

TUVALU
COUNTRY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| Item | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 ^a |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------|
| ECONOMIC INDICATORS | | | | | | |
| A. Income and Growth | | | | | | |
| 1. GDP per Capita (dollars, current) | 1,237 | 1,442 | 1,416 | 1,378 | -- | -- |
| 2. GDP Growth (% in constant prices) | -5.0 | 10.3 | 3.5 | 14.9 | 3.0 | -- |
| Agriculture | 0.6 | -16.2 | 5.8 | 0.7 | -- | -- |
| Industry | -13.1 | 85.6 | 9.0 | 21.5 | -- | -- |
| Services | -4.8 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 16.0 | -- | -- |
| B. Saving and Investment (current market prices) | | | | | | |
| 1. Gross Domestic Investment | 67.6 | 68.0 | 48.1 | -- | -- | -- |
| 2. Gross Domestic Saving | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| C. Money and Inflation | | | | | | |
| 1. Consumer Prices (annual average) | 5.0 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 7.0 | -- |
| 2. Broad Money (M2) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| D. Government Finance (A\$m) | | | | | | |
| 1. Revenue (recurrent) | 8.7 | 9.2 | 11.6 | 16.3 | 20.5 | -- |
| 2. Expenditure (recurrent) | 8.0 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 11.3 | 12.2 | -- |
| 3. Surplus/Deficit (-) | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 8.3 | -- |
| E. Balance of Payments | | | | | | |
| 1. Merchandise Trade Balance (% of GDP) | -62.9 | -54.1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 2. Current Account Balance (% of GDP) | 4.7 | 2.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 3. Export (\$) growth (annual percent change) | 4.3 | 9.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4. Import (\$) growth (annual percent change) | 6.4 | 9.8 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| F. External Payments Indicators | | | | | | |
| 1. International Reserves (billion dollars, end of period) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| - months of imports | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 2. External Debt Service (% of exports of goods & services) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 3. External Debt (% of GDP) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Memorandum Items: | | | | | | |
| GDP (current prices, million <i>local currency</i>) | 11.76 | 15.02 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Exchange Rate (A\$ per US\$) | 1.3490 | 1.2773 | 1.3440 | 1.5920 | 1.5920 | -- |

^a Estimate

Source: Government and POHQ staff estimates.

Note: (--) means no data available

TUVALU
COUNTRY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

| | 1985 | 1990 | 1998 | |
|---|------|------|-------|-----------|
| POPULATION INDICATORS | | | | |
| Total Population (thousands) | 8.2 | 8.93 | 11.0 | 1999 |
| Annual Population Growth Rate (% change) | 0.37 | 1.27 | 3.00 | (1990-99) |
| SOCIAL INDICATORS | | | | |
| Total Fertility Rate (births per woman) | ... | 2.5 | 3.0 | ... |
| Maternal Mortality Rate (per hundred thousand live births) | ... | ... | 0.0 | ... |
| Infant Mortality Rate (below 1 year; per '000 live births) | 54.0 | ... | 51 | ... |
| Life Expectancy at Birth (years) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Female | ... | ... | 67 | ... |
| Male | ... | ... | 70 | ... |
| Adult Literacy (%) | ... | ... | 64 | ... |
| Primary School Enrollment (% of school age population) | ... | ... | 95 | ... |
| Female | ... | ... | 88 | ... |
| Secondary School Enrollment (% of school age population) | ... | ... | 34 | ... |
| Female | ... | ... | 35 | ... |
| Child Malnutrition (% of under age 5) | ... | ... | 0 | ... |
| Population Below Poverty Line (%) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Income Ratio of Highest 20% to Lowest 20% | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Population with Access to Safe Water (%) | ... | ... | 85 | ... |
| Population with Access to Sanitation (%) | ... | ... | 49 | ... |
| Public Education Expenditure as % of GNP | ... | 15.7 | n.a. | ... |
| Public Health Expenditure as % of GDP | ... | 5.1 | n.a. | ... |
| Human Development Index | ... | ... | 0.583 | ... |
| Human Development Ranking | ... | ... | 118 | ... |
| Human Poverty Index | ... | ... | 7.3 | ... |
| ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS | | | | |
| Forestry | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Deforestation | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Total Area | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Annual deforestation | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Biodiversity | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Nationally protected area | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Area | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Number | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| As % of land area | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Biosphere reserves | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Area | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Number | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| World Heritage sites (number) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Wetlands of international importance | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Area | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Number | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Land Use | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Cropland; permanent pasture | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Air Pollution (Ambient concentrations) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Particulates | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| SO ₂ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Water Pollution (concentration of pollutants in water bodies) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Global Environmental Problems | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| CO ₂ emissions (total and per capita) | ... | ... | ... | ... |

Source: UNDP 1999, Pacific Human Development Report; WB, World Development Report

TUVALU

PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE

**Table 1 : Implementation, Disbursement Performance and Postevaluation Results
Public Sector Projects only
(as of 31 December 1999)**

| A. Project Portfolio | Net Loan Amount \$ million % | | Rating (No.) ^a | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | | Total | | Implementation Progress | | | | Development Objectives | | | | | |
| | | | No. | % | HS | S | PS | U | HS | S | PS | U | | |
| Agriculture and Natural Resources | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Energy | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Finance and Industry | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Social Infrastructure | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transport and Communications | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Others/Multisector | 4.09 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4.09 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| B. Disbursements | OCR | ADF | Total |
|---|-----|--------|--------|
| (1) Total funds available for withdrawal (\$ mn, active loans only) | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| (2) Disbursed amount (\$ mn, cumulative, active loans only) | 0.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| (3) Percentage disbursed [(2)/(1)] (%) | | 233.00 | 233.00 |
| (4) Disbursements (\$mn, active loans only, latest year) | 0.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| (5) Disbursement ratio (%) ^b | | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| C. Net Transfer of Resources ^c (\$ million) | OCR | ADF | Total |
|--|-----|-----|-------|
| Net transfer in 1995 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Net transfer in 1996 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Net transfer in 1997 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Net transfer in 1998 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Net transfer in 1999 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |

| D. Post-Evaluated Projects (By Year of Approval) | 1968 - 1977 | | 1978 - 1987 | | 1988 - 1999 | | 1968 - 1999 | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------|-----|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | | |
| 1. Postevaluation Rating (as of 31 December 1999) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rated Generally Successful (GS) | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Rated Partly Successful (PS) | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Rated Unsuccessful (US) | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| No Rating | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | | |
| 2. Postevaluation Rating by Sector 1968-99 (as of 31 December 1999) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | GS | | PS | | US | | NR | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Agriculture and Natural Resources | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Energy | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Finance and Industry | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Social Infrastructure | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Transport and Communications | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Others/Multisector | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| Total | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

^a HS: Highly satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; PS: Partially satisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory

^b Ratio of disbursement during the year over the undisbursed net loan balance less cancellations at the beginning of the year. Effective loans during the year have also been added to the beginning balance of undisbursed loans.

^c Includes private sector projects for countries with private sector operations.

Source : Programs (A), CTD (B & C), OEO (D)

TUVALU
PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE
Table 2: Status of Project Implementation
Public Sector Projects Only
(As of 31 December 1999)

| Sector ^a | Project Title | Net Loan Amount | | Approval Date (mm/yy) | Effectivity Date (mm/yy) | Closing Date | | Project Progress (% complete) | Cum Contract Awards (\$ million) | Cummulative Disbursement (\$ million) | Project Performance Rating ^b | |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| | | OCR (\$ million) | ADF | | | Original (mm/yy) | Revised (mm/yy) | | | | Implementation Progress | Development Objective |
| OTH | Loan 1693-TUV Island Development Program (IDP) | | 4.0 | Jul-99 | Nov-99 | Jul-02 | | - | 2.8 | 2.8 | S | S |
| | Total | 0.0 | 4.0 | | | | | | 2.8 | 2.8 | | |

^a Sector:

AGR: Agriculture & Natural Resources

ENE: Energy

F&I: Finance and Industry

SOC: Social Infrastructure

T&C: Transport and Communications

OTH: Others/Multisector

^b HS: Highly satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; PS: Partially satisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory

TUVALU
OVERALL EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE
(in \$ million)

| External Source | Past 3-5 Years (annual average) | | 1999 Approvals | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| | Loan/Credit | TA | Loan/Credit | TA |
| A. Multilateral Assistance | | | | |
| ADB | -- | 0.3 | 4.0 | 0.6 |
| EU | -- | 0.4 | -- | 0.3 |
| UNDP | -- | 0.3 | -- | 0.3 |
| Others | -- | 0.2 | -- | 0.2 |
| Subtotal | 0.0 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.4 |
| B. Bilateral Assistance | | | | |
| Australia | -- | 1.5 | -- | 1.4 |
| Taipei,China | -- | 0.4 | -- | 3.0 |
| France | -- | 0.2 | -- | 0.4 |
| Japan | -- | 2.3 | -- | 1.0 |
| New Zealand | -- | 0.9 | -- | 1.6 |
| United States | -- | 0.4 | -- | 0.8 |
| Subtotal | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
| Total | 0.0 | 6.9 | 4.0 | 9.6 |
| Memo Items: | | | | |
| External Assistance as % of Current Expenditures | | | | |
| | | 85 | 55 | |
| External Assistance as % of Capital Expenditures | | | | |

Sources: Government and Bank staff estimates

TUVALU
LENDING PIPELINE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, 2001-2003

| Sector/Project Name | Poverty Classification ^{a*} | Crosscutting Operational Priority ^b | Responsible Division | Year of PPTA | PROJECT COST (in \$ million) | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| | | | | | TOTAL | Bank | | | Gov't | Cofinancing (Others) |
| | | | | | | OCR | ADF | Total | | |
| 2001 FIRM LOANS | | | | | | | | | | |
| NONE IDENTIFIED | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2002 LOAN PIPELINE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Social Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tuvalu Maritime School Upgrade | PI | HD | POHQ | 2000 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | | | |
| Subtotal | | | | | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | | | | | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2003 LOAN PIPELINE | | | | | | | | | | |
| NONE IDENTIFIED | | | | | | | | | | |

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

TUVALU
LENDING PIPELINE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, 2001-2003

| Sector/Project Name | Responsible Division | Type of TA | Amount (\$ '000) | | |
|--|----------------------|------------|------------------|--------|--------------|
| | | | ADB | Others | Total |
| 2001 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM | | | | | |
| Others | | | | | |
| 1 PIER 2001 | POHQ | AD | 150.0 | | 150.0 |
| | Subtotal | | <u>150.0</u> | | <u>150.0</u> |
| Finance and Industry | | | | | |
| 1 Microfinance Institutional Enhancement | POHQ | AD | 250.0 | | 250.0 |
| | Subtotal | | <u>250.0</u> | | <u>250.0</u> |
| | Total | | 400.0 | | 400.0 |
| 2002 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM | | | | | |
| Vocational Training | | | | | |
| 1 TMS Strengthening | POHQ | AD | 200.0 | | 200.0 |
| | Subtotal | | <u>200.0</u> | | <u>200.0</u> |
| | Total | | 200.0 | | 200.0 |
| 2003 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM | | | | | |
| NONE IDENTIFIED | | | | | |

TUVALU
LENDING PROGRAM, 2001-2003
BY POVERTY CLASSIFICATION, CROSSCUTTING OPERATIONAL PRIORITY AND SECTOR

| Classification | 2001 (Firm) | | 2002-2003 | |
|---|-------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| | No. | % | No. | % |
| I. By Poverty Classification* | | | | |
| A. Core Poverty Intervention | | - | | 0.0 |
| B. Poverty Intervention (Non-core) | | - | 1 | 100.0 |
| C. Other Development Interventions | | - | | 0.0 |
| Total | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| II. By Crosscutting Operational Priority | | | | |
| A. Environment | | - | | 0.0 |
| B. Gender and Development | | - | | 0.0 |
| C. Good Governance | | - | | 0.0 |
| D. Human Development | | - | 1 | 100.0 |
| E. Private Sector Development | | - | | 0.0 |
| F. Regional Cooperation | | - | | 0.0 |
| Total | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| III. By Sector | | | | |
| A. Agriculture and Natural Resources | | - | | - |
| B. Energy | | - | | - |
| C. Finance and Industry | | - | | - |
| D. Social Infrastructure | | - | 1 | 100.0 |
| E. Transport and Communications | | - | | - |
| F. Others/Multisector | | - | | - |
| Total | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 100.0 |

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

[NAME OF DMC]

| PROJECT PROFILE | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---|--|--------------|
| 1. Project Name: | | | 2. Sector/Subsector: | | |
| 3. Poverty Classification: ^a | | | 4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^b | | |
| 5. Rationale & Objectives: | | | 6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: | | |
| 7. Scope: | | | | | |
| 8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan: | | | Remarks: | | |
| Loan Project Cost (\$m) | | | | | |
| Financing (Source) | FC | LC | | | Total |
| ADB | | | | | |
| Co-financing | | | | | |
| Borrower | | | | | |
| Sub-borrowers | | | | | - |
| Total | | | 0.0 | | |
| 9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: | | | | | |
| 10. Executing Agency: | | | 11. Project Implementation Period: | | |
| | | | Start: | | |
| | | | End: | | |
| 12. Environment Category: | | | 13. Processing Year: | | |

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; PG = Pro-poor Growth

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD=Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation

Note: For 2001 loan projects only.

VIET NAM

| PROJECT PROFILE | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|--|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| 1. Project Name: Central Region Poverty Reduction Project | | | 2. Sector/Subsector: Agriculture and Natural Resources/ Irrigation and Rural Development | | | |
| 3. Poverty Classification: ^{a*} CPI | | | 4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^{b*} ENV | | | |
| 5. Rationale & Objectives: The incidence of income poverty in the Central Region is about 45 percent, with a food poverty line of 20 percent. It is the least developed region of the country with a per capita GDP of \$218, which is about 62% of the national average of \$350. The highest incidence of poverty can be found among the region's farmers. These poor households generally have limited land holdings, suffer from low agricultural productivity, lack outside employment opportunities for surplus labor and, for the most part, have no ready access to savings and credit. The highest levels of underemployment in the country are also found in this region. | | | 6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: The Project is being formulated through a project preparation technical assistance (TA). The TA will make use of extensive participatory analysis and inputs from may different stakeholder and beneficiary groups, local and national government authorities. Workshops will be convened in Hanoi and regional locations to facilitate consultations with target beneficiaries and stakeholders. | | | |
| 7. Scope: The Project will seek to achieve the following: (i) Improving rural productivity, food and income security; (ii) improving infrastructure, access to financial services and mobilizing the private sector; (iii) effective natural resource management; (iv) greater participation and empowerment of the rural poor; and (v) improving decision making and public sector management. The Project will likely include the following components: (i) increased food security and household incomes through improved on--farm productive activities in agriculture (crop production, livestock, aquaculture/fishery, forestry) and off-farm employment opportunities through access to rural financial services; (ii) support for small-scale village/community level infrastructure; (iii) capacity building of local government authorities and beneficiaries to successfully plan and implement project activities; and (iv) strengthening community participation in provision of services and upgrading of local technical skills to facilitate village-level productive activities. | | | | | | |
| 8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan: | | | Remarks Preliminary cofinancing interest from DFID | | | |
| Loan Project Cost (\$m) | | | | | | |
| Financing (Source) | | FC | | | LC | Total |
| ADB | | tbd | | | tbd | 40.0 |
| Co-financing | | tbd | | | tbd | 5.0 |
| Borrower | | tbd | | | tbd | 15.0 |
| Total | | tbd | tbd | 60.0 | | |
| 9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: The Project will contribute to reduction in the level of absolute poverty in the project area, improvement in the status and quality of life of vulnerable groups, and improved natural resource management. | | | | | | |
| 10. Executing Agency: Local Government through relevant Provincial People's Committees. | | | 11. Project Implementation Period: Start: 2001 End: tbd | | | |
| 12. Environment Category: A | | | 13. Processing Year: 2001 | | | |

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions.

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation.

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

VIET NAM

| PROJECT PROFILE | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|--------------|---|
| 1. Project Name: Provincial roads Improvement Project | | 2. Sector/Subsector: Transport/Rural Roads | | |
| 3. Poverty Classification: ^{a*} ODI | | 4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^{b*} | | |
| 5. Rationale & Objectives: Despite the overall good coverage of the road system in Viet Nam, most of it is in poor condition. Initial efforts in the road subsector focussed on National Highway No. 1. Aid agencies also provided assistance for improving/upgrading other important components of the national highway network as well as the district and commune networks. Little attention has been given to the provincial road network that provides for continuity between the national, district and commune road networks. Therefore the overall goal of the project will be to help the Government implement its poverty reduction programs by providing assistance for the improvement of the provincial road networks in 17 provinces located in the northern part of the country. These improvements will be economically feasible, technically sound, cost effective, and environmentally and socially responsible. Activities and assistance to rationalize and improve the policies directing and the capacities of the provincial departments of transport will be included. | | 6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: The Project is being formulated through a project preparation technical assistance (TA). The TA involves consultations with representatives of local communities, community leaders and various other stakeholders. NGOs active in the field will also be consulted. Feedback from such consultations will be used in designing the project, its implementation and sustainability arrangements. | | |
| 7. Scope: The Project will have the following four components: (i) Improvement of about 4,000 km of provincial roads in 17 poor northern provinces; (ii) Consultant services to assist with subproject preparation and implementation; (iii) Consultant services (probably an NGO) to monitor social, environmental and resettlement aspects of implementation; and (iv) Consultant services to assist with developing local level road management capabilities. | | | | |
| 8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan: | | | | Remarks JBIC is a potential cofinancier |
| Loan Project Cost (\$m) | | | | |
| Financing (Source) | FC | LC | Total | |
| ADB | 30.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 | |
| Co-financing | 30.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 | |
| Borrower | 0.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | |
| Total | 60.0 | 60.0 | 120.0 | |
| 9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: The Project will improve the efficiency of transport to and from the rural parts of the 17 provinces thus improving economic opportunity, and improved access to Government and other services. Benefits will accrue to transport users and the rural people served by these roads. | | | | |
| 10. Executing Agency: Ministry of Transport and Communications | | 11. Project Implementation Period: Start: 2001 End: 2004 | | |
| 12. Environment Category: B | | 13. Processing Year: 2001 | | |

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions.

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation.

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

VIET NAM

| PROJECT PROFILE | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------|------|----|-------------|-----|----------|----|-------|----|--|
| 1. Project Name: Third Provincial Towns Water Supply and Sanitation | 2. Sector/Subsector Social Infrastructure/ Water Supply & Sanitation | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Poverty Classification: ^{a*} PI | 4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^{b*} HD | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Rationale & Objectives: The Project will help the Government achieve its development targets for the sector of providing safe drinking water to 90 percent of the urban population and appropriate sanitation facilities in selected provincial and district towns, eliminating subsidies and making the water supply companies financially self-sustaining; and reforming key sector institutions at the central and provincial levels. | 6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: Workshops and beneficiary participation are being undertaken under the ongoing PPTA. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Scope The Project will cover 5 provincial towns and 3 district towns, and include water supply and sanitation improvements, upgrading of raw water pipelines, distribution pipework, water meters, and water treatment facilities. It will also include significant sanitation components including upgrading of latrines, installation of septic tanks, and connections to common drainage system. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan (\$): Loan Project Cost (\$m) | Remarks: Cofinancing interest expressed by AFD (France). | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Source</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bank</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cofinancing</td> <td>Tbd</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Borrower</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Source | Total | Bank | 60 | Cofinancing | Tbd | Borrower | 25 | Total | 85 | |
| Source | Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bank | 60 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cofinancing | Tbd | | | | | | | | | | |
| Borrower | 25 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 85 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: Benefits include provision of safe drinking water at affordable prices to the people, particularly the poor, health improvements to the population served, environmental improvements in the Project areas. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 Executing Agency Ministry of Construction | 11. Project Implementation Period: Start: 2001 End: 2006 | | | | | | | | | | |
| # Environment Category: B | 13. Processing Year: 2001 | | | | | | | | | | |

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions.

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation.

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.

VIET NAM

| PROJECT PROFILE | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--|--|--------------|
| 1. Project Name: Financial Sector Program Loan II (FSPL II) | | | 2. Sector/Subsector: Finance/Capital Markets | | |
| 3. Poverty Classification: ^{a*} ODI | | | 4. Crosscutting Operational Priority: ^{b*} PSD | | |
| 5. Rationale & Objectives: Production is dominated by SOEs. Economic growth will become highly constrained unless capital is allocated to well-governed, accountable SOEs and private enterprises. The capital market plays a vital role in creating and aligning ownership and market incentives. Capital markets and equitization mutually support each others' development, and dynamism that sustains growth, as seen in China. The development of capital markets, in particular the stock exchange, will (i) improve governance and management of enterprises, (ii) promote the mobilization and efficient use of capital, (iii) improve the financial structure of enterprises, and (iv) support balance growth of the financial system. | | | 6. Beneficiary Participation/Consultation Needs: Private sector | | |
| 7. Scope Develop capital markets by (i) improving the legal and regulatory environment, (ii) promoting market liquidity through the development of money markets, (iii) supporting a level playing field to facilitate the growth of private enterprises (supplying issues to the market), (iv) possibly, further facilitating equitization (supplying issues to the market), and (iv) possibly, developing the pension system and insurance markets (developing demand for issues). | | | | | |
| 8. Estimated Cost & Financing Plan (\$): | | | Remarks: Further refinements may be necessary to the Bank's program operations in the financial sector upon completion of the financial sector strategy. | | |
| Loan Project Cost (\$m) | | | | | |
| Financing (Source) | FC | LC | | | Total |
| Bank | | | | | 100.0 |
| Co-financing | | | | | 30.0 |
| Borrower | | | | | 10.0 |
| Sub-borrowers | | | | | |
| Total | | | 140.0 | | |
| 9. Estimated Benefits and Beneficiary Groups: Viet Nam has experienced a remarkable reduction in poverty based on economic growth. The record of growth is now in jeopardy without SOE reform. Capital markets have a vital role to play in this reform. Benefits will be widespread. | | | | | |
| 10. Executing Agency State Bank of Viet Nam and (possibly) State Securities Commission | | | 11. Project Implementation Period: Start: 2001 End: 2004 | | |
| 12. Environment Category: B | | | 13. Processing Year: 2001 | | |

^a CPI = Core Poverty Intervention; PI = Poverty Intervention; ODI = Other Development Interventions.

^b ENV = Environmental Protection; GAD = Gender and Development; GG = Good Governance; HD = Human Development; PSD = Private Sector Development and RC = Regional Cooperation.

* This classification was completed prior to the finalization of the improved and redesigned classification system in December 2000, which will be applied from January 2001.