

Briefing Note Nine (April 2024)
Allocating Canada's Climate Finance to Climate Vulnerable Countries and People¹

Highlights

1. **Canada's policy to guide the allocation of its \$5.3 billion climate finance pledge set out a key objective "to advance feminist climate action that supports the poorest and most vulnerable."**
2. **A proxy indicator is required as there is no acknowledged metric to measure support for the poorest and most vulnerable countries and people.** This indicator makes a distinction between Highly Vulnerable Countries and People and Other Vulnerable Contexts where many vulnerable people may be affected. It includes the following elements
 - a) **Highly Vulnerable Countries and People:**
 - Least Developed Countries (less Small Island Developing States that are also LDCs);
 - Small Island Developing States (SIDS); and
 - Principle Purpose Gender Equality Projects.
 - b) **Other Vulnerable Contexts**
 - Regional Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa (e.g. Multilateral Development Banks); and
 - Lower Middle-Income Countries (less SIDS that are also LMICs)

The focus in this Briefing Note is on Highly Vulnerable Context.

3. **Support for vulnerable countries and people not yet sufficiently reflected in the \$5.3 billion pledge disbursements.** Overall support for the proxy indicator dropped from 46% in the \$2.65 billion pledge to 44% in current disbursements (2021/22 and 2022/23) for the \$5.3 billion pledge. It is expected that this share for the current pledge will improve with disbursements for the final three years of the pledge.
4. **The share of climate finance allocated to Highly Vulnerable Countries is unchanged at 13%.** But within the total proxy indicator above), resources going to [a] Highly Vulnerable Countries has increased to 31% in the \$5.6 billion pledge disbursements to date, from 29% in the previous pledge.
5. **The level of adaptation finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries has increased in the current disbursements for the \$5.3 billion pledge.** Support for adaptation currently accounts for 57% of total finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries, compared to 44% for the \$2.65 billion pledge.
6. **CSOs play a significant role in delivering climate finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries and People.** For the 2.65B billion pledge CSOs delivered both a very small share of the \$2.65 billion pledge overall, and only 2.5% of total Support for Vulnerable Countries and People. For the two years of disbursements for the \$5.3 billion pledge, CSOs increased this share to 16% overall and 26% of allocations for Highly Vulnerable Countries and People. Much of this support is concentrated in adaptation finance.

¹ This Briefing Note was researched and written by Brian Tomlinson, AidWatch Canada, in July 2022 and updated in April 2024 with GAC's final data for international assistance for 2022/23. It has been prepared on behalf of the [Canadian CSO Coalition on Climate Change and Development \(C4D\)](#).

Briefing Note Nine (April 2024) Allocating Canada's Climate Finance to Climate Vulnerable Countries and People

1. Introduction

Canada's policy to guide the allocation of its \$5.3 billion climate finance pledge (2021/22 to 2025/26) sets out a key objective: "to *advance feminist climate action that supports the poorest and most vulnerable* [emphasis in the original]." In doing so, it "recognizes that often the most marginalized and vulnerable people, including women, girls and others, are disproportionately affected by climate change and biodiversity loss, but that they also have an essential role to play in mitigation and adaptation."²

This Briefing Note establishes a vulnerability framework for assessing the allocation of the \$5.3 billion pledge to date (December 2023), comparing the experience of the previous five-year \$2.65 billion climate pledge (2016/17 to 2020/21). This assessment is at best a proxy indication of allocations to the most vulnerable countries and people. A deeper analysis would rely on activity level information for many of the project commitments, which is unavailable.

There is no internationally agreed methodology for determining climate vulnerability.³ The distribution of the \$5.3 billion pledge in this Briefing Note is based on a number of assumptions about the allocation of finance for climate vulnerability. See **Annex One** for a list of these assumptions and their methodological rationale. Canada's allocations to vulnerable people and countries are disaggregated for greater transparency:⁴

a) Highly Vulnerable Countries and People:

- Least Developed Countries (less Small Island Developing States that are also LDCs);
- Small Island Developing States (SIDS);
- Principle Purpose Gender Equality Projects; and

b) Other Vulnerable Contexts

- Regional Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa (e.g. Multilateral Development Banks);
- Lower Middle-Income Countries (less SIDS that are also LMICs)

The analysis below distinguishes between **Allocations to Highly Vulnerable Countries and People** ([a] above) and a **Proxy Indicator of Total Allocations to Vulnerable Countries and People** (the sum of [a] and [b] above). While Other Vulnerable Contexts are relevant, the focus of this Briefing Note is mostly on Highly Vulnerable Countries and People ([a] above).

² Government of Canada, "Canada's Climate Finance for Developing Countries," accessed November 2022 at <https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/funding-financement/climate-developing-countries-climatique-pays-developpement.aspx?lang=eng>

³ See Germanwatch, "Climate Risk Index, 2021, accessed at (https://www.germanwatch.org/sites/default/files/Global%20Climate%20Risk%20Index%202021_2.pdf) and Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative, "ND-GAIN Country Index, 2020" accessed at <https://gain.nd.edu/our-work/country-index/rankings/>. The Notre Dame Index summarizes a country's vulnerability to climate change and other global challenges in combination with its readiness to improve resilience.

⁴ **Annex Two** sets out the lists of countries in each of these categories.

2. Allocations to Vulnerable Countries and Peoples in Canada's \$5.3 Billion Pledge

Table One sets out the disbursements for principal purpose climate finance for 2021/22 and 2022/23 according to the vulnerability indicator framework.⁵

Table One: Disaggregated Disbursements of \$5.3 billion Pledge to Vulnerable Countries and People, 2021/22 and 2022/23 cumulative

Millions of Canadian Dollars, Project Disbursements, GAC Historical Projects Dataset

| Vulnerable Groupings | Adaptation | Mitigation | Total | Share of Total Vulnerable Proxy [3] |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Least Developed Countries (no SIDS) | \$98.6 | \$46.3 | \$144.9 | 17% |
| Small Island Developing States (SIDS) | \$55.0 | \$64.8 | \$119.8 | 14% |
| Principle Purpose Gender Equality Projects | \$1.6 | \$4.7 | \$6.3 | 0.7% |
| 1) Total Highly Vulnerable Contexts | \$155.2 | \$115.8 | \$271.0 | 31% |
| Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Programs (MDBs) | \$92.2 | \$194.6 | \$282.3 | 33% |
| Lower Middle-Income Countries (no SIDS) | \$44.5 | \$262.1 | \$306.6 | 36% |
| 2) Total Other Vulnerable Contexts | \$136.7 | \$456.7 | \$593.4 | 69% |
| 3) Total Proxy Allocation to Vulnerable Countries and People | \$291.9 | \$572.5 | \$864.4 | |
| 4) Total Principal Purpose Climate Disbursements | \$527.1 | \$1,437.9 | \$1,965.0 | |
| Highly Vulnerable Share: (1)/(4) | 29% | 8% | 14% | |
| Other Vulnerable Contexts Share: (2)/(4) | 26% | 32% | 30% | |
| Total Proxy Vulnerable Share: (3)/(4) | 55% | 40% | 44% | |

To date (March 2023), \$864.4 million in principal purpose climate finance has been disbursed to vulnerable countries and people, according to the vulnerability framework set out above. Of this amount, 31% went to highly vulnerable contexts (LDCs, SIDS and gender equality projects). (**Table One**)

These disbursements for vulnerable countries and people amounted to 44% of all principal purpose climate finance disbursements for 2021/22 and 2022/23. Disbursements for highly vulnerable contexts represented only 14% of these total disbursements. (**Table One**)

It is important to note that these disbursements only represent two years out of the five-year climate finance pledge, within which it is hoped the share for Highly Vulnerable Contexts will improve.

⁵ Disbursement data in GAC's Historical Projects Dataset has the most complete country allocation for Canada's climate finance. This table uses disbursements by recipient countries to calculate the allocations to the different categories of vulnerability. These disbursements correspond to the \$5.3 billion pledge project commitments, but often the full disbursement is not completed in the year of commitment. Disbursement data for all project commitments over the five years of the \$5.3 billion pledge is required for a complete and accurate picture of allocations according to vulnerability. All calculations are by the author.

Adaptation finance is highly relevant in support of climate vulnerable people, people living in poverty, in communities exposed to extreme weather events, Small Island Developing States, and small holder farmers highly dependent on stable climate conditions for their livelihood. Almost three quarters (73%) of current disbursements for highly vulnerable contexts were directed to adaptation. On the other hand, 62% of current disbursements for other vulnerable contexts (LMICs and Sub-Saharan Africa regional disbursements) were directed to mitigation projects.

3. Allocations to Vulnerable Countries and Peoples in Canada’s \$2.65 Billion Pledge

How does the current experience with the \$5.6 billion pledge compare with the allocations to vulnerable contexts in the \$2.65 billion pledge over the five-year period 2015/16 to 2020/21?

Table Two sets out the parallel allocations of disbursements for vulnerability for this pledge.

Table Two: Disaggregated Disbursements of \$2.65 billion Pledge to Vulnerable Countries and People, 2015/16 to 2020/21 cumulative

Millions of Canadian Dollars, Project Disbursements, GAC Historical Projects Dataset

| Vulnerable Groupings | Adaptation | Mitigation | Total | Share of Total Vulnerable Proxy [3] |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Least Developed Countries (no SIDS) | \$70.7 | \$69.5 | \$140.2 | 12% |
| Small Island Developing States (SIDS) | \$76.5 | \$123.6 | \$200.1 | 17% |
| Principle Purpose Gender Equality Projects | \$2.2 | -- | \$2.2 | 0% |
| 1) Total Highly Vulnerable Contexts | \$149.4 | \$193.1 | \$342.5 | 29% |
| Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Programs (MDBs) | \$274.5 | \$510.6 | \$785.1 | 66% |
| Lower Middle-Income Countries (no SIDS) | \$15.8 | \$54.7 | \$70.5 | 6% |
| 2) Total Other Vulnerable Contexts | \$290.3 | \$565.3 | \$855.6 | 71% |
| 3) Total Proxy Allocation to Vulnerable Countries and People | \$439.7 | \$758.4 | \$1,198.1 | |
| 4) Total Principal Purpose Climate Disbursements | \$767.9 | \$1,826.4 | \$2,594.3 | |
| Highly Vulnerable Share: (1)/(4) | 19% | 11% | 13% | |
| Other Vulnerable Contexts Share: (2)/(4) | 38% | 31% | 33% | |
| Total Proxy Vulnerable Share: (3)/(4) | 57% | 42% | 46% | |

Of the \$2,594 million disbursed, \$1,198 million or 46% of the pledge was directed to vulnerable countries according to our proxy indicator. Allocations to Highly Vulnerable Countries were \$342.5 million or 13% of the \$2.65 billion pledge disbursements.

How do the two pledge periods compare?

- a) **Overall support for vulnerable countries and people is slightly less to date in the \$5.3 billion pledge, dropping from 46% in the \$2.65 billion pledge to 44% in current two-year disbursements for the \$5.3 billion pledge.** Disbursements for mitigation is over-represented in these first two years of disbursements. It is expected that increased disbursements in the three final years of the pledge for adaptation will increase the share to vulnerable countries and people.
- b) **The share of total climate finance allocated to Highly Vulnerable Countries, however, has not changed** – registering 13% for both the \$2.65 billion pledge disbursements and for those for the \$5.3 billion pledge to date. Within total support for vulnerable contexts, the share allocated to highly vulnerable countries has slightly increased so far to 31% for the \$5.6 billion pledge, from 29% in the previous pledge.
- c) **The share for Other Vulnerable Contexts remains high so far in the \$5.3 billion pledge.** The high level in the first two years of the \$5.3 billion pledge is mainly due to high levels of mitigation spending in lower middle-income countries through the World Bank.
- d) **The level of adaptation finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries has increased at this point in the current disbursements for the \$5.3 billion pledge.** Support for adaptation currently accounts for 57% of total finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries, compared to 44% for the \$2.65 billion pledge. Overall, adaptation allocations in all vulnerable contexts are 34% of the total support for these contexts in the current pledge period, compared to 37% for the five years of the \$2.65 billion pledge.
- e) **Principal purpose gender equality projects make up a miniscule share in both pledge periods.** This share registers at less than 1% of total support for Vulnerable Countries and People for both pledges. (See **Briefing Note Seven**)

4. The Role of CSOs in Delivering Climate Finance to Vulnerable Countries and People

CSOs play a significant role in delivering climate finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries and People. For the 2.65B pledge CSOs delivered both a very small share of the \$2.65 billion pledge overall, and only 2.5% of total Support for Vulnerable Countries and People. For the two years of disbursements for the \$5.3 billion pledge, CSOs increased this share to 16% overall and 26% of allocations for Highly Vulnerable Countries and People. Much of this support is concentrated in adaptation finance. CSOs delivered 30% of adaptation finance for Vulnerable Countries and People and 36% of adaptation finance for Highly Vulnerable Countries and People.

Annex One

Assumptions and Methodology for Allocations to Vulnerable Countries and People

The following assumptions are the basis for allocating project and program disbursements for the \$2.65 billion and \$5.3 billion climate pledges:

- a) Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have very large numbers of people highly vulnerable to impacts of climate change. **Annex Two** list ten Low Income Countries that are deemed to be most vulnerable to climate change impacts.
- b) Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are highly vulnerable to impacts of climate change. SIDS overlap with both LDCs and Lower Middle-Income Countries (LMICs). The analysis identifies allocations explicitly directed to SIDS and removes these country allocations from the totals for LDCs and LMICs to avoid double counting.
- c) Women and girls are disproportionately affected by climate change. As it is not possible to assess the degree to which directing resources to women and girls in projects where this objective is one of several others (significant purpose gender equality), this metric on vulnerability identifies only projects where gender equality is the principal purpose of the project. It therefore underestimates this dimension of vulnerability for some projects. (See **Briefing Note Seven**)
- d) Fragile states are also highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. These states are not a distinct category in analysis as there is very large overlaps with LDCs, SIDS and LMICs. (See the Table on Fragile States in **Annex Two**.) Commitments to all relevant fragile states in the \$2.65 billion pledge are covered by those to LDCs, SIDS and LMICs.
- e) The total of (a), (b), and (c) make up the allocations to Highly Vulnerable Populations and Countries.
- f) Sub-Saharan Africa as a region has a high number of LDCs and large populations of climate vulnerable people. Regional African projects and programs are therefore relevant to the allocation of resources for the vulnerable. However, most of these regional resources from the \$2.65 billion pledge have been channeled through Canada's special climate Funds at the World Bank or the Africa Development Bank. It is often not possible to predict the degree to which these allocations will touch on the conditions of vulnerable populations.
- g) It is important to acknowledge that Lower Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) also include significant numbers of vulnerable populations, which vary by country and socio-economic conditions. The analysis includes commitments to LMICs from the \$2.65 billion and \$5.3 billion pledges to acknowledge this reality, but it is not possible to determine the degree to which these disbursements are reaching these vulnerable populations.
- h) The analysis therefore distinguishes between allocations to 1) Highly Vulnerable Countries and People and allocations to 2) Other Vulnerable Contexts (total of [f] and [g]).
See **Annex Two** for the list of countries in each category.

Annex Two Least Developed Countries, 2023

Since 1971, the United Nations has recognized least developed countries (LDCs) as a category of States that are deemed highly disadvantaged in their development process, for structural, historical and also geographical reasons. [The list of LDCs](#) is reviewed every three years by the United Nations Economic and Social Council, in the light of recommendations by the Committee for Development Policy (CDP).

The following three criteria are used by the CDP to determine LDC status:

- **Per capita income** (gross national income per capita)
- **Human assets** (indicators of nutrition, health, school enrolment and literacy)
- **Economic vulnerability** (indicators of natural and trade-related shocks, physical and economic exposure to shocks, and smallness and remoteness).

LDCs are distinct from the World Bank's classification of countries by income groups (Low Income, Lower Middle Income, Upper Middle Income). There are two countries that are Low Income, but not included by the UN as LDCs: Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea and the Syrian Arab Republic.

See <https://unctad.org/topic/least-developed-countries/list>

List of Least Developed Countries

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Afghanistan | 21. Lao People's Democratic Republic |
| 2. Angola | 22. Lesotho |
| 3. Bangladesh | 23. Liberia |
| 4. Benin | 24. Madagascar |
| 5. Bhutan | 25. Malawi |
| 6. Burkina Faso | 26. Mali |
| 7. Burundi | 27. Mauritania |
| 8. Cambodia | 28. Mozambique |
| 9. Central African Republic | 29. Myanmar |
| 10. Chad | 30. Nepal |
| 11. Comoros | 31. Niger |
| 12. Democratic Republic of the Congo | 32. Rwanda |
| 13. Djibouti | 33. Sao Tome and Principe |
| 14. Eritrea | 34. Senegal |
| 15. Ethiopia | 35. Sierra Leone |
| 16. Gambia | 36. Solomon Islands |
| 17. Guinea | 37. Somalia |
| 18. Guinea-Bissau | 38. South Sudan |
| 19. Haiti | 39. Sudan |
| 20. Kiribati | 40. Timor-Leste |

- 41. Togo
- 42. Tuvalu
- 43. Uganda

- 44. United Republic of Tanzania
- 45. Yemen
- 46. Zambia

Low Income Countries Most Vulnerable to Climate Change

The CSO, Concern UK, has identified the 10 most vulnerable countries to climate change among Low Income Countries, based on data and rankings from the Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative and Germanwatch’s Climate Risk Index.⁶

Afghanistan
Bangladesh
Chad
Haiti

Kenya
Malawi
Niger
Pakistan

Somalia
Sudan

⁶ See Concern, “10 of the countries most affected by climate change,” July 2022, accessed at <https://www.concern.net/news/countries-most-affected-by-climate-change>. See also Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative (<https://gain.nd.edu/our-work/country-index/rankings/>) and Germanwatch’s Climate Risk Index (https://www.germanwatch.org/sites/default/files/Global%20Climate%20Risk%20Index%202021_2.pdf).

World Bank Lower Middle- Income Countries, 2023

The classification of countries by the World Bank by per capita income allocates countries to Low Income, Lower Middle Income, and Upper Middle Income. The measure of income is Gross National Income (GNI).

Low Income Countries (LICs) – Per capita GNI less than US\$1,045 in 2020

Lower Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) – Per capita GNI between US\$1,046 and US\$4,095 in 2020

Upper Middle-Income Countries (UMICs) – Per capita GNI between US\$4,096 and US\$12,695 in 2020

High Income Countries (HICs) – Per capita GNI higher than US\$12,696

List of Lower Middle-Income Countries

See DAC List of ODA Recipients at <https://webfs.oecd.org/oda/DataCollection/DAC%20List/DAC-List-of-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2022-23-flows.pdf>

| | | |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Algeria | 12. India | 25. Samoa |
| 1. Belize | 13. Indonesia | 26. Sri Lanka |
| 2. Bolivia | 14. Iran | 27. Tajikistan |
| 3. Cabo Verde | 15. Kenya | 28. Tokelau |
| 4. Cameroon | 16. Kyrgyzstan | 29. Tunisia |
| 5. Congo | 17. Micronesia | 30. Ukraine |
| 6. Cote d'Ivoire | 18. Mongolia | 31. Uzbekistan |
| 7. Egypt | 19. Morocco | 32. Vanuatu |
| 8. El Salvador | 20. Nicaragua | 33. Viet Nam |
| 9. Eswatini | 21. Nigeria | 34. West Bank and Gaza Strip |
| 10. Ghana | 22. Pakistan | 35. Zimbabwe |
| 11. Honduras | 23. Papua New Guinea | |
| | 24. Philippines | |

Sub-Saharan African Countries Classified as UMICs

1. Botswana
2. Equatorial Guinea
3. Gabon
4. Mauritius
5. Namibia
6. South Africa

Small Island Developing States (SIDS)

Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are those that face unique social, economic and environmental vulnerabilities. They are recognized in the United Nations as a special case both for their environment and development at the [1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development](#) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. There are 38 UN members listed as SIDS and 20 Non-UN Members or Associate Members of the Regional Commissions.

See <https://www.un.org/ohrlls/content/small-island-developing-states>

List of SIDS

See <https://www.un.org/ohrlls/content/list-sids>

| | Country | Income Group |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | Antigua and Barbuda | HIC |
| | Bahamas | HIC |
| | Bahrain | HIC |
| | Barbados | HIC |
| | Belize | LMIC |
| | Cabo Verde | LDC |
| | Comoros | LDC |
| | Cuba | UMIC |
| | Dominica | UMIC |
| | Dominican Republic | UMIC |
| | Fiji | UMIC |
| | Grenada | UMIC |
| | Guinea Bissau | LDC |
| | Guyana | UMIC |
| | Haiti | LDC |
| | Jamaica | UMIC |
| | Kiribati | LDC |
| | Maldives | UMIC |
| | Marshall Islands | UMIC |
| | Micronesia | LMIC |
| | Mauritius | UMIC |
| | Nauru | UMIC |
| | Palau | HIC |
| | Papua New Guinea | LMIC |
| | Samoa | LMIC |
| | São Tomé and Príncipe | LDC |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------|
| | Singapore | HIC |
| | St. Kitts and Nevis | UMIC |
| | St Lucia | UMIC |
| | St. Vincent and the Grenadines | UMIC |
| | Seychelles | HIC |
| | Solomon Islands | LDC |
| | Suriname | UMIC |
| | Timor-Leste | LDC |
| | Tonga | UMIC |
| | Trinidad and Tobago | HIC |
| | Tuvalu | LDC |
| | Vanuatu | LMIC |

DAC Multi-dimensional Fragile Contexts, 2022

The OECD characterizes fragility as the combination of exposure to risk and insufficient coping capacities of the state, system and/or communities to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks. In recognition of fragility's inherent complexity, the OECD introduced its multidimensional fragility framework in *States of Fragility 2016*. This framework captures the diversity of those contexts affected by fragility, measuring it on a spectrum of intensity across six dimensions: economic, environmental, human, political, security and societal.

For more information on multi-dimensional fragility, see <http://www3.compareyourcountry.org/states-of-fragility/about/0/>

Fragility Contexts by Country

See

[https://github.com/kazumayabeoecd/sfr_2022_additional_files/raw/main/List%20of%20fragile%20cont%20exts%20\(2022\).xlsx](https://github.com/kazumayabeoecd/sfr_2022_additional_files/raw/main/List%20of%20fragile%20cont%20exts%20(2022).xlsx)

| | Country | Fragility level | Income Group |
|----|--|-------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Somalia | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 2 | South Sudan | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 3 | Afghanistan | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 4 | Yemen | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 5 | Central African Republic (the) | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 6 | Congo (the Democratic Republic of the) | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 7 | Chad | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 8 | Syrian Arab Republic (the) | Extremely fragile | LIC |
| 9 | Congo (the) | Extremely fragile | LMIC |
| 10 | Haiti | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 11 | Burundi | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 12 | Sudan (the) | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 13 | Eritrea | Extremely fragile | LDC |
| 14 | Iraq | Extremely fragile | UMIC |
| 15 | Equatorial Guinea | Extremely fragile | UMIC |
| 16 | Libya | Other fragile | UMIC |
| 17 | Angola | Other fragile | LDC |
| 18 | Cameroon | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 19 | Niger (the) | Other fragile | LDC |
| 20 | Mali | Other fragile | LDC |
| 21 | Liberia | Other fragile | LDC |
| 22 | Madagascar | Other fragile | LDC |

| | | | |
|----|---|---------------|------|
| 23 | Uganda | Other fragile | LDC |
| 24 | Mozambique | Other fragile | LDC |
| 25 | Guinea | Other fragile | LDC |
| 26 | Nigeria | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 27 | Papua New Guinea | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 28 | Myanmar | Other fragile | LDC |
| 29 | Guinea-Bissau | Other fragile | LDC |
| 30 | Zambia | Other fragile | LDC |
| 31 | Comoros (the) | Other fragile | LDC |
| 32 | Mauritania | Other fragile | LDC |
| 33 | Timor-Leste | Other fragile | LDC |
| 34 | Zimbabwe | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 35 | Burkina Faso | Other fragile | LDC |
| 36 | Ethiopia | Other fragile | LDC |
| 37 | Tajikistan | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 38 | Bangladesh | Other fragile | LDC |
| 39 | Pakistan | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 40 | Sierra Leone | Other fragile | LDC |
| 41 | Cambodia | Other fragile | LDC |
| 42 | Côte d'Ivoire | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 43 | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) | Other fragile | UMIC |
| 44 | Solomon Islands | Other fragile | LDC |
| 45 | Djibouti | Other fragile | LDC |
| 46 | Eswatini | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 47 | Turkmenistan | Other fragile | UMIC |
| 48 | Lao People's Democratic Republic (the) | Other fragile | LDC |
| 49 | Guatemala | Other fragile | UMIC |
| 50 | Tanzania, the United Republic of | Other fragile | LDC |
| 51 | Kenya | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 52 | Togo | Other fragile | LDC |
| 53 | Nicaragua | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 54 | Benin | Other fragile | LDC |
| 55 | Korea (the Democratic People's Republic of) | Other fragile | LIC |
| 56 | Lesotho | Other fragile | LDC |
| 57 | Gambia (the) | Other fragile | LDC |
| 58 | Palestine, State of | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 59 | Honduras | Other fragile | LMIC |
| 60 | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Other fragile | LMIC |

Fragile States not included as LDCs or LMICs:

Iraq
Equatorial Guinea
Libya

Venezuela
Turkmenistan

Small Island States not included as LDCs or LMICs (Excluding High Income Countries):

Cuba
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Fiji
Grenada
Guyana
Jamaica
Maldives
Marshall Islands

Mauritius
Nauru
St. Kitts and Nevis
St Lucia
St Vincent
Suriname
Tonga