b Use of country procurement systems	14%	57%	65%	77%	Not applicable	23%	43%	50%	54%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	59	70	47	51	20	5.9	5.0	2.6	1.5
7 Aid is more predictable	26%	30%	49%	45%	63%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	75%	61%	68%	68%	More than 75%	73%	64%	57%	58%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	14%	14%	12%	13%	66%	16%	18%	16%	17%
10a Joint missions	9%	23%	44%	31%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	12%	42%	87%	81%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.27: SWEDEN

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 23 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 63% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 20 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 60% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 27 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 78% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 201.5 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	35%	52%	55%	49%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	64%	51%	47%	52%	50%	57%	56%	57%	54%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	47%	57%	71%	65%	65%	40%	48%	53%	39%
5b Use of country procurement systems	45%	56%	76%	71%	Not applicable	40%	44%	58%	52%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	33	22	3	6	11	1.4	1.1	0.2	0.2
7 Aid is more predictable	48%	56%	46%	42%	74%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	42%	47%	57%	48%	66%	35%	37%	42%	34%
10a Joint missions	32%	32%	51%	42%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	34%	65%	67%	65%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.28: SWITZERLAND

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 21 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 45% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 21 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 46% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 35 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 77% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 49.0 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	42%	38%	30%	24%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	20%	52%	48%	47%	50%	27%	40%	39%	39%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	43%	39%	38%	27%	56%	46%	38%	26%	18%
5b Use of country procurement systems	49%	48%	36%	29%	Not applicable	52%	47%	24%	21%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	54	55	51	80	18	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.3
7 Aid is more predictable	39%	44%	32%	29%	70%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	95%	97%	98%	98%	More than 95%	92%	87%	94%	96%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	26%	36%	28%	30%	66%	19%	28%	27%	24%
10a Joint missions	31%	21%	25%	18%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	61%	69%	63%	47%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.29: TURKEY

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 2 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 10% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 4 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 33% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 12 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 52% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	0%	0%	0%	0%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	15%	66%	13%	23%	50%	42%	52%	27%	16%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	7%	3%
5b Use of country procurement systems	85%	0%	1%	0%	Not applicable	50%	0%	20%	9%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	0	1	37	42	0	0.0	0.3	6.2	3.5
7 Aid is more predictable	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	0%	0%	15%	9%	66%	0%	0%	13%	6%
10a Joint missions	89%	17%	0%	19%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	100%	--	0%	87%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.30: UNITED KINGDOM

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 21 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 51% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 18 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 47% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 34 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 70% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 530.4 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	50%	69%	48%	42%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	61%	66%	65%	39%	50%	48%	68%	70%	58%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	76%	78%	73%	68%	87%	54%	51%	49%	37%
5b Use of country procurement systems	77%	69%	75%	69%	Not applicable	52%	50%	49%	34%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	40	17	25	56	13	1.9	0.9	1.3	1.6
7 Aid is more predictable	51%	70%	59%	53%	76%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	58%	71%	60%	52%	66%	45%	48%	56%	36%
10a Joint missions	42%	61%	53%	43%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	66%	69%	57%	57%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.31: UNITED NATIONS

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 32 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 38% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 31 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 41% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 77 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 76% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 135.4 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	35%	40%	34%	31%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	49%	62%	67%	70%	50%	55%	64%	68%	66%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	18%	19%	30%	22%	36%	15%	16%	21%	17%
5b Use of country procurement systems	7%	11%	13%	12%	Not applicable	9%	11%	13%	11%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	295	283	299	688	98	9.8	9.1	9.3	8.9
7 Aid is more predictable	18%	30%	25%	23%	59%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	30%	34%	60%	45%	66%	48%	32%	41%	29%
10a Joint missions	28%	45%	42%	38%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	60%	68%	61%	61%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.32: UNITED STATES

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 27 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 25% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 29 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 35% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 61 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 75% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 403.1 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	33%	25%	30%	32%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	47%	54%	37%	49%	50%	34%	44%	44%	58%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	10%	3%	4%	11%	60%	16%	7%	12%	11%
5b Use of country procurement systems	12%	5%	4%	13%	Not applicable	12%	9%	14%	17%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	187	187	180	448	62	7.2	6.7	5.6	7.3
7 Aid is more predictable	29%	37%	30%	28%	65%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	70%	79%	80%	78%	More than 70%	50%	62%	72%	67%
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	27%	36%	18%	20%	66%	16%	19%	18%	20%
10a Joint missions	28%	9%	6%	7%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	40%	37%	39%	42%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.

TABLE C.33: WORLD BANK

2005 column: Information based on data reported in 30 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 55% of country programmed aid in 2005.

2007 column: Information based on data reported in 30 countries of the 32 participating in both the 2006 and 2011 surveys, reflecting 56% of country programmed aid in 2007.

2010 column: Information based on data reported in 76 of the 78 countries participating in the 2011 Survey, reflecting 83% of country programmed aid in 2009. Figures for the 32 baseline countries are also shown to facilitate comparison over time. The donor has also reported an additional USD 111.8 million of aid to the countries covered in the 2011 Survey as being channelled through other donors at country level. This assistance is not considered in the figures shown below.

Indicators	Indicator values				Illustrative 2010 Targets	Average country ratio (a) (for reference)			
	2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries All countries	
3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities	66%	73%	74%	62%	85%	--	--	--	--
4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support	58%	85%	71%	73%	50%	51%	78%	76%	75%
5a Use of country public financial management systems	43%	55%	69%	71%	51%	35%	46%	54%	47%
5b Use of country procurement systems	42%	43%	54%	55%	Not applicable	33%	39%	49%	38%
6 Avoid parallel implementation structures	216	78	44	83	72	8.0	2.6	1.4	1.1
7 Aid is more predictable	65%	71%	61%	51%	83%	--	--	--	--
8 Aid is untied	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9 Use of common arrangements or procedures	56%	57%	59%	59%	66%	41%	49%	53%	40%
10a Joint missions	23%	32%	34%	29%	40%	--	--	--	--
10b Joint country analytic work	47%	58%	55%	59%	66%	--	--	--	--

(a) The average country ratio is the average ratio across all countries where the donor has reported activities.



# D PARIS DECLARATION INDICATORS OF PROGRESS

Indicators	Targets for 2010
<b>1 Operational development strategies</b>	At least 75% of partner countries have operational development strategies.
<b>2a Reliable Public Financial Management (PFM) systems</b>	Half of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., 0.5 points) on the PFM/ CPIA (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment) scale of performance.
<b>2b Reliable Procurement systems</b>	One-third of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., from D to C, C to B or B to A) on the four-point scale used to assess performance for this indicator.
<b>3 Aid flows are aligned on national priorities</b>	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid flows to government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget).
<b>4 Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support</b>	50% of technical co-operation flows are implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies.
<b>5a Use of country Public Financial Management systems</b>	Reduce the gap by two-thirds — A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems. For partner countries with a score of 5 or above on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance (see Indicator 2a).  Reduce the gap by one-third — A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems. For partner countries with a score between 3.5 and 4.5 on the PFM/CPIA scale of performance (see Indicator 2a).
<b>5b Use of country procurement systems</b>	Reduce the gap by two-thirds — A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' procurement systems; for partner countries with a score of 'A' on the Procurement scale of performance (see Indicator 2b).  Reduce the gap by one-third — A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' procurement systems; for partner countries with a score of 'B' on the Procurement scale of performance (see Indicator 2b).
<b>6 Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel PIU</b>	Reduce by two-thirds the stock of parallel Project Implementation Units (PIUs).
<b>7 Aid is more predictable</b>	Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid not disbursed within the fiscal year for which it was scheduled.
<b>8 Aid is untied</b>	Continued progress over time.
<b>9 Use of common arrangements or procedures</b>	66% of aid flows are provided in the context of programme-based approaches.
<b>10a Joint missions to the field</b>	40% of donor missions to the field are joint.
<b>10b Joint country analytic work</b>	66% of country analytic work is joint.
<b>11 Results-oriented frameworks</b>	Reduce the gap by one-third — Reduce the proportion of countries without transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks by one-third.
<b>12 Mutual accountability</b>	All partner countries have mutual assessment reviews in place.

