

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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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 All countries			2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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.

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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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	2010 All countries		2005 32 countries	2007 32 countries	2010 32 countries	2010 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.