



EUROPE INFORMATION

DE 77 □ November 1993

FINANCIAL COOPERATION UNDER THE LOME CONVENTIONS

REVIEW OF AID AT THE END OF 1992

DEVELOPMENT

Report prepared by the Directorate-General for Development
of the Commission of the European Communities, in conjunction
with the European Investment Bank.

Manuscript completed in June 1993.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European
Communities, 1993

© ECSC-EEC-EAEC, Brussels-Luxembourg, 1993

Reproduction is authorized, except for commercial purposes, provided
the source is acknowledged.

Printed in Belgium

**FINANCIAL COOPERATION
UNDER THE
LOME CONVENTIONS**

**Review of Aid
at the end of 1992**

Glossary

ACP : African, Caribbean and Pacific States which have signed the Lomé Convention

CDI : Centre for the Development of Industry

ECU : European currency unit,
worth on average 1.3 US dollars in 1992

MECU : Million ECU

EDF : European Development Fund

EIB : European Investment Bank

NIP : National Indicative Programme

SAF : Structural adjustment facility

SIP : Sectoral import programme

Stabex : Stabilization of export earnings

Sysmin : System for mineral products

Table of contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	3
2. General overview of Lomé aid to ACP States	4
2.1 Total aid from the European Development Fund	4
2.2 Lomé II	5
2.3 Lomé III	5
2.4 Lomé IV	6
3. Programmed aid	11
3.1 Factors affecting the implementation of indicative programmes	11
3.2 The National Indicative Programmes	14
3.3 The implementation of large programmes and projects under Lomé III	26
3.4 Regional Cooperation	28
3.5 Microprojects	31
3.6 Industrial Cooperation and Private Investment	31
3.7 Trade and tourism development	35
4. Structural Adjustment, Special Debt Programme and import support programmes	36
4.1 The Special Debt Programme and import support programmes under Lomé III	36
4.2 Structural Adjustment under Lomé IV	37
4.3 Counterpart funds	43
5. Non-programmed aid	45
5.1 Stabex	45
5.2 Sysmin	46
5.3 Assistance to refugees and returnees	47
5.4 AIDS Control Programme	47
5.5 Aid administered by the European Investment Bank	50
6. Sectoral breakdown of Aid	53
6.1 Aid administered by the Commission	53
6.2 Aid administered by the EIB	60
7. Aid implementation	62
7.1 The study on implementation of aid procedures	62
7.2 Tenders and contracts	62
8. Conclusions	65
Annexes	
I. Explanatory notes	70
II. Statistical annexes	80

PREFACE

Article 327.1 of the Fourth Lomé Convention requires the ACP States and regional organisations, on the one hand and the Commission, in collaboration with the European Investment Bank (EIB), on the other to prepare an annual report on the management of development finance cooperation. These reports are designed to facilitate the work of the Development Finance Cooperation Committee (DFCC) set up under Article 325 of the Convention, in examining whether the objectives of financial cooperation are being attained. The reports should also look at any general and specific problems resulting from the implementation of that cooperation.

In accordance with Art. 327.2(a) the DFCC shall prepare an annual report, which shall be examined by the Council of Ministers at its annual meeting on the definition of the general guidelines for development finance cooperation.

The present report covering the period up to 31 December 1992 - with particular emphasis on the year 1992 - has been prepared by the Commission in collaboration with the EIB.

1. Introduction

1992 was the first full year for financial cooperation under the Fourth Lomé Convention, which came into force on 1 September 1991. It was an active year, in particular for decisions and aid allocations. Financial cooperation also continued for the Second and Third Lomé Conventions.

This report describes progress made in the implementation of financial cooperation under three Lomé Conventions, with particular attention to work in 1992.

After a brief overview of the overall performance in respect of the different types of aid in Chapter 2, Chapter 3 looks at the various components of programmed aid of the European Development Funds and provides inter alia an analysis of national trends and of the progress in larger projects and programmes.⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Chapter 4 outlines the Structural Adjustment policy initiatives which started in the form of import support programmes under Lomé III but have gained particular importance under Lomé IV. Moreover, the generation of counterpart funds by the aid programmes financed under Structural Adjustment adds a new and important dimension to financial cooperation which will also be discussed in that Chapter.

Chapter 5 looks at the different instruments of non-programmed aid, such as the Stabex system, Sysmin and aid to refugees and returnees. The chapter also includes a report on the aid administered by the EIB.

Chapter 6 provides a sectoral analysis of Lomé aid. Procedures for aid implementation are discussed in Chapter 7.

Finally Chapter 8 summarises the conclusions to the report.

It is important that it is understood that the analysis in this report is entirely based on financial data relating to amounts of aid decided by the Commission and the EIB, sums committed in the form of contracts or disbursed. Comparisons are made between situations under different Conventions, between sectors, between different ACP States, citing in each circumstance "above average" or "below average performance". Such comparisons are not intended to pass judgment on the aid implementation "performance" of individual ACP States. They should, moreover, be seen in the context of the mix of programmes and aid instruments discussed and of the aid objectives they are designed to meet. Analyses of payments in the case of inherently quick disbursing operations such as Stabex, Emergency aid or the Structural Adjustment Facility will show different results from those of inherently slower spending rural development or major infrastructure programmes.

(1) A separate EDF has been set up under each Convention, the 5th EDF for Lomé II, 6th EDF for Lomé III and 7th EDF for Lomé IV.

(2) For a description of the different types of aid see point 3 of the Annex. This Annex provides explanatory notes on the principal characteristics and procedures relating to the EDF.

Above all, the Community aim is that financial cooperation should be as effective as possible in achieving development objectives. High quality cannot be sacrificed. The purpose of financial analysis is to contribute to the achievement of that aim. Where aid implementation is unduly delayed, interlinkages of operations are frustrated, costs are increased and quality is impaired. Figures on commitments and disbursements of aid must also be seen as measures of progress in realising physical operations which in turn are means of achieving qualitative and quantitative objectives.

2. General overview of Lomé aid to ACP States

2.1 Total aid from the European Development Fund

Table 2.1 shows the utilisation of funds under the 5th, 6th and 7th EDF by the end of 1992 and the evolution of the annual amounts of decisions, commitments and payments for the period 1989-1992.

EDF financial cooperation increased significantly in 1992 at all stages compared to the three preceding years. In 1992, total decisions amounted to 2.052 billion ECU (1991 : just over 1.2 billion ECU), secondary commitments were 1.73 billion ECU (compared to 1.38 billion ECU in 1991) and payments reached 1.917 billion ECU (in 1991 just under 1.2 billion ECU).

The level of decisions, commitments and payments grew by 66.2%, 25.2% and 63.3% respectively. The takeoff of the Lomé IV Convention contributed significantly to this. Indeed, more than 25% of the financial envelope of the first protocol was decided by the end of the year.⁽³⁾ Secondary commitments reached 13.3% and payments stayed just under 10%.

Quick disbursing aid programmes such as Stabex and Structural Adjustment accounted for a substantial part of these results.

Already in 1991 the bulk of the annual decisions was made under the Lomé IV Convention (EDF 7). This phenomenon has obviously been even more important in 1992 : 95% of all new decisions concerned Lomé IV. Also in respect of secondary commitments the new Convention took the lion's share : 60.5% compared to less than 30% in 1991. Regarding payments, however, the 5th and 6th EDF still played an important role. The 7th EDF represented 46% of the total (nearly 900 MECU).

(3) Note also that part of the total envelope envisaged in the Convention has not yet been allocated (Somalia, Liberia).

2.2 Lomé II

Little progress was made in 1992 in the allocation of remaining funds from the fifth EDF. An amount of 139 MECU remained to be decided. With an increase of only 28 MECU, 92.1% of the envelope was committed by the end of the year. Payments went up by 133 MECU reaching 87.6% of the envelope.

Table 2.2 shows that most progress was made for programmed aid, which still has lower levels of commitments and payments than non-programmed aid. Also payments for the AIDS Control Programme increased in 1992 but remained at only 59.5% of the envelope of 35 MECU allocated to this instrument.

2.3 Lomé III

As might be expected after 7 years of implementation the level of new decisions and commitments under Lomé III dropped in 1992.

With a total of 118.6 MECU of decisions, 92.9% of the total envelope had been decided at year end. Commitments were a substantial 654.5 MECU, resulting in 78.6% of the envelope being awarded in contracts.

The situation of payments is quite different. Payments amounted to 896.1 MECU in 1992 being a satisfactory progress from 52.8% in 1991 to 63.9% of the envelope disbursed at year end.

Table 2.3 which shows the level of programmed aid of the 6th EDF still indicates relatively lower levels of commitments and payments. However, the trend is improving. Between 1990 and 1992 the difference between the rate of commitments and payments of non-programmed aid and that of programmed aid declined from 31.2% to 16.4% and 32.4% to 20.5% respectively.

As can be seen from table 2.3, new decisions and commitments effectively concerned programmed aid, grants and special loans. Most of the non-programmed aid was fully decided before 1992. Secondary commitments also showed little changes during the year, with the exception of Sysmin.

Payments for non-programmed aid amounted to 152 MECU, notably for emergency aid and aid to refugees, interest rate subsidies and risk capital. Still significantly below average was the total volume decided, committed and paid for Sysmin and the interest rate subsidies. The latter instrument will not be used in its entirety since the EIB had finished granting loans from own resources under the Lomé III Convention.

Almost all of the available Stabex funds under Lomé III were disbursed by the end of 1992.

2.4 Lomé IV

Lomé IV came into operation in September 1991.

A total of more than 2.8 billion ECU was decided by the end of the year : 1.3 billion ECU for indicative programmes, 1.185 billion ECU for non-programmed aid and 307.5 MECU for the Structural Adjustment Facility.

Thus the decision rates were 21.2%, 33.5% and 26.7% respectively.

Due to the different nature of the instruments, the levels of commitments and payments for the indicative programmes were large compared to the other forms of aid. The multiannual indicative programmes require a longer gestation period, with the financing of studies and preparatory works in the earlier stages. In fact, less than 5% of the indicative programmes was committed and only 2.3% paid at year end. The non-programmed aid and Structural Adjustment are quick disbursing instruments, often effective within a one-year period. Thus the commitment and payment rates were well over 20% for non-programmed aid and 16.7% and 11.5% respectively for the Structural Adjustment Facility.

The breakdown by aid instrument for EDF 7 in table 2.4 shows the importance of Stabex. Total decisions reached 875 MECU by the end of 1992 i.e. a decision rate of 54.7%. Payments attained 760 MECU of which 600 MECU were made in 1992. These exceptionally high figures were due to delayed payments in relation to application year 1990 and biased in comparison somewhat between 1991 and 1992 in favour of the last year.

As can be seen from table 2.4, decisions and commitments for risk capital were also of significance, as was to a lesser extent interest rebates and emergency aid.

Finally, the 60 MECU decision under Sysmin, introduced as a general import programme in Zambia, should also be mentioned.

Table 2.1

EUROPEAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

	Cumulative Result at 31-12-92 (MECU)	% of the envelope	1989	1990	1991	1992
			annual figures (MECU)			
Decisions						
5th EDF	4515.1	97.0%	36.1	14.8	-64.1	-21.3
6th EDF	7364.7	92.9%	1305.3	855.8	440.6	118.6
7th EDF	2812.7	25.8%	-	-	857.8	1954.9
total	14692.6		1341.4	870.6	1234.3	2052.2
Commitments						
5th EDF	4288.3	92.1%	126.8	118.3	115.2	28.0
6th EDF	6230.1	78.6%	1383.4	1297.3	869.4	654.5
7th EDF	1446.1	13.3%	-	-	397.9	1048.2
total	11964.5		1510.2	1415.6	1382.5	1730.6
Disbursements						
5th EDF	4079.4	87.6%	235.7	187.5	130.7	133.0
6th EDF	5066.8	63.9%	1018.5	1030.3	847.3	896.1
7th EDF	1083.1	9.9%	-	-	195.5	887.6
total	10229.2		1254.3	1217.8	1173.5	1916.7

Note: Envelopes of	5th EDF	6th EDF	7th EDF
Programmed Aid	3109.3	5022.5	6215.0
Non-Programmed Aid	1517.2	2786.5	3535.0
Balances	27.9	121.6	0.0
Structural Adjustment	-	-	1150.0
Total	4654.4	7930.6	10900.0

* the negative figures are due to
decommitments

Table : 2.2 5th EDF

 * EDF POSITIONS *

												MECU		

1	1	Decisions			1	Commitments			1	Payments			1	
1	CUMULATIVE RESULT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
1	AT 31-12-1992	1	Cumulat. % of the	annual	1	Cumulat. % of the	annual	1	Cumulat. % of the	annual	1			
1	&	1	Result envelope	figures	1	Result envelope	figures	1	Result envelope	figures	1			
1	ANNUAL FIGURES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
1		1	(1)	(2)	(3)	1	(4)	(5)	(6)	1	(7)	(8)	(9)	1

1		1				1				1				1
1	Programmed Aid	1	3017.8	97.1%	-15.6	1	2805.1	90.2%	33.2	1	2652.7	85.3%	118.8	1
1	-----	1				1				1				1
1	Grants	1	2526.6	97.8%	-9.7	1	2370.9	91.7%	36.1	1	2251.0	87.1%	88.5	1
1	Special Loans (a)	1	491.2	93.6%	-5.9	1	434.2	82.7%	-2.9	1	401.8	76.5%	30.3	1
1		1				1				1				1
1	Non programmed Aid	1	1479.6	97.5%	-5.1	1	1468.8	96.8%	-6.5	1	1413.6	93.2%	12.1	1
1	-----	1				1				1				1
1	Rehabilitation Fund	1	23.2	93.3%	-0.1	1	22.9	92.1%	-0.1	1	22.5	90.4%		1
1	Interest rebates(a)	1	100.1	96.3%		1	97.6	93.9%	-2.5	1	78.1	75.1%	0.0	1
1	Emergency Aid	1	180.1	100.0%	0.0	1	180.1	100.0%		1	179.2	99.5%	0.0	1
1	Aids	1	35.0	100.0%		1	34.5	98.5%	-0.5	1	20.8	59.3%	5.3	1
1	Risk Capital (a)	1	267.8	97.4%	-5.0	1	267.8	97.4%	-4.4	1	259.7	94.4%	0.8	1
1	Stabex	1	668.3	100.0%		1	665.9	99.6%	1.1	1	665.2	99.5%	2.8	1
1	Sysmin	1	205.0	89.1%	0.0	1	199.9	86.9%	-0.1	1	188.3	81.8%	3.2	1
1		1				1				1				1
1		1				1				1				1
1	Balance	1	17.7	63.3%	-0.5	1	14.4	51.6%	1.2	1	13.1	46.9%	2.1	1
1	-----	1				1				1				1

1	TOTAL 5th EDF	1	4515.1	97.0%	-21.3	1	4288.3	92.1%	28.0	1	4079.4	87.6%	133.0	1
1		1				1				1				1

Note : (a) : EDF statistics.

Table : 2.3 6th EDF

* EDF POSITIONS *

												MECU		

1	1	Decisions			1	Commitments			1	Payments			1	
1	CUMULATIVE RESULT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
1	AT 31-12-1992	1	Cumulat. % of the	annual	1	Cumulat. % of the	annual	1	Cumulat. % of the	annual	1			
1	&	1	Result envelope	figures	1	Result envelope	figures	1	Result envelope	figures	1			
1	ANNUAL FIGURES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
1		1	(1)	(2)	(3)	1	(4)	(5)	(6)	1	(7)	(8)	(9)	1

1		1				1				1				1
1	Programmed Aid	1	4703.6	93.6%	96.4	1	3684.6	73.4%	605.1	1	2875.1	57.2%	730.0	1
1	-----	1				1				1				1
1	Grants	1	4184.8	94.6%	76.8	1	3343.9	75.6%	525.6	1	2646.3	59.8%	641.4	1
1	(b)Special Loans	1	518.7	86.5%	19.6	1	340.7	56.8%	79.5	1	228.9	38.1%	88.6	1
1		1				1				1				1
1	Non programmed Aid	1	2594.2	93.1%	17.0	1	2503.2	89.8%	41.5	1	2166.1	77.7%	152.0	1
1	-----	1				1				1				1
1	Rehabilitation Fund	1	2.1	98.9%	0.0	1	1.6	75.4%	-0.2	1	0.9	40.2%	0.0	1
1	(b)Interest rebates	1	117.3	72.2%	-9.7	1	117.0	72.0%	-6.1	1	67.1	41.3%	22.3	1
1	Emergency Aid	1	189.9	99.9%	2.1	1	186.0	97.9%	4.5	1	166.7	87.7%	25.9	1
1	Aid to Refugees	1	99.8	99.8%	2.2	1	96.7	96.7%	4.4	1	85.4	85.4%	19.6	1
1	Aids	1	4.0	100.0%		1	4.0	99.4%		1	1.1	27.4%	1.1	1
1	(b)Risk Capital	1	582.9	97.1%	3.5	1	575.8	96.0%	5.7	1	358.8	59.8%	65.2	1
1	Stabex	1	1445.9	98.0%	5.4	1	1445.9	98.0%	5.4	1	1445.3	98.0%	8.6	1
1	Sysmin	1	146.3	57.8%	10.5	1	73.1	28.9%	25.8	1	39.8	15.7%	8.2	1
1	(a)Structural Adjust.	1	6.0	100.0%	3.0	1	3.0	50.0%	2.0	1	1.1	17.7%	1.1	1
1		1				1				1				1
1	Balance	1	66.9	55.0%	5.2	1	42.2	34.7%	7.8	1	25.5	21.0%	14.2	1
1	-----	1				1				1				1

1	TOTAL 6th EDF	1	7364.7	92.9%	118.6	1	6230.1	78.6%	654.5	1	5066.8	63.9%	896.1	1
1		1				1				1				1

Note : (a) : Special credit line for studies and short terms consultancy services.
 (b) : EDF statistics.

Table : 2.4 7th EDF
 =====

 * EDF POSITIONS *

MECU

		Decisions			Commitments			Payments		
		Cumulat. % of the	annual	Cumulat. % of the	annual	Cumulat. % of the	annual			
		Result envelope	figures	Result envelope	figures	Result envelope	figures			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1	CUMULATIVE RESULT									
1	AT 31-12-1992									
1	&									
1	ANNUAL FIGURES									
1	Programmed Aid	1318.8	21.2%	1039.3	302.5	4.9%	257.7	143.8	2.3%	137.4
1	Grants	1318.8	21.2%	1039.3	302.5	4.9%	257.7	143.8	2.3%	137.4
1	Structural Adjustment	307.5	26.7%	231.0	191.8	16.7%	163.3	132.8	11.5%	104.8
1	Non programmed Aid	1186.4	33.6%	684.6	951.8	26.9%	627.2	806.5	22.8%	645.4
1	Rehabilitation Fund	-			-			-		
1	(a)Interest rebates	53.5	19.1%	43.6	50.1	17.9%	50.1	5.1	1.8%	5.1
1	Emergency Aid	42.8	17.1%	35.3	27.4	11.0%	21.6	14.2	5.7%	13.7
1	Aid to Refugees	21.0	21.0%	20.3	19.7	19.7%	19.7	9.3	9.3%	9.3
1	Aids	-			-			-		
1	(a)Risk Capital	133.9	16.2%	133.9	94.3	11.4%	94.3	17.7	2.1%	17.7
1	Stabex	875.2	54.7%	391.5	760.4	47.5%	441.5	760.2	47.5%	599.6
1	Sysmin	60.0	12.5%	60.00		0.0%			0.0%	
1	TOTAL 7th EDF	2812.7	25.8%	1954.9	1446.1	13.3%	1048.2	1083.1	9.9%	887.6

Note : (a) : EDF statistics.
 =====

3. Programmed Aid

3.1 Factors affecting the implementation of indicative programmes

The implementation of the indicative programmes in 1992 must be seen against a number of constraints and difficulties which affect programme preparation and implementation. These may be found in the political situation prevailing in ACP partner countries, in the economic policy context, in the project cycle itself and in the procedures for implementation of EDF programmes.

Political developments and prospects have a direct impact on the pace of implementation of EDF activities. At the end of 1992, 7 ACP countries were affected to some degree by suspension measures taken by the Community in relation to the security situation, the lack of progress towards democracy or of commitment to human rights. The countries concerned are the following : Haiti, Liberia, Somalia, Zaire, Malawi, Sudan and Togo. In the latter four, the freeze in force at end 92 only applied to new financing decisions. It was estimated that the frozen resources resulted in a shortfall of 150 to 200 MECU on both annual commitments and disbursements. A number of other ACP countries in 1991 and 1992 went through a period of political uncertainty, accompanied by profound changes in government and in civil service staff and reviews of development priorities. This complicated the policy-dialogue and slowed down the preparation of new EDF programmes. As an illustration Lomé IV programming had to be postponed in two countries (Central African Republic, Suriname) and two other countries asked for a renegotiation of their Lomé IV NIP less than a year after signature (Ethiopia, Trinidad & Tobago).

While it is expected that progress toward democratization and good governance will in the end facilitate aid implementation and improve the quality and relevance of EDF funded programmes, it must be noted that the intensity and pace of political developments in 1992 led to priorities being shifted to the political sphere in a number of ACP countries, thus affecting temporarily their absorption capacity.

Examples of countries where such effects had a noticeable impact on the level of commitments and disbursements were Sierra Leone, Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea and Rwanda. These factors had a significant influence on financial cooperation with Suriname which explained, in part, the lower than ACP average commitment level.

Economic policy in the ACP countries has a strong direct influence on the magnitude and rhythm of EDF operations, due to the links established at the time of programming between the implementation of government measures and the inflow of Community support.

Economic policy changes occurring in the agreed focal sectors also affected the pace of approval and implementation of programmes financed from NIP resources. In a number of cases, appraisal of new programmes had to be delayed until the sectoral policy environment could be clarified. This affected e.g. several large road maintenance and rehabilitation programmes and SMEs development projects in e.g. Ethiopia and Trinidad and Tobago.

The project cycle itself, which requires a thorough policy dialogue, the detailed appraisal and design of new programmes and the coordinated implementation of precise mutual undertakings by the Community and the ACP authorities, created irreducible lags between project identification and approval as well as specific constraints on implementation and disbursement schedules. Because of the need to improve project effectiveness, to ensure sustainability and to take account of a widening range of concerns - environmental impact, distributional effects, consistency with the sectoral and macro-frameworks -, the identification and appraisal stages prove time-consuming particularly for large multi-component programmes which have become a dominant feature of NIPs since Lomé III. On-going evaluations and mid-terms reviews sometimes add to the length of implementation periods when they call for a restructuring of the project. The focus on rural development since Lomé III NIPs and the growing trend to cater for operating costs in the first years of the projects also contribute to lengthening average project life.

Almost all countries showing levels of commitment and/or payment below ACP average under Lomé II and III (see table 3.1) have suffered from specific implementation problems or reviews of projects and programmes.

It currently takes 20 to 30 months between project identification and financing decision. The bulk of financing decisions taken in 1992 correspond to projects whose appraisal began before ratification of the Convention and the bulk of payments made on project aid in 1992 are accountable to Lomé III programmes approved between 1987 and 1989 which have reached maturity.

The Commission decided to adopt a single "integrated approach" (logical framework) for all new projects and programmes as of 1993. The introduction of the methodology in both EC Commission and ACP administrations should facilitate the policy dialogue, smooth out difficulties at the appraisal stage and facilitate project implementation and monitoring. As such, it should contribute to improving aid effectiveness and to a greater compliance with implementation schedules featuring in the financing agreements.

Adherence to agreed implementation procedures also plays a key role in ensuring a smooth flow of EDF resources at the level of the beneficiaries, especially for those tasks which fall under joint responsibility. The entry into force of the new general conditions for EDF contracts, effective since June 1991, contributed to simplifying a number of administrative tasks from tender to payments and dispute settlements and has a positive impact on the overall implementation capacity in 1992.

Another factor of importance is the compatibility of national administration systems with Community aid procedures and adequacy of national contributions to EDF projects which are often constrained by tight financial situations or policies designed to cut public expenditure. These factors have notably hampered financial cooperation in 1992 in the Bahamas, Antigua, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Madagascar, St. Christopher and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, West Samoa and Zimbabwe.

Box 1

EDF project cycle

In the EDF project cycle one may, broadly speaking, distinguish eight stages :

1. Preparation of indicative programmes by ACP States in agreement with the Commission and the EIB;
2. Project preparation by the ACP States and their examination by the Commission (feasibility study and project appraisal);
3. Approval by the Commission of a project financing proposal, following favourable opinion of the EDF Committee, which is composed of representatives of the Member States and chaired by the Commission;
4. Financing agreement between the ACP government and the Commission containing a technical description of the project and covering financing provisions and rules;
5. Project execution on the basis of contracts awarded by the ACP States, generally following international tenders open to firms in the Member States and ACP States;
6. Payments of aid directly to contractors;
7. Monitoring and evaluation;
8. Completion and final evaluation of the project.

3.2 The National Indicative Programmes

3.2.1 Lomé II

By the end of 1992, 92 MECU of the total envelope for programmed aid under Lomé II had still to be approved. This was an increase in comparison to 1991 mainly caused by decommitments for various projects and programmes which had been completed at lower cost than envisaged.

An amount of 304 MECU was available for secondary commitments and 457 MECU had still to be disbursed.

By the end of 1992, seven ACP States showed a decision rate (see box 2 on page 17) lower than 90% of the total allocation for indicative programmes compared to the average of 97% for all ACP States. These countries included Somalia and Sudan where financial cooperation was delayed or suspended in 1992. The other five countries were Barbados, Jamaica, Lesotho, Suriname and Trinidad & Tobago.

General factors affecting financial cooperation in these countries were described in paragraph 3.1.

Most of these countries were already behind in previous years. The position of Lesotho deteriorated due to several decommitments for projects not fully using the finance envisaged. These funds will be applied to new projects in 1993. The political situation in Somalia led to a decommitment of 13 MECU from the 5th EDF. Significant improvements compared to 1991 took place in Gabon and Guinea Bissau where the envelopes were now fully decided by the end of 1992.

Concerning the level of commitments, seven countries showed a rate of less than 85% compared to an average of 93.6% for all ACP States : Ghana, Jamaica, Guinea Bissau, Suriname, Liberia, Belize, Trinidad & Tobago.

Some of these ACP states showed little or no progress in 1992. Commitments for the 5th EDF rose markedly in Fiji (1.5 MECU), Papua New Guinea (3 MECU), Nigeria (4.6 MECU) and Tonga (1 MECU).

Regarding the level of payments, countries with relatively low level of payments (less than 90% of total commitments compared to an average of 94.6% for all ACP States) were Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Fiji, Kiribati, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, Tonga, Trinidad & Tobago.

Some of these states were already below average in 1991. Nevertheless, disbursements increased remarkably in 1992 in Nigeria (6 MECU) and Malawi (9 MECU). Notable progress in 1992 compared to 1991 was further observed in Suriname, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Madagascar and Swaziland. The payment rates of these countries attained percentages between 92 and 98%.

Further details on the indicative programmes are shown in Annex Table 3.

3.2.2 Lomé III

Decisions for total programmed aid under Lomé III came to 96 MECU in 1992. Thus 93.6% of the financial envelope was allocated to projects and programmes.

Commitments reached 605 MECU and payments were 730 MECU, bringing the cumulative totals to 73.4% and 57.3% respectively of the envelope for programmed aid.

For all national programmes (excluding regional programmes) average percentages of the envelope for approvals, commitments and payments were 93.8%, 73.9% and 58.5% respectively.⁽⁴⁾

In approximately 49 countries, 7 more as compared to the situation at end 1991, virtually the entire financial envelope of indicative programmes had been decided and allocated by the end of 1992.

The average rates of decisions, commitments and payments for National Indicative Programmes were 93.8%, 78.8% and 79.2% respectively.

ACP States with significantly lower levels of utilization of funds for indicative programmes under the 6th EDF are shown in the table below.

Table 3.1 EDF 6 - Countries with implementation rates below ACP average.

Decisions compared with envelopes of NIP < 90% ACP average = 93.8%	Commitments compared with decisions of NIP < 70% ACP average = 78.8%	Payments compared with commitments of NIP < 70% ACP average = 79.2%
Angola Antigua & Barbuda Barbados Fiji Ghana Liberia* Madagascar Sierra Leone Somalia* St. Kitts and Nevis Sudan* Suriname	Antigua Barbados Botswana Congo Equator. Guinea Ethiopia Fiji Ghana Guinea Bissau Liberia* Madagascar Nigeria Solomon Islands Sudan* Tonga Trinidad & Tobago Tuvalu Zaire*	Bahamas Barbados Burkina Congo Djibouti Fiji Jamaica Kiribati Liberia* Mauritania Mauritius Nigeria Rwanda Sierra Leone Tonga Western Samoa

* countries with which cooperation was (partly) suspended in 1992

(4) For an explanation of decision, commitment and payment rates see box 2 on page 17.

More details on the National Indicative Programmes are shown in Annex Table 4.

As regards decisions in 1992 remarkable progress was made in Rwanda where an increase of 33.4 MECU in approved aid meant that the entire indicative programme was decided by the end of the year. A similar performance was achieved in Antigua where nearly 70% (3.1 MECU) of the indicative programme was decided in 1992 bringing the total decision level to 86.5%. Notable growth in aid allocation decisions also occurred in the cooperation with Gabon (5 MECU, decision rate 99%) and, although remaining below the ACP average, Madagascar (9 MECU, decision rate 77.6%).

As in the case of the 5th EDF, decommitments for Somalia were high : 39.5 MECU, thereby bringing the decision rate for the Lomé III indicative programme to 44% or 52 MECU.

Compared to 1991 significant progress in commitments under Lomé III could be observed in Mauritania, Sierra Leone and Vanuatu. All three countries thus attained commitment rates higher than the ACP average. However, other countries also realised sizable new commitments, showing continued satisfactory implementation of the indicative programmes. Examples were Burkina Faso, Comoros, Guinea, Jamaica, Rwanda and Zambia. Several of these states were behind in implementation but caught up in 1992. In other countries commitment rates remained below the ACP average but nonetheless progressed well in 1992, examples being Ethiopia, Fiji, Nigeria and Tonga.

Total payments for National Indicative Programmes reached nearly 600 MECU i.e. approx 25% of all payments by the end of 1992.

Various countries picked up speed in implementating their programmes but remained below the average for all ACP States; examples were Congo, Djibouti and Kiribati.

In other countries payments attained high levels, but due to increased commitments their rate of payment remained below average : Burkina Faso, Fiji, Jamaica, Mauritius, Nigeria, Rwanda and Tonga.

Box 2

How to measure progress in implementation?

1. There are several ways to evaluate and appreciate progress in aid implementation : the physical construction of projects, the commitments and contributions of national governments, the introduction of activities with the target groups, the participation of the local administration and/or beneficiary groups, the arrival of goods at their destination etc.
This report is mainly concerned with financial cooperation, therefore measurement is made in terms of financial decisions, commitments and payments. One should, however, bear in mind that these indicators give only a partial reflection of what would be considered as real progress in implementation of indicative programmes.

2. There are four elements used for the measurement of progress in this chapter: the financial envelopes of the indicative programmes and the level of decisions, commitments and payments. Comparing decisions with the envelopes indicates the total fixed allocation of available funds to programmes and projects. This is expressed by the decision rate.
Then in order to see to what extent these allocations are effectively put to contracts with executing agents (constructors, suppliers, technical assistance, etc.) one may compare the commitments with the total of decisions. Thus the commitment rate indicates the effective concluded (i.e. design was finished and operators were appointed) implementation of programmes and projects. Looking at the level of the payments, finally, one may appreciate to what extent the programmes and projects were progressing, since payments are principally made on the basis of 'work in progress'. Comparing payments with commitments, through the payment rate, gives some idea of the level of progress and/or completion of the programmes.

3. An average level of decision, commitment and payment for all ACP states is just a 'pointer' which enables to see how an individual ACP state compares with the total group. In some countries with sizeable financial programmes (e.g. Ethiopia, Zaire) internal events have significantly delayed the implementation of aid programmes, the 'ACP average' of implementation rates is therefore biased downwards.
Countries identified as having a 'below average' result experienced a rate significantly below the ACP average.

3.2.3 Lomé IV

The rapid take-off of Lomé IV was reflected in the high level of decisions for programmed aid : 1,039 MECU in 1992 bringing total decisions to 1,319 MECU.

The effective implementation of programmed aid will be spread over some years, thus commitments (257.7 MECU) and payments (137 MECU) represented a minor percentage of the decisions; being 5% and 2% respectively of the envelope for programmed aid.

The average rate of decisions for National Indicative Programmes was 23.6%(5). 15 countries showed a rate of decision higher than 40%, including Guinea, Jamaica, Lesotho, Mozambique, Senegal, Chad and Zambia, which all had large financial envelopes (more than 40 MECU). For Grenada and Belize the total envelope of the first protocol under Lomé IV was pledged to programmes and projects by the end of the year.

The average rate of commitments was 21.7% for all ACP national programmes. Significant volumes (> 20 MECU) were committed in Mali, Burkina Faso and Nigeria.

The average rate of payment by the end of 1992 was 44%, but the amounts concerned were rather insignificant.

Details on financial cooperation for all ACP countries under Lomé IV are shown in Annex Table 5.

Performance in selected countries

Since by the end of 1992 Lomé IV had been in operation for one full year it is of interest to compare some information on the progress made during that year in various countries. This chapter therefore contains a brief description of the implementation, in particular of the Lomé IV indicative programme, in a number of countries, including the three new members of the Convention : Dominican Republic, Haïti and Namibia.

Burkina Faso

The National Indicative Programme for the 7th EDF, signed in June 1991, started on a turning point with regard to the democratization process in Burkina Faso and implementation of both Structural Adjustment and sectoral policies. In view of the consolidation of these processes during 1992 the conditions for further implementation of the indicative programme are favorable. The National Indicative Programme for Burkina Faso is for an overall amount of 152.5 MECU including 16 MECU in the form of risk capital and 12.5 MECU as a first allocation from the Structural Adjustment Facility.

(5) If the 7 countries where the Community had effectively interrupted its financial cooperation are excluded the average was 27.4%.

With two sectoral priorities - agriculture and road transport - and the funds intended for adjustment, the indicative programme is designed to meet short-term needs while also targetting long-term development requirements. Decisions attained more than 42 MECU by the end of 1992. Secondary commitments and payments reached nearly 23 and 7 MECU respectively.

Dominican Republic

The first National Indicative Programme for the Dominican Republic, a new member of the Lomé Convention, was signed on 6 December 1991. In the course of 1992 total decisions amounted to 33.5 MECU of which 8.5 MECU concerned an oil import programme, financed jointly with a contribution from the Structural Adjustment Facility of 13.5 MECU.

Another important decision was made for an integrated rural development programme in the North-West. The programme will be implemented over 4 years; it includes irrigation works and social infrastructure to improve the living conditions and environment of three small communities (23.6 MECU).

Two big projects in the health and education sector representing 8.8 MECU and 7 MECU respectively, were being prepared in 1992; their presentation to the EDF Committee was expected before the end of the first quarter in 1993.

Ethiopia

Following the end of the war and the change of regime the National Indicative Programme had to be renegotiated and was signed in March 1992.

The amounts available to Ethiopia under Lomé IV were considerably increased during 1992. In view of Ethiopia's decision to embark on a major Economic Reform Programme, the Commission agreed in November to consider, on top of the 265 MECU Lomé IV programmable resources, an additional allocation of around 75 MECU to be provided from the Structural Adjustment funds.

Two large programmes were approved in 1992.

In order to support the transition of Ethiopia towards a market economy and the implementation of its New Economic Policy, a fourth Sectoral Import Programme (27 MECU) was approved that forms part of the EEC contribution to the Emergency Recovery and Rehabilitation project (ERRP). The SIP IV will provide inputs for peasant farmers and basic inputs for private industries. This programme builds on the positive experience gained with three import programmes financed under Lomé III while deliberately shifting the focus to the private sector. The bulk of the SIP IV supplies will be sold to the private sector and counterpart funds used to cover selected local costs of the ERRP.

The main beneficiaries of the SIP IV include small scale private entrepreneurs and smallholders. Both groups should be able to take advantage of the recent policy reforms to increase their output and income. Through the use of counterpart funds, particularly vulnerable groups should benefit from the ERRP social fund.

Thirty years of civil war ending with destruction on a massive scale in many parts of Ethiopia, combined with poor government and several years of drought, had brought Eritrea to the brink of collapse, leaving its socio-economic infrastructure in ruins and its agricultural, industrial and even crafts production facilities unable to function.

The Commission has identified and approved a short-term programme of 20 MECU to aid reconstruction and recovery in Eritrea comprising the following main components :

- integrated rural development, comprising a package of measures designed to improve water management, agricultural production, protection of the environment, health and primary education.
- the road network, specifically repairs to the Massawa-Asmara road link.
- institutional support for a number of government departments, including the preparation of a master plan at national level and technical assistance to accompany the various operations planned on the ground.

Overall, however, it must be recognised that certain political tensions and security problems in a number of regions continued to hamper progress in the preparation and implementation of other development programmes envisaged for EC funding, particularly in rural areas.

Haiti

Haiti is one of the three new members of the Lomé Convention. The Convention was ratified by Haiti but the government was overthrown by a military coup on 30 September 1991 before the indicative programme was signed.

In reaction to this coup the Community and the Member states stopped all financial and technical cooperation with the country as of 3 October 1991.

The Haiti population did benefit, however, from emergency aid financed from the Convention (art. 254) in 1992 (1 MECU) and from NGO cofinancing (1 MECU). Also emergency food aid was provided in the form of 10,000 tons of cereals worth 2.6 MECU.

Other actions were carried out :

- in the framework of decentralised cooperation (0.6 MECU on special budget line), to aid the local population to survive the difficult conditions created inter alia by the embargo on the country. Those projects to build a school and to provide for drinking water in villages were cofinanced with NGOs ;
- 0.6 MECU on budget line "support for promoting human rights and democracy", with an NGO, for supporting associative movements, promoting human rights and democracy, and helping refugees and victims of repression.

All these actions were prepared and implemented outside the official channels of the government.

Côte d'Ivoire

Some large programmes for a total of 53 MECU i.e. 51% of the resources of the National Indicative Programme were approved in 1992. A programme of 28.5 MECU will support coastal communes stimulating the decentralisation policy of the Central Government by increasing the role of the village communes in the economic, political and financial fields in order to improve their contribution to the development of the country.

The programme aims to contribute at various levels to :

- improving living and economic conditions and the urban environment;
- increasing planning capabilities of communities;
- developing economic activities with special attention to the private sector.

Sixteen coastal communities will benefit from this programme.

A second programme will assist the Ministry of Public Health and Social Affairs making available easily accessible and financially attractive basic health facilities to the population. Public services also should become more efficient and effective. The strategy is based on the improvement of infrastructure and the technical competence of the staff in the primary and secondary health services.

Lesotho

Lesotho was confronted with several severe problems in 1992, with the country suffering heavily from the drought which hit the whole region. In response, the Community supplied food aid and contributed to the Government's emergency programme.

Elections were foreseen for November but have been postponed to early 1993. The Community contributed to the democratisation process from counterpart funds and from the EC budget line for human rights support.

The start of the Lomé IV indicative programme was satisfactory. A hydro-electric power project in Muela was approved for a total of 34 MECU from the indicative programme and 20 MECU from the regional cooperation budget. This project should make the country less dependent on outside sources for its energy requirements.

Furthermore a large sum was allocated to microprojects and 8.5 MECU was approved in support of the Structural Adjustment process from the Lomé IV facility.

As a result 82% (35 MECU) of the Lesotho programme had been approved, of which 42% (nearly 15 MECU) had also been committed by the end of the year.

Mali

1992 was a year characterized by particularly positive political trends, with the signature in April 92 of a national pact with the Touaregs and democratic transition with the constitution in June 92 of the first government of the 3rd Republic.

As regards the economy, the objectives of the structural reform programme were pursued. However two important sectors were confronted with new and substantial difficulties:

- the cotton sector due to the fall in the world market rates ;
- the rice sector due to insufficient protection of the national production and the poor management of the Office of Niger.

The implementation of the Lomé III programmes continued, in particular the rehabilitation of major hydro-agricultural installations, together with Lomé IV projects which had started in the second half of 1991:

- a project supporting the creation of small and medium-sized enterprises, thereby extending the successful programmes of previous years;
- Community support for Structural Adjustment (31 MECU) through a general import programme generating counterpart funds which are planned to be used for the social sectors (basic health and education) and the maintenance of road transport infrastructures.

In 1992, the Community supported the organization of democratic elections with counterpart funds. In addition, a new multiannual microproject and study programme in the transport sector were approved and preparatory measures to strengthen cooperation in the field of basic health were taken.

Lastly, cooperation continued in coordination with the principal donors, in the field of food security, in particular, for the restructuring of the cereals market.

Namibia

The third new member of the Lomé Convention had its National Indicative Programme signed on 16 March 1992. It included 45 MECU in grants and 6 MECU to be allocated in the form of risk capital. The NIP states that assistance will be given in the following 3 focal sectors :

- | | |
|---|-----|
| - agriculture and rural development | 40% |
| - health | 30% |
| - education and human resources development | 20% |

The remaining 10% will be used for other activities such as development of trade and services, especially tourism, improvement of low cost housing, technical cooperation and training, communications, cultural cooperation and actions linked to regional cooperation.

By the end of the year 10.5% of the financial envelope had been approved and allocated to projects.

An amount of 4.5 MECU was granted to a programme of In-Service Training and Assistance for Namibian Teachers. Various studies were financed to prepare future programmes.

Under the 1992 Special Food Aid Programme, Namibia was allocated 15.000 tons of wheat, 427 tons of beans and 267 tons of dried fish as drought relief.

Under the normal programme 861 tons of milk powder were donated through the WFP.

Nigeria

The EDF allocation for Nigeria under the first financial protocol of the Lomé IV Convention totals 390 MECU in the form of grants, of which 25 MECU are in direct support of the country's Structural Adjustment process. The indicative programme was signed in December 1990 and by December 1992 the Commission had decided to finance specific actions for a total of 106 MECU (27%). The most important projects are the "Mambilla Tea Integrated Development Project" (28 MECU), the "Aeronautical Satellite Telecommunications Project Central & Western Africa" (38 MECU, including 20 MECU from the Nigerian indicative programme and 18 MECU from the Lomé III regional programme), the "Oban Hills Programme" (16.5 MECU, and 11 MECU financed by KFW-Germany), the "University Libraries Project" (11.5 MECU) and the "Katsina Arid Zone Integrated Development Programme" (25 MECU).

Of the 106 MECU, by end 1992 29.6 MECU had been the subject of secondary commitments and 9 MECU had been disbursed.

The thrust under Lomé IV remains very much the same as under prior Conventions, i.e. rural development and environmental protection, human resources valorisation and export development.

In general the administration of the EC-funded programmes proceeded smoothly although problems remain in relation to the many and complex procedures that need to be followed when bringing supplies into Nigeria. Accumulated delays in clearing and delivering supplies not only result in excessive port charges, but have also serious and detrimental implications on the performance of EC-funded projects, not least when a lot of energy is lost by all concerned in non-productive activities.

Senegal

112 MECU was allocated to Senegal under the 7th EDF. The National Indicative Programme was signed in February 1991 and envisages concentration of resources in two principal sectors:

- the sectoral adjustment programme for transport (PAST);
- the development of the region of St. Louis.

An allocation of 15 MECU under the first allocation of the Structural Adjustment Facility was added to these programmable resources.

In 1992, a financing agreement in support of a structural adjustment programme for the transport sector for 70 MECU, of which 10 MECU from the SAF, was signed between Senegal and the Commission. The 60 MECU from the indicative programme will finance the rehabilitation of part of the priority road network, maintenance of some roads and technical assistance.

10 MECU will be used from the Structural Adjustment Facility for a general import programme. The counterpart funds generated by this programme are to be used on the one hand to cover a part of the needs for road maintenance, and on the other hand to facilitate the voluntary redundancy programme of the Ministry of Equipment, Transport and Sea.

Outside the focal sectors, two projects were decided in 1992: support for the supply of equipment for the elections in 1993 (1.3 MECU) and a tourism promotion project (2 MECU).

At the end of 1992, primary commitments amounted to 57% of the indicative programme and to 67% of the first allocation of the Structural Adjustment Facility.

It was expected that in 1993 the effective implementation of the road programme could start. Furthermore, a financing proposal of 23 MECU in support of the development of the St. Louis region would be submitted to the EDF Committee.

Tanzania

A major political reform - the introduction of multiparty democracy - was carried out in 1992. Nevertheless, obstacles to progress in financial cooperation remained those already identified in previous years : limited local planning and administrative capacity, adverse export crop prices, the slow pace of implementing economic reforms, the still-limited attractiveness of Tanzania to foreign investors (although the mining sector showed major signs of development) and the considerable logistical and climatic handicaps of this very large country. Fortunately Tanzania was spared the worst effects of the 1991-92 East Africa drought. Community food aid was provided - 20,000 MT of cereals equivalent - together with substantial funds for local food distribution and NGO assistance.

In general, EDF assistance to Tanzania progressed well during 1992. Lomé IV primary commitments reached 35% of the total NIP of 166 MECU.

During the year, inflation was contained at about 20% and the growth in food production marginally exceeded population growth. However, despite major reforms in the financial and agricultural sectors the official exchange rate remains about 20% over-valued, and liberalisation of export crop marketing is still incomplete and continues to have major negative effects on the rural smallholder population.

In this context 30 MECU of Structural Adjustment assistance was provided from Lomé resources, to support mainly agricultural sector reforms and the health and education budgets through the use of counterpart funds.

In the priority National Indicative Programme transport and communications sectors, new projects were approved to strengthen the Tanzanian Railways Corporation (19 MECU, plus 14 MECU from Regional EDF funds), to rehabilitate the Musoma-Mukuyu road link between Kenya and Tanzania (10.7 MECU from NIP and 18.7 from Regional funds), and to re-equip the telecommunications network in the Southern Highlands (25 MECU). Assistance of 2 MECU to help prepare the privatisation of the Morogoro Canvass Mill was also approved and a variety of new projects were prepared for decision in 1993.

The preparation of Lomé IV assistance to the agricultural sector, which is the other focal sector of the NIP (with transport), was handicapped throughout the year by the slow pace of reforms in agricultural marketing, which reduced the possibilities for the private sector to grow and maintained a number of administrative inefficiencies and bottlenecks in place. Nevertheless the direction of reform remains good and some initial planning was made in late 1992 for assistance to the sector in 1993.

Zambia

Zambia suffered during 1992 from a severe drought which had a heavy impact on the economy. GDP went down by more than 10%. The Community contributed a total of 107,000 tons of food aid to help avoid famine.

By the end of 1992 decisions amounted to 80.1 MECU (i.e. 63% of the resources available under the NIP and Structural Adjustment Facility). Secondary commitments and payments were 49.3 MECU and 44 MECU respectively.

The most important project approved in 1992 was a Structural Adjustment Support Programme of 41.5 MECU. This included 32 MECU from the Structural Adjustment Facility and 9.5 MECU from the National Indicative Programme. The allocation from the Structural Adjustment Facility to Zambia under Lomé IV was increased in 1992 from 16 to 32 MECU given the enormous needs and the relatively good performance until now. The foreign exchange component of this programme financed a General Import Programme. The counterpart funds generated allowed the Government to finance the social sectors within the budget. The project was approved in June and the payment for the second and last tranche took place in December 1992.

Apart from this programme, an increase of 2.5 MECU was approved out of Lomé IV funds for an import programme originally approved under Lomé III.

Producer Associations in the areas of tobacco, coffee, horticultural products (flowers), and textile fibres will be supported, from a revolving fund, technical assistance, training, etc. with the approval of an export development programme (10 MECU)

A microprojects programme (5 MECU) was decided in 1992. Under the previous Conventions two programmes had been successfully carried out.

Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe was confronted during 1992 with the worst drought in living memory. This had a negative impact in particular on macroeconomic performance and public finances. Thus, real GDP is estimated to have declined by about 11% due to a substantial fall in agricultural and manufacturing output. The Community contributed a total of 80,000 T of food aid in support of the Government's drought relief efforts.

The decision rate of the indicative programme of Lomé IV reached 35% at the end of 1992 notably due to the approval of some large projects.

The Zimtrade Support Programme (10.2 MECU) aimed at developing Zimbabwe's foreign trade was signed in 1992. Implementation will start in 1993.

A large microprojects programme (24 MECU) was approved of which the first in a series of three for a total amount of + 8 MECU started in that year.

Finally, a Structural Adjustment Support Programme (28 MECU) was approved in December of which 9 MECU came from the National Indicative Programme in support of Zimbabwe's Structural Adjustment process.

3.3 The implementation of large programmes and projects under Lomé III

82 programmes and projects each costing more than 10 MECU were approved in 35 ACP States in the context of National Indicative Programmes under Lomé III by the end of 1992⁽⁶⁾.

Details of amounts and dates of approval, commitments and payments are given in Annex Table 8.

The average commitment rate for large programmes was 73.4% compared to 78.7% for all programmed aid, the payment rate was 71.1% (79.2% for all national programmed aid)⁽⁷⁾.

It is normal that larger, multi-component programmes take more time to complete. Yet, from a comparison between the 1991 and 1992 results it can be observed that the implementation of all programmed aid was reaching the final phases. The difference between commitment and payment rates for all national programmed aid compared to projects costing more than 10 MECU decreased by a few significant percentage points from 7% and 10.6% in 1991 to 5.3% and 7.5% respectively by the end of 1992.

(6) The analysis excludes the import support programmes which are discussed in Chapter 4.

(7) For the definition of commitment and payment rate see box 2 on page 17.

15 projects were near completion or closure in 1992, such as the rural rehabilitation project in Benin (24.3 MECU), the rural development programme in the Benoue Bassin in Cameroon (25 MECU), a livestock development programme in Central Africa (10 MECU), the palm plantation project in Côte d'Ivoire (20.9 MECU), an infrastructure rehabilitation project in Guyana (17.25 MECU), the rehabilitation of Beira Port in Mozambique (10.3 MECU) and rural construction and/or rehabilitation projects in Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, Chad and Uganda.

Of a total of 82 large programmes and projects, 56 have had implementation delays when applying the criteria set by the Commission⁽⁸⁾. However, 36 projects had implementation delays due to factors which had their effect before 1992.

Thus 20 projects experienced continued implementation difficulties in 1992.

This number was a significant drop from the 30 projects with implementation difficulties in 1991. Analysis showed that of the 30 projects delayed in 1991, 14 made good progress again in 1992. One project in Somalia was abandoned and decommitted.

Examples of the fourteen projects which were progressing well again in 1992 were the rural development programme in the province of Mono in Benin, the rural development project for the province of Sissilli and the rural construction Yako Ouahigou in Burkina Faso, the Mugamba social economic development programme in Burundi, the rural development poles programme in Cameroon, the livestock development programme in Côte d'Ivoire, the Shewa rural development programme in Ethiopia, the agricultural livestock research support programme in Kenya which underwent a major revision in 1991, the required development programme in Gorgol in Mauritania, the Sokoto desert programme in Nigeria and the strategic food support programme in Rwanda.

Ten of the twenty projects which suffered - continued - delays in 1992 were located in countries with a difficult political situation during the whole year which hampered development cooperation : Ethiopia, Liberia, Sudan (3 projects), Togo and Zaire (4 projects).

(8) The analysis of progress was based on a comparison of individual commitment and payment rates and by looking at movements in the EDF accounts. Where there had been no movement in the accounts for six months or more and/or the rate of commitment and/or payment was 5% points below the average for all large programmes, the project was deemed delayed. For projects approved before 1989 a payment rate of 75% was required. Further analysis was then made to see if the situation of the project had improved during 1992. In general, when a higher than average increase, (i.e. approximately 20% points for commitment if the average rate was below 80% and 30% for the payment rate if the average rate was below 60%) was found the progress in 1992 was considered as satisfactory.

Factors related to general social and political circumstances, explained the slow progress of large projects such as the rural development programmes in Chad, the regional Fedar project in Congo and the cereals reform programme in Kenya and the large irrigation programme in Niger.

It is normal procedure to evaluate and review the implementation of large programmes at their mid-term. In some cases such reviews led to a reorientation of the programme which may have implied certain delays for further continuation. Such situations were found to explain some delays e.g. in the case of the rural development programmes in Chad and Guinea Bissau, the smallholders development programmes in Zambia and the Feeder roads programme for the agricultural sector in Tanzania.

Difficulties related to local institutional or administrative complications retarded progress in a number of countries. Specific examples of large programmes whose implementation suffered from these complexities were the Fedar project in Congo, the transport infrastructure programme in Ghana and the rural development programmes in Togo.

3.4 Regional Cooperation

3.4.1 Lomé III

Article 112 of the Lomé III Convention foresaw 1 billion ECU for the financing of regional programmes and projects.

The total allocation is made up of grants, special loans and risk capital to be financed by the EDF, and loans from the EIB's own resources.

The allocation was reduced in 1989 by 15.2 MECU which was transferred to the Stabex system.

The total amount remaining of 984.8 MECU has been allocated to all regions except for an amount of 99.8 MECU to be used for a global allocation to all ACP States and a reserve for trade promotion, as laid down by Art. 100 of the Convention, with a minimum of 60 MECU.

By the end of 1992, 867 MECU or 88% of these funds had been approved for projects.

The amount decided for programmed regional projects was 824 MECU i.e. 93.2% of the envelope of 884.8 MECU which is nearly equal to the decision rate for national indicative programmes (93.8%).

Differences existed between various regions. A high rate of decision was found in East Africa (94.4%) and in West Africa (92%). Central Africa (59%) and the Pacific (69.1%) represented lower than average levels.

In both regions 1992 was an especially active period for programme preparation which should enable the allocation of funds in 1993.

The global allocation for all ACP States and the 60 MECU for trade promotion was increased and decisions reached 72 MECU by the end of the year.

The Lomé III overall levels of commitment for regional cooperation - 627 MECU (= 72% of decisions) and payments 455 MECU (= 72.6% of commitments) - caught up considerably with national programmed aid commitments and payment rates.

Table 3.2 Lomé III - Regional Cooperation - Approvals, Commitments and Payments by region at end 1992.

Region	Approvals MECU	Commitments MECU	Payments MECU
West Africa	219	145	78
Central Africa	53	31	16
East Africa	203	161	120
Southern Africa	116	85	72
Indian Ocean	24	10	5
Caribbean	60	35	31
Pacific	27	23	13
All ACP	93	85	85
Trade Promotion	72	51	38
Total	867	627	455

As regards large projects and programmes, costing more than 10 MECU, a total of 20 had been approved under regional cooperation programmed aid. Nine of these projects have experienced delays in their implementation⁽⁹⁾. However, only 3 continued to show insufficient progress in 1992. The average rate of commitment and payment for large regional programmes was 78.3% and 69.2% respectively, which is significantly higher than the corresponding averages for large projects financed from National Indicative Programmes.

Five projects were finished or were near completion : the Karonga-Ibanda road, the rehabilitation of the Beira Port in Mozambique, the Northern Corridor Transport Road in Kenya/Uganda, Bequia airport in St. Vincent and the Grenadines and the transport programme for Burundi.

Continued good progress was made in 1992 with the Solar Energy Project in the Sahel, the Environment Information Programme in Burkina Faso, the Bukombe-Isaka road in Tanzania and the Marine Resources Development programme in the Pacific region.

However projects that suffered continued delays were the Regional Education Programme in the Caribbean, Rehabilitation of the Lower Fouta Djallon in Niger and the Rural Rehabilitation of Godomey-Bohicon in Benin.

(9) For criteria see box 2 on page 17.

3.4.2 Lomé IV

The Fourth Lomé Convention attaches particular importance to regional cooperation. In comparison to the former Conventions, Lomé IV contains some essential innovations, both with regard to the objectives, and to the methods and procedures for regional cooperation.

In particular, a central role was attributed to the promotion and support of regional economic integration.

A Regional Indicative Programme was concluded by the end of 1992 for each of the seven ACP regions. In four regions, the programming exercise was coordinated by a regional organisation.

In each of the regional indicative programmes the promotion and support of intra-regional trade and the coordination of sectoral and macro-economic policies at regional level was mentioned as a primary objective. The ACP States concerned have committed themselves to undertake the necessary measures to facilitate this process.

Along with operations which directly promote economic integration, it is planned to select and implement the regional activities to be undertaken in the framework of the priority sectors determined for each region, in accordance with this overall objective. The main sectors on which Lomé IV regional cooperation activities will be concentrated are : transport and communications, food security and the conservation of natural resources, trade and investment development, and human resources development.

The Commission has begun a study of regional integration and contributed to discussions in three major international fora. During 1992, work continued in the Global Coalition for Africa (GCA). In particular, the Commission presented a discussion paper to the GCA Consultative Committee Meeting in May 1992, analysing the conditions favourable to the integration process and proposing some concrete actions in this regard.

After having launched the discussion on the interdependence of regional integration and Structural Adjustment in the Donor Meeting of the Special Programme of Assistance for Sub-Saharan Africa (SPA) in 1991, the Commission also initiated a debate on the topic of regional cooperation and integration in a high level meeting of the Development Aid Committee of the OECD (September 1992). In both fora, a broad consensus existed between donors on the need for coordinated strategies, and a start was made on the definition of the main principles.

In addition, the Commission is providing intellectual support to a number of integration initiatives launched by ACP States. These include the Regional Reform Programme of the Customs Union of Central African States, the transformation of the Monetary Union of West African States into a Monetary and Economic Union and initiatives to facilitate trade, investments and intra-regional payments in Eastern and Southern Africa.

In compliance with another new principle of Lomé IV, i.e. the geographical transcendence of regional cooperation (Art.156 par. 4), a cooperation framework was concluded between the Commission and the five ACP countries having Portuguese as their official language, with a view to undertaking common actions in the field of human resources development. Common constraints, and the advantages of economies of scale in the implementation of such projects form the basis of this cooperation.

The implementation of Lomé IV regional programmes has not progressed significantly in 1992, due to the fact that the regional programmes, providing the framework for concrete activities, were only concluded in the course of the year. Consequently, at the end of 1992, primary commitments of all Lomé IV regional cooperation activities were limited to 211 MECU (17% of the total resources), and secondary commitments did not exceed 62 MECU. Most of the approved programmes were in East and West Africa and for projects concerning all ACP States. At the same date, the disbursement rate for all regional operations was 38 MECU. This situation is comparable to that under previous Conventions. Because of structural constraints linked to reaching agreements on the priorities on a regional level, regional cooperation actions usually take more time to launch than national programmes.

3.5 Microprojects

During 1992, eleven multiannual microproject programmes were adopted under the accelerated decision procedure subject to the signature of the Chief Authorizing Officer. The total of primary commitments entered into was 37.7 MECU. In order to ensure the financing of these actions a second overall amount of 30 MECU was approved by the Commission on 26 November 1992.

The total sum decided in 1992 accounted for approximately 43% of all microprojects financed under Lomé III. This confirms that the microprojects are arousing increasing interest. This tendency is likely to be strengthened. To encourage this the Commission drew up and disseminated a specific document concerning the general guidelines for the use of microprojects within the framework of Lomé IV. This document was based on the conclusions from previous experiences and on the recommendations of a study carried out in 1990-1991.

The sectors mainly concerned by microprojects in 1992 were economic and social infrastructures in rural areas, in particular village water works, education, and health. Various operations also took place in the agricultural productive sector and for small enterprises.

3.6 Industrial Cooperation and Private Investment

A large number of ACP States have included the private sector in their Indicative Programmes as one of the areas in which Community aid under Lomé IV will complement policy measures and actions undertaken by the national authorities.

In the course of 1992, attention has been focused on the identification and appraisal of private sector support projects in the following countries : Burundi, Congo, Comoros, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea Bissau, Jamaica, Kenya, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Seychelles, Togo and Uganda.

These projects can either be situated :

- at the macro-economic level to improve the environment in which the private sector operates;
- at an intermediary level, e.g. to reorganise financial institutions, to support Chambers of Commerce or other bodies providing services to the local enterprises;
- or at the enterprise level, e.g. providing credit line facilities for investment financing, training actions etc.

A financing decision was taken in 1992 for support for the private sector and promotion of small and medium sized enterprises in the Congo.

Commission services also finalised a number of studies and reports to facilitate the appraisal and implementation of future projects in this field. Two studies, in particular, should be noted, on the replicability of SME projects, following experiences in Mali and Malawi, and a report on private sector development in Namibia, Nigeria and Zimbabwe.

Operational coordination between the Commission, the European Investment Bank and the CDI was strengthened during regular meetings in 1992. The Commission also considers it indispensable to coordinate with other donor organisations to improve effectiveness and avoid overlapping of projects.

The Council approved the proposal of the Commission on the implementation of Lomé IV regarding the protection principles of European private investment in ACP countries.

Investment promotion through the organisation of industrial fora whereby European and ACP industrial operators can exchange information on concrete investment opportunities remains an important element of ACP/EEC industrial cooperation. In December 1992 the 10th EC-West Africa Industrial Forum was organised in Dakar. This forum was successful with a high number of participants (750). More than 4,000 bilateral meetings were held and about 65 letters of intent were signed in relation to 400 industrial projects which had been identified beforehand.

In 1992, the Commission agreed to prepare the proposals concerning the legal framework of the CDI. The proposal regarding CDI staff regulations was approved in December 1992.

The CDI carried out 190 operations to promote industrial projects in the ACP States. 94 of these were completed in 1992. 40% of these took the form of studies and technical assistance operations. 48% resulted in specific projects, 20% of which are new undertakings. 2% reached the stage of joint venture agreements. Only 10% have either not had any significant results or have been abandoned by the promoters.

Box 3

Development of Tourism

Article 121 of the Lomé IV Convention states that in view of the real importance of the tourism industry for the ACP States, the Contracting Parties shall implement measures and operations to develop and support tourism. These measures shall be implemented at all levels, from the identification of the tourism product to marketing and promotion.

The aim shall be to support the ACP States' efforts to derive maximum benefit from national, regional and international tourism in view of tourism's impact on economic development and to stimulate private financial flows from the Community and other sources into the development of tourism in the ACP States. Particular attention shall be given to the need to integrate tourism into the social, cultural and economic life of the people.

Article 122 sets out that tourism development programmes and projects based on these policies should cover human resources and institutional development, product development, market development and research and information.

Box 4

Trade Development

The objectives and measures for trade development are laid down in Articles 135 - 138 of the Convention. In particular, Article 136 of the Fourth Lomé Convention sets out that :

1. In promoting the development of trade and services, in addition to developing trade between the ACP States and the Community, particular attention shall be given to operations designed to increase the ACP States' self-reliance, develop intra-ACP trade, trade to international markets and improve regional cooperation in trade and services.
2. Operations shall be undertaken at the request of the ACP States, particularly in the following areas :
 - the establishment of coherent trade strategies;
 - development of human resources and professional skills in the field of trade and services;
 - the establishment, adaptation and strengthening of organisations in the ACP States dealing with the development of trade and services, particular attention being paid to the special needs of organisations in the least-developped, landlocked and island ACP States;
 - support for the ACP States' efforts to develop and improve the quality of their products, adapt them to market requirement and diversify their outlets;
 - market development measures including increasing contacts and exchange of information between economic operators in ACP States, the Member States of the Community and in third countries;
 - support for ACP States in the application of modern marketing techniques in production-oriented sectors and programmes in areas such as rural development and agriculture;
 - support for the ACP States' efforts to develop and improve supportive service infrastructure, including transport and storage facilities, in order to ensure effective distribution of goods and services and in order to enhance the flow of exports from ACP States;

3.7 Trade and tourism development

In the context of the decline of ACP States' share of both world trade and EC trade, the Lomé IV Convention gave greater emphasis than its predecessors to trade, services and tourism development. While many ACP States suffer from a combination of factors which inhibit their trade development efforts, such as reliance on few (or often one) primary materials, absence of competitiveness, few markets and the absence of professional marketing skills, many among them gave greater priority to trade and services development in national and regional programmes under Lomé IV.

The Commission responded positively to the desire of selected ACP States and regional organisations to give greater priority to trade and services development. For countries and regions with a strong commitment to Structural Adjustment, economic reform and trade liberalisation, a strong component for the development of trade and services aimed at domestic, regional or international markets is an essential ingredient.

At the regional level the trade and tourism sectors are among the top focal sectors in the Caribbean, Indian Ocean and the Pacific and feature to a lesser degree in programmes for East, Southern and West Africa.

At the national level too, programmes, in some cases of more substantial proportions than ever before, have either been approved and are in the course of execution (Zimbabwe, Fiji) or were undergoing the final stages of design prior to approval (Botswana, Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar, Nigeria, Senegal, Jamaica, Barbados, Papua New Guinea, Uganda and Zambia).

Despite considerable constraints (terrorism, disease, natural and man-made disasters), tourism, on a global basis, has consistently continued to grow at rates ahead of visible trade. A feature of requests to the Commission for aid for the sector has been the emphasis on support for national strategic planning, product protection (eco-tourism) and market development. This trend is expected to continue. Many countries in the ACP Group are heavily dependent on tourism and have few sectoral development options.

In the field of trade cooperation, the object of the Convention is to promote trade between the ACP States and the Community, taking account of their respective levels of development, and also between the ACP States themselves.

In the pursuit of this objective, particular regard shall be had to improving the conditions of access for their products to the market in order to accelerate the growth of their trade.

Support for the expanding range of activities carried out by professional (ACP/EC) organisations sponsored by the Commission has also featured prominently as part of programmes for trade and services during 1992.

Aproma opened up dialogue and trading opportunities for ACP producers of soft commodities in Central and Eastern Europe while continuing to underpin restructuring of production and distribution networks in existing markets.

Coleacp provided expanded support for ACP producers of fruit, vegetables and floriculture and work continued through the Union de Dakar to strengthen ACP capacities in export credit and insurance, including re-insurance.

Finally the technical and financial support of the Commission was extended to ACP States for 300 operations involving participation at trade fairs, the organisation of trade missions, the provision of over one million pieces of technical literature and brochures, and the organisation of sectoral seminars and conferences.

In the context of Annex XX of Lomé IV, the EDF is supporting a two-phase Trade Development Project for the ACP Secretariat designed to identify factors which inhibit more effective use of trade and services development provisions by the ACP States and to design a programme to minimise such factors and constraints to more effective sectoral development and progress.

4. Structural Adjustment, Special Debt Programme and import programmes

4.1 The Special Debt Programme and import support programmes under Lomé III

The introduction of quick disbursing import support programmes was the Community's response to the severe shortages of foreign exchange in ACP States, thus contributing in the short term to the relief of these external financial problems.⁽¹⁰⁾

Community financing was provided through Art. 188 of the Lomé III Convention which specified the conditions for assistance to resolve problems of a structural nature through the provision of inputs to the productive system, and the Special Debt Programme decided during the Summit in Venice in 1987 and adopted by the Council in December of that year.⁽¹¹⁾

The Community programme was integrated in a more comprehensive initiative for the Sub-Saharan African countries coordinated by the World Bank and with the participation of approximately 20 other bilateral and multilateral donors.

(10) A description of the objectives of and procedures involved in import support programmes is contained at point 5 of the Annex to this report.

(11) The resources of the debt programme (572 MECU) are made up of 311 MECU of additional resources (211 from the Lomé III programmed aid reserve and 100 MECU covered by a Council Decision of 19.12.87) together with 261 MECU from the normal indicative programme allocation of ACP States.

The Community Special Debt Programme was planned in the same way as the World Bank Programme for a period of three years (1988-1990) and expired on 31.12.1990.

At the end of 1992 total payments under the Special Debt Programme amounted to 525.9 MECU i.e. 95.7% (compared to 85.5% at end 1991) of the approved amount of 549.8 MECU.

Total decisions for all import programmes, including the Special Debt Programme, were 815.2 MECU by the end of the year. Payments reached 749.2 MECU, i.e. 92% of all decisions. This rate is considerably higher than for all programmed aid (61%) which confirms the quick disbursing nature of the import support programmes (also see tables 4.1 and 4.2).

Only a very few programmes are confronted with implementation delays.

Countries with relatively low payments were Mauritius and Sierra Leone with percentages of 68.9% and 40.6% respectively.

4.2 Structural Adjustment under Lomé IV

Main policy objectives

On the basis of the relevant provisions of the Fourth Lomé Convention, the Commission has developed its policy in the field of Structural Adjustment along the lines indicated in the Council Resolution of May 1992, which were also endorsed by the ACP/EEC Council⁽¹²⁾

This policy, which implies close cooperation with the Bretton Woods Institutions, has four main objectives :

- (i) to focus efforts on the essential aspects with regard to provisions of the Convention : reconciling adjustment with long-term development, the need to adapt the pace of reforms to the specific constraints and capacities (political and social) of each country, the need to take account of the regional dimension of adjustment and of the social dimension of adjustment;
- (ii) maximising consistency with other Community instruments (food aid, Stabex) which act in a similar manner upon the balance of payments, and which may generate counterpart funds;
- (iii) increasing involvement in the public finances of the States concerned, first in order to help them improve their budgetary process, but also to establish an instrument enabling them to ensure that the recipient ACP States comply with budget commitments and thus to make Community aid safe;
- (iv) stepping up coordination with other donors - i.e. Member States, IMF, World Bank - both at design and operational level.

(12) Resolution ACP/EEC 2126/1/92/Rev. 1.

Implementation

Specific resources totalling 1,150 MECU have been earmarked for support for the adjustment process in the ACP States under Lomé IV.

Of this amount, an initial total allocation of some 460 MECU was made for the 38 eligible countries, topped up with additional resources from the National Indicative Programmes totalling some 220 MECU. The Commission therefore earmarked a sum of 680 MECU to cover requirements of ACP countries undergoing adjustment for the period 1991-92.

Between October 1991 and December 1992, 24 financing decisions were taken, for a total amount of 447.4 MECU, of which 307.5 MECU came from the Structural Adjustment Facility, whereas the remaining funds were taken from the National Indicative Programmes of the countries concerned. Total disbursements amounted to 199 MECU by the end of 1992 i.e. 44.5% of the approved aid.

High levels of payments were recorded in Burkina Faso (17 MECU), Cameroon (17 MECU), Mali (30 MECU), Uganda (14 MECU), Papua New Guinea (11 MECU), Tanzania (15 MECU) and Zambia (41.5 MECU).

Table 4.3 shows the details of decisions and payments by country.

In November 1992, the Commission reallocated all undisbursed funds amongst potentially eligible states for Structural Adjustment support for the years 1993 and 1994.

These disbursement targets for the years 1993 and 1994, for a total amount of 426 MECU were notified to 16 ACP States, whose adjustment programme required commitment of funds during the first semester 1993. Additional resources will be allocated in the course of 1993, for the countries that comply with the minimum criteria set for launching negotiations on a contribution to their adjustment programme.

Table 4.1

 * LOME III SPECIAL DEBT PROGRAMME *

MECU

: Situation as at :		: Additional resource :					
: 31-12-92 :		: N.I.P. :		: & :		: Total :	
: Country :		: Decisions Payments :		: Reserve :		: Decisions Payments :	
: Decisions Payments :		: Decisions Payments :		: Decisions Payments :		: Decisions Payments :	
: Benin	: 19.7 19.4	: 11.0 11.0	: 30.7 30.4				
: Burundi	: 12.0 11.9	: 12.0 11.9					
: Centrafrique	: 7.0 6.2	: 7.0 6.2					
: Gambie	: 1.9 1.9	: 3.0 3.0	: 4.9 4.9				
: Ghana	: 9.0 8.0	: 11.5 11.2	: 20.5 19.2				
: Guinee	: 12.5 12.5	: 12.5 12.5					
: Guinee Bissau	: 3.4 2.5	: 6.0 6.0	: 9.4 8.5				
: Guinee Equatoriale	: 1.5 1.3	: 1.5 1.3					
: Kenya	: 35.0 35.0	: 7.0 7.0	: 42.0 42.0				
: Madagascar	: 4.8 2.1	: 15.0 15.0	: 19.7 17.1				
: Malawi	: 42.2 38.2	: 12.5 12.5	: 54.7 50.7				
: Mali	: 10.0 10.0	: 18.5 18.5	: 28.5 28.5				
: Mauritanie	: 7.0 7.0	: 7.0 7.0					
: Mozambique	: 37.4 36.7	: 21.9 18.6	: 59.3 55.3				
: Niger	: 14.0 13.4	: 14.0 13.4					
: Ouganda	: 17.3 17.2	: 17.1 17.1	: 34.4 34.4				
: Sao Tome	: 0.2 0.2	: 1.0 0.9	: 1.2 1.1				
: Senegal	: 11.5 11.5	: 11.5 11.5					
: Somalie	: 15.0 14.9	: 14.4 14.3	: 29.3 29.2				
: Soudan	: 15.8 11.0	: 15.8 11.0					
: Tanzanie	: 24.5 23.4	: 24.5 23.4					
: Tchad	: 9.5 9.5	: 9.5 9.5					
: Togo	: 3.0 2.9	: 7.0 6.8	: 10.0 9.7				
: Zaire	: 10.5 10.5	: 19.5 19.3	: 30.0 29.8				
: Zambie	: 49.0 46.5	: 11.0 10.9	: 60.0 57.4				
: Total	: 258.1 245.9	: 291.7 280.0	: 549.8 525.9				

Table 4.2

 * LOME III OTHER IMPORT PROGRAMMES *

MECU				

:	:	:	:	:
:	6th EDF	:	Cumulative Situation as at 31-12-92 :	
:	:	:	Decisions	Payments Payment Rate:
:	Country	:	(1)	(2) (3)
:	:	:	:	:

:	Angola	:	38.5	37.9 98.4%:
:	Cameroun	:	12.5	11.9 95.0%:
:	Cap Vert	:	4.0	3.9 96.7%:
:	Cote d'Ivoire	:	41.0	41.0 100.0%:
:	Ethiopie	:	51.5	42.0 81.6%:
:	Guyane	:	17.3	16.2 93.8%:
:	Jamaique	:	15.5	10.3 66.7%:
:	Maurice	:	3.0	2.1 68.9%:
:	Mozambique	:	9.7	0.0 0.0%:
:	Nigeria	:	10.0	10.0 100.0%:
:	Papouasie N. Guinee	:	5.5	5.5 100.0%:
:	Rwanda	:	12.0	10.1 84.1%:
:	Sierra Leone	:	6.0	2.4 40.6%:
:	Soudan	:	17.8	16.9 94.9%:
:	Suriname	:	8.5	7.2 84.7%:
:	Trinite & Tobago	:	12.0	6.0 50.0%:
:	Zambie	:	0.5	- 0.0%:

:	TOTAL	:	265.230	223.332 84.2%:

Note : (3) : Payment Rate : (2)/(1)

Table 4.3

LOME IV

 * STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT *
 * & IMPORT PROGRAMMES *
 ***** MECU

7th EDF	NIP	Cumulative Situation	
Country	&/or SAF	as at 31-12-1992.	Payments
Country	SAF	Decisions	Payments
Benin	NIP/SAF:	17.0	9.0
Burkina Faso	NIP/SAF:	22.5	17.0
Burundi	SAF :	12.0	0.0
Cameroun	NIP/SAF:	29.5	17.0
Cote d'Ivoire	SAF :	15.5	10.1
Dominicaine Republ.	NIP/SAF:	22.0	9.6
Dominique	SAF :	2.0	0.0
Ethiopie	- :	27.0	0.0
Gambie	NIP/SAF:	4.0	2.4
Ghana	NIP/SAF:	20.0	10.0
Guinee	SAF :	14.0	7.0
Guyane	NIP :	4.5	0.0
Jamaique	NIP/SAF:	7.1	0.0
Lesotho	SAF :	8.5	0.0
Mali	NIP/SAF:	31.0	30.2
Mozambique	NIP/SAF:	45.0	0.0
Ouganda	NIP/SAF:	31.3	14.3
Papoua.nlle.Guinee	NIP/SAF:	11.0	11.0
Sao Tome & Principe	SAF :	1.5	0.0
Senegal	SAF :	10.0	5.0
Sierra Leone	NIP/SAF:	20.0	0.0
Tanzanie	SAF :	30.0	15.0
Togo	NIP/SAF:	17.0	0.0
Tuvalu	- :	0.9	0.0
Zambie	NIP/SAF:	41.5	41.5
Zimbabwe	NIP/SAF:	28.0	0.0
TOTAL		472.8	199.1

Note : This table includes the Structural Adjustment Support (NIP) , the Structural Adjustment Facilities (SAF) and other Import Programmes for 2 Countries Ethiopia and Tuvalu.

Box 5

Counterpart funds

Counterpart funds are mainly generated by the following Community instruments :

- Import programmes financed from the Structural Adjustment Facility,
- Import Support Programmes financed from resources of the Indicative Programmes,
- Stabex and Sysmin transfers,
- Food aid.

The constitution, utilisation and monitoring of counterpart funds are the subject of the Council resolution of 27 May 1991 and an instruction note of the Commission of 14 March 1991. These rules provide that counterpart funds must be utilized as part of a single, consistent budgetary policy covering both current expenditure and investment. Priority is given to the social, health and education sectors and the environment.

4.3 Counterpart funds

Community support for Structural Adjustment has mainly taken the form of general import programmes whereby foreign exchange is allocated to the Central Bank of the countries concerned to ensure that economic operators have the necessary resources to finance their imports.

General import programmes predominate because they are a suitable instrument in a situation of economic liberalization and because of the advantages of this type of programme for countries with convertible currencies (the CFA area, for example) which, under current legislation, are unable to obtain direct budget aid.

These programmes generate counterpart funds which have gradually been integrated into the context of macroeconomic policy and the financial and monetary balances of the countries concerned.

A cross analysis of the use made of counterpart funds shows clearly the priority given to the social sectors of health and education, which on an average absorbed 70% of available resources. The political objective sought was, on the one hand, to offset the adverse social effects of budgetary policies resulting from the stabilization process, by ensuring the maintenance of basic social services at an adequate level and giving the neediest sections of the population greater access to them; and, on the other hand, to preserve the conditions for long-term development by sufficient expenditure on human resources development. An overview of the use of counterpart funds is given in Annex Table 11

Box 6

What is Stabex?

The system for stabilizing export earnings from agricultural commodities was first introduced in Lomé I with the objective of providing funds to ACP countries to cover shortfalls in earnings brought about by fluctuations in prices or output of agricultural products exported to EEC countries.

Article 186 of Lomé IV stipulates that the system should contribute to remedying the harmful effects of instability of export earnings and to help the ACP States overcome one of the main obstacles to the stability, profitability and sustained growth of their economies. In order to obtain the objective, transfers shall be devoted, in accordance with a framework of mutual obligations to be agreed between the ACP State concerned and the Commission in each case, either to the sector that recorded the loss of export earnings and be used there for the benefit of economic operators adversely affected by this loss, or, where appropriate, to diversification, for use in other appropriate productive sectors.

Eligibility for assistance is based on the two following criteria :

1. A product is eligible if, in the year prior to the year of application, it represented 5% of a country's total export earnings to all destinations (4 % for sisal).
2. A country is eligible if there has been a drop in earnings of at least 4.5% - as compared to an average for the six years minus the lowest and the highest figures, preceding the year of application.

(Note : in both cases the percentage is 1% for least developed, landlocked and island ACP states.)

Beneficiary countries are required to give an account of what is done with aid funds.

Box 7

Sysmin

The "Special Financing Facility" or Sysmin system was first provided for in Lomé II to assist ACP States heavily dependent on mining exports to the Community to remedy the harmful effects on their incomes of serious temporary disruptions affecting the mining sector.

The products covered by Sysmin under Lomé IV are copper and cobalt, phosphates, manganese, bauxite and alumina, tin, iron ore, uranium. Countries can apply for Sysmin aid if the relevant products have on average, represented more than 15% of their total exports for 4 years (10% for least developed countries) or 20% or more of their export earnings from all mining products (12% for LDIC).

5. Non-programmed aid

5.1 Stabex

For the 1991 application year, the second year during which Stabex is governed by the provisions of the fourth ACP-EEC convention, 35 ACP states benefited from 67 transfers.

After application of Article 197.3 and 4 of the Convention and after the reductions ruled by Article 203 of the Convention, the total sum of the transfer was 1,062 MECU.

The resources available from the system consisted of the annual allocation for the financial year 1991 reduced by the automatic drawing of 25% applied the previous financial year (225 MECU), and increased by the anticipated drawing of 25% over the 1992 application year (75 MECU) and the amount of the interests released on 31 July 1992 in accordance with Article 192 of the Convention (16.5 MECU). This amount of 316.5 MECU was insufficient to cover the total sum of the transfer bases after reductions under Article 230. These were reduced by 10% in accordance with the provisions of Article 194 paragraph 2 of the Convention.

The total sum of the thus reduced transfer bases (956.1 MECU) still exceeded the funds available. The ACP-EEC Committee of Ambassadors, on 16 July 1992, agreed to add to the resources available under the 1991 application year an extra 75 MECU mobilized by an exceptional drawing on the resources of the system, thereby reducing the amount of the annual instalments for the 1993 and 1994 application years by 37.5 MECU

Following this decision of the ACP-EEC Committee of Ambassadors the total financial resources of the system for the 1991 application year were 391.5 MECU, the coverage of the eligible amounts being established at approximately 40.9%.

The result for each beneficiary country (see Annex Table 10) shows, as for the 1990 application year, that compared to the 1988 and 1989 application years the transfers were less concentrated on a small number of countries.

The analysis by product (see Annex Table 10) confirmed the 3-year trend, namely that the income losses due to very low coffee and cocoa prices on the international market explained the biggest share of the transferred amounts. Resources transferred for these two products accounted for 81.7% (64.09% for coffee and 17.61% for cocoa) of the total.

By the end of 1992, most "framework agreements of mutual obligations" which lay down the arrangements for the use of the transfers and the corresponding funds in local currencies relating to the transfers decided for the 1990 application year had been signed and that implementation had started.

5.2 Sysmin

5.2.1 Lomé II

By the end of 1991, 205 MECU were decided for seven projects i.e. 89.1% of the envelope of 230 MECU available under Lomé II. Six projects were either completed or nearly completed by the end of the year. One project in Rwanda was still being implemented.

An amount of approximately 25 MECU was reserved for a project in Jamaica which was still under preparation in 1992.

Commitments and payments reached 200 MECU and 188 MECU respectively by the end of 1992. The Sysmin instrument under the 5th EDF was therefore almost fully used up. The final balance left over from the envelope would be known in the first quarter of 1993.

5.2.2 Lomé III

Between 1985 and 1990 seven projects were financed from Sysmin. By the end of 1992, three projects in Niger, Mauritania and Guinea showed satisfactory progress at the implementation stage. Projects in Botswana and Senegal were also well advanced by the end of 1992. A second contribution of 10.5 MECU to a phosphate project in Senegal was approved and decided. A project in Togo, however, was still at the preparatory phase.

Various complementary arrangements for projects in Guinea (diversification measures), Togo and Senegal (installations for decadmation) will be considered for financing under Lomé IV.

By the end of 1992, a total of 146.3 MECU was decided (i.e. 57.8% of the envelope), 73.1 MECU was committed and 39.8 MECU was paid.

5.2.3 Lomé IV

The envelope for Sysmin under Lomé IV is 480 MECU. The request presented in December 1991 by Namibia was progressing as expected and will be discussed in the EDF Committee early 1993.

One project in Zambia was approved for an amount of 60 MECU. The project is a general import programme and consequently should be of a quick disbursing nature.

In 1992 the Dominican Republic and Niger presented requests for the financing of two projects in the gold and uranium sector. The preparation of these projects was in progress. Decisions by the end of 1992 reached 60 MECU i.e. 12.5% of the total envelope.

5.3 Assistance to refugees and returnees

During 1992, 30 interventions were decided under Article 255 of the fourth Lomé Convention, for a total sum of 35.6 MECU and concerning 10 ACP countries. 28 operations (15 MECU) were implemented with the rapid procedure (operations of less than 750,000 ECU decided by the Chief Authorizing Officer) from the overall authorization decided in September 1992. In addition, two programmes in Malawi (5,224,400 ECU) and Mozambique (15,390,000 ECU) were carried out. Since the entry into force of the Lomé IV Convention (September 1991) 31 operations were decided for a total sum of 36,382,391 ECU on credit available of 100 MECU. Actual commitments and payments reached 19.7 and 8.9 MECU respectively by the end of the year.

Aid for refugees, returnees and displaced persons was mainly concentrated on a small number of countries (Angola: 7.5 MECU; Malawi 5.5 MECU; Mozambique 18.5 MECU). Various regions such as Western Africa, and the Horn of Africa were not major beneficiaries of this aid insofar as the unstable situation led to appeals for humanitarian aid (food aid, emergency aid) instead of the aid provided by Article 255.

The complementarity of instruments (humanitarian aid and Article 255) came into play in several situations (Angola, Mozambique, Sierra Leone). Good coordination also took place with other donors (UNHCR, WFP, Red Cross, Member States) notably in Angola and Mozambique. Also other means available from the EDF (National Indicative Programmes) were called upon in some situations.

The principal partners for the implementation of the interventions were NGOs (86%), and in particular the various branches of MSF; UNHCR accounted for 9% of financing.

Aid was devoted primarily to health measures (technical assistance, supplies). This sector was a priority, because it had in particular positive benefits for the most vulnerable groups. Agricultural operations and the rehabilitation of rural infrastructures were also important fields of action (Angola).

A new element in 1992, with regard to the recipients eligible for assistance provided for in Article 255, was the implementation of a specific programme for "demobilized soldiers" in the case of Mozambique. Globally the various financial contributions by the Community benefitted either directly or indirectly approximately 9,600,000 persons, including refugees, returnees and displaced persons and demobilized soldiers and people in neighbouring areas.

5.4 The AIDS Control Programme

The AIDS Control Programme financed under Lomé II and III entered the consolidation stage in 1992. As a result emergency aid measures are giving way to longer-term activities which are more structured and coordinated at national and international level. The Commission programme is being reoriented in order to cope with urgent action while at the same time long-term plans are made. Moreover attention is being paid to ensure that all local partners in the various sectors concerned play an active part in the national programmes.

Priorities are now established on the basis of epidemiological and cost/benefit information, on opportunities and comparative advantage. Prevention is the primary priority. With regard to care, efforts will continue to be focused on tuberculosis and AIDS, structural improvement of care as well as orphans and abandoned youth.

In preventive activities, priority was given to prevention of the disease through sexual transmission. Sexual contact remains the primary mode for HIV transmission. However, in high prevalence areas control of transmission via blood remains an important strategy to consolidate.

Under the Fourth Lomé Convention (1990-1995), 50 MECU was earmarked for the continuation of the programme to combat AIDS in ACP States. Of this sum, 20 MECU comes from the regional funds for all the ACP countries. The remaining 30 MECU is to be financed by National Indicative Programmes and other regional budgets.

In connection with the new strategy, the aim in financing the campaign against AIDS through National Indicative Programmes was to give ACP governments greater responsibility for implementing projects, to incorporate the AIDS programme more effectively in a sectoral health programme, and to establish links with the country's economic and financial development and other important operations such as family planning and the promotion of participation of women.

In 1992, the Commission carried out an information campaign to explain the new financing policy to ACP governments. The governments have accepted this policy and projects have been launched as part of cooperation programmes in the health sector.

Box 8

The European Investment Bank (EIB)

Financial assistance administered by the EIB consists of loans from its own resources (mainly from borrowings on the capital markets) and aid in the form of risk capital operations from EDF resources.

Financing from the Bank's own resources is always in the form of loans and is principally used for projects in countries whose economic and financial situation is such that they can assume the debt involved and ensure that debt service payments are maintained. The project's forecast operating results and the revenues that it generates should be such as to cover repayment of principal and interest.

Risk capital is a form of aid particularly well suited to the difficult financial and economic situation prevailing in a large number of ACP States. Drawn from budgetary funds, risk capital resources permit the EIB greater flexibility in setting terms and conditions.

Risk capital may be provided in the form of :

- direct equity subscriptions, on behalf of the European Community;
- quasi-capital assistance mainly as :
 - . subordinated loans
 - . conditional loans

The same appraisal and monitoring procedures are applied as for projects funded by loans from the Bank's own resources.

Financing applications for projects in industry, mining, tourism, and energy production schemes linked to investment in these sectors are appraised by the EIB. The Bank is also empowered to finance infrastructure projects in the transport and telecommunication sectors.

5.5 Aid administered by the European Investment Bank

General overview

The scope for EIB operations in the ACP countries during 1992 was more limited than in previous years. Lending operations, even those for risk capital, require, more so than in the case of grant finance, a reasonably stable political and commercial framework. In short there has to be a suitable business climate. This precondition did not exist in many African countries during 1992. Moreover, EIB operations depend on the existence of a project promoter, either in the public or the private sector, who is prepared to take responsibility for implementing a particular project and for the financial commitment involved. With so many African countries in the throes of political change during the year, both private and public promoters were understandably cautious about taking on new commitments. Finally, the continuing debate over monetary policy in the franc zone countries, which have traditionally been regular clients of the EIB, created additional uncertainty in that part of the world. That being said there are a number of countries in Africa which, having bitten the bullet of economic reform, are now seeing a renewed surge of investment, positive rates of per capita income growth and indeed some interest on the part of foreign investors. There is increasing divergence in economic performance and political circumstances between different African countries.

These trends are reflected in the pattern of EIB operations in Africa during 1992. 23 African countries benefited from EIB finance during the year. By and large these were countries which have successfully adopted economic reforms or are in the process of doing so and in which there is some degree of political and social stability. Moreover, within these countries there is growing evidence of a revival of the private sector, both SMEs and larger scale industrial projects.

So far as other regions are concerned, all the Caribbean countries (except Haiti) and the larger countries in the Pacific region, remain regular borrowers from the EIB and offer a suitable business environment. In the event, however, the particular phasing and timing of investments in these regions meant that loans were signed with only three Caribbean countries during 1992.

Taking all these factors together, EIB operations in the ACP countries, which had risen sharply in 1991, declined in 1992 to 241 MECU committed. Of this amount half was from risk capital and half from the Bank's own resources. Most of the finance provided came under the Fourth Lomé Convention, but some 11 MECU of the risk capital committed was drawn from funds provided under the Third Lomé Convention. Of the 32 projects in total, 3 were financed entirely from the Bank's own resources, 25 from risk capital only and 4 received finance from both own resources and risk capital.

With economic reform beginning to show some results and with increasing political change in Africa, it is tempting to see the pattern of EIB lending during 1992 as an indication of future trends. In those countries where reforms have been implemented there is a possible revival of private sector investment opportunities both directly and through financial intermediaries. In 1992 this was most noticeable in Southern Africa and Nigeria. (It was always the case in the Caribbean countries). Yet in other parts of Africa, where such reforms have not taken place, it is increasingly difficult for the EIB to be active at all, except for the occasional infrastructure or energy project. Indeed, between the one group of countries and the other the gap, in terms of economic performance and business climate, may even be widening.

Payments

During 1992, payments reached 232.3 MECU compared with 191.6 in 1991, 158.1 MECU were loans on own resources and 74.2 MECU from risk capital.

Payments under Lomé III represented 186.2 MECU and thereby reached a total of 820 MECU, 458 MECU from own resources and 362 MECU in the form of risk capital. These amounts correspond to more than 60% and to 64% of all the commitments respectively. Payments under Lomé IV reached almost 45 MECU of which 26.6 MECU from own resources.

Payments in 1992 were more than 20% higher than in 1991.

Implementation

The democratization and structural reform process continued in various African countries; in parallel one saw a slight reduction of financial imbalances, but without real significant effects.

In certain countries the situation was particularly unstable with sometimes disastrous consequences for the economy.

On the whole, the unfavourable international environment - in particular the deterioration in terms of trade and the almost-stagnation of exports - contributed to worsening internal difficulties. In general, economic growth rate remained below the population growth.

The following examples illustrate general characteristics of the implementation of the major projects financed with own resources of the EIB, or with risk capital.

In Mauritius, the Central Electricity Board Project (CED IV) (40 MECU) started in 1987, and received a loan from the Bank of 13 MECU. It was the fourth project in the electricity production sector in Mauritius. Under the direct control of relevant technical teams, it was implemented satisfactorily and on schedule. It contributed to the strengthening of production capacity and energy transport in a growing economy. The Bank maintains a close interest in this sector whose needs continued to grow quickly.

In Congo, the SNDE project was intended to repair the installations supplying drinking water to the town of Pointe Noire. After the suspension by Congo of Community debt servicing, the Bank suspended all its payments in February 1991, thereby following the position taken by other external donors. For the SNDE project, this situation resulted in the stoppage of the works and in the departure of companies from the work site. The Bank's loan was withdrawn up to 42% of its initial amount.

In Jamaica, in 1987 the Bank approved a loan of 17 MECU to the Port Authority of Jamaica for the expansion of the Kingston Container Terminal (KCT). The KCT is a major transshipment point for round-the-world container traffic serving the Caribbean countries and the south-eastern seaboard of the USA, taking advantage of Jamaica's strategic geographical position and its excellent deep-water harbour. The KCT is owned by the State-owned Port Authority, is managed by private companies under contract, and is profitable. The project (estimated cost : 34 MECU) comprises the enlargement of container stocking areas, extension of water-front berthing and purchase of additional container handling equipment. Project implementation has been slower than originally forecast - reflecting the reduced rate of growth of traffic following the withdrawal of one of the KCT's major customers, and protracted negotiations over the ownership of land for the extension of the berths. Project completion is expected in 1994.

Finally in Mauritania, under the Lomé III Convention, the Bank, which had granted a first loan in 1979, granted a second conditional and subordinated loan of 10 MECU from risk capital in December 1987 for onlending to the SNIM (Société Nationale Industrielle et Minière). This loan made it possible to partially finance an investment plan intended to improve productivity of existing facilities and to continue technical improvements in the Guelbs factory.

Geographical breakdown of operations

In 1992 the geographical focus was strongly on Africa. The Bank financed 29 projects in 23 African countries for 235.56 MECU (of which 121 MECU was from own resources and 114.56 from risk capital) and 3 projects in 3 Caribbean countries for 5.8 MECU, all of which came from risk capital.

Although, as mentioned earlier, Nigeria received a substantial loan of 75 MECU, operations in West Africa, and particularly in the franc zone countries, remained difficult as they have been in recent years. The paucity of viable industrial projects was to some extent compensated by a number of major operations in the energy and infrastructure sectors. Thus the Bank financed : power development in Guinea (20 MECU), Sierra Leone (15.5 MECU), Guinea Bissau (7 MECU) and Cape Verde (5.4 MECU); telecommunications development in Senegal (13 MECU); and in the industrial sector, a cotton ginnery in Mali (10 MECU); the modernisation of a tuna cannery in Côte d'Ivoire (6.5 MECU); an aluminium recycling project in Ghana (0.2 MECU).

Operations in East Africa included : telecommunications rehabilitation in Ethiopia (6 MECU); port infrastructure in Tanzania (11 MECU) together with a small equity stake in a development finance institution (0.25 MECU); a global loan for SMEs in Uganda (4 MECU); and a venture capital operation in Kenya (2 MECU). In the Indian ocean region a shrimp farm and factory was financed (6.5 MECU) in Madagascar and in Mauritius a dairy (2.6 MECU).

Southern Africa was undoubtedly the most active region for industrial and private sector projects during 1992. In Zambia, which has witnessed both political and economic reform, the Bank financed : a pharmaceutical factory (3 MECU) and a spinning mill (7 MECU). Industrial projects were also financed in Angola (3.08 MECU) for a granite quarry; in Mozambique (3 MECU) for cashew processing; and in Namibia a tannery (2.5 MECU). Operations for SMEs through financial intermediaries were financed in Botswana (4 MECU), in Swaziland (3.5 MECU) and in Zimbabwe (8.1 MECU). There was only one infrastructure project in this region, for sewage water treatment in Zimbabwe (15 ECU).

The two major operations in the Carribean were global loans for SMEs in the Dominican Republic (3 MECU) and in Dominica (2.5 MECU).

In addition, small feasibility studies were financed from risk capital in Jamaica, Sao Tome and Principe, Zimbabwe, Uganda and Zambia.

6. Sectoral breakdown of aid

6.1 Aid administered by the Commission (European Development Fund)

Details of the aid decisions under Lomé III and Lomé IV classified by sector and subsector are shown in Annex Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6.1 below gives a comparison for major sectors of EDF 5, 6 and 7 by the end of 1992⁽¹³⁾.

Previous reports on financial cooperation presented detailed analysis of the comparison and composition of the sectoral breakdown of Lomé II and III.

The figures for Lomé IV only reflect the position after only just over one year of operations and cannot yet be meaningfully compared with the distribution of the other Conventions.

(13) The introduction of a new accounting system in the Commission brought a slight modification in the codification of sectors which complicates comparison with previous years.

Table 6.1 shows, however, the high proportion of aid allocated to quick disbursing instruments such as Stabex and Structural Adjustment in the early stages of the Convention. When looking at the economic sector only, it appeared that projects in the transport and communication sector had a high share which illustrates the relatively easy and rapid conclusion of such investments compared to e.g. rural production where feasibility studies and other preparatory work took more time. The high proportion of aid for social sectors such as health and education was noteworthy reflecting the increasing interest for these areas under the 7th EDF.

Regardless of the sector of application of aid, a number of horizontal themes could be identified as important for new EC-ACP actions. Among them were poverty-alleviation, demography issues, environment and decentralised cooperation. These themes, which are recurrent in Lomé IV project documentation, reflect the new policy orientations set out by the Lomé IV Convention and the consensus that has evolved between the partners on how to tackle such issues. However, and precisely because these thematic objectives are cross-sectoral in nature, it remains difficult to assess and monitor, much less influence, the magnitude of resources that are employed in support of them.

Table 6.1 Sectoral Breakdown of EDF aid approved up to 31.12.92

Sectors	Lomé II		Lomé III		Lomé IV	
	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%
Rural Production	1105	24.6	2031	27.7	269	9.6
Transport & Communications	835	18.5	1226	16.6	334	11.9
Industry	848	18.9	772	10.5	218	7.7
Education & Training	276	6.1	238	3.2	66	2.3
Water Engineering	270	6.0	185	2.5	68	2.4
Health	128	2.8	138	1.9	70	2.5
Stabex	668	14.8	1446	19.6	875	31.1
Others*	374	8.3	1329	18.0	913	32.5
Total	4504	100.0	7365	100.0	2813	100.0

* Others include emergency aid, aid to refugees, trade promotion for Lomé III and IV, most of the import support programmes and the Structural Adjustment Facility, plus various smaller sectors. Under Lomé IV thematic programmes account for much of the total, principally from the Structural Adjustment Facility.

Rural Development

Expenditure on rural development was almost twice as high under Lomé III as compared to Lomé II which confirmed the importance attached to this field of cooperation under the Lomé III Convention.

Under Lomé IV the share of rural development was still low at the end of 1992. Large allocations of aid in the rural development sector were decided in Nigeria (79.2 MECU) and Gambia (14.5 MECU). Integrated rural programmes were started in various countries such as the Dominican Republic (23.6 MECU), Guinea (15 MECU) and Sierra Leone (14.3 MECU). In view of the experience of Lomé III, where most rural development programmes were decided in the second and third year of the Convention, one would expect the share of rural development to increase significantly in the next two years.

Transport and Communications

The lower share for transport and communications under Lomé III could be explained by a deliberate shift away from this sector, in particular from roads and bridges, in favour of the rural development strategies.

However, rural development programmes often include infrastructure building. It should also be noted that programmes in these sectors are still relatively quickly prepared and presented to the Commission. Indeed the share of transport and communications sector was high after just over 1 year of operations under Lomé IV. More than a dozen countries had requested aid to finance roads and bridges e.g. Guinea (50 MECU), Uganda (23 MECU) and Zambia (19 MECU), railways e.g. Tanzania (19 MECU) and telecommunications : Tanzania (25 MECU) and Ethiopia (6 MECU).

Industry

Aid to the industrial sector under Lomé III was voluminous with almost 800 MECU allocated in various subsectors such as the mining and energy sectors under Lomé III and 218 MECU under Lomé IV. Compared to Lomé II, the aid to those sectors declined under Lomé III, partly as a result of the limited success of the Sysmin instrument.

Projects in the energy sector are generally eligible for loan finance from the EIB. Substantial sums were, however, financed from the 7th EDF in Lesotho (34 MECU), Sierra Leone (15.5 MECU), Nigeria (11.1 MECU) and Trinidad and Tobago (10.1 MECU).

Health, social sectors and water engineering

In the health sector the volume of aid was almost equal under Lomé II and III. There was a stronger emphasis on operational expenditure (technical assistance, training, operational costs) and health campaigns and less financing of infrastructure (construction, equipment).

The social sector seems to have received less finance under Lomé III than under Lomé II, but this can partly be explained by a change in definition. Large multi-component programmes in the rural sector include a social dimension and thereby reduce the number of projects identifiable as pertaining to the social sector. However, the relative shares of these sectors under the 7th EDF is higher which could be an indication of increased interest in social development programmes.

One should also take into account the increase of funds available in local currency from counterpart funds generated by import programmes, Stabex and food aid which are often used in the social sector. (See also Chapter 4.3).

The seemingly reduced aid to water engineering under Lomé III can also be explained by a broader definition of rural development programmes.

Substantial amounts were decided for the education sector in Uganda (14.5 MECU), Nigeria (11.5 MECU) and Chad (10 MECU). Health programmes were approved for Mozambique (15.4 MECU), Côte d'Ivoire (11.3 MECU) and Chad (16.5 MECU). Village water engineering projects were started in Burkina Faso (15 ECU) and Togo (11.2 MECU).

Progress in implementation

Table 6.2 shows for Lomé III the ratios for secondary commitments to decisions and of payments to secondary commitments as at the end of 1991 and 1992.

Table 6.2 Lomé III - Commitment and Payment ratios classified by sector (%)

Sector	Commitments/Decisions		Payments/Commitments	
	as at 31 December			
	1992	1991	1992	1991
Rural Development	73	62	72	63
Transport & Communications	80	66	72	65
Industry	90	87	67	61
Health, Social Sector and Water Engineering	74	67	71	53
Other (incl. Stabex)	95	93	95	92
Total	85	77	81	75

The improvement in the commitment rate that took place in 1992 was confirmed for all sectors as can be seen from Table 6.2. The lowest rate is still that for rural development but the gap with other sectors was small. Payment rates improved significantly in all sectors, excluding "others" which had already reached a high level.

Analysis of economic and technical sector breakdown

In 1992 the Commission started with the introduction of the SNPC-OECD statistical codification in its management accounting system which permits the comparison of sectoral breakdown of aid allocation not only by economic but also by technical sectors.

Table 6.3 shows the comparison of economic and technical sectors for the 6th and 7th EDF.

However, by the end of 1992 the codification of the accounting and management systems was not yet fully compatible. As a result only part of the aid decisions are reflected in table 6.3.

The economic sector breakdown confirms the sectoral pattern of Lomé III programmes with a high degree of concentration on rural development followed by industrial development and the social sectors. Programme aid came rather late into the picture, with the first generation of SIPs launched from 1987-1988. It eventually accounted for around 6% of all Lomé III decisions.

Because the bulk of EDF 7 has yet to be committed, it is too early to draw conclusions on the sectoral distribution of aid under Lomé IV. Decisions already made however show a certain shift of emphasis away from rural development, with more resources being allocated to the social sectors (health and education in particular) and to actions in support of the public administration. Characteristic of the first two years of Lomé IV was the increased share of programme aid (mainly sectoral and general import programmes) which financed essential imports. These changes of emphasis clearly reflected the context of Structural Adjustment which prevailed in many ACP States, where severe foreign exchange and fiscal constraints call for an adjustment of the aid pattern itself.

A more elaborate breakdown based on "technical sectors" - i.e. the content of aid rather than its sectoral target -, shows that sectors such as transport and communication, environment, water and sanitation activities as well as institutional support absorb in fact a significant proportion of EDF assistance. This illustrates the highly diversified nature of EC funded activities, even where the sectoral focus of programmes is clearly identified. It confirms that sectoral concentration operates on policy objectives, rather than on aid implements and channels.

Table 6.3 Breakdown of EDF financing decisions by sectors⁽¹⁴⁾

	National programmed aid, by Economic Sector ⁽¹⁵⁾ in %		National & Regional programmed aid by Technical Sector ⁽¹⁵⁾ in %
	6th EDF	7th EDF	7th EDF
Agric. rural dev.	45.4	13.4	5.6
Forestry	3.9	1.9	1.6
Fisheries	1.7	1.6	1.3
Industry, crafts, enterprises	12.4	11.2	5.7
Energy	5.8	4.9	3.7
Trade & Tourism	4.0	5.4	3.2
Transp. & Communications	2.8	3.7	24.1
Education & Training	4.0	5.2	4.5
Health	3.1	8.2	5.8
Env., water & sanit., Urban	2.3	3.7	7.8
Public administration	1.5	3.4	5.5
Progr. Aid/Gen. support	5.8	30.2	27.9
Humanitarian	6.7	4.5	2.3
Others	0.6	2.7	0.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total value of decisions covered (MECU)	4400 ⁽¹⁶⁾	1350	1760

(14) Sectoral aggregates based on the EOCED-SNPC nomenclature. Stabex decisions are not included.

(15) Economic sectors reflect the sectoral target of aid; technical sectors reflect the content of aid. As an example, rural feeder roads are classified under "Agriculture and rural development" from the economic viewpoint and under "transport and communications" from the technical one.

(16) Only part of the (sector) import programmes were accounted for; since over half of them were financed from special resources allocated to the Special Debt Programme.

Regional Cooperation

The sectoral distribution of aid for regional cooperation is shown in table 6.4. The transport and communications sector is particularly suited to regional programmes, indeed this sector absorbed 408 MECU i.e. 45% of the funds allocated to regional cooperation under the 6th EDF by the end of 1992. The contribution to trade promotion is also higher than for the EDF as a whole (10% vs. 2%) which reflects the importance of finance to e.g. international trade fairs and exhibitions.

Thematic actions are often of a regional character, other important regional actions concern the Centre for the Development of Industry and the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation. Since the contributions were fixed and paid annually they represent a relatively high percentage at the start of the new Convention of Lomé IV as can be seen from the table.

Total financing decisions made under Lomé IV came to 230 MECU by the end of 1992 of which 34 MECU was approved for the transport and communications sector, 27 MECU went to industrial projects, 16 MECU to rural production and 22 MECU was used for trade promotion.

Table 6.4 Distribution of aid decisions for regional cooperation classified by sector at end - 1992 (%)

Sectors	EDF 5	EDF 6	EDF 7
Rural Development (excl. CTA)	24	13	7
Transport & Communications	30	45	15
Industry (excl. CDI)	11	2	12
Health, Social sector & Water Engineering	11	10	7
Trade Promotion	5	10	10
Thematic Actions	3	8	14
Non geographic of which :	6	8	31
CDI	4	4	13
CTA	1	3	9
ACP Secretariat	1	1	9
Others*	10	6	4
Total	100	100	100
Amount in MECU	650	867	211

6.2 Aid administered by the EIB

The most striking feature of lending in 1992 was that no less than 42% of the total of 102.3 MECU was for support of small and medium scale enterprises through development banks and other financial intermediaries. The largest operation was a 75 MECU own-resources loan to the Nigerian Industrial Development Bank, a long-time client of the EIB. This was in fact the biggest loan ever made by the EIB to an ACP country and it reflects the size and vitality of the Nigerian industrial sector, notwithstanding continuing economic difficulties and some political uncertainty in that country. Similar operations, drawing on the Bank's own resources and onlending through financial intermediaries, were made in Zimbabwe and Botswana. At the other end of the scale the Bank is increasingly using risk capital to support the small venture capital funds which are now emerging in various ACP countries, and which are likely to play a key role in the future development of the private industrial sector. Worth mentioning in this context are a small operation of 2 MECU of risk capital made to Kenya Equity Management, and a 3 MECU operation with the Asociacion para el Desarrollo de Microempresas in the Dominican Republic, as well as a number of similar operations to more traditional financial intermediaries in other ACP countries. Within the constraints imposed by the terms of the Lomé Convention, the Bank is continually adapting the terms and conditions of its risk capital operations for small and medium enterprises to suit the particular circumstances, so as to approach as near as possible genuine venture capital financing.

Direct loans for the industrial and tourism sectors amounted to a further 46.16 MECU, or 19% of the total and covered a wide range of products and subsectors; in fact no tourism projects were financed in 1992. But the most interesting feature of this sector, compared with the situation of a few years ago, is that almost without exception these projects were to be found in the private sector and a good number have an export orientation. The era of large, publicly owned, highly protected industrial enterprises which merely supply the domestic market of the country concerned is rapidly becoming history.

With the Bank's two key sectors of industrial lending and support for SMEs through financial intermediaries making up nearly two thirds of total operations in 1992, other sectors were relatively less important and certainly less important than they have been in past years; Energy projects, all in the electricity subsector, at 47.9 MECU, accounted for 20% of the total and other infrastructure projects 19% , or 45 MECU. The four energy projects, in Guinea, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau and Cape Verde, were all rather modest in scope and consisted either of rehabilitation of existing thermal systems or small extensions.

In the infrastructure sector, two projects, in Ethiopia and Senegal, were in the telecommunications sector; one was for sewage water treatment in Zimbabwe and one was in Tanzania for port facilities.

Table 6.5 Geographical sectoral breakdown of EIB finance in 1992 (in MECU)

	Total	Own resources	Risk capital	Energy	Infra-structure	Industry & tourism	Global loans & DFCs
Africa	236	121	115	47.9	45.0	45.9	96.8
Caribbean	6		6	0.0	0.0	0.3	5.5
Pacific							
Total	242	121	121	47.9	45.0	46.2	102.3
Sectors as % of total	100	50	50	19.8	18.6	19.1	42.4

Table 6.6 Sectoral breakdown of EIB financing (own resources and risk capital)

Sector	1990		1991		1992		1986-92	
	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%
Energy	53	35.9	118	30.8	47.9	19.8	418	22.4
Infrastructure	19	12.8	63	16.5	45.0	18.6	414	22.2
Industry/ Tourism	76	51.3	201	52.7	148.5	61.6	1032	55.4
<u>of which :</u>								
- Global loans	65	43.9	59	15.4	102.3	42.4	427	22.8
Total	148	100.0	382	100.0	241.4	100.0	1864	100.0

7. Aid implementation

7.1 The study on implementation of aid procedures

The Council, at its meeting in Fiji in May 1990, adopted a proposal of Vice President MARIN that a joint ACP-EEC study be undertaken on the application of the implementation procedures concerning programmed aid under financial and technical cooperation.

The objective of the study was to examine the application of the procedures adopted in the implementation of EDF programmes and projects under financial and technical cooperation with a view to identifying the problem areas and bottlenecks and to make practical proposals aimed at facilitating the implementation of the programmes and projects. The assignment covered the entire project cycle starting from the establishment of the indicative programmes through project preparation, tendering procedures and project execution.

In May 1991, the Council received and noted the project proposal which included the contents of the study and the modalities for its conduct.

The study was to be conducted jointly by the ACP Secretariat and the Commission, within the framework of the Development Finance Cooperation Committee.

The study commenced in May 1991, immediately after the session of ACP/EEC Council of Ministers which endorsed the project proposal referred to above. Phases I and II of the study concerning the inventory of operations in a project cycle and the identification of bottlenecks, undertaken concurrently and jointly by the ACP Secretariat and the Commission, was concluded in November 1991. The conclusions of the report on the first two phases were approved by the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers in Kingston in May 1992. In January 1992, a contract was awarded to the EEC consultants chosen by the ACP Secretariat and the Commission for Phase III of the study: the research and analyses of causes of delays in the operations. The work under this contract was completed by mid 1992. In the final phase the Commission and the ACP Secretariat were to arrive at joint conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of aid implementation. Their joint report was expected to be presented to the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers in Brussels in May 1993.

7.2 Tenders and Contracts

In accordance with the Financial Regulation for the 7th EDF, the Commission informs the Council each year of any contracts concluded during the year. The Commission gives this information in a special annual report on tenders and contracts. The summary data presented here are to complete the picture on aid implementation.

Table 7.1. shows the change in the proportions of works, supplies and service contracts in successive EDFs.

Table 7.1 Distribution of works, supplies and technical assistance contracts at 31.12.92

EDF	Works	Supplies	Technical Assistance
5	49.7	30.5	19.8
6	41.7	35.4	22.9
7	40.3	17.8	41.9

The drop in the share of works contracts under the 6th EDF partly reflects the shift in emphasis from traditional construction type projects to rural development with its high emphasis on human resources. However, the stage of implementation of different Conventions also affects the types of contracts placed, emphasis on technical assistance being relatively more important in the earlier stages of implementation, as shown by the high percentage for such contracts (41.9) under the 7th EDF.

Annex Table 9 gives a breakdown of contracts by nationality of firms as at 31 December 1992.

The high proportion of works contracts shown in Annex Table 9 as going to ACP/OCTs should be noted - 45.6% under Lomé III.

The percentage of ACP/OCTs for supply contracts was 17.4 slightly lower as in 1991. The percentage for technical assistance contracts remained the same as in 1991 : 7.2%.

Table 7.2. shows the distribution of contracts under the 6th EDF for 1986 to 1992 classified by type of procurement procedure adopted in placing the contracts. The statistics collected for contracts placed under the 7th EDF covered only 151 MECU which was still insignificant.

Table 7.2 EDF contracts 1986-1992 - Classified by type of procurement procedure - percentages

	EDF6			EDF7		
	Works	Supplies	Services	Works	Supplies	Services
<u>International tenders</u>						
Open	40.0	62.7	-	46.5	55.2	3.2
Accelerated	8.5	0.3	-	3.7	-	-
Restricted after publication in OJ	6.0	-	5.9	2.4	-	26.0
Total	54.5	63.0	5.9	52.6	55.2	29.2
<u>Other procedures</u>						
Restricted tenders	6.0	9.7	49.7	0.4	1.7	41.9
Supplementary restricted tenders	-	-	5.5	-	-	0.6
Direct agreement	4.2	12.2	32.1	3.9	6.0	25.3
Annual programmes - direct labour	34.7	14.9	0.9	44.0	37.1	1.5
Extension of contracts	0.6	0.2	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	6.9	-	-	2.4
Total	45.5	37.0	94.1	47.2	44.8	71.8
Grand total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
MECU	1657.2	1079.4	780.7	108.0	42.5	122.1

The figures in Table 7.2 are based on the statistics collected by the end of 1992 and represent approximately 59% and 3% of the financial allocations subject to tendering for the sixth and seventh EDF. (17)

(17) Not all forms of aid are subject to tendering. This is true in particular for most of the aid from Stabex, emergency aid, aid to refugees and interest subsidies. The approximate allocations subject to tender and the amounts covered in the statistics at end 1992 are as follows :

<u>Allocations for tender*</u>		<u>Amount at 31.12.92</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>EDF</u>	<u>MECU</u>	<u>MECU</u>	
EDF6	5932	3517	59.3
EDF7	8670	273	3.1

*Total envelope minus Stabex, emergency aid and aid to refugees and interest subsidies.

8. Conclusions

Total aid from the European Development Funds

1992 was the first complete year of financial cooperation between the Community and the ACP States under the Lomé IV Convention which entered into force on 1 September 1991.

The seventh EDF contributed significantly to the large increase in the volume of finance in 1992 compared to the three preceding years. Total new decisions came to over 2 billion ECU, of which 1.954 billion ECU from the 7th EDF, secondary commitments reached 1.73 billion ECU and disbursements amounted to 1.917 billion ECU. The annual growth figures were 66.2%, 25.2% and 63.3% respectively for decisions, commitments and disbursements.

More than 25% of the first financial protocol of Lomé IV was decided by the end of the year. Quick disbursing aid instruments such as Stabex and the Structural Adjustment Facility accounted for a substantial part of this result.

The Lomé IV Convention took the lion's share of decisions (95%) and commitments (60.5%) in 1992; payments under the 5th and 6th EDF of the Lomé II and III Conventions played an important role, representing 54% or 1.129 billion ECU compared to the nearly 900 MECU of the 7th EDF.

The Lomé II Convention made little progress in 1992 and was near final completion, which is expected for 1993.

Commitments and payments under the Lomé III Convention made satisfactory progress in 1992; nearly 80% and 65% respectively of the envelope of the 6th EDF had been committed and paid by the end of the year.

The National Indicative Programmes

The implementation of the indicative programmes in 1992 was confronted with difficulties and constraints related to the political situation in some ACP States, the economic conditions and policies of aid-receiving countries and factors inherent to the project cycle itself and procedures of aid implementation.

Political developments had a direct impact on the pace of implementation in a dozen countries. Aid suspension measures were taken by the Community in relation to the security situation, the lack of progress toward democracy or of commitments to human rights in seven countries : Haïti, Liberia, Malawi, Somalia, Sudan, Togo and Zaire.

As regards Lomé III, in 49 countries virtually the entire financial allocations from the 6th EDF were decided by the end of 1992. Only very few countries, including three countries where aid had been suspended and four small island countries with only one or two major projects, had allocated less than 90% of their envelope.

In two countries, Grenada and Belize, the total envelope of the first protocol under Lomé IV was already decided by the end of the year. In fifteen countries more than 40% of the envelope was approved for projects and programme finance. Commitments reached high volumes in some countries (eg. Mali, Burkina Faso, Nigeria). Payments were still rather insignificant.

The analysis of large programmes financed under Lomé III showed a drop in the number of projects experiencing implementation difficulties in 1992 as compared to 1991. In various countries project implementation resumed in 1992 after delays incurred in previous years, examples were : Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroun, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Mauritania and Nigeria.

Half of the projects suffering from delays were located in countries with a difficult political situation in 1992 : Liberia, Sudan, Togo and Zaire. In general it was observed that average commitment and payment rates for large programmes were getting closer to the average rates for all programmed aid which could also be explained by the fact that Lomé III programmes were reaching the final stage of implementation.

Regional programmes

Regional cooperation under Lomé III showed similar implementation results to national programmed aid by the end of 1992. Variations still existed between regions with particularly low rates of decision in Central Africa and the Pacific. For both regions new programmes were prepared during 1992 which should enable the allocation of considerable funds in 1993. Large regional programmes were generally well advanced in their implementation; only 3 out of 20 projects financed from the 6th EDF experienced delays in 1992.

As regards Lomé IV, all regional programmes had been finalised by the end of 1992. Intensive consultations and discussions in international fora took place concerning the subject of regional cooperation in Africa. However, financial cooperation was still modest, 17% of all resources (211 MECU) was decided by the end of the year, principally in West and East Africa and for programmes concerning all ACP countries.

Other forms of programmed aid

Aid to Microprojects was a success in 1992. The principal sectors concerned with such projects were economic and social infrastructures in rural areas, in particular water engineering, education and health.

Fostering Industrial Cooperation and private sector investments, one of the principal priorities of Lomé IV, was actively pursued in 1992. Initiatives were undertaken to bring investors from the Community and the ACP States together. Coordination of institutions such as the EIB, the CDI and others was strengthened.

Tourism and trade promotion were two areas where financial cooperation has made a promising start under Lomé IV in various ACP States.

The Structural Adjustment Facility

One of the most prominent new instruments of Lomé IV got off to a good start in the first year of financial cooperation. More than 400 MECU were approved from Structural Adjustment, part of which was financed for the National Indicative Programmes. Also some countries not implementing adjustment strategies have agreed to similar interventions in the form of import support programmes, thus bringing the total amount approved to 472 MECU in 26 countries at the end of 1992, of which nearly 200 MECU were paid.

The 52 import support programmes approved under Lomé III, partly financed from the Special Debt Programme, had been nearly completed by the end of the year. Total decisions were 816 MECU and payments nearly 780 MECU.

Non-programmed aid

Stabex allocations accounted for more than 30% of all aid decided under Lomé IV by the end of 1992. 35 countries have already benefited from this instrument through compensations for more than 20 products.

Decisions in 1992 amounted to 391.5 MECU covering 40% of the eligible transfers.

The newly introduced frameworks of mutual obligations have made the Stabex instrument a more effective tool of development.

Support under Sysmin was decided in one country for an amount of 60 MECU. Other requests made under Lomé IV were in progress during 1992. Modest progress was made with the ongoing programmes financed under previous Conventions.

Aid to refugees and returnees continued to make an important contribution to situations of distress and conflict in various ACP countries. Total payments in 1992 reached 45 MECU under Lomé III and 25 MECU under Lomé IV.

The AIDS Control Programme was active in the field of coordination with other donors and by the enlargement of its scope. No decisions were made under Lomé IV. The programme financed under Lomé II progressed well and was near completion.

The European Investment Bank

The scope for EIB operations in the ACP countries during 1992 was more limited than in previous years. With many African countries in the throes of political change in that year both private and public project promoters were understandably cautious about taking on new commitments. Also the debates on monetary policy in the franc zone created additional uncertainty in some countries.

However, some other countries had carried out economic reforms and were seeing a renewed surge of investment. These various trends are reflected in the pattern of EIB operations. 23 African countries benefited from EIB finance during the year. Also most Caribbean and Pacific countries remained regular borrowers from the EIB.

Total EIB operations declined in 1992 compared to 1991 to 241 MECU committed. Of this amount half were risk capital and half from the Bank's own resources. Small amounts of risk capital were still being drawn from the Lomé III Convention.

Payments grew in 1992 to 232.2 MECU compared to 191.6 in 1991, a 20% increase.

Aid implementation

The joint ACP-EEC study on the application of aid procedures reached its final phase in 1992. The Commission and the ACP Secretariat were to arrive at joint conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of aid implementation. Their report was expected to be presented to the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers in Brussels in May 1993.

Annexes

	<u>Page</u>
I. Explanatory notes	
1. List of ACP countries	70
2. List of organisations associated with implementation of regional cooperation	71
3. Financial cooperation - Principal characteristics and procedures	71
4. Programmed aid	73
5. Structural adjustment and import support programmes	74
6. Stabex	76
7. Sysmin	77
8. Financial assistance administered by the EIB	77
9. Cofinancing	78
10. Financing and technical cooperation - Implementation procedures	79
II. Statistical annexes	
Table 1 - Non-programmed aid, 6th EDF	80
Table 2 - Non-programmed aid, 7th EDF	84
Table 3 - Programmed aid, 5th EDF	88
Table 4 - Programmed aid, 6th EDF	90
Table 5 - Programmed aid, 7th EDF	92
Table 6 - Decisions, commitments and payments classified by major sectors and sub-sectors, 6th EDF	94
Table 7 - Decisions, commitments and payments classified by major sectors and sub-sectors, 7th EDF	100
Table 8 - Programmed aid-projects costing more than 10 MECU	104
Table 9 - EDF contracts classified by nationality of firms	109
Table 10 - Stabex transfers under Lomé IV	110
Table 11 - Use of counterpart funds	111

I. EXPLANATORY NOTES ON INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION UNDER THE LOMÉ CONVENTIONS

1. List of ACP Countries

Angola	Madagascar#
Antigua & Barbuda*#	Malawi**
Bahamas#	Mali**
Barbados#	Mauritania*
Belize*	Mauritius#
Benin*	Mozambique*
Botswana**	Niger**
Burkina Faso**	Nigeria
Burundi**	Papua New Guinea#
Cameroon	Rwanda**
Cape Verde*#	St. Christopher & Nevis*#
Cen.African Republic**	St. Lucia*#
Chad**	St. Vincent & Grenadines*#
Comoros*#	Sao Tome & Principe*#
Congo	Senegal
Djibouti*	Seychelles*#
Dominica*#	Sierra Leone*
Equatorial Guinea*	Solomon Islands*#
Ethiopia*	Somalia*
Fiji#	Sudan*
Gabon	Suriname
Gambia*	Swaziland**
Ghana	Tanzania*
Grenada*#	Togo*
Guinea*	Tonga*#
Guinea Bissau*	Trinidad & Tobago#
Guyana	Tuvalu*#
Côte d'Ivoire	Uganda**
Jamaica#	Western Samoa*#
Kenya	Vanuatu*#
Kiribati*#	Zaire
Lesotho**	Zambia+
Liberia	Zimbabwe+
Dominican Republic (added in Lomé IV)#	
Haiti (added in Lomé IV)*#	
Namibia (added in Lomé IV)*	

* Least developed ACP States # Island ACP + Landlocked ACP

2. List of organisations associated with implementation of regional cooperation

SADCC	Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference
PTA	Preferential Trade Area
CEAO	Economic Community of West Africa
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
CILSS	Inter State Committee on the fight against drought in the Sahel
OMVS	Organisation for exploitation of the resources of the Senegal river
ASECNA	Association for air navigation security in Africa
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
SPEC	South Pacific Economic Commission
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission

3. Financial Cooperation - Principal Characteristics and Procedures

Each ACP-EEC Convention provides for a general envelope of aid to be allocated from the EDF during the Convention. In addition, it provides for loans by the European Investment Bank (EIB) from its own resources which may benefit from interest rate subsidies from the EDF.

Aid from the EDF consists of :

- (i) Programmed aid* in the form of grants financing a five year indicative programme prepared for each ACP country.
- (ii) Non-programmed aid
 - stabilization of export earnings from agricultural commodities (STABEX)
 - special financing facility for mining products (SYSMIN)
 - emergency aid
 - risk capital (managed by EIB)**
 - interest subsidies on loans from the own resources of the EIB
- (iii) Structural Adjustment Facility

This facility has been introduced under Lomé IV in the form of grants. It continues similar aid programmes financed from the Special Debt Programme and Art. 188 of the Lomé III Convention.

The structural adjustment aid may be topped up with an amount (maximum 10%) of the allocation for National Indicative Programmes.

* The Lomé Conventions I, II and III also provided special loans (40 year duration, 10 years grace, interest at 1% - 0,50% for least developed ACPs, under Lomé III).

** Under Lomé III and IV, part of the amount provided for risk capital has been included in the national allocation of the indicative programmes for least developed ACP States.

Details of the amounts provided under the various aid headings under Lomé I, II and III and Lomé IV are as follows:

	MECU			
	Lomé I	Lomé II	Lomé III	Lomé IV
Total Convention	3393	5339	9031	12100
EDF	3003	4654	7931	10900
-grants	2096	2955	5029	7995
of which Structural Adjustment Facility	-	-	-	1150
-special loans	421	525	600	-
-risk capital	96	275	600	825
Stabex	390	669	1449	1600
-Sysmin	-	230	253	480
EIB "own resources" loans up to	390	685	1100	1200

The procedures for allocation of non-programmed aid are based on the relevant provisions contained in the corresponding Articles of the Lomé Conventions.

At the beginning of each Convention, the Commission informs each ACP State of the total programmed aid to be allotted to it.

The award of programmed aid is very much dependent on the EDF decision cycle. Broadly speaking, five distinct stages can be identified:

1. Preparation of indicative programmes by ACP States in agreement with the Commission and the EIB;
2. Project preparation by the ACP States and their examination by the Commission;
3. Project approval by the Commission of a project financing proposal, following favourable opinion of the EDF Committee*;
4. Project execution on the basis of contracts awarded by the ACP States, generally following international invitations to tender open to firms in the Member States and ACP States;
5. Payments of aid to contractors. Such payments are made in European currencies to contractors in the Member States or in national currency, where the contractors are nationals of the ACP State concerned, or in respect of local costs incurred by contractors from Member States.

* The EDF Committee is composed of representatives of the Member States and is chaired by the Commission representative.

While there is some overlapping between the five stages discussed above (some of the stages also apply to non-programmed aid), most of the programming of aid takes place in the early years of each Convention; approval and commitment stages are spread out over several years and payments may be made over a number of years. In this regard, while each Lomé Convention runs for up to five years*, the Community legislation (the Internal Agreement and the Financial Regulation) relating to each EDF remains in force until the funds provided by the relevant Convention are paid out.

4. Programmed Aid

Lomé III envisaged more precise definition than in the past of programme content and also stressed the importance of the work done in preparation for programming. This approach was continued for Lomé IV.

On the question of content, it was jointly established that rigour and coordination were increasingly necessary in the management of domestic resources and also in the use of funds from external sources. The Community and the ACP States considered that the best way of securing this coordination and of making cooperation more effective was to situate a growing proportion of its operations in the context of support for sectoral policies because:

- such an approach enables Community operations to be more closely adjusted to the priority sectoral objectives established by each of the ACP States;
- support for sectoral policies makes it possible to use a very wide range of forms of aid (aid for maintenance, technical assistance, training, etc.) in addition to investment projects;
- such support means that for each operation, over and above its own merits, greater weight is given to its contribution to the success of the sectoral policy, so maximising its economic impact.

For this to succeed, the bulk of the Community financial resources placed at each State's disposal must, in the first instance, be focused on a limited number of sectors, or even a single sector. Without such concentration, there is a danger that Community operations would be thinly spread over a large number of highly diversified objectives and that they would have little chance of securing maximum economic impact.

Secondly, this approach means that, on the basis of exchanges of views between representatives of the ACP State and the Commission, the measures and operations most likely to ensure the attainment of the objectives which the ACP State has set itself for the sector concerned have to be specified, irrespective of whether the measures have to be taken by the ACP State itself or on the responsibility of the Community.

* Lomé IV will run for 10 years; the financing provided for in the financial protocol relates to the first 5 years of the Convention.

Lastly, it presupposes effective coordination between the Commission and the main providers of funds (including, obviously, the Member States) in order to ensure that operations in the focal sectors receiving Community aid are coordinated and complement each other.

It is laid down in the Conventions that certain individual operations may be identified, in addition to the focal sectors, in the case of the continuation of projects which were begun under the preceding Convention and which are clearly deserving of priority.

Support for sectoral policies involves a far more demanding approach than in the past, and this has meant a change in the programming process.

The amount of aid is known at the outset, and this assures stable and predictable relations, and no extraneous considerations interfere.

On the basis of an analysis of the social and economic situation in each State conducted by the Commission in conjunction with the main providers of funds, exchanges of views commence between the Commission delegate in each ACP State and the representatives of the State concerned in order:

- to ensure that the Community is aware of the development objectives and priorities of the State concerned;
- to identify the focal sector or sectors for Community aid;
- to seek the most appropriate ways and means of attaining the objectives set.

It is not until the preparatory work has been completed that the programming mission, led by the Commission, and with the participation of the European Investment Bank, goes to each ACP State.

The indicative programme of Community aid is then drawn up with the national authorities; it sets out the sectors chosen, and within this framework, the indicative guidelines for Community aid; it identifies the most appropriate ways and means of implementing them, and determines the operations to be conducted outside the context of support for sectoral policies.

While the compilation of the indicative programme thus marks the end of a process, it is neither possible nor advisable for this document to fix, once and for all, all the conditions, measures and operations to be applied by the State and the Community in order to attain the objectives set. Programming must be sufficiently flexible to enable the action taken to be constantly adjusted in line with the objectives.

5. Structural adjustment and the import support programmes

The problems of structural adjustment cannot be appreciated in isolation from the programming process because the two components - adjustment and programming - both contribute to the objective of long-term development.

As provided for by the Convention, most countries eligible for specific adjustment support have opted to use part of their indicative programme to supplement such support.

This interdependence between programming and adjustment has provided the backdrop to the implementation of the Convention, notably in terms of eligibility, the distribution of resources, the priority areas for Community aid or dialogue concerning the reforms carried out by the countries in question. It has also been taken into account in relations with the other donors (especially the IBRD and the IMF), and in the Community's involvement in wider initiatives, such as the SPA.

The Lomé Convention describes two categories of countries eligible for adjustment assistance:

- (i) those already receiving support (financial or other) from the main multilateral donors, which are automatically eligible;
- (ii) those carrying out an "autonomous" adjustment process, which, to become eligible, must show - on the basis of a joint assessment - that they effectively fulfil the criteria laid down in the Convention (seriousness of imbalances, scope of reforms).

At the programming stage the Commission focused on the first category of countries. Since the question of eligibility had been settled, it was after all only natural to assess the adjustment process under way and work out what strategy to follow to ensure that adjustment and programming backed and strengthened each other.

This approach has not prevented the Commission from carrying out an initial assessment for some of the other countries of the reform process under way and even from taking active steps either to help a country to introduce its reform programme or to assist with negotiations between a country and the World Bank and the IMF.

The structural adjustment support takes the form of import programmes which are quick disbursing both by their nature and because of the speedy procedures involved in their execution.

Two types of programmes can be distinguished: the sectoral and the general import programmes.

Sectoral import programmes (SIP) are divided into:

- imports in kind
- provision of foreign exchange (forex) to import specified goods (the "positive list").

A forex SIP based on a positive list of eligible imports presupposes a realistic exchange rate policy together with a transparent system for allocation of foreign exchange to importers. The choice of this type of programme has in general been influenced by the desire for quick execution and for the best possible sectoral impact.

General Import programmes (GIP) involve provision of foreign exchange for all products with the exception of those set out in a "negative list". Establishment of a GIP presupposes effective implementation in the country of macro-economic reforms.

Both GIP/SIP have a number of common features:

- . they require a central institution to organise and control the programmes. This is generally supported by technical assistance which may be provided jointly by a number of donors;
- . they also generate counterpart funds whose use is decided jointly by the Commission and the National Authorising Officer;
- . they require close monitoring by the Commission Delegate and the ACP authorities for the duration of programmes.

The Commission has issued two policy guideline papers on the application of the structural adjustment policy and the use of counterpart funds generated by inter alia the import programme support.

6. Stabex

Stabex - the system for stabilisation of export earnings from agricultural commodities - was first introduced in Lomé I with the objective of providing funds to ACP countries to cover shortfalls in earnings brought about by fluctuations in prices or output of agricultural products exported to EEC countries*.

A total of 390 MECU was provided for the system in Lomé I and this was increased to 660 MECU in Lomé II, 1449 under Lomé III and to 1600 MECU under Lomé IV**.

Eligibility for assistance is based on the two following criteria:

1. A product is eligible if, the year prior to the year of application, it represented 5% of a country's total export earnings to all destinations (4% in the case of sisal).
2. A country is eligible if there has been a drop in earnings of at least 4.5% - as compared to an average for the six years minus the lowest and the highest figures, preceding the year of application.***

* While, in general, Stabex takes into account only exports to the EEC, by derogation from the general rule, in the case of 13 ACP countries which, because of their geographical situation do not have the EEC as a natural outlet, exports to all destinations are taken into consideration.

** Including increases agreed by the Council in July 1988, July 1989, March 1990 and December 1991 respectively.

*** 1% in the case of least developed ACP States.

Transfers have been used to maintain financial flows in the sector concerned or for the purpose of promoting diversification.

ACP countries are required to give an account of what is done with the aid funds.

Stabex aid takes the form of grants.

7. Sysmin

The "Special Financing Facility" or Sysmin system was first provided for in Lomé II to assist ACP States heavily dependent on mining exports to the Community to remedy the harmful effects on their incomes of serious temporary disruptions affecting the mining sector. 230* MECU was provided for the Facility in Lomé II, and 253* MECU in Lomé III, taking the form of special loans (40 years duration, 10 years grace, interest at 1% - 0.50% for least developed ACPs). Lomé IV provides 480 MECU in the form of grants.

The products covered by Sysmin under Lomé IV are copper and cobalt, phosphates, manganese, bauxite and alumina, tin, iron ore, uranium. Countries can apply for Sysmin aid if the relevant products have, on average, represented more than 15% of their total exports for 4 years (10% for least developed countries) or 20% or more of their export earnings from all mining products (12% for LDLIC).

Award of aid follows case by case analysis of possibilities for reestablishing viable operations in the sector concerned. Most Sysmin aid involves cofinance with other donors e.g. European Investment Bank, World Bank Group, African Development Bank.

8. Financial assistance administered by the EIB

Financial assistance administered by the Bank consists of loans from its own resources (mainly from borrowings on the capital markets) and aid in the form of risk capital from EDF resources.

In accordance with the division of responsibilities between the Commission and the EIB provided for under the Convention, financing applications with respect to productive projects or action programmes in industry (including agricultural processing), mining and tourism, and energy production schemes linked to investment in these sectors are submitted to, and appraised by, the Bank. The EIB is also empowered to finance infrastructure projects of benefit to the economy in such sectors as transport and telecommunications. In providing loans, the EIB takes into account the economic and financial situation of the ACP country concerned as well as factors which can give assurance that the debt will be serviced. The Bank makes the granting of loans conditional upon the receipt of suitable forms of security and requires a guarantee from the country concerned or other first-class guarantees. Loans from the EIB's own resources generally attract interest rate subsidies for which an overall sum is set aside out of EDF grant funds (280 MECU under Lomé IV). The interest rate subsidy is 4%, but when necessary it is automatically adjusted so that the interest rate actually borne by the borrower will be neither less than 3% nor more than 6%.

Risk capital may be granted through the acquisition of holdings or by means of quasi-capital assistance. Holdings taken in the capital of enterprises or development banks in the ACP States are of a temporary and minority nature and are destined for transfer, at an appropriate time, to nationals or institutions of the ACP States. Quasi-capital assistance may be provided in the form of loans subordinated to the redemption of other bank claims or in the form of conditional loans whose repayment, maturity and interest payments depend on the attainment of the level of return or production expected from the project. This capital is a form of financial aid particularly well-suited to the difficult financial situation and economic conditions facing the majority of the ACP States. The total provided in Lomé IV for risk capital is 825 MECU.

9. Cofinancing

A. Forms of cofinancing

Lomé III and IV provide for two types of cofinancing, joint or parallel, preference being given to the solution that is best from a cost and efficiency viewpoint:

- joint financing : all financing resources are placed in a common fund and disbursements made according to the progress of the project and in proportion to the respective contributions;
- parallel financing : each financial contribution is assigned from the outset to a separate part of the project, which is treated independently of the others.

There is, however, a definite preference for joint financing, which avoids competition between different sources of financing and makes it possible to rationalise financial procedures and checks.

B. Cofinancing procedures

Lomé IV lays down (Article 251) that "with the agreement of the parties concerned, necessary measures shall be taken to coordinate and harmonise operations of the Community and of the other cofinancing bodies in order to minimize the number of procedures to be implemented by the ACP States and to allow those procedures to be made more flexible". This point is crucial since, under Community rules, participation in invitations to tender, in other procedures for the award of contracts and in the contracts themselves, is normally confined to Member States and ACP States. Article 296 of Lomé IV provides, however, for participation by non-Community and non-ACP countries in contracts financed by the Community where the Community participates in the financing of regional or interregional schemes involving such third countries and in the joint financing of projects with other providers of funds.

10. Financing and Technical Cooperation - Implementation Procedures.

Financing Agreement : The legal instrument which determines the rights and obligations of the beneficiary ACP State(s) and the Community in respect of projects and programmes aided by the EDF. The agreement which is signed by the Government(s) concerned and the Commission covers financing provisions, rules relating to tendering and placement of contracts and contains a technical description of the aided project and of the manner in which aid is to be implemented.

Amounts provided for in financing agreements which remain unspent are recycled into the EDF allocations for the ACP States concerned.

Loan Contract (abolished under Lomé IV): Where aid to projects consists of special loans, the financing agreement is completed by a loan contract with the borrower which sets out the conditions for execution and reimbursement of the loan and of interest obligations. Where the special loan is made to a body other than an ACP Government, it must be covered by a guarantee agreement with the Government.

Tendering and Contracts : The fundamental principle applied to competition for EDF contracts is that of equal opportunity for bidders in the Community and in the ACP States. Only in exceptional cases are third countries permitted to bid (e.g. where projects involve cofinancing with such countries). Normally, competition takes the form of open international tendering. Contracts are awarded by the authorities of the ACP country concerned with the approval of the Commission Delegate. In exceptional cases (e.g. where a bid although not the lowest, is considered by the national authorities to be economically the most advantageous) the Commission may decide to accept that bid.

Despite the general practice of international tendering, Lomé IV also provides for restricted tendering, contracts by direct agreement or performance of contracts through public works departments in the case of operations relating to emergency aid, and to actions of urgent or minor nature. In order to benefit ACP bidders for EDF financed contracts, an accelerated tendering procedure may be applied to works worth less than 5 MECU* and a preference of 10% on works contracts and of 15% on all supplies contracts is given to ACP firms.

Payments Procedures : The basic concern of the Commission in respect of EDF payments is that each beneficiary State should not have to prefinance EDF aid from its national budget. With this in mind, payments are made directly to firms who supply goods and services; this is true both in respect of payments in ACP currencies authorised locally and for payments in European currencies authorised by the Commission.

In the case of supply contracts, 60% may be paid to the supplier, where he provides a bank guarantee, at the time of signature of the contract, a further 30% on provisional acceptance by the authorities of the ACP State and the last 10% on final acceptance.

* Less than 4 MECU under Lomé III.

Annex Table 1

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

										MECU	
										:	
:	:	Cumulative Result as at 31-12-1992 : Decisions								:	:
:	6th EDF									:	:
:	:									:	E.I.B.
:	Country	INTEREST	EMERGENCY	AID TO	RISK	STABEX	SYSMIN	OTHER	TOTAL	Own	
:	:	REBATES	AID	REFUGEES	CAPITAL			INSTRUMENTS:		Ressources:	
:	:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
:	ANGOLA		14.9	3.1	4.0				22.0		
:	BENIN		0.3	0.1	13.5	17.7		3.4	35.0		
:	BOTSWANA	3.9	0.4	0.4	4.0		21.7	0.8	31.2	24.0	
:	BURKINA		0.4		12.5	7.3		6.6	26.7		
:	BURUNDI		0.2	0.8	11.8	44.5		1.7	59.0		
:	CAMEROUN		0.1		1.0	198.8		3.4	203.3		
:	CAP VERT				3.0			0.2	3.2		
:	CENTRAFRIQUE		0.6		10.0	31.2		0.0	41.9		
:	COMORES				2.0	9.6		0.3	11.8		
:	CONGO				26.0				26.0		
:	COTE D'IVOIRE	17.2	0.9	1.4		365.3		0.9	385.6	87.1	
:	DJIBOUTI		0.5	1.2	2.0			0.2	3.9		
:	ETHIOPIE		49.5	10.7	31.0	98.6		0.2	189.9		
:	GABON		0.1			3.1			3.2		
:	GAMBIE		0.2		5.7	13.7		0.2	19.9		
:	GHANA	4.1			23.0				27.1	21.0	
:	GUINEE		1.1	2.3	19.0		35.0	0.5	57.9		
:	GUINEE BISSAU		0.1		3.5	2.9		0.2	6.6		
:	GUINEE EQUAT.				4.0	9.8		0.3	14.2		
:	KENYA	12.6	0.4	0.0	7.5	70.9			91.5	69.0	
:	LESOTHO				9.5	3.1		0.4	13.0		
:	LIBERIA		7.1	2.2				0.0	9.3		
:	MADAGASCAR		0.3		32.3	4.5		0.2	37.3		
:	MALAWI	1.9	4.4	13.4	13.5	21.7		0.3	55.2	10.5	

Annex Table 1

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result as at 31-12-1992 : Decisions									
Country	INTEREST	EMERGENCY	AID TO	RISK	STABEX	SYSMIN	OTHER	TOTAL	E.I.B.
	REBATES	AID	REFUGEES	CAPITAL			INSTRUMENTS:		Own
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
MALI		0.8		20.5	20.3		2.4	44.0	
MAURICE	4.2	0.1		5.8	3.0		0.2	13.2	28.0
MAURITANIE		0.8	1.5	21.5		18.0		41.8	
MOZAMBIQUE		17.7	13.6	15.0	21.5			67.7	
NIGER		0.4	2.7	14.3	6.6	12.5	0.8	37.3	
NIGERIA	30.9	1.1		5.0			1.1	38.0	213.0
OUGANDA		3.0	6.2	15.6			3.7	28.5	
RWANDA		1.9	0.2	12.0	61.9		1.2	77.2	
SAO TOME		0.1		2.4	1.6		0.0	4.1	
SENEGAL		1.6	4.4	22.3	107.0	25.5	3.4	164.2	
SEYCHELLES	0.3			1.5				1.8	1.5
SIERRA LEONE		0.5					1.4	1.9	
SOMALIE		10.2	4.4	15.4			1.0	31.0	
SOUDAN		42.3	21.1	22.0	63.9		4.2	153.5	
SWAZILAND	1.1		1.4	7.0			0.1	9.6	6.0
TANZANIE		0.1		34.5	8.9		0.7	44.2	
TCHAD		1.2	1.8	8.2	40.4		2.8	54.4	
TOGO				9.3	25.5	15.7	0.1	50.7	
ZAIRE	1.3	1.1	2.1	12.0			0.1	16.5	50.0
ZAMBIE		0.6	0.7	11.7			1.0	13.9	
ZIMBABWE	11.2		1.3	0.6				13.1	70.0
AFRICA	88.5	164.7	97.1	495.5	1 263.3	128.3	43.8	2 281.2	580.1

Annex Table 1

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result as at 31-12-1992 : Decisions									
Country	INTEREST REBATES (1)	EMERGENCY AID (2)	AID TO REFUGEES (3)	RISK CAPITAL (4)	STABEX (5)	SYSMIN (6)	OTHER INSTRUMENTS: (7)	TOTAL (8)	E.I.B. Own Ressources: (9)
ANTIGUA				1.5				1.5	
BAHAMAS	3.3						0.1	3.4	17.6
BARBADES	1.4			1.0			0.7	3.1	7.2
BELIZE	0.3		2.0	1.0			2.1	5.4	2.5
DOMINIQUE				3.8	1.2		0.0	5.0	
GRENADE		0.1		2.8	2.5			5.4	
GUYANE		0.2		4.0			0.1	4.3	
JAMAIQUE	6.8	0.8		2.3			3.3	13.1	34.3
KITS & NEVIS				1.5				1.5	
ST. VINCENT	0.7	0.1		2.8				3.6	3.0
STE. LUCIE	1.2			2.0				3.2	6.0
SURINAME		0.1		3.0			1.1	4.2	
TRINITE & TOBAG:	2.3	0.1		3.0			6.3	11.7	12.0
CARIBBEAN	15.9	1.4	2.0	28.7	3.7	0.0	13.6	65.3	82.6

Annex Table 1

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result as at 31-12-1992 : Decisions									
Country	INTEREST REBATES (1)	EMERGENCY AID (2)	AID TO REFUGEES (3)	RISK CAPITAL (4)	STABEX (5)	SYSMIN (6)	OTHER INSTRUMENTS: (7)	TOTAL (8)	E.I.B. Own Ressources: (9)
FIDJI	3.9	0.3		1.0	0.3			5.4	22.5
KIRIBATI					2.5		0.3	2.8	
PAPOUA N.GUINEE	5.9		0.7	5.5	110.0	18.0	0.2	140.4	33.0
SALOMON		0.4		2.0	31.3		0.1	33.8	
SAMOA		0.2		4.2	11.1		0.1	15.6	
TONGA	0.3			1.8	4.3		0.0	6.5	2.0
TUVALU					0.1			0.1	
VANUATU		0.5			19.3		0.1	20.0	
PACIFIC	10.1	1.5	0.7	14.5	178.9	18.0	0.9	224.6	57.5
NATIONAL TOTAL	114.6	167.6	99.8	538.7	1 445.9	146.3	58.3	2 571.1	720.2
REGIONAL	2.7	22.3		44.2			20.8	90.0	21.0
GENERAL TOTAL	117.3	189.9	99.8	582.9	1 445.9	146.3	79.0	2 661.1	741.2
AVERAGE 1	72%	100%	100%	97%	98%	58%	59%	91%	

NOTE : AVERAGE 1 : % of the financial envelope

(7) OTHER INSTRUMENTS includes : Rehabilitation fund, Aids, Balance and special credit line for studies and short terms consultancy services (structural adjustment).

Annex Table 2

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result at 31-12-1992 : Decisions							E.I.B. : Own : Ressources :	
Country	INTEREST REBATES (1)	EMERGENCY AID (2)	AID TO REFUGEES (3)	RISK CAPITAL (4)	STABEX (5)	SYSGMIN (6)	TOTAL (7)	(8)
ANGOLA		8.5	7.5	3.1			19.1	
BENIN					0.6		0.6	
BOTSWANA							0.0	2.5
BURKINA				3.0	2.1		5.1	
BURUNDI					24.5		24.5	
CAMEROUN	0.3				136.6		136.9	1.5
CAP VERT				5.4	0.1		5.5	
CENTRAFRIQUE					9.3		9.3	
COMORES				2.0	2.5		4.5	
CONGO							0.0	
COTE D'IVOIRE	1.1				162.9		164.0	5.5
DJIBOUTI			0.3				0.3	
ETHIOPIE		4.6	0.4	6.0	114.0		125.0	
GABON							0.0	
GAMBIE				4.3	0.4		4.7	
GHANA					23.3		23.3	20.0
GUINEE	3.9		0.7	8.0			12.7	15.0
GUINEE BISSAU				7.0	0.4		7.4	
GUINEE EQUAT.					3.5		3.5	
KENYA	4.4	7.2		2.0	46.3		59.8	20.0
LESOTHO					0.9		0.9	
LIBERIA		1.0	1.5				2.5	
MADAGASCAR				6.5	38.1		44.6	
MALAWI		1.0	5.5	14.8	4.2		25.5	
MALI		0.2		10.0	0.9		11.1	
MAURICE				3.1			3.1	2.0
MAURITANIE	3.7	1.0		10.0	13.7		28.3	15.0

Annex Table 2

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result at 31-12-1992 : Decisions								E.I.B. : Own : Ressources:	
Country	INTEREST REBATES (1)	EMERGENCY AID (2)	AID TO REFUGEES (3)	RISK CAPITAL (4)	STABEX (5)	SYSMIN (6)	TOTAL (7)	(8)	
MOZAMBIQUE		2.0	3.1	3.0			8.1		
NAMIBIE				2.5			2.5		
NIGER							0.0		
NIGERIA	20.8						20.8	130.0	
UGANDA					71.2		71.2		
RWANDA		2.7	0.7		26.7		30.2		
SAO TOME					2.1		2.1		
SENEGAL	2.6						2.6	13.0	
SEYCHELLES							0.0		
SIERRA LEONE			0.1	15.5	3.4		19.1		
SOMALIE							0.0		
SOUDAN		10.0			63.9		73.9		
SWAZILAND							0.0		
TANZANIE				8.3	31.7		40.0		
TCHAD							0.0		
TOGO					13.0		13.0		
ZAIRE		2.0					2.0		
ZAMBIE				3.0		60.0	63.0		
ZIMBABWE			0.5				0.5	41.0	
AFRICA	36.8	40.2	20.5	117.4	796.4	60.0	1 071.2	265.5	

Annex Table 2

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result at 31-12-1992 : Decisions							E.I.B. : Own : Ressources:	
Country	INTEREST REBATES (1)	EMERGENCY AID (2)	AID TO REFUGEES (3)	RISK CAPITAL (4)	STABEX (5)	SYSMIN (6)	TOTAL (7)	(8)
ANTIGUA							0.0	
BAHAMAS							0.0	
BARBADES							0.0	
BELIZE							0.0	
DOMINICAINE							0.0	
DOMINIQUE					0.8		0.8	
GRENADE				1.5	3.8		5.3	
GUYANE							0.0	
HAITI		1.3			17.0		18.3	
JAMAIQUE	3.1						3.1	12.0
KITS & NEVIS							0.0	
ST. VINCENT							0.0	
STE. LUCIE							0.0	
SURINAME			0.5				0.5	
TRINITE & TOBAG:	10.1						10.1	38.0
CARIBBEAN	13.2	1.3	0.5	1.5	21.7	0.0	38.2	50.0

Annex Table 2

 * SITUATION OF NON PROGRAMMED AID *

MECU

Cumulative Result at 31-12-1992 : Decisions								E.I.B.	
Country	INTEREST REBATES (1)	EMERGENCY AID (2)	AID TO REFUGEES (3)	RISK CAPITAL (4)	STABEX (5)	SYSMIN (6)	TOTAL (7)	Own Ressources (8)	
FIDJI	1.3						1.3	5.0	
KIRIBATI					0.6		0.6		
PAPOUA N.GUINEE:					42.2		42.2		
SALOMON					6.1		6.1		
SAMOA		0.3			4.4		4.7		
TONGA					1.7		1.7		
TUVALU					0.0		0.0		
VANUATU					2.1		2.1		
PACIFIC	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	58.7	5.0	
NATIONAL TOTAL :	51.2	41.8	21.0	118.9	875.2	60.0	1 168.1	320.5	
REGIONAL :	2.3	1.0		15.0			18.3	14.0	
GENERAL TOTAL :	53.5	42.8	21.0	133.9	875.2	60.0	1 186.4	334.5	
AVERAGE 1 :	19%	17%	21%	16%	55%	13%	34%		

Annex Table 3

 * PROGRAMMED AID *
 * NATIONAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES *
 * UNDER THE 5th EDF *

MECU

COUNTRY	ANNUAL FIGURES			CUMULATIVE RESULT AS AT 31-12-92		
	Decisions	Commitments	Payments	Decisions	Commitments	Payments
BENIN	-4.04	-1.37	3.80	50.89	50.29	43.50
BOTSWANA	-0.14	-0.14	0.52	22.68	20.96	18.91
BURKINA	-0.03	1.37	4.52	84.45	83.56	78.61
BURUNDI	-0.06	2.78	6.22	76.91	73.84	67.95
CAMEROUN	-0.15	-0.06	10.51	68.72	68.45	66.59
CAP VERT	0.04	0.13	0.14	15.97	15.67	15.55
CENTRAFRIQUE	-0.17	-1.91	0.66	48.76	43.53	42.51
COMORES	0.70	1.46	1.23	14.39	14.18	13.15
CONGO	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	31.32	31.09	30.87
COTE D'IVOIRE	0.03	1.86	2.02	53.64	50.84	48.68
DJIBOUTI	0.00	0.00	0.09	5.34	5.12	5.00
ETHIOPIE	0.00	-0.07	0.22	140.24	131.94	129.15
GABON	1.55	0.00	0.05	15.90	14.28	14.17
GAMBIE	-0.03	0.11	0.92	13.96	13.73	13.21
GHANA	-0.05	0.32	0.67	60.00	48.74	46.23
GUINEE	6.16	-2.50	0.59	79.99	69.14	67.61
GUINEE BISSAU	4.20	0.03	0.26	24.95	19.40	19.21
GUINEE EQUAT.	0.66	0.00	0.00	8.49	7.80	7.75
KENYA	-0.06	0.97	7.86	87.76	81.96	77.56
LESOTHO	-3.39	-0.05	0.85	22.74	22.56	22.47
LIBERIA	0.00	0.04	0.09	29.99	19.81	16.96
MADAGASCAR	-0.52	0.48	1.78	76.94	71.98	70.30
MALAWI	0.42	2.24	8.94	79.68	73.51	63.41
MALI	-0.33	2.30	3.90	95.46	91.28	82.53
MAURICE	-0.10	-0.03	0.06	20.26	19.15	19.09
MAURITANIE	-1.57	0.33	1.45	39.89	39.42	36.33
NIGER	0.38	0.20	0.38	80.02	72.92	72.06
NIGERIA	0.10	4.55	5.99	50.00	49.20	43.45
OUGANDA	-0.09	1.16	4.11	86.92	82.84	79.34
RWANDA	-1.77	0.24	1.11	76.63	75.30	74.13
SAO TOME	0.00	0.00	0.08	3.97	3.97	3.93
SENEGAL	-1.11	0.80	3.78	66.75	65.97	60.69
SEYCHELLES	0.07	0.05	0.02	3.57	3.55	3.52
SIERRA LEONE	0.04	2.28	3.71	48.48	47.54	42.40
SOMALIE	-12.89	-1.51	1.95	65.47	59.65	57.19
SOUDAN	-0.09	-0.38	0.61	87.74	83.03	80.35
SWAZILAND	-0.52	0.24	2.85	17.61	17.11	16.72
TANZANIE	-4.61	1.76	1.91	115.26	113.27	107.53
TCHAD	-0.03	-0.48	0.46	61.87	60.10	58.22
TOGO	0.38	0.20	0.70	40.34	39.34	37.93
ZAIRE	-0.16	-0.31	1.34	95.21	83.66	80.71
ZAMBIE	0.02	0.13	1.56	57.97	52.87	48.36
ZIMBABWE	-0.15	-0.45	1.66	46.65	42.83	39.28
AFRICA	-17.34	16.71	89.55	2 273.75	2 135.34	2 023.05

Annex Table 3

 * PROGRAMMED AID *
 * NATIONAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES *
 * UNDER THE 5th EDF *

MECU

: COUNTRY :	: ANNUAL FIGURES :			: CUMULATIVE RESULT AS AT 31-12-92 :		
	Decisions	Commitments	Payments:	Decisions	Commitments	Payments:
: ANTIGUA :	0.00	0.00	0.16 :	2.70	2.46	2.26 :
: BAHAMAS :	0.00	0.16	0.16 :	2.10	1.93	1.66 :
: BARBADES :	0.00	0.00	0.10 :	3.19	2.74	2.35 :
: BELIZE :	0.00	-0.08	0.00 :	5.50	0.51	0.51 :
: DOMINIQUE :	0.03	-0.03	0.00 :	3.50	3.44	3.43 :
: GRENADA :	0.00	0.00	0.04 :	3.50	3.45	3.44 :
: GUYANE :	0.00	0.00	0.19 :	14.57	13.93	13.43 :
: JAMAIQUE :	0.13	0.49	0.91 :	23.17	19.15	17.87 :
: KITS & NEVIS :	0.00	0.00	0.00 :	2.19	1.97	1.97 :
: ST. VINCENT :	0.00	0.00	0.00 :	3.61	3.58	3.55 :
: STE. LUCIE :	0.00	0.01	0.00 :	3.63	3.60	3.57 :
: SURINAME :	0.17	1.10	2.49 :	13.17	9.68	9.17 :
: TRINITE & TOBAGO :	-0.14	0.36	0.78 :	9.06	7.27	6.12 :
: CARAIBBEAN :	0.20	2.01	4.81 :	89.88	73.71	69.32 :
: FIDJI :	0.00	1.51	0.82 :	12.99	12.89	11.24 :
: KIRIBATI :	0.00	0.83	0.18 :	4.00	4.00	3.24 :
: PAPOUA N. GUINEE :	-0.67	2.86	0.40 :	22.31	22.20	18.57 :
: SALOMON :	-0.86	-0.51	0.42 :	11.13	11.13	10.81 :
: SAMOA :	-0.04	-0.04	0.00 :	6.16	6.16	6.16 :
: TONGA :	0.00	0.96	0.29 :	3.98	3.79	3.09 :
: TUVALU :	0.00	0.00	0.00 :	0.97	0.96	0.96 :
: VANUATU :	0.19	0.04	0.03 :	4.44	4.29	4.28 :
: PACIFIC :	-1.37	5.65	2.15 :	65.97	65.40	58.34 :
: NATIONAL TOTAL :	-18.51	24.37	96.50 :	2429.60	2274.44	2150.70 :
: REGIONAL :	2.87	8.86	22.31 :	588.21	530.67	501.98 :
: GENERAL TOTAL :	-15.64	33.23	118.81 :	3017.81	2805.11	2652.68 :

Annex Table 4

 * PROGRAMMED AID *
 * NATIONAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES *
 * UNDER THE 6th EDF *

MECU

COUNTRY	ANNUAL FIGURES			CUMULATIVE RESULT AS AT 31-12-92:		
	Decisions	Commitments	Payments	Decisions	Commitments	Payments
: ANGOLA :	3.95	10.28	13.84	85.71	77.60	70.20
: BENIN :	-0.01	10.48	11.83	89.47	80.00	73.77
: BOTSWANA :	-0.13	1.31	1.83	30.27	19.31	15.11
: BURKINA :	0.03	23.21	26.03	106.34	75.81	44.71
: BURUNDI :	-0.10	13.95	22.70	107.87	87.61	73.22
: CAMEROUN :	2.59	2.42	21.44	101.00	87.51	64.91
: CAP VERT :	0.00	1.95	5.29	24.50	20.31	14.64
: CENTRAFRIQUE :	4.10	5.21	6.76	68.90	60.94	52.12
: COMORES :	0.06	3.16	4.45	20.44	17.59	15.66
: CONGO :	5.74	1.25	5.82	47.77	24.42	12.88
: COTE D'IVOIRE :	0.09	2.29	6.50	80.03	74.54	70.38
: DJIBOUTI :	0.00	1.61	3.06	15.98	15.15	9.62
: ETHIOPIE :	0.03	37.82	41.09	209.55	138.75	111.58
: GABON :	5.10	0.14	1.63	25.72	19.16	16.17
: GAMBIE :	0.27	0.59	2.43	20.98	18.59	16.73
: GHANA :	6.21	13.09	10.42	78.05	47.03	36.03
: GUINEE :	5.43	22.12	25.30	112.27	101.00	80.24
: GUINEE BISSAU :	3.59	2.14	3.20	37.42	22.16	17.56
: GUINEE EQUAT. :	0.65	0.65	0.42	11.95	6.04	4.99
: KENYA :	0.45	12.99	17.79	134.99	95.40	79.92
: LESOTHO :	-0.06	2.83	6.31	41.46	38.72	33.54
: LIBERIA :	0.07	0.02	0.53	31.90	11.36	7.49
: MADAGASCAR :	8.98	7.85	8.05	96.96	67.12	58.60
: MALAWI :	0.23	-1.72	10.29	105.24	93.77	89.65
: MALI :	0.02	3.67	30.22	136.97	101.69	79.70
: MAURICE :	0.16	12.36	4.03	27.34	20.89	9.68
: MAURITANIE :	0.82	16.07	6.35	59.13	49.28	31.62
: MOZAMBIQUE :	2.21	22.03	26.69	154.31	123.62	105.98
: NIGER :	0.83	11.16	17.61	121.95	100.47	81.77
: NIGERIA :	-0.03	51.38	46.97	213.43	140.23	88.37
: OUGANDA :	2.12	18.79	28.65	132.94	125.10	105.66
: RWANDA :	33.35	59.38	31.46	110.00	104.11	60.00
: SAO TOME :	0.02	0.38	0.96	6.00	5.94	5.21
: SENEGAL :	0.00	8.57	20.16	108.50	101.84	77.56
: SEYCHELLES :	0.00	1.24	1.57	6.18	5.70	4.18
: SIERRA LEONE :	-3.81	15.93	7.21	55.98	47.27	28.31
: SOMALIE :	-39.44	10.94	6.37	51.54	43.69	38.42
: SOUDAN :	0.67	4.97	7.74	95.54	65.44	57.69
: SWAZILAND :	-0.04	0.40	5.02	25.46	22.84	19.91
: TANZANIE :	4.10	13.38	27.83	176.16	147.59	125.27
: TCHAD :	0.00	2.69	7.17	89.00	64.74	53.41
: TOGO :	0.02	1.31	8.23	60.92	49.27	43.12
: ZAIRE :	-0.04	1.22	10.77	162.30	112.87	81.86
: ZAMBIE :	0.00	16.39	11.40	91.97	81.39	63.11
: ZIMBABWE :	0.03	3.97	4.80	76.96	55.92	41.00
: AFRICA :	48.24	451.87	568.22	3 647.32	2 869.75	2 271.50

Annex Table 4

 * PROGRAMMED AID *
 * NATIONAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES *
 * UNDER THE 6th EDF *

MECU

COUNTRY	ANNUAL FIGURES			CUMULATIVE RESULT AS AT 31-12-92:		
	Decisions	Commitments	Payments	Decisions	Commitments	Payments
: ANTIGUA :	3.10	0.00	0.15 :	3.89	0.74	0.59 :
: BAHAMAS :	0.00	0.99	0.18 :	3.62	3.35	1.99 :
: BARBADES :	0.08	0.14	0.49 :	3.97	2.02	1.39 :
: BELIZE :	0.00	0.02	1.44 :	7.95	7.17	6.37 :
: DOMINIQUE :	0.00	-0.04	0.00 :	6.00	5.96	5.64 :
: GRENADA :	0.05	0.09	0.07 :	5.49	5.10	5.02 :
: GUYANE :	0.72	1.22	1.72 :	21.13	20.62	19.32 :
: JAMAIQUE :	0.00	8.27	7.03 :	36.72	33.64	22.94 :
: KITS & NEVIS :	0.00	0.11	0.38 :	2.76	2.62	2.51 :
: ST. VINCENT :	0.00	1.40	2.88 :	6.99	6.83	5.79 :
: STE. LUCIE :	0.00	-0.03	0.48 :	5.88	4.38	3.49 :
: SURINAME :	1.73	1.85	1.58 :	15.04	11.77	9.84 :
: TRINITE & TOBAGO :	0.00	-0.05	0.14 :	13.71	6.65	6.46 :
: CARAIBBEAN :	5.68	13.99	16.54 :	133.15	110.84	91.33 :
: FIDJI :	0.32	2.05	2.02 :	17.31	10.98	5.93 :
: KIRIBATI :	0.00	0.78	1.41 :	6.50	6.13	3.42 :
: PAPOUA N. GUINEE :	-0.09	1.97	3.74 :	34.38	30.43	27.82 :
: SALOMON :	-0.19	0.90	1.91 :	16.69	11.65	9.36 :
: SAMOA :	0.00	1.98	2.06 :	8.99	8.97	5.16 :
: TONGA :	0.00	1.46	0.55 :	6.50	1.72	0.78 :
: TUVALU :	1.02	0.02	0.03 :	1.93	0.36	0.28 :
: VANUATU :	0.00	1.44	1.15 :	6.70	5.45	3.84 :
: PACIFIC :	1.06	10.59	12.87 :	99.00	75.69	56.59 :
: NATIONAL TOTAL :	54.98	476.45	597.63 :	3 879.5	3 056.3	2 419.4 :
: REGIONAL :	41.43	128.69	132.33 :	824.06	628.32	455.69 :
: GENERAL TOTAL :	96.41	605.14	729.96 :	4703.53	3684.60	2875.11 :

Annex Table 5

 * PROGRAMMED AID *
 * NATIONAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES *
 * UNDER THE 7th EDF *

MECU

COUNTRY	ANNUAL FIGURES			CUMULATIVE RESULT AS AT 31-12-92:		
	Decisions	Commitments	Payments	Decisions	Commitments	Payments
:ANGOLA	9.11	4.95	2.32	9.11	4.95	2.32
:BENIN	13.26	4.33	0.01	17.26	4.33	0.01
:BOTSWANA	6.72	0.86	0.12	6.72	0.86	0.12
:BURKINA	18.32	12.73	6.84	42.17	22.73	6.84
:BURUNDI	38.41	2.46	0.64	38.41	2.46	0.64
:CAMEROUN	15.43	11.27	0.00	15.43	11.27	
:CAP VERT	1.12	0.32	0.00	1.12	0.32	
:CENTRAFRIQUE	0.74	0.00	0.00	0.74		
:COMORES	2.92	0.05	0.05	2.92	0.05	0.05
:CONGO	9.50	0.00	0.00	9.50		
:COTE D'IVOIRE	11.81	0.60	0.24	11.81	0.60	0.24
:DJIBOUTI	11.17	0.20	0.00	11.17	0.20	
:ETHIOPIE	47.18	15.06	0.03	47.18	15.06	0.03
:GABON	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.56		
:GAMBIE	0.80	9.17	3.01	17.30	9.31	3.01
:GHANA	0.49	11.33	10.06	14.49	11.33	10.06
:GUINEE	65.54	0.31	0.08	65.54	0.31	0.08
:GUINEE BISSAU	6.56	0.60	0.27	6.56	0.60	0.27
:GUINEE EQUAT.	5.51	0.44	0.03	5.51	0.44	0.03
:KENYA	10.44	0.00	0.00	12.39		
:LESOTHO	0.02	14.77	4.97	35.02	14.77	4.97
:LIBERIA	0.00	0.00	0.00			
:MADAGASCAR	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.03
:MALAWI	1.20	0.00	0.00	4.40		
:MALI	7.15	5.88	17.16	35.15	20.14	17.16
:MAURICE	8.66	0.00	0.00	8.66		
:MAURITANIE	20.68	0.50	0.01	20.68	0.50	0.01
:MOZAMBIQUE	63.81	0.59	0.00	66.31	0.59	
:NAMIBIE	4.71	1.71	0.07	4.71	1.71	0.07
:NIGER	14.26	14.72	6.55	26.26	14.72	6.55
:NIGERIA	77.95	29.62	8.97	105.95	29.62	8.97
:OUGANDA	43.22	14.81	14.53	57.77	14.81	14.53
:RWANDA	7.14	2.86	0.08	7.14	2.86	0.08
:SAO TOME	3.90	0.00	0.00	3.90		
:SENEGAL	63.36	0.28	0.01	63.36	0.28	0.01
:SEYCHELLES	0.43	0.58	0.25	1.43	0.58	0.25
:SIERRA LEONE	22.60	0.00	0.00	22.60		
:SOMALIE	0.00	0.00	0.00			
:SOUDAN	-0.02	0.00	0.00			
:SWAZILAND	15.33	9.29	1.99	15.53	9.49	1.99
:TANZANIE	57.43	0.54	0.20	57.58	0.54	0.20
:TCHAD	47.02	0.69	0.15	47.02	0.69	0.15
:TOGO	13.46	0.10	0.05	24.66	0.10	0.05
:ZAIRE	0.00	0.00	0.00			
:ZAMBIE	24.71	14.82	12.03	48.11	17.32	12.03
:ZIMBABWE	27.38	0.08	0.00	30.38	0.08	
: AFRICA	800.00	186.56	90.76	1 022.52	213.65	90.76

Annex Table 5

 * PROGRAMMED AID *
 * NATIONAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES *
 * UNDER THE 7th EDF *

MECU

COUNTRY	ANNUAL FIGURES			CUMULATIVE RESULT AS AT 31-12-92:		
	Decisions	Commitments	Payments	Decisions	Commitments	Payments
: ANTIGUA	: 0.21	0.23	0.09	: 0.36	0.23	0.09
: BAHAMAS	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: BARBADES	: 0.30	0.19	0.02	: 0.30	0.19	0.02
: BELIZE	: 8.60	4.40	2.12	: 8.60	4.40	2.12
: DOMINICAINE	: 33.46	8.95	8.37	: 33.46	8.95	8.37
: DOMINIQUE	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: GRENADE	: 2.61	0.26	0.00	: 4.50	0.26	
: GUYANE	: 4.50	4.30	0.00	: 4.50	4.30	
: HAITI	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: JAMAIQUE	: 21.17	0.22	0.13	: 21.17	0.22	0.13
: KITS & NEVIS	: 0.02	0.01	0.01	: 0.02	0.01	0.01
: ST. VINCENT	: 0.02	0.02	0.01	: 0.02	0.02	0.01
: STE. LUCIE	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: SURINAME	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: TRINITE & TOBAGO	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: CARIBBEAN	: 70.88	18.58	10.75	: 72.92	18.58	10.75
: FIDJI	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: KIRIBATI	: 0.41	0.06	0.00	: 0.41	0.06	
: PAPOUA N. GUINEE	: 3.51	7.26	4.15	: 7.85	7.26	4.15
: SALOMON	: 2.33	0.22	0.01	: 2.33	0.22	0.01
: SAMOA	: 0.06	0.06	0.00	: 0.06	0.06	
: TONGA	: 0.00	0.00	0.00	:		
: TUVALU	: 0.98	0.05	0.00	: 0.98	0.05	
: VANUATU	: 0.36	0.00	0.00	: 0.36		
: PACIFIC	: 7.65	7.65	4.16	: 11.99	7.65	4.16
: NATIONAL TOTAL	: 878.53	212.79	105.66	: 1107.43	239.89	105.66
: REGIONAL	: 160.79	44.87	31.68	: 211.36	62.56	38.16
: GENERAL TOTAL	: 1039.32	257.66	137.34	: 1318.79	302.44	143.82

6th EDF

Annex Table 6

Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
		MECU	

TRADE PROMOTION	113.6	82.1	60.3

General	28.7	22.6	16.8
Exhibitions & expositions	21.7	20.1	16.5
Develop.trade and services	21.2	14.7	11.1
Tourism	31.8	18.4	11.2
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	237.8	170.6	120.1

General	51.0	42.9	28.8
Infrastructure	66.7	34.1	24.9
training	88.3	68.7	46.5
of which : Nigeria	30.0	22.8	13.6
Coop. cult. & social	23.1	16.7	14.8
WATER ENGINEERING, URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE & HOUSING	185.1	155.8	100.2

Village water engeneering	31.3	24.5	16.4
Water supplies	80.2	71.6	48.2
of which : Congo	10.0	10.0	4.2
Ouganda	19.5	17.0	12.2
Urban sanitation	32.2	27.5	11.4
of which : Angola	13.1	8.4	4.9
Urban improvment	31.5	22.6	16.5
of which : Cap Vert	19.8	15.6	10.1
HEALTH	137.5	90.3	75.7

General	93.0	56.7	47.7
of which : Nigeria	34.1	14.1	8.5
Angola	22.5	22.4	21.8
Tchad	12.0	11.3	10.7
Infrastructure	42.1	31.2	26.6

6th EDF

Annex Table 6

=====
Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed		Disbursed
		MECU		
TRANSPORT & COMMUNICATIONS	1225.5	977.1		706.2
General	30.5	22.1		20.7
Roads and Bridges	855.8	667.8		501.9
of which :				
Zaire	52.5	21.7		14.4
Cameroun	45.1	45.0		26.8
Rwanda	42.8	37.7		11.5
Papoua. N.G.	37.1	15.9		14.9
Tanzanie	33.4	16.2		7.3
Benin	31.1	29.4		27.0
Sierra Leone	29.6	26.0		14.6
Malawi	29.2	27.0		26.7
Togo	23.3	19.6		18.3
Ghana	21.9	3.6		2.8
Tchad	20.9	20.2		18.4
Burkina	20.5	16.3		10.9
Ouganda	20.3	19.6		18.8
Mozambique	18.6	18.1		14.7
Kenya	18.2	18.2		17.6
Burundi	17.8	17.4		16.3
Mauritanie	16.1	15.9		14.6
Niger	15.1	15.0		10.4
Madagascar	14.4	14.1		12.2
Lesotho	10.3	10.1		9.9
Zambie	10.0	9.7		3.0
Railways	86.9	68.3		55.6
of which :				
Mozambique	25.7	23.9		21.8
Soudan	11.7	0.2		0.2
Ports & rivers	71.3	58.1		39.3
of which :				
Ghana	21.0	10.9		5.1
Tanzanie	15.4	14.0		13.8
Ethiopie	10.0	10.0		3.6
Airports	74.2	72.1		39.8
Telecommunications	83.1	71.2		40.0
of which :				
Mozambique	13.8	3.2		1.6
Senegal	12.0	12.0		12.0
Sierra Leone	10.7	10.2		7.6
Meteo. & Tele-Detection	23.6	17.2		8.9

6th EDF

Annex Table 6

=====
Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
	MECU		
RURAL PRODUCTION	2031.3	1487.9	1076.6
General	352.6	239.7	176.4
of which :			
Nigeria	138.9	92.9	55.8
Kenya	89.1	57.4	46.6
Liberia	27.0	8.3	5.7
Soudan	10.1	7.2	5.9
Plantations	87.3	64.5	48.5
of which :			
Ethiopie	38.1	17.0	9.9
Ouganda	21.9	21.7	15.0
Cote d'Ivoire	21.0	20.3	19.3
Farm Drainage	174.1	108.6	77.8
of which :			
Niger	63.6	43.2	33.7
Mali	58.4	29.4	15.1
Madagascar	21.6	15.0	11.7
Tchad	15.0	9.3	7.2
Agriculture	241.8	186.2	144.0
of which :			
Ethiopie	53.5	40.4	33.8
Soudan	27.7	20.5	17.0
Zambie	24.5	17.9	10.8
Togo	11.5	6.7	4.4
Mozambique	10.3	5.6	3.0
Cooperatives	23.5	22.0	16.7
of which :			
Zimbabwe	23.5	31.9	16.6
Livestock rearing	68.8	36.8	26.1
of which :			
Centrafrique	10.0	8.1	7.3
Fisheries	54.4	37.8	25.4
Forests	106.2	72.5	53.4
of which :			
Centrafrique	28.0	26.1	22.7
Ouganda	11.6	9.4	5.7
Other	36.7	34.2	26.4
Integrated programmes	885.8	685.8	482.0
of which :			
Senegal	97.0	90.3	66.1
Tanzanie	84.7	78.4	67.0
Burkina Faso	77.0	53.9	29.9
Guinea	75.0	68.7	51.2
Burundi	66.8	48.0	35.6
Zaire	61.0	45.1	23.4
Rwanda	51.0	50.6	34.5
Ethiopie	50.2	27.4	20.0
Mali	44.4	38.3	31.0
Congo	40.8	23.3	11.9
Cameroun	37.7	30.0	25.4
Mauritanie	35.0	25.5	9.3
Tchad	28.0	10.9	6.8
Guinee Bissau	23.8	12.6	8.3
Niger	21.8	21.5	18.6
Centrafrique	20.3	18.4	14.6
Benin	16.5	9.9	6.1
Zimbabwe	14.0	1.1	0.7
Cote d'Ivoire	11.0	6.3	3.7

6th EDF

Annex Table 6

=====

Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
	MECU		
INDUSTRIES	771.5	697.7	468.8
General	181.9	177.9	134.5
of which :			
Tanzanie	13.3	13.2	12.6
Maurice	12.2	10.9	5.0
Zambie	10.5	10.5	10.0
Extractive	166.1	113.7	79.3
of which :			
Guinea	35.0	24.5	15.8
Senegal	25.5	1.1	0.3
Botswana	21.7	21.3	1.1
Ethiopie	21.0	21.0	20.7
Mauritanie	16.5	16.5	16.5
Togo	15.7	0.0	0.0
Ghana	13.0	13.0	11.6
Niger	12.5	11.4	8.6
Metals	17.0	17.0	12.7
of which :			
Guinea	13.0	13.0	12.0
Chemicals	12.5	12.5	12.0
Manufacturing	60.6	60.0	40.0
of which :			
Tanzanie	12.0	11.8	3.7
Agro industry	82.1	74.8	45.2
of which :			
Congo	16.0	16.0	7.3
Madagascar	10.5	8.2	6.0
Nigeria	14.2	9.2	2.9
Energy projects	149.4	147.3	79.4
of which :			
Soudan	19.0	19.0	18.7
Madagascar	15.5	15.5	8.1
Niger	14.3	14.3	6.1
Ouganda	11.7	11.6	0.5
Samoa	11.4	11.3	6.5
Mali	11.0	11.0	5.3
Centrafrique	10.0	10.0	0.0
Mining & Energy potential	90.9	87.1	62.2
of which :			
Mauritanie	23.0	19.8	19.0
Tanzanie	16.5	16.5	13.8
Somalie	13.0	13.0	9.6
Zaire	12.0	12.0	0.0

6th EDF

Annex Table 6

=====
 Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
 classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
 beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
		MECU	

THEMATIC ACTIONS	822.9	759.5	706.1

Drought & Desertification	74.6	52.7	20.5
Import Programmes	744.0	702.6	681.8
of which :			
Mozambique	69.0	59.2	55.3
Malawi	52.3	49.3	48.3
Ethiopie	51.5	44.2	42.0
Cote d'Ivoire	41.0	41.0	41.0
Zambie	38.7	36.8	35.8
Angola	38.5	38.4	37.9
Benin	36.7	30.5	30.4
Ouganda	34.4	34.4	34.4
Soudan	33.6	29.6	27.9
Somalie	29.3	29.3	29.2
Mali	28.5	28.5	28.5
Tanzanie	24.5	24.3	23.4
Zaire	24.0	24.0	23.8
Ghana	20.5	19.4	19.2
Guyane	17.3	16.9	16.2
Madagascar	17.2	17.1	17.1
Jamaique	15.5	13.6	10.3
Niger	14.0	13.7	13.4
Guinee	12.5	12.5	12.5
Cameroun	12.5	11.9	11.9
Rwanda	12.0	11.7	10.1
Trinite & T.	12.0	6.0	6.0
Burundi	12.0	11.9	11.9
Senegal	11.5	11.5	11.5
Nigeria	10.0	10.0	10.0
Togo	10.0	9.9	9.7

6th EDF

Annex Table 6

Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
EXEPTIONAL AID, STABEX	1737.9	1722.5	1684.3
Disasters	214.5	201.2	174.6
of which :			
Ethiopie	49.5	49.1	45.7
Somalie	32.6	24.3	15.4
Soudan	32.6	24.3	15.4
Mozambique	17.7	17.4	15.4
Angola	14.9	14.9	13.7
Stabex	1445.5	1445.5	1444.9
of which :			
Cote d'Ivoire	365.3	365.3	365.3
Cameroun	198.8	198.8	198.8
Papouasie N.G	110.0	110.0	110.0
Senegal	107.0	107.0	107.0
Ethiopie	98.6	98.6	98.6
Kenya	70.9	70.9	70.9
Soudan	63.9	63.9	63.9
Rwanda	61.9	61.9	61.9
Burundi	44.5	44.5	44.5
TChad	40.4	40.4	40.4
Salomon	31.3	31.3	31.3
Centrafrique	31.2	31.2	31.2
Togo	25.5	25.5	25.5
Malawi	21.7	21.7	21.7
Mozambique	21.5	21.5	21.5
Mali	20.3	20.3	20.3
Vanuatu	19.3	19.3	19.3
Benin	17.7	17.7	17.7
Gambie	13.3	13.3	13.3
Samoa	11.1	11.1	11.1
Refugees & returnees	71.3	69.9	62.4
of which :			
Soudan	17.9	16.9	14.8
Mozambique	13.5	13.3	12.1
Ethiopie	10.3	10.3	9.9
OTHER	101.7	86.5	68.4
General Technical Assistance	55.9	46.9	35.5
Multisectoral programmes	20.5	18.6	16.6
TOTAL SECTORS	7364.7	6230.1	5066.8

(*) Subsectors and beneficiary States are listed where the amount approved is more than 10 mio ECU.

7th EDF

Annex Table 7

Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
TRADE PROMOTION	49.7	16.7	7.8
General	16.3	3.9	0.6
of which : Zambia	10.0	0.0	0.0
Exhibitions & expositions	15.6	8.4	6.2
Develop. trade and services	12.9	2.5	0.5
of which : Zimbabwe	10.2	0.0	0.0
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	66.2	6.0	2.0
General	41.5	1.9	0.1
of which : Ouganda	14.5	0.0	0.0
Nigeria	11.5	0.0	0.0
Infrastructure	12.8	0.0	0.0
of which : Tchad	10.0	0.0	0.0
training	6.9	1.9	0.5
WATER ENGINEERING, URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE & HOUSING	67.7	13.5	1.5
Village water engeneering	26.4	0.2	0.0
of which : Burkina Faso	15.0	0.0	0.0
Togo	11.2	0.0	0.0
Water supplies	31.4	13.2	1.5
of which : Malawi	8.0	8.0	0.0
Guinee	8.0	0.0	0.0
Urban sanitation	9.6	0.0	0.0
of which : Djibouti	8.8	0.0	0.0
HEALTH	70.1	1.6	0.6
General	36.0	0.9	0.2
of which : Mozambique	15.4	0.0	0.0
Cote d'Ivoire	11.3	0.1	0.1
Infrastructure	20.8	0.3	0.2
of which : Tchad	16.5	0.3	0.2
Technical Cooperation	13.3	0.5	0.3
of which : Benin	11.8	0.0	0.0

7th EDF

Annex Table 7

=====
Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
		MECU	
TRANSPORT & COMMUNICATIONS	334.4	65.4	19.5
Roads and Bridges	244.2	45.2	12.7
of which :			
Guinee	50.0	0.0	0.0
Ouganda	23.0	0.0	0.0
Zambie	19.0	5.2	0.0
Mauritanie	17.5	0.0	0.0
Burkina Faso	15.6	12.3	1.8
Tchad	15.1	0.0	0.0
Jamaïque	13.5	0.0	0.0
Niger	12.0	10.4	5.9
Burundi	11.5	0.0	0.0
Tanzanie	10.7	0.0	0.0
Swaziland	10.0	9.0	2.0
Maurice	5.0	0.0	0.0
Railways	33.0	0.0	0.0
of which :			
Tanzanie	19.0	0.0	0.0
Telecommunications	33.6	8.6	0.5
of which :			
Tanzanie	25.0	0.0	0.0
Ethiopie	6.0	6.0	0.0
Meteo. & Tele-Detection	20.0	10.7	6.2
Nigeria	20.0	10.7	6.2
RURAL PRODUCTION	268.7	60.0	17.0
General	43.5	1.0	0.3
of which :			
Nigeria	41.5	0.0	0.0
Plantations	28.3	16.9	2.2
of which :			
Nigeria	28.0	16.6	1.9
Agriculture	49.0	29.1	13.9
of which :			
Gambie	14.5	7.3	1.8
Nigeria	9.7	9.7	0.0
Livestock rearing	19.6	0.2	0.1
Fisheries	17.1	6.9	0.0
of which :			
Madagascar	6.5	6.5	0.0
Forests	12.7	0.4	0.1
Integrated programmes	94.2	3.0	0.0
of which :			
Rep.Dominic.	23.6	0.0	0.0
Guinee	15.0	0.0	0.0
Sierra Leone	14.3	0.0	0.0
Zimbabwe	8.0	0.0	0.0
Togo	5.0	0.0	0.0
Zambie	5.0	0.0	0.0

7th EDF

Annex Table 7

Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
		MECU	
INDUSTRIES	218.1	130.0	36.5
General	69.9	28.2	14.5
of which :			
Tanzanie	8.3	0.0	0.0
Malawi	6.8	6.8	0.3
Extractive	20.9	16.8	11.4
of which :			
Mauritanie	16.2	13.7	10.0
Manufacturing	18.0	18.0	2.5
of which :			
Mali	10.0	10.0	0.0
Energy projects	90.8	60.5	5.2
of which :			
Lesotho	34.0	13.8	4.7
Sierra Leone	15.5	15.5	0.0
Nigeria	11.1	11.1	0.0
Trinite & T.	10.1	10.1	0.5
Guinee Bissau	7.0	7.0	0.0
Mining & Energy potential	5.6	0.1	0.1
of which :			
Cap Vert	5.4	0.0	0.0
THEMATIC ACTIONS	582.9	300.4	199.1
Drought & Desertification	12.1	0.0	0.0
Hygiene	18.0	0.4	0.0
of which :			
Burundi	18.0	0.3	0.0
Epidemic	20.0	0.0	0.0
Import Programmes	532.8	300.0	199.1
of which :			
Senegal	70.0	10.3	5.0
Mozambique	45.0	0.0	0.0
Zambie	41.5	41.5	41.5
Ouganda	31.3	14.3	14.3
Mali	31.0	30.5	30.2
Tanzanie	30.0	30.0	15.0
Cameroun	29.5	29.0	17.0
Zimbabwe	28.0	0.0	0.0
Ethiopie	27.0	15.0	0.0
Burkina Faso	22.5	22.0	17.0
Rep.Dominc.	22.0	21.9	9.6
Ghana	20.0	20.0	10.0
Sierra Leone	20.0	0.0	0.0
Benin	17.0	17.0	9.0
Togo	17.0	0.0	0.0
Cote d'Ivoire	15.5	15.4	10.1
Guinee	14.0	14.0	7.0
Burundi	12.0	0.0	0.0
Papoua.N.Gui.	11.0	11.0	11.0
Lesotho	8.5	0.0	0.0
Jamaique	7.1	0.0	0.0

7th EDF

Annex Table 7

=====
Total Decisions, Commitments and Disbursements at 31-12-1992
classified by Major Sectors and Subsectors and by main
beneficiary ACP States.

Sector/Subsector and main (*) beneficiary ACP States	Decided	Committed	Disbursed
EXEPTIONAL AID, STABEX	961.6	807.5	783.7

Rehabilitation	10.0	0.0	0.0
of which : Mozambique	10.0	0.0	0.0
Disasters	42.8	27.4	14.2
of which : Soudan	10.0	7.0	3.4
Angola	8.5	6.8	4.5
Kenya	7.2	3.2	0.6
Stabex	875.2	760.4	760.2
of which : Cote d'Ivoire	162.9	162.9	162.9
Cameroun	136.6	136.6	136.6
Ethiopie	114.0	114.0	114.0
Ouganda	71.2	71.2	71.2
Soudan	63.9	0.0	0.0
Kenya	46.3	46.3	46.3
Papoua.N.Gui.	42.2	42.2	42.2
Madagascar	38.1	21.6	21.6
Tanzanie	31.7	31.7	31.7
Rwanda	26.7	26.7	26.7
Burundi	24.5	24.5	24.5
Ghana	23.3	23.3	23.3
Haiti	17.0	0.0	0.0
Mauritanie	13.7	13.7	13.7
Togo	13.0	13.0	13.0
Centrafrique	9.3	9.3	9.3
Salomon	6.1	4.6	4.6
Refugees & returnees	32.1	19.8	9.4
of which : Mozambique	14.1	3.1	1.2
Angola	7.6	6.8	3.4
Malawi	5.5	5.3	3.3
OTHER	193.4	45.0	15.3

General Technical Assistance	79.1	30.4	8.5
of which : Mozambique	9.1	0.0	0.0
Congo	9.0	0.0	0.0
Kenya	6.4	4.4	2.0
Multisectoral programmes	107.5	10.3	5.1
of which : Zambia	62.5	2.5	2.5
Ethiopie	19.8	0.0	0.0
Mali	13.0	4.4	2.6
Niger	12.0	3.4	0.0

TOTAL SECTORS	2812.7	1446.1	1083.1

(*) Subsectors and beneficiary States are listed where the amount approved is more than 5 mio ECU.

6th EDF

Annex table 8 : PROGRAMMED AID
PROJECTS COSTING MORE THAN 10 MECU

MECU

Countries/Project	SITUATION AS AT 31-12-1992				1992, ANNUAL FIGURES		
	Decided	Committed	Paid	date of Approval	Decided	Committed	Paid
ANGOLA	85.71	77.60	70.20		3.95	10.28	13.84
-BOAVIDA HOSPITAL	22.43	22.35	21.76	88.11	0.00	1.07	5.80
-DANITATION OPER LUANDA	13.00	8.34	4.77	90.10	0.00	6.46	3.70
total projects > 10 MECU	35.43	30.69	26.54		0.00	7.52	9.50
BENIN	89.47	80.00	73.77		-0.01	10.48	11.83
-REHAB. ROUTIERES	24.30	24.27	23.27	87.10	0.00	0.30	0.72
-DEV RURAL PROV MONO	16.50	9.93	6.10	88.10	0.00	2.70	2.49
total projects > 10 MECU	40.80	34.20	29.36		0.00	3.00	3.21
BURKINA FASO	106.34	75.81	44.71		0.03	23.21	26.03
-PROG INT SOURUO	44.00	42.02	24.62	88.02	0.00	13.06	14.79
-DEV RUR PROV SISSILLI	31.50	10.43	4.03	89.05	0.00	5.47	2.51
-RENF ROUTE YAKO OUAHIGOU	15.50	11.30	8.49	90.03	0.00	0.16	5.60
total projects > 10 MECU	91.00	63.74	37.15		0.00	18.68	22.90
BURUNDI	107.87	87.61	73.22		-0.11	13.95	22.70
-DEV SOCEC CANKUZO	34.82	27.86	23.10	87.12	0.00	4.36	7.88
-DEV SOCEC MUGAMBA	32.00	20.19	12.45	89.05	0.00	8.03	7.73
total projects > 10 MECU	66.82	48.05	35.55				
CAMEROUN	101.00	87.51	64.91		2.59	2.42	21.44
-DEV RURAL BASSIN BENOUE	25.00	24.70	22.21	87.12	0.00	0.06	4.26
-CONSTR ROUTE YANOUE AYO	42.70	42.70	24.92	88.10	0.00	0.00	15.12
-POL DEV RURAL SAA NTUI	10.30	2.90	1.18	91.03	0.00	2.27	0.89
total projects > 10 MECU	78.00	70.31	48.31		0.00	2.34	20.27
CAP VERT	24.50	20.31	14.64		0.00	1.95	5.29
-AMENAG. VILLE DE PRAIA	19.80	15.63	10.09	88.04	0.00	1.95	3.86
total projects > 10 MECU	19.80	15.63	10.09		0.00	1.95	3.86
CENTRAFRIQUE	68.90	60.94	52.12		4.10	5.21	6.76
-PNDE PROJ NAT DEV ELEV	10.00	8.11	7.30	87.07	0.00	0.20	1.40
-PROG DEVEL REGION NORD	28.00	26.06	22.69	87.07	3.00	1.66	2.40
-DEVEL REGION CENTRE SUD	20.30	18.36	14.62	88.06	0.00	3.44	2.74
total projects > 10 MECU	58.30	52.53	44.60		3.00	5.29	6.54
CONGO	47.77	24.42	12.88		5.74	1.25	5.82
-FEDAR POOL&CUV ACT REG	40.82	23.26	11.86	88.06	4.82	1.64	5.27
total projects > 10 MECU	40.82	23.26	11.86		4.82	1.64	5.27
COTE D IVOIRE	80.03	74.54	70.38		0.09	2.29	6.50
-PALM PLANTT. VILLAGE	20.85	20.17	19.26	87.01	0.00	0.00	1.72
-DEV ELEVAGE BOVIN+OVIN	11.00	6.30	3.68	89.05	0.00	1.96	1.25
total projects > 10 MECU	31.85	26.47	22.93		0.00	1.96	2.97

6th EDF

Annex table 8 : PROGRAMMED AID
 =====
 PROJECTS COSTING MORE THAN 10 MECU

MECU

Countries/Project	SITUATION AS AT 31-12-1992				1992, ANNUAL FIGURES		
	Decided	Committed	Paid	date of Approval	Decided	Committed	Paid
ETHIOPIE	209.55	138.75	111.58		0.03	37.82	41.09

-NORTH SHEWA DEV RURAL	24.00	14.77	10.98	87.09	0.00	4.50	5.30
-SOUTH SHEWA DEV RURAL	26.20	12.61	9.02	88.06	0.00	3.74	5.43
-PADEP CENTRAL SEHA	53.40	40.32	33.70	88.06	0.00	17.37	16.60
-PEASANT SECTOR COFFEE PR	38.10	16.96	9.95	88.12	0.00	6.30	2.50
total projects > 10 MECU	141.70	84.65	63.65		0.00	31.91	29.83
GHANA	78.05	47.03	36.03		6.21	13.09	10.42

-TRANSPORT INFRA PROG	21.00	2.93	2.16	87.04	0.00	0.32	0.10
-PROTS REHAB PROJ. PHAS 2	20.00	9.91	4.05	91.05	0.00	6.46	4.05
total projects > 10 MECU	41.00	12.84	6.21		0.00	6.78	4.15
GUINEE	112.27	101.00	80.24		5.43	22.12	25.30

-DEV RURAL MARITIME	40.00	38.80	31.85	87.07	0.00	9.63	10.89
-DEV RURAL HAUTE GUINEE	30.00	29.89	19.36	87.07	0.00	9.91	8.10
total projects > 10 MECU	70.00	68.69	51.21		0.00	19.54	18.99
GUINEE BISSAU	37.42	22.16	17.56		3.59	2.14	3.20

-DEV RURAL PROV EST	23.80	12.56	8.28	87.12	0.00	1.99	2.84
total projects > 10 MECU	23.80	12.56	8.28		0.00	1.99	2.84
GUYANE	21.13	20.62	19.32		0.72	1.22	1.72

-INFRA REHAB IRP	17.25	16.93	16.18	88.05	0.00	0.06	0.87
total projects > 10 MECU	17.25	16.93	16.18		0.00	0.06	0.87
KENYA	134.99	95.40	79.92		0.45	12.99	17.79

-AGR LIVEST RES PROG	20.00	12.83	6.22	87.07	0.00	7.00	3.21
-NORTH CORRIDOR TRANSP PR	14.50	14.50	14.50	87.07	0.00	0.00	6.09
-CEREALS SECTOR REFORM	30.00	5.60	3.10	88.04	0.00	0.52	1.13
total projects > 10 MECU	64.50	32.94	23.82		0.00	7.52	10.43
LIBERIA	31.90	11.36	7.49		0.07	0.02	0.53

-SEDP SOUTH EAST DEVEL PR	27.00	8.27	5.65	87.10	0.00	0.00	0.40
total projects > 10 MECU	27.00	8.27	5.65		0.00	0.00	0.40
MADAGASCAR	96.96	67.12	58.60		8.98	7.85	8.05

-REHABIL ROUTE RN4	10.00	10.00	9.95	87.09	0.00	0.00	1.47
total projects > 10 MECU	10.00	10.00	9.95		0.00	0.00	1.47

6th EDF

Annex table 8 : PROGRAMMED AID
PROJECTS COSTING MORE THAN 10 MECU

Countries/Project	SITUATION AS AT 31-12-1992				1992, ANNUAL FIGURES		
	Decided	Committed	Paid	date of Approval	Decided	Committed	Paid
MALAWI	105.24	93.77	89.65		0.23	-1.72	10.29
-BLANTYRE LINRANGWE M1	16.46	16.46	16.46	86.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
total projects > 10 MECU	16.46	16.46	16.46		0.00	0.00	0.00
MALI	154.31	101.69	79.70		0.02	3.67	30.22
-PROG SOUT STRATEG ALIM	17.00	14.62	12.64	87.11	0.00	0.08	2.61
-PROG SECU ALIM REGION	21.40	17.66	12.53	88.03	0.00	3.10	7.40
-REHAB AMEN HYDRO AGRIC	57.70	28.66	14.40	89.07	0.00	0.34	14.30
total projects > 10 MECU	96.10	60.93	39.57		0.00	3.53	24.31
MAURITANIE	59.13	49.28	31.62		0.82	16.07	6.35
-PROG ENTRETIEN ROUTIERMA	15.87	15.69	14.45	87.09	0.87	0.87	1.01
-APPUI DEV REGION GORGOL	35.00	25.55	9.29	88.01	0.00	15.12	5.08
total projects > 10 MECU	50.87	41.24	23.75		0.87	15.99	6.09
MOZAMBIQUE	154.31	123.62	105.98		2.21	22.02	26.69
-REHAB NACALA RAILWAY	25.00	23.20	21.13	87.01	0.00	1.09	1.22
-REHAB PORT OF BEIRA	10.30	10.29	9.66	87.07	0.00	10.16	9.56
-AMELIOR. SERVICE TELECOM	13.00	2.75	1.11	91.10	0.00	2.75	1.11
total projects > 10 MECU	48.30	36.24	31.89		0.00	13.99	11.89
NIGER	121.95	100.47	81.77		0.83	11.16	17.61
-ENTRETIEN RN1	15.00	14.85	10.24	87.04	0.00	5.11	1.07
-PROG PETITE IRRIGATION	21.56	21.31	18.37	87.04	0.00	0.22	6.91
-GD IRRIG VAL FLEUVE NIGE	63.60	43.21	33.63	88.06	0.00	4.67	8.21
total projects > 10 MECU	100.16	79.37	62.24		0.00	10.00	16.19
NIGERIA	213.43	140.23	88.37		-0.03	51.38	46.96
-OIL PALM BLET RUR DEV	68.84	47.15	28.16	88.06	0.00	21.38	16.76
-N-EASTARID ZONE DEV PROG	35.00	25.52	16.56	88.07	0.00	10.68	10.57
-SOKOTO DESERT	30.60	15.94	7.35	88.11	0.00	7.14	3.97
-MIDDLE BELT PROG	33.00	12.98	7.53	89.11	0.00	7.50	5.51
total projects > 10 MECU	167.44	101.58	59.60		0.00	46.70	36.81
UGANDA	132.94	125.10	105.66		2.12	18.79	28.65
-NRTHERN CORRIDOR ROADS	19.50	18.85	18.22	87.10	0.00	0.10	1.46
-KAMPALA INFRASTR PROG	19.50	16.98	12.25	89.11	0.00	1.00	7.81
-FARMING SYST SUPP PROG	13.00	12.95	7.35	90.01	0.00	4.18	4.18
total projects > 10 MECU	52.00	48.78	37.82		0.00	5.28	13.45

6th EDF

Annex table 8 : PROGRAMMED AID
PROJECTS COSTING MORE THAN 10 MECU

MECU

Countries/Project	SITUATION AS AT 31-12-1992				1992, ANNUAL FIGURES		
	Decided	Committed	Paid	date of Approval	Decided	Committed	Paid
PAPUA NVL GUINEE	37.38	30.43	27.82		-0.09	1.97	3.74
-BROWN RIVER VEIMAURI ROA	11.80	10.19	9.53	88.11	0.00	1.79	1.88
total projects > 10 MECU	11.80	10.19	9.53		0.00	1.79	1.88
RWANDA	110.00	101.84	60.00		33.35	59.38	31.46
-PROG APPUI STAT ALIM	51.00	50.61	34.46	87.12	0.00	16.47	15.38
-ROUTE GITARAMA-KIBUYE	33.35	28.17	3.16	92.05	33.35	28.17	3.16
total projects > 10 MECU	84.35	78.78	37.62		33.35	44.64	18.54
SENEGAL	108.50	101.84	77.56		0.00	8.58	20.16
-PROG APPUI DEV REG.PODOR	97.00	90.33	66.07	87.07	0.00	8.58	20.16
total projects > 10 MECU	97.00	90.33	66.07		0.00	8.58	20.16
SIERRA LEONE	55.98	47.27	29.31		-3.81	15.93	8.21
-CONSTR FADUGU KUBALA ROA	11.96	11.96	11.96	87.12	-5.54	-0.89	0.50
-REC WATERLOO MASIACA ROA	16.80	13.96	2.56	91.05	-0.00	12.66	2.56
total projects > 10 MECU	28.76	25.92	14.52		-5.54	11.77	3.06
SOUDAN	95.54	65.44	57.69		0.67	4.97	7.74
-JEBEL MARRA RUR DEV PR	15.80	12.05	9.64	87.02	0.00	1.21	0.99
-NUBA MOUNT RURAL DEV PR	11.45	8.07	7.09	87.07	0.00	0.15	0.32
-SRSP RAILWAYS SUP PROG	11.50	0.00	0.00	88.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
total projects > 10 MECU	38.75	20.12	16.73		0.00	1.36	1.31
TANZANIE	176.16	147.59	124.27		4.10	13.38	26.83
-FOOD SECURITY AGRI SECT	20.80	19.74	17.83	87.01	0.00	3.38	4.00
-COFFEE PROD MARK AGRIC S	17.80	16.66	14.17	87.01	0.00	2.23	2.88
-VECHIC TRAC PEPAIR AGRIC	11.20	10.95	10.26	87.01	-0.40	0.16	0.17
-FEDER ROAD MAINT AGRIC SE	20.00	17.74	14.38	87.01	0.00	1.70	5.74
-REHAB ZANZIBAR PORTS	15.38	13.91	13.78	87.07	0.00	0.25	1.05
-FEDER ROADS IN SOUTH WES	16.00	10.75	5.50	90.12	0.00	0.00	5.50
total projects > 10 MECU	101.18	89.75	75.93		-0.40	7.72	19.34
TCHAD	89.00	64.74	53.41		0.00	2.69	7.17
-RENFOR CAPAC ENTRETIER	19.50	18.80	17.07	87.04	0.00	0.48	2.43
-RENF SYST SANTE AUTCHAD	12.00	11.33	10.72	87.06	0.00	0.38	1.56
-PROG DEV RURAL ZONE CONC	15.00	9.31	7.21	87.06	0.00	0.42	0.88
-ODER PROG APPUI DEV ECON	28.00	10.85	6.76	89.03	0.00	1.44	2.18
total projects > 10 MECU	74.50	50.30	41.76		0.00	2.72	7.05
TOGO	60.92	49.27	43.12		0.02	1.31	8.23
-PROG DEV RURAL BASSAR	10.30	5.90	3.94	88.07	0.00	-0.05	2.36
-REHAB INFRASTR ROUTIERE	23.20	19.51	18.23	89.04	0.00	0.50	1.90
total projects > 10 MECU	33.50	25.41	22.17		0.00	0.45	4.26

6th EDF

Annex table 8 : PROGRAMMED AID
PROJECTS COSTING MORE THAN 10 MECU

MECU

Countries/Project	SITUATION AS AT 31-12-1992				1992, ANNUAL FIGURES		
	Decided	Committed	Paid	date of Approval	Decided	Committed	Paid
ZAIRE	162.30	112.87	81.86		-0.04	1.22	10.77
-DEV RUR KIVU	40.00	33.01	18.07	87.07	0.00	0.19	3.59
-REHAB ROUTE MATADI KINSH	22.50	16.77	9.47	87.12	0.00	0.00	1.66
-APEK PROG ARRIER PAYS EC	25.00	14.66	6.99	88.11	0.00	0.95	2.78
-COMPOS. ROUTE PROGR APEK	25.00	0.00	0.00	91.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
total projects > 10 MECU	112.50	64.43	34.53		0.00	1.14	8.03
ZAMBIE	91.97	81.39	63.11		0.00	16.39	11.40
-SMALLHOLDER DEV PROJ COP	12.00	10.97	6.95	87.06	0.00	1.42	1.08
-SMALLHOLDER DEV CENT PRO	12.35	6.80	3.75	88.09	0.00	1.52	1.88
total projects > 10 MECU	24.35	17.76	10.70		0.00	2.94	2.96
ZIMBABWE	76.96	55.92	41.00		0.03	3.97	4.80
-ASSIST AGRI FINAN CORPOR	23.50	21.93	16.64	88.04	0.00	-0.06	0.15
-SMALL SCALE IRRIG PROG	14.00	1.12	0.67	89.11	0.00	0.23	0.59
total projects > 10 MECU	37.50	23.06	17.30		0.00	0.17	0.74
TOTAL PROJECTS NATIONAUX	2033.57	1492.38	1069.50		36.10	288.94	339.56
PROJ. REGIONAUX	824.06	628.32	455.69		41.43	128.69	132.33
-Coop.Agricole Budg 86	23.92	23.92	23.92	86.07	-1.15	-0.08	0.00
-Coop.IndustrielleBudg 86	35.70	35.70	35.70	86.07	-8.26	-3.15	0.00
-Karonga Ibanda road	10.00	10.00	9.97	87.04	0.00	0.00	0.01
-Rehabil port Beira Mazam	44.70	44.70	44.39	87.04	0.00	5.70	6.97
-North corrid transp Keny	22.50	22.39	21.55	87.07	0.00	2.32	1.77
-North corrid Ouganda roa	21.00	20.84	17.65	87.10	0.00	0.66	3.11
-Corridor central urg trc	11.00	9.69	8.12	87.10	0.00	0.08	1.56
-Pac reg marin res dev pr	10.70	9.83	4.87	88.12	0.00	2.67	2.22
-Amenag bas fouta djalon	30.00	11.05	5.97	88.12	0.00	0.47	3.40
-Sahel util energ solaire	34.00	32.09	9.61	89.04	0.00	15.48	5.77
-Form inform environn Bur	10.00	8.51	4.33	89.05	0.00	4.71	2.77
-Bequia airport constr	16.50	16.50	16.50	89.10	0.00	0.00	5.23
-Desenclav transp Burundi	22.00	22.00	22.00	89.12	0.00	0.00	10.22
-Log etud inst reg educ	10.00	1.25	1.08	90.03	0.00	0.00	0.40
-Block trains 50 Tanz-Oug	30.00	28.48	20.83	90.04	0.00	0.03	3.92
-Bukombe Isiaka road Tanz	37.00	30.90	25.13	90.05	0.00	0.00	16.72
-Utilis ecosyst for Congo	24.00	10.37	1.85	90.09	0.00	10.32	1.85
-Rehab route Godommey Boh	18.50	0.00	0.00	91.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
-Kobero-Nyakasanka Road	23.00	21.80	0.98	91.11	0.00	21.80	0.98
-Rehab.Roads S.W. Angola	10.00	8.50	1.70	92.04	10.00	8.50	1.70
-Telec satel aeron Afr.	18.50	17.10	8.82	92.05	18.50	17.10	8.82
-Musoma-Siriari Road	12.00	0.00	0.00	92.10	12.00	0.00	0.00
total projects > 10 MECU	475.02	385.61	284.97		31.09	86.61	77.42
TOTAL PROJECTS > 10 MECU	2508.59	1877.98	1354.47		67.19	375.54	416.98

ANNEX TABLE 9
EDF contracts classified by nationality of firm as at 31 December 1992

Nationality of firms	<u>Sixth EDF</u>							
	Works		Supplies		Tech. Assistance		Total	
	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%
Belgium	49.0	4.5	68.4	7.4	70.8	11.9	188.1	7.2
Denmark	6.1	0.6	4.6	0.5	30.1	5.0	40.7	1.6
Germany	38.4	3.5	123.8	13.5	82.8	13.9	244.9	9.4
Greece	0	0.0	1.7	0.2	8.3	1.4	10.0	0.4
France	297.4	27.5	165.0	18.0	105.2	17.7	567.6	21.9
Ireland	0	0.0	0.6	0.1	13.8	2.3	14.4	0.6
Italy	333.5	30.8	72.4	7.9	53.9	9.1	459.8	17.7
Luxembourg	0.9	0.1	1.5	0.2	9.9	1.7	12.3	0.5
Netherlands	37.5	3.5	93.9	10.2	46.1	7.7	177.5	6.8
Spain	0.2	0.0	15.9	1.7	14.4	2.4	30.5	1.2
Portugal	26.3	2.4	19.7	2.1	23.3	3.9	69.3	2.7
United Kingdom	60.4	5.6	128.2	14.0	92.2	15.5	280.8	10.8
ACP/OCT	232.9	21.5	192.4	20.9	40.0	6.7	465.2	17.9
3rd Countries	0	0.0	30.9	3.4	5.3	0.9	36.1	1.4
Total	1,082.6	100.0	919.0	100.0	596.1	100.0	2,597.2	100.0
%	41.7		35.4		22.9		100.0	

Nationality of firms	<u>Seventh EDF</u>							
	Works		Supplies		Tech. Assistance		Total	
	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%	MECU	%
Belgium	0	0.0	0.03	0.1	10.7	16.9	10.7	7.1
Denmark	0	0.0	0.2	0.7	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.5
Germany	0	0.0	0.1	0.4	15.1	23.9	15.2	10.1
Greece	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
France	27.6	45.6	5.7	21.4	9.9	15.7	43.2	28.8
Ireland	0	0.0	0	0.0	1.3	2.0	1.3	0.8
Italy	7.8	12.8	7.2	27.0	2.2	3.4	17.1	11.4
Luxembourg	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Netherlands	0	0.0	0.8	2.9	1.1	1.8	1.9	1.3
Spain	0	0.0	8.4	31.3	2.2	3.6	10.6	7.1
Portugal	0	0.0	0.6	2.0	1.6	2.5	2.1	1.4
United Kingdom	9.0	14.9	2.3	8.4	12.8	20.4	24.1	16.0
ACP/OCT	16.1	26.7	0	0.0	4.2	6.7	20.3	13.5
3rd Countries	0	0.0	1.6	5.8	1.3	2.0	2.8	1.9
Total	60.5	100.0	26.93	100.0	63.1	100.0	150.2	100.0
%	40.3		17.8		41.9		100.0	

Annex Table 10

Stabex Transfers under Lomé IV
for the application year 1991

Breakdown by country

	Amount in ECU	%
Côte d'Ivoire	77,752,201	18.33
Cameroun	69,201,389	17.68
Ethiopia	49,395,179	12.62
Uganda	34,209,813	8.74
Sudan	32,101,816	8.20
PNG	17,224,931	4.40
Madagascar	16,585,084	4.24
Ghana	16,430,110	4.20
Kenya	16,413,425	4.19
Tanzania	12,528,859	3.20
Rwanda	10,132,156	2.59
Burundi	7,981,905	2.04
Togo	7,749,271	1.98
Haiti	5,369,588	1.37
Mauritania	4,087,698	1.04
Others *	14,336,575	5.18
TOTAL:	391,500,000	100.0

* 20 countries receiving less than 3 MECU.

Breakdown by product

Coffee & related products	250,912,173	64.09
Cocoa & related products	68,935,665	17.61
Cotton & related products	27,722,342	7.08
Leather & Hides	13,568,012	3.47
Copra & related products	5,371,473	1.37
Wood	4,658,747	1.19
Squid, Octopus, Seiches	4,087,698	1.04
Arabic Gum	3,468,736	0.89
Tea	2,288,885	0.58
Others	10,486,268	2.68
TOTAL :	391,500,000	100.00

ANNEX TABLE 11

Financing decisions - use of counterpart funds

Country	Total amount GIP ⁽¹⁾ (MECU)	Use of counterpart funds	%
Benin	24	health sector education sector restructuring of public services (reduction of staff) restructuring of bank sector	6%) 6%) 12% 54% 34%
Burkina Faso	22.5	primary education sector health sector cofinancing of social projects (family planning, assistance to women, technical and professional training) private sector national counterpart of EDF projects	42%) 23%) 65% 13% 9% 7%
Burundi	12	health sector education sector (30%) training and literacy (10%) use and promotion of private sector improving the status of women and social protection reserves (assistance to NGOs)	40%)) 80% 40%) 10% 3% 7%
Cameroon	29.5 (of which 0.5 for technical assistance)	health sector infrastructure works social aspects of restructuring of private companies	20% 40% 40%
Côte d'Ivoire	15.5 (of which 0.5 for technical assistance)	health sector counterpart of EDF projects	94% 6%
Dominican Republic	22	primary education and health sectors social action programmes)) 100%
Gambia	4 (SIP oil)	education sector health sector assistance to companies with public utility	25%) 25%) 50% 50%

(1) if another instrument is concerned (SIP, PAST...) this is indicated between brackets.

Ghana	20	education sector health sector counterpart of EDF projects	49%) 48.5%) 97.5% 2.5%
Guinea	14	education sector health sector road infrastructure rural development support of democratisation process programmable reserve	38%) 27%) 65% 6.5% 10% 6.5% 12%
Gyana	4.50	health and education sectors counterpart of EDF projects	85% 15%
Jamaica	8.50	health and education sectors	100%
Lesotho	8.50	health sector education sector supply of drinking water employment	55%) 20%) 75% 17.5% 7.5%
Mali	31	health sector education sector road maintenance support of public sector in rural areas	44%) 24%) 68% 27% 5%
PNG	11	education sector	100%
Senegal	10 (PAST)	road maintenance reduction of public sector	50% 50%
Tanzania	30	education sector health sector	50%) 50%) 100%
Togo	17 (of which 0.4 for technical assistance)	primary education sector basic health sector programme in favour of young unemployed people sectoral adjustment measures counterpart of EDF projects	52%) 36%) 88% 7% 3% 2%
Uganda	35	education sectors (primary and secondary) basic health sector supply of water road maintenance agriculture and fishing))) 35%) 25% 24%
Zambia	41.5	education sector health sector	50%) 50%) 100%

Catalogue number: CC-AM-93-077-EN-C

ISSN 1012-2184