

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative—Statistical Update

Prepared by the Staffs of the IMF and the World Bank

Approved by Mark Allen and Danny Leipziger

March 21, 2006

Contents	Page
I. Guide to the Tables	
A. Progress in Implementation	4
B. Summary of Costs	5
C. Creditor Participation: Multilateral Creditors	5
D. Creditor Participation: Official Bilateral and Commercial Creditors	6
E. Effect of HIPC Initiative Debt Reduction on Debt Service and Poverty Reducing Expenditures	7
II. Annexes	
1. Country Coverage, Data Sources, and Assumptions for the HIPC Initiative Costing Exercise.....	8
2. HIPC Initiative: Progress in Implementation of Countries in the Interim Period.....	9
III. Statistical Tables	
1. HIPC Initiative: Committed Debt Relief and Outlook.....	10
2. HIPC Initiative: Changes in the Estimates of Potential Costs by Creditor Group	11
3. HIPC Initiative: Breakdown of Estimated Potential Costs by Main Creditors and by Country Groups	12
4. HIPC Initiative: Estimates of Costs to Multilateral Creditors and Status of Their Commitments	13
5A. HIPC Initiative: Status of Delivery of Assistance by the World Bank	14
5B. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Delivery of World Bank Assistance, 2000–2010	15
6A. HIPC Initiative: Status of Commitments by the IMF.....	17
6B. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Delivery of IMF Assistance, 1999-2011	18

7. Status of Bilateral Donor Pledges to the HIPC Trust Fund	20
8A. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Paris Club Costs, by Creditor Country	21
8B. HIPC Initiative: Paris Club Debt Relief	22
9. Paris Club Creditors' Delivery of Debt Relief Under Bilateral Initiatives Beyond the HIPC Initiative.....	24
10A. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Non-Paris Club Official Bilateral Creditors' Costs by Creditor Country.....	25
10B. HIPC Initiative: Delivery of HIPC Initiative Assistance by Non-Paris Club Creditors	27
11A. Summary of Debt Service for the 29 HIPCs that have Reached the Decision Point....	28
11B. Debt Service for the 29 HIPCs that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1998-2008	29
12A. Summary of Poverty-Reducing Expenditures by the 29 HIPCs that have Reached the Decision Point	32
12B. Poverty-Reducing Expenditures by the 29 HIPCs that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1999-2008	33

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
AFESD	Arab Fund for Social and Economic Development
AMF	Arab Monetary Fund
AsDB	Asian Development Bank
BADEA	Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa
BCEAO	Central Bank of West African States
BDEAC	Banque de Développement des États de l’Afrique Centrale (Central African States Development Bank)
BDEGL	Banque de Développement des États des Grand Lacs (Development Bank of Great Lake States)
BEAC	Banque des États de l’Afrique Centrale (Bank of Central African States)
BOAD	Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (West African Development Bank)
CABEI	Central American Bank for Economic Integration
CAF	Corporación Andina de Fomento
CAS	County Assistance Strategy
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CIRR	Commercial Interest Reference Rate
CMCF	Caricom Multilateral Clearing Facility
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DSA	Debt Sustainability Analysis
EADB	East African Development Bank
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EIB	European Investment Bank
EPCA	Emergency Post-Conflict Assistance
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
FEGECE	Fonds d’Entraide et de Garantie des emprunts du Conseil del’Entente
FOCEM	Fondo Centroamericano de Estabilización Monetaria
FONPLATA	Fund for the Financial Development of the River Plate Basin
FSID	Fund for Solidarity and Economic Development
GDF	Global Development Finance
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Country
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Association
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFMIS	Integrated Financial Management Information System
IMF	International Monetary Fund
I-PRSP	Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
IsDB	Islamic Development Bank
JSAN	Joint Staff Advisory Note
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
NPV	Net Present Value
OPEC	OPEC Fund for International Development
PTA	Eastern and Southern African Trade and Development Bank
PEM	Public Expenditure Management
PERs	Public Expenditure Reviews
PRGF	Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SDR	Special Drawing Rights
SMP	Staff Monitored Program
U.A.E.	United Arab Emirates

I. GUIDE TO THE TABLES

This document updates the information provided in the September 2005 Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative – Status of Implementation report.^{1,2} It deals exclusively with the enhanced HIPC Initiative, and does not consider the implications of the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI).³ Below are some highlights drawn from the accompanying tables.

A. Progress in Implementation

(Table 1)

1. The Republic of Congo has reached the decision point in March 2006, increasing the number of countries that have reached their decision points to 29 as of mid-March 2006. A total of US\$34.8 billion in debt relief (in decision point NPV terms) has been committed to these countries. The 18 countries that have reached their completion points account for 64 percent of HIPC Initiative assistance to be delivered irrevocably by all creditors.

2. While some countries are making progress toward reaching the completion point, maintaining macroeconomic stability remains a challenge for others that are currently in the interim period between their decision and completion points.⁴

- Cameroon, Malawi, and São Tomé and Príncipe have been satisfactorily implementing their macroeconomic policy programs and could reach their completion points by mid-2006.
- For Sierra Leone, a new arrangement supported by the IMF under the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) is expected to be approved in March 2006, which could help this country reach its completion point before the end of 2006.
- Burundi, the Republic of Congo, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have been making progress under their macroeconomic programs; however, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is experiencing fiscal pressures and slow progress in the area of structural reforms.

¹ “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative—Status of Implementation,” August 19, 2005, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2005/081905.htm>.

² This paper focuses only on the 29 countries that have reached their decision points under the enhanced HIPC Initiative, and does not address the issues or estimated costs associated with other countries that satisfy the Initiative’s income and indebtedness criteria at end-2004 and might wish to be considered for debt relief under the Initiative. For a discussion of these, see “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative – List of Ring-Fenced Countries That Meet the Income and Indebtedness Criteria at end-2004.”

³ See Fund papers on “Review of Financing of the Fund’s Concessional Assistance and Debt Relief to Low-Income Member Countries” and “The Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative: Progress Report on Implementation,” and “IDA’s Implementation of the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.”

⁴ The completion point is reached when: (i) the PRSP has been satisfactorily implemented for a year; (ii) there have been at least six months of satisfactory performance under a PRGF-supported program; and (iii) all completion point triggers have been met.

- Chad, the Gambia, Guinea, and Guinea-Bissau have been experiencing difficulties in the implementation of their macroeconomic programs. Chad, the Gambia, and Guinea are taking steps to address problems in fiscal management and structural reforms in order to resume their PRGF-supported programs. Guinea-Bissau has been making efforts to restore growth, rehabilitate its public finances, and improve governance so as to pave the way for a possible IMF-supported program.

3. Most countries in the interim period have made progress on the development and implementation of their poverty reduction strategies, a requirement for reaching the completion point. Since September 2005, the two Boards have discussed the second progress report on PRSP implementation for Cameroon. The first progress report for São Tomé and Príncipe was submitted to the Boards in February 2006. The second progress reports for Gambia, Guinea, and Chad, and the third progress report for Malawi are expected to be presented to the Boards in 2006. Sierra Leone has started implementing its PRSP in the fall of 2005. Four countries (Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Republic of Congo, and Guinea-Bissau) have yet to complete their PRSPs, but all are expected to do so in the course of 2006.

B. Summary of Costs (Tables 2, 3)⁵

4. The total cost of HIPC Initiative assistance for the 29 countries that have reached their decision points is estimated at US\$39.8 billion in 2004 NPV terms – an increase of US\$1.6 billion from US\$38.2 billion reported in the September 2005 Status of Implementation Report (Table 2). The higher estimate is due to the inclusion of the cost estimate for the Republic of Congo, which reached its decision point recently. Converting the total cost to 2005 NPV terms, the estimate amounts to US\$41.3 billion, equally divided between multilateral and bilateral creditors.

C. Creditor Participation: Multilateral Creditors (Tables 4, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B and 7)

5. Twenty-three multilateral creditors have committed to provide HIPC Initiative relief to the 29 decision point countries, for approximately US\$20.7 billion (2005 NPV terms) —over 99 percent of the total debt relief required from these creditors (Table 4). Large multilateral creditors, including IDA, IDB, the IMF, AfDB, and the EC have provided relief to most HIPCs in the interim period.

6. The total cost to the World Bank Group of providing HIPC Initiative debt relief to the 29 countries that have reached their decision points is estimated at US\$9.8 billion (in 2005 NPV Terms—Table 4). The total amount of IDA's relief delivered to the 29 countries that reached decision point under both the original and the enhanced HIPC Initiatives is US\$3.6 billion (Tables 5A, 5B).

7. The total cost to the IMF of providing HIPC Initiative debt relief to the 29 countries that have reached their decision points is estimated at US\$3.1 billion (in 2005 NPV terms, Table 4). Of this amount, SDR 1.6 billion has already been disbursed (Tables 6A, 6B).

⁵ The underlying assumptions and caveats on the updated costing estimates are detailed in Annex 1. These costs do not include debt relief granted under the MDRI.

8. The HIPC Trust Fund, administered by IDA, provides support to several multilateral development banks (MDBs). Donors have pledged and contributed a total of US\$3.6 billion to the HIPC Trust Fund to support eligible regional and sub-regional creditors (Table 7). In IDA14, donors fulfilled their original commitment to address IDA's HIPC Initiative costs on a pay-as-you-go basis and pledged an equivalent of US\$1.7 billion, covering debt relief costs during the IDA14 period. HIPC Initiative costs beyond IDA14 will be addressed in subsequent replenishments.

D. Creditor Participation: Official Bilateral and Commercial Creditors
(Tables 8A, 8B, 9, 10A and 10B)

9. Paris Club creditors have committed to provide debt relief estimated at US\$15.2 billion in 2005 NPV terms to the 29 countries that have reached their decision points (Tables 8A, 8B). Most members of the Paris Club have also voluntarily committed to provide additional debt relief beyond that required under the HIPC Initiative (Table 9).

10. The cost of debt relief to the 29 decision point HIPCs attributable to the 54 non-Paris Club official bilateral creditors is estimated at US\$3.8 billion (in 2005 NPV terms – Tables 10A, 10B). Twenty-eight creditors have committed to deliver some or all debt relief under the HIPC Initiative framework, amounting to US\$2.7 billion (in 2005 NPV terms), or about 73 percent of the total cost of relief for the non-Paris Club official bilateral creditors (Table 10B). However, 26 creditors have not yet committed to deliver HIPC Initiative relief to any HIPCs, accounting for about 27 percent of the costs to non-Paris Club official bilateral creditors. Securing the participation of non-Paris Club official bilateral creditors remains a challenge. Staffs of the World Bank and the IMF have continued to rely on the use of moral suasion and on efforts by the HIPCs themselves to increase the participation of these creditors.⁶

11. While debt relief from commercial creditors under the Initiative accounts for less than 4 percent of total HIPC Initiative debt relief, most commercial creditors have not committed to provide HIPC Initiative relief, and many have also not provided traditional relief. Moreover, several commercial creditors have put pressure on HIPCs to settle claims by resorting to litigation and other unilateral action. Staffs continue to closely monitor creditor litigation against HIPCs. The recently enhanced Debt Reduction Facility for IDA-only countries is the main instrument to assist HIPCs in buying back at a discount their debt to commercial creditors.⁷ Since September 2005, the IDA Board has approved the request of the Democratic Republic of Congo to hire a financial adviser to begin the debt buy-back process.

⁶ For a discussion of issues related to non-Paris Club creditor participation in the HIPC Initiative, see “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative—Status of Implementation,” August 19, 2005, Section III. <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2005/081905.htm>.

⁷ Since 1989, the Debt Reduction Facility for IDA-only countries has supported operations and provided technical assistance to 20 of the 29 decision point HIPCs (21 operations) retiring about US\$4.1 billion in principal and US\$3.4 billion of associated interest due to commercial creditors.

E. Effect of HIPC Initiative Debt Reduction on Debt Service and Poverty-Reducing Expenditures (Tables 11A, 11B, 12A and 12B)

12. Interim assistance from key creditors may begin flowing to HIPCs once they have reached the decision point, lowering their debt-service payments. Annual debt-service payments relative to exports and fiscal revenues in the 29 HIPCs that have reached their decision points have declined from an average of about 16 and 24 percent in 1998-99 to about 7 and 12 percent in 2005, respectively (Tables 11A, 11B). Debt service relative to GDP decreased by about 1 percent between 1998-99 and 2005. The debt-service ratios of these countries in the near term are below the average in low-income non-HIPCs.

13. Poverty-reducing expenditures have been increasing as a result of both increased fiscal revenues and international assistance in the form of debt relief and new aid flows. Poverty-reducing expenditures in the 29 countries that have reached their decision points have increased, on average, from about 6 percent of GDP in 1999 to about 9 percent of GDP in 2005, a level more than four times higher than what is spent on debt service (Tables 12A, 12B).⁸ The increase in poverty-reducing expenditures as a percent of GDP between 1999 and 2005 is larger than the decline in debt service relative to GDP for the same period, suggesting that countries have used funds freed by the interim assistance plus other resources to fight poverty.⁹

⁸ The definition of poverty-reducing expenditures varies across countries, although many countries include primary education and basic health as well as expenditures for rural development. Country specific definitions are included in Table 12B.

⁹As reported in a review of the Public Expenditure Management (PEM) systems in 27 decision point HIPCs, some improvement has been made in identifying and tracking poverty-reducing spending since 2002. However, a majority of HIPCs still require substantial upgrading to have effective PEM systems that allow for effective tracking of poverty reducing expenditures. See IDA and IMF staff, "Update on the Assessments and Implementation of Action Plans to Strengthen Capacity of HIPCs to Track Poverty-reducing Public Spending," April 12 2005, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2005/041205a.pdf>.

Annex I. Country Coverage, Data Sources, and Assumptions for the HIPC Initiative Costing Exercise

Country Coverage

- The costing analysis for the decision point countries is based on 29 HIPCs: Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia.

Data Sources

- Staff estimates based on of enhanced HIPC Initiative decision and completion point documents for all 29 countries.

Assumptions for the HIPC Initiative Costing Exercise

- Calculations of total costs include costs under the original and enhanced HIPC Initiative frameworks, including assistance that has already been delivered.
- Cost estimates are based on debt data after full use of traditional debt-relief mechanisms.

Update of Cost Estimates in Net Present Value Terms

- The cost of HIPC Initiative assistance calculated in NPV terms at the time of the decision point was adjusted each year after the decision point year by the average interest rate applicable to the debt relief. This rate was estimated at 4.4 percent and corresponds to the implicit long-term interest rate of currencies that comprise the SDR basket over the period 2003-2005, calculated as an average of the 6-month Commercial Interest Reference Rate (CIRR) over this period, weighted by the participation of the currencies in the SDR basket.

Annex II. HIPC Initiative: Progress in Implementation of Countries in the Interim Period
Status as of March 2006

Country	PRSP Status	HIPC Status	Actual DP Date	Expected CP Date
Burundi	An I-PRSP was completed in November 2003 and issued in January 2004. The final PRSP has been delayed because of difficulties with consultations in some provinces with poor security. The PRSP is expected to be finalized in the second quarter of 2006. A Joint Staff Advisory Note (JSAN) on the PRSP preparation status report was prepared in July 2005.	Burundi has had a satisfactory policy track record under programs supported by the Emergency Post-Conflict Assistance Policy (2002-03) and the PRGF (2004-07). The second review under the PRGF arrangement was completed in July 2005. Macroeconomic developments through early 2005 have been broadly in line with program objectives.	Aug-05	Mid-2007
Cameroon	The PRSP was prepared by the government through an extensive and comprehensive consultation process, adopted by the government in April 2003 and discussed by the Bank and Fund Boards in July 2003. The first PRSP Annual Progress Report (APR) was completed in July 2004, and the JSAN was submitted to the two Boards in May 2005. The JSAN of the second APR, covering the period January 2004-March 2005, was issued in February 2006. The third APR covering 2005 was sent to the IMF and World Bank in February 2006. A JSAN is being prepared and will be issued together with the completion point document.	The IMF Executive Board approved a PRGF arrangement covering the period 2000-03 (and later extended it to 2004) concurrently with the decision point. The PRGF arrangement lapsed at end-2004 after going off track due primarily to fiscal slippages. An SMP was put in place in 2005. Building on the broadly satisfactory implementation of the SMP the authorities prepared a medium-term economic program (covering the period July 2005-June 2008) for which they requested support under the PRGF. The Executive Board approved the PRGF arrangement in October 2005. Performance under the PRGF-supported program since July 2005 has been good, including in the area of budget implementation and transparency. Some improvements have also been made in the areas of governance and public enterprise reform. Nevertheless, the reinforced governance framework has yet to show concrete results. Cameroon could reach the completion point in April 2006.	Oct-00	Q2 2006
Chad	The PRSP was completed in June 2003 and discussed by the Boards of the Bank and the Fund in November 2003. The first PRSP APR was completed in December 2004 and circulated to the Boards of the two institutions in June 2005. Institutional consultation and monitoring mechanisms were eventually set up and the Second PRSP APR was finalized by end-2005 and submitted to the PRSP Steering Committee. Although further progress has been observed in terms of budget allocations to priority areas in 2005, budget execution needs to be strengthened.	A PRGF arrangement was approved in January 2000 and extended to January 2004. The last review was not completed because of poor overall performance under the program, notably in the area of public finance management. A successor PRGF arrangement was approved by the Board in February 2005. The first review under the PRGF has not been completed largely because of the deterioration in fiscal performance in 2005 and delays in agreeing on a satisfactory 2006 budget, in the context of the revision of the petroleum revenue management law (PRML). On December 29, the National Assembly approved amendments to the PRML, which were promulgated on January 11, 2006. As a result, the Bank suspended all disbursements on active projects. Most end-June 2005 quantitative performance criteria were not observed. Except for some progress in the cotton sector, implementation of the structural agenda lagged. The HIPC completion point has been delayed.	May-01	2007
Congo, Dem. Rep. of	An I-PRSP and a Joint Staff Advisory Note were discussed by the Boards in December 2004. A full PRSP is expected by mid-2006. A third draft was circulated to development partners and civil society in February 2006. The final version will incorporate results from surveys on employment, the informal sector, and household consumption.	A PRGF arrangement was approved in July 2002. The fifth PRGF review was completed at end-August 2005, along with a request for extension of PRGF (through end-March 2006) and additional HIPC interim assistance. Macroeconomic developments through 2005 have been mixed. Inflation was slightly below program target but the fiscal situation deteriorated during the third quarter of 2005 due to an overrun on domestically-financed government spending. The authorities are committed to implement a range of corrective measures. Progress in the area of structural reforms has been slow. The completion point can come as early as mid-2007 (following one year of satisfactory implementation of PRSP).	Jul-03	Q2 2007
Congo, Rep. of	An I-PRSP and JSAN were discussed by the Boards in December 2004. A full PRSP is expected by end-2006.	In December 2004 the IMF Board approved a PRGF arrangement and the World Bank approved an Economic Recovery Credit. This was followed by a Paris Club rescheduling agreement to restructure the Republic of Congo's external public debt under Naples terms. The Fund Executive Board completed the first review under the PRGF arrangement on August 1, 2005. The country reached its decision point in March 2006.	Mar-06	Q4 2007
Gambia, The	A full PRSP covering 2002-05 was completed in April 2002 and presented to the Bank and Fund Boards in July 2002. The first PRSP APR was finalized in December 2004 and the JSAN in April 2005. The second APR and new PRSP are being prepared.	The PRGF arrangement, approved in July 2002, went off-track due to fiscal and monetary policy slippages, and governance issues. Macroeconomic performance strengthened in the last two years in response to strong financial policies, although some slippages in fiscal sector occurred in the first quarter of 2005. An SMP covering the period October 2005-March 2006 was finalized in December 2005. Satisfactory performance under the SMP could pave the way for a new PRGF arrangement. Satisfactory performance under a new PRGF is a precondition for reaching the completion point.	Dec-00	Q2 2007
Guinea	A full PRSP was completed in January 2002 and endorsed by the Bank and Fund Boards in July 2002. The first APR and JSAN were discussed by the Boards in August 2004. The second APR is expected to be issued in April 2006.	A PRGF arrangement was approved in May 2001, but went off-track in December 2002, largely due to budgetary overruns in non-priority sectors and excessive bank financing. Initial discussions on an SMP began in January 2003 but the program was only put in place at end-May 2005, covering April 2005-March 2006. The program supports the authorities' efforts in restoring macroeconomic stability and in establishing a track record of policy implementation that could pave the way for a new PRGF arrangement.	Dec-00	Q1 2007
Guinea-Bissau	The preparation of the full PRSP was delayed as a result of political instability and capacity constraints. In June 2004 a draft PRSP was discussed, on an informal basis, with World Bank and IMF staff and representatives of the donor community. A final PRSP is expected to be ready by end-2006.	The PRGF-supported program went off track immediately after its inception at the end of 2000, reflecting fiscal policy slippages associated with heavy defense spending, increases in the wage bill, and political interference in public financial management. In March 2005, the government engaged in an SMP, covering April-December 2005, focused on stabilizing the fiscal situation, including avoiding new domestic arrears, promoting economic growth by rebuilding infrastructure and removing excessive regulation, and improving governance. Review of progress under the SMP did not materialize as scheduled because the political situation deteriorated. A new SMP of similar characteristics will be discussed with authorities in March to cover 2006, to help the authorities establish a track record of policy implementation and address governance and PEM issues.	Dec-00	Q4 2009
Malawi	The first APR and JSAN were discussed by the World Bank and Fund Boards in October 2003 and indicated that MPRSP implementation was limited. The second APR and JSAN (covering July 2003-June 2004) were submitted to the Boards in June 2005 and indicated that the MPRSP implementation would still need to be improved. The third APR (covering July 2004-Dec. 2005) is expected to be submitted in early 2006. This will help determine whether the HIPC completion point condition of one year satisfactory PRS implementation was met. The MPRSP expired in June 2005, and the government is expected to complete the Malawi Development and Growth Strategy by the spring of 2006.	A PRGF arrangement was approved in December 2000 and expired in 2004, after completing only one review in 2003. Satisfactory implementation under the SMP, covering July 2004-June 2005, allowed Malawi to move to a new PRGF. The arrangement was approved by the IMF Board in August 2005. The overarching objective of the Fund-supported program is to reduce poverty through private sector-led growth. The first PRGF review was completed in late February. Malawi could reach the HIPC completion point in June 2006, at the time the second review under the new PRGF arrangement is completed.	Dec-00	Q2 2006
Sao Tome and Principe	A full PRSP was adopted by the government in December 2002 and presented to the World Bank and the Fund in early 2005. The PRSP was discussed at the World Bank Board in April 2005. The IMF Board discussed São Tomé and Príncipe's PRSP together with the approval of a new PRGF arrangement on August 1, 2005. The first PRSP APR was submitted to the World Bank and IMF in February 2006.	The PRGF arrangement, approved in April 2000, went off track in 2001 due to fiscal and structural reform slippages, compounded by governance concerns in the oil sector. Structural reforms and macroeconomic policy implementation were broadly satisfactory in 2002 and 2003 under the SMP. In 2004, external payments arrears continued to increase, although the country remained current in its debt service to multilateral institutions. The new PRGF-supported program approved by the IMF Board in August 2005 is designed to strengthen macro-economic stability while protecting pro-poor expenditures. The first review under the PRGF was concluded in March 2006. São Tomé and Príncipe could reach the HIPC completion point by July 2006 at the time the second PRGF review is completed.	Dec-00	Mid-2006
Sierra Leone	An I-PRSP was completed in September 2001. The final PRSP was delayed, but was finally circulated to the World Bank and IMF and to the rest of the donor community in the spring of 2005. Implementation of the PRSP started in 2005. Donors confirmed their continuous support to Sierra Leone in the Consultative Donor meeting in London in November 2005.	Satisfactory progress was made under the PRGF arrangement approved in September 2001, which expired in June 2005 and was fully disbursed. A fourth Economic Rehabilitation and Recovery operation was approved by the World Bank in June 2005 to support the government's updated agenda for post-conflict reconstruction and poverty reduction. Board discussion on a successor PRGF arrangement is expected in late March 2006.	Feb-02	Q3 2006

Table 1. HIPC Initiative: Committed Debt Relief and Outlook 1/
Status as of mid-March 2006
(In millions of US dollars, in NPV terms in the year of the decision point)

	Reduction in NPV Terms			Nominal Debt Service Relief			Completion/ Decision Point Date
	Original HIPC Initiative	Enhanced HIPC Initiative	Total	Original HIPC Initiative	Enhanced HIPC Initiative	Total	
Countries that have reached their Completion Points (18)							
TOTAL 2/	3,118	19,020	22,138	6,364	31,252	37,616	
Benin	0	265	265	0	460	460	Mar-03
Bolivia	448	854	1,302	760	1,300	2,060	Jun-01
Burkina Faso 3/	229	324	553	400	530	930	Apr-02
Ethiopia 3/	0	1,982	1,982	0	3,275	3,275	Apr-04
Guyana	256	335	591	634	719	1,353	Dec-03
Ghana	0	2,186	2,186	0	3,500	3,500	Jul-04
Honduras	0	556	556	0	1,053	1,053	Apr-05
Madagascar	0	836	836	0	1,900	1,900	Oct-04
Mali	121	417	539	220	675	895	Mar-03
Mauritania	0	622	622	0	1,100	1,100	Jun-02
Mozambique	1,717	306	2,023	3,700	600	4,300	Sep-01
Nicaragua	0	3,308	3,308	0	4,500	4,500	Jan-04
Niger 3/	0	664	664	0	1,190	1,190	Apr-04
Rwanda 3/	0	696	696	0	1,400	1,400	Apr-05
Senegal	0	488	488	0	850	850	Apr-04
Tanzania	0	2,026	2,026	0	3,000	3,000	Nov-01
Uganda	347	656	1,003	650	1,300	1,950	May-00
Zambia	0	2,499	2,499	0	3,900	3,900	Apr-05
Countries that have reached their Decision Points (11)							
TOTAL 2/	0	12,613	12,613	0	21,632	21,632	
Burundi	0	826	826	0	1,472	1,472	Jul-05
Cameroon	0	1,260	1,260	0	2,800	2,800	Oct-00
Chad	0	170	170	0	260	260	May-01
Congo, Dem. Rep. of the	0	6,311	6,311	0	10,389	10,389	Jul-03
Congo, Rep. of	0	1,679	1,679	0	2,881	2,881	Mar-06
Gambia, The	0	67	67	0	90	90	Dec-00
Guinea	0	545	545	0	800	800	Dec-00
Guinea-Bissau	0	416	416	0	790	790	Dec-00
Malawi	0	643	643	0	1,000	1,000	Dec-00
São Tomé and Príncipe	0	97	97	0	200	200	Dec-00
Sierra Leone	0	600	600	0	950	950	Mar-02
Total debt relief committed 2/	3,118	31,633	34,750	6,364	52,884	59,248	

Sources: HIPC country documents; and World Bank and IMF staff estimates.

1/ Committed debt relief under the assumption of full participation of creditors.

2/ The total amounts shown are only indicative, as they represent the sum of individual commitments expressed in different NPV terms, corresponding to the time of the decision point of each HIPC.

3/ The assistance under the enhanced HIPC Initiative includes topping up with the NPV calculated in the year of the completion point.

Table 2. HIPC Initiative: Changes in the Estimates of Potential Costs by Creditor Group 1/
(In billions of U.S. dollars)

	Spring 2006		September-05	Spring 2006
	2005 NPV Terms 2/ 3/	(In percent)	2004 NPV Terms 4/	2004 NPV Terms 2/ 4/
Total costs (29 Decision Point HIPCs)	41.3	100.0	38.2	39.8
Bilateral and commercial creditors	20.5	49.7	18.3	19.8
Paris Club	15.2	36.8	13.8	14.6
Other official bilateral	3.8	9.3	3.6	3.7
Commercial	1.5	3.7	0.9	1.5
Multilateral creditors	20.7	50.3	19.9	20.0
World Bank	9.8	23.7	9.4	9.4
Of which: IDA	9.4	22.8	9.0	9.1
IBRD	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.4
IMF	3.1	7.5	3.0	3.0
AfDB/AfDF	3.5	8.5	3.3	3.4
IaDB	1.4	3.4	1.3	1.3
Other	2.9	7.1	2.8	2.8

Sources: HIPC Initiative country documents; and staff estimates.

1/ All 29 decision point HIPCs.

2/ Reflects decision point for Republic of Congo.

3/ The discount rate used is the 3-year average SDR CIRR for 2003-2005, which was 4.4 percent.

4/ The discount rate used is the 3-year average SDR CIRR for 2002-2004, which was 4.6 percent .

Table 3. HIPC Initiative: Breakdown of Estimated Potential Costs by Main Creditors and by Country Groups
(In billions of U.S. dollars, in 2005 NPV terms)

	Retroactive 1/ (6 countries)	New cases 2/ (23 countries)	Total (29 countries)
Total costs	7.6	33.6	41.3
Bilateral and commercial creditors	3.0	17.5	20.5
Paris Club	2.3	12.8	15.2
Other official bilateral	0.6	3.3	3.8
Commercial	0.1	1.4	1.5
Multilateral creditors	4.6	16.1	20.7
World Bank	2.0	7.8	9.8
Of which: IDA	2.0	7.4	9.4
Of which: IBRD	0.0	0.4	0.4
IMF	0.7	2.4	3.1
AfDB/AfDF	0.5	3.0	3.5
IaDB	0.7	0.7	1.4
Other	0.6	2.3	2.9
Memorandum item:			
In percent of total cost	18.5	81.5	100.0

Sources: Country authorities; and Fund staff estimates.

1/ These countries have reached their decision points under the original HIPC Initiative: Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guyana, Mali, Mozambique, and Uganda.

2/ Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Niger, Republic of Congo, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, and Zambia.

Table 4. HIPC Initiative: Estimates of Costs to Multilateral Creditors and Status of Their Commitments

(In millions of U.S. dollars, in 2005 NPV terms)

Creditors	Cost of Providing HIPC Relief 29 countries
Total	20,731
Delivering or committed to deliver debt relief to the 29 decision point countries 1/	20,649
World Bank Group	9,785
African Development Bank (AfDB)	3,514
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	3,103
Inter-American Development Bank (IaDB)	1,391
European Union/European Investment Bank (EU/EIB)	838
Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI)	634
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	340
Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA)	244
OPEC Fund for International Development	200
Islamic Development Bank (IsDB)	155
Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF)	117
Arab Fund for Social and Economic Development (AFESD)	79
Caricom Multilateral Clearing Facility (CMCF)	72
West African Development Bank (BOAD)	55
Fund for the Financial Development of the River Plate Basin (FONPLATA)	31
Nordic Development Fund (NDF)	28
Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)	21
Arab Monetary Fund (AMF)	15
European Union/IDA (EU/IDA)	9
Central Bank of West African States (BCEAO)	7
Nordic Investment Bank (NIB)	4
East African Development Bank (EADB)	0
Banque des Etats de l'Afrique Centrale (BDEAC)	4
Asian Development Bank (AsDB)	1
Have not indicated intentions to provide relief under the HIPC Initiative	82
Banque des Etats de l'Afrique Centrale (BEAC)	40
Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)	17
Eastern and Southern African Trade and Development Bank (PTA Bank)	10
Banque de Développement des Etats des Grands Lacs (BDEGL)	8
Conseil de L'Entente (FEGECE)	3
Fondo Centroamericano de Estabilización Monetaria (FOCEM)	2
Fund for Solidarity and Economic Development (FSID)	1
Arab Petroleum Investment Corporation (APICORP)	0

Sources: HIPC documents; HIPC authorities; and World Bank staff estimates.

1/ Some of these creditors are providing relief on a case-by-case basis and have yet to agree to full participation in the enhanced HIPC Initiative. Moreover, for a few of these creditors, there have been significant delays in developing the modalities for the actual delivery of debt relief.

Table 5A. HIPC Initiative: Status of Delivery of Assistance by the World Bank
(In millions of U.S. dollars as of February 1, 2006)

Member	Decision Point	Completion Point	Total Committed Debt Service Reduction	Debt Service Reduction Delivered 1/	Debt Service Reduction Delivered (In percent of total committed reduction)
Under the Original HIPC Initiative 2/					
Bolivia	Sep. 1997	Sep. 1998	65.4	65.4	100.0
Burkina Faso 3/	Sep. 1997	Jul. 2000	182.8	182.8	100.0
Guyana 3/	Dec. 1997	May. 1999	60.8	60.8	100.0
Mali 4/	Sep. 1998	Sep. 2000	78.6	78.6	100.0
Mozambique 5/	Apr. 1998	Jun. 1999	975.0	975.0	100.0
Uganda 5/	Apr. 1997	Apr. 1998	354.5	354.5	100.0
Total Original HIPC			1,717.0	1,717.0	100.0
Under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative 6/					
Benin	Jul. 2000	Mar. 2003	124.3	40.7	32.8
Bolivia	Feb. 2000	Jun. 2001	221.8	49.4	22.3
Burkina Faso 7/	Jul. 2000	Apr. 2002	236.7	46.4	19.6
Burundi	Aug. 2005	Floating	782.5	3.7	0.5
Cameroon	Oct. 2000	Floating	265.6	63.9	24.1
Chad	May. 2001	Floating	106.7	26.0	24.4
Congo, Republic 8/	Mar. 2006	Floating	70.7	0.0	0.0
Congo, Dem. Rep. Of 9/	Jul. 2003	Floating	1,031.2	82.3	8.0
Ethiopia 7/	Nov. 2001	Apr. 2004	1,278.4	146.7	11.5
Gambia, The	Dec. 2000	Floating	31.8	9.1	28.6
Ghana	Feb. 2002	Jul. 2004	1,445.7	185.3	12.8
Guinea	Dec. 2000	Floating	233.6	60.9	26.1
Guinea Bissau	Dec. 2000	Floating	179.6	26.2	14.6
Guyana	Nov. 2000	Dec. 2003	72.0	11.7	16.3
Honduras	Jun. 2000	Apr. 2005	107.7	44.4	41.3
Madagascar	Dec. 2000	Oct. 2004	444.4	83.9	18.9
Malawi	Dec. 2000	Floating	588.5	104.2	17.7
Mali	Sep. 2000	Mar. 2003	213.2	61.2	28.7
Mauritania	Feb. 2000	Jun. 2002	172.8	36.3	21.0
Mozambique	Apr. 2000	Sep. 2001	80.1	41.1	51.4
Nicaragua	Dec. 2000	Jan. 2004	382.6	46.0	12.0
Niger 7/	Dec. 2000	Apr. 2004	408.7	58.9	14.4
Rwanda 7/	Dec. 2000	Apr. 2005	709.0	74.4	10.5
São Tomé and Príncipe	Dec. 2000	Floating	44.9	6.3	14.1
Senegal	Jun. 2000	Apr. 2004	163.9	72.8	44.4
Sierra Leone	Mar. 2002	Floating	229.9	29.9	13.0
Tanzania	Apr. 2000	Nov. 2001	1,157.1	253.8	21.9
Uganda	Feb. 2000	May. 2000	629.1	109.5	17.4
Zambia	Dec. 2000	Apr. 2005	885.2	132.2	14.9
Total Enhanced HIPC			12,297.7	1,907.3	15.5
Grand Total			14,014.8	3,624.3	25.9

Sources: HIPC country documents; and World Bank staff estimates.

1/ Assistance is considered as provided: i) at the effective date of the purchase of IDA credits, provision of IDA grants or prepayment of IBRD loans; and ii) at the due date in the case of debt service reduction.

2/ Figures are from the respective completion point documents, they include the reduction in interest payments associated with the cancellation of loans and the provision of grants instead loans. Assistance provided through the reduction of the debt service to IDA, unless otherwise indicated.

3/ Assistance provided through the purchase by the HIPC Trust Fund of selected IDA credits.

4/ Assistance provided through the purchase by the HIPC Trust Fund of selected IDA credits and the reduction of the debt service to IDA.

5/ Assistance provided through the provision of IDA grants; the purchase by the HIPC Trust Fund of selected IDA credits and the reduction of the debt service to IDA.

6/ Unless otherwise indicated, assistance to be provided through the reduction of the debt service to IDA.

7/ Includes topping-up assistance.

8/ Since it reached the decision point in March 2006, the Republic of Congo had received no relief as of February 1, 2006.

9/ Corresponds to the assistance provided through the reduction of debt service payments to IDA on the disbursed and outstanding debt as of end-2002, which would provide a relief of US\$597 million in NPV terms. The remaining US\$223 million in NPV terms needed to cover the World Bank share of assistance was provided through the clearance of arrears.

Table 5B. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Delivery of World Bank Assistance, 2000-10

(In millions of U.S. dollars)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Debt service before HIPC relief 1/											
Benin	10	12	14	16	18	21	21	22	23	24	26
Bolivia	31	21	23	27	32	28	36	38	43	48	51
Burkina Faso	13	14	19	21	24	27	28	29	29	29	30
Burundi	13	14	16	19	19	21	22	22	24	25	27
Cameroon	87	80	69	59	60	57	50	39	40	41	40
Chad	8	11	11	12	17	14	17	18	20	22	25
Congo, Republic of	5	80	12	11	9	7	7	7	7	7	7
Congo, Dem. Rep. of	-	-	353	37	40	43	47	51	53	54	54
Ethiopia	34	36	42	54	63	70	72	74	88	93	94
Gambia, The	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8
Ghana	56	63	65	76	87	97	102	109	116	124	130
Guinea	18	21	22	26	27	31	33	34	38	41	44
Guinea-Bissau	5	5	5	6	7	7	8	8	9	10	10
Guyana	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8	9
Honduras	56	46	45	45	40	28	25	26	26	31	32
Madagascar	27	29	32	37	42	46	50	54	60	63	68
Malawi	36	35	36	42	47	50	53	56	58	64	66
Mali 2/	20	23	25	28	33	36	38	41	43	45	47
Mauritania	9	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	18	19	21
Mozambique	19	22	24	27	30	33	35	36	38	41	46
Nicaragua	12	12	10	12	15	18	19	19	21	24	26
Niger	14	14	15	17	20	22	25	28	30	31	31
Rwanda	11	14	16	19	21	23	24	25	26	28	29
São Tomé and Príncipe	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Senegal	27	29	31	35	39	44	47	51	57	60	66
Sierra Leone	4	5	6	9	11	13	13	13	13	13	14
Tanzania	57	61	68	78	89	91	92	99	102	106	119
Uganda	29	34	42	53	65	73	71	75	80	84	92
Zambia	27	33	35	43	45	50	54	58	60	64	67
TOTAL	643	732	1,060	835	929	978	1,020	1,065	1,138	1,211	1,283
Debt service after HIPC relief											
Benin	8	6	7	9	11	12	12	13	14	15	16
Bolivia											
<i>after: original HIPC relief</i>	13	-	17	27	32	28	36	38	43	48	51
<i>enhanced HIPC relief</i>	13	-	8	14	18	14	21	22	25	29	31
Burkina Faso											
<i>after: original HIPC relief</i>	10	8	13	16	18	21	22	23	23	22	23
<i>enhanced HIPC relief</i>	7	1	6	9	9	12	13	14	15	13	13
<i>topping up</i>	7	1	6	9	9	12	13	14	15	13	13
Burundi	13	14	16	19	19	11	1	1	1	1	1
Cameroon	87	74	41	30	14	16	21	21	23	32	37
Chad	8	7	6	7	11	8	10	11	12	13	15
Congo, Republic of							4	3	3	3	3
Congo, Dem. Rep. of	-	-	25	12	7	9	10	11	11	11	11
Ethiopia	34	35	17	26	32	37	37	39	47	50	51
<i>topping up</i>	34	35	17	26	21	13	12	12	17	18	18
Gambia, The	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	5	5
Ghana	56	63	32	31	39	44	45	49	52	56	59
Guinea	18	10	11	14	14	17	18	19	21	23	25
Guinea-Bissau	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3
Guyana											
<i>after: original HIPC relief</i>	6	6	7	7	6	5	6	6	6	6	7
<i>enhanced HIPC relief</i>	6	4	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
Honduras	51	27	33	45	40	23	16	16	17	19	20
Madagascar	27	14	16	20	24	27	29	32	36	39	42
Malawi	36	18	18	22	25	26	27	29	30	34	36
Mali											
<i>after: original HIPC relief</i>	16	19	21	24	29	33	35	38	39	41	43
<i>enhanced HIPC relief</i>	14	9	10	13	17	19	20	22	23	25	26
Mauritania	5	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9	10	12
Mozambique											
<i>after: original HIPC relief</i>	9	11	12	13	14	14	15	16	16	18	22
<i>enhanced HIPC relief</i>	5	6	6	5	5	4	6	5	5	15	22
Nicaragua	12	6	2	3	5	6	6	6	7	9	11
Niger	14	4	5	7	8	10	12	13	14	14	15
<i>topping up</i>	14	4	5	7	6	7	8	8	9	9	9
Rwanda	11	1	2	4	5	9	11	11	12	12	13
<i>topping up</i>	11	1	2	4	5	5	3	3	3	3	3
São Tomé and Príncipe	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senegal	22	15	16	24	29	26	28	31	35	38	61
Sierra Leone	4	5	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4

Table 5B (concluded). HIPC Initiative: Estimated Delivery of World Bank Assistance, 2000-10
(In millions of U.S. dollars)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Debt service after HIPC relief											
Tanzania	29	22	25	32	41	42	43	46	48	49	60
Uganda 3/	16	17	32	47	87	101	97	103	110	117	130
<i>after: original HIPC relief</i>	13	14	23	33	57	65	63	67	71	75	83
<i>enhanced HIPC relief</i>	4	3	9	14	30	36	34	36	39	42	47
Zambia	27	14	13	17	16	16	16	18	20	22	26
TOTAL	520	365	337	391	422	419	427	455	492	550	629
World Bank debt relief 4/											
Benin	3	6	7	8	8	8	9	9	9	10	10
Bolivia	18	21	15	13	13	14	15	16	18	19	20
<i>of which: original HIPC 5/</i>	18	21	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	-	0	9	13	13	14	15	16	18	19	20
Burkina Faso	6	13	13	14	15	16	16	16	17	18	18
<i>of which: original HIPC 5/</i>	3	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	3	7	7	7	9	9	9	9	9	9	10
<i>topping up</i>	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1
Burundi	-	-	-	-	-	10	21	21	23	24	26
Cameroon	-	6	28	29	46	40	28	18	17	9	2
Chad	-	3	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	9	9
Congo, Republic of	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	4	4	4
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 6/	-	-	329	25	32	34	37	40	42	43	43
Ethiopia	-	1	25	29	43	57	60	62	71	75	76
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	-	1	25	29	31	33	35	36	41	43	44
<i>topping up</i>	-	-	-	-	11	24	26	27	30	32	33
Gambia, The	-	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
Ghana	-	-	33	45	49	53	57	60	64	68	71
Guinea	-	11	11	12	13	13	14	15	16	18	19
Guinea-Bissau	1	4	4	5	6	6	6	6	7	7	8
Guyana	1	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
<i>of which: original HIPC 5/</i>	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	0	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Honduras	6	19	12	-	-	5	10	10	10	12	12
Madagascar	-	15	16	16	17	19	20	22	24	25	25
Malawi	-	17	19	21	23	23	26	27	28	30	31
Mali	6	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	19	20	20
<i>of which: original HIPC 5/</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	2	10	11	11	12	14	15	15	16	16	17
Mauritania	5	6	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	9
Mozambique	14	16	18	22	25	29	29	31	33	26	24
<i>of which: original HIPC 5/</i>	11	11	13	14	16	19	19	20	22	23	24
<i>enhanced HIPC 7/</i>	3	5	5	8	9	10	10	11	12	3	-
Nicaragua	-	6	8	8	10	12	13	13	14	15	15
Niger	-	9	10	10	14	15	18	19	21	21	21
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	-	9	10	10	12	12	14	15	16	16	16
<i>topping up</i>	-	-	-	-	2	3	4	5	5	5	5
Rwanda	-	12	14	15	16	17	21	22	23	25	26
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	-	12	14	15	16	14	13	14	15	16	16
<i>topping up</i>	-	-	-	-	-	4	8	8	9	10	10
São Tomé and Príncipe	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Senegal	5	14	15	11	11	18	19	20	22	23	6
Sierra Leone	-	-	4	7	8	9	10	10	10	10	10
Tanzania	28	39	43	46	48	49	50	53	54	57	59
Uganda	25	31	33	39	35	37	37	38	41	42	45
<i>of which: original HIPC 5/</i>	17	20	20	20	8	8	8	8	9	9	9
<i>enhanced HIPC</i>	9	11	14	20	27	29	29	30	32	33	36
Zambia	-	19	22	26	29	34	38	40	40	42	41
TOTAL	117	288	711	434	499	557	595	613	650	665	659
Memorandum item											
Average Annual Debt Service Reduction 8/	18%	39%	67%	52%	54%	57%	58%	58%	57%	55%	51%

Sources: HIPC country documents; and World Bank staff estimates.

1/ From 2000 to 2005, information corresponds to debt service actually paid to the World Bank. Debt service after 2005 are based on stocks as of end-June 2005.

2/ Debt service before the purchase of IDA credits.

3/ These numbers differ from those in the 2nd completion point document, as the document did not reflect new borrowing that took place between the original decision point and the enhanced decision point.

4/ From 2000 to 2005, figures correspond to actual debt relief received.

5/ Figures from the Completion Point Document under the original HIPC.

6/ Corresponds to the assistance provided through the reduction of debt service payments to IDA on the disbursed and outstanding debt as of end-2002, including the assistance delivered through concessional financing of the bridge loan to clear arrears.

7/ These numbers differ from those in the 2nd completion point document, as a new schedule of delivery was approved at end-

8/ Weighted by each country's share in total debt service before HIPC.

Table 6A. HIPC Initiative: Status of Commitments by the IMF

(In millions of SDRs; as of March 8, 2006)

Member	Decision Point	Completion Point	Amount Committed	Amount Disbursed 1/
Under the Original HIPC Initiative				
Bolivia	Sep. 1997	Sep. 1998	21.2	21.2
Burkina Faso	Sep. 1997	Jul. 2000	16.3	16.3
Cote d'Ivoire 2/	Mar. 1998	--	16.7	--
Guyana	Dec. 1997	May. 1999	25.6	25.6
Mali	Sep. 1998	Sep. 2000	10.8	10.8
Mozambique	Apr. 1998	Jun. 1999	93.2	93.2
Uganda	Apr. 1997	Apr. 1998	51.5	51.5
Total Original HIPC			235.3	218.6
Under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative				
Benin	Jul. 2000	Mar. 2003	18.4	20.1
Bolivia	Feb. 2000	Jun. 2001	41.1	44.2
Burkina Faso	Jul. 2000	Apr. 2002	27.7	29.7
Burundi	Aug. 2005	Floating	19.3	0.1
Cameroon	Oct. 2000	Floating	28.5	11.3
Chad	May. 2001	Floating	14.3	8.6
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 3/	Jul. 2003	Floating	228.3	3.4
Congo, Rep. of	Mar. 2006	Floating	5.6	--
Ethiopia	Nov. 2001	Apr. 2004	45.1	46.7
Gambia, The	Dec. 2000	Floating	1.8	0.1
Ghana	Feb. 2002	Jul. 2004	90.1	94.3
Guinea	Dec. 2000	Floating	24.2	5.2
Guinea-Bissau	Dec. 2000	Floating	9.2	0.5
Guyana	Nov. 2000	Dec. 2003	31.1	34.0
Honduras	Jun. 2000	Apr. 2005	22.7	26.4
Madagascar	Dec. 2000	Oct. 2004	14.7	16.4
Malawi	Dec. 2000	Floating	23.1	11.6
Mali	Sep. 2000	Mar. 2003	34.7	38.5
Mauritania	Feb. 2000	Jun. 2002	34.8	38.4
Mozambique	Apr. 2000	Sep. 2001	13.7	14.8
Nicaragua	Dec. 2000	Jan. 2004	63.5	71.2
Niger	Dec. 2000	Apr. 2004	31.2	34.0
Rwanda	Dec. 2000	Apr. 2005	46.8	50.6
São Tomé and Príncipe 4/	Dec. 2000	Floating	--	--
Senegal	Jun. 2000	Apr. 2004	33.8	38.4
Sierra Leone	Mar. 2002	Floating	98.5	66.0
Tanzania	Apr. 2000	Nov. 2001	89.0	96.4
Uganda	Feb. 2000	May. 2000	68.1	70.2
Zambia	Dec. 2000	Apr. 2005	468.8	508.3
Total Enhanced HIPC			1,628.1	1,379.1
Grand Total			1,863.4	1,597.7

1/ Includes interest on amounts committed under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative.

2/ Equivalent to the committed amount of US \$22.5 million at decision point exchange rates (3/17/98).

3/ Amount committed is equivalent to the remaining balance of the total IMF HIPC assistance of SDR 337.9 million, after deducting SDR 109.6 million representing the concessional element associated with the disbursement of a PRGF loan following the Democratic Republic of Congo's clearance of arrears to the IMF on June 12, 2002. arrears to the IMF on June 12, 2002.

4/ At the time of its decision point, São Tomé and Príncipe did not have any eligible debt to the IMF.

Table 6B. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Delivery of IMF Assistance, 1999-2011 1/
(In millions of U.S. dollars; as of March 8, 2006)

	Actual						Projections 2/						
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
IMF debt service before HIPC relief													
Benin	17	14	16	16	16	12	8
Bolivia	34	31	32	30	30	40	55
Burkina Faso	6	11	15	15	18	19	16
Burundi	8	6	6	3	1	29	1	1	1	1	5	10	13
Cameroon	20	21	5	3	12	26	37	48	54	49	39	29	18
Chad	5	2	4	8	10	13	14	14	13	12	11	10	7
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 3/	3	0	0	570	5	6	12	7	66	128	142	153	160
Congo, Rep. of 4/	6	1	3	10	9	12	12	4	0	0	0	3	5
Ethiopia 5/	7	12	14	15	16	13	13
Gambia, The	4	2	1	0	0	10	2	4	4	5	4	3	1
Ghana	72	39	68	17	22	40	49
Guinea	8	9	13	13	16	18	24	18	19	16	12	10	6
Guinea Bissau	1	1	1	2	5	5	3	3	3	2	1	1	0
Guyana	22	26	17	17	17	18	16
Honduras	7	10	14	44	41	15	26
Madagascar	13	6	3	5	8	8	12
Malawi	22	10	8	8	10	13	17	25	18	8	6	4	4
Mali	13	19	24	29	29	29	25
Mauritania	10	12	15	18	19	17	14	12	13	12	12	9	7
Mozambique	32	31	29	24	21	22	28
Nicaragua	4	7	7	7	9	17	26
Niger	6	3	2	4	9	13	13
Rwanda	9	13	12	7	2	5	9
São Tomé and Príncipe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Sierra Leone	13	27	78	31	32	20	8	5	14	21	25	32	33
Senegal	34	25	31	30	39	46	43
Tanzania 5/	36	32	27	27	26	31	47
Uganda 5/	60	53	50	44	45	40	50
Zambia	9	9	222	220	222	223	224
TOTAL	484	431	715	1216	687	759	805	142	207	254	257	263	253
IMF debt service after Enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 2/													
Benin	17	11	11	11	10	7	6
Bolivia	23	21	23	19	21	23	42
Burkina Faso	6	8	8	9	4	3	3
Burundi	8	6	6	3	1	29	1	1	1	1	1	4	6
Cameroon	20	20	4	3	12	22	36	41	42	40	37	28	18
Chad	5	2	2	5	6	12	12	14	10	8	8	9	7
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 3/	3	0	0	570	4	4	10	5	26	49	58	81	89
Congo, Rep. of 4/	6	1	3	10	9	12	12	4	0	0	0	2	3
Ethiopia 5/	7	12	14	10	10	9	7
Gambia, The	4	2	1	0	0	10	2	4	3	3	3	3	1
Ghana	72	39	68	8	5	23	28
Guinea	8	9	10	12	14	17	24	14	10	6	4	10	6
Guinea Bissau	1	1	0	2	5	5	3	2	0	0	1	0	0
Guyana	0	17	6	10	8	6	6
Honduras	7	10	12	39	41	10	14
Madagascar	13	6	2	3	4	7	10
Malawi	22	10	5	8	8	9	14	18	11	2	2	4	4
Mali	13	18	17	19	18	17	14
Mauritania	10	7	7	7	8	9	9	10	12	12	12	9	7
Mozambique	18	0	2	6	9	9	14
Nicaragua	4	7	7	6	6	9	5
Niger	6	3	2	3	6	7	4
Rwanda	9	13	4	3	2	1	2
São Tomé and Príncipe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Sierra Leone	13	27	78	2	2	2	3	3	2	9	16	24	23
Senegal	34	23	26	25	32	32	30
Tanzania 5/	36	25	6	5	9	16	37
Uganda 5/	45	32	20	20	22	16	30
Zambia	9	9	71	67	70	221	25
TOTAL	422	340	414	884	349	548	404	117	118	131	142	174	164

Table 6B (concluded). HIPC Initiative: Estimated Delivery of IMF Assistance, 1999-2011 1/
(In millions of U.S. dollars; as of January 31, 2006)

	Actual							Projections					
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
IMF Original and Enhanced HIPC Initiative assistance 6/													
Benin	...	2	5	5	6	5	2
Bolivia	11	10	9	11	9	17	13
Burkina Faso	...	3	6	6	14	15	13
Burundi	0.1	0	0	0	4	6	7
Cameroon	...	1	1	0	0	4	1	7	12	9	3	1	0
Chad	...	0	2	3	4	1	2	0	2	4	3	1	0
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 3/	1	2	2	2	41	79	84	72	70
Congo, Rep. of 4/	0	0	0	0	1	2
Ethiopia 5/	7	5	5	3	5
Gambia, The	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Ghana	72	9	17	17	21
Guinea	8	0	3	1	2	0	0	4	9	10	8	0	0
Guinea Bissau	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0
Guyana	22	9	11	7	9	12	10
Honduras	7	0	1	5	0	5	12
Madagascar	13	0	1	2	4	2	2
Malawi	22	0	3	0	2	4	3	6	7	6	3	0	0
Mali	13	1	7	9	10	12	11
Mauritania	10	5	8	11	11	8	4	2	2	0	0	0	0
Mozambique	14	31	27	18	12	12	14
Nicaragua	...	0	0	1	2	8	21
Niger	...	0	1	1	4	7	9
Rwanda	...	0	9	4	0	4	7
São Tomé and Príncipe	...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sierra Leone	30	30	19	5	2	12	12	9	8	10
Senegal	...	2	4	5	7	13	13
Tanzania 5/	...	7	21	22	16	15	10
Uganda 5/	15	21	29	24	22	24	20
Zambia	...	0	151	154	152	2	199
TOTAL	219	91	300	333	338	211	401	25	89	123	115	90	89
<i>Memorandum item:</i>													
<i>Average Annual Debt Service Reduction 7/</i>	13%	21%	42%	27%	49%	28%	50%	18%	43%	49%	45%	34%	35%

Sources: Staff estimates and HIPC country documents.

1/ Under Original and Enhanced HIPC Initiative.

2/ No projections for countries which benefited from the first phase of the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative. For other HIPC members, projections are based on credit outstanding as of end-December 2005.

3/ The figures for 1998-2002 shown in the table represent actual payments made by the DRC to the IMF, including the settlement of its arrears on June 12, 2002.

4/ For 2007-09, projected IMF assistance is less than SDR 50,000.

5/ Fiscal year data.

6/ Using SDR/U.S. dollar exchange rate at the completion point (for original HIPC assistance) or at the decision point (for enhanced HIPC assistance). Includes projected investment income.

7/ Weighted average.

Table 7. Status of Bilateral Donor Pledges to the HIPC Trust Fund

(As of January 31, 2006, amounts in nominal US dollar millions)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Inception through September 2002			From October 2002 through October 2004			From October 2004 onwards		
	Contributions Pledged		Memo: Total Contributions	Contributions Pledged			Contributions Pledged ^{d/}		Total Contributions since inception
Donor	EC-ACP Contribution	Bilateral	Including EC-ACP Contribution (Cols.1,2)	EC-ACP Contribution a/	Bilateral b/	Paid-in	Bilateral b/	Paid-in	Including EC-ACP Contribution (Cols. 3,4,5,7)
Australia		13	13						13
Austria	18	26	44	6					50
Belgium	26	20	46	10	9	2			64
Canada		116	116		51	51	28	28	195
Denmark	15	43	58	5	21	21			85
Finland	10	25	35	3	13	13	13	13	64
France	166	21	187	60	11				259
Germany	160	72	232	58	60	c/ 12			350
Greece	9	3	12	3	2	2			17
Iceland		2	2		1	1			3
Ireland	4	20	23	1					25
Italy	86	70	156	31	31				217
Japan		200	200		58	58			258
Korea					10	10			10
Luxembourg	2	1	2	1					4
Netherlands	36	136	172	13	56				240
New Zealand		2	2						2
Norway		79	79		47	47	20	c/ 13	146
Portugal	7	15	22	2					24
Russian Federation					10	10	15	c/ 10	25
Spain	40	85	125	15	25				165
Sweden	19	58	77	6	26	26			109
Switzerland		60	60		35	35			95
United Kingdom	88	221	310	32	95	49			436
United States		600	600		150	75			750
Total Bilateral Contributions		1889			711	412	76	64	2675
Total EC-ACP Contributions	685			246	c/	126			931
Total	685	1,889	2,574	246	711	538	76	64	3606
<i>Memo: Total contributions less contributions earmarked for IDA</i>	685	1,808	2,493	246	711	538	76	64	3526

a/ This column reflects the decision on May 16, 2003 when the ACP-EU Council bringing together Ministers from African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries and and EU Member States approved a new contribution to the HIPC Trust Fund of EUR 200 million (eq. \$246 million). This contribution is funded from resources already allocated to EU-ACP co-operation through the 8th and 9th European Development Fund.

b/ From Chairman's Summary of HIPC Technical Meeting of October 24, 2002. Most EU Member States pledges made at the October 2002 meeting included the donor's share of an expected EC-ACP contribution. The bilateral pledges of EU members have as a result been adjusted to take into account the new EC-ACP contribution. This bilateral attribution is based on each donor's share in EDF9. In addition, a number of donors made pledges after the October 2002 meeting or increased the amount of their pledges including Canada, Finland, Greece, Korea, Norway, Russia and the UK.

c/ Contribution agreements have been signed covering the full amount of the donor's outstanding pledge. The EC has signed and paid for EUR100 million. Germany has signed an agreement for Euro 50 million, of which Euro 10 million has been paid and Euro 20 million each is payable in 2006 and 2007. Norway has paid 13 million dollars out of its pledge of US\$ 20 million and US\$ 7 million is scheduled to be paid in 2006. Russia has paid US\$ 10 million and US\$ 5 million is scheduled to be paid in 2006.

d/ Excludes contribution earmarked for IDA provided in the context of IDA 14.

Note: 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), specific country-held multilateral debt relief facilities, bilateral debt relief Trust Funds and the Central American Emergency Trust Fund.

Table 8A. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Paris Club Costs, by Creditor Country
(In millions of U.S. dollars, in 2005 NPV terms)

	Total (29 countries)	Benin	Bolivia	Burkina Faso	Burundi	Cameroon	Chad	Congo, Dem. Rep. of	Congo, Rep. of	Ethiopia	Gambia	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Guyana	Honduras	Mada-gascar	Malawi	Mali	Mauritania	Mozambique	Nicaragua	Niger	Rwanda	São Tomé & Príncipe	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
Total	15,175	80	512	28	86	1,067	17	3,766	913	598	6	982	189	186	221	209	485	160	140	170	1,282	1,077	133	43	24	156	213	933	148	1,349
Australia	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	450	-	36	3	7	215	0	48	-	3	3	10	4	-	-	-	18	9	-	53	10	2	-	2	-	-	0	18	5	5
Belgium	720	-	32	-	0	94	-	484	12	4	-	2	3	6	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	1	11	55	-	-
Brazil 1/	401	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	33	-	-	-	4	9	-	-	-	-	-	24	172	47	-	-	-	-	-	74	-	36
Canada	221	-	0	-	-	77	-	25	12	0	-	19	-	-	1	5	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	29	-	34
Denmark	31	-	1	-	0	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	22	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	0	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
France	2,805	38	32	10	53	334	15	608	561	3	1	87	62	7	1	23	137	4	82	33	213	53	96	30	2	114	18	63	23	104
Germany	1,542	3	134	-	0	132	0	273	45	39	-	81	2	2	3	4	37	-	-	4	123	306	-	0	6	0	10	45	1	292
Israel 1/	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-
Italy	1,200	-	-	6	0	79	2	146	46	117	-	28	10	92	-	12	70	-	0	0	300	79	-	0	7	7	28	62	63	45
Japan	2,579	-	158	-	23	0	-	587	-	7	-	482	10	-	1	82	63	142	5	4	39	69	14	9	-	0	71	355	5	455
Netherlands	486	9	26	5	0	7	0	228	-	0	-	70	-	-	4	5	-	-	2	24	-	29	-	0	-	6	21	48	-	0
Norway	76	26	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	2	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	7	6	5	-
Portugal 1/	234	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	166	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
Russia	1,177	-	-	1	2	-	0	-	34	379	-	-	72	7	2	-	49	-	44	-	119	258	-	-	1	-	-	63	-	145
South Africa 1/	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	505	-	36	2	-	2	-	2	102	-	-	42	4	3	-	30	43	3	-	15	8	183	10	-	2	14	0	0	5	-
Sweden	137	-	-	-	-	35	-	60	-	2	-	28	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switzerland	55	-	-	-	-	24	-	11	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-
Trinidad and Tobago 1/	140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	822	4	34	1	0	26	-	102	53	10	-	117	3	-	62	-	14	-	6	9	98	1	9	0	-	0	3	106	19	145
United States	1,550	-	24	-	-	13	-	1,181	12	33	-	9	8	-	3	42	12	-	0	4	27	40	5	0	-	1	33	12	1	89

1/ Creditor invited on a case-by-case basis to participate in some Paris Club agreements.

**Table 8B. HIPC Initiative: Paris Club Debt Relief 1/
Status as of Mid-March, 2006**

Country	Date of Enhanced Decision/ Completion Point	Interim Relief Provided?	Topping up or New Rescheduling	Date of Paris Club Rescheduling	Comments
1. Enhanced completion point reached					
Benin	Jul-00 / Mar-03	Yes	New rescheduling	23-Apr-03	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$65 million in nominal terms canceled; this does not take into account additional cancellation committed by some creditors on a bilateral basis.
Bolivia	Feb-00 / Jun-01	Yes	New rescheduling	10-Jul-01	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$685 million canceled. No interim relief beyond original HIPC relief from the Paris Club.
Burkina Faso	Jul-00 / Apr-02	Yes	Topping up	19-Jun-02	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$29 million canceled. Creditors also provided US\$18.8 million in topping up relief. As the decision point under the enhanced HIPC Initiative and the completion point under the original framework were reached on the same day, creditors did not grant a stock operation, but a flow rescheduling on Lyon terms.
Ethiopia	Nov-01/Apr-04	Yes	Topping up	13-May-04	Paris Club stock operation and topping up on Cologne terms, US\$1.3 billion canceled. Agreed Minutes were signed on October 13, 2005, after being only initiated in May 2005. Most creditors also committed on a bilateral basis to cancel up to 100 percent of their claims.
Ghana	Feb-02/Jul-04	Yes	New rescheduling	22-Jul-04	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$821 million in nominal terms canceled. Most creditors also committed on a bilateral basis to grant additional relief amounting to US\$823 million. At decision point, the cutoff date was reset to June 20, 1999.
Guyana	Nov-00 / Dec-03	No	New rescheduling	14-Jan-04	Paris Club and Trinidad and Tobago stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$156 million canceled. The majority of Paris Club creditors (Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK) offered to provide complete write-off of their debts.
Honduras	Jul-00/Apr-05	Yes	New rescheduling	12-May-05	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms. Creditors cancelled US\$206 million in nominal terms. Most creditors also committed on a bilateral basis to grant additional relief amounting to US\$855million. Cologne flow rescheduling on pre-cutoff date credits in arrears as of end-2003 and maturities between January 2004 and Jun 2005 were granted in April 2004. After the decision point, creditors decided not to provide a HIPC treatment because Honduras was benefiting from a deferral of debt service during November 1998–March 2002, following Hurricane Mitch.
Madagascar	Dec-00/Oct-04	Yes	New rescheduling	16-Nov-04	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$752 million in nominal terms canceled. Most of the creditors agreed to provide additional debt relief amounting to US\$699 million.
Mali	Sep-00 / Mar-03	Yes	New rescheduling	12-Mar-03	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$145 million canceled. Interim relief was initially approved for September 2000–December 2002.
Mauritania	Feb-00 / Jun-02	Yes	New rescheduling	8-Jul-02	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$210 million canceled. After decision point, maturities between July 1999 and June 2002 were subject to interim relief.
Mozambique	Apr-00 / Sep-01	Yes	New rescheduling	20-Nov-01	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$2.3 billion canceled.
Nicaragua	Dec-00 / Jan-04	Yes	New rescheduling	4-Mar-04	Paris Club and Israel stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$3 billion canceled. Brazil declined to participate. Debt service due from October 2002 to completion point was subject to interim relief under Cologne terms.
Niger	Dec-02/Apr-04	Yes	Topping up	12-May-04	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, including topping up. Following Spain's initiative, creditors decided on a bilateral basis to cancel all remaining maturities. Interim relief was originally approved on debt service falling due between December 2000–December 2003.
Rwanda	Dec-00/Apr-05	Yes	Topping up	10-May-05	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms reduced nominal debt by US\$82.7 million. After additional relief (US\$7.7 million) to be provided on a bilateral basis, debt would be fully canceled. The April 2000 Paris Club rescheduling agreement on Naples terms was topped up to Cologne terms for the period December 2000–April 2002 at decision point, which was subsequently extended until end-June 2005.
Senegal	Jun-00/Apr-04	Yes	New rescheduling	11-Jun-04	Paris Club and Brazil stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$127 million canceled. Most creditors also committed on a bilateral basis to grant additional relief. Interim relief was originally approved for June 2000–December 2003.
Tanzania	Apr-00 / Nov-01	Yes	New rescheduling	14-Jan-02	Paris Club and Brazil stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$973 million canceled. In a side letter, Japan agreed to a deferral over three years of maturities due under the 1997 rescheduling in light of the continuing delays in signing bilateral agreements. Interim relief was provided on maturities due from April 2000.
Uganda	Feb-00 / May-00	Yes	New rescheduling	11-Sep-00	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms, US\$147 million canceled. No interim relief from the Paris Club beyond original HIPC relief because of the short time period between the decision and completion points.
Zambia	Dec-00/Apr-05	Yes	New rescheduling	11-May-05	Paris Club stock operation on Cologne terms. Debt cancellation of US\$1.4 billion in nominal terms. Most creditors committed on a bilateral basis to provide additional debt relief, a further US\$0.4 billion reduction in nominal terms. In addition, creditors rescheduled 50 percent of the payments due in 2005–07. From January 2001, Paris Club creditors provided interim debt relief on Cologne flow terms on pre-cutoff date debt.

**Table 8B (concluded). HIPC Initiative: Paris Club Debt Relief ^{1/}
Status as of Mid-March, 2006**

Country	Date of Enhanced Decision Point	Interim Relief Provided?	Topping up or New Rescheduling	Date of Paris Club Rescheduling	Comments
2. Decision point cases					
Burundi	Aug-05	yes	new rescheduling	15-Sep-05	Paris Club creditors agreed on a flow rescheduling on pre-cut-off date debt on Cologne terms on maturities falling due from end-July 2005 up to end-2006. In March 2004, Paris Club creditors provided Naples flow rescheduling on all pre-cut-off date debt falling due during January 1, 2004 and end-2006.
Cameroon	Oct-00	yes	new rescheduling	24-Jan-01	Cologne flow rescheduling on pre-cut-off date debt in arrears accumulated during October–December 2000 and all maturities on pre-cut-off date debt falling due during January 2001–December 2003. In December 2003, creditors extended the consolidation period in line with the extension of the PRGF and agreed on the entry into force of the third phase under the 2001 Agreed Minutes. Following the approval of the new PRGF-supported program, the Paris Club extended the consolidation period until end-March 2006.
Chad	May-01	yes	new rescheduling	12-Jun-01	Cologne flow rescheduling on maturities on all pre-cut-off date debt falling due during May 2001–March 2003. Arrears on pre-cut-off date debt as of April 2001 were rescheduled on Naples terms. In April 2003, the Paris Club decided to extend the consolidation period until the end of the current PRGF arrangement (January 2004). In January 2005, creditors agreed to extend the consolidation period to end-September 2005.
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Jul-03	yes	topping up	17-Nov-03	Paris Club creditors agreed to top-up their debt relief to Cologne terms. Rescheduling on Naples terms covering the period from July 1, 2002 up to June 30, 2005.
Republic of Congo	Mar-06	yes	new rescheduling	n.a.	Cologne flow rescheduling to be provided.
Gambia, The	Dec-00	yes	n.a.	9-Jan-03	Cologne flow rescheduling on the maturities falling due from July 17, 2002 to July 17, 2005. Given the absence of a Fund program, in October 2003, creditors agreed to send a letter informing the authorities of the non-entry into force of the second phase of the consolidation period under the January 2003 Agreed Minutes.
Guinea	Dec-00	yes	new rescheduling	15-May-01	The Paris Club provided a Cologne flow rescheduling on pre-cut-off, non-ODA debt falling due during December 2000–March 2004. Arrears on pre-cut-off date debt outstanding at end-November 2000 were rescheduled on Naples terms. In June 2003, Paris Club creditors agreed that in the absence of a Fund supported program, the third phase of the 2001 Agreed Minutes will not enter into force.
Guinea-Bissau	Dec-00	yes	new rescheduling	26-Jan-01	The Paris Club provided a Cologne flow rescheduling on pre-cut-off date debt falling due during December 2000–December 2003 (except the payments on a deferral in the context of the 1995 agreement, which were deferred again on nonconcessional terms). Arrears on pre-cut-off date debt were rescheduled on Naples terms. Given the absence of a Fund program, in January 2003, creditors decided on the explicit non-entry into force of the phase envisioned under the Agreed Minutes.
Malawi	Dec-00	yes	new rescheduling	25-Jan-01	The Paris Club provided a Cologne flow rescheduling on all pre-cut-off date debt falling due during December 2000–December 2003. Also, creditors moved the cutoff date from January 1, 1982 to January 1, 1997, which made all of Malawi's debt pre-cut-off date debt. As Malawi's program under the PRGF arrangement went off-track, in January 2003, creditors decided on the explicit non-entry into force of the phase envisioned under the 2001 Agreed Minutes. In November 2003, creditors agreed to extend the consolidation period in line with the extension of the PRGF arrangement to December 2004. Following the approval of a new PRGF on August 2005, creditors decided to extend the consolidation period retroactively until September 1, 2006.
São Tomé and Príncipe	Dec-00	yes	topping up	16-May-00	In September 2005, following the approval of a new PRGF arrangement in August 2005, and the payment of arrears in November 2005, Paris Club creditors resumed interim relief and decided to extend the consolidation period and to top up the 2000 agreement to Cologne terms. Maturities falling due during May 1, 2001 and end-2007 were treated. The Paris Club had agreed in May 2000 to a rescheduling on Naples terms. However, phases 2 and 3 covering the period from May 2001 until September 2005 did not take effect because of PRGF interruptions.
Sierra Leone	Mar-02	yes	topping up	10-Jul-02	The Paris Club provided a Cologne flow rescheduling on maturities falling due on pre-cut-off date debt during March 2002–September 2004. Following an extension of the PRGF arrangement, creditors agreed to an extension of the consolidation period to June 2005.

Source: Paris Club Secretariat.

^{1/} For the 29 countries that have already reached the decision point under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative.

Table 9. Paris Club Creditors' Delivery of Debt Relief Under Bilateral Initiatives Beyond the HIPC Initiative 1/
(In percent)

	Official Development Assistance (ODA)		Non-ODA		Provision of relief	
	Pre-cutoff date debt	Post-cutoff date debt	Pre-cutoff	Post-cutoff date debt	Decision Point	Completion point
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Australia	100	100	100	- 2/	flow	stock 2/
Austria	100	-	100	-	flow	stock
Belgium	100 3/	100 3/	100	-	flow	stock 3/
Canada	4/	4/	100 4/	100 4/	a	stock 4/
Denmark	100 5/	100 5/	100 5/	100 5/	flow	stock 5/
France	100 6/	100 6/	100 6/	-	flow 6/	flow/stock 6/
Finland	100 7/	7/	100	7/	stock 7/	7/
Germany	100	100	100	- 8/	flow	stock 8/
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	100 9/	100 9/	100 9/	100 9/	flow 9/	stock 9/
Japan	100	100	100	- 10/	-	stock 10/
Netherlands, the	100 11/	100 11/	100 11/	- 11/	90-100 flow/stock 11/	stock 11/
Norway	12/	12/	12/	-	-	stock 12/
Russia	13/	13/	- 13/	- 13/	- 13/	- 13/
Spain	100 14/	100 14/	100	-	flow	stock
Sweden	15/	15/	100 15/	-	-	Case-by case, stock 15/
Switzerland	15/	16/	16/	16/	Case-by-case, flow 16/	stock 16/
United Kingdom	100	100	100	100	stock 17/	17/
United States	100	100	100	100 18/	flow	stock 18/

Source: Paris Club Secretariat.

1/ Debt relief beyond HIPC is provided on a bilateral basis after the debtor country reaches the decision and completion point.

A "100 percent" mention in the table indicates that the debt relief provided under the enhanced-HIPC Initiative is topped up to 100 percent through a bilateral agreement.

2/ Australia will provide relief on post-COD non-ODA claims incurred before a date to be finalized.

3/ Belgium cancels all ODA debt granted before December 31, 2000.

4/ Canada had already cancelled 100 percent of ODA claims on HIPC prior to 1996. It has granted a moratorium of debt service on all non-ODA debt and commercial credits disbursed before end-March 1999 for 13 out of 17 HIPC with debt due to Canada (Benin, Bolivia, Cameroon, Dem. Rep. Of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Madagascar, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, and Zambia). Canada's debt moratorium is extended to countries meeting governance and human rights standards.

For the other HIPC, debt relief is granted at decision and completion point.

5/ Denmark provides 100 percent cancellation of ODA loans and non-ODA credits contracted and disbursed before September 27, 1999.

6/ France cancels 100 percent of debt service on pre-COD commercial claims on the government as they fall due starting at the decision point. Once countries have reached their completion point, debt relief on ODA claims on the government will go to a special account and will be used for specific development projects.

7/ Finland does not have post-COD claims. All ODA debt stock is cancelled at decision point.

8/ Germany will cancel all debts incurred before June 20, 1999 (date of the Cologne Summit) depending on a consensus within Paris Club creditors.

9/ Italy cancels 100 percent of all debts (pre- and post-COD ODA and non-ODA) incurred before June 20, 1999.

Debt service falling due during the interim period is written-off. At completion point, Italy cancels the stock of remaining debt.

10/ Japan is ready to support expanding the coverage of debt to include claims on post-COD commercial debts contracted before June 20, 1999.

11/ At decision point, the Netherlands cancelled all ODA debts. For some countries it also cancelled non-ODA debt service due during the interim period (Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia). All other HIPC will receive interim relief up to 90 percent reduction of the consolidated amounts. At completion point, all HIPC will receive 100 percent cancellation of the remaining stock of the pre-cutoff date debt.

12/ Norway has already cancelled all ODA claims. Due to the current World Bank/IMF methodology for recalculating debt reduction needs at HIPC completion point, Norway has postponed the decisions on whether to grant 100% debt reduction until after the completion point. Only pre-COD commercial claims are cancelled.

13/ Russia provides debt relief within the scope of Paris Club Agreed Minutes. However, the Russian authorities are currently considering further steps to provide debt relief beyond HIPC (up to 100% debt relief on pre-COD commercial claims).

14/ Spain cancels 100 percent of all ODA debts incurred before June 20, 1999 and all non-ODA pre-COD debts.

15/ Sweden has already cancelled all ODA claims. It provides 100 percent debt cancellation only after the completion point and on a case-by-case basis. Only pre-COD commercial claims are cancelled.

16/ Switzerland grants, in principle, 100 percent cancellation of pre-cutoff date non-ODA debt. However, Switzerland claims the right at the decision point to forgive only 90 percent in case of major political weaknesses. During the 1990s, 20 HIPC were granted 100% debt relief and 4 countries were provided partial debt reduction.

17/ United Kingdom provides 100 percent flow relief at decision point, and holds in trust any debt service paid before the decision point, to be reimbursed at the completion point.

18/ United States cancels 100 percent of post-COD non-ODA debt assumed prior to June 20, 1999.

Table 10A. HIPC Initiative: Estimated Non-Paris Club Official Bilateral Creditors' Costs, by Creditor Country 1/
(In millions of U.S. dollars, in 2005 NPV terms)

Latest Data at Decision Point	Total: (29 countries)	Benin	Bolivia	Burkina Faso	Burundi	Cameroon	Chad	Congo, Dem. Rep.	Congo, Rep. of	Ethiopia	Gambia	Ghana	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Guyana
Total	3,820.5	15.4	23.7	76.9	33.1	16.4	23.7	239.0	58.1	137.3	15.6	39.9	77.4	75.5	31.9
Algeria	234.4	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0
Angola	36.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	0.0
Argentina	4.7	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Brazil	8.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Bulgaria	106.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	9.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.2
Burundi 2/	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cameroon 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cape Verde 2/	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
China	345.2	5.2	10.3	3.0	3.7	6.0	4.2	29.5	11.0	11.5	2.8	10.9	10.0	1.2	4.1
Colombia	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Costa Rica	467.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cote d'Ivoire	12.1	0.0	0.0	11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Croatia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cuba	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.2
Czech Republic	6.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 2/	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Egypt	11.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Former Yugoslavia	109.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.2	0.0	34.3	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.2
Guatemala 3/	444.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Honduras	120.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	16.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
India	36.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
Iran	66.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Iraq	105.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
Israel	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	15.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kuwait	370.2	6.3	0.0	17.6	12.6	7.0	6.1	36.1	13.3	10.2	1.4	13.8	19.8	15.7	8.3
Libya	275.3	0.3	0.0	4.1	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	40.6	1.1	0.0	4.6	0.7	7.4
Mexico	62.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Morocco	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0
Namibia	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Niger 2/	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nigeria	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oman	27.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Pakistan	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
People's Dem. Rep. of Korea	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
Peru	9.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poland	19.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Korea, Republic	6.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Romania	42.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
Rwanda	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Saudi Arabia	242.2	0.0	0.0	8.0	10.2	3.5	3.5	17.0	16.5	0.0	0.8	9.2	25.6	11.0	0.0
Senegal 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Slovak Republic	33.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Africa	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taiwan, Province of China	374.1	0.0	7.2	32.2	0.0	0.0	9.8	31.5	0.0	0.0	9.6	0.0	0.0	32.7	0.0
Tanzania	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Thailand 2/	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Togo 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
United Arab Emirates	104.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	67.2	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	2.5
Venezuela	68.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3
Zambia 2/	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zimbabwe 2/	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sources: HIPC Country Documents; IMF staff estimates.

1/ Countries whose names appear in bold have delivered or agreed to deliver HIPC debt relief on all claims. Figures surrounded by a box represent HIPC debt relief already delivered.

Figures in bold indicate that creditors have agreed to deliver HIPC debt relief. Figures in italics indicate that less than the traditional debt relief has been offered or delivered.

2/ Debt to Argentina was settled through a buyback operation on terms comparable to those provided by Paris Club creditors.

3/ Guatemala's claims on Nicaragua were taken over by Spain in a debt swap. Spain has agreed to provide HIPC relief to Nicaragua on those claims.

Table 10A. (concluded) HIPC Initiative: Estimated Non-Paris Club Official Bilateral Creditors' Costs, by Creditor Country 1/
(In millions of U.S. dollars, in 2005 NPV terms)

Latest Data at Decision Point	Honduras	Madagascar	Malawi	Mali	Mauritania	Mozambique	Nicaragua	Niger	Rwanda	São Tomé and Príncipe	Senegal	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
Total	54.4	99.3	18.0	66.9	153.4	288.1	1,546.0	151.3	34.9	12.2	105.8	46.4	236.5	74.1	69.3
Algeria	0.0	19.0	0.0	4.7	22.9	116.4	22.4	13.4	0.0	0.4	2.2	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0
Angola	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0
Argentina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Brazil	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bulgaria	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	74.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	1.6
Burundi 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Cameroon 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cape Verde 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
China	0.0	7.0	0.0	22.8	20.7	6.8	3.5	5.3	12.6	2.4	17.1	34.1	46.3	13.5	39.7
Colombia	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Costa Rica	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	462.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cote d'Ivoire	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Croatia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cuba	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Czech Republic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.1
Congo, Dem. Rep. of 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Egypt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
Former Yugoslavia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.8	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	11.7
Guatemala 3/	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	438.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Honduras	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	120.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0
India	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	9.5	11.5
Iran	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.7	0.0	0.0
Iraq	0.0	35.9	0.0	3.3	22.2	23.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.4	0.0	0.5
Israel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kuwait	7.9	5.2	1.6	8.2	32.2	22.8	0.0	28.0	9.4	0.0	39.4	8.7	25.7	13.0	0.0
Libya	0.0	28.0	0.0	1.4	12.9	37.0	70.3	15.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.7	18.9	0.0
Mexico	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Morocco	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Namibia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Niger 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nigeria	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Oman	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	6.3	0.0
Pakistan	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
People's Dem. Rep. of Korea	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Peru	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Korea, Republic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0
Romania	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
Rwanda	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
Saudi Arabia	0.0	2.8	0.0	19.6	37.6	0.0	0.0	26.5	11.2	0.0	26.7	0.9	8.6	2.8	0.1
Senegal 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Slovak Republic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.2	24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Africa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Taiwan, Province of China	13.3	0.0	16.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	147.5	59.9	0.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tanzania	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Thailand 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Togo 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
United Arab Emirates	0.0	0.8	0.0	6.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.2	0.0	4.9	0.0	7.0	0.4	0.0
Venezuela	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zambia 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
Zimbabwe 2/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sources: HIPC Country Documents; IMF staff estimates.

1/ Countries whose names appear in bold have delivered or agreed to deliver HIPC debt relief on all claims. Figures surrounded by a box represent HIPC debt relief already delivered.

Figures in bold indicate that creditors have agreed to deliver HIPC debt relief. Figures in italics indicate that less than the traditional debt relief has been offered or delivered.

2/ Debt to Argentina was settled through a buyback operation on terms comparable to those provided by Paris Club creditors.

3/ Guatemala's claims on Nicaragua were taken over by Spain in a debt swap. Spain has agreed to provide HIPC relief to Nicaragua on those claims.

Table 10B. HIPC Initiative: Delivery of HIPC Assistance by Non-Paris Club Creditors

Status as of end-February 2005
(In millions of U.S. dollars, 2005 NPV terms)

Creditor Country	Total Costs	Percent of Total Costs (In percent)
I. Delivered debt relief on all claims on HIPCs:		
South Africa 1/	4.7	0.1
Slovak Republic	33.2	0.9
Total	37.9	1.0
II. Committed to deliver debt relief on all claims on HIPCs:		
Brazil 1/	8.0	0.2
Bulgaria	106.7	2.8
Cameroon 2/	0.0	0.0
Honduras	120.4	3.2
Hungary	16.9	0.4
Mexico	62.8	1.6
Morocco	5.8	0.2
Tanzania 3/	4.0	0.1
Total	324.7	8.5
III. Committed debt relief on some, but not all, claims on HIPCs: 4/		
Argentina 5/	4.7	0.1
Algeria	234.4	6.1
China	345.2	9.0
Costa Rica	467.8	12.2
Cuba	2.7	0.1
Czech Republic	6.6	0.2
Egypt	11.9	0.3
Guatemala 6/	444.6	11.6
India 7/	36.9	1.0
Kuwait	370.2	9.7
Oman	27.7	0.7
Pakistan	1.5	0.0
Poland	19.2	0.5
Republic of Korea	6.6	0.2
Rwanda 8/	0.9	0.0
Saudi Arabia	242.2	6.3
United Arab Emirates	104.9	2.7
Venezuela	68.0	1.8
Total	2,395.8	62.7
IV. Not yet committed to deliver HIPC relief: 9/		
Angola	36.1	0.9
Burundi	1.3	0.0
Cape Verde 2/	0.2	0.0
Colombia	4.5	0.1
Congo, Dem. Rep. of the 2/	0.4	0.0
Cote d'Ivoire	12.1	0.3
Former Yugoslavia	109.7	2.9
Iran	66.9	1.8
Iraq	105.3	2.8
Israel 1/	15.8	0.4
Libya 10/	275.3	7.2
Namibia	0.6	0.0
Niger 3/	0.3	0.0
Nigeria	2.0	0.1
People's Democratic Republic of Korea	3.7	0.1
Peru	9.3	0.2
Romania	42.1	1.1
Senegal 2/	0.0	0.0
Taiwan Province of China	374.1	9.8
Thailand	0.5	0.0
Togo 2/	0.0	0.0
Zambia 2/	0.2	0.0
Zimbabwe 2/	0.1	0.0
Other 11/	1.6	0.0
Total	1,062.2	27.8
Grand Total (I+II+III+IV)	3,820.5	100.0

Sources: HIPC country documents, country authorities; and staff estimates.

1/ Some claims have been dealt with in the context of the Paris Club.

2/ Total claims are less than \$0.5 million.

3/ Claims on Uganda are under dispute. Therefore, Tanzania has been moved from category I to category II.

4/ In many cases, commitments to provide relief may only materialize at the completion point of the debtor countries.

5/ Recent information indicates that no agreement could be reached in the debt relief negotiations between Argentina and Guyana. Hence, Argentina has been moved from category II to category III.

6/ Guatemala's claims on Nicaragua were taken over by Spain in a debt swap. Spain has agreed to provide HIPC relief to Nicaragua on those claims.

7/ In June 2003, India announced its intention to write off all non-export credit claims on HIPCs. However, most bilateral agreements have not yet been finalized or signed.

8/ Rwanda has provided relief to Uganda, but has not yet agreed to provide HIPC relief on its claim on the Congo, Dem. Rep.

9/ Including countries which have not provided any information to the World Bank and the IMF.

10/ Libya was moved from Category II to IV as a result of a recent letter to the IMF, indicating Libya's intention to withdraw its participation from the Initiative due to insufficient support for ratification.

11/ These include: Ecuador, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay.

Table 11A. Summary Debt Service for the 29 HIPCs that Reached the Decision Point

(In millions of US dollars, unless otherwise indicated)

	Average		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	1998-99	2000-01							
				Actual		Preliminary		Projected	
African Countries 1/									
Debt service paid	2,541.8	2,027.3	1,669.9	2,141.2	2,599.2				
Total debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 2/						2,806.5	2,660.7	2,634.2	2,578.7
Ratio of debt service to exports (in percent) 3/	15.2	11.1	7.9	8.5	8.1	7.4	6.2	5.9	5.6
Ratio of debt service to government revenue (in percent) 3/	23.5	18.6	12.7	13.0	13.4	11.9	10.2	9.4	8.5
Ratio of debt service to GDP (in percent) 3/	3.2	2.5	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.5
Latin American Countries									
Debt service paid	895.8	679.9	706.7	757.8	644.0				
Total debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 2/						618.5	743.5	699.5	724.3
Ratio of debt service to exports (in percent) 3/	17.1	11.8	12.0	11.6	8.0	6.9	7.7	7.0	6.9
Ratio of debt service to government revenue (in percent) 3/	23.8	17.2	18.0	18.5	13.5	10.9	12.2	11.0	10.8
Ratio of debt service to GDP (in percent) 3/	5.5	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.5
Total (29 countries)									
Debt service paid	3,437.6	2,707.2	2,376.6	2,899.0	3,243.2				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 2/						3,425.0	3,404.3	3,333.7	3,302.9
Weighted average (29 countries)									
Debt service/exports (in percent)	15.7	11.2	8.8	9.1	8.1	7.3	6.5	6.1	5.9
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	23.5	18.2	13.9	14.1	13.4	11.7	10.6	9.7	8.9
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	3.6	2.7	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.7

Sources: HIPC country documents; and World Bank and IMF staff estimates.

1/ Data is not available for all countries for all years. The following data are missing: Burundi for 1998-99, Democratic Republic of Congo, for 2000-01, and Republic of Congo, for 1998-2002.

2/ The debt service figures for 2000 largely reflect pre-HIPC relief debt service because many countries did not reach their decision point until late in 2000 or later. Thus, the full impact of relief for them will not be felt until 2001 and thereafter. See Table 5 for a detailed breakdown.

3/ Weighted averages.

Note: Debt service figures for 1998 and 1999 reflect debt relief already provided to Bolivia, Guyana, Mozambique and Uganda under the original framework.

Table 11B. Debt Service for the 29 HIPCs that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1998-2008
(In millions of US dollars, unless otherwise indicated)

	Average		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	1998-99	2000-01							
	Actual				Preliminary	Projected			
Benin									
Debt service paid	65.1	45.4	35.7	32.5	35.8				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						36.2	40.3	43.4	42.2
Debt service/exports (in percent)	16.6	11.8	9.5	8.0	7.6	6.3	7.2	6.8	6.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	17.2	12.0	7.8	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.4	4.8
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.8	1.9	1.3	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8
Bolivia									
Debt service paid	319.7	264.4	274.9	374.0	321.8				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						367.6	441.5	386.8	375.1
Debt service/exports (in percent)	23.8	17.7	17.6	20.0	12.6	12.4	13.9	12.7	12.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	15.9	14.3	16.3	22.3	15.3	13.5	15.3	12.8	11.7
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	3.8	3.2	3.5	4.6	3.7	3.8	4.2	3.4	3.2
Burkina Faso 2/									
Debt service paid	58.9	41.6	33.5	48.9	45.7				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						40.3	46.6	53.2	54.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	20.8	16.9	11.3	12.8	9.1	7.8	8.1	8.4	8.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	15.7	13.4	8.1	8.7	6.5	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.4
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.1	1.5	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
Burundi 3/									
Debt service paid	...	18.1	25.1	27.8	70.4				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						24.7	10.5	4.6	5.0
Debt service/exports (in percent)	...	35.8	65.0	50.4	119.4	34.2	13.1	5.4	5.6
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	...	14.2	22.7	22.3	53.2	14.7	6.0	2.3	2.3
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	...	2.6	4.0	4.7	10.6	3.1	1.1	0.4	0.4
Cameroon 3/									
Debt service paid	401.0	300.3	240.4	284.8	259.1				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/ 5/						406.5	305.8	329.8	303.2
Debt service/exports (in percent)	16.3	11.0	8.8	8.8	7.1	9.8	6.9	7.8	7.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	26.0	17.7	13.6	13.0	10.8	14.1	9.9	10.6	9.4
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	4.2	3.3	2.2	2.1	1.6	2.4	1.8	1.8	1.6
Chad 3/									
Debt service paid	27.8	22.5	32.7	37.0	40.3				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						59.3	39.2	40.3	52.2
Debt service/exports (in percent)	10.1	9.4	12.9	5.5	1.8	1.9	1.1	1.1	1.6
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	22.0	19.8	19.2	16.2	10.1	11.5	6.4	6.1	7.0
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.1	1.5	1.7	1.4	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.6	0.8
Democratic Republic of Congo 3/									
Debt service paid	1.9	...	34.2	125.8	94.5				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						148.3	200.7	206.5	222.5
Debt service/exports (in percent)	0.2	...	2.9	8.5	4.8	6.6	7.4	7.2	7.5
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	0.9	...	8.2	21.0	14.0	11.3	11.5	11.4	11.4
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	0.0	...	0.6	2.2	1.5	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.3
Congo, Rep. of 3/									
Debt service paid	365.7	539.6				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						650.9	632.0	529.2	359.4
Debt service/exports (in percent)	12.9	14.7	12.6	11.4	10.5	7.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	35.1	38.6	27.7	25.0	23.4	15.2
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	10.2	12.4	10.9	10.4	8.9	5.8
Ethiopia 3/									
Debt service paid	114.0	154.0	108.4	82.9	94.7				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						73.5	103.5	109.4	121.6
Debt service/exports (in percent)	11.8	15.7	11.0	7.3	6.3	4.0	4.7	4.4	4.4
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	9.8	12.9	8.9	5.1	5.3	3.1	4.3	4.0	4.4
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	1.8	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
Gambia, The 3/									
Debt service paid	22.9	18.7	26.1	12.2	28.5				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						24.6	34.2	23.6	21.2
Debt service/exports (in percent)	13.7	17.8	23.9	12.0	23.2	18.0	22.2	14.1	11.9
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	18.9	26.5	43.2	22.0	33.6	26.7	32.8	21.6	18.7
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	5.4	4.5	7.0	3.5	7.1	5.4	7.0	4.6	4.0
Ghana 3/									
Debt service paid	540.8	406.9	266.8	160.9	195.0				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						174.8	102.9	151.0	175.4
Debt service/exports (in percent)	21.6	16.8	10.2	5.2	5.6	4.5	2.6	3.8	4.1
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	47.2	54.0	25.6	10.4	9.3	6.9	4.3	5.7	6.0
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	7.1	8.0	4.3	2.1	2.2	1.6	0.9	1.2	1.3
Guinea 3/									
Debt service paid	129.9	83.6	76.2	68.3	61.5				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						99.6	137.3	148.0	127.3
Debt service/exports (in percent)	16.5	11.0	9.7	8.5	7.5	11.1	14.2	15.0	12.1
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	34.4	24.5	19.7	18.0	14.9	23.5	31.9	30.7	24.3
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	3.7	2.7	2.4	1.9	1.5	3.0	4.3	4.3	3.4

Table 11B (continued). Debt Service for the 29 HIPC's that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1998-2008
(In million of US dollars, unless otherwise indicated)

	Average		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	1998-99	2000-01							
				Actual	Preliminary		Projected		
Guinea-Bissau 3/									
Debt service paid	6.5	6.8	1.9	5.1	5.6				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						61.8	33.6	32.1	28.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	17.1	9.9	3.2	7.1	5.5	52.7	26.6	23.5	19.5
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	39.0	16.4	6.2	14.1	12.1	108.7	56.3	52.2	44.3
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	3.1	3.1	1.0	2.1	2.1	21.5	11.6	10.5	8.9
Guyana 3/									
Debt service paid	100.4	53.7	58.4	48.9	44.2				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						24.2	29.6	32.0	37.5
Debt service/exports (in percent)	14.7	8.0	8.7	7.3	5.9	3.4	3.9	4.0	4.5
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	50.2	23.8	25.0	20.9	17.1	9.0	10.2	10.2	11.3
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	14.1	7.5	8.0	6.6	5.6	3.1	3.6	3.6	4.0
Honduras 3/									
Debt service paid	275.5	192.8	215.5	236.6	201.7				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						130.8	144.5	149.0	165.0
Debt service/exports (in percent)	11.6	7.8	8.6	8.8	6.5	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.1
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	27.3	17.6	17.9	18.4	13.9	8.3	8.5	8.3	8.6
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	5.2	3.1	3.3	3.4	2.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7
Madagascar 3/									
Debt service paid	136.2	54.9	50.5	53.6	62.7				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						52.5	68.0	79.7	90.1
Debt service/exports (in percent)	16.1	4.4	6.9	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.7	5.1	5.3
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	33.4	11.8	14.3	9.3	11.9	10.3	11.4	11.5	11.5
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	3.6	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.4	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.5
Malawi 3/									
Debt service paid	77.3	87.0	55.5	107.5	69.2				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						67.6	80.2	67.2	51.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	14.3	18.9	11.8	22.4	13.5	12.2	13.4	10.8	8.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	21.2	30.9	18.6	28.6	17.3	14.6	16.6	12.7	9.1
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	4.4	5.1	2.9	6.1	3.6	3.3	3.7	2.9	2.1
Mali 2/									
Debt service paid	78.8	80.6	67.3	67.2	78.2				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						98.3	106.0	110.0	109.5
Debt service/exports (in percent)	11.9	10.9	6.3	5.8	6.4	7.5	6.9	6.4	6.0
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	18.5	21.8	11.9	8.8	9.3	11.7	11.2	10.5	9.4
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.9	2.8	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.7
Mauritania 2/									
Debt service paid	84.7	66.9	43.7	35.8	41.3				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						50.6	61.5	58.7	67.1
Debt service/exports (in percent)	22.2	17.7	11.5	10.9	9.6	7.9	3.3	3.0	3.1
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	32.7	25.8	10.9	9.1	9.2	10.2	8.1	6.9	5.9
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	9.2	6.2	3.9	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.0	1.7	1.7
Mozambique									
Debt service paid	82.1	22.5	62.0	71.8	57.9				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						80.8	85.4	98.8	103.4
Debt service/exports (in percent)	25.2	2.6	5.2	5.3	3.2	3.9	3.7	4.2	4.3
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	17.7	4.8	12.2	11.6	7.8	8.9	8.6	8.6	8.1
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.0	0.6	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2
Nicaragua 3/									
Debt service paid	200.2	169.0	158.0	98.3	76.3				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						95.9	127.9	131.7	146.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	24.1	15.2	13.8	7.5	4.6	5.1	6.0	5.7	5.8
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	36.5	21.7	19.6	11.1	7.9	8.6	10.8	10.7	11.4
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	11.5	4.2	3.9	2.4	1.7	1.9	2.4	2.4	2.6
Niger 3/									
Debt service paid	17.9	28.3	53.0	27.1	22.7				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						32.4	36.6	38.4	40.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	5.4	10.1	17.5	6.4	4.6	5.9	6.7	6.3	6.2
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	9.8	16.7	23.0	9.3	6.4	9.6	9.7	8.8	8.1
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	1.1	1.5	2.4	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4
Rwanda 3/									
Debt service paid	27.5	29.7	15.9	15.5	18.5				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						10.5	10.6	11.9	12.5
Debt service/exports (in percent)	34.5	19.5	12.0	11.1	9.8	5.2	4.7	4.7	4.5
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	19.5	17.6	8.1	7.2	7.1	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.2	1.7	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5

Table 11B (concluded). Debt Service for the 29 HIPCs that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1998-2008
(In million of US dollars, unless otherwise indicated)

	Average		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
	1998-99	2000-01							
	Actual				Preliminary		Projected		
São Tomé and Príncipe 3/									
Debt service paid	4.3	2.1	1.7	3.2	2.3				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						6.3	4.7	3.4	3.4
Debt service/exports (in percent)	33.4	13.0	9.0	15.2	11.6	29.3	19.1	12.4	11.4
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	52.8	22.6	13.5	21.1	13.2	33.3	21.9	14.1	12.9
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	10.2	4.5	3.1	5.3	3.6	8.9	6.7	4.4	4.0
Senegal 4/									
Debt service paid	192.5	147.3	145.6	159.6	160.8				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						171.9	164.2	153.0	165.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	13.5	10.9	9.5	8.7	7.6	7.6	7.2	6.4	6.6
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	24.0	18.6	14.1	11.8	10.1	10.7	9.6	8.4	8.5
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	4.0	3.3	2.9	2.5	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.7
Sierra Leone									
Debt service paid	22.7	73.5	21.0	14.3	24.5				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						26.5	23.7	7.8	16.0
Debt service/exports (in percent)	24.5	59.4	0.0	7.2	10.2	9.2	6.4	1.8	3.3
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	47.8	77.9	19.2	12.7	19.6	18.5	14.7	4.1	7.2
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	3.4	10.0	2.2	1.4	2.3	2.2	1.8	0.5	1.0
Tanzania 5/									
Debt service paid	208.5	123.2	90.3	83.2	121.7				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						124.5	108.5	101.7	158.0
Debt service/exports (in percent)	18.5	9.3	6.0	4.8	6.4	4.9	3.9	3.3	4.9
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	24.4	12.2	8.0	6.8	9.0	8.2	5.7	4.7	6.6
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	2.5	1.3	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.9
Uganda									
Debt service paid	104.0	72.9	59.7	61.7	97.8				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						118.4	123.9	124.8	99.5
Debt service/exports (in percent)	13.4	10.9	8.5	8.0	10.0	10.3	9.7	8.6	6.4
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	14.5	10.9	8.6	8.6	10.5	10.6	10.6	9.3	6.6
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	1.7	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	0.9
Zambia 3/									
Debt service paid	136.7	140.6	122.7	189.1	370.8				
Debt service due after enhanced HIPC Initiative relief 1/						165.8	100.8	107.7	147.7
Debt service/exports (in percent)	15.5	14.7	11.4	15.2	18.2	7.0	3.9	3.8	5.3
Debt service/government revenue (in percent)	23.6	24.8	18.2	24.4	37.3	13.3	7.1	6.9	8.6
Debt service/GDP (in percent)	4.3	4.1	3.3	4.4	6.8	2.4	1.2	1.2	1.5
Total debt service paid	3437.6	2707.2	2376.6	2899.0	3243.2				
Total debt service due						3425.0	3404.3	3333.7	3302.9
Ratio of debt service to exports (in percent)									
Simple average	17.3	15.1	12.4	10.9	12.3	10.7	8.5	7.3	6.8
Weighted average	15.7	11.2	8.8	9.1	8.1	7.3	6.5	6.1	5.9
Ratio of debt service to government revenue (in percent)									
Simple average	26.0	21.7	15.8	14.9	15.1	15.9	13.2	11.4	10.4
Weighted average	23.5	18.2	13.9	14.1	13.4	11.7	10.6	9.7	8.9
Ratio of debt service to GDP (in percent)									
Simple average	4.4	3.4	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.2
Weighted average	3.6	2.7	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.7

Sources: HIPC country documents; and World Bank and IMF staff estimates.

1/ Debt service due after the full use of traditional debt relief mechanism and assistance under the enhanced HIPC Initiative. For the completion point countries, these figures are also after additional bilateral assistance beyond HIPC.

2/ Debt service data have been revised from 2000 according to new information from the authorities.

3/ The debt service figures for 2000 largely reflect pre-HIPC relief debt service because these countries did not reach their decision point until late in 2000 or later. Thus, the full impact of relief for them did not take effect until 2001 and thereafter.

4/ The source for debt service data has changed from the Debt Office to the Treasury, and accordingly the data series have been revised from 2000-08.

5/ Debt service reflects some payments to commercial creditors and payments on moratorium interest not reflected in the completion point document.

Table 12A. Summary of Poverty-Reducing Expenditure by the 29 Countries that have Reached the Decision Point

	1999	2000-01	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
		Average		Actual		Preliminary		Projected	
<i>(In millions of US dollars)</i>									
Poverty-reducing expenditure 1/									
African Countries	4,140	4,466	5,491	7,077	8,333	10,776	12,114	13,273	13,978
Latin American Countries	1,800	1,963	2,055	2,074	2,378	2,717	3,000	3,174	3,369
Total	5,940	6,428	7,546	9,151	10,712	13,493	15,113	16,446	17,347
<i>(In percent)</i>									
Ratio of poverty-reducing expenditure to government revenue 2/									
African Countries	38.6	40.4	41.9	43.1	43.0	45.7	46.7	47.5	46.0
Latin American Countries	47.6	49.6	52.3	50.7	49.8	47.9	49.4	49.7	50.0
Total	40.9	42.7	44.3	44.6	44.3	46.1	47.2	48.0	46.7
Ratio of poverty-reducing expenditure to GDP 2/									
African Countries	5.5	5.6	6.1	6.8	7.0	8.0	8.3	8.4	8.3
Latin American Countries	10.8	10.2	10.7	10.4	11.0	11.5	11.7	11.8	11.8
Total	6.4	6.5	6.9	7.4	7.6	8.5	8.8	8.9	8.8

Sources: HIPC country documents; and World Bank and IMF staff estimates.

1/ Data are not available for all countries, for all years. The following data are missing: Burundi for 1999, Democratic Republic of Congo for 1999-2001, Republic of Congo, for 1999-2002, and 2005-10; Guinea-Bissau for 1999-2001, Sierra Leone for 1999, and São Tomé and Príncipe for 2000. No data replacement methodology was applied. The coverage of poverty-reducing expenditure varies across countries, but is generally consistent with the definition in the PRSP and the budget. In some countries, the definition of poverty-reducing expenditures has evolved over time to include more sectors; therefore, some of the increase in such spending over the 1999-2003 period may reflect changes in the definition.

2/ Weighted averages.

Table 12B. Poverty-Reducing Expenditure by the 29 HPCs that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1999-2008 1/
(In millions of US dollars)

	1999	2000-01 Average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
			Actual			Preliminary		Projections	
Benin									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/	114.5	135.6	162.2	153.1	165.8	199.0	222.4	247.1	288.2
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	30.0	35.6	35.4	25.3	24.9	29.3	30.0	31.0	33.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.8	5.5	5.8	4.3	4.1	4.5	5.0	5.1	5.5
Bolivia									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 4/	882.0	944.6	1,018.9	941.6	1,041.3	1,172.0	1,288.7	1,378.0	1,457.2
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 5/	44.8	51.3	60.4	56.1	49.5	43.1	44.6	45.4	45.4
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	10.7	11.4	12.8	11.6	11.9	12.0	12.2	12.3	12.3
Burkina Faso									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 6/ 7/	113.8	116.7	156.8	201.1	274.8	331.0	344.0	380.7	422.1
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	29.6	37.6	37.8	35.6	39.0	48.1	43.8	42.4	42.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.0	4.2	4.8	4.7	5.3	5.8	5.9	6.0	6.1
Burundi									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 8/	...	27.5	27.1	29.0	33.5	25.2	28.5	30.7	33.1
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	...	21.6	24.6	23.3	25.3	14.9	16.2	15.4	15.2
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	...	4.0	4.3	4.9	5.0	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.8
Cameroon									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/	264.0	311.2	365.0	489.0	499.6	533.3	581.4	629.6	...
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	15.8	18.2	20.7	22.3	20.8	18.5	18.8	20.3	...
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.5	...
Chad									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 9/	63.0	63.4	84.8	113.0	132.4	279.5	330.3	361.5	378.5
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	50.0	54.2	49.7	49.5	33.3	54.5	53.7	54.9	51.1
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.2	3.1	5.1	5.5	5.8	6.1
Democratic Republic of Congo									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 10/	26.2	85.2	130.2	142.6	279.5	426.3	690.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	6.3	14.2	19.3	10.9	16.0	23.4	35.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	0.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	3.3	4.7	7.1
Congo, Republic of									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 11/	143.8	193.7
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	13.8	13.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.0	4.5
Ethiopia									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 12/	710.0	671.5	884.1	1,001.4	1,180.4	1,619.8	2,172.5	2,290.4	2,457.5
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 5/	61.0	54.9	72.6	61.9	65.9	68.3	89.9	83.9	88.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	11.0	9.3	12.1	12.6	12.1	14.5	17.0	17.0	17.0
The Gambia									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 13/	23.5	20.2	18.4	16.3	21.5	17.6	24.2	38.3	46.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	30.2	29.2	30.5	29.5	25.3	19.1	23.3	35.0	41.1
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	5.4	4.9	5.0	4.6	5.4	3.8	5.0	7.5	8.7
Ghana									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 14/	344.8	212.8	276.1	483.3	676.2	878.3	869.4	1,036.1	1,152.9
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	35.3	38.7	26.5	31.1	32.2	34.6	36.4	39.0	39.4
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.4	5.8	4.4	6.3	7.6	8.2	7.7	8.5	8.7
Guinea									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 15/	85.1	91.4	131.5	121.9	116.3	114.4	107.9	123.2	139.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	22.8	25.7	34.0	32.1	28.2	27.0	25.0	25.6	26.7
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	2.5	2.9	4.1	3.4	2.9	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.7
Guinea-Bissau									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/	6.4	7.3	9.4	15.4	15.4	16.1	17.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	20.6	20.3	20.3	27.1	25.8	26.3	26.2
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	3.1	3.1	3.5	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.3
Guyana									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 16/	87.0	133.6	134.4	127.6	133.6	147.7	165.4	176.0	187.5
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	43.6	56.9	57.6	54.4	51.7	54.8	57.2	56.4	56.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	12.5	16.9	18.5	17.1	17.0	18.9	20.1	20.1	20.1
Honduras									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 17/	487.7	529.1	493.5	520.8	616.8	744.0	837.9	877.1	940.2
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	46.9	52.4	40.9	40.5	42.5	47.4	49.0	48.8	49.1
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	9.0	9.5	7.5	7.5	8.3	9.1	9.4	9.4	9.4
Madagascar									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/	156.0	188.2	190.9	202.9	134.5	205.7	216.0	223.6	233.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	36.7	40.7	54.3	35.4	25.6	40.4	36.3	32.3	29.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.2	4.5	4.2	3.7	3.1	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.9
Malawi									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 18/	208.0	148.0	190.0	194.0	218.8	270.9	331.5	340.8	363.7
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	66.1	52.6	63.7	51.7	54.6	58.6	68.7	64.7	64.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	11.5	8.6	9.8	11.0	11.5	13.1	15.4	14.9	14.6

Table 12B (concluded). Poverty Reducing Expenditure by the 29 HIPC countries that have Reached the Decision Point, by Country, 1999-2007
(In millions of US dollars)

	1999	2000-01 Average	2002 Actual	2003	2004	2005 Preliminary	2006 Projections	2007 Projections	2008
Mali									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 18/	103.4	149.2	190.0	322.5	367.4	400.3	411.7	453.0	459.6
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	24.3	40.3	33.5	42.0	43.7	47.5	43.4	43.0	39.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	3.8	5.2	5.7	7.3	7.0	7.9	7.7	7.7	7.2
Mauritania									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 19/	85.0	74.5	105.0	214.2	179.0	129.2	173.0	208.5	235.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 20/	34.7	29.5	26.2	54.6	40.0	26.1	22.8	24.6	20.6
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	9.0	6.8	9.4	16.0	11.8	6.7	5.5	5.9	6.0
Mozambique									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 21/	543.0	676.6	647.4	762.7	842.9	1,119.1	1,220.5	1,259.7	1,347.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	52.8	144.4	127.1	123.3	113.0	122.6	122.4	109.5	105.5
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	6.3	18.2	15.8	15.9	14.3	16.7	17.6	16.6	16.2
Nicaragua									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 22/	342.9	355.4	408.2	483.6	586.7	652.8	707.5	742.5	783.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 5/	60.1	45.8	50.7	54.4	60.7	58.8	59.7	60.0	61.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	15.5	8.8	10.1	11.7	12.9	13.2	13.5	13.6	13.9
Niger									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/	104.4	100.8	125.9	142.0	177.7	183.1	188.1	192.3	200.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	58.2	60.6	54.5	49.0	50.0	54.2	49.9	43.9	39.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	5.1	5.4	5.8	5.2	5.9	6.1	6.5	6.6	6.7
Rwanda									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 23/	75.2	81.5	107.8	115.4	137.0	196.5	247.7	267.7	302.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	39.5	46.7	54.8	53.9	52.8	61.9	76.9	76.9	80.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	3.9	4.7	6.2	6.9	7.5	9.2	10.6	10.8	11.5
São Tomé and Príncipe									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 18/	8.0	10.0	10.4	15.8	14.3	20.3	22.1	24.3	26.9
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	87.8	103.2	84.0	105.6	81.0	107.4	102.5	100.2	101.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	17.0	21.1	19.4	26.7	22.3	28.8	31.1	31.2	31.4
Senegal									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/	254.3	271.1	313.2	456.3	622.2	700.7	734.4	773.5	828.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	30.8	34.0	30.4	33.8	39.2	43.8	43.1	42.4	42.4
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	5.3	6.0	6.3	7.1	8.1	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.4
Sierra Leone									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 2/ 24/	...	30.1	57.4	59.7	49.8	56.8	65.0	103.1	132.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	...	31.9	52.7	53.2	39.9	39.8	40.4	54.4	60.0
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	...	4.1	6.1	6.0	4.7	4.8	4.9	6.9	7.9
Tanzania									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 25/	412.3	561.7	825.3	977.5	1,130.2	1,479.4	1,646.2	1,831.9	2,038.6
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	42.8	54.3	72.8	80.2	83.4	97.2	86.0	85.1	84.9
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	4.8	6.1	8.8	9.7	10.6	12.2	12.1	11.7	11.8
Uganda									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 26/	306.0	423.7	553.1	724.8	914.7	1,039.7	1,004.4	1,017.9	1,072.8
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	40.4	63.9	79.3	101.3	98.0	92.9	85.8	75.9	71.4
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	5.3	7.3	9.5	11.6	13.4	11.9	10.7	10.3	10.0
Zambia									
Poverty-reducing Expenditure 27/	166.0	100.3	35.7	44.9	111.0	818.5	877.8	996.5	1,110.3
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/Government Revenue (in percent) 3/	30.1	19.4	5.3	5.8	11.2	65.9	61.6	64.0	64.7
Poverty-reducing Expenditure/GDP (in percent)	5.3	3.0	0.9	1.0	2.0	11.8	10.7	11.2	11.6
Total Poverty-reducing expenditure 28/	5,939.9	6,428.2	7,545.8	9,150.8	10,711.7	13,492.6	15,113.4	16,446.5	17,347.2
Ratio of Poverty-reducing expenditure to government revenue									
Simple average	42.3	47.3	46.7	46.7	44.3	50.5	51.1	50.9	50.5
Weighted average	40.9	42.7	44.3	44.6	44.3	46.1	47.2	48.0	46.7
Ratio of Poverty-reducing expenditure to GDP									
Simple average	7.0	7.3	7.4	8.0	8.0	9.1	9.5	9.7	9.8
Weighted average	6.4	6.5	6.9	7.4	7.6	8.5	8.8	8.9	8.8

Sources: HIPC country documents; and staff estimates. 1.87 2.4 3.18 3.16 3.30 3.94 4.44 4.93 5.25

- 1/ The coverage of Poverty-Reducing Expenditures varies across countries, but is generally consistent with the definition in the PRSP and the budget.
- In some countries, the definition of Poverty-Reducing Expenditures has evolved over time to include more sectors; therefore, some of the increase in such spending over the 1999-2003 period may reflect changes in the definition.
- 2/ Data refer to health and education spending.
- 3/ Level of government is central government.
- 4/ Refers to poverty related spending by the public sector. Includes spending on health, education, basic sanitation, and selected urban and rural development, both current and capital. Excludes education spending at the university level, pension contributions, and health and education spending by the Ministry of Defense.
- 5/ Level of government includes central, local, and public enterprises.
- 6/ There have been recent revisions in classification.
- 7/ Includes current and capital expenditure on health, education, rural roads, promotion of women, employment and youth, water resources, environment, justice and communication.
- 8/ Refers to education, health, reinsertion conflict affected victims and other social sectors.
- 9/ Domestically-financed government spending in health, education, rural development, infrastructure, and good governance.
- 10/ For 2003 and 2004, social expenditure definition reflects the I-PRSP objectives and uses the new pro-poor definition, which includes infrastructures. Projections for 2006-09 are based on HIPC assistance projected.
- 11/ Pro-poor spending, including on health, education, infrastructure, electricity and water, social protection, and disarmament, demobilization and reinsertion of former combatants.
- 12/ Poverty-related spending, including health, education, agriculture, and rural road.
- 13/ Spending on education, health and agriculture.
- 14/ Spending on basic education, primary health care, poverty-focused agriculture and infrastructure.
- 15/ Expenditure in health and education during 1999-2001. Expenditure in health, education, transport, road maintenance, justice, rural development, urban planning, and social affairs from 2002.
- 16/ Spending on health and education. For 2003-05 and projections, poverty reducing expenditure includes infrastructure.
- 17/ Spending on education, health, water and sanitation, rural infrastructure, and social safety projects.
- 18/ Education and health sectors, as well as funding for social safety nets.
- 19/ Spending on education, health, and poverty reduction programs.
- 20/ Level of government includes central and local.
- 21/ Includes expenditures on health, education, HIV, roads, sanitation, public works, governance and judicial system, agriculture and rural development, and other.
- 22/ Spending on education, health, rural infrastructure and food assistance.
- 23/ Spending on health and education expenditure. Relevant capital expenditures included from 2002, and spending on energy development from 2005.
- 24/ The 2003 figure was a projection and was revised reflecting the receipt of actual data.
- 25/ Spending on education, health, water, agricultural research and extension, land, roads, and the judiciary.
- 26/ Spending on education, health, roads, agriculture, water, and public order. Including spending out of the Poverty Action Fund.
- 27/ Beginning in 2005, the definition of PRSPs was broadened to include spending on basic health and education. During 2001-04 figures reflect poverty reducing priorities (mostly investment projects) financed by HIPC relief.
- 28/ For countries without projections, the last available data are used in the aggregate total for future years, thus understating the likely level of social spending.