

# PARTNER SCORECARD FOR SWEDEN



## **AGENCY PROFILE**

Sweden's total development aid budget for 2010 was SEK 31,4 billion. This equals 3.9% of Sweden's annual budget, and 1% of GDP for 2010. Of this budget Sida, Sweden's international development cooperation agency, disbursed SEK 15.4billion in 2010 of which 9% were allocated to the health sector.

## **COUNTRIES WHERE THE AGENCY IS DEMONSTRATING PROGRESS**









**COUNTRIES WHERE THE AGENCY IS REPORTING LIMITED PROGRESS** 

## **EXPECTED RESULTS**



Commitments are documented and mutually agreed.







An IHP+ Country Compact or equivalent has been signed by the agency in 33% of IHP+ countries where they exist. Target = 100%.



Support is based on country plans & strategies, including to strengthen Health Systems.



In 2009 100% of health sector aid was reported by the agency on national health sector budgets - no change from 100%. Target = 50% reduction in aid not on budget (with  $\ge 85\%$  on budget).



This Standard Performance Measure was deemed not applicable to Sweden.



In 2009 95% of health sector aid was provided by the agency through programme based approaches - an increase from 79%. Target = 66%.



Funding commitments are long-term.



In 2009 99% of health sector aid was provided by the agency through multi-year commitments - an increase from 55%. Target = 90%.



Funds are disbursed predictably, as committed.



In 2009 100% of health sector aid disbursements provided by the agency were released according to agreed schedules - no change from 100% in 2005. Target = 90%.



Country systems for procurement & public financial management are used & strengthened.



In 2009 100% of health sector aid provided by the agency used country procurement systems. Target = 33% reduction in aid not using procurement systems (with  $\geq$  80% using country systems).



In 2009 100% of health sector aid provided by the agency used national public financial management systems - no change from 100%. Target = 33% reduction in aid not using PFM systems (with  $\geq$  80% using country systems).



In 2009 the stock of parallel project implementation units (PIUs) used by the agency in the surveyed countries was 0.0 - no change from 0.0. Target = 66% reduction in stock of PIUs.



Resources are being managed for Development Results.



In 2009 national performance assessment frameworks were routinely used by the agency to assess progress in 75% of IHP+ countries where they exist. Target = 100%.



Mutual accountability is being demonstrated.



In 2009 the agency participated in health sector mutual assessments of progress in 100% of IHP+ countries where they exist. Target = 100%.



Civil Society actively engaged.



In 2009, evidence exists in 75% of IHP+ countries that the agency supported civil society engagement in health sector policy processes. Target = 100%.





## DETAILS OF WHAT THE AGENCY IS DOING TO ACHIEVE RESULTS

This additional information is reported by the Agency to explain what specific actions it is taking to implement its IHP+commitments to the 8 Expected Results, or to qualify its measures of progress.



## Commitments are documented and mutually agreed

Sweden signed a compact in Mali. Burkina Faso has not yet developed a compact for IHP+ and does not have a MoU for the health sector. Sida signed a Joint Financial Agreement in June 2009. Sida does not consider itself 'active' in the health sector in Mozambique and Ethiopia in the sense that it wasn't involved in the defining of health sector related policies.



Support is based on country plans and strategies that sufficiently address Health Systems Strengthening in 2009 100% of Sweden's health sector aid was reported on national health sector budgets. 95% of its aid was provided through programme based approaches. Sida has not provided any specific support for technical assistance which is reflected in the n/a rating.



### Funding commitments are long-term

Sweden is fully committed to long-term support has increased between 2005 and 2009. In Burkina Faso, Mali and Mozambique a 100% of fundings were disbursed through multi-year commitments. Only in Ethiopia those distributions decreased to 90%.



## Funds are disbursed predictably, as committed

All disbursements have been made according to plans.



### Country systems for procurement & public financial management are used & strengthened

Sweden provides general and sector budget support in Burkina Faso, Mali and Mozambique hence country systems for procurement and public financial management are being used. It is not possible to specify the amounts of the contributions.



## Resources are being managed for Development Results

Sweden is acting through the Netherlands in Mali and Burkina Faso, which used a single PAF. In 2005 Sweden was also active in Ethiopia but did not at that time use a PAF. Not present in the health sector in 2009. In Mozambique it only gave support to the National AIDS Council (NAC).



#### Mutual Accountability is being demonstrated

Sweden has participated in health sector annual mutual assessments in all countries where they exist.



#### Civil Society actively engaged

Swedish CSO support to Mozambique and Burkina Faso mainly for service delivery but also to strengthen NGOs to be able to better advocate policy-making processes.

# HOW TO INTERPRET THIS SCORECARD

12 Standard Performance Measures (SPMs) were agreed by IHP+ signatories to track the implementation of Expected Results (see below). A detailed list of SPMs can be found at www.ihpresults.net

Countries where the Agency is reporting limited progress: Where ratings of of for the minority of SPMs.

**Expected Results:** Reflect key commitments made in the IHP+ Global Compact.

**Progress:** Symbols illustrate whether the Agency has achieved , is making progress , or has not made progress against 12 SPMs. Specific points on interpreting progress:

- Comparability of ratings: Five targets\* track change over time. For these, 🔁 reflects progress since baseline, rather than absolute performance in 2009. Negative or flatline trend performance receives []. These ratings should not be used to compare absolute performance between agencies. In all instances shows that the target has been met.
- Scorecard ratings are aggregates of performance across a number of countries. Aggregates might hide variations in the agency's performance. The additional information above provides more detail on the agency's performance. This was drafted by IHP+Results using data provided by the agency, but in some cases the agency made significant changes before the final text was agreed.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding to the following Standard Performance Measures (SPMs) - 2DPa, 4DP, 5DPa, 5DPb, 5DPc. For more information on SPMs and targets see www.ihpresults.net