



UNLDC-IV



UN-OHRLS

National Reports on the Implementation  
of the Brussels Programme of Action for  
the Decade 2001–2010  
*Synthesis Report*

**Note**

The report highlights the best practices based on those illustrated in the national reports submitted to the Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island and Developing States in preparation for the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. Since the completion of this report, the number of least developed countries has decreased from 49 to 48, following the graduation of Maldives in January 2011.



UNLDC-IV



UN-OHRRLLS

National Reports on the Implementation  
of the Brussels Programme of Action for  
the Decade 2001–2010  
Synthesis Report



<b>Abbreviations</b>	7
<b>Preface</b>	11
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	12
<b>Introduction</b>	13
<b>Section I: Key Economic, Social, and Environmental trends</b>	15
<b>Section II: Assessment of the progress made and best practices in the implementation of the Commitments of the Programme of Action for LDCs for the Decade 2001–2010</b>	18
<p>Commitment 1: Fostering people-centered policy framework</p> <p>Commitment 2: Good governance at national and international levels</p> <p>Commitment 3: Building human and institutional capacities</p> <p>Commitment 4: Building productive capacities to make globalization work for the Least Developed Countries</p> <p>Commitment 5: Enhancing the role of trade in development</p> <p>Commitment 6: Reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment</p> <p>Commitment 7: Mobilizing financial resources</p>	
<b>Section III: Key Challenges and Lessons Learned</b>	38
<p>(1) Key Challenges</p> <p>(a) Lack of budgetary support to implement BPoA</p> <p>(b) Quantity of ODA and its distribution</p> <p>(c) Limited capacity for domestic resource mobilization</p> <p>(d) Debt overhang and long term sustainability</p> <p>(e) Lack of statistical capacity</p> <p>(f) Inadequate physical infrastructure</p> <p>(g) Fast urbanization</p> <p>(h) Weak institutions and political instability</p> <p>(i) Inadequate health and education infrastructures</p> <p>(j) Environmental degradation and the impact of climate change</p> <p>(k) Negative impact of the global financial and economic crisis on Least Developed Countries</p> <p>(2) Lessons Learned</p>	
<b>IV. Conclusion and Way Forward</b>	50
<b>References</b>	53

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Statistical Annex

- Table Annex 1:** Least Developed Countries Financial Flows: Economic Growth, Gross Fixed Capital Formation and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)
- Table Annex 2:** Poverty and Hunger
- Table Annex 3:** Least Developed Countries Total Remittance Inflows, per capita GDP, and population growth
- Table Annex 4:** Primary Education and gender equality in education
- Table Annex 5:** Adult Literacy
- Table Annex 6:** Infant and Child Health
- Table Annex 7:** Maternal Mortality and HIV/AIDS Prevalence
- Table Annex 8:** Malaria and Tuberculosis Prevalence, Mortality, Prevention and Treatment
- Table Annex 9:** Water and Sanitation
- Table Annex 10:** Official Development Assistance (ODA) Flows to Least Developed Countries
- Table Annex 11:** Least Developed Countries ODA Share per Sector
- Table Annex 12:** Least Developed Countries External Debt per GDP
- Table Annex 13:** Least Developed Countries External Debt Service as a Share of Exports of Goods and Services

### Table

- Table 1.** Real GDP Growth
- Table 2.** Population Growth
- Table 3.** Investment to GDP Ratio
- Table 4.** Communications
- Table 5.** Imports of Capital Goods
- Table 6.** Net Inflows of Official Development Assistance
- Table 7.** Foreign Direct Investment in LDCs
- Table 8.** Workers Remittances in LDCs
- Table 9.** ODA Share per Sector in LDCs

## ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	Anti Corruption Commission
ACIS	Advanced Cargo Information System
ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
AGOA	African Growth Opportunity Act
APTA	Asia- Pacific Trade Agreement
ASYCUDA	Automated System for Customs Data
BIMSTEC	Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral, Technical and Economic Cooperation
BPoA	Brussels Programme of Action
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CCAF	Common Country Assessment Framework
CCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
CBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CHAI	Clinton Foundation's HIV/AIDS Initiative
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
DGWR	Directorate General of Water Resources
DLDP	District-Level Decentralization Programme
DTIS	Diagnosis Trade Integration Study
DWS	Drinking Water Supply
EBA	Everything But Arms
EFA	Education for All
EIF	Enhanced Integrated Framework
EPAs	Economic Partnership Agreements
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FEACC	Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission
FPE	Free Primary education
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GNH	Gross National Happiness
GNI	Gross National Income
GSTP	Generalized System of Trade Preferences

## ABBREVIATIONS

HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
HIV/AIDS	Human immunodeficiency virus
ICT	Information and communication technology
IDA	International Development Association
IF	Integrated Framework
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPs	Integrity Pacts
JITAP	Joint Integrated Technical Assistance Programme
KYS	Know Your Status (campaign)
LAC	Law Access Centers
Lao NCAW	Lao National Commission for the Advancement of Women
LCD	Lesotho Congress for Democracy
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDRI	Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative
NAC	National AIDS Commission
NAPA	National Adaptation Program of Action
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NERICA	New Rice for Africa
NGOs	Non Governmental Organizations
NSRT	National Strategy for Rural Transport
NSS	National Strategy for Sanitation
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee
PACER	Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations
PACT II	Programme for building African Capacity for Trade
PICTA	Pacific Island Countries Trade Agreement
PMTCT	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission
PoA	Programme of Action
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
PRODEJ	Programme for the Development of Justice
PRSPs	Poverty reduction Strategy Papers
R&D	Research and Development
RWSS	Rural Water Supply and Sanitation

## ABBREVIATIONS

---

SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAFTA	South Asian Free Trade Area
SDA	Sustainable Development Agenda
SDS	Strategy for Development of Samoa
SOPAC	South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission
SPBD	South Pacific Business Development Foundation
SPGPR	Strategic Plan for Growth and Poverty Reduction
SPT	Sectorial Programme for Transport
TANROADS	Tanzanian National Roads Agency
TFSCB	Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building
TSIP	Transport Sector Investment Programme
UN	United Nations
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN-OHRLLS	United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island and Developing States
WTO	World Trade Organization



The international community under the auspices of the United Nations framework, adopted the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the decade 2001-2010 (BPoA) at the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Brussels in 2001.

The overarching goal of the BPoA was “to make substantial progress towards halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and suffering from hunger by 2015”. It was also aimed at achieving equitable, sustained growth, and sustainable development, in order to end the marginalization of LDCs, to bring about their structural transformation and graduation from LDC status, and to promote their beneficial integration in the global economy.

A decade later, the Fourth United Nations Conference on the LDCs will be held in Istanbul, Turkey from 9 to 13 May 2011, in view to undertake an assessment of the results of the ten year action programme contained in the BPoA, and adopt new measures and strategies for the next decade. In that context, OHRLLS in collaboration with the UN Resident Coordinators undertook broad-based consultations.

Broad-based national consultations on the implementation of the BPOA were launched with the support of UN Resident Coordinators and the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Islands Developing States (UN-OHRLLS), involving a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including governments, parliamentarians, civil society and private sector. The consultations culminated in result-oriented analytical country reports, which served as the basis for the preparation of this report.

The synthesis report highlights the progress made by LDCs in fulfilling the seven commitments of the BPOA. It also provides an overview of the challenges and constraints faced by LDCs on the one hand and their success stories and good practices on the other hand. Although the individual experiences vary strongly between countries, overall, the reports show that countries have made some progress in the implementation of the commitments of BPOA. Many countries, and in particular the commodity-exporting countries, were able to benefit from the economic boom that started in the beginning of the decade. Economic growth was in many cases accompanied with achievements in other areas of human developments. For instance, many LDCs have made considerable progress towards gender equality and universal primary education and many of them have worked to improve access to essential services such as health, education, water and sanitation, energy, transportation and others.

Since the adoption of the Brussels Programme of Action for Least Developed Countries in 2001, the overall economic and social development in least developed countries has improved relatively, with mixed results among regions, and across countries. Most LDCs remain committed to the implementation of BPoA, and significant progress has been made toward the implementation of a number of BPoA commitments. However, numerous obstacles were encountered given the multitude of countries and the individual circumstances that surrounded them during and prior to the implementation process.

For the least developed countries as a group, the period since the adoption of the BPoA was marked by a particularly strong growth acceleration. During the period 2002 – 2007, their real gross domestic product (GDP) surpassed the 7 per cent growth target set by the BPoA, up from less than 4 percent during the previous decade. During the 2000s, LDCs made rapid progress in universal primary education and gender equality in school enrolment. Considerable efforts to increase women’s position in public life was undertaken in several countries such as Ethiopia where effective quotas for affirmative action for women in leadership and politics have been enforced.

Despite progress made in some areas of the BPOA, the overall lesson from the reports is that LDCs continue to suffer from multiple development challenges. The recent food, fuel and financial crises have compounded the development challenges of LDCs and, in many cases, canceled out or severely

## PREFACE

undermined the gains made during the last decade. Furthermore, the effects of climate change have become increasingly apparent, and have had devastating impacts in some LDCs.

LDCs have special needs and interests that call for their special treatment in terms of policy space and the nature as well as magnitude of support. The response needs to be in the context of mutual accountability between LDCs and partners at the national, regional and global levels. A genuine partnership against poverty and a compact for prosperity is needed to unlock huge potential of LDCs and avoid a developmental catastrophe that could impact the whole world.

At the eve of the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries and as we embark on a new decade and a new era, there is a clear recognition that the LDCs with their large resources reservoir, potentials for production and consumption, can serve as locomotives for restoring growth to the global economy. Our work is to make this possibility a reality. The Synthesis and analysis of the National Reports was prepared by UN-OHRLLS in an attempt to shed light on good practices and success stories for development of the least developed countries, but also as a source of inspiration and a guide for further efforts in achieving global prosperity. The peoples of LDCs need and deserve solidarity and support from the world, which has high stakes in LDCs development.



Cheick Sidi Diarra  
Under-Secretary-General  
Special Adviser on Africa  
High Representative  
and  
Secretary-General  
of the Fourth UN Conference on  
the Least Developed Countries

### Acknowledgements

In the preparation of the Synthesis Report of the National Reports on the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action, the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLLS) designated Andre Nikwigize, Senior Programme Officer to guide and act as the overall team leader. Bobo Diallo with the assistance of Grace Gabala researched, synthesized and authored this report. Valuable comments were received from Sarah Mueller and Ricardo Dunn.

The Brussels Programme of Action (BPoA) for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) for the decade 2001–2010 has led many LDCs to undertake specific actions within the framework of national development strategies, macroeconomic policies, and commitments set by the programme. The aim of the BPoA is to promote long term sustainable economic growth and development, eradicate poverty and inequality, and enable the population from LDCs to integrate into and benefit from the global economy.

Despite the fact that many existing poverty reduction policies already address some of the areas covered in the BPoA, several LDCs undertook additional policies, and set up institutional arrangements to facilitate the implementation of the key recommendations of the Programme. Overall, most national development plans, regardless of geographical location, have objectives in the following areas: (i) sustained macroeconomic stability and pro-poor economic growth, (ii) improving education and health, (iii) good governance, (iv) poverty reduction and improving service delivery, (v) employment creation and environment sustainability, (vi) export promotion, and (vii) institutional reforms to foster peace, freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

To insure implementation of the policies, LDCs have all established monitoring and evaluation systems, such as National Statistical Agencies, to provide the necessary data to be used for analysis and evaluation purposes. The monitoring process encompasses government-generated data, as well as survey-based data on indicators used to track progress on policy outcomes. Furthermore, efforts have been undertaken to make monitoring and evaluation systems more result oriented, with increased focus on outcomes, rather than processes. In general, most countries have established the Ministry of Finance and Development as the main coordinating institution to conduct annual review and report on the progress made in the achievement of the targets sets by the BPoA.

To increase the participation of all national stakeholders, national development plans were discussed by government officials, regional and local officials, political representatives such as members of parliament in some cases, and civil society.

The main objectives of this report are to provide an assessment of the progress made and challenges faced by LDCs in their implementation of the BPoA, and to also highlight common obstacles, best practices, and success stories. Although all LDCs were asked to produce a national report on the implementation of BPoA, only 35 countries did so. This report is partially based on general information available on all LDCs and their progress on meeting the commitments of the BPoA, but mainly on the information contained in the national reports submitted to the Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island and Developing States (UN-OHRLLS).

Among the countries that produced a national report, 27 have effectively integrated BPoA into their national development plan, and even mainstreamed it into their national policy frameworks. Civil society and the public at large have been given a greater role in determining development priorities, through not only parliamentary processes but also through community participation in decision-making at the local level. Civil society organizations are increasingly participating in the design and delivery of development programmes and projects but also in the monitoring of their Government's effectiveness.

Section II of the report analyzes overall key economic, social, and environment trends for regional and income groupings, as well as those of some individual countries.

Section III provides an assessment and analysis of overall progress made and challenges faced by LDCs in the implementation of the commitments of the BPoA for the decade 2001-2010.

## **INTRODUCTION**

---

Section IV draws attention to the lessons learned from individual or regional experiences, as well as on individual and common challenges encountered. The section also highlights what worked and what did not, and draw some inferences on how the new Programme of Action for the LDCs can be improved upon.

Section V summarizes the key findings of the report, draw some conclusions, and outlines the way forward.

## KEY ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL TRENDS.

From 2001 to 2009, real GDP for LDCs grew at an annual average of 7.03 percent. Owing to the diversity among LDCs, macroeconomic performance was unevenly distributed, with real GDP growth as low as 0.8 percent for Central African Republic, and as high as 18.79 percent for Afghanistan, which was mostly fuelled by post conflict reconstruction efforts. In terms of country groupings and their performance, African LDCs plus Haiti led all groups with an annual average real GDP growth of 7.08 percent, followed by Asian LDCs with 6.98 percent, Landlocked Developing Countries with 6.42 percent, the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) with 5.79 percent, the Pacific Islands LDCs at 5.42 percent, and the Small Island Developing States with 3.31 percent. However, in most cases, much of the growth recorded did not translate into employment creation or improved well-being for the population of the LDCs as a whole.

**Table 1: Real GDP Growth**

	Real Gross Domestic Product			
	Annual growth rate of real GDP (percent)			
	2001-2009*	2001	2008	2009
Least developed countries	7.03	5.71	7.05	4.67
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	7.09	5.98	7.89	4.01
LDCs: Asia	6.98	5.29	5.49	6.05
LDCs: Pacific Islands	5.42	0.82	4.41	0.06
Landlocked developing countries	6.42	5.64	6	4.48
Small island developing States	3.32	1.37	2.94	-1.68
Heavily indebted poor countries	5.8	4.72	6.11	4.6

Source: \*OHRRLLS calculations based on data from UNCTADstat database

International events in the 1970s and 1980s -particularly the oil price shocks, high interest rates, recessions in industrial countries and weak commodity prices - contributed heavily to the debt problem that engulfed many LDCs. However, following the initiative of the IMF /World Bank to provide debt relief to LDCs under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) programme, 28 LDCs had reached either the completion or decision point by the end of 2010, and therefore receiving full or partial debt relief, while 5 more, including Chad, Comoros, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, and Togo had expressed interest in joining the initiative by reaching the pre-decision point. By the end of 2010, the initiative had provided fiscal space for many LDCs and allowed them to divert resources to poverty reduction programmes and social protection initiatives to fulfill the commitments of the Brussels Programme of Action.

Most LDCs have also introduced a wide array of microeconomic measures, including the privatization of State-owned enterprises (electricity, telecommunications, transportations) and an easing of regulations on businesses, aimed at stimulating the private sector and improving efficiency. Changes in external sector policies have been manifested in more flexible exchange rates, liberalized foreign investment regimes, and trade liberalization. All least developed countries have adopted the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF), which is a multi-donor programme supporting LDCs efforts to mainstream trade into national development plans and policies, and help them be more active players in the global trading system by helping them tackle supply-side constraints to trade. The programme works towards a wider goal of promoting economic growth and sustainable development and reduc-

## SECTION I

ing poverty. Regional orientation workshops have already been held in the Pacific, Asia and Africa, and the programme currently has several viable project proposals. LDCs were already benefiting from the Framework, which was part of a partnership of those countries' governments, the private sector and civil society. Initiatives include special funds exclusively geared towards supporting LDCs' socio-economic development.

During the last decade, many LDCs have made significant progress toward reforming government institutions. In some cases, such as in Africa, improvements in governance are being reinforced by inter-country arrangement such as the African Peer Review Mechanism of the New Partnership for Development (NEPAD), in which 18 LDCs are participating. In addition, 20 of the 33 African LDCs have ratified the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption and 11 are signatory. In Asia, Afghanistan has joined the Central and South Asia Counter-Narcotics Security Working Group and is benefiting from the assistance of donor countries to combat organized crime and the production of narcotics.

At the international level, 32 of the 49 least developed countries are State parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption and 6 are signatory. In terms of transparency and accountability regarding revenue from natural resources, 5 LDCs are compliant to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative while 16 are currently candidate to join the initiative. Among diamond exporting LDCs, 10 countries are currently members of the Kimberley Process for diamond-exporting countries, which aims to ensure that diamonds offered for sale on international markets were not obtained illegally from conflict countries, and 3 more have affirmed their intention to join in.

Overall, LDCs have made some progress toward decreasing the poverty headcount ratio at \$1.25 a day (PPP). Evidence shows that by the end of 2007, none but Gambia and Mauritania had met BPoA commitment one: to halve the poverty headcount ratio by 2015. Overall, individual country data show that the incidence of poverty is relatively higher in rural areas than urban centers, and that some of the poorest households operate in general in informal sectors, but in particular in informal agriculture.

Since 2001, LDCs have made significant investment in education, to improve access and quality. The net primary enrolment ratios increased overall in LDCs between 2000 and 2008. In Africa, all but five countries achieved a primary enrolment ratio of at least 70 percent, with some reaching as high as 100 percent. In Asia, countries fared much better than their African counterparts, with 7 out of 9 countries with a primary enrolment ratio between 74 percent and 99 percent. In the Pacific, the only two countries for which data is available had a primary enrolment ratio of 92 percent and 95 percent respectively. The adult literacy rate improved modestly for LDCs as a group, increasing from 54 percent to 58 percent between 2004 and 2008 respectively. In Africa, only 10 countries had an adult literacy rate above 70 percent, while in Asia, 4 out of 9 countries had achieved a minimum of 70 percent adult literacy rate. In the Pacific, the only two countries for which data is available had an adult literacy rate of 97 percent and 99 percent respectively.

The majority of LDCs have taken steps to formulate a national health policy to improve quality, affordability, and access to basic health services in both urban and rural areas. Overall, between 1990 and 2008, least developed countries decreased their infant mortality rate per 1000 by 31. Furthermore, the maternal mortality rate per 100,000 decreased by 21 percent between 2000 and 2008. Although each country achieved a decrease in the infant and maternal mortality rates, African and Asian LDCs still have the highest infant and maternal mortality rates, and achieved the greatest improvements in this area between 1990 and 2008. Pacific LDCs on the other hand achieved modest improvements between 1990 and 2008, albeit from currently some of the lowest infant and maternal mortality rates among all LDCs.

HIV prevalence has overall decreased slightly in least developed countries and averaged around 2.31 percent between 2000 and 2008. In Africa, noticeable progress was made during the last decade, but the majority of countries still have an average above that of other least developed countries as a whole. In Asia, each of the five countries for which data was available had an HIV prevalence of less than 1 percent. There was no data available on HIV prevalence for LDCs in the Pacific. However, East Asia and the Pacific as a region had an HIV prevalence rate of 0.3 percent by the end of 2007. Tuberculosis, and its association with HIV/AIDS has also been a serious issue for LDCs in general. In Africa, Tuberculosis related deaths have been on the rise between 2000 and 2007, with all but 13 countries showing a decrease in their death rates. In Asia and the Pacific, Tuberculosis related death have decreased in each country, although the actual level of death rates remain relatively high and comparable to those in Africa.

Malaria on the other hand is essentially an African pandemic, with 15 of the 18 least developed countries classified as high burden being on the continent, making it one of the leading causes of death in the continent. 2006 is however the only year for which data is available and the numbers show that Malaria related deaths are in general 10 to 20 times higher in African LDCs than in their Asian and the Pacific counterparts.

Environmental degradation has been a great challenge for LDCs during the last decade. Least developed countries as a whole account for relatively little in terms of negative impact on the environment as the data shows that between 1990 and 2007, OECD countries as a group have on average produced more than 70 times the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per capita produced by least developed countries as a group. However, they suffer the most from natural disasters, which include: drought, earthquakes, epidemics, extreme temperatures, floods, insect infestation, storms, volcanoes and wild-fires. In recent years, landlocked countries in Africa have suffered frequent droughts, which has greatly affected agriculture and put some stress on achieving food security. In small island states; especially those in the Pacific, the frequency of tsunamis, rising sea levels, and flooding has created a new set of challenges that need to be address urgently for their own survival. LDCs have witnessed significant progress in recent years in terms of human development; however, this development is being threatened by the unsustainability of current consumption and production patters.

Several governments have put in place a national environment management agency to coordinate; monitor, and implement policies geared toward environmental sustainability, and mitigate the effects and challenges of climate change. Environmental protection is of outmost importance for LDCs in general given the major role that agriculture plays in their respective economies and the devastating effect the sector generally suffers from environmental degradation. Given their low capacity to adapt as a result of inadequate technical, and financial capacities, LDCs are the most vulnerable when it comes to the impact of climate change. This problem is also exacerbated by the fact that fossil fuels occupy a great part in their energy consumption, given the high cost of clean energy sources.

## SECTION II

### ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS MADE AND BEST PRACTICES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITMENTS OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR LDCS FOR THE DECADE 2001-2010

#### *Commitment 1: Fostering people-centered policy framework*

African LDCs as a whole recorded strong economic growth over the period 2001-2009, with an annual real GDP growth of 7.03 percent, which was slightly above the 7 percent goal under the BPoA, and several countries in the region averaged well above that target. The best performing countries include Equatorial Guinea (21.46 percent), Angola (11.78 percent), Sierra Leone (9.73 percent), Sudan (8.63 percent), Ethiopia (8.47 percent), Chad (8.34 percent), Mozambique (8.18 percent), and Uganda (7.26 percent). However, with the exception of Ethiopia, the capital-intensive nature of most of the export-oriented sectors in those countries was such that this unprecedented economic growth did not necessarily translate into significant improvement in poverty reduction.

In Asia and the Pacific, LDCs also witnessed a relatively strong economic performance over the same period. Asian LDCs as a group grew at 6.98 percent, while the Pacific LDCs grew at an annual average of 5.42 percent, with both regions achieving below the 7 percent goal under the BPoA. However, Afghanistan (18.79 percent), Myanmar (10.98 percent), Bhutan (8.76 percent), and Cambodia (7.93 percent) performed well above the 7 percent target.

Overall, 12 LDCs exceeded the 7 percent BPoA target for the 2001-2009 period, 8 of them were in Africa, and the remaining 4 in Asia, while 13 LDCs, recorded an annual average real GDP growth of less than 3 percent, highlighting thus the variation in economic performance among countries and within regions.

In terms of the effect of population growth on poverty reduction, the data show that overall; LDCs have had an average population growth of 2.8 percent between 2001 and 2009, which was well below the 7.03 percent average GDP growth for the same period. However, on the regional level, the situation is somehow different. LDCs in Africa and the Pacific mirror the demographic dynamic of LDCs in general with an average GDP growth rate between 2001 and 2009 exceeding population growth rate by 4.29 percent and 3.22 percent respectively. This was in contrast to LDCs in Asia where the average population growth exceeded the average GDP growth rates by 0.72 percent.

**Table 2: Population Growth**

	Population			
	Population Growth (percent)			
	2001	2008	2009	2001-2009*
Least developed countries	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.8
LDCs: Asia	2	2.4	2.4	7.7
LDCs: Pacific Islands	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2
Landlocked developing countries	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.3
Small island developing States	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7
Heavily indebted poor countries	..	..	..	..

Source: \*OHRRLLS calculations based on data from UNCTADstat database

LDCs governments in Africa, Asia and the Pacific undertook several initiatives to translate the modest economic performance into significant reduction in poverty. Food subsidies to the poor and vulnerable were instrumental in helping mitigate the negative effects of the global food crisis that preceded the recent global economic downturn. In Bangladesh, a Food for Works Programme and the maintenance and construction of rural infrastructures generated employment and income for the poor and vulnerable.

In Lesotho, an old-age pension programme is helping reduce poverty among the old and those who depend on them for survival. The initiative was a risky initiative from the government given the lack of domestic resources and the non-contributory nature of the pension scheme. Old age pensions are generally rare among LDCs and Lesotho; along with Nepal are currently the only known countries among them to have implemented such a policy. The key provisions of the plan are summarized under Box 1 below.

**Box 1: Lesotho's Old-Age Pension Scheme: A model for reducing poverty and vulnerability among the elderly.**

Lesotho is the most recent country in Africa to establish an old age pension. It is the only LDC in Africa to operate a non-contributory pension and along with Nepal is one of only two LDCs worldwide to do so. It is non-contributory and given to all Lesotho residents over the age of 70. This is especially important for reducing overall vulnerability as the elderly bear a disproportionate burden in caring for the sick, the disabled, orphans and vulnerable children. The ruling Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD) first announced that the pension was to be implemented in the 2004 Government budget and within months the first payments were made. Parliamentary debate of the pension was held shortly before registration began and following a month-long registration process, the first pensions were delivered in November 2004. In May 2005, there were 69,046 registered recipients, out of a total of 74,000 citizens of 70 years and over. In design, it closely resembles the pre-existing War Veteran's Pension, but is disconnected from Public Assistance, a cash transfer provided to the poorest families by the Department of Social Welfare, under the Ministry of Health. In contrast, the Old Age Pension is administered by the Department of Pensions, under the direction of the Commissioner of Pensions, within the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning. All Lesotho residents over 70 years old are entitled to receive the single rate of M150 (£12.50) per month. The success of Lesotho's Old Age Pension lies into the acknowledgement by its leaders of the importance of a shared responsibility to support the elderly and the disabled, orphans, and the sick, who may depend on them.

Source: Final Review of the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action (BPOA) 2001-2010, Government of Lesotho

Most LDCs also undertook initiatives to encourage inflows of investment. These measures included improving the business environment by simplifying procedures for business licensing and the acquisition of land by new businesses, removing restrictions, strengthening of existing laws to protect personal property, eliminating taxes on business profit, the establishment of business court, and the easing of credit for new business investment initiatives. However, most of the efforts have not translated into increased investment. Least developed countries as a whole performed modestly in terms of investment over the 2001-2009 period, with an annual average investment to GDP ratio of 21.46, which however remains short of the 5 percent BPoA target. In Africa, between 2001 and 2009, investment to GDP ratio was relatively flat, with an annual average of 18.87 percent. The best performers in the region were Equatorial Guinea (39.29 percent), Chad (30.13 percent), Lesotho (29.98 percent),

## SECTION II

Mauritania (29.91 percent), and Senegal (26.48 percent), which achieved well above the BPoA target. In Asia, investment to GDP ratios increased in recent years, with an annual average of 34.72 percent. The best performers in the region were Bhutan (52.38 percent), Maldives (33.85 percent), and Laos PDR (33.84 percent), and have already exceeded the BPoA target in that category.

**Table 3: Investment to GDP Ratio**

	Gross fixed capital formation as a percent of GDP (percent)
	2001-2009
Least developed countries	21.46
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	18.87
LDCs: Asia	34.72
LDCs: Pacific Islands	..
Landlocked developing countries	..
Small island developing States	..
Heavily indebted poor countries	19.77

Source: OHRLLS calculations based on data from UNCTADstat database

### ***Commitment 2: Good governance at national and international levels***

The majority of LDCs have undertaken steps to promote good governance, reform the management of public resources, combat corruption, reform the judicial system, promote human rights and gender equity, and achieve the decentralization of governance as a way to create a fertile environment to encourage business initiatives, and foster sustainable and equitable economic growth, where the rewards are shared by all members of society regardless of economic or social status.

#### **The fight against corruption**

Since 2001, several LDCs had already in place a national anti-corruption policy to reduce or eliminate corruption in both the public and private sectors. In Ethiopia, the Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (FEACC) was established in 2001, the first known such institution in Africa. Other countries in Africa that implemented a national anti-corruption policy include Burkina Faso, Burundi, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia. In Asia and the Pacific, national anti-corruption institutions were established in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Bhutan, Laos PDR, Nepal, Samoa, Tuvalu, and Yemen. Additional measures undertaken by LDCs includes the drafting of anti-corruption laws, which carries heavy penalties, the drafting of legislation that requires high level officials and senior civil servants to declare their incomes and properties. In Samoa, preventative procedures and mechanisms against corrupt practices have been in place in key Ministries like the Public Service Commission, Chief Auditor, Ombudman's Office and Ministry of Justice. Loans from the multilateral financial institutions as well as bilateral partners now require anti corruption compliance measures particularly in the sector they are engaged in. On the international level, Yemen, and most mineral-rich African LDCs have joined the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, which aims to strengthen accountability and prudent use of revenues from the extractive industry, and the Kimberley Process for diamond-exporting countries, which aims to prevent diamonds obtained illegally from conflict countries to be sold on international markets.

### Decentralization of governance

The decentralization of governance over the last decade was an initiative undertaken mainly by African LDCs. Since 2001, most African LDCs have taken initiatives to decentralize central government expenditures policies, as well as service deliveries. Decentralization has added to the institutionalization of democratic governance and participatory development, and was a welcomed initiative to respond to the need of the people, especially the most vulnerable in remote rural areas.

In Ethiopia, the District-Level Decentralization Programme (DLDP) launched in 2002 has transferred full responsibility of service delivery to the district-level government (Wereda), and increased their responsibilities in terms of government expenditures.

In 2008, Senegal undertook a national redistricting initiative to increase the number of local districts and governments as a measure to strengthen its decentralization policy. As a result of the decentralization of government, local communities had resources made available by the State through the National Programme for Local Development and the Programme for Strengthening and Equipment for Local Government, and more traditional means such as the Capital Development Fund and Local Governments Endowment Fund.

Fiscal decentralization was undertaken in Laos, Mali, Senegal, and Tanzania as a way of broadening the tax base and improving government revenue collection.

In Mali, the government undertook a major decentralization initiative as a way to promote inclusive growth and poverty reduction. The main objective of the initiative was to decentralize the system of resource management to empower local communities, and strengthen accountability. Some of the key features of the programme are summarized under Box 2 below.

#### **Box 2: Decentralization as a people-centered policy initiative for poverty reduction in Mali**

To significantly reduce poverty in Mali, the Strategic Plan for Growth and Poverty Reduction (SPGPR) is considering anchoring development from the bottom up, embracing the contours of decentralization, to improve production conditions in rural areas and create new poles of development of local economies. In this context, special attention was given to redistribution of wealth by social class and space, to reduce social inequalities. As the competitiveness of the economy improves, the capacity of the private sector will be strengthened to make it the main driver of growth, human resources developed, diversified centers of wealth and new sources of growth identified and exploited. However, to catch up in the implementation of the PBoA, the Government of Mali has developed the Initiative for the Acceleration of the MDGs in the 166 municipalities most vulnerable. The “166 initiative” aims to satisfy the basic needs of targeted populations through a package of multisectoral interventions led by the communities themselves, which is to make innovative investments in agriculture and nutrition, child and maternal health, food production, education, access to drinking water and basic infrastructure so that villages can escape extreme poverty. This is a program that relies on decentralization and the national systems of resource management to strengthen accountability, capacity design, implementation and monitoring of development activities by local communities.

Source: National Report on the Status of Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action in Mali for the Decade 2001-2010

## SECTION II

### **Judicial reform**

Reforming the justice system in LDCs has been long overdue, and remains at the center of any sustainable and equitable development policy. Respect for the rule of law is a key prerequisite for any policy to encourage the private sector's involvement in development.

In Mali, the government undertook several steps to reinforce the credibility of the judicial system. Specific measures included the decentralization of the judicial administration to ensure greater accessibility to justice, the establishment of Law Access Centers (LAC), and the creation of a legal assistance program for improve access to justice for women and children. The process involved the creation of a Programme for the Development of Justice (PRODEJ) whose objective is to facilitate access to justice for citizens, make judicial decisions more credible and protect civil and individual liberties.

In Tanzania, the government introduced the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanism to expedite dispute resolutions and reduce the number of pending civil cases in the high courts and resident magistrate courts.

Bangladesh undertook major judicial reforms in 2003, with the objective of modernizing court processes, reducing case backlog, expediting dispute settlement, and facilitating access to justice. To expedite the settlement of disputes regarding loan recovery of financial institutions, the "Money Loan Court", 2003 (Artha Rin Adalat, 2003) as established. Under this Act, banks are now empowered to sell the collaterals without prior approval of the court. Since 2007, the judiciary has been separated form the executive branch of the government. The government is introducing some reforms in the judicial system such as; (a) appointing a court Ombudsman according to article 77 of the Constitution; (b) recruitment and selection of competent judges in a transparent, independent and fair process; (c) establishing a separate pay commission for judges; (d) introducing a system of disclosure of their assets at the time of entry and during the tenure intermittently.

In Laos PDR, the revised Legal Sector Master Plan provides a comprehensive analysis and guiding principles to move towards a state fully governed by the 'rule of law'. By the end of 2008, 59 more district courts had been set up. Three appeal courts had also been established, in the Northern, Central and Southern regions. Village mediation units were also set up in almost 90 percent of the villages.

### **Gender equity and human rights**

Respect for basic human rights and the promotion of gender equity must be at the core of any national development policy. The majority of LDCs have undertaken measures to improve gender equity. Specific measures include affirmative actions and quotas to ensure increased representation of women in the political as well as economic decision-making process. LDCs as a group fared relatively low in terms of increasing women representation in parliaments. By the end of 2009, women represented only 18 percent of parliament. The lack of women representation is worldwide and concerns some of the most advanced economies. In fact, even in high-income countries, women represented just above 24 percent of parliament. Among LDCs, some countries have made remarkable progress in terms of gender equity. Tanzania, Burundi, Uganda, Mozambique, and Angola have all achieved rates ranging between 30 and 40 percent of women representation in parliament at the end of 2009. Rwanda; stands out the most given her achievement of 56 percent women representation in parliament in 2009, currently the world's highest.

In Tanzania, a renewed focus was placed on gender equality and women empowerment, reflected in government initiatives that included amendment to the constitution in 2003 to increase the proportion of women at the level of political representation to 30 per cent achieved in 2008. Furthermore, gender mainstreaming in national development policies were undertaken in Burundi, Lesotho, and Sierra Leone.

In Lesotho, the government enacted the Gender and Development Policy (2003) which aspires for a nation that perceives women, men, girls and boys at all levels and spheres of life as equal partners based upon principles of equal participation in development, non-discrimination and the empowerment of the marginalised women and men, girls and boys. The Land Bill (2008) gave women equal rights as men in terms of land and property ownership. The Ministry of Gender and Youth, Sports and Recreation has undertaken an awareness campaigns against gender based violence. Lesotho is a signatory to a number of international and regional instruments, including: the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Belgium Declaration and Platform for Action (1995), the Protocol on Gender and Development Declaration of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) of 1997, the protocol of the African Charter on Human and People's Rights and the Rights of Women in Africa (2003). The Local Government Electors (Amendment) Act of 2005 reserved no less than 30% of the seats in the local councils for women and in the local elections of 2005.

In Laos PDR, the Government established in 2002 the Lao National Commission for the Advancement of Women (Lao NCAW) to promote gender equality and eliminate discrimination against women by assisting the government in formulating national policies and strategic plans for promoting women's advancement and gender equality in all spheres and at all levels in society. In 2003, the National Assembly adopted a constitutional amendment increasing the responsibility of all sectors to promote the advancement of women in accordance with the Laos Government's international commitments, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and the Beijing Platform for Action. A Law on Women's Development and Protection was approved in 2007. This law includes Articles protecting women (especially the female children) against human trafficking.

### **Political plurality**

Since 2001, African as well as Asian, and Pacific LDCs have held regular local, municipal, parliamentary, and presidential elections. In Afghanistan and Yemen, presidential elections were held in 2006 and 2009 respectively. In 2008 Bhutan transitioned to a constitutional monarchy with multi-party parliamentary elections. In Africa, since 2005, presidential or legislative elections took place in Burkina Faso, Comoros, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia.

### ***Commitment 3: Building human and institutional capacities***

Improving population access to water and sanitation, education, basic health, and decent nutrition are the founding principles of a healthy and well trained labor force, and are a prerequisite for any national development planning aimed at reducing poverty.

### **Education**

Since 2001, LDCs in general have made enormous progress in terms of education. Every least developed country achieved an increase in the net primary enrolment ratio, gender parity, and well as adult literacy between 2001 and 2008. Various approaches to education led to some of the positive outcomes; including free and universal access to primary education. Donor- supported investment in education infrastructure such as building of new schools, and the hiring of additional teachers were instrumental in increasing school enrollment, access, and affordability.

In Gambia, an African Development Bank funded project led to the construction of over 100 new classrooms, and the provision of furniture for over 150 existing classrooms.

## SECTION II

In Guinea, a project funded by the World Bank led to an increase in physical capacity and helped support the country's initiative to achieve universal education. The implementation of the project is summarized in Box 3.1 below.

### **Box 3.1: A World Bank funded project on capacity building to improve education in Guinea**

The main objective of the First Education for All Project (EFA1) was to establish a stable framework for universal primary education. The World Bank funded the project and its implementation started in 2006. It has established an effective and efficient mechanism for transferring public funds to local communities for the financing of prioritized rural community infrastructure, with funds provided to over 200 local development plans. Progress towards achieving the development objective of the Guinea Education for All Project was satisfactory in 2006. 400 primary classrooms have been completed contributing to support access to education (intake rate in first grade is 89%). For the first time in 2006, primary schools have received grants to be used by school committees to purchase teaching and learning material. The improvement of the schooling environment, the availability of better-trained teachers, grants for girls, the abolition of tuitions fees among others have stimulated the demand for education (targeting the region with lowest enrollment figures). The project continued to finance the upgrade of teacher colleges' facilities (construction and rehabilitation of 5 teacher colleges, provision of equipment and learning materials). The first phase of the curriculum reform for Teacher College is almost completed. The project launched a new initiative to provide grants to primary schools that prepare a three-year school improvement plan. In tertiary education, the first phase of the higher education reform was completed, focusing on the adoption of a new organization of studies. Progress as to the strengthening of decentralization of the education progress was more modest. However, education development plans were finalized in 10 education district offices.

Source: Status of World Bank Project in Execution-FY06, Republic of Guinea

In Tanzania, the construction of girls' hostels has boosted the number of girls accessing secondary education on one hand, and the expansion of community secondary schools countrywide on the other hand. The Government also prepared a bridging course to enable vocational school's graduates to access training at higher levels of education.

In Lesotho, the introduction of free primary education (FPE) in 2000, led to an increase in the net primary enrolment ratio from 69 percent in 2000 to 85 percent in 2003. In 2009, the enactment of the Education Law made primary education compulsory. Combined primary and secondary schools and a double shift policy were introduced to further increase access. A textbook rental scheme was also introduced in 2004 to reduce the costs of attending school. In the 2008/09 Budget, qualified teachers were rewarded with a 32 percent pay rise to ensure the retention of existing staff and the attraction of new ones. Lesotho has met its MDG target on the pupil- teacher ratio.

Asia-Pacific LDCs also made noticeable progress in education since 2001, however, progress remains mixed. Bangladesh and Laos PDR increased their net primary enrollment.

In Samoa, the introduction of a school fee relief scheme and the passage of the Compulsory Education Act in 2003 led to an increase to 90 percent of the net primary enrollment ratio and a 100 percent gender parity ratio during the review period.

In Bangladesh, gender disparity in primary and secondary education was reduced through implementation of a female stipend programme in 2000. The ongoing interventions to retain students in the schools include programmes such as food for education programme and the female scholarship scheme at the primary and secondary levels.

Nepal is providing access to primary education for all 5-9 year old children under its “Education for All” (EFA) programme (2001-2015). Universal primary education is aimed at being achieved through decentralized planning and management of school education and other innovative measures. Teaching license system and school operation grant manual for a cost sharing in secondary education have been introduced to enhance quality. Mid-day meal schemes were introduced to sustain continuity and extend nutrition facilities to children in specific geographic regions and communities are also being given monthly allowances.

### **Access to water and sanitation**

Since 2001, access to basic sanitation and water has improved in most LDCs. Several governments have already established a national water and sanitation policy to overcome some of the major challenges in the delivery of services in that area. These policies aim to improve accessibility of potable water, adequate public and private facilities, and promote good hygiene practices.

In Gambia, a national sanitation Policy was set up to improve sanitation services for all, support the formation of a sanitation and Hygiene Committee in each local government, provide support to these committees for sanitation and hygiene promotion using international sanitation best practice, and provide support to the Regional Sanitation and Hygiene Committees to conduct annual sanitation survey of their communities.

In 2007, the government of Burkina Faso adopted a policy document on a national strategy for sanitation (NSS). The implementation of the strategy of wastewater and sewage resulted in the creation of the sanitation branch within the Directorate General of Water Resources (DGWR). Targeted actions included the building of 335 institutional latrines, 1,081 new wells, and 110 new mini water supply systems for rural populations.

In Bhutan, the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Programme was initiated in 1974 when rural access to safe drinking water was at less than 5%. By 2007, 90.9 percent of the Bhutanese population had access to an improved water source. Even in rural areas, access to improved source of drinking water coverage levels are now at 88% and almost all districts have upwards of 80% coverage levels. The country has a vast natural resource base in particular rich forest and freshwater resources. Natural vegetation covers 72.5 percent of the total land area encompassing rich and diversified ecological systems with slightly more than half the total land area classified as protected areas. The per capita water availability is among the highest in the world with the long-term mean annual water flow estimated to be 73,000 million m<sup>3</sup>. An experimental initiative to use a compensated caretaker to manage a rural water distribution point showed that community ownership could significantly improve efficiency in rural water management systems. The key provisions of the initiative are summarized under Box 3.2 below.

## SECTION II

### **Box 3.2: Rural Water and Sanitation (RWSS) Programme in Bhutan: a model of community ownership and an efficient water management system.**

Bhutan's experience with the implementation of rural water schemes point to certain evident benefits of appointing designated and trained water caretakers who receive some form of compensation in cash or kind. A rural water supply functionality survey revealed that schemes with trained and compensated caretakers enjoyed vastly improved water quality, were better maintained and their water schemes and promoted effective community self-management. Another survey also revealed vast improvements in water quality, operation and maintenance of rural water schemes and village management in communities where community planning and management training activities had been conducted. These surveys convey a valuable lesson that the long term functionality and sustainability of the rural water schemes in Bhutan can be better ensured through the appointment of paid community water caretaker and by strengthening by strengthening community capacity and ownership through community planning and management activities.

Source: Keeping Promises: A Report on the Status of Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action in Bhutan for the Decade 2001–2010

In Nepal, A Water and Sanitation Strategy was implemented. The aim of the overall strategy is to increase sustainable access to safe drinking water supply and sanitation facilities to both rural and urban areas. Targeted actions included: (i) cost recovery in the operation of drinking water supply (DWS) projects, (ii) implementation of rural DWS projects through consumers' committees or NGOs while ensuring conservation of local resources, (iii) priority to DWS projects affordable to consumers committees based on simple and appropriate technology, (iv) priority to reconstruction and on-going rural DWS projects, (v) development and conservation of natural water storage, (vi) sanitation as an integral component of drinking water project, (vii) improvement of water quality, (viii) ensure sustainable water supply, (ix) and promote and extend sanitation facilities with the participation and contribution of local agencies and users' committees.

### **The impact of HIV/AIDS**

The HIV/AIDS pandemic has had devastating effects on LDCs in general, but on African LDCs in particular. HIV prevalence in adults has increased over the last decade, reaching 11.9 percent, 12.5 percent, 15.2 percent, and 23.2 percent in Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, and Lesotho respectively in 2007. To tackle the issue, most affected countries in Africa have put in place a national health strategy to combat the pandemic. Specific actions include free access to anti-retroviral treatments, mandatory testing, and nationwide campaigns to promote awareness.

Uganda was one of the most successful countries in bringing down HIV prevalence from 13.8 percent in 1991 to 5.4 percent in 2007. The government drafted a 'National Over Reaching HIV/AIDS' policy in the National Strategic Plan, which focused on HIV infection and addressing factors that increase vulnerability to HIV infection. Antiretroviral Treatment services have been scaled up (50,000 persons were served by 2005) and Antiretroviral Therapy is now part of the national drug distribution system.

In Lesotho, the government established the National AIDS Commission (NAC) to form the institutional driving force in the fight against HIV and AIDS. Targeted actions included the Know Your Status (KYS) campaign aimed at achieving universal voluntary HIV counselling and testing to prevent new infections among adults, and in 2003, the Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV (PMTCT) programme in partnership with the World Health Organisation (WHO) and United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF), the free distribution of anti-retroviral therapy, especially among pregnant women. The Clinton Foundation's HIV/AIDS Initiative (CHAI) helped enhance access to treatment by providing clinical mentors, lab support, paediatric drugs, supply chain management

expertise as well as assisting in the day to day running of clinics. On the support dimension to HIV and AIDS, a joint UN programme involving UNDP, UNAIDS, FAO and WFP has been designed to facilitate the greater involvement and empowerment of people living with HIV and AIDS by developing a national action plan to ensure implementation of rights of those living with the disease.

***Commitment 4: Building productive capacities to make globalization work for the least developed countries***

**Infrastructure Development**

The Development of adequate public infrastructures (airports, seaports, railways, and roads) is essential for regional integration, export/import promotion, sustainable long- term economic growth, poverty reduction, and an equitable prosperity shared by all. In an effort to build public infrastructure, some LDCs have put in place several policies to increase new investment in the sector, and mobilize resources for the maintenance of existing infrastructure. Most countries have established national transport and infrastructure plans as a central planning mechanism to oversee all the major initiatives undertaken in that area.

In Sudan, the Infrastructure Master Plan oversaw the completion of coastal roads, construction of new toll collection stations and weight bridges, modernization of loading and unloading and containers handling equipment, reconstruction of roads and bridges in the south, and the maintenance and rehabilitation of road networks.

In Burkina Faso, the Sectorial Programme for Transport (SPT) and the National Strategy for Rural Transport (NSRT) were at the center of the infrastructure development strategy. The programmes oversaw in 2002 the construction of a new airport in Ouagadougou, the rehabilitation of secondary airports, and the paving of urban and rural road networks.

In Tanzania, a fund was established to oversee the construction of new transport infrastructure and help maintain existing ones. The Tanzanian National Roads Agency (TANROADS), which received most of the devoted funds, led the way in the actual task of improving national and regional road networks. Key provisions of the initiative are summarized in Box 4 below.

**Box 4: Institutional Reform for Transport Infrastructure Development in Tanzania**

The United Republic of Tanzania has undertaken a number of commendable steps to create a sound institutional framework for transport infrastructure development. A Roads Fund and Roads Fund Board were established in 1998 with the primary responsibility of providing cost-effective and sustainable road maintenance and development. The fund is financed through the collection of road and fuel tolls and resources mobilization has become increasingly successful: in 2009/10, funds collected for road maintenance were TSh 284.1 billion, up from 32 billion in 2000/01. The Fund, managed by the Roads Fund Board (consisting of private sector and Government representatives) disburses funds to implementing agencies. The Tanzanian National Roads Agency (TANROADS) receives the bulk of it (63%). TANROADS is responsible for managing a network spanning over 33,000 km, of which close to 12,800 km are trunk roads (the overall road network of Tanzania is about 85,000 km). The Government developed a Ten-Year Road Sector Development Programme (2001-2011) to upgrade roads on the basis of specifically designated priority status. The National Transport Policy of 2003 aims at developing safe, reliable, effective, efficient and fully integrated transport infrastructure and operations. To operationalize the policy, the Transport Sector Investment Programme (TSIP) was developed in 2005, aiming to facilitate the mobilization of local and international resources.

## SECTION II

Tanzania National Roads Agency (2010): Tanroads@10. 10th Anniversary Souvenir 2000-2010. Accessible at [http://tanroads.go.tz/Tanroads%20final\\_ENG.pdf](http://tanroads.go.tz/Tanroads%20final_ENG.pdf)

In Benin, the investment share of the budget was increased to 20.2 percent in 2006. Overall, between 2001 and 2006, infrastructure investment in road transportation represented on average over 40 percent of total investment. The government undertook the construction of a highway system in the capital city of Cotonou to improve traffic fluidity of goods and passengers. In 2008, the construction of parking with a capacity of 21 airplanes was started to expand the main airport's capacity.

In Samoa, the government, with assistance from the world bank, invested significantly in upgrading its social and economic infrastructure, in particular development of ports and shipping services, road networks on the two main island, airport, and bridges construction, communications and coastal protection.

In Laos PDR, the government undertook several efforts to improve transportation networks and help the country graduate from "landlocked" to "landlinked" country. The government has built a road network connecting South Asia, the People's Republic of China, and other countries in Southeast Asia. The East-West Economic Corridor connecting Vietnam with Thailand via central Laos has been completed and is functional. The section of the road connecting Kunming (in China) with Chiang Mai (Thailand) that passes through Lao PDR (i.e. the North-South Economic Corridor) has also been completed. The government has also undertaken the development of the Mekong waterways and other rivers, which provide many local communities with relatively easy and efficient access to markets and social services, which otherwise are inaccessible or difficult to reach through land routes. This helped improve trade with neighbouring countries as well.

### **Agriculture and agro-industry development**

One of the main goals that governments in LDCs must strive for is food security, which once achieved can have a lasting impact on health, education, and overall well-being of society. However, food security cannot be achieved without prioritizing agriculture. Other than providing income and livelihood for the rural population, subsistence farm has been the main sources of food for the majority of rural households, and therefore has been critical in ensuring food security to households and beyond at the national level. However, despite several initiatives in recent years, the majority of LDCs have not given agriculture the priority it deserves, and make it the center of focus of national development policies.

In retrospect, the recent global food crisis was a wake up call for the world community in general, and LDCs in particular to make agriculture the center of their national development policy, and making sure that food security is put at the forefront of the main priorities and treated as a national security issue.

A growing and dynamic agriculture sector is of outmost importance for LDCs given the high number of people employed by the sector (between 60 and 80 percent of total employment), and positive multiplier effect of the sector on poverty reduction. The transition from low to high value agricultural products, the increase in mechanization and fertilizer use were key features of national agriculture policies in many LDCs.

Given the high multiplier effect of agriculture on poverty reduction, several countries have put the sector at the center of their national poverty reduction plan. As a result, a national agricultural development plan was implemented in 14 African LDCs, including Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Senegal, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, and Uganda. Most of the national agricultural plans aim to help transform it from basic subsistence to high value crops.

In Asia and the Pacific, several countries have also developed a national plan to strengthen the agriculture sector. These countries include Bangladesh, Bhutan, Laos PDR, Nepal, Samoa, and Solomon

Islands. Some governments took specific policies to address a given crop or export. Such targeted initiatives included tax waiver on agriculture machinery, government subsidies on fertilizers, international cooperation such as the Expanded Rice Production Initiative between Gambia and China.

Overall, most agricultural policies had targeted goals such as improvements in irrigation techniques and water management through the protection of water sources, integrating rural roads irrigations and micro-irrigation for agricultural intensification. Furthermore, targeted initiatives included increasing research in agriculture, rural finance projects (including micro finance and insurance schemes to fund farmers) to fund investment in agriculture and encourage reverse migration from urban to rural areas, and increasing the share of public expenditure devoted to agriculture as outlined in the Maputo Agreement.

The Integrated Framework (IF) for Trade Related Technical Assistance to LDCs, spearheaded by six multilateral institutions (World Bank, UNDP, United Nations Conference on Trade And Development (UNCTAD), WTO, International Trade Center, and IMF), was extended to Lesotho in 2001. Key initiatives included the establishment of a mushroom production project, the development of an agro-sector wide strategy for export promotion, and the development of the Textile and Clothing Strategy in 2009.

Benin, Gambia, Guinea, guinea Bissau, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Togo, are benefiting from the New Rice for Africa (NERICA) project within the framework of the 2008 Tokyo International Conference on African Development. The project was jointly funded by Japan, the African Development Bank, and the United Nations Development Programme. Key features of the rice variety include: high protein content, pest-and disease-resistant, high yield, and fast growing.

The International Trade Centre of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development/World Trade Organisation assisted in market and business practice analysis in the areas of organic food, biodiversity products and medicinal plants that are of high interest to the least developed countries. Other international agricultural supports in Africa included the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), which was established in 2003 as part of NEPAD and provides assistance on improving and promoting agriculture in Africa

In Cambodia and Bangladesh, the International Trade Centre of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development/World Trade Organisation provided support in silk and jute productions respectively.

### **Transfer of technology**

An efficient and vibrant Information and Communication Technology (ICT) sector can have a positive multiplier effect on trade, employment, increasing FDI inflows, improving and expanding service delivery to remote areas, reducing business costs, improving governance and promoting economic growth. The deregulation of the telecommunication industry in many LDCs increased competition in the sector, lowered prices, and increased access and affordability.

Since 2004, total fixed telephone line and mobile cellular subscriptions as a share of the population in LDCs as a group increased from just 3.6 percent in 2004 to 21.9 percent in 2008, although the effective penetration rate is still low compared to other developing countries as a group. Internet users, as a share of the population also increased from 0.6 percent to 2.1 percent during the same period. The performance of individual regions mirrors that of the LDCs as a whole, although with some variations. African LDCs recorded an increase in the telephone line and mobile subscription as a share of the population from 3.9 percent to 20.9 percent, while Internet users increased from 0.7 percent to 2.7 percent. A similar outcome occurred in Asia and the Pacific, which saw their telephone and mobile subscriptions shares of the population increasing from 3.1 percent and 7.0 percent to 23.2 percent and 24.1 percent respectively. Internet users in Asia and the Pacific increased from 0.3 percent

## SECTION II

and 2.4 percent to 0.9 percent and 4.1 percent respectively. Despite these recent advances, LDCs as a group are still lagging behind the rest of the world and increasing investment in telecommunication infrastructure could help bridge gap from this widening digital divide.

**Table 4: Communications**

Regions	Permanent and mobile post office per 100,000 pop.		Fixed telephone lines an mobile cellular subscriptions							Internet users per 100 pop.	
			Fixed lines per 100 population			Mobile line per 100 pop.		Total per 100 pop.			
	2000	2008	2000	2004	2008	2004	2008	2004	2008	2004	2008
Africa	1.3	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.8	3.2	20.1	3.9	20.9	0.7	2.7
Asia	2.4	4	0.6	0.9	1.4	2.2	21.8	3.1	23.2	0.3	0.9
Pacific	20.9	18.1	3.1	3.8	5.2	3.3	18.9	7	24.1	2.4	4.1
LDCs	1.8	2.1	0.5	0.8	1	2.8	20.9	3.6	21.9	0.6	2.1

Source: Universal Postal Union, Postal Statistics Database and the International Telecommunications Union, ICT Statistics Database

In terms of Technology and Research and Development, LDCs have made the least progress since 2001 relative to other developing countries. The data shows that most LDCs invested very little in the development of new technologies (R&D/GDP of less than 1 percent, low registered patents), and also did not invest enough on the licensing of new technologies. R&D expenditure is certainly not the only indicator, but firm-level data at the country level indicate deficiencies in technological capabilities, particularly in domestic enterprises.

**Table 5: Imports of Capital Goods**

	Machinery and transport equipment (percent of total imports)			
	2001	2008	2009	2001-2009*
Least Developed Countries	26.88	28.97	27.37	26.67
Developing Countries	41.88	35.51	37.81	40.22

Source: \*OHRLLS calculations based on data from UNCTADstat database

Investment in capital equipment is identified as the most important channel of technological acquisition by firms, especially those in LDCs, which are generally at the early stage of development. Furthermore, one way to overcome the restricted access to new technologies by LDCs would be to import capital goods and upgrade thus the process of industrial production. However, individual country reports, as well as aggregate regional data show that the majority of LDCs have very low levels of capital goods imports. For instance, for LDCs as a group, capital goods represented on average 26.67 percent of total imports between 2001 and 2009. In contrast, for developing countries as a whole, capital goods represented 40.22 percent of total imports. This shows the level of difficulty those LDCs as a group face in terms of building productive capacities.

### ***Commitment 5: Enhancing the role of trade in development***

Recent multilateral and bilateral initiatives to facilitate trade between LDCs and Developed countries on one hand, and among LDCs is a great opportunity for many LDCs if they can translate those opportunities into tangible trade benefits and increase export of manufactured goods, and imports of more capital goods. However, the great majority of LDCs rely exclusively on primary commodities exports as their source of revenue and foreign exchange, which makes them vulnerable to external shocks

given the pro-cyclical nature of commodity prices. As such, trade promotion and export diversification must remain the cornerstone of any growth policy. A lot of progress has been made already, but yet, LDCs still account for less than 1 percent of global merchandise trade.

### Market access

Improving market access for LDCs has been one of the main goals of most of the trade preference initiatives achieved in recent years. The implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action has put the improvement of trade at the forefront of its fight against poverty. Many LDCs are set to benefit through their preferential market access, special and differential treatment, and participation through the Generalized System of Trade Preferences (GSTP).

Numerous efforts to promote regional integration and international trade have helped LDCs to access foreign market through initiatives such as the African Growth Opportunity Act (AGOA), the European Union's Everything But Arms (EBA), and Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with the European Union. Asian LDCs have joined the South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA), and the Asia-Pacific Trade Agreement (APTA). In the Pacific, countries are all members of the Pacific Island Countries Trade Agreement (PICTA), and the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER) with Australia and New Zealand.

The International Trade Centre (ITC) is also supporting several initiatives in LDCs in the area of trade capacity. In Africa, ITC, with the support of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), is implementing The "Programme for building African Capacity for Trade" (PACT II), which is a trade-related technical assistance programme aimed at strengthening the support capacity of African regional and national institutions to enhance export competitiveness, market linkages and export revenues of African small and medium size enterprises with a special focus on women-owned enterprises.

All 35 LDCs in this report have adopted the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF), a programme providing LDCs supports into mainstreaming trade into national development plans. Such a programme was implemented in Samoa to help it overcome supply capacity constraints and expand trade. The details of the programme are summarized under Box 5 below.

#### **Box 5: UNDP helping Samoa address its supply constraints and expand its participation in global trade through the Integrated Framework (IF).**

As part of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), 2008-2012 and Samoa's Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), 2008-2012, UNDP has taken the leading role in spearheading the Integrated Framework (IF) for trade through strengthening of the private sector's trade initiatives. The IF project provided Samoa with the inputs for further strengthening the mainstreaming of gender balanced development oriented sustainable trade objectives and to address its supply side constraints and provide Samoa with a coordinated and responsive mechanism of trade related technical assistance from the international community. The IF process for Samoa comprises of the following:

- Completion of a Diagnostic Trade Integration Study to identify constraints to overall competitiveness and supply chains and sectors of greatest export and import substitution potential. Developing an Action Matrix – a list of trade priorities – for better integration into the global trading system.
- Completion of a multi-year work plan for the IF implementation and integration of the priority DTIS recommendation (Action Matrix) into the national development strategy.
- Implementing the Action Matrix in partnership with the development partners.

## SECTION II

UNCTAD is helping many LDCs improve their capacity to generate efficient trade-supporting services and to benefit from the opportunities generated by the expansion of Electronic Commerce. A number of LDCs, including Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Nepal, Sudan, and Tanzania, have been assisted in provision and installation of the Advance Cargo Information System, (ACIS), a transport management tool which tracks cargo and transport equipment on rail, at ports and on rivers and generates transport statistics. In customs reform, national administrations in LDCs (e.g. Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chad, Ethiopia, Gambia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Maldives, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo, Uganda, Yemen and Zambia) have benefited through the implementation of the Automated System for Customs Data (ASYCUDA).

Kiribati, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, and Tuvalu are bound to take advantage of the Pacific Island Countries Trade Agreement (PICTA) which aims to create a common market and increase trade within the region as well as the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER) with Australia and New Zealand, laying the foundations for a single Pacific market.

In Bangladesh, the government has taken steps to help promote export diversification and trade, by offering a number of attractive incentives. The export policy 2003-2006 identified 5 products, including software and ICT products, agro-products and agro-processed goods, light engineering products, leather goods, and high-value ready made garments, to be considered as sectors with the highest priority, which will benefit low interest project loans, income tax rebates, and infrastructure development support. Since 2001, Bangladesh has successfully concluded and is in the process of concluding a number of trade arrangements at the regional level. These include, among others: South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA), Asia-Pacific Trade Agreement (APTA), Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral, Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC).

### **Cotton export**

While it is true that net exporters of cotton and other affected products are hurt by domestic constraints such as high domestic costs and inadequate supply capacities, lower world prices as a result of farmers' subsidies in developed countries have contributed greatly to depress the terms of trade for LDCs with comparative advantage in those commodities. Most agricultural primary commodities in which LDCs have comparative advantage such as coffee, cocoa and bananas, are not produced in developed countries, and market access is relatively open for unprocessed exports of those commodities. However, cotton is the dominant export commodity for Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, and Togo, where it accounts for 30 to 70 per cent of total merchandise exports, and is the second largest export crop after coffee in Uganda and Tanzania. It has become the main source of cash income for large numbers of poor smallholders and farm laborers in those countries.

The outcome of WTO talks held in Hong Kong in 2005, where government reached a deal that sets a deadline for eliminating cotton export subsidies by 2006 and all other agricultural export subsidies by 2013, was well received by African LDCs. However, negotiations have stalled ever since as manifested in the collapse of the most recent negotiations in July 2008. Encouraging international initiatives in the area of cotton trade include the recent launch by the International Trade Centre (ITC) of a dynamic, interactive trilingual version of its Cotton Exporter's Guide as part of its drive to increase the exchange of information in the sector and improve the skills and abilities of developing countries in cotton trading and marketing. The aim is to reach out to cotton stakeholders around the world and stimulate cotton trade, especially in the poorest African countries.

### ***Commitment 6: Reducing vulnerability and protecting the environment***

A major part of the population in LDCs rely on natural resources for either income generation or personal consumption, which make them the most vulnerable to environmental degradation. Rapid

urbanization has put tremendous stress on resources in urban areas, and decreased the quality of life for many already living in poor conditions. On the back of those developments, many LDCs have increased their focus on specific actions to promote environmental sustainability and reduce vulnerability. Most LDCs have established either a ministry of environment or a national environmental protection agency to coordinate all the efforts and initiatives undertaken at the national and international level in the area of environmental protection

In landlocked African countries such as Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad, and even coastal countries such as Mauritania and Senegal, desertification has advanced relatively fast during the last two decades, several initiative such as national campaigns to plant trees are helping reverse desertification.

Senegal and Mali have achieved the greatest progress in the area of reforestation, with their implementation of a national monitoring system, which is allowing their respective governments to keep track of advances in desertification and progress made as a result of reforestation campaigns, and the monitoring of droughts, inundations, and locust invasions. Other actions undertaken included the completion of a study on vulnerability and adaptation to climate change in agriculture, livestock, wetlands, water resources, health, wildlife, fisheries and transport as well as national inventory of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of an information brochure and public awareness on biodiversity.

In Mozambique, the Master Plan of Natural Disaster Prevention and Mitigation has allowed the government to establish some National Emergency Response Centres at provincial and district level to give a timely response to disasters, to conduct cyclone and flood drills in order to test information and communication systems among the centres, and the establishment of community radios in vulnerable districts, which can be accessed through the internet to facilitate the flow of information during an emergency. The government has also made investments in the National Institute of Meteorology to improve the quality of weather forecasts, the dissemination of information, and the installation of early warning systems.

The small island nations in the Pacific, who face a different set of environmental challenges, have also put environment protection and disaster management at the center of their main national development policies. Given the frequency of cyclones, flooding, landslides, tsunamis, and rising sea levels in the area, Kiribati, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, and Tuvalu are all benefiting from international community's support in the establishment of the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management for Action 2006-2011, which focuses on improving disaster risk management and sustainable development. The initiative is supported by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience's Commission (SOPAC). Efforts continue to focus on both policy and implementation, with a strong emphasis on mainstreaming climate change into national development planning.

Under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Samoa prepared its National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) through funding from the Least Developed Countries Fund. The Global Environmental Facility (GEF), established in November 2002, allocated funds to the least developed countries including Samoa to aid in the preparation of their national environmental and disaster management plans. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment was restructured and areas such as watershed and natural disaster management, forestry, and meteorological services were added under its jurisdiction. The 2004 Planning and Urban Management Act created a framework for the control and management of unsustainable types of land use.

In Bhutan, a National Environment policy was implemented to promote sustainability and conservation. Protecting biodiversity and maintaining forest were two of the main pillars of the programme. The key details of the policy are summarized under Box 6 below.

## SECTION II

### Box 6: National Environment Policy in Bhutan

The Kingdom of Bhutan has taken critical steps to develop and implement a strong policy framework for environmental sustainability. The Constitution of Bhutan enshrines the protection of the environment as an important aspect of state policy and refers to the fundamental duty of every citizen to contribute to the protection of the natural environment, conservation of the rich biodiversity and prevention of all forms of ecological degradation. To conserve the country's natural resources and to prevent degradation of the ecosystem, it mandates that a minimum of sixty percent of Bhutan's total land shall be maintained under forest cover for all time. The Gross National Happiness (GNH) philosophy, which provides the basis for all policy decisions further, further contributes to this policy framework by recognizing environmental preservation as one of the four pillars. At the heart of Bhutan's conservation strategy is a sprawling system of national parks, protected areas and biological corridors that cover more than half of the country's total land mass. This protected area, a network of biological corridors that links up all protected areas, is the Bhutan Biological Conservation Complex, the B2C2. The corridors allow for migration of species large species to migrate and range uninhibitedly instead of being confined to one particular area. Choosing this 'landscape' approach, B2C2 aims at holistic and integrated management of the protected areas and biological corridors, avoiding that way the risk of piecemeal measures. B2C2 encompasses five national parks, four wildlife sanctuaries and one strict nature reserve that are legally protected and have varying management practices in place with the majority of parks zoned into core, administrative, buffer and multiple-use zones.

Source: Royal Government of Bhutan, Tenth Five Year Plan (2008-2013)

In Nepal, a 15-year Sustainable Development Agenda (SDA) was prepared in May 2003 to guide and influence national level planning and policies up to 2017. There was a successful implementation of community forestry, and partial success in the leasehold forestry. This is expected to ameliorate the process of deforestation and also help in alleviation in poverty. Community forestry in Nepal is considered as one of the world most successful models. In the field of disaster, a National Strategy for Disaster Management was prepared, and disaster preparedness and mitigation programmes are under implementation. Likewise, water induced disaster management has been given priority in the National Water Plan (2002-2027).

Bangladesh, which is recognized as one of the world's most climate vulnerable countries, had already drawn up a five-Year Strategic Plan for Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme, which ran from 2004 to 2008. The plan brought a paradigm shift in disaster management from conventional response and relief practices to a more comprehensive risk reduction culture. In 2009, a Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan was adopted, which resulted in the establishment of a \$45 million Climate Change Trust Fund to help implement key policy recommendations under the plan, and fund research activities such as impact prediction modeling. Bangladesh has signed and ratified various international conventions, treaties and protocols such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and Kyoto Protocol, the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and Cartagena Protocol on Bio Safety, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the Basel Convention on the Control of Trans Boundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD).

***Commitment 7: Mobilizing financial resources***

During the last decade, LDCs have all undertaken a set of reforms (economic, social, political, and fiscal) to improve the overall business environment and improve their image and create conditions needed to attract investment (domestic and foreign), and encourage foreign donors to support their national development planning objectives. Capacity-building and resources mobilizations are the main tools that will facilitate the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action. Most least developed countries have made sustained efforts to improve economic and fiscal governance over the last decade. The establishment of a national anti-corruption policy to eliminate corruption in both the public and private sectors, and the adoption of investment guides have improved the overall investment frameworks and helped improve the image of these countries as sound and profitable investment destinations. The resources for development in LDCs come from essentially four broad sources: domestic savings; foreign aid, private capital flows, and remittances.

**Table 6: Net Inflows of Official Development Assistance**

	Total official development assistance, net (US Dollars at current prices and current exchange rates in millions)	
	2001	2008
Least developed countries	13782.39	38427.05
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	10415.86	27805.31
LDCs: Asia	3120.41	9806.7
LDCs: Islands	246.12	815.04
Landlocked developing countries	8548.17	22616.72
Small island developing States	985.03	2003.8
Heavily indebted poor countries	14504.21	37481.73

Source: Based on UNCTADstat database

With respect to official development aid (ODA), two points are worth noting. First, there has been an increase in aid flows to least developed countries since the Monterrey Consensus. ODA flows to least developed countries increased from \$13.78 billion in 2001 to \$38 billion in 2008. Second, there's been a growing interest among donor countries and multilateral organizations in improving aid quality as a way to enhance its effectiveness. ODA continues to be the main source of financing for development in LDCs and a conduit for productive capacity and infrastructure building and upgrading. The large investment requirements of LDCs imply a need for new and additional resources and efforts to increase ODA to LDCs.

Private capital flows, composed mainly of FDI, are also emerging as a significant source of development finance for LDCs. Net FDI inflows to LDCs increased from \$7 billion in 2001 to \$35 billion in 2008, before receding down to roughly \$28 billion in 2009 as a result of the recent global financial crisis.

In 2009, LDCs in Africa received the greatest share, with 91 percent of the total FDI inflows to least developed countries. Asian LDCs received 8 percent of total FDI, while those in the Pacific received 1 percent. Africa's share of total FDI inflows in least developed countries in recent years is an encouraging development and is showing that most efforts undertaken to diversify the sources of development finance are starting to bear fruits. However, this development also obscures the fact that the

## SECTION II

largest part of FDI inflows to the region is concentrated in oil and mineral exporting countries such as Angola (51 percent), Sudan (11.87 percent), and the Democratic Republic of Congo (3.7 percent). In Asia, FDI was mostly concentrated in the garment sector, with countries such as Cambodia and Bangladesh combined for close to 60 percent of FDI inflows in the region. In the Pacific, FDI has been mostly concentrated in countries that invested mostly in transport services and tourism such as the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu who together account for over 70 percent of regional FDI inflows.

**Table 7: Foreign Direct Investment**

	FDI inflows (million of current US\$)			FDI inflows, as a share of total regional or income group (percent)		
	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009
Least developed countries	7061.42	32358.45	27971.01	0.86	1.83	2.52
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	6143.17	27845.64	25574.94	87	86.05	91.43
LDCs: Asia	876.83	4297.95	2117.31	12.42	13.28	7.57
LDCs: Islands	41.42	214.87	278.77	0.59	0.66	1
Landlocked developing countries	6174.35	26339.54	21900.22	87.44	81.4	78.3
Small island developing States	2536.74	7608.97	4974.56	35.92	23.51	17.78
Heavily indebted poor countries	4758.1	19046.49	16996.12	67.38	58.86	60.76

Source: UNCTADstat

Moreover, in recent years, workers' remittances have become an important source of financing for development in LDCs. Remittance flows mainly go to the private sector and so contribute to private savings and support for private consumption and social safety nets. Annual flows of remittances in least developed countries increased from \$6.6 billion in 2001 to \$24.4 billion in 2009. Asian LDCs accounted for most of the remittances in 2009, at 63.1 percent of total remittances to least developed countries, followed by African LDCs, at 36.2 percent, and the Pacific Islands for a meager 0.8 percent. Overall, Bangladesh, Haiti, Nepal, Senegal, and Sudan accounted for the largest share of remittance inflows at just over 78 percent of total remittance inflows in all LDCs combined.

**Table 8: Workers Remittances**

	Workers remittances					
	Total remittance inflows (million of current US\$)			Remittance inflows, as a share of total LDCs remittances (percent)		
	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009
Least developed countries	6604.37	22800	24392.94	N/A	N/A	N/A
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	2684.15	9055.97	8818.58	40.65	39.72	36.16
LDCs: Asia	3796.62	13554.47	15389.23	57.49	59.45	63.09
LDCs: Islands	123.6	189.56	185.13	1.88	0.84	0.76
Landlocked developing countries	2093.19	16003.83	13603.71	31.7	70.2	55.77
Small island developing States	1929.16	3572.86	3256.48	29.22	15.68	13.36
Heavily indebted poor countries	3791.81	15438.54	14345.51	57.42	67.72	58.82

Source: UNCTADstat

During the last decade, the role of microfinance institutions in least developed countries has increased overall. The lack of data availability in the sector makes it relatively difficult to make a clear assessment of the progress made. A review of national reports seems to indicate that microfinance schemes seem to be relatively more successful in Asian and Pacific LDCs than in their African counterparts. Most countries have indicated in their national reports that access to credit has been limited by the lack of collateral from potential borrowers.

In Samoa, the South Pacific Business Foundation helped overcome the burden of collateral requirements by providing unsecured loans to women in rural areas to start small businesses in the agriculture sector. The programme has helped increase credit access to populations on small remote islands, who would otherwise never gain such opportunities.

Box 7 provides a detailed analysis of the programme, its implementation, and key accomplishments.

**Box 7: Fostering micro-entrepreneurship and providing access to inclusive financial services: the South Pacific Business Development Foundation in Samoa**

The South Pacific Business Development Foundation (SPBD) was created in 2000 to improve the quality of life of poor families of Samoa through the provision of small, unsecured loans to groups of rural women. Such loans allow them to start micro-businesses based on their existing livelihood skills, many of which are based in the agricultural sector. The agricultural sector presents the biggest potential to reduce poverty and guarantee food security given the high share of people employed in the sector. Micro-businesses by SPBD customers include, small plantations and vegetable gardens, chicken or pig farms, banana or taro chip manufactures, food preparation and distribution, and roadside and market place trading and vending. Since disbursing its first micro-loan in 2000, SPBD has helped over 12,000 poor Samoan families. On its ten-year anniversary, it has reached the milestone of having disbursed micro-loans adding up to USD 12.5 million. Members who have already successfully started a micro-business and paid down at least one SPBD micro business loan can now receive unsecured housing improvement loans, childhood education loans and life insurance policies. Credit-worthiness among SPBD customers remains high, with a default rate of less than one per cent and a repayment delinquency rate of less than two per cent. In 2008, SPBD opened operations on the two Samoan islands of Savaii and Manono, with populations significantly more isolated and rural than on the main island of Upolu. On Manono, no roads, vehicles and regular boat services exist. On a simple walking path around the island, SPBD's field officer visits local entrepreneurs once a week, reaching approximately 100 micro-entrepreneurs.

Source: South Pacific Business Development Foundation (SPBD): <http://www.spbd.ws>, accessed on 21 December 2010.

The MicroDreams Foundation (2008 and 2009): Annual Reports 2008 and 2009. [http://www.microdreams.org/annual\\_report\\_2009.pdf](http://www.microdreams.org/annual_report_2009.pdf)

## SECTION III

### KEY CHALLENGES LESSONS LEARNED

#### 1. Challenges

The implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action was achieved with mixed results given the complexity of some of the challenges faced by many least developed countries. As it stands, the progress made by the majority of least developed countries will fall short of achieving the goals of sustained growth and sustainable development, and the eradication of poverty.

##### *(a) Lack of international support to implement BPoA*

The least developed countries reported that the lack of budgetary support in the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action was the greatest challenge. They argue that most of the policies recommendation highlighted in their national development planning or PRSPs could not be implemented for lack of funding. Even in rare cases where disbursements met expectations, the evaluation of the implementation of assistance over the last decade reveals problems of states absorptive capacity in terms of donor resources. Among the factors explaining this situation are: (i) weak human capacity to design and implement projects and programs, (ii) the internal administrative and procedural obstacles, (iii) institutional instability in many least developed countries, and (iv) the complexity of procedures for certain donors.

In general, disbursements have fallen short of expectations, when taking into account formal donor commitments. The most important disbursements concern the sectors of public works, rural development, good governance and institutional support, education and health. For instance, the 2008-2015 Education Sectorial Programme in Guinea could not be implemented because the \$117 million committed by the World Bank in 2008 to support it were not disbursed for bad governance and political instability.

There is an agreement among all LDCs that each commitment of BPoA requires funding support to allow countries to effectively implement the policies designed under the framework. All LDCs are already fully committed to implement BPoA and lay down a foundation for a strong global partnership to promote sustainable growth and development, reduce poverty and inequality, and integrate the global economy. However, this could not be achieved unless the international community steps up its efforts and help LDCs mobilize more resources, in addition to current development assistance. Current Debt burden in LDCs is already high enough and has reached unsustainable levels, and they should not have to incur additional debt to fulfill their BPoA commitments.

##### *(b) Quantity of ODA and its distribution*

Official development assistance has for a long time been a major source of funding for development planning in least developed countries. Despite increase in the overall volume of ODA received in recent years, LDCs have noted that several donor countries have yet to meet their commitments in terms of increasing their share of ODA per GNI to the 0.15 percent target. By the end of 2008, only Belgium Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom out of 22 OECD/DAC donor countries had met the target. Taken together, net disbursements from all OECD/DAC donors represented only 0.09 percent of their gross national income.

Beyond the quantity of Aid flows, some least developed countries have expressed concern about the distributional role of aid flows and its impact on effectiveness. In 2009, total ODA inflows in least developed countries was distributed as follow: 6 percent in production, 10 percent in economic infrastructure and services, 17 percent in government and civil society, and 48 percent in social infrastructure and services. The high share devoted to social infrastructure reflects indeed donors' priorities for poverty reduction and BPoA commitments in general. Investment in social sectors is critical for

least developed countries, however, the low share of aid currently allocated to economic infrastructure and production sectors ignores the complementary roles played by the public sector, employment and private incomes to reduce poverty. Unless aid is used to expand investment in physical capital to galvanize the domestic private sector, many LDCs will find it difficult, if not impossible to maintain most of the progress made in the last decade in the area of human development, given the fact that aid will not flow indefinitely. Such a situation could keep most LDCs in the vicious circle of aid dependency for years to come.

**Table 9: Least Developed Countries ODA Share per Sector**

Year	Sectors*			
	Social Infrastructure and Services (% of total)	Government and Civil Society (% of total)	Economic Infrastructure and Services (% of total)	Production Sector (% of total)
2002	27	8	6	5
2003	25	8	5	4
2004	30	9	7	4
2005	35	11	8	4
2006	40	14	8	4
2007	44	15	8	5
2008	42	15	8	5
2009	48	17	10	6

Source: Calculations based on data from OECD StatExtracts online: [http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=ODA\\_RECIP#](http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=ODA_RECIP#)

\*numbers may not add up to 100 because all sectors are not represented

### ***(c) Limited capacity for domestic resource mobilizations***

In terms of domestic resource mobilization, least developed countries have in general expressed concern about the narrowness of their tax base, and the weakness of their domestic tax collection and policies, which in turn make domestic resources mobilization an even greater challenge for many of them, who mainly rely on ODA. These challenges were noticeable in Asia and the Pacific in countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, and Nepal with an annual average tax revenue as a share of GDP of less than 10 percent between 2001 and 2009.

### ***(d) Debt overhang and long-term unsustainability***

Despite the fact that a large part of least developed countries has benefited from debt relief under the HIPC and MDR initiatives, several LDCs have expressed concern about debt sustainability. This was particularly true for Africa where by the end of 2010, 24 of the 33 countries had reached either pre-decision or post-completion points and were therefore benefiting from partial or full debt relief. African LDCs have seen a decrease in their external debt relative to GDP and debt service relative to exports, which decreased from 85 percent and 13 percent in 2000 to 25 percent and 3 percent respectively in 2008. However, following the recent global economic crisis, individual countries are expressing concerns that those indicators have been on the rise since 2008, putting the majority of them in a position of debt distress.

## SECTION III

### *(e) Lack of statistical capacity*

In terms of statistical capacity, the majority of LDCs have expressed concern about the lack of sound institutions to produce good quality and reliable data for monitoring and evaluation of BPoA implementation. Quite often, they rely mainly on international organization such as the World Bank, the IMF, and the UN to provide input for monitoring exercises. Some have expressed concern that BPoA lacks intermediate indicators that can be monitored. Even for countries where statistical capacity exists, statistical indicators are collected irregularly, and the quality of data is suspicious. Overall, least developed countries noted that their technical capacity to assess the impact of government policies is inefficient or weak at best.

### *(f) Inadequate physical infrastructure*

The lack of adequate infrastructure in least developed countries is perhaps the greatest challenge they have faced in the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action. Good and strong infrastructure supports sustained economic growth, encourages FDI inflows, facilitates trade, and improves social well-being. Economic and social infrastructure such as sustainable energy, water and sanitation, transportation, information and communication technology (ICT), education and health are essential for poverty reduction through growth and full participation of least developed countries in the world economy.

The overall condition of least developed countries' physical infrastructure, especially in rural areas remains weak. The majority of basic infrastructure utilities in least developed countries are characterized by weak management, systematic under-investment and gross inefficiencies, which led to accumulation of large deficits, and their subsequent privatization. The situation is even more critical for landlocked countries, which face some of the highest transportation costs in the world, and small island nations, which are in most cases composed of several disconnected small islands. For landlocked LDCs, high transport costs are related to geographical disadvantages and the difficulties of establishing cross-border transit systems, including both physical infrastructure and related services. Weak infrastructures in least developed countries is not only a challenge for development in individual countries, but also a constraint to regional integration as it prevents the movement of goods and services across borders. Furthermore, within a sub-region, policies and regulatory systems, where they exist, are not adequately harmonized.

In least developed countries of Asia and the Pacific, infrastructure poses obstacles to greater investment. Since power outages and load shedding lead to erratic electricity supply, firms in these countries often need to rely on generators. Many of these countries have transport problem owing to their rugged terrain and topography. Road and rail networks are limited, narrow roads allow only limited loads and speeds, and maintenance of infrastructure is difficult. Landlocked countries also depend on transit countries to enable their access to the sea. Port and airport infrastructures also need to be improved.

Small islands least developed countries have expressed concern about their geographic isolation from regional and international markets, and the small size of their domestic markets, which limit economies of scales, competition and innovation. High transport costs due to long distances, low population density, low demand for freight, low passenger numbers and poor infrastructure, impede access of small islands and landlocked least developed countries to international markets. In addition, the procyclical nature of tourism revenue, coupled with the fact that the majority of small islands least developed countries rely mainly on the sector makes them highly vulnerable to external shocks.

***(g) Fast urbanization***

Rapid urbanization across least developed countries is causing enormous challenges and increasing stress on natural resources. Between 2000 and 2009, urban and total populations in least developed countries grew at an annual average of 4.11 percent and 2.34 percent respectively. The growth or urbanization at a rate above total population growth means that there are increasing challenges associated with maintaining the capacity and level of services to meet the demands of such growth. The current situation is aggravated by the emerging labor shortages for commercial farming if the rural-urban out migration continues. Beyond rapid urbanization, population growth in itself is a major challenge for least developed countries in general. This was in particular true for countries such as Guinea Bissau, Kiribati, the Solomon Islands, and Togo, which, between 2000 and 2009 experienced an annual average population growth rate in excess of the real GDP growth rate.

***(h) Weak institutions and political instability***

Despite all the efforts undertaken in recent years by least developed countries to improve governance and eliminate corruption, the majority of them remain still characterized by weak public sector institutions and underdeveloped administration, low quality of human resources, lack of rigorous management of public affairs and a culture of impunity. Political reforms have improved the democratic process and led to parliamentary elections across most least developed countries. However, in many cases, parliamentary oversight has remained weak, and judicial reforms have been relatively slow. Despite progress made toward improving governance from multilateral institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, and WTO, the voice and representation of African least developed countries remains marginal, especially in the area of trade negotiations. Asian and Pacific least developed countries have also been marginalized in international trade because of lack of trade-related technical assistance. Political instability and crisis in Afghanistan and African LDCs such as Comoros, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mauritania, Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of Congo has made it relatively challenging to implement most of the policies of the Brussels Programme of Action. Incidentally, these countries made the least progress in terms of human development, and would most likely fail to meet several of the BPOA commitments.

***(i) Inadequate health and education infrastructures***

In terms of health, least developed countries have been lacking human capacity, in addition to an already existing weak physical infrastructure. Aside from insufficient access to health care facilities, the actual quality of health care in least developed countries has been relatively low. The shortage of trained medical professionals, the short supply of essential equipment, pharmaceuticals, and medical supplies have all contributed to slowing down progress in the area. Inadequate availability of emergency obstetric care services and adequate skilled birth attendants has hampered efforts in improving maternal and child health. Despite the encouraging progress recorded in recent years, the HIV/AIDS pandemic and Malaria continues to pose a major threat to most LDCs, but African LDCs in particular. Voluntary HIV testing initiatives were not as successful as expected given the cultural and social stigma associated with the disease. The disease is primarily a matter of human well being, but it also threatens the development and retention of human capacity, and has contributed to the depletion of manpower in all sectors of life. The increase in the number of orphans subsequent to the disease will represent a huge challenge for decades to come.

The majority of LDCs have increased access to education during the last decade, as attested by increasing enrolment ratios across countries. However, the quality of education did not improve at the same rate as its expansion. In addition, capacity limitations for higher enrolment figures at secondary school level are constraining the absorption of ever increasing number of pupils qualifying for further

### SECTION III

studies at the primary school level. Continuing high dropout rates for girls in primary and secondary education, and contradictions in culture and traditions that favour boys to girls in accessibility to education; continue to pose a major challenge for the elimination of gender disparity in education. This has been in particular true for African and Asian LDCs, but much less so for the Pacific Islands LDCs, which, in majority, have already achieved gender parity in education.

#### *(j) Environmental degradation and the impact of climate change*

Environmental degradation and climate change represent daunting challenges for all least developed countries, and it threatens to wipe out most of the progress achieved in terms of development in recent years. Island nations are disproportionately affected by the adverse effects of climate change owing to high vulnerability and lowest adaptive capacities.

The adverse effects of sea level rise in countries such as Kiribati, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu present significant risks and the long-term effects of climate change may threaten their very existence.

Among Asian LDCs, Bangladesh is being recognized by the international community as one of the most climate vulnerable countries in the world, where frequent cyclones damages infrastructures, agriculture crops, livestock, poultry, and small and medium enterprises. The situation in Bangladesh is more exacerbated by its population density, which is among the world' highest. In landlocked countries, Agriculture is essentially rain-fed, and as a consequence, recurrent droughts are threatening agriculture, and present a major threat to development. The negative impact on agriculture in least developed countries in general cannot be under-emphasized given the major role played by agriculture in terms of employment and poverty reduction.

Environmental threats to agriculture also have an indirect impact on food security by affecting both availability (through low supplies) and affordability (through loss of employment and increase in poverty). Small and large-scale mining activities are also causing environmental degradation and were expressed as a concern by countries such as Guinea, Lesotho, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. In addition, the majority of least developed countries have expressed concern that high poverty levels remain a problem for most people, as it reduces their capacity to respond to unforeseen disaster mitigation measures at the level of the individual through such instruments as life insurance schemes, and at the national level, to rehabilitate destroyed infrastructures. Overall, almost all LDCs agree that limited availability of financial resources to support national initiatives and interventions on environmental protection, has hampered their progress and limited the impact of their initiatives.

#### *(k) Negative impact of the global financial and economic crisis on least developed countries*

The impact of the crisis on least developed countries has been mixed and countries have been more or less affected according to their export composition, and the level of integration of their domestic financial systems into the global system. Overall, the low degree of integration of these economies into the global financial markets initially shielded most of them from the direct effects of the financial crisis.

This was in contrast to the indirect effects, which were felt by several LDCs. As the crisis unfolded, global demand for commodity went down and hence LDCs exports shrank both in volume and value terms. Indeed a slow down in the US economy dampened energy demand and industrial production contracts, which translated in lower import of energy products, especially oil. This had severe damages on oil exporting LDCs such as Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, and Sudan causing a fall in overall growth at their respective gross domestic products. The unfolding crisis also exacerbated price dynamics: with economic activities slowing down, demand for oil fell and the cost per barrel declined. The price of other primary commodities exported by LDCs also decreased, thus reducing the value of commodity exports by LDCs.

As a result of the crisis, Real GDP growth for LDCs as a group declined from 6.96 percent in 2008 to 4.11 in 2009, and growth is expected to be even lower in 2010. The crisis also affected regions to different degrees. In Africa, real GDP declined from 7.89 percent in 2008 to 4 percent in 2009, a decline of almost 50 percent in the growth rate. In Asia, real GDP growth increased from 5.49 percent in 2008 to 6.04 percent in 2009. The Pacific region was the most affected, with GDP growth declining from 4.4 percent in 2008 to 0.06 percent in 2009.

Following the crisis, World financial markets became less liquid and hence it became more difficult for LDCs governments to finance their budget through bonds. This put further strains on domestic public finance. The credit crunch in the US and Europe also translated into a decline in lending by foreign banks to private banks in LDCs and the predictability of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to LDCs and realization of standing commitments was not fully met. This was particularly the case for ODA coming from OECD/DAC countries.

Remittance from migrant workers in the developed countries, which has now become fairly significant, declined slightly in African and Pacific LDCs, as the jobs and incomes become threatened by an impending recession. This potential decrease in remittances caused severe hardships on poor households that depended on remittances as a vital supplement to their incomes. All in all, however, LDCs experienced overall a slight increase in remittances, reflecting mainly the increase in remittances observed in Asian LDCs.

## 2. Lessons Learned

The implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action by least developed countries was achieved with mixed results. An overall assessment indicates slow progress in several of the seven commitments. However, despite some setbacks, some countries have made significant progress, and their example should be used by others to further improve in areas where progress fell short of the objectives.

During the implementation of BPoA, the main task of LDCs and development partners were to foster economic development and promote opportunities for broad-based growth by developing effective policy with the objective of building sustained economic resilience, including safeguarding macro-economic stability; protecting core services; targeted support for the vulnerable; boosting national competitiveness through improvement of productive capacities, and strengthening development coordination.

### *Taking into account diversity among LDCs*

The overall analysis of the implementation of BpoA indicates that between 2001 and 2009, most LDCs achieved high economic growth, and improvement in several of the commitments. Individual countries achieved mixed results as success and failures were distributed across all three regions. However, the formulation of policy objectives under BPoA did not take into consideration country-specific circumstances such as crisis, vulnerability to natural disasters or climate change, population size, lack of economic diversification, geographical location, and initial conditions. A new Programme of Action will be more efficient if it is tailored to address specific needs of LDCs, common vulnerabilities, and associates national stakeholders in the design of policy objectives.

### *Improving Agriculture*

The agriculture sector is the most important sector in least developed countries as it often employs on average between 60 percent and 80 percent of the labor force. However, BPoA did not provide it with the attention it deserves. If poverty reduction will remain the main focus of the new PoA, then agriculture must be brought at the forefront of policy design, including the provision of finance

## SECTION III

to support new initiatives to improve the sector. Despite the importance of agriculture, ICT and manufacturing development remain the keys to trade, growth, and sustained prosperity. The new PoA must increase attention on these two sectors as a way to promote economic diversification and reduce LDCs vulnerability to external shocks.

LDCs and development partners must continue efforts to better ensure food security across countries, in particular, expediting efforts to improve food standards and quality and support agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries, through reinvestment in the sectors and promotion of organic production.

As it stands, food security and climate change have disconnected policy agendas. Careful consideration must be given to the impact of climate change on food security, and building the resilience of the agriculture, fisheries and forestry sectors to safeguard food security in a time of multiple crises and risks. There is a need to continue to mainstream food security into adaptation initiatives. Reviewing policy is necessary to determine where it is necessary to mainstream food security into regional and national climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction initiative.

Aside from the lack of focus on the sector, the need to mainstream gender into agriculture policy is acknowledged. Women in LDCs are disproportionately represented in agriculture activities, both subsistence but also large scale. However, none of the agricultural development plans undertaken by LDCs addressed their predominant role in the sector. The social, political, and economic discrimination women face reduces their access to land, credit, and means of production in general, making it harder to have a significant impact if these issues continue to be ignored.

With the exception of a few Asian LDCs, which have diversified their economies into manufacturing, a large majority of LDCs still rely essentially on commodity exports for revenue generation, which makes them highly vulnerable to external shocks. Furthermore, despite all the efforts undertaken at the national and international level, the share of LDCs in global trade remains marginal at best, given their constraints on supply capacity. All these factors have increased the level of vulnerability of LDCs in general and need to be address in the new PoA.

### *Poverty reduction and employment*

Despite the strong economic performance recorded by most least developed countries during the past decade, the growth-poverty reduction nexus remains still elusive as much of the growth was not broad based, but fuelled mainly by the capital intensive oil and mineral sectors, which added little to employment, and therefore could not contribute to poverty reduction. The issue of employment creation was not specifically addressed by BPoA, beyond the recognition of the importance of the agriculture sector in LDCs. The public sector, employment and private incomes all play a complementary role to reduce poverty. However, while BPoA spelled out a broad framework to address economic growth and poverty reduction, it did not specifically spell out the mechanisms through which poverty reduction could be achieved. The new PoA must be specific in stressing the importance of investment in productive infrastructures, targeted investment, and the use of redistributing mechanisms to reduce inequality.

With the exception of a few countries which face intense diversification, most LDCs are well-endowed, and often hold the world's largest reserves in natural resources such as fertile and arable land for agriculture, biodiversity, natural fresh water, rainforests, renewable energy sources, gold, diamonds, bauxite, oil, natural gas, and many other minerals. Responsible and equitable management of these resources can help spread the benefits of growth and prosperity to a wider part of the population, including the poorest and most vulnerable.

Although the majority of least developed countries have attempted with mixed success to mainstream BPoA into their national development plans, the multitudes of commitments under various other

programmes has decreased awareness of BPoA on the country level. The lack of budgetary support for meeting the commitments under BPoA has relegated the programme behind well-established international initiatives such as the MDGs. To provide funding for support measures, the new PoA must be mainstreamed into trade, and aid strategies from donor countries, and integrated into the design of PRSPs and national development plans. Donors should consider budget support as a long term strategy to assist LDCs in their implementation of the new PoA, and reiterate their commitment to assist them.

### ***Aid availability and effectiveness***

The issue of aid availability and effectiveness has been raised by least developed countries, many of which rely heavily on it for implementation of BPoA and other national and international development initiatives. So, successful implementation of BPoA commitments is highly contingent upon the fulfilment of aid commitments. However, as of 2008, all OECD/DAC countries as a group had disbursed only a meager 0.09 percent of their GNP, which stands still short of the 0.15 to 0.2 percent target they all committed to, and represent an additional US\$ 42.5 billion aid gap that could have benefited least developed countries, had they met the 0.2 target.

Donors should increase their ODA contributions to LDCs to meet their commitments and help them cope with the negative effects of the global economic and financial crisis. By reorienting their aid strategies, they could help support the development of agriculture, social services, infrastructure, and productive capacities. Microfinance and other innovative sources of finance must also be considered as complementary sources of financing for development.

The allocation of aid should be determined by economic, social and environmental concerns and directed to addressing economic growth and poverty reduction. Any aid policy framework for LDCs should insist on the principle of providing assistance in the form of grants and where there is the ability to incur financial obligations, be able to set a realistic level of debt sustainability.

Aside from the issue about the quantity of aid, the expenditure composition of aid remains a challenge for many LDCs. How aid is currently being spent by recipient countries reflect the priorities of donor countries, which as it stands, is mainly focused on social infrastructures, services and poverty reduction initiatives. Expenditures on the productive sector and physical infrastructures have now taken a back seat in terms of priorities, and together represent less than what is spent on government and civil society alone.

ODA can strengthen national capacities to generate even more revenue. In this context, it is important for donor countries to design ODA such that it increased domestic capacity to mobilize domestic sources of development finance, by helping reform and strengthen domestic financial institutions, so that they can more effectively perform the function of mobilizing finance and channelling them into productive investment. Much of the debate on aid effectiveness has diverted attention from reforming ODA so that it can contribute effectively to long-term development and short-term stabilization issues. For least developed countries to mobilize sufficient resources to finance development and continue making progress in the implementation of BPoA, it would require that current ODA levels at least not be reduced.

### ***Physical and institutional capacity building***

The development of physical infrastructure in LDCs would offer universal access to services, which is a pre-requisite for accelerated and sustained economic development, high levels of educational attainment, good healthcare, efficient and productive entrepreneurial activities, and improved access to information and markets. Unless one assumes that aid will continue to flow indefinitely, many LDCs would not be able to continue to support poverty reduction initiatives on their own because they lack

## SECTION III

a dynamic economy supported by a vibrant private sectors and a healthy and educated workforce. Donor countries must progressively shift their priorities toward a balance approach whereby poverty reduction and physical infrastructure building complement each others.

Given the weak and outdated nature of physical infrastructures in LDCs, there is a strong incentive to scale up investment in infrastructure, although doing so will present a number of challenges for individual countries and collectively, as well as for development partners. The slow pace of private sector involvement in infrastructure development indicates that the enabling environment needs to be improved. Targeted investment incentives are warranted to attract the effective participation of the private sector in infrastructure development. However, any efforts to increase investment in infrastructure investment in least developed countries must take into account the effect of a rapid scaling up in infrastructure on macroeconomic stability within the countries, as it is often a misconception that the key constraint facing LDCs in their infrastructure development efforts is lack of financial resources. It is now apparent that the ability of LDCs to absorb additional resources poses a bigger threat to scaling up infrastructure development.

LDCs, with assistance from development partners, must strengthen the ability of the private sector to participate competitively in a global economy through the necessary enabling environments and support mechanisms. Broad-based, sustainable private sector-led growth is essential to achieving faster development progress and building resilience against external shocks, including through micro-economic reform, economic diversification through manufacturing, trade facilitation, improved financial services including micro-finance and investment.

### *Resource mobilization*

Given the recent trends of volatility in external sources of funding such as ODA and FDI, the long-term sustainability of economic and social progress in least developed countries depends on their ability to build productive capacities and increase reliance on domestic resource mobilization and private sources of external finance, and can effectively compete in global markets without preferential market access. If development finance to least developed countries continues to increase and complemented by effective trade policies that foster the development of productive capacities, external finance provided by development partners would ultimately translate into sustained economic growth and long-term poverty reduction.

The Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC), and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) have played a major role in improving the external debt position of many least developed countries. On the back of the recent global economic crisis, many least developed countries have increased their borrowing and therefore debt sustainability will continue to remain a challenge for many years to come. As such, lending organization must address the issue of the impact of the financial crisis on debtors' ability to fulfill their obligations. In addition, they should also reform the process to allow more LDCs to participate in the initiatives and benefit from debt relief. As for the complementarity of debt relief and ODA, donor countries and lending institutions must concert their effort so that neither debt relief nor ODA is used as substitute for one another. Addressing the issue of debt sustainability must therefore be one of the key priorities of the new PoA.

Remittances play an important role for LDCs in general as it provides income and may contribute to poverty reduction. Discussing the complicated issue of the effect of remittances on economic growth, investment, and development is beyond the scope of this report. Individual country reports confirm that remittances are used essentially for household consumption and social safety nets, and therefore are unlikely to make significant contribution to either saving or investment. Nevertheless, governments in LDCs, with the help of development partners should help design a schemes through which parts of remittances are brought into formal banking channels, while acknowledging that the high consumption rate of remittances limit the potential to do so.

***Macroeconomic policies***

Because of their dependence on commodity exports with volatile international prices, the growth rates of least developed countries tend to fluctuate. An active fiscal policy can be used effectively to reduce growth fluctuations through public budget management. However, LDCs must be provided with the fiscal space required to implement the kind of active fiscal policies that can have a lasting affect. To mitigate the impact of the recent global economic downturn, most of the major industrial countries adopted active fiscal policies stressing both countercyclical interventions in the short and medium term, and public investment to foster long term sustainable growth. The new PoA must specifically address the issue of macroeconomic stability as a tool to mitigate the impact of external shocks and promote long term economic growth.

With the exception of a few Asian LDCs, which achieved some forms of diversification into manufacturing, there has not been a significant structural shift in individual countries economies, in which agriculture is by far the largest employer, but contributes proportionally very little to GDP. The new PoA must specifically address the issue of structural transformation and promote progressive diversification away from low value added and low productivity agriculture, into high value added manufacturing.

***Monitoring and evaluation***

LDCs challenges in terms of lack of statistical capacity, unreliability and low quality of data, has been recognized. Despite efforts by many countries to centralize their data collection efforts through a National Statistical Office, many countries still rely on international organizations such as the World Bank, IMF, and the UN for their data needs. The new PoA must address the issue of statistical capacity building in order to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of implemented policies. In this area, the World Bank has taken the lead in helping developing countries in general. The Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (TFSCB) was created in 1999 by the Development Data Group to provide grants to developing countries to support improvements in their statistical systems. This program is funded by several donors to provide small grants with a maximum implementation period of three years. Recently, emphasis has been placed on the preparation of national strategies for the development of statistics. As of 2008, the TFSCB has approved funding for more than 100 statistical projects, representing an investment in statistics of close to \$22 million.

Furthermore, the commitments under BPoA require long period for implementation. For instance, improvements in education, health, and infrastructures do not occur overnight and require sometime decades to achieve noticeable results. So, unlike BPoA, the new PoA must specify short and medium term targets against which policies can be monitored and evaluated, and from which lessons can be learned to better implement the commitments for the duration of the programme.

Development partners must continue to provide technical assistance to strengthen monitoring frameworks for sustainable development strategies, and coordinating a policy action matrix that all development partners can accept as preconditions for budget support, developing and ensure a public release of a communications and engagement strategy that explains and provides for effective feedback from the private sector and civil society on key policy actions.

***Mainstreaming BPoA into national development plans***

The task of establishing a causal link between BPoA, implemented policies and the progress achieved is a difficult one and goes beyond the scope of this report. The multitude of programmes being implemented simultaneously on the country level make it almost impossible to isolate the effects of BPoA initiatives. The new PoA must address this issue and should be fully integrated into national development plans and PRSPs in a way that its policy implications can be isolated and identified for

## SECTION III

a better impact analysis. The participation of civil society, the private sector, and local governments in the design of the new PoA would reinforce shared ownership and lead to a programme that is people-centered and addresses issues relevant to stakeholders.

The analysis of individual country reports shows that each country has to some extent assumed an ever important role in the design of their national development policy, which involved state and local governments, civil society, and development partners. However, in reality, the design of national development plans is highly influenced by donors priorities, monitoring, and financing choices. By removing conditionality on aid, donor would provide some flexibility for recipient countries to reorganize their priorities and design policies that address their specific needs.

The need to ensure consistency among different policies or initiatives internationally and at the country level is recognized. Doing so will prevent the duplication of efforts and promote a more efficient ownership of national development plans in least developed countries. Given the implementation of multiple initiatives and programmes, it is acknowledged that governments in LDCs can be overextended as they try to simultaneously implement several international development frameworks as well as their own development policies.

### *Enhancing trade*

The Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to LDCs (EIF) is a key technical instrument to improve LDCs institutional capacity as a way of enhancing their productive capacities. The success of the programme in Lesotho in the production of mushrooms and peach shows that country ownership is essential to the success of the EIF, which is a major part of several aid for trade international initiatives embedded in the Doha Development Agenda.

LDCs are in general benefiting from international and intra-regional trade opportunities by proceeding with the implementation of key regional trade agreements and, in particular, working to allow for freer movement of goods and services. While the current trade and Investment policy statements are premised on the mission and vision of the national strategy, they do not specifically identify how the recommended strategies would address the reduction of poverty or lessen the negative impact of economic integration on the disadvantaged sectors of the population. In addition, although regional and international integration are desirable, and indeed encouraged under BPoA, most LDCs will lose their ability to raise tariffs in order to protect infant industries and generate revenues. The new PoA must address this contradiction and take a clear position on the way forward.

In terms of market access, there is a need to improve special and differential treatment of LDCs, especially removing all duties and quotas for all LDCs products, as agreed by developed and developing countries during the Sixth WTO Ministerial Conference held in Hong Kong in December 2005. The process to ensure preferential rule of origin applicable to imports from LDCs must also be transparent and simplified to facilitate market access.

### *Environmental protection and sustainable energy policy*

Environmental protection is critical to LDCs given their high reliance on natural resources and agriculture for employment, private income generation, and public revenue mobilization. However, the BPoA did not specifically spell out the mechanism through which environment policies must be conducted. The new PoA must address the issues of vulnerability and environmental sustainability and mainstream them into national development plans and PRSPs.

In addition, developed countries, bearing the highest responsibility in the current degradation of the environment must provide funding to least developed countries, disproportionately suffering from the effects of climate change, to help them mitigate its effects. Concerted efforts must be put into action

by all countries, especially developed countries as well as emerging markets and other developing countries to finally reach an agreement on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

In light of the spike in oil prices, and the increase in energy and food prices that unfolded prior to the global financial crisis in 2008, there must be concerted efforts between national stakeholders and their international counterparts to promote the development of renewable energy sources, which LDCs are generally well-endowed in, and a renewed commitment by the international community to increase investment in this area to help them benefit from the resulting economies of scale. In general, investment in renewable energy has been carried out by the public sector. There need to be a concerted effort to encourage private investment in green technology, and other environmentally friendly business initiatives. Disproportionate use of fossil fuel as the primary source of energy in LDCs has put significant stress on the overall environment and currently contributes greatly to soil erosion and degradation, which in turn impact agriculture and increases vulnerability.

## SECTION IV

### CONCLUSION AND WAY FORWARD

Since the adoption of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries in 2001, the overall economic and social development of the least developed countries has improved relatively, with mixed results among regions, and across countries. Most LDCs remain committed to the implementation of BPoA, and significant progress has been made toward the implementation of a number of BPoA commitments. However, numerous obstacles were encountered given the multitude of countries and the individual circumstances that surrounded them during and prior to the implementation process.

Economic growth in LDCs has been relatively strong between 2001 and 2009 despite the recent economic crisis. Social indicators also show that noticeable progress was accomplished. However, the sustainability of the progress made will eventually depend on the building of productive capacities in a way that these countries can ultimately rely more on domestic resources and private instead of external sources of finances, and can effectively compete on a level playing field in international markets without preferential treatment or special market access. LDCs and their development partners must work together to ensure that growth is inclusive, sustainable and participatory. To achieve this, will require the scaling up of supply capacities, which will in turn contribute to employment generation. However, such structural transformation could not be achieved without an enabling policy framework that will accelerate the process of technological progress and capital accumulation. This can be achieved through inclusive development policies, complemented by efficient international support measures.

Most LDCs share common characteristics, given their level of development, but also differ in other aspects that were not address in BPoA. The new PoA must be designed to address the specific needs of LDCs, which could include individual circumstances, vulnerability, geographical location and initial conditions. For instance, the vulnerability of conflict countries such as Afghanistan, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and the Democratic Republic of Congo must be specifically addressed in the setting of targets, allocation of aid, and designing of national development planning.

LDCs have attempted with mixed success to mainstream BPoA into their national development strategies, but quite often, the simultaneous implementation of multiple national and international initiatives has increased inefficiencies and caused delays in the attainment of some of the key objectives of BPoA.

The critical role of agriculture in poverty reduction and food security is acknowledged and the new PoA must make it an important priority and give it the attention it deserves. Similarly, LDCs must also make manufacturing and ICT development as a key objective to complement a dynamic agricultural sector, which would increase diversification and decrease LDCs vulnerability to external shocks.

Food security in LDCs is often affected by climate change, and the two have generally had disconnected agendas in policy debates. The new PoA must recognize this by mainstreaming food security into adaptation initiatives.

Constrained by supply capacity, most LDCs have failed to benefit from regional and international preferential trade initiatives, and continue to be marginalized in global trade. Building supply capacity must therefore be addressed and integrated into the new PoA to allow LDCs to increase their share of trade and become active members of global trade.

The strong economic performance achieved by LDCs in general has not translated into proportional gains in poverty reduction as much of the growth was fuelled by commodity exports. LDCs and their development partners must address this issue and promote growth policies that are broad based, equitable, sustainable, and conducive of poverty reduction. The policies must be specific and should spell out the channels through which growth would translate into poverty reduction.

Responsible, equitable, and sustainable management of LDCs enormous wealth of natural resources could help spread prosperity to a broader range of the population, decrease inequality, and reduce poverty levels. International initiatives to promote transparency in the extraction of natural resources must therefore be strengthened, to prevent corruption and increase awareness.

Investing in all levels of education, especially in technical skills and the building up of technological capabilities, is particularly important given the currently low levels of schooling in most LDCs. Weak human resources make technology absorption difficult and slow down the technology catch-up process.

With the exception of a few countries which face intense diversification, most LDCs are well-endowed, and often hold the world's largest reserves in natural resources such as fertile and arable land for agriculture, biodiversity, natural fresh water, rainforest, renewable energy sources, gold, diamonds, bauxite, oil, natural gas, and many other minerals. Responsible and equitable management of these resources can help spread the benefits of growth and prosperity to a wider part of the population, including the poorest and most vulnerable.

The successful implementation of BPoA requires budgetary support through the availability of ODA. Donor countries must meet their commitments to allocate no less than 0.15 percent of their GNI to development aid. Beyond BPoA, ODA contributions to LDCs help them cope with the negative impact of the recent global economic downturn, which continues to affect world economies, and LDCs in particular. Donors are also encouraged to remove ODA conditionality in order to provide more flexibility to LDCs in their design of national development plans. Ultimately, the increased external resources provided by the international donors will not necessarily result in sustained progress unless development finance continues to increase, and be complemented with trade and long term development of productive capacities.

The importance of an adequate physical infrastructure has already been established, and donor countries must progressively increase the share of aid expenditure allocated to the productive sector in order to improve physical infrastructure and create conditions for long-term sustainable growth and development. LDCs, with assistance from development partners, must strengthen the ability of the private sector to participate competitively in a global economy through the necessary enabling environments and support mechanisms. Broad-based, sustainable private sector-led growth is essential to achieving faster development progress.

The Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC), and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) have helped improve the external debt position of many least developed countries. However, given their existing debt levels, debt sustainability for LDCs will continue to remain a challenge. Addressing the issue of debt sustainability must therefore be one of the key priorities of the new PoA.

Remittances have been shown to play a positive role on consumption and income, and in some cases does contribute to poverty reduction. However, channelling remittances through official saving channels is problematic and difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, governments in LDCs, with the help of development partners should seek ways to bring remittances into formal finance channels.

Given the weak and outdated nature of physical infrastructures in LDCs, there is a strong incentive to scale up investment in infrastructure, which is shown to have a higher multiplier effect in growth. Upgrading infrastructure in LDCs must be given more prominence, including support measures to mitigate the effects of rapid scaling up in infrastructure development.

The provision of fiscal space to LDCs will increase flexibility in policy design and broaden the options in terms of avenues to be used to mitigate the effects of unforeseen events. The new PoA must specifically address the issue of macroeconomic stability as a tool to mitigate the impact of external shocks and promote long term economic growth.

## SECTION IV

---

The new PoA must address the issue of environmental degradation among LDCs, who rely essentially on agriculture for employment, private income generation, and public revenue mobilization. The new PoA must address the issues of vulnerability and environmental sustainability and mainstream them into national development plans and PRSPs. All countries must work to reach an agreement on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. There must also be concerted efforts between national stakeholders and their international counterparts to promote the development of renewable energy sources and a renewed commitment to promote agriculture in order to insure food security.

The new PoA must address the issue of statistical capacity building in order to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation process of policies implemented. Furthermore, the commitments under BPoA require long period for implementation that goes beyond the programme's completion date. So, the new PoA must specify short and medium term targets against which policies can be monitored and evaluated.

Development partners must also continue to provide technical assistance to strengthen monitoring frameworks for sustainable development strategies, and coordinating a policy action matrix that they can accept as preconditions for budget support, developing and ensure a public release of a communication and engagement strategy that explains and provides for effective feedback from the private sector and civil society on key policy actions.

LDCs are in general benefiting from international and intra-regional trade opportunities by proceeding with the implementation of key regional trade agreements and, in particular, working to allow for the freer movement of goods and services. However, implemented trade policies they do not identify how strategies address the reduction of poverty. The new PoA must therefore address this issue.

### **Statistical Annex**

**Please see attachment**

- (2009). *Samoa Integrated Framework Diagnostic Trade Integration Study*. March 2009
- (2010). *Africa Regional Preparatory Meeting on the Review of the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action*. Outcome Document.  
Online: <http://pfcmmc.com/wcm/webdav/site/ldc/shared/ARR%20Final%20document.pdf>
- (2010). *Asia-Pacific Regional Review of the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010*. Dhaka Outcome Document.  
E/ESCAP/66/6, 10 March 2010
- (2010). *Government of Lesotho. Final Review of the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action (BPOA) 2001-2010*.
- (2010). *Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010*. Report of the Secretary General, A/65/80-E/2010/77, 17 May 2010
- (2010). *Keeping Promises: A Report on the Status of Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action in Bhutan for the Decade 2001-2010*
- (2010). *National Report on the Status of Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action in Mali for the Decade 2001-2010*
- (2010). *Ten Year Appraisal and Review of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010*. Report of the Secretary General. (Advance copy), A/CONF.219/XX, 24 January 2011
- The MicroDreams Foundation (2008): Annual Report 2008.  
Online: [http://www.microdreams.org/annual\\_report\\_2008.pdf](http://www.microdreams.org/annual_report_2008.pdf)
- The MicroDreams Foundation (2009): Annual Report 2009.  
Online: [http://www.microdreams.org/annual\\_report\\_2009.pdf](http://www.microdreams.org/annual_report_2009.pdf)
- Status of World Bank Project in Execution-FY06, Republic of Guinea
- Tanzania National Roads Agency (2010): Tanroads@10. 10th Anniversary Souvenir 2000-2010.  
Online: [http://tanroads.go.tz/Tanroads%20final\\_ENG.pdf](http://tanroads.go.tz/Tanroads%20final_ENG.pdf)
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2010). *Towards a New International Development Architecture for the LDCs*: New York, USA; Geneva, Switzerland: UNCTAD, 2010
- United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (2008). *Best Practices in the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010*: New York, United Nations, 2008
- United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (2011). *Compilation of National Reports for the Review of the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Decade 2001-2010 Volume I*: New York, United Nations, 2011

## REFERENCES

---

- United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (2011). *Compilation of National Reports for the Review of the Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Decade 2001-2010. Volume II*: New York, United Nations, 2011
- United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (2011). *Recueil des Rapports Nationaux sur la Mise en Œuvre du Programme d'Action de Bruxelles pour la Décennie 2001-2010. Volume III*: New York, United Nations, 2011
- United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (2011). *Recueil des Rapports Nationaux sur la Mise en Œuvre du Programme d'Action de Bruxelles pour la Décennie 2001-2010. Volume IV*: New York, United Nations, 2011
- United Republic of Tanzania (2009): Tanzania Country Report – *Implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action (LDC III) and Initiatives for LDC IV Action Plan*. President's Office, Planning Commission, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania.

TABLE ANNEX 1

**Least Developed Countries Financial Flows: Economic Growth, Gross Fixed Capital Formation and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)**

Country or Region	Real Gross Domestic Product				Foreign Direct Investment									Gross fixed capital formation as a percent of GDP (percent)
	Annual growth rate of real GDP (percent)				FDI inflows (million of current US\$)			FDI inflows, as a share of total regional or income group (percent)			FDI inflows, as a share of GDP (percent)			
	2001-2009*	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009	
Afghanistan	18.79	-3.5	3.35	22.55	0.68	300	185	0.08	6.99	8.74	0.03	2.37	1.25	24.02
Angola	11.78	3.14	14.8	-0.41				34.93	59.55	51.23	24.02	47.38	45.63	12.44
Bangladesh	5.76	5.27	6.21	5.43	354.5		716	40.43	25.28	33.82	0.79	1.38	0.82	23.99
Benin	4.07	6.25	5.03	2.7	43.86		92.55	0.72	0.63	0.37	1.76	2.62	1.41	19.69
Bhutan	8.76	6.79	6.55	6.34	0.01	29.7	36.37	0.01	0.7	1.72	0.01	2.24	2.75	52.38
Burkina Faso	5.37	7.09	4.49	3.21	6.27	137.1		0.11	0.5	0.68	0.23	1.73	2.12	18.13
Burundi	3.05	2.1	4.53	3.48	-0.01	13.6	9.9	-0.01	0.05	0.04	-0.01	1.23	0.79	10.48
Cambodia	7.93	8.15	6.03	-2.46	149.4		532.5	17.04	18.97	25.15	3.75	7.29	4.97	18.58
Central African Rep.	0.81	0.26	2.2	1.7	5.19		42.26	0.09	0.43	0.17	0.53	5.82	2.1	8.77
Chad	8.34	11.52	0.34	-1.58				7.49	0.84	1.81	26.9	2.8	6.76	30.13
Comoros	1.82	3.33	0.98	1.15	1.15	7.53	9.09	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.53	1.43	1.72	11.87
Democratic Republic of Congo	4.73	-2.11	6.2	2.84	80.3		951.4	1.31	6.21	3.73	1.53	14.87		15.52
Djibouti	3.81	1.9	5.78	4.97	3.36	234	100	0.06	0.85	0.4	0.59	23.85	9.55	19.99
Equatorial Guinea	21.46	67.8	15.2	5.33				15.32	-2.86	6.4	55.51	-4.44	13.8	39.29
Eritrea	2.01	8.76	1.03	3.61	12.1	-0.24	0.04	0.2	-0.01	0.01	1.61	-0.02	0.01	22.66
Ethiopia	8.47	8.3	11.3	9.95	349.4		93.58	5.69	0.39	0.37	4.35	0.43	0.34	22.85
Gambia	3.6	5.78	4.89	4.56	35.48	70.11	47.36	0.58	0.26	0.19	5.17	6.64	5.08	20.64
Guinea	2.49	3.77	3.96	-0.29	1.68			0.03	1.38	0.56	0.06	7.69		17.2
Guinea-Bissau	1.09	0.2	3.1	3	0.4	5.97	13.96	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.21	1.48	3.5	12.33
Haiti	0.79	-1.05	1.3	2.9	4	30	38	0.07	0.11	0.15	0.12	0.43	0.54	
Kiribati	1.03	-6.46	6.32	-0.7	15.1	1.95	2.2	36.46	0.91	0.79	37.02	2.52	2.94	
Lao People's dem. Rep.	6.99	5.74	7.5	7.59	23.9	227.7	156.7	2.73	5.3	7.41	1.43	4.28	2.78	31.78
Lesotho	3.55	3.04	3.51	1.43	28.2	55.6	48	0.46	0.2	0.19	3.97	3.45	2.94	29.98
Liberia	1.34	2.88	7.13	4.58	8.3	200	378	0.14	0.72	1.48	1.53	24.11	44.17	9.75
Madagascar	2.7	5.99	5.04	-5.03	93.06			1.52	4.24	2.13	2.06	12.65	6.42	24.36
Malawi	5.32	-4.8	7.42	7.99	60.09		60.45	0.98	0.62	0.24	2.55	4.12	1.26	19.83
Maldives	6.25	3.26	5.83	-3.03	12	12	10	1.37	0.28	0.48	1.93	0.96	0.74	33.85
Mali	5.66	11.85	4.72	4.46				1.99	0.65	0.43	4.04	2.09	1.24	23.25
Mauritania	5.93	2.19	2.23	-1.07	76.7	338.4	-38.3	1.25	1.22	-0.15	7.14	10.35		29.91
Mozambique	8.18	12.25	7	6.33	255.4	591.6		4.16	2.13	3.45	6.27	6.02	8.83	20
Myanmar	10.98	11.34	4.54	4.84	192			21.9	6.6	15.26	2.52	1.07	1.02	11.04
Nepal	3.75	0.12	5.6	4.66	20.85	1.02	38.56	2.38	0.03	1.83	0.35	0.01	0.27	20.25
Niger	4.68	7.44	5.89	-0.86	22.9			0.38	2.04	2.89	1.27	10.87	14.52	15.12
Rwanda	6.6	6.67	11.23	4.14	18.5		118.7	0.31	0.38	0.47	1.12	2.32	2.4	20.6
Samoa	2.83	8.25	-3.43	-4.93	1.2	12.96	1.36	2.9	6.03	0.49	0.51	2.43	0.26	

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Sao Tome and Principe	6.09	3.06	5.8	4	3	32.5	35.8	0.05	0.12	0.14	3.93			
Senegal	3.85	4.58	2.49	1.55				0.52	0.98	0.82	0.66	2.06	1.63	26.48
Sierra Leone	9.73		5.52	4.01	9.85	53	33.4	0.17	0.2	0.14	0.84	2.29		12.93
Solomon Islands	2.98	-7.97	6	-2.2	-9.32						-2.79			9.38
Somalia	2.74	3.5	2.6	2.6	0.04	87	108	0.01	0.32	0.43	0.01	3.28		
Sudan	8.63	6.41	7.55	4.52	574			9.35	9.34		3.66	3.71	4.62	19.54
Timor-Leste	4.95		6.8	7.4					0.89	0.87		6.65	2.73	17.5
Togo	1.7	-2.82	1.1	2.48				1.04	0.09	0.2	4.78	0.84	1.77	
Tuvalu	3.97		2	2	0.58	1.66	2.24	1.4	0.77	0.8	4.52	5.23		20.91
Uganda	7.26	6.33	9.53	7.06				2.47	2.83	3.13	2.37	4.98		
United Republic of Tanzania	6.9	6.07	7.47	5.46			645	7.61	2.44	2.53	4.4	3.19	2.8	21.23
Vanuatu	3.15	-2.73	5.7	3.3						9.75	7.67	5.91	5.01	18.95
Yemen	3.99	3.55	3.89	3.87						6.11	1.32	5.01	0.45	21.5
Zambia	5.39	4.89	6.3	6.31	71.7			1.17	3.38	3.76	1.98	6.5	7.5	21.89
Least developed countries	7.03	5.71	7.05	4.67				0.86	1.83	2.52	3.79	6.38	5.51	21.46
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	7.09	5.98	7.89	4.01				87			5.76	8.64	8.32	18.87
LDCs: Asia	6.98	5.29	5.49	6.05						7.57	1.13	2.39	1.09	34.72
LDCs: Islands	5.42	0.82	4.41	0.06				0.59	0.66	1	2.33	4.89	6.09	
Landlocked developing countries	6.42	5.64	6	4.48					81.4	78.3	4.96	6.04	5.55	
Small island developing States (UNCTAD)	3.32	1.37	2.94	-1.68							6.06	9.07	6.69	
Heavily indebted poor countries	5.8	4.72	6.11	4.6							3.21	4.78	4.32	19.77

UNCTAD, Accessed January 17th 2011. [http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx?sCS\\_referer=&sCS\\_ChosenLang=en](http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx?sCS_referer=&sCS_ChosenLang=en)

\*The averages are the author's calculations

TABLE ANNEX 2

Poverty and Hunger

	Poverty rate ests. Perc. Pop.			Food insecurity									
				Population undernourished						Refugees, internationally displaced people (000s)		Life expectancy	
	International estimate, \$PPP 1.25/day		National estimate	Percentage		Perc. Difference	Food crisis countries		Pop growth % per year	In country	Outside country	Years	Change in years
	1990/99	2000/07	1998/04	1990/92	2004/06	1990-06	*	+	2010	2008	2008	2005/10	1995-10
<b>Least Developed Countries</b>													
<b>Africa</b>													
Angola	..	54	..	66	46	-20			2.7	16	172	43	2
Benin	..	47	29	28	19	-9			3.2	7	<0.05	57	2
Burkina Faso	71	57	46	14	10	-4			3.5	1	1	52	2
Burundi	86	81	68	44	63	19			3	126	288	50	4
Central African Republic	83	62	..	47	43	-4	*		1.9	206	126	45	-1
Chad	..	62	..	59	39	-20			2.7	497	58	51	-1
Comoros	..	46	..	..	..			+	2.3	..	<0.05	65	5
Democratic Rep. of the Congo	..	59	..	29	76	47	*		2.8	1615	404	47	4
Djibouti	5	19	..	..	..			+	1.8	10	1	55	2
Equatorial Guinea	..	..	..	..	..				2.6	..	<0.05	52	3
Eritrea	..	..	..	67	68	1	*		3	5	201	58	5
Ethiopia	61	39	44	71	46	-25	*		2.6	200-300	95	53	4
Gambia	67	34	61	20	30	10		+	2.8	15	2	59	4
Guinea	93	70	..	19	17	-2	*		2.3	22	12	56	5
Guinea-Bissau	52	49	66	..	..		*		2.2	8	1	46	2
Lesotho	56	43	68	15	15	0	*		0.9	..	<0.05	43	-13
Liberia	..	84	..	..	40		*		4.6	10	78	46	4
Madagascar	73	68	71	32	37	5		+	2.7	..	<0.05	59	4
Malawi	83	74	65	45	29	-16			2.8	11	8	48	1
Mali	86	51	64	14	11	-3			2.4	11	3	55	5
Mauritania	43	21	46	10	8	-2			2.4	27	46	64	4
Mozambique	81	75	54	59	38	-21		+	2.3	8	1	42	-4
Niger	78	66	..	38	29	-9		+	4	<0.05	1	57	6
Rwanda	..	77	60	45	40	-5		+	2.8	55	79	46	10
São Tomé and Príncipe	..	34	..	..	..				1.6	..	<0.05	66	2
Senegal	54	53	..	28	26	-2		+	2.7	36	17	63	3
Sierra Leone	63	..	70	45	47	2			2.6	8	35	43	3
Somalia	..	..	..	..	..		*		2.2	1288	582	48	4
Sudan	..	..	..	..	21				2.3	4776a	437	59	3
Togo	..	39	..	45	37	-8		+	2.5	10	18	58	0
Uganda	64	52	38	19	15	-4			3.3	1024	11	52	7
United Republic of Tanzania	73	89	36	28	35	7		+	2.9	322	4	53	4
Zambia	65	64	68	40	45	5		+	2.5	84	1	42	2
<b>Asia</b>													
0													
Afghanistan	..	..	..	..	..				3.5	231	2856	44	2
Bangladesh	59	50	50	36	27	-9			1.4	28	17	64	5
Bhutan	..	26	..	..	..				1.6	..	106	66	7
Cambodia	49	40	35	38	26	-12			1.7	0	17	60	3

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Lao People's Democratic Rep.	49	44	33	27	19	-8		1.9	..	9	64	5
Maldives	..	..	..	..	..			1.4	..	<0.05	69	5
Myanmar	..	..	..	44	19	-25		0.9	791	207	62	2
Nepal	68	55	31	21	15	-6		1.8	926	6	64	4
Timor-Leste	..	53	..	..	..		*	3.2	16	<0.05	61	6
Yemen	5	18	42	30	32	2	+	2.9	241	2	63	5
<b>Pacific</b>												
Kiribati	..	..	..	..	..			1.6	..	<0.05	..	..
Samoa	..	..	..	..	..			0	..	<0.05	72	3
Solomon Islands	..	..	..	..	..		+	2.5	..	<0.05	64	3
Tuvalu	..	..	..	..	..			0.4	..	<0.05	..	..
Vanuatu	..	..	..	..	..			2.6	<0.05	..	..	..
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>												
Haiti	..	55	..	63	58	-5	*	1.6	36	36	61	4

Sources: World Bank, World Development Indicators 10 (Washington, D.C.), table 2.6, and PovcalNet, <http://go.worldbank.org/NT2A1XUWPO>, update in progress; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2009—Economic crises—impacts and lessons learned (Rome, 2009), United Nations Population Division, World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision, Data online, <http://www.un.org/esa/population/unpop.htm> (accessed 15 March 2010), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Statistical Yearbook 2007, tables 1 and 2, and additional analysis provided by the UNHCR Field Information and Coordination Support Section.

\*"Food crisis" countries requiring external assistance (FAO, The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2008, p.21).

+Countries severely affected by high commodity prices and at high risk of food crisis (FAO, 2008, p.21)

a United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs estimate.

### TABLE ANNEX 3

#### Least Developed Countries Total Remittance Inflows, per capita GDP, and population growth

Country or Region	Workers remittances						Income per Capita				Population			
	Total remittance inflows (million of current US\$)			Remittance inflows, as a share of total LDCs remittances (percent)			Annual average growth rate of GDP per capita (percent)				Population Growth (percent)			
	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009	2001	2008	2009	2001-	2001	2008	2009	2001-2009*
Afghanistan							-6.4	-0.1	18.4	14.7	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.6
Angola	5	8	6	0.08	0.04	0.03	0.2	11.8	-3	8.6	3	2.7	2.6	2.9
Bangladesh	2104.55			31.87	39.22	43.14	3.4	4.7	4	4.1	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.6
Benin	83.6	271		1.27	1.19	1.1	2.9	1.8	-0.4	0.7	3	1.6	1.5	2.4
Bhutan							3.6	4.9	4.7	6.2	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.4
Burkina Faso	49.92	50	49.07	0.76	0.22	0.21	3.8	1	-0.2	1.9	2	3	2.8	2.8
Burundi		3.65	3.82		0.02	0.02	0.1	1.5	0.6	0.2	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7
Cambodia	132.5	325.22		2.01	1.43	1.35	6.2	4.3	-4.1	6.2	2	1.9	1.9	
Central African Rep.							-1.7	0.3	-0.2	-1	3.6	2.7	2.7	
Chad							7.6	-2.3	-4.1	4.9	2.2	2.3	2.3	
Comoros	12	12	12	0.19	0.06	0.05	1.1	-1.3	-1.1	-0.5	2.9	2.8	2.7	
Democratic Republic of Congo							-4.8	3.3	0.1	1.7	2.4	1.8	1.8	
Djibouti	11.95	30.33	30.33	0.19	0.14	0.13	-0.5	3.9	3.2	1.9	3	2.6	2.6	2.8
Equatorial Guinea							63	12.2	2.7	18.2	4	3	3	3.7
Eritrea							4.6	-2	0.6	-1.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6
Ethiopia	18.31	386.7		0.28	1.7	1.24	5.5	8.5	7.1	5.7	3.4	2.8	2.7	3

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Gambia	7	66.82	64.84	0.11	0.3	0.27	2.3	2.1	1.8	0.5	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.1
Guinea	8.72	71.79	70.91	0.14	0.32	0.3	1.8	1.7	-2.6	0.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.4
Guinea-Bissau	10.03	30	29.92	0.16	0.14	0.13	-2.2	0.8	0.7	-1.3	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.7
Haiti	623.58			9.45	6.01	5.64	-2.8	-0.3	1.3	-0.9	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.7
Kiribati	7	9	8.72	0.11	0.04	0.04	-8.1	4.7	-2.2	-0.7	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8
Lao People's dem. Rep.	0.69	1	0.95	0.02	0.01	0.01	3.8	5.5	5.6	5.1	1.4	0.9	0.9	1
Lesotho	209.43	438.55		3.18	1.93	2.02	1.6	2.6	0.6	2.5	4.7	4.6	4.3	3.8
Liberia		58.12	55.15		0.26	0.23	-1.8	2.4	0.3	-2.4	3	2.7	2.7	2.8
Madagascar	10.87	11	10.92	0.17	0.05	0.05	2.9	2.3	-7.5	-0.1	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.9
Malawi	0.75	1	1	0.02	0.01	0.01	-7.6	4.5	5	2.4	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4
Maldives	1.82	3.13	3.11	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.7	4.3	-4.4	4.7	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.4
Mali	88.17	430.98	338.6	1.34	1.9	1.39	9.4	2.3	2	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.4	2.6
Mauritania	2	2	1.97	0.04	0.01	0.01	-0.6	-0.2	-3.3	3.2	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.5
Mozambique	41.82	115.74		0.64	0.51	0.46	9.3	4.5	4	5.5	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8
Myanmar	117.28	150		1.78	0.66	0.61	10.4	3.6	3.9	10.1	2.3	1.8	1.8	2
Nepal	146.99			2.23	11.97	12.24	-2.1	3.7	2.8	1.7	3.4	4	4	3.7
Niger	21.97	79.35	79.24	0.34	0.35	0.33	3.9	1.8	-4.7	1	4.4	2.8	2.8	2.6
Rwanda	7.85	67.8	92.62	0.12	0.3	0.38	2.1	8.2	1.3	3.9	0.5	0	0	0.1
Samoa	45	135		0.69	0.6	0.54	7.7	-3.4	-4.9	2.7	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.7
Sao Tome and Principe	0.55	3	3	0.01	0.02	0.02	1.3	4.1	2.4	4.3	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7
Senegal	304.68	1288		4.62	5.65	5.23	1.9	-0.2	-1.1	1.2	3.3	2.6	2.5	3.4
Sierra Leone	6.57	27.52	46.71	0.1	0.13	0.2	14.4	2.9	1.5	6.1	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.6
Solomon Islands	4.53	20.43	20.03	0.07	0.09	0.09	-10.4	3.4	-4.5	0.4	2.7	2.2	2.3	2.4
Somalia							0.8	0.4	0.3	0.4	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.1
Sudan	739.6			11.2	13.6	12.54	4.1	5.2	2.2	6.3		3.2	3.2	3.8
Timor-Leste								3.5	4.1	1.1	3	2.5	2.5	2.6
Togo	68.5	337.06		1.04	1.48	1.14	-5.6	-1.4	0	-0.9	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4
Tuvalu							12.6	1.6	1.6	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Uganda	348.58	723.52		5.28	3.18	2.85	3	6	3.6	3.8	2.6	2.9	3	2.8
United Republic of Tanzania	15.25	18.64	18.23	0.24	0.09	0.08	3.4	4.4	2.4	4	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.6
Vanuatu	52.7	7	6.9	0.8	0.04	0.03	-5	3.1	0.7	0.5	3	2.9	2.9	2.9
Yemen	1294.61	1410.5		19.61	6.19	5.76	0.6	1	0.9	1	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4
Zambia		68.2	67.57		0.3	0.28	2.4	3.7	3.7	2.9	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.4
Least developed countries	6604.37	22800					3.2	4.6	2.3	4.5	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	2684.15			40.65	39.72	36.16	3.1	5	1.3	4.2	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.8
LDCs: Asia	3796.62			57.49	59.45	63.09	3.4	3.7	4.3	5.1	2	2.4	2.4	7.7
LDCs: Islands	123.6	189.56		1.88	0.84	0.76	-1.2	2	-2.3	-1.1	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2
Landlocked developing countries	2093.19			31.7	70.2	55.77	3.4	3.6	2.1	4.1	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.3
Small island developing States (UNCTAD)	1929.16			29.22	15.68	13.36	-0.2	1.3	-3.2	1	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7
Heavily indebted poor countries	3791.81			57.42	67.72	58.82	2	3.4	1.9	3				

UNCTAD, Accessed January 17th 2011. [http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx?sCS\\_referer=&sCS\\_ChosenLang=en](http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx?sCS_referer=&sCS_ChosenLang=en)

\*The averages are the author's calculations

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

### TABLE ANNEX 4

#### Primary Education and gender equality in education

	Net enrolment ratio in primary Education (percent)		Ratio of girls to boys enrolment in primary education		Ratio of girls to boys enrolment in secondary education		Ratio of girls to boy enrolment in tertiary education	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008
<b>Least developed countries</b>								
<b>Africa</b>								
Angola	..	..	..	0.8	0.8	..	..	..
Benin	..	93	0.7	0.9	0.5	..	0.3	..
Burkina Faso	36	61	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.5
Burundi	43	99	0.8	1	..	0.7	0.4	..
Central African Republic	..	66	..	0.7	..	0.6	0.2	0.3
Chad	54	..	0.6	0.7	0.3	..	0.2	0.1
Comoros	73	..	0.9	0.9	0.8	..	0.7	..
Democratic Rep. of the Congo	..	..	..	0.8	..	0.6	..	..
Djibouti	27	48	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.9	..
Equatorial Guinea	69	..	1	..	0.6	..	0.4	..
Eritrea	38	40	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.2	..
Ethiopia	41	79	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.3
Gambia	73	72	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.3	..
Guinea	47	72	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.6	..	0.3
Guinea Bissau	52	..	0.7	..	0.5	..	0.2	..
Lesotho	78	..	1	..	1.3	..	1.5	..
Liberia	75	..	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7	..
Madagascar	68	..	1	1	..	0.9	0.9	0.9
Malawi	..	91	1	1	0.8	0.8	0.4	..
Mali	..	75	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5
Mauritania	63	77	1	1.1	0.8	..	..	..
Mozambique	56	80	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.7	..	..
Niger	27	50	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6	..	0.3
Rwanda	..	96	1	1	0.9	0.9	0.5	..
São Tomé and Príncipe	..	100	..	1	..	1.1	..	..
Senegal	58	75	0.9	1	0.7	0.8	..	0.5
Sierra Leone	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Somalia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sudan	42	..	0.9	0.9	..	0.9	0.9	..
Togo	82	79	0.8	..	0.4	..	..	..
Uganda	..	97	0.9	1	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.8
United Republic of Tanzania	53	100	1	1	..	..	..	..
Zambia	69	97	0.9	1	0.8	0.8	0.5	..
<b>Asia</b>								
Afghanistan	..	..	..	0.7	..	..	..	..
Bangladesh	..	85	..	1.1	1	..	0.5	..
Bhutan	59	84	0.9	1	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.6

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Cambodia	88	89	0.9	0.9	0.5	..	0.3	0.5
Laos People's Democratic Rep.	79	82	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.8
Maldives	99	96	1	0.9	1.1	..	a	..
Myanmar	..	..	1	1	1.1	..	..	..
Nepal	74	..	0.8	..	0.7	..	0.4	..
Timor-Leste	..	77	..	0.9	..	..	..	..
Yemen	59	73	0.6	0.8	0.4	..	0.3	..
Pacific								
Kiribati	..	..	1	..	1.6	..	..	..
Samoa	92	..	1	..	1.1	..	..	..
Solomon Islands	..	..	0.9	..	0.8	..	..	..
Tuvalu	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..
Vanuatu	95	..	1	..	1.1	..	..	..

### Latin America and the Caribbean

Haiti	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Source: World Bank Development Indicators (WDI)

## TABLE ANNEX 5

### Adult Literacy

Least Developed Countries	Adult Literacy (aged 15+) (percentage literate)						Change in gender difference, perc. Pts 1995/04-2005/08	Change in adulte literacy, perc. Pts 1995/04-2005/08
	1995/04			2005/08				
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total		
<b>Africa</b>								
Angola	54	83	67	52	83	70	-3	3
Benin	23	48	35	28	53	41	1	6
Burkina Faso	15	29	22	22	37	29	1	7
Burundi	52	67	59	60	72	66	-3	7
Central African Republic	33	65	49	41	67	55	-6	6
Chad	18	39	28	22	44	33	-1	5
Comoros	67	78	72	70	80	75	-1	3
Democratic Republic of Congo	54	81	67	56	78	67	-5	0
Djibouti	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Equatorial Guinea	80	93	87	89	97	93	-5	6
Eritrea	40	65	53	55	77	65	-3	12
Ethiopia	23	50	36	23	50	36	0	0
Gambia	..	..	..	34	57	45	..	..
Guinea	18	43	29	26	50	38	-1	9
Guinea Bissau	..	..	..	37	66	51	..	..
Lesotho	90	74	82	95	83	90	-4	8
Liberia	46	58	52	53	63	58	-3	6

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Madagascar	65	77	71	..	..	..	..	..
Malawi	54	75	64	65	77	71	-9	7
Mali	16	33	24	18	35	26	0	2
Mauritania	43	60	51	50	64	57	-2	6
Mozambique	25	55	39	40	70	54	0	15
Niger	9	9	9	15	43	29	28	19
Rwanda	60	71	65	56	75	70	8	5
São Tomé and Príncipe	78	92	85	83	93	88	-4	3
Senegal	29	51	39	33	52	42	-3	3
Sierra Leone	24	47	35	29	52	40	1	5
Somalia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sudan	52	71	61	60	79	69	0	8
Togo	38	69	53	54	77	65	-8	12
Uganda	59	78	68	67	82	75	-5	7
United Republic of Tanzania	62	78	69	66	79	73	-2	4
Zambia	62	81	69	61	81	71	1	1
<b>Asia</b>								
Afghanistan	13	43	28	..	..	..	..	..
Bangladesh	41	54	47	50	60	55	-3	8
Bhutan	..	..	..	39	65	53	..	..
Cambodia	64	85	74	71	85	78	-7	4
Lao People's Democratic	61	77	69	63	82	73	3	4
Maldives	96	96	96	98	98	98	0	2
Myanmar	86	94	90	89	95	92	-2	2
Nepal	35	63	49	44	70	57	-1	8
Timor-Leste	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Yemen	35	73	54	43	79	61	-3	7
<b>Pacific</b>								
Kiribati	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Samoa	98	99	99	98	99	99	0	0
Solomon Islands	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Tuvalu	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Vanuatu	73	78	75	80	83	81	-1	6
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>								
Haiti	53	57	55	64	60	62	-7	7

Sources: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, EFA-Global Monitoring Report 2010-Reaching the marginalized (Paris, 2010), tables 5, 8, 9A and 12, and updated data provided 17 March 2010 by UNESCO Institute for Statistics (Montreal).

TABLE ANNEX 6

## Infant and Child Health

Africa	Under-5 mortality rate per 1000				Infant mortality rate per 1000				1-yr old children immunized (%)		Children <6 months exclusively breastfed (%)	Moderately/severely under-weight children < five (%)
	1990	2000	2008	1990-2008	1990	2000	2008	1990-2008	Measles	DTP3		
									2008	2008	2003/08	2003/08
Angola	260	239	220	-40	154	141	130	-24	79	81	11	16
Benin	184	144	121	-63	111	89	76	-35	61	67	43	23
Burkina Faso	201	188	169	-32	110	102	92	-18	75	79	7	32
Burundi	189	178	168	-21	113	107	102	-11	84	92	45	39
Central African Republic	178	181	173	-5	116	119	115	-1	62	54	23	29
Chad	201	205	209	8	120	122	124	4	23	20	2	37
Comoros	128	114	105	-23	90	81	75	-15	76	81	21	25
Democratic Republic of Congo	199	199	199	0	126	126	126	0	67	69	36	14
Djibouti	123	106	95	-28	95	84	76	-19	73	89	1	33
Equatorial Guinea	198	168	148	-50	120	102	90	-30	51	33	24	19
Eritrea	150	89	58	-92	92	58	41	-51	95	97	52	40
Ethiopia	210	148	109	-101	124	91	69	-55	74	81	49	38
Gambia	153	131	106	-47	104	93	80	-24	91	96	41	20
Guinea	231	185	146	-85	137	111	90	-47	64	66	48	
Guinea Bissau	240	218	195	-45	142	129	117	-25	76	63	16	19
Lesotho	101	109	79	-22	80	83	63	-17	85	83	36	20
Liberia	219	174	145	-74	146	118	100	-46	64	64	29	24
Madagascar	167	132	106	-61	101	83	68	-33	81	82	67	42
Malawi	225	162	100	-125	133	100	65	-68	88	91	57	21
Mali	250	217	194	-56	139	120	103	-36	68	68	38	32
Mauritania	129	122	118	-11	81	77	75	-6	65	74	16	31
Mozambique	249	183	130	-119	166	124	90	-76	77	72	37	18
Niger	305	227	167	-138	144	107	79	-65	80	66	4	43
Rwanda	174	186	112	-62	106	112	72	-34	92	97	88	23
São Tomé and Príncipe	101	99	98	-3	65	64	64	-1	93	99	60	9
Senegal	149	131	108	-41	72	66	57	-15	77	88	34	17
Sierra Leone	278	252	194	-84	163	151	123	-40	60	60	11	30
Somalia	200	200	200	0	119	119	119	0	24	31	9	36
Sudan	124	115	109	-15	78	73	70	-8	79	86	34	31
Togo	150	122	98	-52	89	76	64	-25	77	89	48	21
Uganda	186	158	135	-51	114	98	85	-29	68	64	60	20
United Republic of Tanzania	157	139	104	-53	97	87	67	-30	88	84	41	22
Zambia	172	169	148	-24	105	104	92	-13	85	80	61	19

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

<b>Asia</b>												
Afghanistan	260	257	257	-3	168	165	165	-3	75	85	..	39
Bangladesh	149	91	54	-95	103	67	43	-60	89	95	43	46
Bhutan	148	106	81	-67	91	68	54	-37	99	96	..	19
Cambodia	117	106	90	-27	85	80	69	-16	89	91	60	36
Lao People's Democratic Rep.	157	86	61	-96	108	64	48	-60	52	61	26	37
Maldives	111	55	28	-83	79	43	24	-55	97	98	10	30
Myanmar	120	107	98	-22	85	77	71	-14	82	85	15	32
Nepal	142	85	51	-91	99	63	41	-58	79	82	53	45
Timor-Leste	184	129	93	-91	138	100	75	-63	73	79	31	49
Yemen	127	98	69	-58	90	71	53	-37	62	69	12	46
<b>Pacific</b>												
Kiribati	89	63	48	-41	65	49	38	-27	72	82	80	13
Samoa	50	34	26	-24	40	28	22	-18	45	46	..	..
Solomon Islands	38	37	36	-2	31	30	30	-1	60	78	74	21
Tuvalu	53	42	36	-17	42	35	30	-12	93	99	35	..
Vanuatu	27	29	33	6	23	25	27	4	65	76	40	..
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>												
Haiti	151	109	72	-79	105	78	54	-51	58	53	41	22
Least developed countries	179	150	129	-50	113	95	82	-31	76	78	39	33

Sources: United Nations Children's Fund, State of the World's Children 2010: Special Edition, Statistical Tables (New York), tables 1-3.

## TABLE ANNEX 7

### Maternal Mortality and HIV/AIDS Prevalence

<b>Africa</b>	<b>Maternal mortality ratio (modeled estimate, per 100,000 live births)</b>			<b>Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49)</b>		
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>Change 2000/2008</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>Change 2000/2007</b>
Angola	880	610	-30.7	1.5	2.1	40
Benin	560	410	-26.8	1.3	1.2	-7.7
Burkina Faso	650	560	-13.9	2.1	1.6	-23.9
Burundi	1200	970	-19.2	3.8	2	-47.4
Central African Republic	900	850	-5.6	6.4	6.3	-1.6
Chad	1300	1200	-7.7	3.3	3.5	6.1
Comoros	390	340	-12.9	0.1	0.1	0
Congo, Dem. Rep.	850	670	-21.2			
Djibouti	330	300	-9.1	3	3.1	3.4
Equatorial Guinea	480	280	-41.7	3.6	3.4	-5.6
Eritrea	420	280	-33.4	1.2	1.3	8.4
Ethiopia	750	470	-37.4	2.4	2.1	-12.5

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Gambia	560	400	-28.6	0.8	0.9	12.5
Guinea	920	680	-26.1	1.1	1.6	45.5
Guinea-Bissau	1100	1000	-9.1	1.7	1.8	5.9
Lesotho	470	530	12.8	23.9	23.2	-3
Liberia	1100	990	-10	1.4	1.7	21.5
Madagascar	580	440	-24.2	0.1	0.1	0
Malawi	770	510	-33.8	13.5	11.9	-11.9
Mali	980	830	-15.4	1.4	1.5	7.2
Mauritania	640	550	-14.1	0.6	0.8	33.4
Mozambique	780	550	-29.5	9.5	12.5	31.6
Niger	1100	820	-25.5	0.7	0.8	14.3
Rwanda	1100	540	-51	4.7	2.8	-40.5
Sao Tome and Principe						
Senegal	560	410	-26.8	0.4	1	150
Sierra Leone	1300	970	-25.4	1.2	1.7	41.7
Somalia	1200	1200	0	0.4	0.5	25
Sudan	770	750	-2.6	1.4	1.4	0
Tanzania	920	790	-14.2	7.1	6.2	-12.7
Togo	450	350	-22.3	3.6	3.3	-8.4
Uganda	640	430	-32.9	8.5	5.4	-36.5
Zambia	600	470	-21.7	15.5	15.2	-2
<b>Asia</b>						
Afghanistan	1800	1400	-22.3			
Bangladesh	500	340	-32			
Bhutan	420	200	-52.4		0.1	
Cambodia	470	290	-38.3	1.6	0.8	-50
Lao PDR	790	580	-26.6	0.1	0.2	100
Maldives	110	37	-66.4			
Myanmar	290	240	-17.3	0.9	0.7	-22.3
Nepal	550	380	-31	0.5	0.5	
Timor-Leste	520	370	-28.9			
Yemen	340	210	-38.3			
<b>Pacific</b>						
Kiribati						
Samoa						
Solomon Islands	110	100	-9.1			
Tuvalu						
Vanuatu						
<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>						
Haiti	450	300	-33.4	2.2	2.2	0
Sub-Saharan Africa (developing only)	800	650	-18.8	5.6	5	-10.3
East Asia & Pacific (developing only)	130	88.73	-31.8	0.3	0.3	-1.5
Heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC)	810	640	-21	3.7	3.3	-11.3
Least developed countries	750	590	-21.4	3.2	2.2	-31.1

Source: World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI)

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

### TABLE ANNEX 8

#### Malaria and Tuberculosis Prevalence, Mortality, Prevention and Treatment

	Malaria							Tuberculosis									
	High burden country	Estimated cases per 1,000 pop.	Estimated death per 100,000 pop.	Children under 5 years				High burden country	Estimated cases per 100,000 pop.				Stop TB Strategy				
				Use of treated bed nets (%)		With fever using anti-malarial drugs (%)			2009	2000	2007	2000	2007	Case detection rate (%)		Treatment success (%)	
				2000/04	2005/08		2005/08							2000	2007	2000	2008
Least Developed Countries	2009	2006	2006	2000/04	2005/08		2005/08	2009	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2008	2000	2007	
<b>Africa</b>																	
Angola	x	215	128	..	18	..	29		530	294	57	22		80		18	
Benin		370	146	7	20	60	54		128	135	12	12		..		..	
Burkina Faso	x	434	178	2	10	50	48		338	403	34	41		11		73	
Burundi		278	94	1	8	31	30		455	647	46	68		20		83	
Central African Republic		369	100	2	15	69	57		485	425	47	38					
Chad	x	399	173	1	..	32	..		420	497	43	51		18		54	
Comoros		251	36	9	..	63	..		112	83	8	6		..		..	
Democratic Republic of Congo	x	389	158	1	6	52	30	x	592	659	65	77	35	43	78	87	
Djibouti		47	14		1		10		761	1104	70	91		45		78	
Equatorial Guinea		390	220	1	..	49	..		274	469	22	48		..		..	
Eritrea		4	2	4	..	4	..		114	134	12	13		76		90	
Ethiopia	x	153	51	2	33	3	10	x	486	564	53	64	42	47	80	84	
Gambia		282	106	15	49	55	63		491	404	53	43		42		58	
Guinea		410	164	1	44				332	448	35	46		34		75	
Guinea Bissau		367	180	7	39	58	46		273	319	30	30		..		..	
Lesotho		..	..	..	..	..	..		356	568	16	37		17		66	
Liberia		408	171	..	..	..	59		435	398	46	41		..		..	
Madagascar	x	34	12	0	..	..	34		359	417	39	45		42		78	
Malawi	x	334	95	3	25	27	25		362	305	23	21		49		78	
Mali	x	361	201	..	27	..	32		571	599	61	63		13		76	
Mauritania		184	85	..	..	33	21		619	559	67	60		28		41	
Mozambique	x	354	92	..	23	15	37	x	499	470	47	36	31	42	75	79	
Niger	x	419	229	1	7	48	33		278	292	30	31		35		77	
Rwanda		344	59	5	56	13	6		442	590	39	57		19		86	
São Tomé and Príncipe		67	19	23	42	61	25		272	240	30	26		..		..	
Senegal	x	121	80	2	29	36	9		420	468	45	49		29		76	
Sierra Leone		396	154	2	26	61	52		675	941	71	98		27		87	
Somalia		72	41	..	11	..	8		414	352	67	55		49		89	
Sudan	x	133	85	..	28	..	54		375	402	53	59		29		82	
Togo		325	113	..	38	60	48		656	750	66	76		8		67	
Uganda	x	355	145	..	10	..	61	x	364	343	30	27	37	43	63	75	
United Republic of Tanzania	x	292	98	..	26	58	57	x	391	129	34	13	67	75	78	88	
Zambia	x	313	121	7	41	52	43		658	387	47	25		74		85	

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

### Asia

Afghanistan		22	0	..	..	..	..	x	346	271	41	34	18	55	88	87
Bangladesh	x	19	4	..	..	..	..	x	500	412	58	50	24	42	81	92
Bhutan		24	3	..	..	..	..		515	363	60	43		59		89
Cambodia	x	18	4	..	4	..	..	x	758	680	83	79	28	55	91	94
Lao People's Democratic Republic		4	1	18	41	9	8		344	289	27	22		43		92
Maldives		..	..	..	..	..	..		96	48	7	4		88		91
Myanmar	x	87	19	..	..	..	..	x	267	466	32	60	16	62	82	89
Nepal		1	0	..	..	..	..		312	240	28	22		63		88
Timor-Leste		475	93	8	..	47	..		644	378	70	47		87		79
Yemen		12	4	..	..	..	..		164	130	12	10		30		83

### Pacific

Kiribati		..	..	..	..	..	..		546	423	62	49		95		90
Samoa		..	..	..	..	..	..		27	25	3	3		..		..
Solomon Islands		218	30	..	..	..	..		300	180	33	21		61		90
Tuvalu		..	..	..	..	..	..		422	203	40	17		97		75
Vanuatu		134	14	..	..	..	..		143	102	16	12		70		90

### Latin America and the Caribbean

Haiti		17	8	..	..	12	..		403	366	53	47		45		82
-------	--	----	---	----	----	----	----	--	-----	-----	----	----	--	----	--	----

Sources: World Health Organization, World Malaria Report 2008 (Geneva, 2009), <http://www.who.int/hiv/pub/epidemiology/pubfacts/en/>, and Global Tuberculosis Control 2009: epidemiology; strategy; financing (Geneva, 2009), table 3. United Nations Children's Fund, The State of the World's Children 2010: Special Edition, Statistical Tables, table 3 (United Nations, 2010).

\*Data for malaria and TB high-burden countries are shown in bold type.

## TABLE ANNEX 9

### Water and Sanitation

Least Developed Countries	Drinking water coverage (%)				Sanitation coverage (%)				Population growth percent per year 2005-2010	
	Urban		Rural		Urban		Rural			
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008	Urban	Rural
<b>Africa</b>										
Angola	43	60	40	38	70	86	11	18	4.3	0.6
Benin	78	84	59	69	19	24	3	4	4.1	2.5
Burkina Faso	85	95	55	72	31	33	4	6	6.9	2.3
Burundi	89	83	70	71	46	49	45	46	5.8	2.5
Central African Republic	85	92	49	51	32	43	16	28	2.3	1.6
Chad	60	67	41	44	22	23	3	4	4.6	2.1
Comoros	93	91	92	97	42	50	23	30	2.5	2.2
Democratic Republic of Congo	85	80	27	28	23	23	13	23	4.6	1.8
Djibouti	88	98	61	52	69	63	30	10	1.8	1.6
Equatorial Guinea	45	..	42	..	60	..	46	..	3	2.3
Eritrea	70	74	50	57	54	52	2	4	5.2	2.6
Ethiopia	88	98	18	26	26	29	5	8	3.5	2.4
Gambia	91	96	77	86	65	68	61	65	4.3	0.8

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Guinea	88	89	51	61	27	34	9	11	3.6	1.5
Guinea-Bissau	79	83	45	51	43	49	7	9	2.5	2.1
Lesotho	92	97	69	81	35	40	28	25	3.8	-0.1
Liberia	82	79	44	51	23	25	4	4	4.9	4
Madagascar	73	71	24	29	15	15	8	10	3.8	2.2
Malawi	93	95	58	77	51	51	50	57	5.4	2.2
Mali	69	81	34	44	41	45	28	32	4.7	1.2
Mauritania	45	52	37	47	38	50	9	9	2.9	2
Mozambique	75	77	27	29	37	38	4	4	4.5	1.1
Niger	78	96	35	39	27	34	3	4	4.4	3.7
Rwanda	85	77	64	62	43	50	40	55	4.1	2.3
São Tomé and Príncipe	86	89	70	88	27	30	15	19	3	-0.5
Senegal	90	92	48	52	66	69	31	38	3.2	2.2
Sierra Leone	75	86	44	26	21	24	5	6	3.5	2.2
Somalia	36	67	17	9	45	52	10	6	3.5	1.6
Sudan	73	64	55	52	58	55	20	18	4.1	1
Togo	83	87	39	41	24	24	5	3	4.1	1.3
Uganda	85	91	53	64	37	38	45	49	4.4	3.1
United Republic of Tanzania	86	80	45	45	29	32	22	21	4.6	2.3
Zambia	88	87	36	46	60	59	40	43	2.8	2.2
Subtotal Africa	77	80	38	43	38	41	17	21	..	..
<b>Asia</b>										
Afghanistan	36	78	17	39	46	60	28	30	4.6	3.1
Bangladesh	86	85	77	78	57	56	43	52	3.2	0.8
Bhutan	99	99	88	88	87	87	54	54	4	0.6
Cambodia	64	81	42	56	50	67	10	18	3	1.3
Lao People's Democratic Republic	77	72	40	51	62	86	16	38	5.6	0.1
Maldives	100	99	87	86	100	100	74	96	4.9	-0.6
Myanmar	80	75	60	69	81	86	59	79	2.9	-0.1
Nepal	94	93	81	87	47	51	19	27	5	1.2
Timor-Leste	69	86	47	63	55	76	25	40	4.8	2.8
Yemen	82	72	59	57	81	94	21	33	4.8	2
Subtotal Asia	80	82	66	71	63	66	38	48	..	..
<b>Pacific</b>										
Kiribati	77	..	50	..	47	..	22	..	1.7	1.5
Samoa	92	..	88	..	100	100	100	100	-1	0.2
Solomon Isla	94	..	65	..	98	98	18	..	4.2	2.1
Tuvalu	95	98	93	97	87	88	79	81	1.4	-0.5
Vanuatu	93	96	66	79	57	66	36	48	4.3	2
Subtotal Pacific	90	..	69	..	79	88	39	..	..	..
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>										
Haiti	67	71	49	55	34	24	15	10	4.9	-1.5
Total Least Developed Countries	78	80	50	54	47	50	26	31	4	1.6

Source: World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund, Progress on Sanitation and Drinking-Water-2010 Update (Geneva and New York, 2010); United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects; The 2009 Revision (<http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/index.htm>, accessed 5 April 2010).

TABLE ANNEX 10

Official Development Assistance (ODA) Flows to Least Developed Countries

Country or Region	Total official development assistance, net ( US Dollars at current prices and current exchange rates in millions )								
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Afghanistan	135.97	404.64	1300.49	1590.7	2170.4	2736.28	2955.78	3964.59	4865.08
Angola	302.21	282.72	414.03	493.71	1144.42	414.56	163.51	246.22	368.81
Bangladesh	1171.73	1043.72	914.58	1392.15	1413.78	1319.83	1219.84	1514.6	2061.4
Benin	240.79	277.76	219.04	299.72	393.67	346.87	373.85	474.47	640.83
Bhutan	53.09	60.48	73.58	77.34	77.97	90.04	101.53	89.82	86.52
Burkina Faso	337.81	412.14	479.82	525.6	641.27	693.81	869.17	951.48	997.94
Burundi	93.12	139.12	171.99	227.76	364.03	363.46	410.21	473.14	508.5
Cambodia	395.72	420.88	485.24	518.3	485.34	538.85	529.34	674.53	742.81
Central African Republic	75.28	76.39	60.24	51.22	109.75	88.52	133.56	176.82	256.43
Chad	130.15	182.82	231.38	252.35	336.75	380.01	281.57	353.57	416.22
Comoros	18.71	27.56	32.4	24.48	26.19	22.77	30.64	44.49	37.25
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	177.12	243.11	1174.93	5416.9	1825.69	1774.38	2043.35	1241.36	1609.75
Djibouti	71.36	56.36	77.67	79.18	64.12	74.01	114.95	112.42	120.87
Equatorial Guinea	21.29	13.24	20.15	20.93	29.16	38.13	26.21	31.36	37.63
Eritrea	175.78	280.58	230.17	316.56	264.85	349.21	125.79	157.05	143.13
Ethiopia	686.05	1095.72	1302.62	1605.21	1808.76	1909.93	1941.4	2562.94	3327.46
Gambia	49.64	52.18	62.02	62.91	55.26	60.37	73.16	73.17	93.84
Guinea	152.85	279.94	249.86	246.22	278.49	198.14	155.19	228.07	318.98
Guinea-Bissau	80.29	59.96	59.53	150.38	76.38	66.03	80.84	122.32	131.62
Haiti	208.15	170.7	155.64	212.77	258.92	443.5	580.46	701.58	911.81
Kiribati	17.87	12.43	20.88	18.97	16.71	27.99	26.86	26.96	26.9
Lao People's dem. Rep.	280.64	244.85	278.48	301.06	269.91	301.93	363.72	396.13	495.6
Lesotho	36.67	55.12	76.79	78.87	98.03	67.48	70.62	128.79	143.4
Liberia	67.42	38.48	52.03	106.93	213.24	222.44	260.4	698.4	1250.36
Madagascar	320.19	364.9	369.01	542.41	1262.75	912.91	747.91	894.53	841.42
Malawi	446.1	405.96	376.37	515.42	503.47	573.38	682.11	742.08	912.66
Maldives	19.15	24.77	27.46	23.24	28.22	75.82	37.52	37.37	54.26
Mali	359.45	357.74	480.31	559.12	587.85	703.8	824.02	1020.28	963.8
Mauritania	216.36	272.54	355.19	249.3	188.57	182.3	199.24	341.89	310.68
Mozambique	902.81	961.78	2219.84	1047.87	1242.7	1296.96	1601.04	1778.03	1993.78
Myanmar	105.64	125.65	119.03	125.02	123.45	144.83	145.71	197.73	533.5
Nepal	387.23	393.09	361.52	466.58	425.09	424.13	510.59	602.1	716.31
Niger	208.44	253.48	303.26	461.2	547.16	519.96	518.47	541.83	605.37
Rwanda	321.45	304.79	362.82	335.13	489.59	577.03	580.59	722.29	930.6
Samoa	27.14	42.83	37.87	32.97	30.93	43.55	47.08	37.47	39.45
Sao Tome and Principe	34.89	38.54	25.92	37.98	33.62	32.45	21.53	35.98	47.03

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Senegal	424.3	424.82	448.38	453.53	1056.61	683.7	823.43	872.25	1057.72
Sierra Leone	180.64	334.82	383.13	337.09	376.28	339.66	337.86	545.29	366.82
Solomon Islands	68.25	58.77	26.18	60.14	121.32	198.47	204.51	246.05	224.32
Somalia	101.01	147.73	190.97	173.69	198.68	236.95	390.95	384.14	758.26
Sudan	220.39	180.63	343.3	613.18	991.93	1823.22	2044.13	2111.51	2383.58
Timor-Leste				175.03	161.24	184.76	209.07	278.27	277.54
Togo	69.55	46.08	51.5	49.91	64.48	82.21	79.05	121.32	329.65
Tuvalu	4.03	9.51	11.71	6.24	8	9.2	15.34	11.74	16.62
Uganda	844.22	821.14	728.61	996.53	1214.71	1191.05	1539.1	1737.28	1656.76
United Republic of Tanzania	1034.76	1272.02	1269.08	1723.99	1766.75	1497.5	1813.75	2819.55	2330.72
Vanuatu	45.8	31.71	27.48	32.81	38.74	39.48	48.79	56.69	91.67
Yemen	262.76	427.1	582.8	233.58	250.6	289.47	280.04	236.17	305.48
Zambia	794.65	551.09	794.86	758.77	1130.47	1166.16	1419.05	998.46	1085.91
Least developed countries	12378.92	13782.39	18040.16	24080.95	25266.3	25757.49	28052.83	32814.58	38427.05
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	9350.3	10415.86	13714.54	18964.36	19584.79	19277.64	21304.94	24363.89	27805.31
LDCs: Asia	2792.78	3120.41	4115.72	4704.73	5216.54	5845.36	6106.55	7675.67	9806.7
LDCs: Islands	235.84	246.12	209.9	411.86	464.97	634.49	641.34	775.02	815.04
Landlocked developing countries	7662.7	8548.17	10433.84	12091.7	13960.25	14893.41	16437.27	18864.14	22616.72
Small island developing States (UNCTAD)	962.64	985.03	951.21	1141.72	1321.55	1541.24	1513.76	1843.76	2003.8
Heavily indebted poor countries	12286.02	14504.21	18861.11	24601.57	26039.32	27055.95	29958.33	33426.34	37481.73

Source: UNCTAD, Accessed January 25th 2011. <http://unctadstat.unctad.org/>

## TABLE ANNEX 11

### Least Developed Countries ODA Share per Sector

Year	Sectors			
	Social Infrastructure and Services (% of total)	Government and Civil Society (% of total)	Economic Infrastructure and Services (% of total)	Production Sector (% of total)
2002	27	8	6	5
2003	25	8	5	4
2004	30	9	7	4
2005	35	11	8	4
2006	40	14	8	4
2007	44	15	8	5
2008	42	15	8	5
2009	48	17	10	6

Source: Shares are author's calculations based on data from OECD StatExtracts, accessed on February 3rd 2011 [http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=ODA\\_RECIP#](http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=ODA_RECIP#)

\*numbers may not add up to 100 because all sectors are not represented

TABLE ANNEX 12

Least Developed Countries External Debt per GDP

Country or Region	Total external debt as a share of GDP (percent)								
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Afghanistan	0	0	9	23	3	3	3	3	3
Angola	21	33	17	16	14	11		10	3
Bangladesh	10	9	9	8	7	8	5	7	6
Benin	12	8	8	7	7	8	9	5	
Bhutan	6	5	5	5	6	3	2	5	15
Burkina Faso	16	11	11	12	9	8	8	6	6
Burundi	26	38	50	63	95	44	42	42	35
Cambodia	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Central African Republic									
Chad	10	8	8	5	2	2		2	3
Comoros	4	5	11	5	6	7	7	38	17
Democratic Republic of Congo									
Djibouti	6	4	5	6	8	6	7	7	6
Equatorial Guinea	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Eritrea	4								
Ethiopia	13	18	7	7	6	5	8	5	4
Gambia	13	19	17	22	31	29	26	24	16
Guinea	19	11	12	14	20	15	16	13	10
Guinea-Bissau	7	6	3	4	6	4	16		
Haiti	7	6	4	8	17	9	8	7	6
Kiribati									
Lao People's dem. Rep.	7	8	18	21	22	17	17	16	15
Lesotho	22	21	17	13	7	12	6	11	4
Liberia	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	115	14
Madagascar	9	5	6	5	6	5	5	1	1
Malawi	13	9	7	6	10	11	10	4	4
Maldives	5	5	5	4	5	7	5	5	6
Mali	11	8	6	5	7	6	5	4	3
Mauritania	17	16	11	13	9	8	5	8	4
Mozambique	13	9	6	6	4	3	2	1	2
Myanmar	4	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	3
Nepal	8	8	11	11	10	10	12	11	10
Niger	7	9	7	8	7	7	11	4	
Rwanda	19	10	12	14	12	8	11	5	3
Samoa				4	4	3	4	4	5
Sao Tome and Principe	21	29	26	28	44	48	55	50	16
Senegal	15	13	13	12	14	8	9	6	
Sierra Leone	34	22	16	10	10	6	11	4	2
Solomon Islands	8	8	8	10	15	10	3	7	6
Somalia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sudan	11	11	6	10	8	8	5	4	3

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Timor-Leste									
Togo	4	5	1	1	1	2	3	1	18
Tuvalu									
Uganda	8	5	8	8	7	9	7	3	3
United Republic of Tanzania	11	8	5	4	4	3	3	2	1
Vanuatu	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Yemen	3	6	4	4	4	3	3	3	2
Zambia	18	12	15	42	12	10	4	3	3
Least developed countries	11	11	9	9	8	7	7	7	4
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	14	15	11	11	9	8	9	7	3
LDCs: Asia	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	5	5
LDCs: Islands	5	5	5	4	6	6	5	6	5
Landlocked developing countries	17	18	19	19	19	19	16	22	20
Small island developing States (UNCTAD)	8	7	8	7	6	6	5	7	6
Heavily indebted poor countries	14	11	11	10	8	7	6	6	6

Source: UNCTAD

### TABLE ANNEX 13

#### Least Developed Countries External Debt Service as a Share of Exports of Goods and Services

Country or Region	Total external debt service as a share of imports of goods and services (percent)								
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Afghanistan	6	7	8	11	11	11	12	19	16
Angola	89	79	66	55	52	48	31	31	37
Bangladesh	34	33	35	36	35	32	32	30	27
Benin	62	61	61	49	46	41	17	16	14
Bhutan	46	55	70	77	84	78	79	63	53
Burkina Faso	47	48	44	37	37	35	18	19	20
Burundi	147	149	176	211	196	155	135	144	113
Cambodia	64	60	61	62	58	51	46	41	35
Central African Republic	84	78	95	77	72	64	58	50	41
Chad	72	58	58	52	35	26	26	25	21
Comoros	103	101	98	82	76	67	65	61	51
Democratic Republic of Congo	150	144	160	181	154	133	116	114	94
Djibouti	44	42	51	58	59	54	56	75	68
Equatorial Guinea	17	12	11	9	6	3	3	3	2
Eritrea	43	53	68	70	64	66	65	66	65
Ethiopia	66	70	82	83	64	49	15	14	11
Gambia	56	64	88	112	119	100	101	85	40
Guinea	86	85	85	81	74	84	86	73	57
Guinea-Bissau	382	392	412	383	360	303	314	283	248

## STATISTICAL ANNEX

Haiti	30	31	35	45	35	33	29	24	26
Kiribati									
Lao People's dem. Rep.	149	147	173	113	108	103	101	107	93
Lesotho	84	82	94	68	56	45	41	39	41
Liberia	212	200	220	298	269	229	178	152	150
Madagascar	111	84	94	85	80	64	23	19	19
Malawi	106	105	101	122	126	112	26	24	21
Maldives	30	29	35	38	43	44	42	42	40
Mali	101	88	79	69	63	57	27	28	25
Mauritania	189	181	170	162	140	119	53	51	51
Mozambique	150	102	106	71	68	53	30	30	29
Myanmar	73	66	52	59	56	44	38	32	21
Nepal	46	44	47	45	42	34	33	29	27
Niger	95	84	84	76	65	56	22	21	18
Rwanda	66	71	80	80	79	60	14	17	15
Samoa	60	56	56	52	46	39	41	40	46
Sao Tome and Principe	371	381	342	339	330	288	274	105	88
Senegal	69	67	67	59	47	43	20	20	20
Sierra Leone	106	89	90	94	100	90	74	14	15
Solomon Islands	45	48	65	52	45	37	35	30	25
Somalia	89	91	91	93	89	82	76	74	75
Sudan	82	65	59	51	44	34	27	22	18
Timor-Leste									
Togo	95	91	91	90	83	70	71	66	52
Tuvalu									
Uganda	49	52	54	60	53	42	11	12	12
United Republic of Tanzania	58	52	55	51	54	49	21	23	22
Vanuatu	30	30	34	30	26	20	18	15	19
Yemen	41	43	41	39	34	28	24	23	19
Zambia	140	137	149	136	118	63	17	19	16
Least developed countries	67	62	62	59	54	45	32	30	26
LDCs: Africa and Haiti	85	77	78	72	64	52	31	29	26
LDCs: Asia	42	41	42	41	39	34	33	31	27
LDCs: Islands	59	60	66	52	51	45	44	35	33
Landlocked developing countries	55	56	59	58	54	46	41	41	37
Small island developing States (UNCTAD)	24	24	25	23	22	21	20	21	19
Heavily indebted poor countries	87	80	81	77	68	56	36	31	27

Source: UNCTAD: [http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx?sCS\\_referer=&sCS\\_ChosenLang=en](http://unctadstat.unctad.org/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx?sCS_referer=&sCS_ChosenLang=en)





# The Least Developed Countries

## Africa [ 33 ]

Angola  
Benin  
Burkina Faso  
Burundi  
Central African Republic  
Chad  
Comoros  
Democratic Republic of the Congo  
Djibouti  
Equatorial Guinea  
Eritrea  
Ethiopia  
Gambia  
Guinea  
Guinea-Bissau  
Lesotho  
Liberia  
Madagascar  
Malawi  
Mali  
Mauritania  
Mozambique  
Niger  
Rwanda  
São Tomé and Príncipe  
Senegal  
Sierra Leone  
Somalia  
Sudan  
Togo  
Uganda  
United Republic of Tanzania  
Zambia

## Asia [ 14 ]

Afghanistan  
Bangladesh  
Bhutan  
Cambodia  
Kiribati  
Lao People's Democratic Republic  
Myanmar  
Nepal  
Samoa  
Solomon Islands  
Timor-Leste  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu  
Yemen

## Latin America and the Caribbean [ 1 ]

Haiti

---

## UN-OHRLS

Room DC 1-1210  
New York, NY 10017, USA  
Telephone: (917) 367-6006  
Fax: (917) 367-3415  
E-mail: [OHRLS-UNHQ@un.org](mailto:OHRLS-UNHQ@un.org)

[www.un.org/ohrls](http://www.un.org/ohrls)