



# Energizing Poverty Reduction

A Review of the Energy-Poverty Nexus in  
Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

**The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)** is the UN's global development network, advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience, and resources to help people build a better life. We are on the ground in 166 countries, working with them on their own solutions to global and national development challenges. As they develop local capacity, they draw on the people of UNDP and our wide range of partners.

World leaders have pledged to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, including the overarching goal of cutting poverty in half by 2015. UNDP's network links and coordinates global and national efforts to reach these Goals. Our focus is helping countries build and share solutions to the challenges of:

- Democratic Governance
- Poverty Reduction
- Crisis Prevention and Recovery
- Energy and Environment
- HIV/AIDS

UNDP helps developing countries attract and use aid effectively. In all our activities, we encourage the protection of human rights and the empowerment of women.

# Energizing Poverty Reduction

## A Review of the Energy-Poverty Nexus in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

Lead authors:

Minoru Takada

Ndika Akong Charles

Report editors:

*Editorial support:* Jem Porcaro and Maria Salazar

*Copy editor:* Leslie Berke and Karen Holmes

*Technical support:* Silvia Fracchia

March 2007

Copyright © UNDP 2007  
All rights reserved

United Nations Development Programme  
One United Nations Plaza  
New York, NY 10017

March 2007

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent those of the member countries of the UNDP Executive Board or of those institutions of the United Nations system that are mentioned herein. The designations and terminology employed and the presentation of material do not imply any expression or opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or of its frontiers or boundaries.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Key Global Findings</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. Africa</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5. Asia</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>6. Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>7. Latin America</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	
<b>Annex 1. Terms of Reference</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Annex 2. Matrix of Analysis</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Annex 3. Status of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Annex 4. Individual Country Analysis</b>	<b>46</b>

## FOREWORD

The way in which energy services are produced and consumed has important economic, social, and environmental implications for all of humanity. The availability of energy services has a distinct impact on the lives of the poor, and women in particular, as energy is essential for meeting the most basic human needs—such as lighting, pumping water, cooking without harmful smoke, or using mechanical power for productive uses. Energy is also critical in how it impacts the environment, especially as our use of fossil-fuels contributes to three-quarters of human-originated greenhouse gas emissions, and hence climate change. Indeed, none of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) can be achieved without addressing key dimensions of energy issues simultaneously: accessibility, security, and sustainability.

UNDP has been at the forefront in supporting countries to fully incorporate the MDGs into their development frameworks and is fully committed to working on energy for sustainable development as a prerequisite for achieving the MDGs. This publication, *Energizing Poverty Reduction: A Review of the Energy-Poverty Nexus in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers*, is part of this focus.

This report examines to what degree energy-poverty dynamics are reflected in the current policies and plans set forth in poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs). While energy's significance to national development is generally recognized in many development strategies, the concept stops short at the operational-level, where the linkages between energy and a variety of development impacts are not fully realized. This publication reveals an apparent lack of energy targets and a low level of energy investments in the Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks of PRSPs, indicating that too many countries could fall short of delivering the energy services required to reach the MDGs.

Yet, we have some good examples to draw from. For instance, in 2006 the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) resolved to integrate energy access goals in national and regional development strategies. More importantly, this action has stimulated policy debates to scale-up and accelerate national efforts for integrating energy access considerations into MDG-based poverty reduction strategies. ECOWAS has also set a target to increase energy access fourfold in the region by the year 2015.

Change is possible. With political commitment articulated in terms of national energy access targets and investments, we can achieve dramatic improvements in the provision of energy services for the poor. With the current cycle of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD-15) focusing on energy for sustainable development as one of its core themes, we have a renewed opportunity to strengthen action to expand energy access for poverty reduction. We hope this publication illustrates the need to integrate energy into national development plans so that energy services can be delivered to those who currently have no access to clean cooking fuels, motive power or electricity.



Olav Kjørven  
Assistant Administrator and Director  
Bureau for Development Policy  
United Nations Development Programme

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This publication benefited greatly from the valuable contributions and collaborative efforts of many people, starting with the editors and authors, as well as the numerous staff working on sustainable energy in the Bureau for Development Policy of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

UNDP is very grateful to Minoru Takada (UNDP, New York), who served as the principal editor and co-author of the publication, as well as co-author Ndika Akong Charles (UNDP consultant), who skilfully led the drafting of the publication and the analysis contained herein. UNDP also thanks Jem Porcaro (UNDP, New York), Maria Salazar (UNDP consultant) and Silvia Fracchia (UNDP consultant) for their continuous help in developing and refining the publication. We are also very grateful to Leslie Berke and Karen Holmes for their excellent work in copy-editing the publication.

The publication was subjected to a rigorous process of peer review. In addition to being reviewed internally among a network of some 100 UNDP staff working on energy and the environmental issues at the global, regional and country levels, the draft version of this publication was also shared externally on at least two occasions, the first being an Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) meeting of energy ministers in October 2005, the other being the 14<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD 14) held in New York in May 2006. The publication benefited significantly from the feedback received from external partners at both international conferences.

Coordination for this project was provided by Minoru Takada, Manager of UNDP's Sustainable Energy Programme. We are grateful for his considerable time and effort in producing this publication.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

At the 2005 World Summit, governments of all nations resolved to implement comprehensive national development strategies to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).<sup>1</sup> To do so will involve looking beyond yearly or short-term economic plans and budgets, and placing greater emphasis on the types of long-term policies and investments needed to reduce poverty and hunger and promote health, education, gender equality, and environmental sustainability by 2015. While there are various forms of national development strategies, one of the most common in low-income developing countries is the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). The achievement of the MDGs will, therefore, depend heavily on how the MDGs are integrated in the development, implementation and monitoring of PRSPs.

As of late 2005, some 54 countries had prepared PRSPs, including 44 full PRSPs and 10 preliminary versions. The links between PRSPs and national plans to reach the MDGs are particularly significant for energy-related issues. Since no MDG directly references energy, the connections between energy and poverty reduction are perhaps most likely to become evident in the context of the PRSP development process.

Traditionally, energy has been seen as a single-sector, ‘hardware’-driven issue, with limited linkages between how energy services are delivered and the associated impacts on national development goals. All too often, national macroeconomic planning emphasises expansion of large-scale, centralised systems of *energy supply* (such as fossil fuel-fired electricity generation or large hydroelectric plants) rather than focusing on *expanded access to energy services* (such as fuel for household cooking or mechanical power for productive uses), which matters most to the poor. Many poor, rural communities lie well beyond the limits of a centralised electricity grid, and instead place much higher priority on replacing traditional fuels, such as wood or dung, with modern, cleaner-burning fuels, such as liquid petroleum gas (LPG).

Indeed, the importance of the links between energy and attainment of all of the MDGs is widely acknowledged, at least at the conceptual level. Increased access to modern, affordable energy services, especially for the poorest and most vulnerable groups in society, is absolutely central to sustainable poverty reduction as well as other improvements in education, health, and gender equality set forth in the MDGs. However, the operational implications of this broad, conceptual-level consensus on the energy-MDG nexus are not so clear.

If there is any indication of how the energy-MDG nexus is being dealt with at the national level, it is likely to emerge out of PRSPs. With this in mind, this report examines to what degree energy-poverty dynamics are reflected in the current policies and plans set forth in national poverty reduction strategies. Admittedly, other forms of national development strategies, other than PRSPs, exist and could be evaluated similarly. However, owing to their widespread use among the least developed countries (LDCs) and their emerging importance to the MDG agenda, this report focuses on PRSPs as a point of reference for its analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> The MDGs are global benchmarks of development progress, which set specific, time-bound targets for the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger (MDG 1); achievement of universal primary education (MDG 2); gender equality (MDG 3); reduction in child mortality and improving maternal health (MDGs 4 and 5); combating HIV/AIDS (MDG 6); ensuring environmental sustainability (MDG 7); and, developing global partnerships for development (MDG 8).

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This report is based on a desktop review of current, publicly accessible Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). Overall, 54 PRSPs were reviewed, including 44 full PRSPs and 10 interim PRSPs, which were publicly available at the time of this study (August 2005). PRSPs were sourced from the World Bank and IMF websites.<sup>2</sup>

The analysis was disaggregated by region, according to United Nations regional categories, as indicated in Table 2.1. More than half (30 of 54) of the PRSPs reviewed came from African countries, while the remainder originated from Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (10), Asia (9), and Latin America (5).

**Table 2.1 Status of PRSPs by Region**

Region	Status	
	Full	Interim
Africa	23	7
Asia	8	1
Eastern Europe/CIS	9	1
Latin America	4	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>10</b>

The approach used to evaluate the energy-related content of PRSPs borrows from that used in previous studies of environmental mainstreaming in PRSPs, most notably studies conducted at the World Bank (Bojö and Reddy 2002, 2003a, 2003b) and the WWF Macro-economics for Sustainable Development Program Office (Tharakan and MacDonald 2004). The review of PRSPs was conducted in two parts: Tier 1 featured quantitative comparisons of energy-related content across PRSPs, while Tier 2 consisted of qualitative analysis of this content.

### 2.1 Criteria for Assessment

In Tier 1, the treatment of energy-related topics in PRSPs was evaluated using 41 criteria (described in detail in Annex 1). These criteria fall into three broad categories: linking energy to national development goals; prioritising the needs of the poor in national energy strategies; and, budgeting for the energy needs of the poor in national strategies. Examples of criteria within the first category, linking energy to national development goals, include:

- links between energy and macroeconomic development;
- links between energy and income poverty;
- links between energy and social development goals, including health, education, and gender equality;
- links between energy and environmental sustainability, including deforestation, desertification, and global climate change; and,
- links between energy and international economic co-operation, including trade and debt sustainability.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/prsp.asp>,  
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EXTPRS/0>,

Examples of criteria in the second category, prioritising the needs of the poor in national energy strategies, include:

- priority given to energy issues important to the poor, such as household fuels for cooking and/or heating, management of traditional biomass fuels, and mechanical power for productive applications such as grinding grain;
- differentiated treatment of energy-related issues facing rural, urban, and peri-urban communities; and,
- setting of explicit targets for attainment of specific energy-related goals, such as percentage of population with access to modern energy services.

Some criteria within the third category, budgeting for the poor, include:

- existence of specific budgetary allocations for energy within the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF);
- budgetary allocation for energy, as a percentage of total MTEF resources; and,
- per capita allocation for energy within the MTEF.

Within Tier 1, these variables were scored quantitatively on a scale of 0 to 2, in which:

- 0 = little to no mention
- 1 = mentioned, but not elaborated on
- 2 = mentioned and elaborated on

In Tier 2 of the analysis, the same variables were assessed qualitatively, providing a detailed picture of the treatment of energy-related issues in individual PRSPs. The following report presents several brief excerpts from the PRSPs of selected countries, in order to illustrate the energy-related content of PRSPs. The consolidated data can be found in Annex 4.

## **2.2 Limitations of the Approach**

This study was a desk review of PRSPs and as such, is subject to the limitations inherent in this mode of research. Determining the extent to which the content of PRSPs is an accurate reflection of on-the-ground realities is, by definition, beyond the scope of this study. Similarly, progress made by governments in actual implementation of the plans laid out in PRSPs is outside the limits of our consideration.

The approach used to score PRSPs along various dimensions of their treatment of energy-related topics is also subject to significant limitations. Numeric scoring of PRSPs for the 41 criteria considered represents a convenient way to condense a large volume of information into a single number, which can be easily compared across multiple countries and global regions. However, the approach is characterised by a degree of subjectivity, and the results should therefore be viewed with caution. At the same time, we have endeavoured to make the scoring process, despite its subjectivity, as consistent and transparent as possible.

With respect to the analysis of energy-related budget allocations within PRSPs, the budgetary information contained in these documents was in some cases incomplete, making it difficult to determine how budgetary estimates for energy were derived. Where budgetary figures are cited, such figures are often estimates based on the best data available.

### 3. KEY GLOBAL FINDINGS

This section describes how energy issues are generally treated in the PRSPs and how energy priorities are further reflected in terms of targets, timelines, and budgetary allocations in Mid-Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs).

The extent to which PRSPs acknowledge the linkages between energy and the various MDG-related dimensions varies by region and by topic. Table 3.1 indicates this by showing the proportion of PRSPs within each region that make explicit and strong reference to the linkages between energy and selected elements of the MDGs. A value of 0 indicates that none of the PRSPs in a region elaborated on a particular theme in a strong and explicit way, while a value of 1 indicates that all of them did.

Table 3.1 also provides a cumulative, average score across all the diverse development dimensions considered. This score is simply an arithmetic average of the individual values for each of the development dimensions. Calculating such a score lends a means of comparison across regions, however simplistically, of the comprehensiveness of energy reporting in PRSPs.

**Table 3.1 Proportion of PRSPs with Strong Reference to Energy by Region**

Context of Discussion	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe/CIS	Latin America	All Regions
<i>Total number of PRSPs</i>	30	9	10	5	54
Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)	0.93	1.00	0.90	0.80	0.93
Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)	0.57	1.00	0.80	0.80	0.70
Reducing hunger (MDG 1)	0.27	0.44	0.50	0.40	0.35
Education (MDG 2)	0.13	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.19
Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)	0.20	0.44	0.10	0.20	0.22
Health (MDG 4/5/6)	0.27	0.22	0.50	0.40	0.31
Climate change (MDG 7)	0.10	0.33	0.60	0.60	0.28
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	0.60	0.89	0.80	0.40	0.67
International trade (MDG 8)	0.43	0.56	0.80	0.40	0.52
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	0.20	0.33	0.70	0.00	0.30
<b>Average</b>	0.37	0.52	0.63	0.40	0.45

#### 3.1 Linking Energy to National Development Goals

- Links to macroeconomic growth and poverty reduction.* When energy analyses and discussions appear in the PRSP reports, they most often relate to macroeconomic issues and economic growth, as well as the links between lack of energy and income poverty at the household level. On average, 93 percent of PRSPs addressed the linkages between energy and macroeconomic development, while 70 percent mentioned the link between energy and income poverty. A noticeable exception is to the relatively low reporting of energy-poverty linkages in Africa. Only 57 percent of the African reports made explicit links between energy and income poverty. The connection between energy and other,

international economic issues—such as debt sustainability and international trade—was repeatedly highlighted among the reports from Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), but these issues were not prominently reflected in other PRSPs.

- *Links to social development: education, empowerment of women, and health.* Discussions linking energy to social development goals were much less prominent. For instance, only 19 percent of PRSPs explicitly mention the connection between energy services and access to primary education. Similarly, PRSPs do not strongly feature the importance of energy services to promote gender equality and the advancement of women, with only 22 percent of reports soundly making the connection. Issues relating to indoor pollution and smoke inhalation appeared in PRSPs of every region with, on average, 31 percent of PRSPs strongly correlating energy quality with an impact on health.
- *Links to environmental sustainability.* Energy-related environmental issues are strongly cited in 67 percent of PRSPs. Some of the most salient issues that are highlighted include deforestation from fuel wood use, air pollution, and the need for energy efficiency and conservation. However, fewer reports directly mention the energy-climate change nexus. While 60 percent of reports from Latin America and Eastern Europe and CIS region discuss this topic, it is much less frequently mentioned in the PRSPs of African and Asian countries.

**Table 3.2 Key Energy Issues and their Treatment in PRSPs: Proportion of PRSPs with Strong Reference to Particular Energy Issues, by Region**

Energy Strategy	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe/CIS	Latin America	All Regions
<i>Total number of PRSPs</i>	30	9	10	5	54
Electricity, electric grid extension/development	0.97	1.00	0.80	0.80	0.93
Modern household fuels for cooking or heating (LPG, kerosene, ethanol, etc.)	0.17	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.20
Mechanical power for productive applications (such as agricultural mechanisation, motive power)	0.23	0.11	0.10	0.20	0.19
Fuels for transport	0.13	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.09
Use of traditional biomass (such as wood, dung)	0.27	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.15
Modernised biomass (such as biogas, gasification)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.02
Decentralised renewable energy options (such as solar, wind, or mini-hydro)	0.27	0.78	0.20	0.60	0.37

### 3.2 Prioritising the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies

- *Energy service needs of the poor.* Across the regions, access to energy is recognised as a key input to development, albeit to differing degrees. The extent to which energy service needs of the poor are prioritised in the PRSPs is more implicit than explicit. For example, heating and cooking are critical energy needs of the poor. Yet, as Table 3.2 demonstrates, the energy strategies detailed in the PRSPs are skewed heavily in favour of electricity provision, not heating and cooking fuels. Likewise, little emphasis is placed on mechanical power for productive applications and traditional biomass management.

- *Disaggregating energy issues based on differing conditions.* Among the PRSPs reviewed, 80 percent disaggregate their energy analysis or data into rural, urban, and peri-urban categories (see Table 3.3), albeit to varying degrees. The context of this disaggregation often has more to do with energy source and supply discussions rather than disaggregating data on, for example, affordability and accessibility of energy services for the poor in rural, urban, and peri-urban areas.

**Table 3.3 Number of PRSPs with Energy Issues Disaggregated by Rural, Urban, and/or Peri-urban Categories**

	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe/CIS	Latin America	All Regions
Number of reports that disaggregate	24	9	6	4	48
Number of reports that do not disaggregate	6	0	4	1	11
Proportion that disaggregate	0.80	1.00	0.60	0.80	0.80

- *Fuel choices.* Compared to electrification, energy strategies relating to the provision of commercial fuels receive much less attention in the PRSPs. On average, just 20 percent of PRSPs (mostly from Eastern European and CIS reports) discuss policies to expand access to convenient and efficient liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and kerosene end-use technologies. In addition, strategies concerning fuels for transportation are rarely discussed in the PRSPs, across all regions.
- *Centralised and decentralised energy options.* The types of technological options explored in PRSPs favour conventional, large-scale hydropower or fossil fuel-powered plants. All energy policy discussions in the PRSPs primarily emphasise grid electrification. Decentralised renewable energy options, such as solar and wind technologies, are also discussed, though to different degrees from region to region.

Nineteen percent of reports discussed mechanical power, such as agricultural mechanization. This type of energy service is important for productive applications but is notably given less attention in PRSPs. One exception is the PRSP from the government of Mali, which underscores the importance of mechanical power (i.e. the multifunctional platform project) for poverty-reduction projects that are designed to reduce the burden of women’s household chores, modernise village artisanal activities, increase profitability of agricultural production, create new revenue-generating activities, and strengthen the role of women in the development process.

- *Target setting.* Slightly more than half (30 of 54) of the PRSPs reviewed set explicit targets for the energy policies and programs they describe (see Table 3.4). Typically, these targets establish benchmarks for increasing access to electricity or improving energy efficiency.

**Table 3.4 Number of PRSPs with Energy Targets**

	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe/CIS	Latin America	All Regions
Number of reports with explicitly defined targets	14	8	5	3	30
Number of reports with no explicit targets	16	1	5	2	24
Proportion that define targets	0.47	0.89	0.50	0.60	0.56

### 3.3 Budgeting for the Poor in National Development Strategies

- Energy allocations.* There is an apparent disconnect between the level of energy discussions found in the PRSPs and the presence of budgetary provisions for energy in MTEFs. As shown in Table 3.5, only 45 percent of PRSPs identify specific energy investments in their MTEFs. Among those that do, the annual budgetary allocation for energy represents 7.9 percent of the total MTEF budget, on average, although the range varies from 1.5 percent in Latin America to 13.8 percent in the Eastern Europe and CIS region.
- Per capita investment needs.* Meanwhile, the average per capita budgetary allocation for energy across all regions is \$9.90. This figure—most of which is typically earmarked for investment in conventional, centralised technologies—is still small compared to the level that many experts agree is the energy investment needed in many developing countries. For example, the UN Millennium Project estimates that a \$10 to \$20 per capita investment in energy is required to meet the goals described in the MDGs.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 3.5 Budgetary Resources Allocated By Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) to Energy, by Region**

	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe/CIS	Latin America	All Regions
Number of PRSPs without explicit budgetary resources for energy in MTEF	19	5	3	3	30
Number of PRSPs with explicit budgetary resources for energy in MTEF	11	4	7	2	24
Average amount for energy (among PRSPs that make explicit energy allocation) as a percentage of the total MTEF budget (%)	5.6	10.7	13.8	1.5	7.9
Average annual per capita budgetary allocation for energy in MTEF (US\$)	6.9	3.8	28.2	0.8	9.9

The lack of time-bound energy targets, the low levels of public investment being committed for energy, and the low focus on energy services for the poor—all of these findings suggest that many PRSPs could fall short of supporting the delivery of energy services that are required to achieve the MDGs at the country-level. There is an observed disconnect between what needs to be done, and the political commitment and provisions required to make it happen. In other words, the PRSPs reviewed do not sufficiently deliver the energy access plans, targets and

<sup>3</sup> Based on a study of minimum per capita energy investments needed for Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda, as projected in the 2003 United Nations Millennium Project draft report, *Millennium Development Goals Needs Assessment : Country Case Studies of Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ghana, Tanzania, and Uganda*.

investments required to make basic energy services accessible and affordable for the poor. Urgent attention is needed to redress this situation as countries try to integrate the MDGs into their PRSPs and other national development strategies.

## 4. AFRICA

African countries had developed 30 PRSPs as of July 2005, with an additional eight PRSPs under development at that time. A review of all 30 currently available PRSPs from Africa revealed the following findings with regard to the treatment of energy.

### Overview of Findings for Africa

- Of the 30 PRSPs analysed, all but two referred to energy in the context of meeting national development goals.
- Virtually all African PRSPs (28 of 30) placed strong emphasis on the role of energy in macroeconomic growth and its importance as a factor of production. Slightly more than half (17 of 30) strongly mentioned the connections between energy and reducing income poverty. Only eight PRSPs (27 percent) explicitly cited the connection between energy and food security.
- Some 18 African PRSPs (60 percent) strongly explored the linkages between energy and environmental sustainability, particularly the relationships between use of biomass fuels and environmental degradation, including deforestation, soil erosion, and loss of soil fertility. However, only three PRSPs discussed explicitly the connections between energy use and global climate change.
- Relationships between energy and other social development goals received comparatively little consideration, with only eight PRSPs (27 percent) linking energy with improved health, six (20 percent) linking energy with increased gender equality, and four (13 percent) linking energy with expanded education.
- PRSPs stressed expansion of electricity supply as the principal strategy for meeting energy needs. Discussions of rural electrification focused on grid extension, with 23 PRSPs (74 percent) explicitly planning their national energy strategies on development of fossil fuel-powered generation and large-scale hydropower.
- Only eight PRSPs (27 percent) explored the potential for decentralised, renewable energy options, such as solar and wind, for meeting energy needs.
- Primary energy needs of the poor, such as cooking, heating, and mechanical power, received marginal attention in PRSPs. For instance, the need to improve access for the poor to modern household fuels for cooking and heating was explored in only five (17 percent) PRSPs.
- Moreover, less than half of African PRSPs (14 of 30) set out explicit targets for reaching energy-related goals, making it difficult to measure and monitor achievements.
- In terms of budgeting for energy needs, only 11 PRSPs (37 percent) explicitly allocated budgetary resources to national energy priorities in their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs). Of these 11 PRSPs, an average of 5.6 percent of the MTEF budget was allocated to energy priorities, with per capita MTEF energy expenditures averaging some US\$6.90.

### 4.1 Linking Energy to National Development Goals

There were commonalities and dissimilarities in the way energy was linked to national development goals in the 30 PRSPs analysed in sub-Saharan Africa. With the exceptions of Sao Tome and Djibouti, all the other PRSPs made reference to energy, with Zambia allocating a

stand-alone chapter for energy. However, the quality of discussions linking energy to national development goals, particularly the achievement of the MDGs, paled significantly in comparison with that of macroeconomic and structural reform, as well as other social sectors, such as education and health services. In most instances where energy was mentioned, the emphasis was on the form rather than the functionality of energy.

Though energy was cited with respect to all MDGs, most discussions on energy centred on macroeconomic growth as shown in Table 4.1 below. Almost all PRSPs underscored the role of energy in economic development and stressed its importance as a key factor of production. In fact, 28 PRSPs (93 percent) elaborated on the energy-macroeconomic nexus (MDG 1), while 17 of them (54 percent) strongly mentioned the connection to income poverty (MDG 1).

**Table 4.1 The Energy-MDG Nexus of Africa**

Context of Discussion	Strongly Mentioned	Mentioned	Not Mentioned
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 30</i>			
Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)	28	1	1
Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)	17	9	4
Reducing hunger (MDG 1)	8	6	16
Education (MDG 2)	4	3	23
Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)	6	4	20
Health (MDG 4/5/6)	8	4	18
Climate change (MDG 7)	3	5	22
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	18	3	9
International trade (MDG 8)	13	0	17
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	6	2	22
<b>Total</b>	111/300	37/300	152/300
<b>Score</b>	0.37	0.12	0.51

In contrast, the nexus of energy and social sectors, like health and gender equalities, received much less focus in PRSPs. Since biomass was mentioned throughout the PRSPs as a primary source of energy for the poor in Africa, the expectation was that the reports would elaborate on the social issues associated with biomass use. However, only six PRSPs (20 percent) made an explicit connection between biomass use and gender inequality (MDG 3), for example. One of these was the PRSP of Ghana, which highlighted the strong connections between biomass usage, gender, and poverty—noting that, ‘the increase[d] use of kerosene will contribute greatly to the reduction of time and energy expended by women in the search and transportation of fuel wood. The freed time and energy for women will enable them to expand activities such as in agricultural production, industrial processing and marketing’. Meanwhile, 20 PRSPs (67 percent) had no mention of gender in relation to national energy-development goals.

Furthermore, the health effects of energy use, such as indoor air pollution, were given scant attention in PRSPs. Despite the fact that most PRSPs associated fuel wood as the primary source of energy for the poor, the health impacts of indoor smoke caused by using this inferior energy source did not come through in the reports. In fact, 18 PRSPs (60 percent) never mentioned energy in connection to health (MDG 4/5/6). However, among the eight PRSPs (27 percent) that

made an explicit connection between energy access and health, Zambia's PRSP conspicuously underscored the cross-cutting nature of gender, energy, HIV/AIDS, and environment, positing that energy access and health form the critical pillars to attaining national development goals. Additionally, Burundi's PRSP stressed the connection between electricity access and health. It noted that 'the lack of electricity makes it impossible to conserve certain kinds of medications, to maintain medical equipment and proper hygiene'.

Education (MDG 2) is another social issue that was largely excluded in energy discussions in PRSPs. Only four PRSPs (13 percent) strongly mentioned the connection between energy and attaining the goal of universal primary education. Although most PRSPs disaggregated energy into urban, peri-urban, and rural needs, very few highlighted the connection between energy access and the improvement in the quality of education, particularly in rural areas. Malawi's PRSP envisaged a strategy to put in place energy- and water-saving measures to 'free colleges from utility bills, such that utility expenses will fall by 20 percent in real terms'. In contrast, 23 PRSPs (77 percent) failed to mention energy in connection with education.

Additionally, the importance of biomass as a primary source of energy was underscored in most PRSPs, yet only eight (27 percent) explicitly elaborated on the connection between biomass use and food security (MDG 1). To guarantee food security, Ethiopia's PRSP envisioned some 'initiatives and measures to ensure minimum transport needs of female rural farmers carrying goods and produce to and from the market and carrying water and fire wood. This will contribute not only towards increasing female farmer's efficiency but also to ease women's labor burden'. Along those same lines, Burkina Faso's strategy for rural electrification, among other things, aimed to target the use of energy 'for activities related to the production, processing and conservation of agricultural products'. Meanwhile, 16 PRSPs (53 percent) made no mention of the energy-food connection.

The environmental sustainability of energy use was mentioned in most PRSPs (MDG 7). Over 18 PRSPs (60 percent) elaborated extensively on the connection between energy use, in particular biomass and environmental degradation. However, the discussions were limited to deforestation, desertification, soil erosion and fertility. Climate change issues were emphasised less, with only three PRSPs providing a strong mention of the energy-climate change nexus. One example, the PRSP of Madagascar, discusses a strategy to preserve and market 'wood energy — in order to reduce health risks, deforestation, and Greenhouse Gas effect'. Meanwhile, 22 PRSPs (73 percent) did not mention climate change at all.

Additionally, the link between energy and international trade was discussed in some detail, with 13 PRSPs (43 percent) elaborating on the nexus. The focus was on cross-border power trade, with most of the hydropower-rich countries aiming to develop the sector as an export revenue earner. Guinea's long-term energy strategy is to develop its massive hydro potential and transform itself into an electricity exporter.

As seen in Table 4.1, the PRSPs of Africa averaged a score of 0.32, on a scale of 0 to 1, for strong mentions of energy-MDG linkages, and hence fall in the lower range of thoroughly and comprehensively link energy to the multiple aspects of national development goals and the MDGs.

## 4.2 Prioritising the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies

Since access to energy services was noted as a marker of poverty in almost all PRSPs' consultations, the expectation, therefore, was that energy needs of the poor should be of utmost priority in the national development strategies for poverty reduction. While only 23 PRSPs (74 percent) disaggregated energy issues into urban, peri-urban, and rural needs, there was also an apparent disconnect between the needs of the poor and energy policy discussions. Among the PRSPs there is a distinct focus on electricity supply, with all 29 PRSPs (96 percent) prioritising it as the prime policy direction to meet rural energy needs. Nonetheless, only eight of them (25 percent) went further to target their policies for rural electrification to rural services, such as health and agro-processing. With plans to foster rural electrification dependent on extending the grid to rural areas, there was an implicit assumption that electricity in itself is a service rather than a carrier of energy. However, empirical evidence shows that the availability of electricity is less likely to facilitate development on its own in areas such as health and gender equality<sup>4</sup>. In this light, Rwanda's PRSP stood out in advocating for subsidies to support rural electrification on the basis that the beneficiaries are the poor and it is a public service.

Meanwhile, labour- and energy-intensive survival activities, such as cooking, got secondary priority in the energy strategies. While most PRSPs discuss the need for sustainable management of traditional biomass, fewer advocated for strategies to facilitate the adoption of modern household fuels for cooking, such as kerosene and LPG, as seen in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Priority Focus of Energy Strategies in African PRSPs**

<b>Energy Strategy</b>	<b>Strongly Mentioned</b>	<b>Mentioned</b>	<b>Not Mentioned</b>
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 30</i>			
Electricity, electric grid extension/development	29	0	1
Modern household fuels for cooking or heating (LPG, kerosene, ethanol, etc.)	5	8	17
Mechanical power for productive applications (such as agricultural mechanisation, motive power)	7	8	15
Fuels for transport	4	0	26
Use of traditional biomass (such as wood, dung)	8	15	7
Modernised biomass (such as biogas, gasification)	0	2	28
Decentralised renewable energy options (such as solar, wind, or mini-hydro)	8	11	11

The development of modernised biomass ranked lowest among the energy strategies described in the PRSPs. However, Malawi's PRSP, aiming at technological 'leapfrogging', focused on facilitating the development of modernised biomass (biogas) at an economically accessible and market-reliable price, together with targets to be achieved.

Even though radical improvements in the quality of life in rural areas often depend on replacing human and animal power with motive power,<sup>5</sup> fuels for transport received the least attention on

<sup>4</sup> UNDP, *Achieving the Millennium Development Goals: The Role of Energy Services* (New York: UNDP, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> A. Reddy, 'Energy Technologies and Policies for Rural Development', in *Energy for Sustainable Development: A Policy Agenda* (UNDP, IIEE and IEI, 2002).

the scale of policy priorities for the poor, and mechanical power for productive applications received mixed coverage as an energy concern. And yet, the drudgery of many rural subsistence tasks, such as grinding grains and milling, are often carried out by women who are too often deprived of access to these important energy services. In this regard, Burkina Faso's PRSP describes plans to purchase mills, shea nut presses, cereal-hulling machines, motor pumps, sewing machines, wheelbarrows, carts, etc. These initiatives, according to the PRSP, will result in improvements in the people's economic and social situation.

All in all, throughout the PRSPs, there is an apparent dichotomy between the policy discussions and the political commitment that would make access to energy services a reality. As shown in Table 4.3, only half of African PRSPs set explicit targets to meet the energy priorities they discuss. It is therefore unclear how success will be measured and monitored.

**Table 4.3 Number of PRSPs with Energy Targets and Benchmarks of Africa**

Total number of PRSPs	30
Explicit targets/ benchmarks	14
No explicitly defined targets/benchmarks	16

Furthermore, when energy targets are established, they are not always accompanied by timelines. For example, the Kenya PRSP describes plans to increase the rate of rural electrification from 4 percent to 40 percent without any timeline for that goal to be achieved. Also, some of the indicators used to monitor progress of rural electrification are restricted to community-level indicators as opposed to household indicators, highlighting the strong inclination toward energy supply rather than access. For instance, Benin's rural electrification plans are to extend electricity to 51 communities, but the report does not expand on projected household use nor does it reference a timeline.

In the African PRSPs, energy targets are almost exclusively focused on electrification. Two exceptions are the Zambia report, which cites plans to reduce charcoal production by 40,000 tons by 2010, and Madagascar's PRSP, which looks to increase energy intensity from 0.3 TEP/capita/year to 0.517 TEP/capita/year by 2006.

#### **4.3 Budgeting for the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies**

One way to gauge how far political *intentions*, as expressed in the PRSP policy articulations, will be translated into concrete *actions* to reduce poverty, is to look at budgetary resources.

With only 11 PRSPs (37 percent) explicitly allocating budgetary resources to national energy priorities in their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs), the political commitment to make energy services accessible and affordable to the poor is questionable. Even among reports that do make budgetary provisions for energy priorities, targets and timelines are often missing. Hence, it is unclear how priorities will be monitored.

**Table 4.4 Numbers of PRSPs with Budget Resources Allocated to Energy in MTEFs**

Total number of PRSPs	30
Explicit budgetary resources allocated for energy	11
No explicit budgetary allocated for energy	19

Out of the 11 PRSPs that provide explicit energy budgetary line-items, the average percentage allocated for energy with respect to total budgetary expenditure was 5.6 percent, with Niger having the smallest percentage (0.6 percent) and Kenya the largest (15.4 percent), as shown in Table 4.5. With the exceptions of Senegal and Ghana, both of which divided their budgets into internal and external financing, PRSPs did not indicate how allocations would be funded. Additionally, only eight reports separated budgetary allocations into rural and urban categories, or by energy source or energy carrier.

Rural electrification strategies and grid extension clearly dominated the budgetary allocations for made energy in African MTEFs. However, there were a couple of noticeable exceptions. For example, Zambia allocated \$9.6 million to promote improved use of biomass energy, and Rwanda assigned \$10.8 million to promote renewable energy development. Senegal also allotted \$4.5 million to scale up the use of domestic fuels.

**Table 4.5 Budgetary Resources Allocated to Energy by Medium Term Expenditure Review Frameworks (MTEFs) of Africa**

Country	Percent MTEF Budget allocated to energy (%)	Annual MTEF Expenditure allocated to energy (US\$ million)	Population	Per Capita Energy Expenditure per year in MTEF (US\$)
Benin	N/A	N/A	7,649,360	N/A
Burkina Faso	N/A	N/A	13,491,736	N/A
Burundi	N/A	N/A	7,795,426	N/A
Cameroon	N/A	N/A	16,988,132	N/A
Chad	N/A	N/A	9,657,069	N/A
Central Africa Republic	N/A	N/A	4,237,703	N/A
Congo	N/A	N/A	3,602,269	N/A
Democratic Republic of Congo	N/A	N/A	60,764,490	N/A
Djibouti	N/A	N/A	476,703	N/A
Ethiopia	1.8	110.4	73,053,286	1.5
Gambia	N/A	N/A	1,595,086	N/A
Ghana	9.2	55	21,946,247	2.5
Guinea	N/A	N/A	9,452,670	N/A
Guinea Bissau	N/A	N/A	1,413,446	N/A
Ivory Coast	N/A	N/A	17,298,040	N/A
Kenya	15.4	747.1	33,829,590	22.1
Lesotho	N/A	N/A	2,031,348	N/A
Madagascar	3.2	4.8	18,040,341	0.3
Malawi	1.4	0.72	12,707,464	0.006
Mali	N/A	N/A	11,415,261	N/A
Mauritania	N/A	N/A	3,086,859	N/A
Mozambique	N/A	N/A	19,406,703	N/A
Niger	0.6	2.4	12,162,856	0.2
Rwanda	2.6	8.5	8,440,820	1.0
Sao Tome	N/A	N/A	187,410	N/A
Senegal	6.5	23.6	11,706,498	2.0
Sierra Leone	N/A	N/A	5,867,426	N/A

Tanzania	N/A	N/A	36,766,356	N/A
Uganda	N/A	N/A	27,269,482	N/A
Zambia	9.5	114	11,261,795	10
<b>TOTAL</b>			463,601,937	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	5.6	118.5		6.9

Nonetheless, the average per capita expenditure on energy was \$6.90, far less than the calculated per capita investment for energy needed to meet the MDGs. Although the information on expenditure forecasts culled from PRSPs is scant, the evidence so far suggests that governments have not fully committed to making investments in energy services for the poor. Most of the policies on the provision of energy services to the poor remained as goal statements without targets, timelines, and budgetary figures.

## 5. ASIA

Asian countries have developed nine PRSPs as of July 2005. Additionally, there is one PRSP under development. A review of all nine currently available PRSPs from the Asian region revealed the following findings with regard to the treatment of energy.

### Overview of Findings for Asia

- All nine of the PRSPs analysed referred to energy in the context of meeting national development goals.
- All Asian PRSPs placed strong emphasis on the role of energy as a driver of macroeconomic growth, and all explored the connections between energy and reducing income poverty. However, a little more than half (55 percent) considered the linkages between energy and international trade, and only a third emphasized the connections between energy and debt sustainability.
- Virtually all Asian PRSPs (8 of 9) strongly mentioned the linkages between energy and environmental sustainability. Yet, only a third of PRSPs discussed the connections between energy use and global climate change.
- Relationships between energy and other social development goals received comparatively little consideration, with only four PRSPs explicitly linking energy with gender equality, two linking energy with health, and none devoting serious attention to linkages between energy and education.
- All nine Asian PRSPs stressed access to electricity as the most critical energy need. Attention focused on large-scale power plants and grid-based technologies, even though some PRSPs highlighted physical constraints to rural grid extension.
- Seven of the nine PRSPs also contained discussions of the potential for decentralised, renewable energy options, such as solar and wind, although typically these received lesser priority than conventional power development.
- Primary energy needs of the poor, such as cooking, heating, and mechanical power for productive uses, received scant attention in Asian PRSPs. For instance, only three PRSPs mentioned (but did not discuss in detail) the management of traditional biomass fuels, and only one PRSP mentioned the need to improve access for the poor to modern household fuels for cooking and heating.
- All but one of the Asian PRSPs set out explicit targets and timelines for reaching energy-related goals.
- In terms of budgeting for energy needs, only four PRSPs (44 percent) explicitly allocated budgetary resources to national energy priorities in their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs). Of these four PRSPs, an average of 10.7 percent of the MTEF budget was allocated to energy priorities. Per capita MTEF energy expenditures averaged some US\$3.80, far below the level typically needed to reach the MDGs.

### 5.1 Linking Energy to National Development Goals

There were apparent commonalities in the way energy was linked to national development goals in the nine PRSPs analysed from Asia. Like most other regions, none of them allocated a standalone chapter for energy, but all Asian PRSPs contained references to energy, with energy issues discussed primarily in relation to infrastructure development. The PRSP for Laos

underscored the importance of energy as a critical component in development and essential to the improvement of living standards.

There is variability in the quality of discussions linking energy and MDGs in the PRSPs, as shown in Table 5.1 below. All the PRSPs made explicit connections between energy and macroeconomic development and reducing income poverty (MDG 1). All in all, the Asian PRSPs placed considerable emphasis on the role of energy as a driver of economic growth. Cambodia’s PRSP posited that the development of the energy sector is predicated on the ‘need to exploit the country’s potential to improve the standards of living of the populations, agro-factory and industry, and reduce the present cost of energy’. Pakistan’s PRSP noted that ‘access to electricity will enable pumping of sub-sol water for domestic and agricultural purposes that will enhance productivity’.

**Table 5.1 The Energy-MDG Nexus of Asia**

<b>Context of Discussion</b>	<b>Strongly Mentioned</b>	<b>Mentioned</b>	<b>Not Mentioned</b>
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 9</i>			
Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)	9	0	0
Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)	9	0	0
Reducing hunger (MDG 1)	4	2	3
Education (MDG 2)	0	1	8
Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)	4	1	4
Health (MDG 4/5/6)	2	0	7
Climate change (MDG 7)	3	0	6
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	8	1	0
International trade (MDG 8)	5	0	4
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	3	1	5
<b>Total</b>	47/90	6/90	37/90
<b>Score</b>	0.52	0.07	0.41

Several PRSPs discussed energy in terms of international trade (MDG 8), with more than 50 percent of PRSPs citing the need to develop the energy sector as an export revenue earner. Bhutan’s PRSP observed that ‘electricity export to India has increased from 1354 million ngultrum in 1997 to about 1495 million ngultrum, in 2000’, and its ‘contribution to the national exchequer was 45 percent of the total revenue’.

Regarding the linkages between energy and debt sustainability (MDG 8), Sri Lanka’s PRSP noted that ‘sudden changes in external and internal settings could derail government’s effort to achieve a more sustainable fiscal balance. Fiscal consolidation could be adversely affected by several factors such as internal trade disruption, a downward surge in global primary commodity prices, or an unanticipated upsurge in global energy prices’.

On the other hand, the link between energy and social issues, like education, health, and gender equality, received secondary prominence in Asian PRSPs. Education issues garnered the least attention, with no PRSP elaborating on the energy-education nexus. This was followed by health (MDG 4/5/6), where less than 30 percent of the PRSPs focused on the connection between access to energy and both the improvement of maternal mortality and the ability to reduce diseases.

The connection between energy provision and gender equality (MDG 3) received some reporting. Cambodia’s PRSPs remarked that ‘it was clear from consultations that women bear a ‘triple burden’ of labour outside the house, cooking and other household duties’. In fact, Laos’s PRSP posited that ‘easier access to electricity will facilitate the lives of women and reduce their household chores while contributing to poverty eradication’.

Discussions relating to energy and environmental sustainability (MDG 7) were prevalent, with all but one PRSP making an explicit connection between energy and environmental sustainability—though the contexts of discussion differed widely among the various PRSPs. For example, the Pakistani report underlined the economic incentives to ‘continue to encourage the use of compressed natural gas, as an alternate to reduce environmental degradation, save foreign exchange and generate employment’. On the other hand, the PRSP from Mongolia underscored social and health concerns, noting that pollution from the widespread use of coal ‘threatens peoples’ right to live in a healthy and safe environment. The throwing of ashes and water in open places pollutes air and increases diseases among peoples, particularly the poor’. In the Vietnam report, the focus was on energy efficiency and government planning to encourage clean production by promoting the use of efficient technologies that do not harm the environment.

However, the attention paid to the climate change nexus was lower in compared to other environmental issues, with just over 30 percent of PRSPs discussing energy in terms of climate change. Mongolia’s PRSP noted that ‘due to climate change, desertification has increased in Mongolia, lakes and rivers have dried up’.

In sum, with an averaged score of 0.52 (see Table 5.1), the PRSPs of Asia fall in the middle range in terms of how thoroughly they link energy to the multiple aspects of national development goals and the MDGs.

## 5.2 Prioritising the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies

Access to electricity, as described in the nine PRSPs, is the most highly prioritised energy need of the region. Pakistan’s PRSP noted that ‘expanding electricity supply to rural areas which account for most of the population that do not have access to electricity represents a special challenge’. As shown in Table 5.2 below, electricity is the energy strategy most often described in the PRSPs. The PRSP of Laos noted that the country has ‘the lowest rate of electrification in Asia, with only 20 percent of villages and 24 percent of households has access to electricity’.

**Table 5.2 Priority Focus of Energy Strategies in Asian PRSPs**

Energy Strategy	Strongly Mentioned	Mentioned	Not Mentioned
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 9</i>			
Electricity, electric grid extension/development	9	0	0
Modern household fuels for cooking or heating (LPG, kerosene, ethanol, etc.)	0	1	8
Mechanical power for productive applications (such as agricultural mechanisation, motive power)	1	2	6
Fuels for transport	0	0	9
Use of traditional biomass (such as wood, dung)	0	3	6
Modernised biomass (such as biogas, gasification)	0	1	8

Decentralised renewable energy options (such as solar, wind, or mini-hydro)	7	0	2
---	---	---	---

Unlike other regions, all Asian PRSPs disaggregated energy issues into rural and urban categories and articulated explicit policies in support for rural electrification. Even though some PRSPs highlighted the physical constraints of grid-based technologies for rural electrification, there was still an overwhelming bias observed in favour of conventional, large-scale hydropower plants. Bhutan’s PRSP noted that ‘due to topography and low economies of scale for the extension of a grid to scattered settlements, bringing electricity to these communities is difficult’.

As indicated in Table 5.2, decentralised energy technologies are also fairly high on the list of energy priorities for the region. Seven out of nine reports strongly mentioned solar, wind or other renewable energy options. Environmental protection was found to be a recurring impetus for the focus on renewable energy technologies. The Vietnam report, for example, describes plans to promote ‘energy technologies that do not harm the environment’. Making the same connection, Cambodia’s PRSP calls for the use of alternative energy sources to encourage environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources. The PRSP for Laos, rather, underscored the need to provide off-grid electricity to remote areas and rural areas to improve living standards and help reduce poverty.

Energy strategies relating to modern household fuels for cooking or heating were conspicuously missing from the Asian PRSPs. This finding goes against the expectation that since biomass is the primary source of energy for the poor, policies should have focused equally on overcoming biomass scarcity and inefficient end-use technologies. In contrast, the management of traditional biomass and development of modernised biomass received a mere 12 and 7 percent, respectively, of the priority attention in the national development strategies to eradicate poverty. Mongolia’s PRSP proposed to distribute ‘fuel-efficient stoves to poor households at discounted prices, to save fuel and reduce household expenses especially for the poor’. In addition, Bangladesh’s PRSP noted that ‘the provision of infrastructure support like gas is also important to household sector and women to undertake income generating activities’.

**Table 5.3 Number of Asian PRSPs with Energy Targets/Benchmarks**

<i>Total number of PRSPs</i>	9
Number of PRSPs with explicitly defined targets and benchmarks	8
Number of PRSPs without explicitly defined targets and benchmarks	1

As Table 5.3 indicates, most of the region’s PRSPs (8 of 9) defined specific targets for energy policy priorities. With the exception of Bangladesh, all PRSPs have established explicit targets with timelines, and nearly all of those targets are linked to the development of the electricity sector. One example of ambitious target-setting is Bhutan’s rural electrification strategy which plans to achieve 100 percent electrification by 2010.

### **5.3 Budgeting for the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies**

Beyond merely describing political commitments in their PRSPs, many Asian governments also allocated explicit budgetary resources for energy in their Medium Term Expenditure

Frameworks (MTEFs). Over half of the PRSP from Asia (55 percent) made explicit financial allocations for energy-specific investments.

**Table 5.4 Number of Asian PRSPs with Budget Resources Allocated to Energy**

Total number of PRSPs	9
Explicitly defined allocation for energy in MTEF	4
No explicitly defined allocation for energy in MTEF	5

The average percentage budgetary allocation to energy, 10.7 percent, is relatively high compared with those of the other regions. Indeed, the average country expenditure on energy is \$73.7 million in this region. On the other hand, the per capita expenditure on energy is \$3.80, which is considerably less than what would be needed to deliver energy services to achieve the MDGs.<sup>6</sup>

**Table 5.5 Budgetary Resources Allocated to Energy in the Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) of Asia**

Country	Percent of MTEF Budget allocated for Energy (%)	Annual MTEF Budget allocated to Energy (US\$ million)	Population	Per capita energy expenditure per year in MTEF (US\$)
Bangladesh	N/A	N/A	144,319,628	N/A
Bhutan	10.0	0.1	2,139,549	0.07
Cambodia	31.6	167.0	14,789,315	11.3
Lao People's Democratic Republic	N/A	N/A	6,217,141	N/A
Mongolia	N/A	N/A	2,791,272	N/A
Nepal	N/A	N/A	27,676,547	N/A
Pakistan	0.3	18.7	162,419,946	0.1
Sri Lanka	9.6	132.5	19,742,439	6.7
Viet Nam	1.8	50.3	82,689,518	0.6
<b>TOTAL</b>			462,785,355	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	10.7	73.7		3.8

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.unmilleniumproject.org/documents/MP\\_CCS\\_paper\\_ExecSumm\\_Jan17.pdf](http://www.unmilleniumproject.org/documents/MP_CCS_paper_ExecSumm_Jan17.pdf)

## 6. EASTERN EUROPE AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES

Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States had developed 10 PRSPs as of July 2005 with another PRSP under development at the time. Analysis of the 10 PRSPs available in the region revealed the following findings with regard to the treatment of energy.

### Overview of Findings for Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States

- All ten of the PRSPs analysed from Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (EE-CIS) referred to energy in the context of meeting national development goals.
- Virtually all PRSPs from the EE-CIS region (9 of 10) contained elaborate discussions of the linkages between energy and macroeconomic development, stressing energy as a factor of production and an engine of economic growth. Most PRSPs (8 of 10) made an explicit connection between energy and income poverty. Most also considered the linkages between energy and international trade (8 of 10), and between energy and debt sustainability (7 of 10).
- Eight PRSPs explored the linkages between energy (especially energy efficiency) and environmental sustainability, and six PRSPs discussed the connections between energy use and global climate change.
- Relationships between energy and other social development goals received varying levels of attention. Six PRSPs discussed linkages between energy and education, and five PRSPs considered connections between energy and health, but only one explored the implications of energy use for gender equality.
- PRSPs from the EE-CIS region stressed heating as the most critical energy need of the poor. Governance issues dominated discussions of the energy sector, including issues of privatisation and full-cost recovery at the consumer level.
- Attention focused on district heating systems and the need to shift to decentralised technologies, such as co-generation.
- Half of the PRSPs from the EE-CIS region set out explicit targets for reaching energy-related goals. However, several set targets without corresponding timelines for reaching them.
- In terms of budgeting for energy needs, seven PRSPs (70 percent) explicitly allocated budgetary resources to national energy priorities in their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs). Of these seven PRSPs, an average of 13.8 percent of the MTEF budget was allocated to energy priorities. However, values ranged widely—from 0.7 percent (Moldova) to 57 percent (Azerbaijan)—with a median value of just 5 percent.
- The median value for per capita MTEF energy expenditures was approximately US\$28.

### 6.1 Linking Energy to National Development Goals

Energy was linked to national development goals in all 10 PRSPs analysed from Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States. Although none allocated a stand-alone chapter for the treatment of energy issues, all of them made reference to energy, mostly in the context of infrastructure and transport. With the exception of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the PRSPs tended to elaborate on the nexus between energy and the key elements of the MDGs.

Nevertheless, the treatment of energy and MDG linkages in PRSPs varied, as shown in Table 6.1. There were extensive discussions on energy and macroeconomic development (MDG 1) in nine PRSPs (90 percent). The focus was on energy as a factor of production and an engine of economic growth. For instance, Armenia’s PRSP noted that ‘the energy sector is one of the most important infrastructures for economic development’, and that ‘the impact of the energy sector on poverty is manifested through the general economic development pattern’. The link between macroeconomic health and the energy sector was underscored equally in almost all PRSPs, with particular focus on the fiscal problems associated with the transition from a socialist to a capitalist economy. Tajikistan’s PRSPs commented that ‘while the energy sector has significant development potential, it currently is in a difficult situation. Due to lack of financing no investments have been made in the electricity sector, oil, gas and coal mining industry’.

**Table 6.1 Energy-MDG Nexus of Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States**

Context of Discussion	Strongly Mentioned	Mentioned	Not Mentioned
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 10</i>			
Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)	9	0	1
Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)	8	0	2
Reducing hunger (MDG 1)	5	0	5
Education (MDG 2)	6	0	4
Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)	1	0	9
Health (MDG 4/5/6)	5	0	5
Climate change (MDG 7)	6	1	3
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	8	0	2
International trade (MDG 8)	8	0	2
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	7	1	2
<b>Total</b>	63/100	2/100	35/100
<b>Average Score</b>	0.63	0.02	0.35

Almost all PRSPs made an explicit connection between energy and income poverty. Azerbaijan’s PRSP noted that ‘the lack of reliable energy supplies is considered a major problem by the rural population. It limits employment opportunities and it limits opportunities for investment’. Additionally, debt sustainability received attention, with some PRSPs, like that of Tajikistan, providing figures on the debt situation of the sector.

Half of the PRSPs from this region made an explicit connection between energy access and health (MDG 4/5/6), although none elaborated on the health impacts of indoor smoke from fuelwood use. Armenia’s PRSPs observed that ‘in many populated areas households see stove wood as the only means of heating. As a rule, such wood is obtained from neighbouring forests[,] thereby significantly degrading the environmental situation in the community’. It failed, however, to further highlight the health impacts of indoor air pollution caused by this energy source.

Six PRSPs elaborated on the role of energy in promoting education (MDG 2). Georgia’s PRSPs maintained that an ‘energy crisis and information vacuum aggravates the problem of access to education and health care, especially in remote villages’. However, the role of energy in

promoting gender equality and the advancement of women was notably underreported, with only one PRSP mentioning the energy-gender nexus. Armenia's report commented that 'women and old men have greater difficulty to heat their houses through rationally sound cutting of trees and are forced to buy expensive firewood or not to heat their houses in winter'.

On the other hand, international trade issues (MDG 8) received relatively strong attention among the region's PRSPs. While resource-rich countries elaborated on developing the sector as an export earner, energy-importing countries stressed debt sustainability and security of energy supplies. Kyrgyzstan emphasised that 'significant dependence on energy imports necessitates the development of energy conservation policy'.

Eight PRSPs elaborated on the relationship between energy and environmental sustainability (MDG 7). Notably, the need for energy efficiency and conservation were highlighted in most of the PRSPs. Albania's report underscored its government's plan for demand-side management of electricity through 'measures to reduce demand, stimulated by the use of alternative energy sources for heating, cooking and improved efficiency in the use of energy'. Climate change received slightly few mentions, with six countries exploring the topic. In its PRSP, Serbia planned feasibility studies for accession to the Kyoto Protocol and described plans to set up a national Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) strategy.

All in all, with an averaged score of 0.6, on a scale of 0 to 1, (see Table 6.1) the PRSPs of Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States did relatively well in linking energy to MDG-based national development strategies.

## **6.2 Prioritising the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies**

Access to reliable energy services was highlighted as a marker of poverty in many of the PRSPs reviewed. Heating was noted as the most critical energy need of the poor, with six PRSPs going one step further to disaggregate access to heating fuels across urban and rural areas. Azerbaijan's PRSP observed that the lack of reliable energy supplies is considered a major problem by the rural population. In addition, Armenia's PRSP noted that although electricity access was close to 100 percent, accessibility to heating services is extremely low. It revealed that households without central heating used wood 56 percent of the time, electricity 17.9 percent of the time, and gas 72 percent of the time to meet their heating needs.

Meanwhile, none of the PRSPs disaggregated energy expenditures as a percentage of household income across rural and urban areas. Nevertheless, Azerbaijan's PRSP combined energy expenditures as a percentage of household income with housing and water across urban and rural households. The results showed that rural households spend \$1.70 per month as compared with \$1.50 per month for urban households.

Energy-sector governance was a common theme in all reports, many of which proposed shifting energy sector ownership toward private capital and/or increasing measures to recuperate the full cost of energy delivery from consumers. Seven PRSPs also prioritised the expansion of the energy supply infrastructure, while two advocated for an acceleration to a more sustainable energy system.

**Table 6.2 Priority Focus of Energy Strategies in PRSPs from the EE-CIS Region**

Energy Strategy	Strongly Mentioned	Mentioned	Not Mentioned
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 10</i>			
Electricity, electric grid extension/development	8	1	1
Modern household fuels for cooking or heating (LPG, kerosene, ethanol, etc.)	6	1	3
Mechanical power for productive applications (such as agricultural mechanisation, motive power)	1	2	7
Fuels for transport	1	2	7
Use of traditional biomass (such as wood, dung)	0	3	7
Modernised biomass (such as biogas, gasification)	0	4	6
Decentralised renewable energy options (such as solar, wind, or mini-hydro)	2	6	2

Table 6.2 above indicates which national energy strategy priorities were mentioned in the ten PRSPs. As in all regions, expansion of electricity garners the greatest amount of analysis in these strategies. However, the Eastern Europe and CIS region also places a priority focus on natural gas-based technologies, and district and building-based heating systems. Armenia's PRSP noted that investments in the central heating area should target access to services with an emphasis on the installation of local heating systems. Some PRSPs cited the need to develop cogeneration technologies to be more energy efficient. The PRSP of Bosnia and Herzegovina suggested 'the possibilities of combined production of heat and electric power, an option that is convenient for larger buildings or groups of buildings. Because of its efficiency, the district heating saves fuel, and also contributes to reduced emission of CO<sub>2</sub>. The district heating systems can be used in hospitals, hotels, recreational and trade centers, and other larger public facilities, particularly those where the natural gas can be used as a fuel'. Biomass-based technologies, fuels for transport, and mechanical power were not readily cited in the energy policy portfolios of Eastern Europe and CIS reports.

On the other hand, because poor people cope with unreliable district heating and rising energy prices by substituting for less expensive and less clean energy (including wood, coal and kerosene), the expectation was that PRSPs will elaborate on the effects of the full-cost recovery policy shift on the energy use pattern and technological choices of the poor. However, none of the PRSPs dealt with the tradeoffs between the fuel and technological mix of the poor and the deregulation policies they so explicitly advocated for in the reports.

Meanwhile, half of the PRSPs set explicit targets to turn energy policy articulations into political commitment, as evidenced in Table 6.3 below. Yet, among the PRSPs that did set targets, many came without any projected timelines to meet them. Tajikistan's PRSP, for example, set a target for full-cost recovery, planning to increase the efficiency of utility bills by up to 70 percent in 2002 and 100 percent afterward.

**Table 6.3 Number of PRSPs from the EE-CIS Region with Energy Targets/Benchmarks**

<i>Total number of PRSPs</i>	<i>10</i>
Number of PRSPs with explicitly defined targets and benchmarks	5
Number of PRSPs without explicitly defined targets and benchmarks	5

### 6.3 Budgeting For the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies

The countries of Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States did relatively well in backing the political commitments with explicit budgetary resources for energy in PRSPs. As shown in the table below, seven of them allocated annual budgetary resources to response measures to make energy services a factor in their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEF). It is worth noting that Moldova's PRSP backed the targets without timelines but with budgetary resources. Additionally, Bosnia and Herzegovina, without an MTEF, suggested an indicative share of public expenditure with respect to energy in its PRSP.

**Table 6.4 Number of PRSPs from the EE-CIS Region with Budgetary Resources Allocated to Energy**

Total number of PRSPs	10
Explicitly defined allocation to energy in MTEF	7
No explicitly defined allocation to energy in MTEF	3

On average, energy expenditures represented 13.8 percent of total budgetary expenditures, as illustrated in Table 6.5 below.

**Table 6.5 Budget Resources Allocated to Energy in Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks of Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States**

	Percent of MTEF Budget Allocation for Energy (%)	Annual MTEF Budget for Energy (US\$ million)	Population	Per capita Expenditure allocated to Energy per year (US\$)
Albania	N/A	N/A	3,563,112	
Armenia	2.6	23.9	2,982,904	8.0
Azerbaijan	57.0	822.4	7,911,974	103.9
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N/A	N/A	4,430,494	
Georgia	16.4	210	4,677,401	44.9
Kyrgyzstan	3.8	144.5	5,146,281	28.1
Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic	N/A	N/A	2,045,262	
Moldova Republic	0.7	1.7	4,455,904	0.4
Serbia And Montenegro	5.0	8.9	10,829,175	0.8
Tajikistan	11.5	79.3	7,163,506	11.1
<b>TOTAL</b>			53,206,013	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	13.8	184.4		28.2

The variability in the allocation proportions is noteworthy, with Azerbaijan (57 percent) and Moldova (0.7 percent) as clear outliers in these results. (Azerbaijan's energy-related allocation, which represents over half of the country's budget, is almost entirely due to the construction of the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline.) Only five PRSPs disaggregated budgetary allocations into rural versus urban categories, or by fuel type. The greatest budgetary allocations went to the rehabilitation of the heating-gas systems, and the restructuring of utilities. Tajikistan's PRSP allocated a small portion of its budget for developing non-traditional energy sources for rural energy supply from 2002 to 2004. With the exception of Armenia, all other PRSPs distilled

budgetary resources of their MTEF to define the financial sources: either domestic sources and Official Development Assistance (ODA) contributions.

This region has already achieved a minimum level of energy access, yet there is still a need for improved energy services, particularly for heating. The information culled from PRSPs seemed to suggest that there was a relatively strong commitment on the part of the governments to make access to energy services a reality.

## 7. LATIN AMERICA

Latin American countries had developed five PRSPs as of July 2005, with a sixth PRSP under development. Analysis of the five PRSPs that were already established revealed the following findings with regard to the treatment of energy.

### Overview of Findings for Latin America

- All five of the PRSPs analysed from Latin America referred to energy in the context of meeting national development goals.
- Four of the five made an explicit connection between energy and macroeconomic growth, and four explored the connections between energy and reducing income poverty. Regarding other macroeconomic links to energy, only two Latin American PRSPs explicitly cited the linkages between energy and international trade and none explored the connections between energy and debt sustainability.
- In contrast with other regions, climate change received more attention, with the majority of PRSPs (3 of 5) exploring the linkages between patterns of energy use and global climate change. Two PRSPs discussed the connections between energy use and other dimensions of environmental sustainability, such as deforestation.
- Relationships between energy and other social development goals received lesser attention. Two PRSPs discussed linkages between energy and health, and one PRSP strongly mentioned the connections between energy and gender equality, but none explored the implications of energy services for expanding access to education.
- PRSPs from Latin America stressed electricity as the most critical energy need, with strong emphasis on expansion of supply. Attention focused on conventional fossil fuel-based technologies and large-scale hydropower development. However, three PRSPs also discussed deployment of decentralized, renewable energy options, such as solar and wind.
- Despite the fact that the poor often rely on biomass as a primary energy source for cooking, strategies such as increasing access to modern household fuels or improving management of traditional biomass fuels received scant consideration.
- Three PRSPs set out explicit targets and associated timelines for reaching energy-related goals.
- In terms of budgeting for energy needs, a minority of Latin American PRSPs (2 of 5) explicitly allocated budgetary resources to national energy priorities in their Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs). However, the percentage of MTEF budget allocated for energy priorities was only 2.9 percent for Honduras, and only 0.03 percent for Guyana, with per capita expenditures of US\$1.30 and US\$0.20, respectively.

### 7.1 Linking Energy to National Development Goals

There were considerable variations and similarities in the way PRSPs in Latin America linked energy to national development goals to reduce poverty. As in most other regions, none of the five PRSPs analysed reserved a standalone chapter for energy. Nevertheless, all of them referenced energy and treated the energy-poverty nexus with particular emphasis on infrastructure. For instance, Honduras's PRSP noted that infrastructure support for productive activities, such as electricity consumption, is below the regional average and should be increased.

As indicated in Table 7.1, the five PRSPs from the Latin America region gave a variable coverage of energy's role in the various MDG areas.

**Table 7.1 Energy-MDG Nexus of Latin America**

<b>Context of Discussion</b>	<b>Strongly Mentioned</b>	<b>Mentioned</b>	<b>Not Mentioned</b>
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 5</i>			
Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)	4	1	0
Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)	4	0	1
Reducing hunger (MDG 1)	2	0	3
Education (MDG 2)	0	0	5
Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)	1	1	3
Health (MDG 4/5/6)	2	0	3
Climate change (MDG 7)	3	0	2
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	2	2	1
International trade (MDG 8)	2	1	2
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	0	0	5
<b>Total</b>	20/50	6/50	23/50
<b>Score</b>	0.40	0.12	0.46

With the exception of the Dominican Republic, the PRSPs made an explicit connection between energy and macroeconomic development (MDG 1). Guyana's PRSP noted that 'unreliable power-supply and high cost of energy contribute to high cost of production and uncompetitiveness of Guyana's products in regional and international markets'. The same types of discussions were found in relation to the role of energy in reducing income poverty (MDG 1). The PRSP for Honduras posited that 'the objective of the rural electrification program is to provide rural communities with electric power service that will support production and improve the well-being of the rural population'.

Meanwhile, other macroeconomic links, like international trade and debt sustainability (MDG 8), received less attention in the PRSPs as shown above. Nicaragua's PRSP commented that the 'economy has been affected by exogenous factors such as wide and frequent movement in terms of trade - especially the hikes in oil prices. This affects investment levels and growth while seriously disrupting production and stable macroeconomic management'. In its report, Bolivia plans to increase its fiscal revenue from royalties derived from gas exports to Brazil and also through its thermoelectric stations to export electricity and gas.

On the other hand, the links between energy and social issues like health, education, gender equality and food security received less prominence in the PRSPs. Only two PRSPs made an explicit connection between energy and reducing hunger (MDG 1) and none of the PRSPs mentioned or elaborated on the nexus between energy and education (MDG 2). Similarly, only one PRSP discussed energy in terms of gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3), while two PRSPs elaborated on the connection between energy and health (MDG 4/5/6). Bolivia's PRSP underscored that air pollution within households affects a large percentage of rural families and is caused by cooking, traditionally a female task.

In contrast to other regions, climate change (MDG 7) received relatively more analysis, with three out five PRSPs making the connection between patterns of energy use and climate change. The Honduran PRSP described plans to promote the development and application of energy technologies that respond to climate change, and Nicaragua’s report included quantified carbon dioxide emissions (metric tons per year) as one of the economic and social indicators for sustainable development.

Unlike in other regions, environmental issues like deforestation received less attention, with only two PRSPs elaborating on energy use in connection with other environmental sustainability issues. Again, the Honduran PRSP noted that ‘deforestation problems are also associated with the high consumption of firewood, which continues the fuel of domestic consumption and easiest access’.

In sum, with an averaged score of 0.4, on a scale of 0 to 1,(see Table 7.1) the PRSPs of Latin America fared below average, compared to other regions, in their comprehensiveness in linking energy to the multiple aspects of national development goals to eradicate poverty.

## 7.2 Prioritising the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies

Like other regions, electricity expansion or development plans were the most frequently cited energy strategy in the Latin American PRSPs, with a focus decidedly on the expansion of electricity supply. Most PRSPs disaggregated energy issues into rural and urban categories and also discussed explicit policies in support of rural electrification.

Although decentralized renewable energy source options, like wind and solar power, were discussed in three PRSPs, there was nonetheless an observed inclination in favour of conventional centralised technologies, such as large-scale hydro and thermal power plants, as priority energy strategies. The Bolivian PRSP described plans to enhance rural electrification programs by including renewable energy sources. It noted that the general goal of the strategy is to eliminate financial, institutional, technical and human resource-related barriers to achieving the successful implementation of projects to initiate sustainable programs that can be replicated in rural areas of the country.

**Table 7.2 Priority Focus of Energy Strategies in Latin American PRSPs**

<b>Energy Strategy</b>	<b>Strongly Mentioned</b>	<b>Mentioned</b>	<b>Not Mentioned</b>
<i>Total number of PRSPs = 5</i>			
Electricity, electric grid extension/development	4	0	1
Modern household fuels for cooking or heating (LPG, kerosene, ethanol, etc.)	0	1	4
Mechanical power for productive applications (such as agricultural mechanisation, motive power)	1	0	4
Fuels for transport	0	1	4
Use of traditional biomass (such as wood, dung)	0	3	2
Modernised biomass (such as biogas, gasification)	1	0	4
Decentralised renewable energy options (such as solar, wind, or mini-hydro)	3	0	2

The PRSPs cited several reasons for making the development of renewable and decentralised energy technologies a priority action, including for achieving energy efficiency, environmental sustainability and overcoming the physical constraints of geography and remoteness. Guyana's PRSP notes that 'little or no information exists on current energy access and use patterns and the local energy resource endowment of the hinterland areas, thus resources will be provided to evaluate economically and socio-environmentally viable options and requirements, and sustainable institutional and financial schemes for hinterland electrification'.

Since biomass was recognised in the PRSPs as the primary source of energy for the poor, the expectation was that there would be a strong policy push for improved biomass-based technologies. Yet, the management of traditional biomass was hardly referenced and the development of modernised biomass as an energy strategy was discussed in only one PRSPs.

**Table 7.3 Numbers of Latin American PRSPs with Energy Targets/Benchmarks**

<i>Total Number of PRSPs</i>	5
Number of PRSPs with Explicitly defined targets for energy	3
Number explicitly defined targets for energy	2

As shown in Table 7.3 above, three PRSPs set out explicit targets and timelines to meet specific measures and programs to deliver energy services. Bolivia's PRSP aims to expand rural electrification by 40 percent before 2006, while Guyana's report had set a target of expanding electricity to 40,000 un-served rural household by January 2004. On the other hand, the Nicaraguan PRSP described plans to install electricity-generating systems pioneered by solar energy for cold storage and marketing, but failed to set any timeline or targets.

### **7.3 Budgeting for the Energy Needs of the Poor in National Development Strategies**

In general, the PRSPs of Latin America fell below average in backing political commitments with explicit budgetary resources for energy policy priorities in their Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). As shown in Table 7.4 below, two PRSPs made specific and clear financial allocations to response measures to alleviate energy poverty.

**Table 7.4 Number of Latin American PRSPs with Budgetary Resources Allocated to Energy**

<i>Total Number of PRSPs</i>	5
Number of PRSPs with Explicitly defined budgetary allocation to energy in MTEF	2
PRSPs without explicitly defined budgetary allocation to energy in MTEF	3

The average budgetary allocation is 1.5 percent, which is the low in comparison with other regions. The per capita expenditure on energy, approximately \$0.80, is also the lowest among the four regions examined in this report; though the comparison is subjective given the fact that Latin America is more advanced than other regions in the level of availability of energy services.

**Table 7.5 Budget Resources Allocated to Energy by Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks of Latin America**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Percent of MTEF Budget Allocated for Energy (%)</b>	<b>Annual MTEF allocated to Energy (US \$ million)</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Per Capita Energy Expenditure per year in MTEF (US\$)</b>
Bolivia	N/A	N/A	8,857,870	N/A
Dominican Republic	N/A	N/A	9,049,595	N/A
Guyana	0.03	0.2	697,286	0.2
Honduras	2.9	9.2	7,167,902	1.3
Nicaragua	N/A	N/A	5,465,100	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>			31,237,753	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	1.5	4.7		0.8

## REFERENCES

- Bojo, J. and Reddy, R. 'Status and Evolution of Environmental Priorities in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: An Assessment of Fifty Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers,' World Bank Environmental Economics Series, 2003.
- 'Energy for Sustainable Development,' UNDP, 2004
- Energy for sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific region: challenges and lessons from UNDP projects, United Nations Development Programme, 2004
- 'Energizing Poverty Reduction in Africa: Europe's Chance to Help Light up Africa Practical Action,' 2005 [http://www.itdg.org/?id=energy\\_aid](http://www.itdg.org/?id=energy_aid)
- 'Energy the Challenge for Achieving Millennium Development Goals,' UN-Energy Paper July 2005 <http://esa.un.org/un-energy/pdf/UN-ENRG%20paper.pdf>
- Lampiotti and Meyer, 'Coping with the Cold: Heating Strategies for Eastern Europe and Central Asia's Urban Poor, Europe and Central Asia Region Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Infrastructure and Energy,' The World Bank, 2002, [www.worldbank.org/eca/environment](http://www.worldbank.org/eca/environment)
- Reddy, A, 'Energy technologies and policies for rural development in energy for sustainable development, A policy agenda,' UNDP, 2002; 'Achieving the millennium development goals: the role of energy services, Case studies of Brazil, Mali, and Philippines,' UNDP, 2005
- Sachs, et al, 'Millennium Development Goals Needs Assessment : Country Case Studies of Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ghana, Tanzania, and Uganda,' (working draft), 2003
- Tharan, P. and Mc Donald, M. 'Poverty and Environment: Developing and Testing a PRSP Evaluation Methodology,' WWF Macroeconomics for Sustainable Development Program Office, (2004) <http://www.panda.org/downloads/policy/prspfinal.pdf>
- World Energy Assessment Overview, 2004, UNDP [http://www.undp.org/energy/docs/WEAOU\\_full.pdf](http://www.undp.org/energy/docs/WEAOU_full.pdf)

# ANNEXES

## Annex 1

### Terms of Reference

#### Review of the treatment of energy issues in PRSPs

##### **Introduction:**

Access to energy services is fundamental for poverty reduction and sustainable development. Indeed, none of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) can be met without an increase in access to energy services in developing countries. Yet, to date there are 2.4 billion people who are still dependent on traditional biomass for cooking and heating, while 1.6 billion people have no access to electricity.

UNDP's development efforts are focused on five thematic priority areas, one of which is energy and environment. UNDP's efforts in energy for sustainable development support the Millennium Summit objective of reducing by half the proportion of people living in poverty by 2015. As the UN system resident coordinator, UNDP works to identify strategic entry points for enhancing policy options by supporting capacity development, assisting with projects and delivering knowledge derived from on-the-ground lessons.

UNDP's Sustainable Energy Programme works toward ensuring that the policy guidance and operational tools of UNDP support the three pillars of sustainable development — economic development, social concerns and environmental protection at the global, regional and national levels. UNDP's energy portfolio, 1996-2003, amounts to more than \$2 billion, the largest among the UN agencies. UNDP's four priority areas in energy are:

- Strengthening national policy frameworks to support energy for poverty reduction and sustainable development;
- Promoting rural energy services to support growth and equity;
- Promoting clean energy technologies for sustainable development; and
- Increasing access to investment financing for sustainable energy.

The major advocacy and analysis publication of UNDP dealing with sustainable energy is the "World Energy Assessment: Energy and the Challenge of Sustainability". This and other UNDP publications on energy are available on the Web site [www.undp.org/energy](http://www.undp.org/energy).

##### **Scope of Work:**

Having recognized energy's critical importance, how is energy treated in national development strategies? Do those strategies indeed adequately reflect the role of energy in contributing to national development goals?

The objective of the present assignment is to examine the above questions by assessing the treatment of energy services, in particular, those related to the poor, within macro-development strategy documents. Given the limited time framework, the assessment will almost exclusively focus on reviewing existing poverty-reduction strategy documents that are publicly accessible<sup>7</sup>, with some focus on sub-Saharan Africa.

Key questions to be assessed include:

- How is energy discussed in relation to each of the MDGs?
- Are there any biases toward certain technologies or energy sources?
- Is the distinction recognized between energy supply and energy services?
- Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, what is the percentage of access to electricity or modern cooking fuels, such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity, etc.?
- What are the recommended policy priorities (e.g., electrification versus fuels; rural versus urban; traditional biomass; transport, etc.)?
- How much budget priority does energy get? What is the level/share of funding for energy within the national budget? Any disaggregation, e.g., urban versus rural, or electricity versus fuels, etc.?
- What percentage of energy budgets are supported by internal and external sources, respectively?
- How have the estimates for energy budgets been derived?

Specifically, the following activities should be conducted:

**Activity 1:** Conduct a quick review of all available PRSPs (about 70). This is to create a bird's-eye view of where PRSPs are vis-à-vis energy. The assessment should be summarized in a table format and should not include narrative discussions. The following points should be reviewed for each of all available PRSPs:

### **Energy's links with national development goals:**

- a. Is energy mentioned? (y/n)
- b. Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document? (y/n) If no, under which chapter is it primarily discussed?
- c. Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters as well? (y/n) If yes, in which chapters?
- d. Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?  
Answer (y/n).
  - Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)
  - Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)
  - Reducing hunger (MDG 1)
  - Education (MDG 2)

---

<sup>7</sup> The most common place to locate those will be in the poverty reduction strategy section of the website of the World Bank.

- Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)
- Health (MDG 4/5/6)
- Climate change (MDG 7)
- Other environmental issues (MDG 7)
- International trade (MDG 8)
- Debt sustainability (MDG 8)

**National energy priorities and the poor:**

- e. Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document? Choose one. If two are necessary, put them in order of priority.)
  - Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.
  - Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.
  - Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.
- f. Which energy policy priorities are put forward? Choose and rank in the order of priority given in the document (with 1 being most important): electrification, fuels for transport, modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, kerosene, etc.), mechanical power for productive applications, management of traditional biomass, deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol, etc.), deployment of other renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc.) and others.
- g. Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural? (y/n)
- h. Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country? (y/n). If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized (Note: Use the same categories listed in question F above).
- i. Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, what is the percentage of access to electricity or modern cooking fuels, such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity, etc.? If they do set targets/benchmarks, please list the set targets.

**National budgets for energy:**

- j. Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document? (y/n)
- k. What annual allocations for energy are suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?
- l. Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, lending, etc)?
- m. Does it provide any disaggregation, such as budgets for rural versus urban; electrification, fuels, biomass, etc.? If yes, please list those categories and associated budgets.

**Activity 2:** Based on the findings of Activity 1, develop a report that provides narrative descriptions to discuss main findings and trends. As needed, tables, figures and graphs should be used to visualize the key trends. While this assessment will not focus on investigating the root causes of the current trends, it is expected that supplementary interviews will be conducted to get some anecdotal information/evidence on this aspect, which should be reflected in the report. A suggested composition of the report will be as follows:

Foreword (including the objective of the review)

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Overview/Executive Summary (maximum 1.5 pages)

Chapter 2. Regional trends

- Africa (5 pages maximum, including figures/tables)
  - a. Summary findings
  - b. Energy's links to national development goals
  - c. National energy priorities and the poor
  - d. National budgets for energy
- Asia/Pacific Islands (same length/subchapters as above)
- Eastern Europe/CIS (same length/subchapters as above)
- Latin America and Caribbean (same length/subchapters as above)

Chapter 3. Conclusion (1 page)

## Annex 2

### MATRIX OF ANALYSIS

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>
<i>Electrification</i>
<i>Mechanical Power for productive applications</i>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, kerosene, etc.)</i>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol, etc.)</i>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc.)</i>

**e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels, such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity, etc.?**

**NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY**

**a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?**

**b) What annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?**

**c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, lending, etc)?**

**d) Does it provide any divisions, such as budgets for rural versus urban; electrification, fuels, biomass, etc.?**

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

### Annex 3

#### STATUS OF POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY PAPERS

##### AFRICA

COUNTRY	STATUS	YEAR
CAMEROON	FULL	2003
BENIN	FULL	2003
BURKINA FASO	FULL	2004
BURUNDI	INTERIM	2004
CHAD	FULL	2003
CENTRAL AFRICA REPUBLIC	INTERIM	2000
DRC	INTERIM	2004
CONGO	INTERIM	2002
IVORY COAST	INTERIM	2002
DJIBOUTI	INTERIM	2002
ETHIOPIA	FULL	2002
GAMBIA	FULL	2002
GHANA	FULL	2004
GUINEA	FULL	2004
GUINEA-BISSAU	INTERIM	2000
KENYA	FULL	2005
LESOTHO	FULL	2004
MADAGASCAR	FULL	2003
MALAWI	FULL	2002
MALI	FULL	2003
MAURITANIA	FULL	2002
MOZAMBIQUE	FULL	2001
NIGER	FULL	2002
RWANDA	FULL	2002
SAO TOME	FULL	2002
SENEGAL	FULL	2002
SIERRA LEONE	INTERIM	2001
TANZANIA	FULL	2000
UGANDA	FULL	2000
ZAMBIA	FULL	2002

##### EASTERN EUROPE AND COMMON WEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES

COUNTRY	STATUS	YEAR
ALBANIA	FULL	2002
ARMENIA	FULL	2003

AZERBAIJAN	FULL	2003
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	FULL	2004
KYGYZSTAN	FULL	2002
THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA	INTERIM	2000
MOLDOVA	FULL	2004
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	FULL	2004
TAJKISTAN	FULL	2002
GEORGIA	FULL	2003

## ASIA

COUNTRY	STATUS	DATE
BANGLADESH	INTERIM	2003
CAMBODIA	FULL	2002
LAOS PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	FULL	2004
MONGOLIA	FULL	2003
PAKISTAN	FULL	2004
NEPAL	FULL	2003
VIET NAM	FULL	2004
SRI LANKA	FULL	2002
BHUTAN	FULL	2004

## LATIN AMERICA

COUNTRY	STATUS	DATE
BOLIVIA	FULL	2001
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	INTERIM	2004
GUYANA	FULL	2002
HONDURAS	FULL	2001
NICARAGUA	FULL	2001

## Annex 4

### INDIVIDUAL COUNTRY ANALYSIS

#### AFRICA

#### **Benin**

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<i>Comment:</i> The electrification of 51 rural communities and the electrification of border localities and of large community –administered villages.	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment:</i> The document doesn't make explicit allocation for energy, as it makes for other sectors as education, health and roads.	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Burkina Faso

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	2
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	0
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	No
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: Mines, quarries, energy – Small mining and rural identification: CFAF billion: 0.45 (2004), 0.68 (2005), 0.55 (2006).</i>	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Burundi

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	Yes
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	1
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	2
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	1
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	1
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0

<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: The document recognizes the Government's necessity to expand the energy sector in order to increase and diversify its output. Energy is one of the sectors that continue under public control. It is also in the program of Public Expenditure Reviews (PER) that will have an individual budgetary level, but the document does not have more information about it.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Cameroon**

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: Energy is mentioned as one of the sectors in which the Government of Cameroon has to make deep reforms. However, the document does not mention specific goals or results that must be reached by the reforms. Electricity is recognized as one of the three major concerns of the population with regard to infrastructure services. According to the document, the energy sector reform program constitutes the main instrument for extending electricity to the population, including to remote rural areas. In order to ensure that the program benefits both economic operators and the population as a whole, the government is taking steps to strengthen the capacities of the regulatory agency (ARSEL) and to work closely with AES/SONEL, the main operator in the energy sector. Both are steps in implementing the investment program that was agreed upon as part of the privatization deal. At the same time, the government is contemplating different options for improving the country's capacity to generate electricity, including the construction of a new hydroelectric power plant, and thermal stations, and mini stations or other plants in areas outside the interconnected grid. Also, in the period 2003 – 2005, the Government plans to develop and make accessible alternative forms of energy and to extend the rural electrification program, but it doesn't recognized some percentage or indicator that must be reach.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Chad

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>1</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	<b>X</b>
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>

<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	2
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: Increase the proportion of households with access to electricity to 20% in 2006 from 1.1% in 1993. The document proposes the use of alternative sources of energy that actually exist in the country to expand the service to the population.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Central Africa Republic

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	Yes
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	1
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	

<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: Página: 53</i> One of the goals is to create a regulatory agency for water, electricity, telecommunications and petroleum products. The government is looking to eliminate existing controls over prices or margins, including those relating to petroleum, electricity, water, transportation, and telecommunications, as the relevant companies are privatized. At the time the document was drafted, this policy was applied to petroleum products, and the government was thinking of expanding its application to water and telecommunications.	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Democratic Republic of Congo

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: The document proposes the rehabilitation of infrastructures – including electricity – for the poor, mainly in rural areas.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Congo

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Djibouti

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>

f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.	No
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?	No
b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?	N/A
c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?	N/A
e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Ethiopia

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
a) Is energy mentioned?	Yes
b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?	No
c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?	Yes
d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	2
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	2
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?	Yes
c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?	Yes
d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?	
<i>Electrification</i>	2

<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: Electrify 164 Woreda towns. The percentage of electrified Woreda towns in each regional government is expected to reach 73% by the end of the project. The project cost is estimated at about USD 160 million; which 140,53 was going to be obtained in Foreign currency and 19,47 was going to be obtained in local currency. Another of the target is the increase of the generation capacity from 327 MW to 663 MW. The number of electrified towns will increase from 458 to 651. As a result, the percentage of population having access to electricity will increase from 13% to 17% by 2004/05.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: The allocation to energy is found under the “Program Cost for Water” and is for Hydropower Study and Design.</i>	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>1.75%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Gambia

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>

<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**Note:** The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Ghana

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	1
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	X
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	1
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	9.19%
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	G 14.8% E 65.18%
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	No

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Guinea

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Guinea Bissau

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>

f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.	No
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?	No
b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?	N/A
c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?	N/A
e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Ivory Coast

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
a) Is energy mentioned?	Yes
b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?	No
c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?	Yes
d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	1
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	1
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?	Yes
c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?	Yes
d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?	
<i>Electrification</i>	2

<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: The rural electrification objective was directed at stepping up implementation of the national program, bringing power to 2,000 rural localities per year. This was to raise coverage from 23 percent in 1997 to 33 percent in 2000. As of December 31, 2000, 112 localities were electrified, up from 93 in 1999. In the period 1998-2000, 282 villages underwent electrification out of the 600 planned, corresponding to an execution rate of 47 percent. The percentage of households that use electricity as their main source of lighting was 42.8 percent. In rural areas that rate was just 14 percent, compared to 77 percent in urban areas and 87.5 percent in Abidjan.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**Note:** The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Kenya

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	1
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	2
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: With regard to electricity, the aim of the government is “to reach a penetration rate of at least 40 per cent of the rural population by 2020 from the current 4 per cent.” The document also discusses <b>objectives</b> for the improvement of petroleum and new and renewable energy, but it does not provide specific benchmarks.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	15.42%
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: The budget allocations for energy are thoroughly disaggregated. Specific amounts of money are linked to projects for “reliable energy services available at lower costs,” “access to electricity by rural communities,” “increased usage of alternative energy resources,” “the increase of LPG consumption,” “lowering costs and improving competition as well as creating safety standards,” and for “discovering petroleum and coal deposits.”</i>	

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Lesotho

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Madagascar

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>

<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment:</i> Energy consumption is expected to increase from 0.3TEP/capita/year (2002) to 0.5 TEP/capita/year (2005). The rate of access to electricity should increase from 22 per cent in 2002 to 26 per cent in 2006. 150 villages should be electrified every year. The number of subscribers connected a year should increase from 15,000 to 20,000 subscribers. Additional capacity of 110 MW per period. The share of wood energy in energy supply down from 75 per cent in 2003 to 65 per cent in 2006.	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment:</i> In 2004, the expected total amount to be spent on energy is 117.7 FMG billions. As part of the STRATEGIC FOCUS 2 (to accelerate growth through increased, effective investment and through opening up the world economy) the government planned to spend 117.7 FMG billions in an energy program. There are several subprograms: (1) institutional reform, (2) electrification, production, transportation and distribution of energy, (3) sustainable management of the supply of wood for energy use, (4) improved energy supply. However, the amount available is not disaggregated according to the subprograms.	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>3.17%</b>
<i>Comment:</i> Moreover, Of the budget allocated to infrastructure, in 2004 3.0% is allocated to energy, in 2004 2.9% is allocated to energy and in 2006 2.8% is allocated to energy.	
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Malawi

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	2
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	1
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	1
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	2
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: Target by 2005: to electrify 73 new sites, create 103 new biogas plants, and disseminate charcoal and wood stove technology to 27 districts.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	1.36 %
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	No
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	Yes

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Mali

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	Yes
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	

Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)	2
Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)	2
Reducing hunger (MDG 1)	0
Education (MDG 2)	0
Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)	2
Health (MDG 4/5/6)	2
Climate change (MDG 7)	2
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	2
International trade (MDG 8)	2
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	2
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	0
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	No
<i>Comment: The government has some general objectives (reduce wood consumption, increase electricity access) but no set targets.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Mauritania

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>

*Comment:* The “Matrix of Priority Measures under the PRSP” (Annex 3), contains energy-related objectives for the period 2001-2004. Under ‘Basic Infrastructure’ these objectives include: Improve supply and access to electricity and telecommunications infrastructure, including the privatization of electricity provider; Continuation of investment program in electricity; Promote rural electrification and energy savings; and Secure petroleum product supplies. No specific targets are discussed.

Under ‘Urban Development’ the energy-related objectives are: Restructure and service shanty towns of NKC and NDB and make basic infrastructure (water, sanitation, electricity, housing, etc.) accessible to 500,000 people.

Under ‘Access to Universal Services’, the energy-related objectives are: Increase access to electricity and promote alternative energies, and rate study on the costs of electricity.

#### **NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY**

<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

*Note:* The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Mozambique**

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	

<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: Report describes 'principle measures to be undertaken' for the energy programme: -Electrify 25 administrative posts, through the use of solar energy systems. -Install power plants in 42 district headquarters. -Expand the national grid through the building of new lines: 110 KV, Xai-Xai Lindela; 110 KV, Nampula-Nacala; 110KV, Nampula-Chiure-Pemba; 110KV, Gurue-Lichinga; 400 KV, Songo-Nacala. - Other measures include supplying electricity to 60,000 new domestic consumers.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>Comment: unverifiable</i>	
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Niger

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comments: Under Priority Actions Related to the Productive Sectors: “expanding the power grid coverage from 4 percent to 15 percent in 2005 while increasing the access rate from 5 percent to 25 percent over the same period; curbing the use of wood fuel by encouraging the use of alternative sources of energy.” &amp; Strengthen the institutional capacity of Ministry of Mines and Energy.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>0.57%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: For each of three targets/objectives (see above) the PRSP Action Plan includes line-item actions, including rural electrification project.</i>	

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Rwanda

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: PRSP identifies a number of “Actions” for energy but falls short of setting firm targets. For example, some actions include: · More generation capacity will be created in 2002 so as to reduce the costs of energy.</i>	

- Financing options for rehabilitation, network extension and new power stations will be explored in 2002.
- Private sector participation in the sector will be welcomed, particularly for peat and gas exploitation.
- A programme of rural electrification will be mounted, after careful consideration of the best private-public balance in supply, over 2002-05.
- Grid extension and the connection of villages already close to power lines will be high priorities.
- We will disseminate information about improved stoves and other forms of low-cost energy, and possibly subsidise them after careful study.
- Solar cells, dryers and water heaters are projects that may be undertaken at the community, household or enterprise level. Government will provide relevant information and support research, and possibly mount demonstrations.

#### **NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY**

<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
<i>Comment: Currently programmed MTEF energy expenditures are only .21% of national total; but after proposed increase, the ratio increases to 2.6% (under “unconstrained PRSP scenario”)</i>	
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: Disaggregates between central vs province, and electricity vs new and renewable energy.</i>	

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Sao Tome**

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	

<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Senegal

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>

Health (MDG 4/5/6)	2
Climate change (MDG 7)	0
Other environmental issues (MDG 7)	2
International trade (MDG 8)	0
Debt sustainability (MDG 8)	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	2
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	1
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	2
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	No
<p><i>Comment:</i> While the PRSP does not set specific target or benchmarks, the report does delineate the following priorities for developing the country's energy sector:  (i) development of production capacities (promotion of electric power use in productive activities); (ii) development of energy infrastructures and services through involvement of the private sector, village associations and local authorities; (iii) ensuring the financing of development activities for the energy subsector; (iv) diversification of energy sources; (v) improvement of and ensuring the population's access to household fuels, and (vi) strengthening of rural electrification.</p> <p>Within these priorities, more concrete actions are identified as well. For example, "Electrification of all rural towns" is an action point.</p>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	6%
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	G 24%    E 4.07%
<p><i>Comment:</i> amount of government and external funds committed PTIP for energy equal 24% and 4% of amount expected under PRSP for energy. Additional funding to cover the financing shortfall will come from both government and external, equaling 44% and 56% respectively (annex III).</p>	
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	Yes

*Comment:* Budget disaggregated into two categories: ‘improving populations’ access to domestic fuels’ and ‘expansion of rural electrification’.

**Note:** The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Sierra Leone

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>

*Comment:* No specific targets are set, but general ‘steps to be taken’ include: i) to improve energy sector governance and regulation and ii) to reduce the health and environmental costs associated with energy supply and use. Also, a “plan to complete the Bumbuna Hydro-Electricity Dam to serve the Western Area and parts of the Northern Province...within the period of implementation of the PRSP.”

<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

*Note:* The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Tanzania

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	Yes
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	1
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	No
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	No

<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Uganda

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	

<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: A target of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) 2000 is to achieve “12% rural electrification by 2010.”</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: A category exists in the MTEF for ‘Energy and Minerals [Natural Resources]’ but there is no stand-alone category for energy identified.</i>	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>No</b>

**Note:** The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Zambia**

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	2
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	2
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	1
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	2
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<p><i>Comment:</i> Programmes in the energy sector to contribute to poverty reduction under the Zambian National Energy Policy (NEP) will aim at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing the electricity access rate from the current 20 percent to 35 percent by the year 2010.</li> <li>• Reducing the production of charcoal by about 400,000 tonnes by 2010.</li> <li>• Increasing of electricity exports to neighbouring countries by 300 percent by the year 2010 from the current levels</li> </ul> <p>In addition the PRSP identifies three strategies for the energy sector: 1) To increase electricity access rate for both rural and urban areas; 2) To reduce dependency on wood fuel and promote efficient use of alternative energy resources; 3) To create new energy delivery infrastructure and increase electricity exports to neighbouring countries; 4) To supply and utilise petroleum in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.</p> <p>Under these three strategies there are <u>a number of programs and actions listed, but these are not all time-bound targets</u>. They include, for example: Rehabilitation of power stations; Implement solar energy projects for 150 rural schools, 50 rural health centres, and at least 1,100 households through solar home systems for three years; Develop the Kafue Gorge Lower Hydro Electric Scheme; etc.</p>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure</b>	Yes

<b>Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>\$114,000,000 9.50%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment:</i> Report includes a costing breakdown of the Energy Policy Actions. Appendix 2-10 shows the costs for the various programmes of the four main objectives (listed above). This includes programmes for rural electrification projects and increasing renewables, for example.	

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## ASIA

### Bangladesh

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>

b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?	N/A
c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?	N/A
e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Bhutan

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
a) Is energy mentioned?	Yes
b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?	No
c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?	Yes
d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?	Yes
c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?	Yes
d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	0
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	0

<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: One of the goals of the 'Ninth Plan' is to achieve "100 percent rural electrification by 2020." The major activities proposed are a) rural electrification targeting 15,000 households, three-fold increase over the Eighth Plan target of 5,000 household; b) construction of transmission grid; c) preparation of energy and water resource master plan including feasibility studies of new hydroelectricity projects; and d) institutional strengthening and capacity building of energy sector.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>Nu 6359.884 million 9.1%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Cambodia

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>1</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	

<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<p>Comment: The Cambodia Action Plan includes two strategic objectives for energy that address increasing adequate and reliable supply of energy through public investment in energy infrastructure and grid extension.</p> <p>This plan includes some time-bound targets and other indicators of progress that are not time-bound: For example: 20% decrease in power tariff; Increased percentage of households using electricity; National grid from; Vietnam established 2005; National grid from Thailand established in 2004; Cambodia power system integrated/interconnected 2020; 200 rural communities receiving power supply; Percentage of electricity generated by private sector 60%; Decline in tariff by 30%; etc.</p>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>31.60%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Laos

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	

<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	2
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	1
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	1
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	1
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	2
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: The target for Energy and Rural Electrification is to “ensure that 70 percent of the households have electricity by 2010.”</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Mongolia

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system</i>	<b>X</b>
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>

*Comment:* According to the Mid-Term Policy Matrix of the Mongolian PRSP, the following targets will be achieved in the period 2003-2006:

- To start implementing the second phase of the rehabilitation of Ulaanbaatar thermal powerstation #2
- To implement a project to reduce energy distribution loss at Ulaanbaatar, Dornod, Suhbaatar, Zavhan, Bayanhongor, Huvsgul, Umnogovi and Govi-Altai aimags' powerplants
- With the aim to generate cheap energy source, to ensure preparations for construction of several hydro-powerstations (HPS), and carry out the construction
- To implement projects on renewable energy (wind and solar) in rural areas.
- To complete the construction of Ulaanboom HPS, and to connect to Zavhan and Govi-Altai aimag centers through high voltage air lines
- “To intensify the implementation of the national program A hundred thousand sun lights”, and supply 30,000 rural herders' households with renewable energy generators

**NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY**

<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

*Note:* The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

**Nepal**

**ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>

**NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES**

<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
---	--

<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: The PRSP has several target for the power sector, under the objective to expand electricity coverage. These actions and targets include: Increase in percentage of population with access to electricity from 40 to 55 percent; Adopt a subsidy policy for grid-based rural electrification by FY 2004; Adopt a framework for cooperative based rural electrification; Increase installed capacity from 527 MW to 830 MW; and Increase length of transmission lines from 1962 km to 2392 km.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Pakistan**

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>

<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	1
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	2
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	0
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	2
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: "The Government of Pakistan has launched a rural electrification program. Under this program 15,000 villages will be electrified during 2003-04 to 2005-06."</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	5611 (Rs million) 0.33%
<i>Comment: 5611 million Rs. is for rural electrification expenditure.</i>	
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Sri Lanka

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: The Power Sector Action Plan of the Sri Lankan PRSP contains 17 time-bound priority actions and targets. These include, for example: "Expedite the implementation, by the private sector, of a 165 MW combined Cycle Power plant at Kelanitissa by mid-2003," or, "Strategy to provide electricity for the rural sector" by 2003. And, to revitalize rural development and reduce rural poverty, the PRSP also targets for "Electricity reaching 80 percent of all households by 2005."</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	

a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?	Yes
b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?	531 (\$million) 9.6%
c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?	N/A
e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?	No

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Vietnam

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
a) Is energy mentioned?	Yes
b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?	No
c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?	Yes
d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	1
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?	Yes
c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?	Yes
d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0

<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: The PRSP contains the target to “Expand the national transmission grid to 900 poor commune centers by 2005.” Other energy-related commitments in the action plan include: Construct and approve the Electricity Law; Develop decrees on the demand side of energy management and energy efficiency, and; Encourage the use of biogas in rural areas and develop solar, wind energy and other energy resources.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## EASTERN EUROPE AND THE COMMON WEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES

### Albania

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>

*Comment:* Although they are not firm targets, the Albanian Plan of Action includes several ‘Public Priority Measures’ that are to be completed in the period 2002-2005. These measures aim to improve management of energy resources and expand energy generation capacity. For example:

- Enhancing the competencies and the financial resources of the Energy Regulatory Body
- Approval of a new, cost-based tariff electricity structure
- Improvement of collection of electricity bills from all consumers
- Reduction of technical and non-technical losses in electricity transmission and distribution
- Preparation and implementation for rehabilitation of existing electricity generation facilities and the construction of new facilities
- Implementation of measures to reduce demand for electricity through stimulated use of alternative energy sources for heating and cooking and the improved efficiency in the use of energy;
- Improvement of electricity supply for rural population, mainly through improvement of the general condition of the supply network;

#### **NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY**

<b>a). Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	0
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

### **Armenia**

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	Yes
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	2
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	2
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2

<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Comment: The Armenian PRSP contained only two general targets relating to energy. They are to “Increase accessibility to heating” in the period 2004-2006, and “Increase the efficiency of the energy system” from 2004 forward.</i>	
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a). Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>42.3 billion drams 2.6%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Azerbaijan**

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	1
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	0
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes

*Comment:* The Azerbaijan Energy Policy as defined in the PRSP has 5 key measures:

- 1) *Improving energy supply to the population through strengthening financial discipline in the fuel-energy sector.*
- 2) *Implementation of structural reforms.*
- 3) *Development of carbohydrate capacity.*
- 4) *Introducing efficient price policy.*
- 5) *Improve the energy supply system.*

Each policy measure contains 2-4 time-bound actions or targets that are to be completed from 2003 to 2005, and beyond. Some of these actions include: • Improving the payment system for consumption of energy carriers; • increasing public awareness of energy savings; • privatizing long-term management of gas distribution; • developing a national programme on alternative energy resources; etc.

Also, under the goal of “improving the social living conditions of refugees and IDPs,” the PRSP commits to the following energy-related targets and actions:

- Replacing the old electricity distribution lines and 70 transformers in IDP camps
- Purchasing 32,000 kerosene/gas stoves for heating during winter
- Purchasing kerosene fuel for 92,000 IDP families
- Rehabilitating energy supply system in IDP camps

For “Public Investment in Utility and Infrastructure,” the PRSP identifies the following targets:

- Gas storage capacity brought up to 3.5 billion m3;
- Oil export capacity increased up to 50 billion ton;
- Gas export capacity increased up to 7 billion m3 per annum;
- Additional 2,600 MWt power capacity ensured by 2005 to existing 5,000MWt

<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a). Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>732,356 (US\$ thousands) 57%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>D 4.3%, E 27%, G 68.7%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Bosnia Herzegovina**

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>

<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	2
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	No
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical power</i>	1
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	1
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	1
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<p><i>Comment:</i> The BiH PRSP has set many targets in order to “establish, develop and implement clear, well designed energy policy and appropriate action plans.” It also has a range of targets for individual energy sector: electric power sector, coal sector, natural gas sector and district heating, mostly to be completed between 2004 and 2006. Example of energy targets in the PRSP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to reduce energy consumption, use existing and available technologies such as heat isolation, air recycling, more efficient electric appliances etc.</li> <li>• expand the gas distribution network to include several cities to which gas can be cost effectively supplied through the extensions of the existing system,</li> <li>• expand the district heating coverage in cities and towns where the district heating systems have been reconditioned; etc.</li> </ul>	
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a). Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	0
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	No
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	No

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Georgia

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>

<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>630 Million GEL</b> <b>16.4%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>D 36.0%</b> <b>ODA 64.0%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: Yes, there are provisions for renewable energy, but also for oil and gas exploration, energy efficiency improvements, etc.</i>	

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## **Kyrgyz Republic**

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<p><i>Comment:</i> The PRSP commits to the following energy-related targets and actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce non-traditional and renewable sources of energy using the energy of mountain streams (mini-HPPs), solar and bio-stations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The shares of non-traditional and renewable sources of energy increased from 015 percent (2001) to 35 percent (2005) in the total volume of generated energy</li> <li>○ Bio-gas stations introduced in villages, field crop capacity increased by 20 center/ha</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Construction or rehabilitation of 8 Hydropower plants</li> </ul> <p>Improving supply of electricity to Osh and Batken regions and other districts/villages.</p>	
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>3.77%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>D 30% ODA 69%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Macedonia former Yugoslav Republic

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>

<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	No
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	No
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	0
<i>Mechanical power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	0
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	0
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	0
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	No
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	No
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	No
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Moldova Republic

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	<b>X</b>
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>

<i>Comment:</i> Although the Moldova PRSP does not set firm energy targets, it does outline the following actions to be completed for the medium-term development of the energy sector: 1. Extension of gas main-pipelines connections by constructing gas distribution stations and inter-urban gas pipelines 2. Promotion and implementation of the National Program for renovation and decentralization of heating supply systems in cities of the Republic of Moldova 3. Restructuring the energy sector by attracting private capital in different forms 4. Improving the regulatory framework to support development of the energy market and competition 5. Improving payment collections for energy along with social protection of vulnerable groups; & raising the share of non-traditional sources of energy (such as solar, wind, biogas).	
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>0.69%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>AP D 27.1% ODA 73%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>No</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Serbia and Montenegro

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	

<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>21.75 million Euros</b> <b>5%</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>D 35%</b> <b>ODA 63.4%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Tajikistan

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>

<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	2
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	2
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	2
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	X
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	Yes
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	Yes
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	2
<i>Mechanical power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	2
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	1
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	1
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	Yes
<i>Comment: To develop the energy sector, the Tajikistan PRSP outlines several energy-related measure and actions. Among these actions is a target to “Increase collection of funds from electricity users up to 100%”. Several specific power sector investments are also identified.</i>	
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	Yes
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	79,300 (US\$ thousand) 11.5%
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	D22.5% ODA77.6%
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	Yes

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## LATIN AMERICA

### Bolivia

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical Power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>f) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: In a section on Rural Electrification, the Bolivian PRSP states: Expanding into a second phase of PRONER will involve connecting about 200,000 more rural households to the electricity system, in addition to those already connected, and about 76,000 more that PRONER I is expected to connect during the years 2000-2002. In this way, a coverage of 40 percent of rural households will be</i>	

<i>achieved in 2006.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	N/A
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	N/A
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Dominican Republic

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	1
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	0
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	X
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	No
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	No
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	0

<i>Mechanical power</i>	0
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	0
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	0
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	0
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	0
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	0
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	No
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	N/A
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	N/A
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	N/A

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Guyana

<b><u>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</u></b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	Yes
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	No
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	Yes
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	2
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	0
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	0
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	0
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	2
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	0
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	1
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	0
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	0
<b><u>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</u></b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	

<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<i>Comment: The Guyana PRSP Action Plan has as one of its objective to “Provide electricity to underserved areas,” with requisite actions. This objective contains the target to connect 40,000 rural households over 3 years.</i>	
<b><u>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</u></b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>0.03%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc. If yes, please list down those categories and associated budgets?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Honduras

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macro economic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>

<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a) Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>2.90%</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.

## Nicaragua

<b>ENERGY LINK WITH NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS</b>	
<b>a) Is energy mentioned?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b) Does energy have a stand-alone chapter in the document?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>c) Is energy discussed/mentioned at all in other chapters too?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) Is energy recognized and discussed in relation to the following development aspects?</b>	
<i>Macroeconomic development (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing income poverty (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Reducing hunger (MDG 1)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Education (MDG 2)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Gender equality and the advancement of women (MDG 3)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Health (MDG 4/5/6)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Climate change (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Other environmental issues (MDG 7)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>International trade (MDG 8)</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Debt sustainability (MDG 8)</i>	<b>0</b>
<b>NATIONAL ENERGY PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>a) Which of the following expressions most closely describes the treatment of energy issues in the document?</b>	
<i>Expanding investments into energy supply infrastructure in the country.</i>	<b>X</b>
<i>Improving access to reliable and affordable energy services for the poor.</i>	
<i>Accelerating transition to a more sustainable energy system.</i>	
<b>b) Are the discussions on energy issues disaggregated per urban, peri-urban and rural?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c) Does it explicitly prioritize the energy needs of the poor, rather than of the country?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>d) If yes, which needs of the poor are recognized?</b>	
<i>Electrification</i>	<b>2</b>
<i>Mechanical power</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Fuels for transport</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Modern household fuels for cooking/heating (LPG, Kerosene, etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Management of traditional biomass</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>Deployment of modernized biomass (such as biogas, gasification, ethanol etc)</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>Deployment of renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, etc) others</i>	<b>2</b>
<b>e) Do they set targets/benchmarks to be achieved? For example, percentage access to electricity or modern cooking fuels such as LPG, efficiency, energy intensity etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>NATIONAL BUDGETS FOR ENERGY</b>	
<b>a). Is there an explicit and annual allocation for energy in the Mid Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in the document?</b>	<b>N/A</b>

<b>b) How much an annual allocation for energy is suggested (aggregated across all energy interventions)? And, what is its percentage share within the entire national budget?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>c) Out of the allocation for energy, what percentage is supposed to be from internal (national) revenues? And what percentage is from external (ODA, inc. lending)?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>e) Does it provide any disaggregating, such as budgets for rural vs. urban; electrification, fuels, biomass etc.?</b>	

Note: The numbered scores used in the above table express the following statements: 0 = little to no mention; 1 = mentioned but not elaborated on; 2 = mentioned and elaborated on.





United Nations Development Programme  
Bureau for Development Policy  
Energy and Environment Group

304 East 45th Street  
New York, NY 10017, USA

[www.undp.org/energyandenvironment](http://www.undp.org/energyandenvironment)