Table 1: HIPC Initiative: Status of Country Cases Considered Under the Initiative April 8, 2000

Country	Decision Point	Completion Point	1		Assistance nillions of U Bilat-		, present val	ue) World	Percentage Reduction in NPV of	Estimated Total Nominal Debt Service Relief (In millions of	Satisfactory Assurances from Other
			(in percent)		eral	lateral		Bank	Debt 2/	U.S. dollars)	Creditors
Decision point reached under enha	anced framework										
Bolivia				1302	425	876	84	194	30	2,060	
original framework	Sep. 97	Sep. 98	225	448	157	291	29	53			Received
enhanced framework	Feb.00	Floating	150	854	268	585	55	141			Being sought
Mauritania	Feb.00	Floating	137 3/	622	261	361	47	100	50	1,200	Being sought
Mozambique				1,970	1,235	736	141	434	72	4,300	
original framework	Apr. 98	Jun. 99	200	1716	1076	641	125	381			Received
enhanced framework	Apr. 00	Floating	150	254	159	95	16	53			Being sought
Tanzania	Apr. 00	Floating	150	2,026	1,006	1,020	120	695	54	3,000	Being sought
Uganda				1,003	183	820	160	517	40	1,950	
original framework	Apr. 97	Apr. 98	202	347	73	274	69	160			Received
enhanced framework	Feb.00	Apr. 00	150	656	110	546	91	357			Being sought
Completion point reached under o	riginal framework										
Guyana	Dec. 97	May 99	107 3/	256	91	165	35	27	24	410	Received
Decision point reached under orig	inal framework										
Burkina Faso	Sep. 97	Apr. 00	205	115	21	94	10	44	14	200	Being sought
Côte d'Ivoire	Mar. 98	Mar. 01	141 3/	345	163	182	23	91	6	4/ 800	Being sought
Mali	Sep. 98	Spring 00	200	128	37	90	14	44	10	250	Being sought
Total assistance provided/comm	itted			7,767	3,422	4,344	634 5/	2,146		14,170	
Preliminary HIPC document issue	ed 6/										
Ethiopia			200	636	225	411	22	214	23	1,300	
Guinea			150	638	256	383	37	173	34	1,148	
Guinea-Bissau			200	300	148	153	8	73	73	600	
Honduras			137 3/	569	208	361	18	85	18	1,024	
Nicaragua		•••	150	2,507	1,416	1,091	32	188	66	5,000	
No assistance required under original	inal frameworkto	be reassessed und	er enhanced fram	ework							
Benin	Jul. 97										
Senegal	Apr. 98										

Sources: IMF and World Bank Board decisions, completion point documents, decision point documents, preliminary HIPC documents, and staff calculations.

<sup>1/</sup> Assistance levels are at countries' respective decision or completion points, as applicable.

<sup>2/</sup> In percent of the net present value of debt at the decision or completion point (as applicable), after the full use of traditional debt-relief mechanisms.

<sup>3/</sup> Eligible under fiscal criteria; figures provided show the ratios of debt-to-exports that correspond to the targeted debt-to-revenue ratio. For Guyana and Cote d'Ivoire, a 280 percent NPV of debt-to-revenue ratio was targeted at the completion point; for Honduras and Mauritania a 250 percent ratio was targeted at the decision point.

<sup>4/</sup> Nonreschedulable debt to non-Paris Club official bilateral creditors and the London Club, which was already subject to a highly concessional restructuring, is excluded from the NPV of debt at the completion point in the calculation of this ratio.

<sup>5/</sup> Equivalent to SDR 374 million at an SDR/USD exchange rate of 0.744.

<sup>6/</sup> Figures are based on preliminary assessments at the time of the issuance of the preliminary HIPC document; and are subject to change.

Assistance levels for Ethiopia and Guinea-Bissau were based on the original framework and applied at the completion point; for Nicaragua, Tanzania, Guinea, and Honduras, targets are based on the enhanced framework and assistance levels are at the decision point.

Table 2. HIPC Initiative--Estimates of Potential Costs by Creditor (US\$ billion in 1998 and 1999 NPV terms)

	April Costing Exercise (33 countries) <sup>1/</sup>	Updated Costing Exercise (32 countries) <sup>2/</sup>			
	1998 terms	1998 terms	1999 terms		
Total costs	27.4	26.6	28.2		
Bilateral and commercial creditors	14.2	13.3	14.1		
Multilateral creditors	13.3	13.3	14.1		
World Bank	5.1	5.9	6.3		
IMF	2.3	2.2	2.3		
AfDB/AfDF	2.0	2.1	2.2		
IaDB	1.0	1.1	1.1		
Other	2.9	2.1	2.2		

Source: Modifications to the HIPC Initiative IDA/SecM99-475 and EBS/99/138, July 26, 1999; and HIPC Initiative: Update on Costing the Enhanced HIPC Initiative, IDA/SecM99-679, December 8, 1999.

<sup>1/</sup> Excluding Liberia, Somalia and Sudan. Based on the application of retroactivity to historical decision points, as discussed in the July 1999 Modifications paper.

<sup>2/</sup> Excluding Ghana, which has not requested HIPC Initiative assistance, and Liberia, Somalia and Sudan. Based on the application of retroactivity to end-1998 data, the latest available at the time of endorsement of the enhanced framework, as discussed in the July 1999 Modifications paper.

Table 3. Enhanced HIPC Framework: Status of Bilateral Donor Pledges to the HIPC Trust Fund a/

Contributions

(As of April 10, 2000, amounts in nominal US\$ million)

Contributions Pledged During

Total Announced

Memo Item: Overall Contr/

	Controllous	Contributions		Contributions	I leaged During	,	Total Almounced	Weino Rein. Overan Conu/	
	(received prior to	Pledged Bef	ore	& Subsequent to	o Annual Meeti	ng	Pledges	Pledges to Current&Enhanced Framework (Col.1+5) d/	
Donor	September 1999) b/	September 19	999	EU/EC c/	Others		(Cols 2 thru 4)		
	(1)	(2)		(3)	(4)		(5)	(6)	
Australia	5				7	f/	7	12	
Austria				19			19	19	
Belgium	4	8		28			36	40	
Canada	27				75	f/	75	102	
Denmark	26			16			16	42	
Finland	15			11			11	26	
France		21		178			199	199	
Germany		27	f/	171	54		252	252	
Greece	1			9			9	10	
reland	15			4			4	19	
taly				92	70		162	162	
apan	10				190		190	200	
Luxembourg	1			2			2	3	
Vetherlands	61			38	70	f/	108	169	
New Zealand					2		2	2	
Norway	42							42	
Portugal	15			7			7	22	
Spain	15			43	70		113	128	
Sweden	28			20			20	48	
Switzerland	30							30	
Jnited Kingdom e/	36	135		95	50		280	316	
United States					600		600	600	
Total	331	191		734	1,187		2,112	2,443	

<sup>(</sup>rather than transferring them to the HIPC Trust Fund) but has authorized the World Bank to use them to provide debt relief as necessary under the HIPC Initiative. There remain approximately \$83 million in ISF surplus assets that have not been allocated. c/ For illustration, exchange rate used is EUR1 - US\$1.

d/ Many donors have also provided debt relief through other initiatives and mechanisms including: the Debt Reduction Facility for IDA-only Countries (providing financing for commercial debt reduction efforts), and specific country-held multilateral debt relief facilities. Most notably, additional

Spain - \$30; Norway - \$15; Netherlands - \$12.8; Switzerland - \$15.5; Italy - \$12; United Kingdom - \$16.3; Austria - \$2.7; Canada - \$5.4;

Contributions

debt service relief has also been provided to several Central American countries in the aftermath of Hurricane Mitch through the Central American Emergency Trust Fund. Bilateral donor funding to that trust fund to provide debt service relief to Honduras and Nicaragua includes (in \$ million):

Germany - \$13.2; Sweden - \$16.6; United States - \$25; and Denmark - \$10.9 (through a bilateral trust fund administered by IDB). These resources are not included herewith as the debt relief under HIPC is additional to these efforts. e/ In addition, the United Kingdom has contributed SDR31.5 million to the HIPC Trust Fund for the IMF for debt relief to Uganda.

For these donors, contribution agreements have been signed.