



## COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

### NINETENTH SESSION

#### FUNDING OF THE IPPC EPHYTO SOLUTION

##### AGENDA ITEM 12.1

*(Prepared by the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution)*

### 1. Introduction

- [1] The Eighteenth Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Issues (CPM-18) in 2024 agreed that the funding model for the IPPC ePhyto Solution would be implemented as a transitional pilot, with contributions by contracting parties starting in 2025. It was also agreed at CPM-18 (2024) that the funding model would be reviewed after two years (2027), and the findings reported to the CPM. However, some contracting parties needed more time, or wanted modifications to the model to be explored before they begin their contributions. As a result of this, the term of the CPM Focus Group on Sustainable Funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution was extended until CPM-19 (2025), and the Focus Group was requested to explore the alternative fee structures outlined in the CPM-18 (2024) report.
- [2] Many alternatives were explored by the focus group as it developed the funding model presented to CPM-18 (2024). Based on feedback received from the CPM since CPM-18 (2024), the focus group has explored the following additional alternatives, which are discussed further below:
- removing usage fees for both United Nations Least Developed Countries (UN-LD) and countries classified as Low Income in the World Bank classification (WB-LI);
  - changing the weighting in the funding model from 2/3 base fee and 1/3 usage fee, to 1/3 base fee and 2/3 usage fee;
  - using models other than the World Bank development classification to differentiate the development levels of countries;
  - whether to only count sending an ePhyto, rather than both sending and receiving; and
  - making a distinction between commercial and non-commercial ePhyto exchanges.
- [3] Each of these alternatives are examined below.

### 2. Removing usage fees for both United Nations Least Developed (UN-LD) and World Bank Low Income (WB-LI) countries

- [4] The focus group adjusted the funding model to exempt UN-LD and WB-LI countries from paying usage fees. The model already exempts these countries from paying a base fee, so this alternative would mean UN-LD and WB-LI countries using the IPPC ePhyto Solution would not be expected to contribute any funding. Currently, nine (9) of 44 UN-LD/WB-LI status countries are using the IPPC ePhyto Solution.
- [5] The financial impact of this alternative on the remaining countries contributing funding is small – the maximum increase is USD 1 400. This is because there are currently only three (3) countries that will stop paying (Nepal, Senegal and Uganda). There are six (6) other UN-LD/WB-LI countries currently not paying because their current usage is low (less than 5 000 exchanges). The cost of subsidizing UN-LD/WB-LI countries will increase as more countries start using the IPPC ePhyto Solution. However, if

this alternative is agreed and implemented soon, the more developed countries may not feel the burden of the subsidy, as it would be factored into the system at an early stage.

- [6] Removing fees for UN-LD and WB-LI countries is likely to increase support for the funding model from those countries but may not be favoured by more developed countries. In the CPM-approved funding model, Lower-Middle development status countries pay usage fees but no base fee if they are also low usage.
- [7] After assessing this proposal, the focus group considers that, given the potential benefits and the relatively small impact on costs to contributing members, the CPM could decide at CPM-19 (2025) to extend a usage fee exemption to both UN-LD and WB-LI status countries. This could be implemented immediately without having a significant impact on funding for the IPPC ePhyto Solution in 2025 and 2026.

### 3. Changing the weighting in the funding model from 2/3 base fee and 1/3 usage fee, to 1/3 base fee and 2/3 usage fee

- [8] The focus group adjusted the funding model so that 2/3 of the funding would come from usage fees, instead of base fees.
- [9] The financial impact of this change is substantial. Some countries would be expected to contribute USD 26 400 more than under the current, CPM-agreed funding model – a 42 percent increase. Under this scenario, **31 countries would pay more**, and **41 countries would pay less**. Almost all countries that would pay less are High development status countries, and the **less developed countries would be the ones expected to contribute more to fund the IPPC ePhyto Solution**. This shift would effectively penalize the less developed countries that have been early adopters of ePhyto, and those that follow.
- [10] The focus group considers that this option may be worth re-examining in the future when ePhyto usage has reached the point where all countries that will use it, are using it for all, or most, of their phytosanitary certification exchanges. At that point, it will be clearer which countries are benefiting the most from the IPPC ePhyto Solution. If higher developed countries were to become the highest users, the model could be amended to implement this option without placing a disproportionate burden on less developed countries. At that time, CPM will also be able to make a decision that does not penalize early adopters.
- [11] The focus group does not support changing the weighting in the funding model from 2/3 base fee to 2/3 usage fee at this early stage.

### 4. Using models other than the World Bank development classification to differentiate the development levels of countries

- [12] At CPM-17 (2023), the CPM expressed a preference for a funding model that had both a base fee that varied according to development status, and a usage fee that varied according to the number of exchanges. The focus group then developed a model using the World Bank development classification to differentiate between economic development categories of contracting parties.
- [13] At CPM-18 (2024), the CPM asked that different development categorization models be analysed. Several international organizations have established categorizations to assess and compare the economic development levels of nations. Four (4) alternatives to the World Bank model have been examined. The full analysis is provided in Appendix 1, but a summary is provided here.
- [14] In exploring the four (4) development categorization models listed below, it was apparent that they each use different criteria to determine development status, are not based on universally agreed objective definitions, and, consequently, the status of individual nations can vary depending on the model used. However, each model serves the purposes it was specifically developed for.
- [15] **United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)**. This model is based on the concept of the “initial development status” of a country, and divides countries into developed and developing economies. The “developing economies” category is further broken down into High,

Medium, and Low-Income Developing countries, based on Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita. This index classifies countries based on their development status with a focus on trade and economic needs and is updated annually. It is less widely recognized than the World Bank Index.

- [16] **UNDP Human Development Index (HDI).** This model combines three dimensions: health (life expectancy), education (mean years of schooling), and income (GNI per capita). The HDI was created in support of the idea that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country. Although attempting to be more holistic, there are challenges with data availability to inform the index and significant disparities within a country may not be apparent due to its composite nature.
- [17] **International Monetary Fund (IMF).** This model classifies countries as advanced economies (41), emerging market and middle-income economies (95), and low-income developing countries (59), with a focus on macroeconomic stability and growth potential to help inform economic policy and investment strategies. The listing is updated every two (2) years.
- [18] **Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).** This model consists of all low and middle-income countries based on Gross National Income (GNI) per capita, as published by the World Bank, except for former G8 members, European Union members, and countries with a firm date for entry into the European Union. The list also includes all the Least Developed Countries (UN-LDs) as defined by the United Nations. It is similar to the World Bank index but some countries that do not meet specific criteria may be excluded.
- [19] The two (2) most relevant and usable categorizations were considered to be the World Bank and UNCTAD. The focus group considered the inclusion of education and health in the HDI as less relevant to the trade-enabling IPPC ePhyto Solution. The IMF is updated only every two years, and the OECD index does not include all IPPC contracting parties. While there are differences in the income levels for the categories, when countries are allocated using these models, the differences are mainly within the two middle categories, benefiting or disadvantaging a few countries depending on which model is preferred but with no clear indication that one model should be preferred over the other (see Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix 1).
- [20] After considering the merits of each development model, the focus group considers that on balance, the overall benefits of switching from the World Bank Classification to the UNCTAD classification are not significant. The focus group considers the World Bank index (with the focus group modification to also include all UN-LDs as low-income) remains a good choice. It is already used within the IPPC and FAO, and so should be familiar to many contracting parties. It is well maintained and has four (4) distinct categories to provide sufficient differentiation between categories that ensures higher developed countries are contributing a larger share of IPPC ePhyto Solution funding than lower developed countries. When more countries are using the IPPC ePhyto Solution, it may be worth comparing the World Bank and UNCTAD models again to see if one provides a more preferable result than the other.

## 5. Whether to only count sending an ePhyto, rather than both sending and receiving

- [21] In the CPM agreed model, an ePhyto exchange is counted when a contracting party either sends or receives an ePhyto. The focus group was tasked to explore the impact of counting only the certificates that are sent.
- [22] This alternative was explored by analysing the 2023 exchange data by country to determine how many countries only receive ePhytos, the feasibility of this alternative, and the impact of a change to the funding model:
- forty-eight (48) of the 88 countries (55 percent) using the ePhyto Solution have greater than 75 percent of exchanges as import certificates;
  - almost 75 percent (35 out of 48) of those are receiving less than 5 000 ePhytos, so under the CPM approved model, do not currently pay a usage fee; and
  - twenty-one (21) of the 88 countries (25 percent) are only receiving ePhytos and are not sending any. Of those countries, only two (2) are receiving more than 5 000 ePhytos. The remaining 19

countries that are only receiving ePhytos would not pay any usage fee under the CPM-approved funding model, as they are receiving less than 5 000 ePhytos.

- [23] Although some countries are only receiving ePhytos, most of those countries (19 out of 21) are in the low usage category and would not pay a usage fee.
- [24] Additionally, the costs of the IPPC ePhyto Solution cannot be differentiated into costs for issuing certificates and costs for receiving certificates. The construction of the infrastructure entailed the same costs for countries predominantly receiving phytosanitary certificates as for the countries issuing a large number of certificates for export.
- [25] The IPPC ePhyto Solution is a system that facilitates the exchange of phytosanitary certificates, not a system that focuses solely on the issuing of phytosanitary certificates for export. All participating countries benefit from the advantages of the IPPC ePhyto Solution, not just the countries that issue certificates for export. This has the advantage that the costs do not exclusively rest with countries issuing many export certificates, and that countries predominantly receiving certificates (import) can use the ePhyto Solution free of charge.
- [26] The focus group considers that this alternative should not be implemented at this stage and recommends that “exchanges” (both sending and receiving) remain as the unit for calculating the use of the ePhyto Solution, as all participating countries benefit from the advantages of the IPPC ePhyto Solution, not just the countries that issue certificates for export.

## 6. Making a distinction between commercial and non-commercial ePhyto exchanges

- [27] At CPM-18 (2024) it was noted that some countries issue ePhytos for non-commercial consignments of goods, e.g. passengers carrying foods for which import requirements apply. The focus group has considered an alternative of excluding ePhytos issued for non-commercial purposes from the count of exchanges.
- [28] Currently, it is impossible for the Hub to distinguish an ePhyto issued for commercial purposes from an ePhyto issued for non-commercial purposes. As part of system security and confidentiality, the Hub does not access the content of the electronic certification. It would require system changes to enable the differentiation requested. If such a system change was made and non-commercial ePhytos were not counted as exchanges, then a new risk would exist that commercial exchanges could be incorrectly classified as non-commercial.
- [29] Although it cannot currently be quantified, it is apparent that this issue affects a very small number of countries (most of which are likely to be in the low usage category) and so would not pay a usage fee. The IPPC ePhyto Solution is still being used to produce an ePhyto, so it is reasonable that a base fee applies, depending on the development status of the country.
- [30] Although sympathetic to the concerns of affected countries, the focus group considers such a change should not be made at this time. It would be preferable for contracting parties issuing large quantities of ePhytos for non-commercial purposes, and contracting parties requiring ePhytos for non-commercial purposes, to engage in bilateral discussions to explore alternatives that would not require ePhytos to be issued.

## Recommendations

- [31] The CPM is invited to:
- (1) *agree* to remove usage fees for both UN-LD (United Nations Least Developed) and WB-LI (World Bank Low-Income) countries, starting in 2026;
  - (2) *agree* to continue the current weighting in the funding model of 2/3 base fee and 1/3 usage fee, as per the CPM-18 (2024) agreed funding model;
  - (3) *agree* to continue using the World Bank development classification to differentiate the development levels of countries, as per the CPM-18 (2024) agreed funding model;

- (4) *agree* to continue counting both sending and receiving ePhytos when calculating exchanges;
- (5) *agree* to continue to include non-commercial ePhyto exchanges when calculating exchanges; and
- (6) *agree* to amend the Procedures for the IPPC ePhyto Solution Funding Model as necessary to reflect these decisions.

## **Appendix 1: Review of World Bank development status indices and their potential application to EPhyto funding model**

### **1. Background**

- [1] At CPM-18 (2024), a longer-term potential funding model was presented that included three core components: funding contributions from donors or FAO, a base fee which utilizes the World Bank assessment of Gross National Income (GNI) per capita, and a fee based on usage. A few contracting parties suggested that other development indices be considered such as the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) or GDP. This document provides a description and review of the major world development status indices currently in use and considers their key attributes of relevance in relation to the ePhyto funding model.

### **2. Overview of development status measures**

- [2] The development status of countries is an important factor influencing international policy, economic aid, and global cooperation. Various international organizations have established categorizations to assess and compare the developmental levels of nations. These classifications are not based on a universally agreed objective definition, and consequently vary somewhat between organizations.
- [3] Within this paper, several leading classification systems are described, focusing on attributes and their relevance in the context of the ePhyto funding model. These include the classification systems used by the World Bank, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Each classification is briefly described and reviewed in relation to its suitability or non-suitability with regard to utilization within the ePhyto funding model, and against the current classification system utilized within the model.

#### **2.1 World Bank**

- [4] The World Bank classifies countries based primarily on their GNI per capita. This system categorizes countries into four (4) groups: low-income, lower-middle-income, upper-middle-income, and high-income. The classifications are updated annually based on GNI per capita data.

#### **2.2 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development**

- [5] The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) classifies countries based on their development status with a focus on trade and economic needs. This overall index is based on the concept of the “initial development status” of a country, and divides countries into developed and developing economies. Within the “developing economies” category, UNCTAD further breaks down this group into High, Medium, and Low-Income Developing countries, based on GDP per capita. The UNCTAD list of countries by category is further reviewed at Table 2 as a comparison to the World Bank listing of countries indicated above (i.e. low-income, lower-middle-income, upper-middle-income, and high-income).

#### **2.3 UNDP Human Development Index**

- [6] The UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) combines three (3) dimensions, namely: health (life expectancy), education (mean years of schooling), and income (GNI per capita). The HDI was created to emphasize that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country.

#### **2.4 International Monetary Fund**

- [7] The International Monetary Fund (IMF) classifies countries as advanced economies (41), emerging market and middle-income economies (95), and low-income developing countries (59), with a focus on



macroeconomic stability and growth potential in order to help inform economic policy and investment strategies. The listing is updated every two (2) years.

## 2.5 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

- [8] The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee classifications identify countries eligible for official development assistance in order to target aid effectively and direct resources to those in need. These countries and territories consist of all low- and middle-income countries based on GNI per capita, as published by the [World Bank](#), with the exception of former G8 members, European Union members, and countries with a firm date for entry into the European Union. The list also includes all of the Least Developed Countries (UN-LDs) as defined by the [United Nations](#).
- [9] A comparison of the various classification systems is provided in **Table 1**.

## 3. Conclusions

- [10] The World Bank Classification was chosen due to its familiarity among all parties and its existing use within FAO for various purposes. It is also well maintained and has four (4) discrete categories of countries (low-income, lower-middle-income, upper-middle-income, and high-income), which provides sufficient disaggregation for the ePhyto sustainability model purposes. The focus group modified the classification by including all UN-LDs as low-income.
- [11] The UNCTAD classification system also has merit, in terms of its relevance to trade and the context of the ePhyto sustainable funding model. It could be considered as a potential alternative classification system to the World Bank Classification system for ePhyto sustainable funding purposes. It also has four (4) discrete categories (Developed, High, Medium, and Low-Income Developing countries) based on GDP per capita. However, it is less familiar to many IPPC members.
- [12] **Table 2** provides further comparison of the World Bank and UNCTAD country categorization by income definitions.
- [13] **Tables 3 and 4** compare for each country the current World Bank Classification with the current UNCTAD classification system,<sup>1</sup> and could be used to model the application of this classification system if deemed desirable to do so.

---

<sup>1</sup> Link to the UNCTADstat classifications website:

[https://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/Classifications.html#:~:text=UNCTAD%20classifies%20all%20target%20economies,5500\)%2C%20and%20their%20subregions](https://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/Classifications.html#:~:text=UNCTAD%20classifies%20all%20target%20economies,5500)%2C%20and%20their%20subregions)

**Table 1:** Comparison of various country classification systems

<b>Index/Measure</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
World Bank –Gross National Index (GNI)	Straightforward, widely recognized and able to compare economic performance across countries. Extensive and regularly updated datasets that enhance transparency and decision making.	The classification of a specific country may vary from year-to-year (as GNI per capita changes). Annual classifications may lag behind significant economic or other shifts.
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)	Focus on trade and economic needs reflecting importance of economic integration and capacity development. Updated yearly	Trade focus Less widely recognized compared to World Bank Index.
UNDP Human Development Index (HDI)	Holistic, incorporating multiple dimensions of human development (HDI)	Data availability and currency Significant disparities within a country may not be obvious due to composite nature (e.g. urban vs rural communities).
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	Focusses on insights into a country's economic conditions and stability. Regularly updated	Narrow in scope – focussed on economic metrics and less applicability to divergent economies and socio-economic contexts.
Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD)	Focus on development assistance needs helps target aid and resources effectively.	Some countries that don't meet specific economic criteria may be excluded. Overall, similar to World Bank Index



**Table 2:** Comparison of World Bank and UNCTAD country categorization by income definitions

<b>UNCTAD</b>	<b>Range</b> (2019 to 2021 <b>GDP per capita</b> ) <sup>2</sup>	<b>World Bank</b>	<b>Range</b> ( <b>GNI per capita</b> (2025 database) calculated using the World Bank Atlas method) <sup>3</sup>
Developed  Other countries not listed as developing economies (see below).	Other countries not listed as developing economies (see below)	High-income economies	Greater than USD 14 005
High-income developing economies  Developing economies	On average, higher than USD 5 907	Upper middle-income economies	Between USD 4 516 and USD 14 005
Middle-income developing economies  Developing economies	On average, between USD 1 313 and USD 5 907	Lower middle-income economies	Between USD 1 146 and USD 4 515
Low-income developing economies  Developing economies	On average, lower than USD 1 313	Low-income economies	USD 1145 or less

<sup>2</sup> [https://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/Classifications/US\\_EconomicGroupings\\_Criteria.pdf](https://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/Classifications/US_EconomicGroupings_Criteria.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups#:~:text=For%20the%20current%202025%20fiscal,those%20with%20a%20GNI%20per>

**Table 3:** World Bank and UNCTAD Developing status of countries using ePhyto

<b>Contracting party</b>	<b>WB development status</b>	<b>UNCTAD status</b>
Australia	High	Developed
Austria	High	Developed
Belgium	High	Developed
Croatia	High	Developed
Cyprus	High	Developed
Czech Republic	High	Developed
Denmark	High	Developed
Estonia	High	Developed
Finland	High	Developed
France	High	Developed
Germany	High	Developed
Greece	High	Developed
Hungary	High	Developed
Ireland	High	Developed
Israel	High	Developed
Italy	High	Developed
Korea (the Republic of)	High	Developed
Latvia	High	Developed
Lithuania	High	Developed
Luxembourg	High	Developed
Malta	High	Developed
Netherlands (the)	High	Developed
New Zealand	High	Developed
Poland	High	Developed
Portugal	High	Developed
Romania	High	Developed
Slovakia	High	Developed
Slovenia	High	Developed
Spain	High	Developed
Sweden	High	Developed
Switzerland	High	Developed
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (the)	High	Developed
United States of America (the)	High	Developed
Bahamas (the)	High	Developing high
Chile	High	Developing high
Guyana	High	Developing high

Hong Kong SAR, China	High	Developing high
Panama	High	Developing high
Trinidad and Tobago	High	Developing high
Bulgaria	Upper-Middle	Developed
Argentina	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Brazil	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Colombia	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Costa Rica	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Dominica	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Dominican Republic (the)	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Ecuador	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Malaysia	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Mexico	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Peru	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Saint Lucia	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Thailand	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Fiji	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Guatemala	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Indonesia	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Jamaica	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Marshall Islands (the)	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Paraguay	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
South Africa	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Tonga	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Cook Islands (the)	Lower-Middle	Developing high
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Cameroon	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Côte d'Ivoire	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Ghana	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
India	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Jordan	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Kenya	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Kiribati	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Morocco	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Nigeria	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Papua New Guinea	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Philippines (the)	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Samoa	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Sri Lanka	Lower-Middle	Developing middle

Tunisia	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Uzbekistan	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Pakistan	Lower-Middle	Developing low
Niue	Lower-Middle	Unclassified
Senegal	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Solomon Islands	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Tuvalu	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Madagascar	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Nepal	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Tanzania, United Republic of	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Togo	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Uganda	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Zambia	Low or UN-LD	Developing low

**Table 4:** World Bank and UNCTAD developing status of countries not using ePhyto

<b>Contracting party</b>	<b>WB development status</b>	<b>UNCTAD development status</b>
Canada	High	Developed
Iceland	High	Developed
Japan	High	Developed
Norway	High	Developed
Antigua and Barbuda	High	Developing high
Bahrain	High	Developing high
Barbados	High	Developing high
Kuwait	High	Developing high
Oman	High	Developing high
Qatar	High	Developing high
Saint Kitts and Nevi	High	Developing high
Saudi Arabia	High	Developing high
Seychelles	High	Developing high
Singapore	High	Developing high
United Arab Emirates (the)	High	Developing high
Uruguay	High	Developing high
Albania	Upper-Middle	Developed
Belarus	Upper-Middle	Developed
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Upper-Middle	Developed
Moldova (the Republic of)	Upper-Middle	Developed
Montenegro	Upper-Middle	Developed
Russian Federation (the)	Upper-Middle	Developed
Serbia	Upper-Middle	Developed

Botswana	Upper-Middle	Developing high
China	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Cuba	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Equatorial Guinea	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Gabon	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Grenada	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Kazakhstan	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Libya	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Maldives	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Mauritius	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Palau	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Suriname	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Türkiye	Upper-Middle	Developing high
Armenia	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Azerbaijan	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Belize	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
El Salvador	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Georgia	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Iraq	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Namibia	Upper-Middle	Developing middle
Republic of North Macedonia	Upper-Middle	Unclassified
Ukraine	Lower-Middle	Developed
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Lower-Middle	Developing high
Lebanon	Lower-Middle	Developing high
Algeria	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Bhutan	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Bolivia	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Cabo Verde	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Congo (the)	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Egypt	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Eswatini	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Honduras	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Lao People's Democratic	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Micronesia (Federated States of)	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Mongolia	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Nicaragua	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Vanuatu	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Viet Nam	Lower-Middle	Developing middle
Zimbabwe	Lower-Middle	Developing middle

Kyrgyzstan	Lower-Middle	Developing low
Tajikistan	Lower-Middle	Developing low
Bangladesh	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Cambodia	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Comoros (the)	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Djibouti	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Haiti	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Mauritania	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
São Tomé and Príncipe	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
South Sudan	Low or UN-LD	Developing middle
Afghanistan	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Benin	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Burkina Faso	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Burundi	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Central African Republic (the)	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Chad	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Congo (the Democratic Republic of the)	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Eritrea	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Ethiopia	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Gambia (the)	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Guinea	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Guinea-Bissau	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Korea (the Democratic People's Republic of)	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Lesotho	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Liberia	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Malawi	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Mali	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Mozambique	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Myanmar	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Niger (the)	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Rwanda	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Sierra Leone	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Somalia	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Sudan (the)	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Syrian Arab Republic	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Yemen	Low or UN-LD	Developing low
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Unclassified	Developing middle