



OECD Journal on Development

# Development Co-operation Report 2007



By Richard Manning,  
Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)



*Efforts and Policies  
of the Members  
of the  
Development Assistance Committee*

# **Development Co-operation Report 2007**

Report by Richard Manning  
Chair of the **D**evelopment **A**ssistance **C**ommittee



# ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Pursuant to Article 1 of the Convention signed in Paris on 14th December 1960, and which came into force on 30th September 1961, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) shall promote policies designed:

- To achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy.
- To contribute to sound economic expansion in member as well as non-member countries in the process of economic development.
- To contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, non-discriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.

The original member countries of the OECD are Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The following countries became members subsequently through accession at the dates indicated hereafter: Japan (28th April 1964), Finland (28th January 1969), Australia (7th June 1971), New Zealand (29th May 1973), Mexico (18th May 1994), the Czech Republic (21st December 1995), Hungary (7th May 1996), Poland (22nd November 1996), Korea (12th December 1996) and the Slovak Republic (14th December 2000). The Commission of the European Communities takes part in the work of the OECD (Article 13 of the OECD Convention).

*In order to achieve its aims the OECD has set up a number of specialised committees. One of these is the Development Assistance Committee, whose members have agreed to secure an expansion of aggregate volume of resources made available to developing countries and to improve their effectiveness. To this end, members periodically review together both the amount and the nature of their contributions to aid programmes, bilateral and multilateral, and consult each other on all other relevant aspects of their development assistance policies.*

*The members of the Development Assistance Committee are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Commission of the European Communities.*

Publié en français sous le titre :  
**Coopération pour le développement**  
Rapport 2007

© OECD 2008

---

Permission to reproduce a portion of this work for non-commercial purposes or classroom use should be obtained through the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC), 20, rue des Grands-Augustins, 75006 Paris, France, tel. (33-1) 44 07 47 70, fax (33-1) 46 34 67 19, for every country except the United States. In the United States permission should be obtained through the Copyright Clearance Center, Customer Service, (508)750-8400, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 USA, or CCC Online: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com). All other applications for permission to reproduce or translate all or part of this book should be made to OECD Publications, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

---

## Preface by the Secretary-General

*In 2007, there were dramatic changes in the OECD's engagement with countries outside its current membership. At the Ministerial Council Meeting, Chile, Estonia, Israel, Russia and Slovenia were invited to open discussions on membership in the Organisation and a policy of "enhanced engagement" with a view to Membership was extended to Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa. The Heiligendamm Summit mandated the OECD to serve as a "platform" for discussions between the G8 and the new G5 (Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa) on several important topics, including development, with a special focus on Africa. Many individual directorates, as well as the Development Centre, also strengthened their involvement with countries outside the OECD.*

*Development co-operation is also changing fast. Aid from non-DAC and non-OECD countries is on the rise. Foundations and other charitable bodies are becoming increasingly important players. Remittances, private investment and shifts in commodity prices are altering the realities on the ground. These new trends are helping Africa to grow at a rate that used to be thought of as being out of reach. And yet, many countries and regions are presently not on track to reach the Millennium Development Goals. That is why we should try harder.*

*Since 2003, official development assistance (ODA) provided by OECD members to least developed countries, other low-income and lower middle-income countries has been on the rise. In contrast, some of the stronger lower middle-income countries, whose ODA receipts are marginal, have seen sharp falls in their ODA. While Afghanistan and Iraq have received large recent increases, Africa has seen a marked rise in programmable aid – from USD 22 billion in 2004 to USD 29 billion in 2006, though still far from the Gleneagles' commitment to double total aid to Africa to some USD 50 billion by 2010.*

*In parallel, both donor and partner countries have made major efforts to improve the quality and effectiveness of ODA. The sharp growth in ODA to the health and basic education sectors has contributed to some notable results. The number of children dying before their fifth birthday has fallen below 10 million per year for the first time and deaths from measles in Africa have fallen by 91% since 2000, thanks to well focused aid. Work on Aid Effectiveness, hosted by the Development Assistance Committee, has improved the dialogue between donor and partner countries about where and how aid is delivered. It has provided a baseline from which to measure improvements in the way donors provide their aid and is encouraging new thinking among the global health funds and agencies.*

*So the information and analysis in this Report is timely and important. It brings out the positive results noted above, while showing that much remains to be done, both in delivering the promises of dramatically increased aid and in meeting the commitments set out in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. It also highlights the huge challenges of the inequality that is still prevalent in the world and of growing global problems – such as climate change. The*

*evidence of this Report is that more aid, better targeted, better managed and effectively delivered, will deliver better results.*

Angel Gurría  
Secretary-General



## Foreword

**T**his is the last Foreword to the Development Co-operation Report that I have the honour to write as Chair of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). As ever, the Report that follows gives the world's most comprehensive statistics on development co-operation over the past year. In doing so, it maintains the tradition of open reporting which has been at the heart of the Committee's work from its inception. The importance of this is all the more evident as we look forward to key international events in 2008, including the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum in July, the Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in September, and finally the Doha Conference on Financing for Development at the end of the year.

The Report also attempts to provide some analysis of what the data mean. The first chapter is a kind of "report-card" on the aid effort, as seen from my perspective over the past few years. The second offers key lessons from peer reviews on the effective management of aid. The third chapter puts DAC's aid effectiveness work into context. It looks at the way aid effectiveness concepts are being implemented in the health sector, and how important issues like human rights, gender or the environment can be addressed within a locally owned approach to development. These three chapters should contribute to a better understanding of how aid is delivered, and how the international dialogue on aid effectiveness is moving forward.

The last chapter provides a short introduction to the aid programmes and performance of each DAC member, and also rightly embraces other OECD countries and significant players outside the OECD for which comparable reporting exists. A major priority for the international community is to achieve, perhaps working in conjunction with the UN, a fully comparable accounting of all flows of concessional resources, regardless of the source.

The Report also provides a brief guide to the work of the DAC and of its various subsidiary bodies. Finally, the Statistical Annex contains the most up-to-date and detailed aid statistics available.

Writing this Report involves many members of the staff of the Development Co-operation Directorate, including notably those mentioned in the box below. This Secretariat is a great resource for the development community, with an exciting mix of backgrounds, ages and experience and a shared commitment to making development work. It has been a real pleasure and privilege to be part of the team for the past five years, and to see how, under the leadership of Angel Gurriá, the OECD as a whole is adapting to the rapidly changing global development scene.

Equally, it has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with the members of the DAC itself. They too are a diverse group, but united in their search for constructive ways to build common ground and move the agenda forward. A particular word of thanks is due to all those who have served the Committee as members of the Bureau, peer review examiners or leaders of ad hoc groups during my time as Chair. The DAC's working parties and networks carry out much of its work, and I should like to put on record my appreciation of their work, and that of their chairs and bureaux. Among these, the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness stands out for its very wide membership, including both developing countries and multilateral organisations. The role of its chair is particularly taxing, and

I should like to acknowledge specifically the work of Michel Reveyrand (former chair) and Jan Cedergren in this demanding position.

The recent evaluation of the DAC provides strong evidence of the relevance of its work and offers the donor community a good opportunity to reflect on how to position the Committee for the future in the fast evolving world of development finance. I would like to welcome my successor, Eckhard Deutscher – the twelfth Chair of the DAC since its foundation – to this fascinating position at a time of both challenge and opportunity.

Richard Manning  
DAC Chair



### Acknowledgements

Yasmin Ahmad, Sebastian Bartsch, Christine Graves, James Hradsky, Karen Jorgensen, Brenda Killen, Frans Lammersen, Patti O'Neill, Rémi Paris, Neil Patrick, Elisabeth Sandor, Simon Scott, Jens Sedemund, Elisabeth Thioleron and Chantal Verger contributed to the drafting of the Development Co-operation Report 2007. Elena Bernaldo, Aimée Nichols and Ann Zimmerman helped to gather and prepare the statistical information. Kjerstin Andreasen, Jeanette Dargaville, Jean McDonald, Madeleine Paris, Meria Puhakka and Nigel Wilkie provided technical and other support. Stephanie Coic contributed to the graphic design. Carola Miras managed the process and provided editorial input.

**This book has...**



**StatLinks** 

**A service that delivers Excel® files  
from the printed page!**

Look for the *StatLinks* at the bottom right-hand corner of the tables or graphs in this book. To download the matching Excel® spreadsheet, just type the link into your Internet browser, starting with the <http://dx.doi.org> prefix.

If you're reading the PDF e-book edition, and your PC is connected to the Internet, simply click on the link. You'll find *StatLinks* appearing in more OECD books.

## Table of Contents

<b>Preface by the Secretary-General</b> .....	3
<b>Foreword</b> .....	5
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	6
<b>List of Acronyms</b> .....	11
<b>1. Overview by the DAC Chair</b> .....	13
Introduction .....	14
Measuring progress .....	15
Aid volume (measures 1 and 2) .....	15
Aid allocation (measures 3-5) .....	19
Fragile situations (measure 6) .....	23
Aid effectiveness (measures 7-10) .....	23
The efforts of recipient countries (measure 11) .....	26
Are we seeing results? (measure 12) .....	27
Notes .....	29
<b>2. Effective Aid Management: Twelve Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews</b> .....	35
Introduction .....	36
Strategy .....	36
Finding the appropriate legal and political foundation .....	36
Managing competing national interests .....	37
Achieving greater policy coherence for development .....	38
Public awareness .....	39
Organisational management .....	40
Identify a leadership structure that works .....	40
Bilateral aid: Dealing with institutional dispersion .....	41
Managing contributions to the multilateral institutions .....	43
Decentralising management to the field .....	44
Management of delivery .....	44
Managing the scaling up of development aid .....	44
Maintaining a focused approach: Countries, sectors .....	45
Performance-based management, evaluation and quality control .....	46
Human resource management priorities .....	48
Learning for the future .....	50
Notes .....	50

<b>3. Aid Effectiveness: Implementing the Paris Principles</b> .....	51
Introduction .....	52
Why aid effectiveness matters in health .....	52
The increasing aid effectiveness challenges in health .....	53
Responding to the challenges: How has this evidence been translated into action? .....	54
Implementing the Paris principles: A more aid effective approach to development assistance for health? .....	56
The building blocks are in place, but results are needed .....	58
The Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: An agenda for action .....	59
Lessons learned from implementing the Paris Declaration in human rights, environmental sustainability and gender equality .....	60
Key messages from the Dublin workshop .....	60
National ownership is about genuine collective ownership by society as a whole .....	60
Next steps .....	62
Notes .....	62
Annex 3.A. Best Practice Principles for Global Health Partnership Activities at Country Level .....	64
<b>4. Efforts and Policies of Bilateral Donors</b> .....	67
Introduction: DAC members' aid performance in 2006 .....	68
Did members meet their 2006 targets? .....	69
Future prospects .....	70
Notes on DAC members .....	71
Australia .....	72
Austria .....	73
Belgium .....	74
Canada .....	75
Denmark .....	77
European Community .....	79
Finland .....	81
France .....	83
Germany .....	84
Greece .....	85
Ireland .....	86
Italy .....	87
Japan .....	88
Luxembourg .....	89
Netherlands .....	90
New Zealand .....	91
Norway .....	92
Portugal .....	93
Spain .....	94
Sweden .....	96
Switzerland .....	97

United Kingdom .....	98
United States .....	99
Notes on other OECD donors .....	100
Czech Republic .....	100
Hungary .....	100
Iceland .....	101
Korea .....	101
Mexico .....	102
Poland .....	102
Slovak Republic .....	102
Turkey .....	103
Notes on non-OECD donors .....	104
<b>The DAC at Work</b> .....	107
Development Assistance Committee .....	108
The Development Assistance Committee Representatives in 2007 .....	110
Selected Activities of the DAC in 2008 .....	111
The DAC's Subsidiary Bodies .....	113
DAC Subsidiary Bodies' Mandates and Work Programmes .....	114
OECD's Development Co-operation Directorate .....	124
DAC Website Themes and Aliases .....	127
<b>Statistical Annex</b> .....	129
<b>Technical Notes</b> .....	229
Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts .....	230
Notes on Definitions and Measurement .....	235
DAC List of ODA Recipients – As at 1 January 2006 .....	238
<b>List of boxes</b>	
1.1. Donor responses in fragile situations .....	24
1.2. ODA to Iraq .....	31
1.3. Aid for Trade at a Glance .....	32
2.1. Seeking high-level clarity in the United Kingdom .....	37
2.2. Development and national interest in the United States .....	38
2.3. Promoting policy coherence for development in Sweden .....	39
2.4. Public awareness in Ireland .....	40
2.5. The development leadership structure in the Netherlands .....	41
2.6. Institutional consolidation in Japan .....	42
2.7. Different lead responsibilities for managing multilateral relationships with the Multilateral Development Banks .....	43
2.8. The European Commission's decision to operate from the field .....	44
2.9. The challenges of scaling up in Spain .....	45
2.10. DEReC: Disseminating lessons .....	47
2.11. Performance based management in Canadian aid .....	48

2.12.	The joint training of development staff among DAC agencies, and with their developing country counterparts: “Train4Dev” . . . . .	49
3.1.	The Paris Declaration as a framework for assessing aid effectiveness in health . .	57
4.1.	DAC peer review of Canada, 10 October 2007 . . . . .	76
4.2.	DAC peer review of Denmark, 8 June 2007 . . . . .	78
4.3.	DAC peer review of the European Community, 26 June 2007 . . . . .	80
4.4.	DAC peer review of Finland, 27 November 2007 . . . . .	82
4.5.	DAC peer review of Spain, 15 November 2007 . . . . .	95

### List of tables

1.1.	OECD DAC Secretariat simulation of DAC members’ net ODA volumes in 2006 and 2010 . . . . .	17
1.2.	Countries where development projects, programmes and technical co-operation fell most between 2002 and 2006 . . . . .	22
1.3.	Keeping the score . . . . .	30
2.1.	Who is responsible for bilateral aid policy and management? . . . . .	41
4.1.	ODA performance in 2006 against the Monterrey targets set in 2002. . . . .	70

### List of figures

1.1.	DAC members’ net ODA 1990-2006 and DAC Secretariat simulations of net ODA to 2007 and 2010 . . . . .	16
1.2.	Net ODA flows by type . . . . .	18
1.3.	Total net ODA to LDCs and OLICs. . . . .	20
1.4.	Total net ODA by region. . . . .	21
1.5.	Paris Declaration baseline survey 2006: Proportion of analytical work done jointly by donors . . . . .	26
1.6.	Trends in government revenue and ODA disbursements in sub-Saharan Africa . . . . .	27
3.1.	Distribution of donor funding for health by strategic objective in Rwanda . . .	54
3.2.	Volatility in aid for health in seven countries . . . . .	55

## List of Acronyms\*

<b>ACP</b>	African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
<b>AEGI*</b>	Spanish Agency for International Development
<b>AfDF</b>	African Development Fund
<b>BMZ</b>	Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>CIDA</b>	Canadian International Development Agency
<b>DAC</b>	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development
<b>EDF</b>	European Development Fund
<b>EC</b>	European Community
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>GDP</b>	Gross domestic product
<b>GFATM</b>	Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
<b>GNI</b>	Gross national income
<b>GNP</b>	Gross national product
<b>HIPC</b>	Heavily indebted poor country
<b>IDA</b>	International Development Association
<b>IFFIm</b>	International Finance Facility for Immunisation
<b>IRAI</b>	IDA Resource Allocation Index
<b>LDC</b>	Least-developed country
<b>LIC</b>	Low income country
<b>LMIC</b>	Lower middle-income country
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>NZAID</b>	New Zealand's International Aid and Development Agency
<b>ODA</b>	Official development assistance
<b>OLIC</b>	Other low-income country
<b>SDR</b>	Special drawing rights (IMF)
<b>Sida</b>	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
<b>TC</b>	Technical Co-operation
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNFPA</b>	United Nations Population Fund
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>USD</b>	United States dollar

\* This list is not exhaustive. See also Chapter 4 of this Report for country-specific acronyms.



## Chapter 1

# Overview by the DAC Chair

*This chapter assesses progress on a number of indicators first set out in the Development Co-operation Report for 2003 to measure how the development community is contributing to the sustainable reduction of poverty. It finds that there is progress on many fronts, but that it has been relatively modest. As the indicators measure the results of a huge number of decisions by many different actors, it is not surprising that overall change is quite slow. But the findings underline the scope for much further progress if the development community is to make as large an impact as it should on helping poor countries advance towards the Millennium Development Goals.*

## Introduction

As I hand over the chairmanship of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) to my successor, Eckhard Deutscher, it is a good moment to reflect on the substantial changes in official development assistance (ODA) that I have seen over my term of office since June 2003. It is also important to assess how these relate to what we see happening in the least developed countries (LDCs), the other low-income countries (OLICs) and the lower middle-income countries (LMICs), i.e. the main recipients of ODA.

In brief, we are seeing clear signs of robust though uneven progress in many of these countries. In LDCs and OLICs these have coincided, as this chapter will show, with considerable increases in ODA from both DAC members and other countries. This is also true not just of total ODA but of ODA that delivers resources that can be planned to support local development strategies (country programmable aid, as defined below).

In some of the stronger LMICs, by contrast, progress has coincided with sharp falls in ODA as donors react to the greatly enhanced ability of these countries to sustain their own development. These drops have almost always been marginal in relation to the size of the economies in question.

Progress has also coincided with considerable efforts to improve the quality and effectiveness of ODA. However, this Report is issued too soon to capture the results from the 2008 round of monitoring the indicators and targets set in the Paris Declaration of 2005, let alone the initial findings of work to evaluate the impact of the Declaration.

Of course, most of the credit for progress must go to the efforts of the countries themselves, and to the largely benign international economic environment of the past few years. The increasing ability of these countries, including in sub-Saharan Africa, to strengthen their revenue base, is noted later in this chapter as a key development. But where ODA has grown sharply, as has been the case in health and in basic education, it has been associated with a marked acceleration in observable results. For example, the annual number of infant and child deaths appears finally to have fallen below 10 million. More evaluation and research is needed to explore whether such associations are sufficiently robust to demonstrate causal links.

Huge challenges remain. Deprivation and gross inequality still mark our world. Some global problems, such as climate change, loom ever larger. For their part, as this Report shows, donors have much to do to deliver on their promises and improve their effectiveness.

In the *Development Co-operation Report 2005*, I suggested that we were seeing more of a joint enterprise for development, built around the objectives set in the Millennium Declaration. As we take a step closer towards reviewing progress since the landmark UN conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, I believe that despite all the problems, the sense of joint purpose and the reality of joint action are becoming increasingly evident.

## Measuring progress

The *Development Co-operation Report 2003* was the first to which I had the pleasure of contributing. In it, I proposed a dozen measures of a common-sense kind for measuring the contribution that development co-operation is making to development results, and expressed the hope that we would see real gains on these measures by 2006. Subsequent Reports have contained a brief section in which progress, or the lack of it, has been assessed in a summary fashion. In this Report, my last contribution to the series issued under the authority of the DAC Chair since 1960, these twelve measures will constitute the backbone of this customary overview chapter (Table 1.3).

Of these measures, 10 are essentially within the control of donors. On three of these (volume, proportion of ODA going to LDCs and OLICs and untying) the targets that I had proposed for 2006 were achieved. On four more, three relating to aid effectiveness and one to fragile states, there are not yet clear enough metrics, but there are indications of progress. Three targets for 2006 were not achieved: that the bulk of increased ODA should involve a genuine transfer of resources in balance of payments terms, that a higher share of ODA should go to countries with relatively good performance and large populations, and that the proportion of ODA needed for emergency and humanitarian aid should decline. Developing countries as a group met the indicator of effort that I had suggested – impressively so in terms of revenue effort, rather marginally so in the proportion of government expenditure going on health and education. The final indicator, progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), continues to show the familiar picture of impressive global progress in the reduction of absolute poverty, less progress against many other Goals, and huge challenges in particular for sub-Saharan Africa and for the Pacific.


One cannot survey the utilisation of ODA during my time as Chair without reference to Iraq, which in 2005/06 accounted for nearly USD 7 billion of ODA a year, even excluding debt relief. Because Iraq stands out as a special case, and because it is likely that quite a large proportion of aid to it, particularly from the largest donor, the United States, was “additional” in the sense that it would not have been voted for other aid purposes, I have shown the analysis of several of the indicators both with and without Iraq. Box 1.2, towards the end of this chapter, gives a brief factual analysis of the source and composition of ODA flows to Iraq over the last four years when aid to Iraq reached substantial levels.

### Aid volume (measures 1 and 2)

Back in 2003, I suggested two measures of progress on aid volume. The first was that in 2006 donors should deliver at least USD 75 billion (at 2002 prices and exchange rates) in net disbursements, compared to a 2002 baseline of USD 57.5 billion. This headline commitment has been fulfilled: donors reported net ODA disbursements in 2006 which equate to USD 77.8 billion at those prices and exchange rates. Excluding Iraq, the figure would have been USD 70.7 billion. On the face of it, this is an impressive result, when one considers that ODA had oscillated around the USD 50 billion mark for many years. Figure 1.1 presents actual ODA net disbursements by DAC members from 1990 to 2006, and Secretariat simulations to 2010. Table 1.1 contains the simulation in greater detail. Based on latest information on commitments, this table shows slightly lower figures in 2010 as compared to the simulation in last year’s Report, both in real terms and as a proportion of the gross national income of DAC members.

However, my second measure was more demanding: that the bulk of increased flows should involve genuine transfer of resources into the economies of developing countries.

Figure 1.1. **DAC members' net ODA 1990-2006 and DAC Secretariat simulations of net ODA to 2007 and 2010**



The concept is a difficult one, and has proved over-ambitious, since there is no database that gives sufficient detail. The Secretariat has retained the spirit of my proposal by publishing a metric which excludes from ODA bilateral humanitarian aid, debt relief, administration costs, in-donor country refugee costs and imputed student costs. It is clear from this metric, which broadly tracks what one might call “programmable aid”, that the bulk of the increase from USD 57.5 billion to USD 77.8 billion was **not** from programmable aid, but from debt relief. Figure 1.2 shows in more detail the make-up of the ODA flows in 2002 and 2006, with and without Iraq. This is not to deny the significance of debt relief, which has transformed the creditworthiness of many countries over the past few years and has had directly positive balance-of-payment impacts to the extent that it offset actual debt service repayments.

Looking forward, there is every reason to suppose that reported relief of commercial debt will fall sharply, and **we need therefore to see a surge in programmable aid if the increased numbers in the simulation are to be achieved.** Figure 1.1 makes this very clear by showing that without the extremely large debt relief granted to Iraq and Nigeria, ODA in 2006 was well short of a straight line increase towards the 2010 ODA figures implicit in DAC members' public commitments. The Secretariat calculate that the annual growth in ODA (other than debt relief grants and humanitarian aid) from 2006-10 which would be required to reach the levels shown for 2010 is **12%**, assuming that debt relief and humanitarian aid in 2010 are at their historical levels. Moreover, since the cost of relief of commercial debt to the donor taxpayer is normally much less than the face value reported as ODA, increases in programmable aid are relatively more costly to the taxpayer.

Most, but not all, DAC members have announced medium-term commitments to increase ODA, at least to 2010 (Table 1.1), and there is a common commitment to double ODA to Africa from 2004 to 2010. Few members have yet published clear plans for delivering their commitments, though some members with multi-year public expenditure plans have indeed done exactly that. One important indicator will be the ODA outturn for 2007, the first year when the major commitments made in 2005 could reasonably be

Table 1.1. OECD DAC Secretariat simulation of DAC members' net ODA volumes in 2006 and 2010

In constant 2006 USD million

The data below are not forecasts, but Secretariat projections based on public announcements by member countries of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The key figures from such announcements are shown as "Assumptions". To calculate net ODA and ODA/GNI ratios requires projections for GNI for 2010. For 2007 and 2008 the projections of real growth for each country are taken from the OECD Economic Outlook No. 81 (May 2007) Annex Table 1. For the period 2009-10, real annual GNI growth of 2% is assumed for all countries. While calculations have been discussed at technical level with national authorities, the **DAC Secretariat is responsible for the methodology and the final published results**. Note that debt relief levels are exceptionally high in 2006, assisting some donors to meet or exceed their 2006 targets.

	2006		Assumptions	2010	
	Net ODA (2006 USD m)	ODA/GNI (Per cent)		Net ODA (2006 USD m)	ODA/GNI (Per cent)
Austria	1 498	0.47	0.51% in 2010	1 796	0.51
Belgium	1 978	0.50	0.7% in 2010	3 025	0.70
Denmark	2 236	0.80	Minimum 0.8%	2 423	0.80
Finland	834	0.40	0.51% in 2010	1 183	0.51
France <sup>1</sup>	10 601	0.47	0.42% in 2007 and 0.7% in 2015	12 519	0.51
Germany	10 435	0.36	0.51% in 2010	16 355	0.51
Greece	424	0.17	0.51% in 2010	1 402	0.51
Ireland	1 022	0.54	0.6% in 2010 and 0.7% in 2012	1 294	0.60
Italy	3 641	0.20	0.51% in 2010	10 163	0.51
Luxembourg	291	0.89	1% in 2009	376	1.00
Netherlands	5 452	0.81	Minimum 0.8%	5 962	0.80
Portugal	396	0.21	0.51% in 2010	1 031	0.51
Spain <sup>1, 2</sup>	3 814	0.32	0.5% in 2008 and 0.7% in 2012	7 920	0.59
Sweden	3 955	1.02	1%	4 331	1.00
United Kingdom <sup>1, 2</sup>	12 459	0.51	0.37% in 2007-08, 0.56% in 2010 and 0.7% in 2013	14 856	0.56
<b>DAC EU members, total</b>	<b>59 035</b>	<b>0.43</b>		<b>84 636</b>	<b>0.57</b>
Australia <sup>3</sup>	2 123	0.30	See footnote 3	2 934	0.37
Canada <sup>4</sup>	3 684	0.29	See footnote 4	4 162	0.30
Japan <sup>5</sup>	11 187	0.25	See footnote 5	10 092	0.21
New Zealand <sup>6</sup>	259	0.27	See footnote 6	344	0.33
Norway	2 954	0.89	1% over 2006-09	3 661	1.00
Switzerland <sup>7</sup>	1 646	0.39	See footnote 7	1 828	0.40
United States <sup>8</sup>	23 532	0.18	See footnote 8	24 705	0.17
<b>DAC members, total</b>	<b>104 421</b>	<b>0.31</b>		<b>132 361</b>	<b>0.35</b>
				<b>25 600</b>	<b>43</b>
				<b>810</b>	<b>38</b>
				<b>478</b>	<b>13</b>
				<b>-1 095</b>	<b>-10</b>
				<b>85</b>	<b>33</b>
				<b>707</b>	<b>24</b>
				<b>1 181</b>	<b>11</b>
				<b>1 173</b>	<b>5</b>
				<b>27 940</b>	<b>27</b>

1. ODA/GNI ratios interpolated between 2007 and/or 2008 and the year to be attained.

2. Spain is aiming for a minimum of 0.5% by 2008, with the intention then to aim for 0.7% by 2012; the UK has announced 0.56% in 2010 and 0.7% by 2013.

3. Australia expects to continue increasing its ODA. Funding has been set aside in Australia's Budget to allow Australia to increase its ODA to about 4.3 billion Australian dollars by 2010-11, and Australia intends to reach an ODA/GNI target of 0.5% by 2015-16. The figure here is discounted by 2.5% per annum for inflation.

4. Canada intends to double its 2001 International Assistance Envelope (IAE) level by 2010 in nominal terms. The Canadian authorities estimate ODA will be CAN\$ 5.1 billion in 2010. The ODA figure shown here is adjusted for 2 per cent annual inflation and converted to USD at the 2006 exchange rate.

5. Japan intends to increase its ODA by USD 10 billion in aggregate over the five years 2005-09 compared to 2004. The Secretariat's estimate assumes USD 1.17 billion extra in 2010, compared to 2004, no adjustment being made for inflation.


6. New Zealand has announced commitments of 0.30% in 2007-08 and 0.35% in 2009-10 and 0.35% in 2010-11 on a fiscal year basis. This is translated into a commitment of 0.33% in 2010 on a calendar year basis.

7. The current financial projections assume that 0.4% will be reached by 2010.

8. The United States does not issue or approve forecasts on projected ODA. The amount shown here is purely a Secretariat estimate. It is based on 2004 ODA plus USD 5 billion nominal per annum to cover the Gleneagles G8 commitments on increased aid to Africa, Millennium Challenge Account, and initiatives on HIV/AIDS, malaria and humanitarian aid.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176272037617>

Figure 1.2. Net ODA flows by type



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174700128051>

\* Comprises costs for administration, in-donor country refugees and imputed student costs.

reflected in actual spending. As debt relief will certainly have fallen, the level of ODA net of debt relief will be a very important indicator of delivery.

Another significant indicator of donors' intentions is their decision to contribute to three key multilateral replenishments: the International Development Association (IDA), the African Development Fund (AfDF) and the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM). These decisions were taken towards the end of 2007, and all involve three-year funding commitments. The outcomes show funding increases as follows:

- IDA: commitment authority increased by **25%** from the SDR 21.9 billion agreed in the last Replenishment to SDR 27.3 billion (USD 41.6 billion) in IDA-15, or from SDR 7.3 billion to SDR 9.1 billion a year. (In dollar terms, the increase represents 30%.) Donor pledges rose in fact by **36%** in SDR terms, the difference being accounted for by the cost to IDA of the Multilateral Debt Reduction Initiative (MDRI).
- AfDF: commitment authority increased by **52%** to Fund Units of Account 5.6 billion (USD 8.9 billion), or FUA 1.9 billion a year.
- GFATM: increased from USD 4.7 billion over the two years of the First Replenishment period (2006-07) to at least USD 9.7 billion over the three years of the Second Replenishment (2008-10), or from USD 2.35 billion a year to just over USD 3.2 billion a year, an increase of **38%** in dollar terms.

In addition, the European Commission has advised that it expects its disbursements to rise by 26% between 2006 and 2010, to reach EUR 10.1 billion in the latter year.

These decisions are important. They clearly show the willingness of donors to increase very considerably the funding of major multilateral institutions, both those with broad mandates such as the Commission and the two development banks, and those with more focused aims such as the Global Fund. This gives some confidence that ODA will indeed be scaled up significantly over the next three years, if we assume that the share of these major funds in total ODA will not change greatly. The increases, which are in current

prices, fall short (except for the AfDF) of the 12% real annual increase posited above, but have the virtue that they are, subject to ratification, firm binding commitments.

One factor that has changed significantly in the past few years is the importance of non-DAC official donors and charitable bodies (both voluntary agencies and foundations).

Net disbursements by OECD countries not yet members of the DAC rose impressively from an estimated USD 0.4 billion in 2002 to some USD 1.9 billion in 2006. Non-OECD EU Member States also raised their much smaller aggregate flows significantly. Good data on flows from countries outside the OECD and the EU remain limited, but it is evident that China in particular has now become a significant source of funding for a growing number of countries. It is highly desirable that consistent and transparent accounting of flows from these countries is put in place as soon as possible, perhaps through the new ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum. South-South co-operation needs fuller and more transparent recognition on the same basis as ODA from DAC members.

Grants by private voluntary agencies and foundations in DAC member countries also rose sharply from USD 8.8 billion in 2002 to USD 14.6 billion in 2006. These figures are as reported by DAC members and are likely to be conservative, though the strong upward trend is not in doubt. With the Gates Foundation alone likely to be disbursing USD 3 billion of grants annually in a couple of years' time, most of it for development assistance, the significance of these sources of funds is evident.

While DAC members' ODA remains the dominant source of non-commercial flows<sup>1</sup> specifically for development purposes to developing countries, the increasing aid from these other channels means **that the average recipient has seen a sharper increase in aid-type receipts than the figures from DAC members only would suggest**. This discrepancy is likely to become more marked over time.

### Aid allocation (measures 3-5)

Here I proposed three measures of progress. First, that the proportion of ODA going to least developed countries (LDCs) and other low-income countries (OLICs) should rise significantly from 2002. Second, that a higher share of ODA should go to countries with relatively good performance and large numbers of poor people. Third, that emergency and humanitarian relief should be on a downtrend at least as a proportion of total aid.


The first measure shows an increase in the proportion of ODA going to LDCs and OLICs from 40% of net bilateral ODA in 2002 to 46% in 2006. The comparable figures for total ODA are 47% and 49% respectively, reflecting the fact that multilateral aid is rather more poverty-focused than bilateral aid.

This measure is heavily affected by two exceptional factors in 2006 which operate in different directions:

- First, the large rise in ODA to Iraq. If Iraq, which is classified as a lower-middle income country, is excluded from the denominator, the increase in poverty focus is even more significant – to 52% for bilateral aid and to 54% for total ODA.
- Second, the cancellation of large amounts of the commercial debt of Nigeria, a low-income country. The increase in the poverty focus of ODA in 2006 is more than accounted for by this exceptional debt relief. Excluding this last factor, the proportion of net bilateral ODA going to LDCs and OLICs declined marginally, from 40% in 2002 to 39% in 2006.

More significantly, the period saw a rise of nearly 38% in real terms in ODA for development projects, programmes and technical co-operation (TC) to LDCs and OLICs (Figure 1.3).

Figure 1.3. **Total net ODA to LDCs and OLICs**



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174722863183>


Note: It is not possible to measure country programmable aid by recipient country as the data on imputed student costs, administrative costs and costs for refugees in donor countries are not identified separately on a recipient basis.

A regional breakdown (Figure 1.4) shows that, as would be expected, Africa's share of programmable aid is rising as a result of the commitment to double ODA to Africa between 2004 and 2010.

So, which countries are receiving less ODA? Table 1.2 shows the largest proportionate declines between 2002 and 2006. Single year figures of this kind need to be read with caution, since they may reflect one-off factors. But some trends seem clear. Middle-income countries like Brazil, China, Indonesia and Thailand (which was, in addition, repaying ODA debt in 2006), and resource rich countries like Angola are receiving less ODA as donors increasingly look to aid countries less able to finance their own development. India (though still a low-income country) is, like these other countries, not at all dependent on ODA and has made clear what it does and does not want from donors. This confirms that the "poverty efficiency" of ODA is continuing to increase, though this is not to deny the place of ODA in helping to address some of the key development and poverty challenges in middle-income countries.

There has clearly been a significant increase in ODA to the poorest countries. But what about a different group, good performers with large shares of poor people? Do donors reward good performance? For the purpose of this analysis, the Secretariat defines the countries covered as the two upper quintiles of the World Bank's IDA Resource Allocation Index (IRAI). The proportion of net bilateral ODA going to this group, all of whom are LDCs or OLICs, has declined (19% in 2002 and 17% in 2006). This still implies a substantial increase in real terms, since ODA itself has increased, but a fall in the relative weight is given by bilateral donors to good performers. These figures exclude Iraq from the

Figure 1.4. Total net ODA by region

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174746234454>

Note: See note to Figure 1.3.

**Table 1.2. Countries where development projects, programmes and technical co-operation fell most between 2002 and 2006**

Constant 2005 USD million

	2002	2006	Difference between 2002 and 2006
Indonesia	1 491.2	725.0	-766.2
Brazil	739.8	102.6	-637.2
India	1 783.9	1 162.2	-621.7
Thailand	330.0	-253.7	-583.7
Pakistan	1 653.5	1 274.9	-378.6
Angola	365.0	24.3	-340.7
Cote d'Ivoire	564.4	270.3	-294.1
China	1 679.9	1 454.6	-225.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina	601.2	401.1	-200.1

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176272516557>

denominator. (With Iraq included, the proportion declines further to only 15% in 2006.) This result is, however, also affected by the large debt cancellation to Nigeria (a low-income country not in the top two quintiles of the IRAI). Excluding both Iraq and Nigeria debt cancellation from the equation, the proportion of net bilateral ODA going to the good performers would be virtually static (19% in 2002 and 20% in 2006). The lack of any stronger prioritisation of good performers no doubt also reflects the growing interest of DAC members in engaging effectively with fragile states and an increase in funds allocated to lower-income post-conflict countries.

My hope that the proportion of emergency and humanitarian aid would decline was not, of course, based on any questioning of the importance of delivering prompt and generous assistance to those facing emergencies. It was based on the hope that the spate of natural and, in particular, man-made emergencies might decrease. In practice, emergency and humanitarian assistance has risen slightly as a proportion of total ODA from 5% in 2002 to 6% in 2006, a figure not much affected by whether Iraq is included or excluded. In real terms the absolute figure rose by a substantial 90% between 2002 and 2006, still probably reflecting the huge relief efforts made after the Indian Ocean tsunami of late 2004 and the Pakistan earthquake of late 2005. This figure was only partially mitigated by some reduction in humanitarian spending in relation to some long-running man-made emergencies where relief requirements have diminished (though many would argue that resources are still very inferior to needs). Looking ahead, the expectation must be that the level of costs arising from natural disasters will increase as long as population growth and climate change effects outweigh remedial measures. Thankfully, there seems reason to hope that the decline in conflicts will continue and the cost of man-made emergencies will lessen gradually.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore realistic to expect that the humanitarian share of ODA will continue at its recent levels of 6 to 7% compared to the 5% average of the last 15 years, no doubt with significant variations from year to year. It is very important that such aid is effectively managed, in accordance with the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles adopted by the DAC in 2006. Continued scrutiny in peer reviews is already producing some useful lessons on this.

## Fragile situations (measure 6)

While I had hoped to see good performance being more clearly rewarded, it is also very important for donors to make well-considered interventions in poor countries where effective transfers are possible. Indeed, as progress continues, a steadily rising proportion of the extremely poor and those in the worst social and environmental conditions are likely to be living in fragile situations of one kind or another, as Paul Collier has highlighted in his book *The Bottom Billion*. Donors cannot remain indifferent to human rights violations and violence against the vulnerable, notably women and girls, in such situations, particularly where conflict is prevalent. Back in 2003 I did not propose any quantitative target, but certainly hoped to see an increasing number of such interventions. While in some cases very poor governance clearly precludes large increases in aid, there is evidently a case for enhanced aid to countries whose needs and relative governance performance may warrant closer engagement.

There has been a lot of good conceptual work, including by the DAC's Fragile States Group, on how donors should act in these difficult situations, each one of which has its own particularities. There is some evidence of progress at field level, though clearly, much more needs to be done. Let us take three characteristic situations: states emerging from conflict, states burdened by some form of "resource curse", and states in whose policies few of us have any confidence. Continued effort is needed to maximise the effectiveness of donor interventions in these challenging situations. The DAC's Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations remain highly relevant, but the key is to move from agreement on principles to achieving real progress in donor co-ordination and in helping to build competent and accountable local institutions. The sub-regional dimension is also extremely important, and too often given too little weight.

## Aid effectiveness (measures 7-10)

This strategic theme has of course been at the heart of the work of the DAC. I had proposed four criteria for measuring progress by 2006:

- i) a higher proportion of aid is untied;
- ii) much more aid is clearly aligned to local priorities, programmes and systems, and figure in recipients' budgets;
- iii) indicators of harmonisation show a quantum leap from 2002/03 baseline;
- iv) TC expenditure is demonstrably more efficient (including through more co-ordinated support, use of country systems and more use of local or other "southern skills") and more effective.

How have DAC members scored against these desiderata?

On untying, progress has been made – up to a point. The proportion of financial aid from DAC members recorded as untied has increased appreciably – from 42.5% in 2002 to 53.0% in 2006, and the proportion reported as tied has fallen from 7.3% to 3%. However, the tying status of a large share of financial aid is not reported, notably by the United States:<sup>3</sup> 50.2% in 2002 and still 43.9 in 2006, making it impossible to say if the share of untied financial aid has really increased.

As regards technical co-operation, on which there is no DAC consensus on untying, the DAC does not have **any** useable comparable figures on tying status.

### Box 1.1. Donor responses in fragile situations

#### Post-conflict

- **Liberia** is a state emerging from conflict and faces enormous challenges. Despite the election of Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf as President in 2006 and a new government with a reform mandate, the situation in the country remains complex, with serious capacity and accountability challenges. Some interesting innovations have been tried, such as the Governance and Economic Management Assistance Plan (GEMAP), a robust mechanism designed to improve and oversee governance and accountability for funds during the reconstruction period. Liberia has also established, together with the World Bank, a multi-donor infrastructure trust fund to encourage co-ordinated donor support for the urgently-needed reconstruction of the country, taking account of the still weak capacities of this post-conflict country. But well-known problems like clearance of arrears to the International Financial Institutions and a prompt move from emergency aid to effective rehabilitation once again took longer to resolve than they should.
- In **Haiti**, another state with a long history of conflict, it is encouraging to see evidence both of stronger whole-of-government approaches by DAC members, a greater willingness to remain engaged for the long haul, thus changing “rational expectations” on the ground, and close working with actors outside the DAC such as Brazil.

#### “Resource curse”

- **The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)**, one of the poorest countries in the world, is also home to some of the world’s largest deposits of natural resources, including cobalt, copper and 6% of the world’s rain forest. Rather than bringing wealth to the country, the natural resources have catalysed conflict, corruption and poor governance. The country held its first free and fair elections in 40 years in 2006, but faces persisting challenges. The international community continues to help with security system reform (SSR) as a precondition to development. In relation to this work, it is encouraging that donors are engaged with other policy communities, particularly defence, security and diplomatic, in complex whole-of-government approaches to the security system. There is much to do to achieve really coherent and co-ordinated donor responses to the challenges of providing effective support to this very important country, where significant national interests are at stake. But there are encouraging signs, such as the agreement among all donors on a Country Assistance Framework and a broad consensus, enshrined in a successful Consultative Group meeting in December 2007, between government and donors that enhanced harmonization and alignment needs to be pursued in a spirit of mutual accountability.

#### Fundamental problems

- **Myanmar’s** policies strongly test the confidence of donors, given that the military regime in place since 1988 effectively pursues a policy of martial law, with disregard for human rights, fair political representation, and repression of ethnic groups. The regime’s attempts to control aid programmes and international pressure to isolate Myanmar make the environment for delivering aid extremely challenging and uncertain, as illustrated by the withdrawal of the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) in 2005. Donors remain largely powerless in situations of this type.

This paucity of data is all the more unfortunate as a number of DAC members have either fully untied their aid (*e.g.* Australia, Ireland, Norway and the United Kingdom) or almost untied their bilateral aid programmes (*e.g.* Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Sweden and

Switzerland).<sup>4</sup> In addition, the European Community has adopted two regulations governing access to EC external assistance, under which all aid to the LDCs is to be untied. Moreover, all expertise (e.g. technical co-operation) and food aid will be untied and aid from the EU budget (i.e. excluding the European Development Fund) will be open to other donors on the basis of reciprocity. This offer has been followed up by Australia, Canada and Switzerland and negotiations are proceeding. Iceland, Lichtenstein and Norway have already been granted the EU treatment as part of the European Economic Area agreement, which means that they already have the same access as any EU Member State. The US Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), the purpose of which is to provide additional foreign assistance to promote economic growth and the elimination of extreme poverty while strengthening good governance, economic freedom and investments in people, also provides its aid in untied form.

The DAC has built on its landmark Recommendation of 2001, under which members undertook to untie all aid to LDCs other than food aid and free-standing technical co-operation, by abolishing the threshold above which such aid would be untied (2005). It is discussing possible options for broadening the coverage of the 2001 Recommendation. Work also continues on the parallel but logically separate issue of encouraging more local and regional procurement.

The latest figures on the award of untied contracts suggest that although several donors are untying within, and indeed beyond, the DAC Recommendation, a large proportion of contracts still go to their national suppliers. There are a number of possible explanations for this, and it will be important to assess the position further in the light of current studies.

My second and third measures in this bracket are squarely in line with the (subsequent) Paris Declaration, under which an extensive monitoring process is underway. At the time of writing, only the baseline data for 2005 – summarily reported in the 2006 DCR and available in full on [www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring](http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring) – are available, and it is only after the monitoring round due to take place in 2008 that quantitative measures of progress since this baseline will be available.


The baseline data are consistent with an earlier finding that there is much good practice to be seen in both alignment (i.e. how far donors align to the policies and systems of the recipient) and harmonisation (i.e. how far donors work together to minimise unnecessary costs to recipients and indeed to themselves), but that this is not yet general practice.

To illustrate this point, the baseline results show that in terms of showing the proportion of aid to the government sector recorded on the national budget (a proxy for alignment), performance among DAC members varied from 24% to 87% and among the recipients (excluding a couple of even more extreme outliers) from 32% to 99%. For harmonisation, a useful indicator is the proportion of analytical work done jointly. Among DAC members able to report figures for at least ten recipient countries the figure varied from 12% to 80% (Figure 1.5).

The baseline survey makes six key policy recommendations, which are worth repeating here:

- partner countries need to deepen their ownership of the development process;
- donors need to support these efforts by making better use of partners' national budgets;
- partner countries need to take the lead in determining priority programmes of capacity development;

Figure 1.5. Paris Declaration baseline survey 2006:  
Proportion of analytical work done jointly by donors



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174750031451>

Note: Each vertical bar represents a donor that has reported data for at least 10 recipient countries.

- to further harmonisation, donors must work aggressively to reduce the transaction costs of delivering and managing aid;
- to promote managing for results, countries and donors should make greater use of performance assessment frameworks;
- to begin addressing mutual accountability commitments, countries and donors should clearly define a mutual action agenda.

The measure that I had proposed on technical co-operation will also be illuminated up to a point by findings from the Paris Declaration monitoring survey, though focused on the dimension of a more co-ordinated approach to capacity building. The Baseline Survey notes that further efforts will be necessary to disseminate and evaluate the evidence that lies behind the vision in the Paris Declaration, and suggests that both donors and recipients should be reviewing, in the light of this evidence, whether the expectations they currently have of each other and of themselves on this issue are sufficiently far-sighted and ambitious.

One significant problem remains the variety of different types of assistance which are reported under the generic heading of “technical co-operation”. The DAC’s Working Party on Statistics has done useful work in breaking down the miscellany of items covered under this heading. Work is continuing in the Working Party to separate out elements and so facilitate a better understanding of the various types of activity that underlie the aggregate numbers. Until there is progress here, it will be very difficult to give this important investment by donors the policy attention that it deserves.

### The efforts of recipient countries (measure 11)


Aid is only a complement to the development efforts of individual countries. I therefore included as a measure of progress that recipients should themselves be seen to expand the provision of services and also raise domestic revenue by several percentage points: a key way of avoiding unhealthy dependence on foreign aid.

In practical terms, the Secretariat tracks this measure by reporting public expenditure on health and education as a percentage of GDP, as well as current revenue, also as a percentage of GNP. They and I have been frustrated by the gaps in international data on

developing countries' revenue and their education spending (the health data are also relatively incomplete). Judging from the figures that are available, the situation appears to be that there is indeed progress in raising revenue (from around 15% in 2000 to 18% in 2004), but that developing countries on the DAC List of ODA Recipients are only marginally increasing their expenditure on health and education as a proportion of GDP.

Progress in raising revenue seems particularly encouraging in sub-Saharan Africa. Figure 1.6 shows how the growth in domestic revenue in sub-Saharan Africa has outpaced the rise in ODA over the period from 2001-06, a striking tribute to greater African self-reliance, and an important factor in addressing concerns about aid dependency.

Figure 1.6. **Trends in government revenue and ODA disbursements in sub-Saharan Africa**



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174751662720>

Source: Using data from IMF, *Regional Economic Outlook: Sub-Saharan Africa*, October 2007 and OECD-DAC database.

## Are we seeing results? (measure 12)

As a final measure, but in many ways the most important, I said that I hoped to see by 2006 increased and more effective support beginning to be translated into more progress towards the harder-to-reach MDGs, not least in sub-Saharan Africa.

To make any sense of progress on this measure, one needs three things:

- **Sufficiently reliable basic statistical information.** This remains a problem for many indicators (maternal mortality and HIV/AIDS prevalence being two striking examples).<sup>5</sup> Indeed, reports that the number of people with incomes below USD 1 a day had at last fallen below 1 billion have been put in question by recent revisions of economic data. Nevertheless, data from multiple sources are now being compiled more effectively, and the comprehensiveness and reliability of some key indicators are improving. For example, the latest estimates on poverty draw on over 500 surveys of households from 100 developing countries, which represent 93% of the population of the developing world.
- **A clear sense of the rate of progress over time.** Too often, commentary assumes that we are at some sort of “midpoint” between the base year of the MDGs and their achievement. In fact, the base year for all the Goals is 1990, and most of them reflect the

conclusions of UN summit meetings in the early 1990s, long before they were packaged, first in 1996 by the DAC and then in 2000 by the Millennium Assembly, into a set of key goals. In most cases, we are therefore looking at performance over the first 15 years (since most figures become available only with a time-lag) of a 25-year period. An indication whether progress has been accelerating or decelerating over the first 15 years is therefore important.

- **Some plausible link between aid and the results**, while avoiding attributing exclusively to aid certain results that almost always stem principally from local efforts. It is more realistic to consider whether an aid intervention is **one** of the probable causes of observed change, although this still requires a clear logical argument about why the observed change would occur with the support of aid.

As was the case five years ago, the *Millennium Development Goals Report 2007* shows that at global level, and according to present trends, the income poverty goal is going to be reached well before 2015. Again, as stated in previous reports, progress against most other indicators is insufficient, in some cases seriously so, to achieve the Goals by 2015 at global level, or in many regions, let alone in every country, which would be a far more demanding target. Sub-Saharan Africa still stands out (with the Pacific) as the region where least progress is visible.

However, there is **evidence that more rapid progress has been made recently** in many sectors and in many countries, including in Africa. For example:

- The number of extremely poor people in sub-Saharan Africa has leveled off, and its poverty rate has declined by nearly six percentage points since 2000.
- Most of the progress made in getting more children into school in the developing world (enrolment in primary education grew from 80% in 1991 to 88% in 2005) has taken place since 1999. For example, primary school enrolment increased by 36% in sub-Saharan Africa between 1999 and 2005.
- Globally, deaths from measles fell from 757 000 in 2000 to 242 000 in 2006, a drop of 68%, and by nearly 91% in Africa over the same period. This is one factor contributing to the marked declines in recent years in infant and child mortality in some sub-Saharan African countries that I commented on last year.
- The so-called “transition countries” of south-east Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States have seen declines in poverty since the turn of the century at least as steep as the increases many of them experienced in the 1990s.

There is therefore some evidence of accelerating progress against several of the Goals, even though not yet at a rate that will see their full achievement on either a global scale or in most regions.

Can international aid claim to have been a contributing factor to this acceleration? Clearly, it is far from the only one. Commercial flows and remittances have risen faster than aid overall. For many countries, growth has been driven by rising prices of many commodities, reflecting robust growth and the increasing requirements of large emerging economies. Lastly, the international economic environment has been relatively benign, particularly from 2002 onwards. Of the specific examples quoted above, ODA has probably been too small in many of the “transition countries” to be more than a very marginal factor. Yet the sharp rise in ODA for health and (to a lesser extent) for basic education is significant in many poor countries, and seems likely to have made some contribution in these sectors. And in Africa, while the commodity boom has been a principal driver of recent growth for many countries, it seems unlikely that poverty would at last be falling at a significant rate

without the multiple effects of aid-supported policy reform, governance improvement and investment over many years, in line with the conclusions of the Monterrey Financing for Development conference and the principles of NePAD. (For example, consider how the maintenance of the overvalued exchange rates of the past would have blunted the opportunities for primary producers.) Proper research and analysis of the ever-changing data is, as always, necessary for any definitive conclusion.

Table 1.3 summarises the data on which this chapter is based.

In last year's *Development Co-operation Report* I included a chapter on Aid for Trade. This underlined the need to ensure that multilateral trade liberalisation has an effective impact on pro-poor growth, because market access improvement is not a panacea in itself: political incentives are necessary to increase aid effectiveness. Box 1.3 reports on the joint OECD/WTO report "Aid for Trade at a Glance 2007" and makes an appraisal of trends and developments in aid flows.

I have been fortunate to chair the Development Assistance Committee over a period rich in change. International concern about poor countries has rightly had greater weight than often in the past. The scope for progress has been relatively high, and the development community has – gradually and still, as this chapter suggests, rather modestly – been shifting gears in response to the opportunities for more effective aid which the new environment provides. DAC has played a role in encouraging this through its transparent reporting – a hallmark of OECD – of the volume and composition of ODA, through its many initiatives to improve aid effectiveness, and through its work in building common policies. The recent evaluation of the Committee has assessed the relevance of its work as very high, and its effectiveness and sustainability as high, while calling for more work on its efficiency, not least in setting priorities.

I hope that my successor will similarly be able to look back in a few years time and see more evidence that the international development effort, in a rapidly-changing environment, is indeed showing results for poor people around the world, and that the DAC is making a positive contribution to this.

## Notes

1. Remittances, of course, provide another extremely large and rapidly growing flow of resources, and are a very significant contribution to the recipients' welfare. I have omitted them from this analysis in view of their private-person to private-person character.
2. According to the *Human Security Report 2005* and the follow up "Human Security Brief 2006" the number of armed conflicts around the world has declined by more than 40% since the early 1990s. Notwithstanding the escalating violence in Iraq and the escalating war in Darfur, the 2006 data indicate that from the beginning of 2002 to the end of 2005 the number of armed conflicts being waged around the world shrank 15% from 66 to 56. By far the greatest decline was in sub-Saharan Africa. See the *Human Security Report 2005* and the "Human Security Brief 2006", published by the Human Security Centre, the University of British Columbia, Canada.
3. Although the United States does not report to the DAC statistical reporting systems, it does report to the Bulletin Board, which shows steady increases in untied reporting.
4. These countries contribute to various multilateral programmes which are substantially but not fully untied, such as the soft funds of the Regional Development Banks and the European Development Fund.
5. A large share of data on key development parameters are still derived from statistical models. In other words, they are not empirical data but are estimates made on the basis of the average relationship of the indicator in question to other indicators.

Table 1.3. Keeping the score

Target for 2006	Indicator	2002 baseline	Latest indicator (2006 unless otherwise shown)	Result
<b>Aid Volume</b>				
Measure 1	Donors deliver at least USD 75 billion in net disbursements	USD 57.5 billion	USD 77.8 billion (excl. Iraq; 70.7 billion)	Achieved
Measure 2	Bulk of increased flows involves genuine transfer of resources in balance of payments terms	ODA flows delivering resources for development (i.e. excluding humanitarian aid, debt relief, admin. costs, in-donor refugee costs and imputed student costs; at 2002 prices and exchange rates)	USD 45.5 billion 78% of total net ODA	Not Achieved
<b>Aid Allocation</b>				
Measure 3	Proportion of ODA to LDCs and other low income countries rises significantly from proportion in 2002	Net bilateral ODA: Total net ODA:	46% (excl. Iraq; 52%) 49% (excl. Iraq; 54%)	Achieved
Measure 4	Higher share of ODA to countries with relatively good performance and large numbers of poor	Net bilateral ODA: Total net ODA:	15% (excl. Iraq; 17%) 19% (excl. Iraq; 21%)	Not Achieved
Measure 5	Emergency and humanitarian relief is on a downturn at least as a proportion of total aid	Humanitarian aid as % of total aid	6% (excl. Iraq; 6%)	Not Achieved
<b>Fragile Situations</b>				
Measure 6	Well thought-through interventions in poor performing countries where effective transfers are possible	<i>Partially assessed through the work of the Fragile States Group (see text)</i>		
<b>Aid Effectiveness</b>				
Measure 7	Higher proportion of aid is untied ( <i>Data are available for financial aid only; coverage limited</i> )	Untied aid Tied aid	53.0% 3.0%	Achieved
Measure 8	Much more aid clearly aligned to local priorities, programmes and systems, and shown in recipients' budgets	Not reported	43.9%	Not Clear
Measure 9	Indicators of harmonisation show quantum leap from 2002/03 baseline	<i>The Paris Declaration Indicators address these aspects: a survey took place in 2006 and progress is being monitored early in 2008</i>		
Measure 10	Tc expenditure demonstrably more efficient (including through more co-ordinated support, use of country systems and more use of local or other "southern skills") and more effective	<i>The Paris Declaration Indicators provide a partial baseline for these aspects (see above)</i>		
<b>Efforts of Recipient Countries</b>				
Measure 11	Recipients expand provision of services but also raise domestic resource mobilisation by several percentage points	Public expenditure on health as % of GDP Public expenditure on education as % of GDP Current revenue as % of GDP	2000: 2.6% <sup>1</sup> 2000: 3.9% <sup>1</sup> 2000: 15.4% <sup>1</sup> 2004: 2.8% <sup>1</sup> 2003: 4.3% <sup>1</sup> 2004: 18.1% <sup>2</sup>	Achieved Achieved Achieved
<b>Results</b>				
Measure 12	Increased and more effective support beginning to be translated into more progress towards the harder-to-reach MDGs, not least in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)	Selected MDGs <sup>3</sup> Poverty (% < USD 1 per day) Primary enrolment Child mortality (per 1 000 births) Access to improved sanitation	Developing countries (1990) SSA (1990) 27.9% 79% 106 35% 44.6% 53% 185 32%	Developing countries (2002-04) SSA (2002-04) 19.4% 86% 87 50% Progress – but still well short of what is needed to achieve Goals by 2015, except for Global Poverty target

1. Source: World Development Indicators (WDI) 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006.

2. OECD Secretariat estimate based on WDI database.

3. Source: Millennium Development Goals Report 2006.

### Box 1.2. ODA to Iraq


In the 1980s, aid to Iraq was negligible. Although donors' contributions rose to about USD 550 million in 1991, at the time of the Gulf War, it fell back again afterwards.

In 2003, after the beginning of the Iraq war, bilateral aid to Iraq rose substantially to USD 2.1 billion, due mostly to humanitarian and reconstruction aid, the bulk of which was provided by the United States (USD 1.5 billion).

In 2005, net bilateral ODA disbursements for Iraq reached nearly USD 22 billion, the highest amount ever recorded for an individual aid recipient. Most of this (USD 14 billion) was due to debt forgiveness following a Paris Club agreement to reduce most of the debt owed by Iraq. In 2006, DAC donors provided about USD 8.5 billion to Iraq, still a considerable amount, of which about USD 3.3 billion were for debt forgiveness. Aid to Iraq will remain high over the next two years as donors implement the successive phases of the Paris Club agreement.

Although the United States was by far the largest provider of ODA to Iraq, over the period 2005-06 Iraq was the largest recipient of ODA for no fewer than nine members of the DAC and among the top three recipients for 14 members. Details are in the boxes below.

#### Net bilateral ODA from DAC donors to Iraq



#### Top ten donors of gross bilateral ODA

2005-06 average, USD million

1	United States	8 005
2	Japan	2 168
3	Germany	1 204
4	United Kingdom	760
5	Italy	719
6	France	713
7	Austria	521
8	Canada	202
9	Spain	192
10	Australia	150

Box 1.2. **ODA to Iraq (cont.)****Main donors for whom Iraq is among the top five recipients**

2005-06 average, gross disbursements

	Per cent of total ODA	Rank
Australia	7.9	3
Austria	33.7	1
Belgium	6.2	3
Canada	5.4	1
Finland	8.9	1
France	5.9	2
Germany	10.2	2
Italy	15.5	1
Japan	12.1	1
Spain	5.0	1
Sweden	4.0	1
Switzerland	4.8	1
United Kingdom	6.3	2
United States	30.0	1
<i>DAC countries</i>	<i>13.0</i>	<i>1</i>

Box 1.3. **Aid for Trade at a Glance**

In today's globalised world there is clear evidence that trade is a powerful engine for economic growth, which, in turn, is essential for poverty reduction. But many developing countries lack the basic capacity – whether in terms of policies, institutions or infrastructure – to take advantage of trade openings and a more interconnected world economy. To address this challenge, the WTO's 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Conference called for the expansion of Aid for Trade to help developing countries (and in particular the least-developed) benefit from WTO agreements and, more broadly, expand their trade. In 2006, the WTO Task Force on Aid for Trade identified a broad range of assistance activities that need to be connected in a coherent trade and development strategy to ensure that trade works for all developing countries. In addition, it called on the WTO and the OECD to have a monitoring role in order to provide incentives for more and better Aid for Trade.

The joint OECD/WTO report “Aid for Trade Aid a Glance 2007” takes stock of trends and developments in aid flows that are most closely related to Aid for Trade. It also provides an overview of donor and partner country responses to a survey about their Aid for Trade strategies, pledges and delivery. The joint report was presented by OECD Secretary-General Angel Gurría to the first Aid for Trade Global Review hosted by the WTO in November 2007.

The WTO Aid for Trade Task Force defined Aid for Trade as comprising support for i) trade policy and regulations; ii) trade development; iii) trade-related infrastructure; iv) building productive capacity and v) trade-related adjustment, if identified as a trade-related development priority in partner countries' national development strategies. The OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS) is recognised as the best source of data for tracking Aid for Trade flows at global level, although it cannot provide data that match exactly all the above categories. Instead, it offers proxies for key categories.

### Box 1.3. Aid for Trade at a Glance (cont.)

Between 2002 and 2005, bilateral and multilateral donors committed on average USD 21 billion per year on categories closely associated with Aid for Trade. This included USD 11.2 billion to build economic infrastructure, USD 8.9 billion to promote productive capacities (including USD 2 billion for trade development) and USD 0.6 billion for increasing the understanding and implementation of trade policy and regulations. The average share of Aid for Trade against total sector aid was 34% between 2002 and 2005, during which time commitments rose by 22% in real terms. The share fell slightly from 35% to 32% during that period, reflecting high levels of donors' spending on social sectors, such as education and health. The volume of aid dedicated to improving the capacity of developing countries to become more dynamic players in the global economy could rise significantly. This would need increased donor attention to trade, infrastructure and the broader economic growth agenda. If the recent annual growth rate of Aid for Trade (6.8%) continues, an additional USD 8 billion would be delivered by 2010, with total Aid for Trade commitments reaching USD 30 billion.

Bilateral donors provide on average 31% of their sector allocable ODA to Aid for Trade. However, considerable variation across countries is evident, with shares ranging from a high of 62% in the case of Japan – driven to a large extent by its sizeable support for economic infrastructure – to a low of 8%. In volume terms, Japan and the United States are the largest providers, which is not surprising since they are also among the largest donors. Other important bilateral donors in volume terms are Germany, the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands. Large multilateral and regional institutions – *e.g.* the World Bank and the regional development banks – provide around 50% of their sector programmes to Aid for Trade. In volume terms, the World Bank and the European Commission are also large donors, providing particularly significant support for infrastructure and productive capacity building.

Between 2002 and 2005, Asia received 51% of total Aid for Trade, Africa 30%, Latin America and the Caribbean 7%, Europe 5% and Oceania 1%. Asia's predominance is driven by large allocations to economic infrastructure. Most Aid for Trade went to lower middle-income countries (36%), followed by the least developed countries (25%). Asian countries receive on average more than double the Aid for Trade received by African countries, while other low-income countries obtained, on average, more than twice the amount of Aid for Trade compared to least developed countries or lower middle-income countries.

Almost two years after the 2005 Hong Kong WTO Ministerial Declaration, Aid for Trade has assumed growing importance in most donors' programmes. This enhanced profile is likely to be maintained, possibly even expanded over the medium term. The development of new strategic statements, a gamut of initiatives to strengthen in-house capacities and the increased prioritisation of Aid for Trade in donor-partner dialogues are all clear indications of this trend. Most donors now have institutional remits, dedicated structures, as well as professional teams and operational guidance that are specifically focused on delivering "more" and "better" Aid for Trade.

High-level political backing to assign priority to trade in national development strategies is a key condition for donors' support. In cases where political commitment and local ownership are absent, donors increasingly seek to reinforce mainstreaming of trade by raising the issue in dialogues with partner countries. They also provide support for trade-related capacity building and undertake common needs assessments such as the Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance in the least developed countries. In this connection, donors and partners were requested to respond to a survey. Although the response rate from partner countries was low, the quality of their answers was impressive and showed that despite their diverse economic characteristics, all consider trade to be a central element in their economic development strategies.

### Box 1.3. **Aid for Trade at a Glance** (cont.)

Almost all partner country respondents have, or will shortly have, an Aid for Trade strategy that defines their Aid for Trade needs. These strategies are usually developed through inclusive processes involving multiple stakeholders from the public, private and non-governmental sectors. However, in some cases, they are not yet part of a comprehensive, government-wide development strategy. Increasingly, partner countries also have trade development strategies that have been costed. Partner countries are usually able to identify constraints to trade development not currently addressed by aid. These range from deficits in physical infrastructure and a need to modernise customs, to general shortcomings in the areas of productivity and skills improvement.

Donors and partners agree, without exception, that the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness sets out the principles that should guide the delivery of Aid for Trade. The commitment to these principles, which encapsulate decades of lessons learned and which set out clear guidance on how to deliver aid most effectively, was evident in all responses. However, putting these principles more broadly and widely into practice requires continuing effort and attention. There is little evidence to date, therefore, on results that can be translated into policy improvements. Donors and partners noted that the challenges in delivering Aid for Trade effectively are not unique but are, in fact, part and parcel of the broader aid effectiveness agenda.

The approach of the Paris Declaration, in setting out clear and mutually supporting objectives and monitoring progress towards them, might thus be adapted for the Aid for Trade initiative. In doing so, it would help provide focus to this part of the initiative. The value of monitoring Aid for Trade will be maximised if it is used as a tool to encourage and share best practices. To do so requires partner countries to engage more fully in the monitoring exercise. This might require changing the surveys to ensure that partner countries derive direct benefits from answering them and not just from the outcome of the whole exercise. Finally, the monitoring framework is very much focused on countries. More efforts are needed to integrate the regional dimension.

Next year's Aid for Trade at a Glance report will start tracking progress in the implementation and impact of Aid for Trade. In terms of aid delivery there is a need to spur greater mutual accountability on the results that Aid for Trade is producing. Additional evaluation methods and indicators are required to see how countries and regions are doing in terms of trade capacity building. However, this will be a difficult task. Politically, there are important challenges in moving from evaluating input to measuring outcomes; policy makers and other stakeholders will need to focus on results. Technically, the task ahead is also challenging. Impact evaluation is complex. Indicators have to connect to policies. But there is much that can be drawn from the monitoring process itself in terms of sharing concrete success stories and learning from them, especially on a South-South basis. The Secretary-General's proposal to establish a Knowledge Network is a practical and promising way forward.

## Chapter 2

# Effective Aid Management: Twelve Lessons from DAC Peer Reviews

*Peer reviews have brought many issues to the attention of the Development Assistance Committee over the last five years. This chapter retains twelve of the more prominent examples of the lessons learned or reconfirmed over the period concerning effective aid management to achieve development results. Lessons at the level of strategy are: i) find the appropriate legal and political foundation; ii) manage competing national interests; iii) achieve greater policy coherence for development and iv) invest in delivering, measuring and transmitting results of aid-financed activity. Organisational management lessons are: v) identify a leadership structure that works; vi) deal with institutional dispersion, vii) manage contributions to multilateral institutions and viii) decentralize management to the field. Lessons concerning management of delivery are: ix) manage the scaling-up of development aid; x) maintain a focused approach towards countries and sectors; xi) emphasise performance-based management, evaluation and quality control; and xii) make human resource management a priority.*

## Introduction

In 2006, the 23 members of the DAC disbursed over USD 100 billion of public funds for the purposes of development. This represents an estimated 90% of total ODA spent worldwide. How effectively do they manage these funds? As DAC Chair since June 2003, I have presided over peer reviews of the development co-operation systems for 22 members of the Committee, and visited all of them.<sup>1</sup> This has been a unique experience for learning about the characteristics of effective systems.

Collectively, these system reviews cover the full range of aid management issues<sup>2</sup> confronted by our members, from policy to delivery, and draw objectively from the unique DAC data bank on ODA flows. They attempt to offer “critical, helpful and respectful” commentary on current member practice and are substantially enhanced at the end of each review by a full day of open discussion between the DAC and the leadership of the reviewed member. The peer reviews greatly help the DAC member countries to foster a more common understanding of today’s bilateral aid practice and to provide them with regular feedback on donor innovations and achievements in support of more effective aid management. Two Secretariat reports issued in 1999 and 2005 summarised the management practices of DAC membership.<sup>3</sup> Another update is planned for 2008.

While the peer review process has brought many issues to the attention of the DAC over this period, I have retained here twelve of the more prominent examples of lessons learned or reconfirmed about the factors that encourage effective management of aid funds to achieve development results. They can be subsumed into the broad categories of: i) strategy; ii) organisational management; and iii) management of delivery.

## Strategy

### *Finding the appropriate legal and political foundation*

**Lesson 1: Have a clear, top-level statement of the purpose of development co-operation, whether in legislation or another form, that has wide ownership and can remain relevant for a sufficient period**

Recent DAC peer reviews demonstrate the importance of obtaining clarity at the highest political level on the overall aim of the national aid programme. Development co-operation generally operates in a complex political environment, with multiple relationships and actors whose purposes are not limited to development or may be quite different. The newer, emerging donors who interact with the DAC also affirm that high-level clarity is a central topic of interest for them as they seek to shape the foundations of their own approach. Anchoring development policy unambiguously in legislation has provided an effective framework for governments that have a strong interest in development. However legislation, if not regularly updated, also can restrain system efficiency in the fast evolving world of development co-operation, so too much detail can be counter-productive.

Currently, slightly more than one-third of DAC members have comprehensive development legislation. More commonly, DAC members use some form of high-level development policy to guide their operations. Slightly over two-thirds of DAC members use this approach which, in a number of cases, complements legislation. While easier to introduce and change over time, such policy statements may not be strongly binding across government and do not normally convey the same sense of national priority as an act of law. Peer reviews also note the importance of a clear high-level mandate for downstream aid management and for delivery approaches that are internally efficient and that can adjust to evolving international agendas, such as that of aid effectiveness.

#### **Box 2.1. Seeking high-level clarity in the United Kingdom**

The UK's International Development Act 2002 provides a clear legislative mandate around poverty reduction and gives national development co-operation its current strategic orientation on issues of development, not only aid. For the first time in the UK, it reflects in law the centrality of poverty elimination and forbids the use of development assistance for other purposes, including the tying of bilateral aid to procurement contracts for British companies. As it has been designated the lead ministry for carrying out this legal mandate, the Department for International Development (DfID) enjoys an unambiguous relationship with other ministries, which allows it to influence cross-government thinking on development policy. This clarity of purpose also permits DfID's downstream operations to be more efficiently managed and evaluated. The Act has been a cornerstone in the substantial improvement of the UK's approach to international development since 1997.

### ***Managing competing national interests***

#### **Lesson 2: Avoid letting short-term pressures jeopardise the long-term common interest in effective development**

As DAC members seek to anchor their aid programmes sustainably within overall national policy, it is important to be clear how development co-operation can best function within the context of other potentially competing national interests. The DAC recognises that development policy does not operate in a vacuum and that all nations have widespread interests (such as trade, political relationships or security) which respond to national priority concerns. Applied to relations with developing countries, a feature of national interest is that while in the short term they may be (but do not have to be) divergent, in the long term all DAC members (and indeed all countries) have a common interest in developing countries achieving sustainable and broad-based development. Indeed, this common interest is recognised in the Millennium Declaration. DAC counsel has been that, while national interests are legitimate, if they result in ineffective aid they will prove self-defeating. Of course, to sustain this position, it is necessary for development actors to demonstrate that coherent policies and well-considered development co-operation can, and do, contribute to overarching long-term national interests. More attention should be paid to the need to assemble and disseminate sufficiently convincing evidence of this.

### Box 2.2. **Development and national interest in the United States**

Given the nature of its political system, the US has traditionally justified development co-operation policies in terms of both recipient country need and its own foreign policy objectives. This was true of the Marshall Plan (rebuilding Europe while repelling communism and improving US trade) and is in keeping with the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act (helping developing countries while supporting US national security and prosperity). It is at the heart of the special congressional practice of extensively “earmarking” the annual foreign assistance budget based on its own perception of priorities. With the end of the Cold War in 1991, US development co-operation lacked a strong sense of political vision. However, since the events of 9/11 the government has been very successful in boosting the image of development co-operation among Congress and the American public. The 2002 National Security Strategy elevated development to one of the three pillars of national foreign policy, along with diplomacy and defence. While not without its implementation difficulties (for example, over whether other priorities may weaken the development effectiveness of some interventions), this explicit strategic explanation of the need for a more harmonious and integrated national policy on development has permitted the US to open an important debate over the legitimate place of development co-operation within American political priorities.

### **Achieving greater policy coherence for development**

#### **Lesson 3: Set a clear mandate and establish mechanisms to ensure that policies are assessed for their impact on poor countries**

DAC members commonly agree that today’s global environment requires greater donor attention to ensure that wider policies are coherent with the objective of development. Peer reviews have demonstrated regularly the challenges of maintaining this approach in relation to important national policies that may either promote or work against the needs of poor countries (in fields such as trade, migration or environment). While it is unrealistic to suppose that in every case it will be the interests of poor countries that are given the greatest weight, peer reviews emphasise the importance of national policy formulation that includes full appreciation of the potential impact of these policy decisions on the development of poor countries. They also conclude that development agencies need to pursue strategic alliances with other national and international stakeholders to promote policy coherence for development in priority areas.

Peer review reports note that maintaining development policy at the heart of a national vision requires high-level commitment (parliament, government), preferably structured so that priorities are clear and that expected results are tracked and reported. It also requires specific designation of those parts of government which provide leadership to foster such a policy environment in the context of a “whole-of-government” approach. This mandate should stipulate the formal and informal operational mechanisms required across government to identify, analyse and report on progress in implementing the policy coherence agenda. The human resources required to address these tasks may be placed in a range of locations. Some donors deal with policy coherence issues primarily through official means such as a dedicated unit inside government; others favour recourse to *ad hoc* capacities, often outsourced to public or private specialists. In 2008, the OECD Secretariat will use the 2003-07 peer review series to produce a special synthesis report which analyses the impact of different institutional mechanisms on the promotion of policy

coherence for development. Evaluation evidence, such as that provided by the recent evaluation of the “Triple C” policies of the European Union (Complementarity, Co-ordination and Coherence) will be useful in this regard.

DAC members increasingly recognise the need to seek collective action and to better identify good practice in this area: what is effective and what is not. For example, the European Commission now has a short list of priority development coherence issues common to all 27 EU Member States, for which it is testing common operational approaches to identification, analysis and reporting.

### Box 2.3. Promoting policy coherence for development in Sweden

Sweden has long recognised both the need for national policy to address trans-boundary issues and the fact that national decisions have international impact. At the level of domestic policy, a set of guidelines called “Sweden’s Policy for Global Development” was adopted by parliament in 2003. These ambitious guidelines mandate an integrated policy for global development, affecting all policy areas of government. It requests a government role in support of policy action in multilateral contexts, such as the European Union or other specialised forums (e.g. Doha, Monterrey, Johannesburg) and promotes candid international examination of industrialised country policy choices and of fulfilment of international commitments towards the developing world. Following its recognition of the challenges inherent in implementing this vision, parliament requested an annual report on the status of its implementation. This report can be used administratively as an annual trigger for attention to, and action on, issues of policy coherence.

## Public awareness

### Lesson 4: Invest in delivering, measuring and communicating results of aid-financed activity

Public awareness of, and support for, development co-operation is fundamental. Peer reviews demonstrate that strong public support is the best guarantee of political and legislative support for strong and dynamic national development programmes. DAC members whose aid systems have weak public or political support are obliged to work in a far more difficult domestic environment, which can include excessive levels of scrutiny and multiple external controls. The level of public support for development co-operation often is pre-conditioned by domestic cultural tradition (e.g. past religious engagement in poor countries, the donor country’s own context of past underdevelopment, national values concerning public solidarity) or by humanitarian compassion provoked by a recent natural disaster. But it also requires pro-active and targeted forms of public education and awareness building. Most recently, DAC members have linked national approaches to international campaigns which emphasise specific results (e.g. the Millennium Development Goals, or the objectives of special purpose “vertical” funds) as an effective way of raising public understanding of their development co-operation and national interest in it.

While sustaining public and political support for development co-operation is most difficult for DAC members during periods of economic adversity, obtaining public engagement and public support is always a challenge. Even where, as often, the public recognises that the degree of poverty and inequality in the world is both a humanitarian issue and a risk to all our futures, there is widespread scepticism about whether official aid

is effective in tackling it and whether scarce public funds should be devoted on more than a token scale to purposes outside the country of origin. In response, donors are increasingly seeking to engage domestic constituencies in regular public debates on aid effectiveness. In response to public scepticism on the effectiveness of aid, donors increasingly focus on reporting how the impact of aid is improving the lives of poor people.

#### Box 2.4. Public awareness in Ireland

Averaging 90%, public support for development assistance in Ireland has been high and stable for several decades. A 2004 survey of Irish attitudes to aid found that 66% of the population think it is very important and a further 28% fairly important to help people in poor countries. Ireland's own history of poverty contributes to strong Irish solidarity with poor people worldwide. Indeed this sense of solidarity – nurtured by development education by Irish NGOs and the national effort to build public awareness – helped sustain high support for aid during challenging economic times in the 1980s and early 1990s. It also translates into cross-party political support for Ireland's growing ODA budget towards 0.7% of GNI by 2012. Still, a key challenge persists: the depth of knowledge about the national aid effort remains shallow. Building knowledge to sustain support remains a high priority for Irish Aid which is striving for greater transparency and accountability to Irish taxpayers for effective aid. The 2006 White Paper on Irish Aid – which was prepared in consultation with Irish citizens – stresses the centrality of public information, development education and work with the media for public ownership and awareness of the development programme. Concrete steps to achieve this are demonstrated by a recently opened Volunteering and Information Centre in Dublin's city centre and increased support and funding for development education.

## Organisational management

Peer reviews reveal that the institutional shape of bilateral systems can vary substantially depending on the national political environment, the system of government and civil service practice. Recent peer reviews have noted that organisational reforms seem increasingly linked to the international aid effectiveness agenda. This is particularly true in relation to today's tendency to tackle organisational “fragmentation” at the level of headquarters, while operational authority is often decentralised to the field.

### **Identify a leadership structure that works**

#### **Lesson 5: Task a sufficiently senior and publicly accountable figure with clear responsibility at the political level for the delivery of effective development co-operation**

The choice of leadership structure used by DAC member systems tends to depend on the political priority attributed to development. National systems for promoting international development that have the highest level political priority tend to be led by a minister or deputy minister with a strong government position. Unless a donor has its own development ministry (only two DAC members currently have ministries dedicated to development alone, but five more have development ministers in a combined ministry), highest level administrative responsibility for development co-operation is most frequently attributed to the ministry for foreign affairs, often led by a deputy minister or state secretary (although variations are significant). The DAC position in peer review

discussions has been to favour systems which best strengthen delivery of effective support for development at the political level.

### Box 2.5. The development leadership structure in the Netherlands

The Netherlands' Ministry of Foreign Affairs has a "two-headed" structure with a cabinet-level minister for foreign affairs and another for development co-operation. Together, they oversee an integrated administrative structure. The approach is based on a 1994 review of Dutch foreign policy which aimed to improve the ability of the government to "speak with one voice". The review resulted in a "de-compartmentalisation" of the ministry: the departments were restructured along integrated lines, with regional and thematic departments that worked for both ministers. The new ministry personnel system now rotates all staff every three to four years between the developmental and political sides of Dutch foreign policy so as to reinforce the integration of functions.

## Bilateral aid: Dealing with institutional dispersion

### Lesson 6: Rationalise bilateral aid structures to facilitate coherent action at country level

DAC members use a number of different structures for the management of bilateral aid. As Table 2.1 shows, some combine most policy and operational work in one place and others divide overall policy from delivery. Each structure operates in a local context that is unique, and no table can fully capture the subtleties of, for example, the role of government-wide co-ordination systems, or the extent to which agencies – whose main business is delivery – in fact also contribute importantly to policy.

Table 2.1. Who is responsible for bilateral aid policy and management?

Responsibility resides with a single body	Responsibility for policy mainly resides in ministry and for management in agency
a) Ministry of Foreign Affairs	a) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Denmark	Austria
Finland	Belgium
Greece	Luxembourg
Ireland	Portugal
Italy (reform under consideration)	Sweden
Netherlands	
Norway	
b) Specialised ministry	b) Specialised ministry
United Kingdom	Germany
c) Specialised agency	c) Specialised responsibility for bilateral loan aid policy
Australia	France
Canada	Japan
New Zealand	Spain
Switzerland (two agencies)	
United States (several agencies)	

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176303260785>

It is unclear whether any one of these systems is unambiguously linked with more effective aid. Indeed, peer reviews show that effectiveness may vary considerably among countries which operate superficially similar models. What can be said is that clarity of responsibility and accountability, professionalism and effective co-ordination are essential to the proper functioning of any system.

Take the case of co-ordination: peer reviews show that many types of institution may deliver development aid, whether they be at the national, regional or municipal level. All bilateral institutions which are responsible for reporting ODA are considered to be part of the national system in a peer review. Classified in this manner, larger national systems can include as many as 30 different official development actors. Especially since donors have officially recognised the importance of aid effectiveness (notably at the high-level forums in Rome in 2003 and Paris in 2005) several DAC members have either undertaken to consolidate their national system or are studying this option. Current developmental thinking suggests that better integrated national development co-operation systems will foster complementary relationships and synergy by integrating, or at least better co-ordinating, fragmented systems under one strategic umbrella. The DAC has favoured approaches which make it easy to bring together all forms of assistance at country level, rather than having two separate approaches for loans, grants and technical co-operation, or for programmes of a “vertical” kind. Similarly, greater effort is now being made to better link government and other development groups (think tanks, universities, foundations, NGOs) or sub-national authorities (regions, districts or municipalities within the donor country). These closer ties maximise the comparative advantages of different actors within the national context and avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

#### Box 2.6. **Institutional consolidation in Japan**

Japan is the world’s third largest bilateral donor with USD 11.6 billion of ODA in 2006. Debate within the Japanese Diet has highlighted the improvement of structure in the management of the nation’s large development co-operation programme which has moved from a system managed by multiple development actors to a more integrated one. The Diet also pointed to Japan’s historically compartmentalised approach towards different ODA instruments (loans, grants, technical co-operation), carried out by separate parts of the national administration. Substantial management reform was initiated in 2006 which i) created a top-level, cross-ministerial body (the Overseas Economic Co-operation Council) chaired by the Prime Minister to deliberate on important development matters; ii) reorganised the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ bilateral and multilateral aid responsibilities into one bureau; and iii) will merge the ODA loan function of the Japan Bank for International Co-operation (JBIC) and a part of the grant aid function of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs into an empowered Japanese International Co-operation Agency (JICA). The immediate result of this consolidation is a more strategic and integrated national approach which will strengthen the effectiveness of the Japanese system in delivering the national policies determined by the Overseas Economic Co-operation Council.

## Managing contributions to the multilateral institutions

### Lesson 7: Promote greater coherence between those responsible for different aspects of multilateral aid

DAC members have tended to contribute a fairly large percentage of their national ODA to multilateral institutions, particularly to the European Community, the World Bank and the UN family. In 2005, the DAC average was 23% for all members (30% without bilateral debt relief) although the range was from 9% to 55% (10% to 83% without debt relief). A recurrent theme for many of the peer reviews is the extent to which there is a need for stronger strategic and operational connections between the bilateral and multilateral portions of the national aid system. The lead actors of the development system – usually the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in association with a lead implementation agency – are generally directly responsible for the bilateral portfolio and for the UN family, which usually constitutes a minority aspect of the multilateral one. In contrast, the major part of the multilateral portfolio (usually the development banks) is handled in a majority of DAC member countries by the Ministry of Finance (Box 2.7), which also typically handles bilateral as well as multilateral debt relief. Vertical funds are supported in some cases by foreign ministries and in others by ministries of finance, both of which have also played a leading role in looking at innovative ways of financing development. In addition, in some countries line ministries are also significant actors in multilateral finance. An effort to co-ordinate these various parts of the system is sometimes made but it is not always very effective. DAC peer reviews increasingly call for all facets of the national system which affect the multilateral development system to be better linked, in the interest both of more efficient world-wide aid architecture and of more effective national and international aid impacts in the field.

**Box 2.7. Different lead responsibilities for managing multilateral relationships with the Multilateral Development Banks**

Ministry of Finance/Economy	Ministry/agency with lead responsibility on most other forms of multilateral (and usually also bilateral) aid
Austria	Australia
Belgium	Denmark
Canada	Finland
France	Greece
Italy	Germany
Japan	Ireland
Luxembourg	Netherlands
New Zealand	Norway
Portugal	Sweden
Spain	United Kingdom
Switzerland	
United States	

### ***Decentralising management to the field***

#### **Lesson 8: The decentralisation of responsibility to the field level can be beneficial, but it needs high-quality, lean supporting systems**

Almost all DAC members use country-level strategies with linkages to partner country planning, particularly the local national poverty strategy, if there is one. A donor mandate at the country level which is both clear and strategic provides a reliable basis for delegated decision making and a decentralised approach permits the donor to be more adaptive and responsive to locally expressed needs and to co-ordinate more readily with other partners.

Most members have therefore increased the decentralisation of management authority to the donor field office. With special attention given to field delivery and poverty impact, DAC members now widely acknowledge that a decentralised approach better places decision making where delivery realities lie and where more operationally efficient donor co-ordination and harmonisation take place, while respecting the need for local ownership.

As donor decentralisation becomes increasingly widespread, peer reviews note common challenges such as higher field operational costs (notably for expatriate staff) and the need for coherent and co-ordinated communications both between headquarters and the field and among partners at both levels. One result of donor decentralisation is a growing realisation that bilaterally funded development specialists in country often overlap with each other. This is now giving rise to an interest among donors to explore joint strategies, implementation and evaluation approaches, as well as a better division of labour among them.

#### **Box 2.8. The European Commission's decision to operate from the field**

A key component of the European Commission reform process has been the devolution of management responsibility to field delegations. Devolution began in 2000 guided by the statement that "Anything that can be better managed and decided on the spot, close to what is happening on the ground, should not be managed and decided in Brussels." The Commission made a major effort, particularly through EuropeAid, to transform its centralised bureaucracy into one that was substantially devolved to 81 field delegations by 2004.

Now, committee management, financing decisions and global commitments are the responsibility of Brussels, while individual commitments, tendering, contracting and payments are made by the delegations. Delegations identify activities, assess feasibility, implement and evaluate them, while Brussels is responsible for programming and for general, thematic and quality support. By 2005, EuropeAid estimated that more than 80% of geographic funds and 66% of thematic funds were managed primarily by the delegations. A total of 1 559 staff posts were relocated to the field over this period, giving delegations a different staffing profile as they were joined by financial, contracting or legal experts and engineers.

## **Management of delivery**

### ***Managing the scaling up of development aid***

#### **Lesson 9: Radical reforms in aid delivery will be vital as donors are forced to deliver more aid per head of agency staff, while increasing the effectiveness of this aid**

Since 2003, individual donor information provided by peer reviews has offered insight into the significant operational challenges represented by the international scaling up agenda and the time frames to which donors are politically committed. While ODA has increased in recent

years, much of the increase was due to a temporary spurt of debt relief. It has become apparent that further discussion of organisational capacity, including instruments and channels, is needed to scale up programmable aid quickly and to improve the medium-term predictability of aid as called for in the Paris Declaration. Many peer reviews have underscored the need for well thought-out scaling-up plans at the national level to be able to anticipate the future management needs of the system. Most DAC members do not appear yet to have developed such plans. At the global level, there is a need for advance information on where agencies are planning to spend their increased budgets. Projections of future flows will help identify resource gaps and opportunities for scaling up in individual countries.

### Box 2.9. The challenges of scaling up in Spain

Spain is significantly increasing its ODA volumes (+20.1% from 2005 to 2006, or +32.2% without debt relief) and ambitiously aspires to attain a 0.7% ODA/GNI ratio by 2012, fully three years before the European Union deadline. Spain undertook a nationwide consultation exercise to set overall priorities for its aid and to sustain public support. This resulted in the Master Plan for Spanish Co-operation 2005-08, in which several delivery reforms are specified in order to attain the 0.7% target. They include use of new instruments, further concentration in geographic and sector terms, greater use of the multilateral channel, organisational reforms of the Spanish Agency for International Development (AECI), specific aid management improvements and special attention to the country strategic planning process, including multi-annual funding envelopes. At the same time, Spain's human resource capacity to implement this scaling-up target is constrained by government-wide legal and recruitment requirements; this will affect in particular the forthcoming increase of capacity of field operations. The current AECI reform proposal attempts to address these constraints in its human resources plan.

A current preoccupation for most major donors is how to do “more with less”. Individual DAC members with growing aid levels are commonly confronted with parallel issues of restraining or downsizing the staff of national government departments. For donor management this means that national organisations will need to change ways of doing business if they are to handle substantially greater resources and still use them effectively. But in at least some cases, a moderate increase in staff numbers may also be necessary in order to cope with the increasing workload that comes with scaling up.

Across DAC members the scaling-up debate appears to have stimulated a growing spirit of innovation. Approaches found in peer reviews to date have included “wholesaling” through greater investment in multilateral systems, much greater interest in using budget support mechanisms (general and sector) and longer-term interest in expanding the use of “delegated partnerships” for downstream implementation. The results remain to be seen.

### **Maintaining a focused approach: Countries, sectors**

**Lesson 10: Most DAC members should focus their assistance on fewer countries, fewer sectors and, in particular, fewer activities**

Most DAC members understand and agree that it is both more efficient and developmentally desirable to limit the range of countries and sectors in which they work over the longer term while paying due attention to the comparative advantage of each donor. Maintaining this more focused approach in practice is a challenge for bilateral

donors whose aid allocation is shaped around both country needs and special agendas at the national or international level. Many donors find their geographic and sector aid allocations frequently driven by domestic political leadership or legislative initiatives, which are often short term and *ad hoc*. Even where donors establish clear allocation priorities, it may be difficult to convince domestic decision makers of the importance of maintaining such a disciplined and longer-term approach.

There appears to be some modest progress on concentration at country level. Admittedly, DAC statistics reveal that in 2005 donors on average provided some form of aid to 109 countries, the same spread as ten years earlier. But many of these recipients receive only “micro” portfolios, such as a few training places or small amounts of charitable aid. More significantly, the proportion of ODA going to the top 10 recipient countries rose on average from 52% in 1995 to 66% in 2005. The very large flows, including debt forgiveness, to Iraq are of course one element in this increase, which is therefore rather less impressive than it appears at first sight.

At sector level, there is little change in the *relative* concentration of donors’ aid to their preferred sectors, even though these sectors themselves have changed over the period. Over the past 20 years, the shares of aid accounted for by the social sectors (especially governance and humanitarian aid) have risen substantially, while the shares of agriculture, commodity aid and economic infrastructure have fallen.

DAC members continue to put in place each year an extraordinary number of activities. In the *Development Co-operation 2003 Report*, my first as Chair, I noted that over 1999-2001 DAC members reported undertaking an average of some 35 000 transactions per year, representing an average transaction value of USD 1.5 million. While comparison with more recent data poses methodological issues, it is disconcerting that this situation does not appear to have improved. The preliminary data from 2005 suggests that the number of transactions reported has continued to grow in the intervening four years. Whatever the number, its size is significant and represents transaction costs for aid agencies and governments alike.

In its peer reviews the DAC regularly encourages members to focus their bilateral geographic and sector contributions to international development even further. They are also encouraged to work even more collaboratively within broader donor frameworks to enhance the complementarity of donors’ efforts. One important effort in this sense was recently launched between the European Commission and European Union Member States. Both bodies now seek a more efficient division of labour among the European Union States around a common code of conduct and statement of vision agreed by the EU Council in May 2007. It will be interesting to see how this is followed through in practice.

### **Performance-based management, evaluation and quality control**

#### **Lesson 11: Develop a stronger culture of managing for results and align incentives accordingly, but in ways that promote, not weaken, local structures of accountability**

Peer reviews show that most donors are under increasing pressure from parliaments, government and civil society to use performance-based management approaches as a means of improving system efficiency and to achieve greater aid effectiveness and accountability. Attempts at performance-based management often initially include the traditional feedback areas of monitoring, evaluation and audit, and are usually more effective when linked also to the assessment of performance by individual units and members of staff. The resulting “corporate performance framework” concept put in place by some has been applauded by the DAC, although all efforts to date merit further integration and simplification. Agencies also need to be alive to the danger that such

frameworks can lead to perverse incentives or to excessive aversion to risk. There is also a potential conflict between the performance information that helps managers “run the business” and what is needed for external political or public audiences, where it may be more important to “tell the story” rather than simply provide an array of technical data.

### Box 2.10. DEREc: Disseminating lessons

#### Did you know?

- One of the biggest weaknesses of the support operation during the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami relief efforts was its lack of understanding of the local context and its reluctance and/or inability to consult with and work through local communities, groups and organisations. Humanitarian aid was found to work best when local communities and authorities had been consulted and involved in the planning and management of programmes. More information can be found in the *Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean tsunami: Synthesis Report* (Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, 2006).
- Poverty targeting has been used widely in development projects to channel funds to poor regions or deliver benefits to poor households. However, the approach is based on easy assumptions; poor people live in poor regions, public investment in poor regions leads to poverty reduction, and the solution to poverty reduction in a poor region lies within that region. Findings are that the bulk of the poor live in less poor regions, the location of projects in poor regions does not guarantee significant poverty reduction, and the solution to persistent rural poverty in remote and poorly endowed regions lies largely outside them. More information can be found in “Pathways out of Rural Poverty and the Effectiveness of Poverty Targeting” (Asian Development Bank, 2006).
- Security and justice sector reform programming in Africa often lacks a rigorous political analysis and risk mitigation strategy. A more coherent strategic approach by donors can help determine the most appropriate reform interventions in difficult political environments. More information can be found in “Security and Justice Sector Reform Programming in Africa” (DFID, 2007).

These and many other evaluations can be found on the DAC Evaluation Resource Centre (DEReC); [www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork/derec](http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork/derec).

Evaluation is one tool for performance management but, more broadly, it is also about development agency accountability and independent reporting of results to the public, parliament and the media. As such, development evaluation systems have evolved substantially in recent years. In some donor programmes, persistent budget constraints and new development programming demands – paradoxically – have reduced evaluation system capacity while requiring evaluation departments to engage in a broader range of activities and deliver new types of products. In other donor programmes increased attention and resources are now devoted to evaluation, often related to growing demands for aid agency accountability. Peer reviews emphasise the important role that evaluation can play in the context of internal performance-based management systems, while also pointing out the need to maintain the independence of the evaluation function to ensure the objectivity and reliability of findings. In several cases this has led to the use of new, independent structures. Evaluations and the assessment expertise associated with them can be central to the broader evolution of development co-operation system learning and knowledge management. Equally, evaluations conducted jointly with recipient countries can help build more evidence-based policies locally: strengthening the evaluation capacity of recipient countries is a key step in improving

accountability and effective management for results. The establishment of a readily searchable repository of evaluation reports in the DAC Evaluation Resource Centre (DEReC) should greatly facilitate mutual learning. Box 2.10 gives a taste of what is available.

As donors regularly reform their policies and operations, some have come to realise the importance of setting up quality control mechanisms that typically use internal peer review processes to enhance the quality of new activities (“quality at entry”). These mechanisms can be both light and comprehensive so as to minimise additional bureaucracy while creatively reviewing the overall functioning of the aid system.

Donors are increasingly conscious that their bilateral, parallel results monitoring and reporting efforts reflect their own perspective and corporate needs and that there is need for some form of common approach to overall results in any one sector or country setting. The Millennium Development Goals provide an international template within which there are country-specific yardsticks. These can measure the kind of development that countries wish to see and the objectives they wish to attain. Some donors are proactively working to build capacity at the level of the partner country’s monitoring and reporting systems, usually located in the national government structure, to set the basis for a future common results reporting system. (The possible roles for civil society and local legislative bodies are also important, as argued in last year’s Report.) While this is a long-term solution and is still fraught with local capacity and methodological issues, many DAC members believe that this approach merits greater attention from the international community as it pursues the harmonisation and alignment agenda. The Hanoi Roundtable on Managing for Development Results of February 2007 provided some encouraging information on good practice by a growing number of aid recipient countries. These are building national systems for evidence-based policy, developing evaluation and placing greater focus on the real results of national programmes, including those supported by aid. In the long term, effective local systems will give donors greater assurance than the stand-alone donor-led systems that have multiplied over the past 40 years.

#### Box 2.11. **Performance based management in Canadian aid**

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) integrates the functions of results-based management, evaluation, internal audit and knowledge management into the same administrative division. A Results, Risk Management and Accountability Framework sets out the current approach to monitoring and provides the basis for evaluation and risk assessments. In 2007, as part of its rolling reform process, the government announced additional changes to its evaluation policy which will strengthen the evaluation function and make it independent from operations.

### **Human resource management priorities**

**Lesson 12: Securing and developing well-qualified, well-motivated local and expatriate staff is essential for any agency to function effectively. The good news is that quality agencies attract quality staff**

Peer reviews often emphasise the critical importance of appropriate numbers of skilled and experienced personnel for effective development co-operation. Of course, peer reviews also recognise that broader issues (civil service regimes or government budget austerity) can create complex management situations.

Peer reviews have identified a variety of effective human resource management issues and constraints: the downsizing of government personnel; inadequate staffing levels; the imminent retirement of significant numbers of senior officials; changing skill needs; rapid turnover in staff. Peer reviews regularly call for advance development resource planning to place such issues in a context of organised change over time. They also suggest that individual donors need to address these issues more broadly and recognise the potential for development staff sharing or secondments, either within the national system of co-operation or with other donors, in a context of delegated partnerships or shared responsibility for activities.

Peer reviews also point to the benefits, in any system, of maintaining a reasonable level of core staff, recruited with the expectation that they will spend a large portion of their career on development issues. This does not mean that one should staff agencies with people who just “do development”. The insights provided by staff with other backgrounds in both public and private spheres are essential. But systems that assign senior staff with little development background to the majority of senior policy positions risk unnecessary mistakes, limit continuity of purpose, and discourage the entry of high-quality staff who feel a strong commitment to work in international development.

As donors progressively decentralise authority and capacity, one aspect of rapidly growing interest is the use of local expertise in field operations. Most donors have discovered that local professional staff, with their cultural knowledge, technical skills and language abilities, can be vital partners in the design and implementation of local operations. They also provide a form of corporate memory and continuity against a background of regular expatriate staff turnover. At present, a majority of donors do not have organised local staff statutes and guidelines, and peer review field visits regularly reveal that local staff may feel underutilised or not fully integrated into the local donor team. The use of local expertise needs to be considered in balance with the concern that donors in the aggregate do not unduly deprive the local labour market of quality local professionals, a particular concern in small countries with limited qualified staff.

**Box 2.12. The joint training of development staff among DAC agencies, and with their developing country counterparts: “Train4Dev”**

In 2003, the Joint Donors’ Competence Development Network (JD CDN, currently known as Train4Dev) was established. This forum for donor agencies includes some 17 bilateral donors and multilateral groups such as the European Commission, the UN and the World Bank. Train4Dev was created to promote aid effectiveness for poverty reduction through enhanced donor co-operation in competence development and training. The network refers in its basic documents to the Rome and Paris Declarations as points of reference. The network operates informally, with a light governance structure under a small “core group”, and holds an annual meeting. Much of the substantive work is carried out by specialist subgroups, currently delivering training on poverty reduction strategy papers, sector-wide approaches, public finance management, crisis prevention and peace building, education and promoting pro-poor growth. Some training is carried out jointly in developing countries with participation of local officials. The DAC’s Network on Poverty Reduction (POVNET) has already initiated a joint learning event with Train4Dev in order to disseminate its pro-poor growth policy messages to both donor field staff and partner country officials.

**Box 2.12. The joint training of development staff among DAC agencies, and with their developing country counterparts: “Train4Dev” (cont.)**

This initiative has the potential i) to help encourage agencies to align their approaches to common development challenges and help build cross-agency communities of practice and ii) to provide development agency staff jointly agreed products, including those developed in the DAC. This effort offers a potential pathway to disseminate and improve the implementation of DAC policy and good practice. An important step in realising this potential was the Pilot Learning Event on Promoting Pro-Poor Growth, a joint initiative between Train4Dev and POVNET which took place in December 2007.

## Learning for the future

Peer reviews regularly provide important insight into the overall management of bilateral development co-operation systems around the world. They put into perspective the reality of historical and other domestic considerations that may influence i) the aid allocations and management style of individual donors and ii) the efficiency and effectiveness of bilateral systems.

As the member governments of the DAC afford growing political priority to development co-operation (including official commitments to scale up and increase aid effectiveness), they are collaboratively evolving towards development co-operation concepts which increasingly shift priority attention to the quality and impact of delivery in recipient countries. Recent peer reviews, which now dedicate an entire chapter to aid effectiveness, usefully describe DAC member operational interest in the principles of the Paris Declaration aid effectiveness agenda. A special report, drawing on the insights of the peer reviews, will be prepared on this topic for the third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, to be held in September 2008.

### Notes

1. Finland, Ireland, Japan (2003), France, Italy, Austria, Norway, Australia (2004), New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium, Germany (2005), Portugal, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Greece, United States (2006), Denmark, European Community, Canada, Spain, and again Finland (2007). Only Luxembourg was reviewed outside my mandate, but I had the opportunity to visit in early 2007.
2. The current six-chapter format of Peer Reviews cover policy, policy coherence, ODA flows, organisation and management, aid effectiveness and special issues. The “DAC Peer Review Content Guide” can be accessed on [www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews](http://www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews).
3. OECD, *Managing Aid: Practices of DAC Member Countries* (2005) and “A Comparison of Management Systems for Development Co-operation in OECD/DAC Members” (1999).

## Chapter 3

# Aid Effectiveness: Implementing the Paris Principles

*This chapter describes current efforts to put the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness into practice, with a particular focus on health. Lessons are also drawn from aid effectiveness work in support of key development priorities such as gender equality, environmental sustainability and human rights. Health is a complex sector that exhibits all of the challenges captured in the Paris Declaration. It is also at the forefront of the debate on aid effectiveness, with health donors and partner countries working to put the Paris principles into practice. Many challenges remain: i) focusing on results and developing capacities to assess progress; ii) focusing on ownership and making sure that countries, including civil society, are engaged in the design and implementation of initiatives; iii) focusing on collective action that builds on the comparative advantage of each partner; iv) paying attention to countries in fragile situations where sustained, harmonised and coordinated aid is essential.*

## Introduction

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness was endorsed in March 2005, and already many initiatives are translating the five pillars of the Paris agenda (ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for development results and mutual accountability) into reality on the ground. These initiatives – some of which are described in this chapter – offer useful lessons on how to “put Paris into practice”. They also help to illustrate why making better use of aid leads to quicker and more sustainable development impact in countries – an important step in gaining international support for more, and better, aid.

The wealth of evidence of how aid effectiveness bottlenecks have hindered achievement of the health Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) has encouraged donors and partner countries to change their ways of doing business in health. The health sector shows how aid effectiveness concepts are being increasingly used as a point of reference and applied in a sector where there is genuine scaling up and several new actors. This means that health is an important sector for tracking progress on the implementation of the Paris Declaration in the lead up to the third High-Level Forum (HLF) on Aid Effectiveness to be held in Accra, Ghana in September 2008.

The opportunities and challenges of greater harmonisation and alignment for important cross-cutting issues are increasingly under debate. The recent workshop on Development Effectiveness in Practice, hosted by the Government of Ireland in Dublin in April 2007, reviewed how practitioners are applying the Paris Declaration’s overarching principles to advance gender equality, environmental sustainability and human rights. Its findings offer important guidance on how to translate better quality aid into better development results.

Last year’s *Development Co-operation Report* outlined some of the headlines from the baseline survey that looked at commitments under the Paris Declaration.<sup>1</sup> The first monitoring round assessing progress against this baseline is still in progress at the time of writing, and this chapter takes the opportunity to look at aid effectiveness in practice ahead of the Accra High Level Forum – drawing on the lessons emerging from work in health and on cross-cutting issues. The chapter is therefore organised in two parts: the first describes efforts to implement the Paris principles in the health sector; and the second outlines some examples of how aid effectiveness is being promoted in other policy priority areas such as environment, human rights, fragile states and gender equality. Both sets of issues will be considered further at Accra.

## Why aid effectiveness matters in health

Health is a complex sector with multiple actors, needs and financing streams. With just seven years to go to the 2015 target date for achieving the Millennium Development Goals,<sup>2</sup> the rapid increase in flows of development assistance to health, and the large number of donors active in the sector, have created a challenging environment for harmonisation and alignment efforts. In parallel with these developments, a significant

body of work has been produced – including the studies and discussions undertaken in the context of the High Level Forum on the Health MDGs (2004-05)<sup>3</sup> – which highlights the increasing difficulties countries face in adapting to the new aid architecture in health. This work demonstrates the need for all development partners to change their behaviour in order to make best use of the additional funding available for better health outcomes. Health has been chosen as a sector deserving special attention (a “tracer sector”) to monitor progress in the implementation of the Paris Declaration as part of the preparations for the Accra HLF.<sup>4</sup> This sector provides concrete examples of what aid effectiveness aims to achieve and how the way aid is provided impacts on development results. In this way, it offers useful lessons and recommendations for other policy areas.

### **The increasing aid effectiveness challenges in health**


**Health has become a major recipient of aid – including from innovative financing sources.** For a variety of reasons – humanitarian concerns, fear of epidemics (HIV/AIDS, pandemic influenza), and recognition of health’s importance for economic growth, poverty reduction and realisation of human rights – health is a central pillar of most development policies. **Development assistance for health has increased from just over USD 6 billion in 1999 to USD 13.4 billion in 2005.**<sup>5</sup> The bulk of this increase can be credited to new major global stakeholders or global health partnerships (GHPs) such as the GAVI Alliance (formerly known as the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation) and the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM). Other sources include specific and new programmes such as the US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and private foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Funding from these global programmes and philanthropies account for 20% to 25% of development assistance for health. Estimates suggest that there are now, depending on definition, between 80 and 100 global health partnerships. Several GHPs aim to improve aid effectiveness by mobilising and channelling funding to countries more quickly than via traditional routes. Nevertheless, many studies suggest that the situation has become **more** complex, as countries with limited capacity to manage and spend aid effectively attempt to deal with the multiplicity of aid instruments and mechanisms on offer. **The challenges raised by these trends make it even more urgent to tackle aid effectiveness in health.**

Health has long been at the forefront of the debate on aid effectiveness, by pioneering, for example, the design and implementation of sector-wide approaches in the 1990s. Beginning in spring 2003, a series of informal high-level fora on the health MDGs, co-piloted by the World Bank and the World Health Organization, brought together senior-level representatives from developed and developing countries with major GHPs and public and private organisations in health to discuss ways to scale up aid in order to achieve the health MDGs.<sup>3</sup> Through in-depth country and qualitative analytical studies on key issues related to aid effectiveness, including fiscal space and sustainability, the role of GHPs at country level and delivering better aid in post-conflict states, this work has highlighted ineffective aid practices at country level and identified the bottlenecks that prevent progress in developing countries.

One major concern is that, with an ever-increasing proportion of development assistance for health being channelled through vertical funds which target assistance on specific diseases or sub-sectors, **aid is not aligned with government priorities and holistic health systems’ approaches are insufficiently funded.** Health aid is increasingly earmarked for specific purposes: only about 20% is given as general or sector budget

support to finance governments' overall programmes, while an estimated 50% of health aid is off-budget. In the case of Rwanda, although the government has identified seven strategic objectives for health, donor funding is heavily earmarked for just one of these (HIV/AIDS), leaving other priorities underfunded and preventing balanced investment in the health system (Figure 3.1).<sup>6</sup>

Figure 3.1. **Distribution of donor funding for health by strategic objective in Rwanda**



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174801252062>

Source: Republic of Rwanda Ministry of Health.


A study undertaken by McKinsey & Co. to assess the impact of GHPs at country level demonstrated that, although there have been benefits in the form of increased political and technical focus and greater financial resources for major health threats, the high number of donors present in health means that **health aid can be poorly harmonised and lead to increased transaction costs for governments**, with district health staff spending valuable time hosting missions and writing reports instead of delivering health services.

As Figure 3.2 illustrates, aid volatility in health is a severe problem, with some countries experiencing large fluctuations in external funding for health from one year to the next. Such uncertainty about funding for the sector undermines efforts to scale up long-term expenditure in health, for example on health workers, especially in the poorest and most aid-dependent countries. The situation is yet more challenging in countries in fragile situations, where aid is even more volatile and is usually channelled through parallel systems to compensate for the weakness of governments.

### **Responding to the challenges: How has this evidence been translated into action?**

On the strength of the evidence-based analysis outlined above, stakeholders have reached a consensus on the need to change behaviour in order to accelerate the

**Figure 3.2. Volatility in aid for health in seven countries**  
 DAC members' disbursements to the health sector: 2001-05, constant 2005 prices



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174814388687>

achievement of the health MDGs. In particular, health donors and aid recipients have agreed that more predictable and sustainable financing for health is needed, supported by increased co-ordination and harmonisation of donors' aid within country-owned and country-led health plans, and based on mutual accountability mechanisms.

One very concrete outcome of the High-Level Forum on the health MDGs has been the definition of 17 best practice principles for GHPs at country level which derive from the five pillars of the Paris Declaration, with a strong focus on alignment. Five additional best practice principles were designed for larger partnerships with formalised governance arrangements. These best practice principles, which are presented in the annex to this chapter, have been adopted by the boards of a number of GHPs and are guiding their implementation of the Paris principles.

The "Harmonisation for Health in Africa" (HHA) initiative responds to concerns about donor fragmentation. It was presented to African ministers of health at the 2006 WHO Africa Regional Committee (Addis Ababa, August 2006) and supported by five regional organisations (World Bank, WHO-AFRO, UNFPA, UNICEF, African Development Bank). The HHA aims to provide demand-driven joint high-level technical support to facilitate and co-ordinate the process of country-led development of evidence-based health policies, plans and budgets.

The debate on how to improve aid effectiveness in health has also been greatly enriched by the adoption of the "**Three Ones**",<sup>7</sup> which tackles the issue of harmonisation and alignment in the HIV/AIDS area and by the emergence of **innovative financing mechanisms such as the IFFIm<sup>8</sup> and Unitaid<sup>9</sup>** which respond to the country demand for more sustainable and predictable funding for health.

As noted above, health is an important sector for tracking implementation of the Paris Declaration, to measure progress and generate lessons in the lead up to the Accra HLF. A background note prepared by the World Bank and WHO on how the health sector can be used to trace aid effectiveness on the ground offers **an analysis of five selected indicators identified in the Paris Declaration from the perspective of the health sector** (Box 3.1).

### ***Implementing the Paris principles: A more aid-effective approach to development assistance for health?***

Health offers several examples of continuing progress towards better aid effectiveness:

- **Renewed interest and investment in strengthening health systems**, better aligning aid with national priorities, and helping to redress some of the distortions caused by vertical programmes. This includes the development of more predictable, flexible support for strengthening health systems such as GAVI's health system strengthening window. There are positive ongoing efforts within the health community to make sure there is a proper division of labour and better use of each institution's comparative advantage on strengthening health systems at all levels.
- **Harmonisation and alignment** of aid is also improving. The Country Harmonisation and Alignment Tool (CHAT) for HIV/AIDS helps to address three main questions in countries: i) Do we have inclusive, participatory national responses to AIDS? ii) Do we have effective co-ordination and funding partnerships for the national AIDS response? iii) How can we improve our partnerships to strengthen the response to AIDS? This tool was piloted by UNAIDS in 2006 and is now being used in several countries.

### Box 3.1. The Paris Declaration as a framework for assessing aid effectiveness in health

**Indicator 3** of the Paris Declaration looks at aligning aid flows with national priorities. This is a particularly important issue in health for a number of reasons. First and foremost, the diverse nature of the health sector often means that countries have a range of “competing” plans, for example, separate plans on population, maternal health and child health, each supported by a different donor. Thus, there may not be a single “plan” or an agreed set of priorities for donors to align behind. Second, the broad range of stakeholders involved in health, including NGOs and activists from developed countries which seek to influence health sector spending in line with their particular priorities, underscore the need to agree upon common health sector goals. Third, the independent expenditures by donors may generate large distortions and misalignments not only with respect to the burden of disease in the recipient country, but also in the expenditures across regions, targeted populations and between health and other sectors which influence health outcomes. These distortions generate serious doubts as to the long-term sustainability of current expenditure efforts.

**Indicator 5b** is concerned with the use of country procurement systems. Beyond the broader issues of transparency and lack of corruption, using developing country systems to procure medicines and health equipment may raise issues unique to the health sector. First, quality is more important than it is for other kinds of products, which adds extra risk with local suppliers and systems. Counterfeit drugs are a serious global problem carrying both large financial and individual health risks. Second, international trade rules around intellectual property rights of pharmaceutical patents can pose challenges for procurement efforts. Finally, as access to medicines is an inherently political issue, governments are often under pressure from donors and activist groups to invest in particular treatment regimens or drugs which may not be available locally.

**Indicator 7** looks at predictability of aid. This indicator is particularly important to the health sector and particularly difficult to address because of the multiple funding streams and the large number of health donors. Also, the inherently political nature of foreign aid within donor countries complicates efforts to make aid long-term and predictable.

**Indicator 9** is concerned with the use of common arrangements and procedures, including programme-based approaches, while **Indicator 11** encourages use of results-oriented frameworks. This is complicated in health as there is no formal agreement (as there is in the education sector) on what constitutes a “good sector plan” and, as discussed above, measuring results is complex in health. This means that the dialogue on whether or not donors should provide sector budget support must effectively start from scratch in each country, as there is no agreed framework or set of pre-requisites to compare against. Similarly, there is not yet consensus on what constitutes progress in health sector performance, nor how to monitor it, so there is no independent way of assessing the impact of sector support. The Health Metrics Network (HMN) is currently working on the issue of monitoring health sector performance, and should have an agreed set of indicators ready early in 2008. The new Health Sector Strategy being developed by the World Bank is also focusing on developing indicators to monitor results.

Source: “Aid effectiveness in Health”. Contribution by the World Bank and the WHO to the Pre-meeting on Aid Effectiveness in Health, 4 December 2006.

- **Managing for results and results-based financing** has also become increasingly important for interventions in health. The **Health Metrics Network** – established in response to concerns raised through the High Level Forum on the health MDGs about lack of good quality health data – is facilitating better planning and monitoring of needs and expenditure in the health sector. And recently launched initiatives such as the global campaign to scale up MDGs 4 and 5 also aim to promote measurement of results and results-based financing.
- Progress is being made on implementing **compacts for mutual accountability**, based on a joint commitment by all partners to align with the national health sector strategic plan; supported by effective monitoring and evaluation; and linked to the national budget and medium-term expenditure framework. For example, in Rwanda a detailed health sector-wide approach memorandum of understanding is about to be signed by all partners – addressing many of the problems described earlier in this chapter.

There is also a **commendable and promising attempt to develop an overall more comprehensive and coherent aid architecture in health**. This trend is illustrated by the creation of the group of eight heads of health agencies and the launch of the International Health Partnership.

On 19 July 2007, **global health leaders from eight international organisations** (WHO, GFTAM, GAVI Alliance, UNICEF, UNFPA, WB, UNAIDS, Gates Foundation) met to discuss ways to strengthen their collaboration in order to achieve better health outcomes in poor countries. In particular, the global health leaders (the “H8”) agreed to:

- Work together to better define their individual and collective accountabilities for better and faster results.
- Develop a more robust and co-ordinated approach to knowledge management.
- Engage emerging global initiatives in a co-ordinated manner to ensure that their organisations effectively support countries through funding and/or technical and policy assistance. They also emphasised the need for closer alignment around an over-arching health sector strategy at the country level.

The International Health Partnership (IHP) was launched on 5 September 2007 by the United Kingdom. It is supported by donor governments (France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway), multilateral organisations (European Commission, World Bank, UNAIDS, WHO, GAVI, GFATM, UNICEF), the Gates Foundation and seven developing countries (Burundi, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal, Zambia) and is directly linked to the H8. The IHP has three main objectives:

- improving health systems;
- providing better co-ordination among donors;
- supporting countries in developing their own health plans.

The IHP is developing a work plan that will support the H8 objectives, driven by the partnership of WHO and the World Bank. The plan includes global and country actions to enhance co-ordination and efficiency in aid delivery and the early results of these will contribute to discussions on health and aid effectiveness at the Accra HLF.

### ***The building blocks are in place, but results are needed***

Despite the progress described above, greater effort is required to make aid more efficient in improving the health status of the poorest. The growing interest in improving the quality of aid for health is welcome. But care is needed to ensure that the large number of aid effectiveness initiatives being launched in the sector do not lead to yet more

fragmentation and new transaction costs. The challenge now is to make sure that the various contributions to health systems strengthening will be harmonised, mutually reinforcing, and monitored.

**Aid effectiveness is about achieving more results** – The aid effectiveness agenda is not just about process – it is meant to produce better results and outcomes. Rapid and large-scale progress is needed: the 2007 *Millennium Development Goals Report*<sup>10</sup> found that despite improvements in areas such as child mortality, use of key interventions to control malaria or tuberculosis and increased use of HIV/AIDS treatments, key challenges remain in health or health-related areas such as maternal mortality, child mortality, access to safe water and climate change. The health community must remain focused on health outcomes, in particular by ensuring that each initiative includes a rigorous and independent monitoring and evaluation framework, with agreed baselines, indicators and reporting mechanisms.

**Behavioural change remains key** – More effort is needed to reduce the fragmentation of donor aid, avoid the distorting effects of earmarked funding, reduce transaction costs, and develop results-based country-led health strategies. This requires a major change in the way donors and countries do business. All partners need to fulfil their commitments, with a focus on practical and collective action within agreed frameworks that build on the comparative advantages of each partner. Lessons should be learned and widely shared. And – most importantly – these changes must deliver results at country level by scaling up towards better health.

**Keep track of changes in the various pilot countries for lessons learning** – One of the positive features of recent initiatives in global health is that action is focused on countries or regions that are most in need, with the objective of producing results as fast as possible. It is important that these pilots are effectively monitored so that lessons can be learned and shared. This may be a complex task, given the diversity and number of initiatives.

**Ensure country ownership** – Ownership is the first of the Paris Declaration principles and is central to sustainable development. All the recent aid effectiveness initiatives in health recognise this, and emphasise stronger co-ordination, harmonisation and alignment within **country-led and country-managed** single health plans. But the role of partner countries in driving these efforts remains unclear. Ownership requires that countries are strongly involved in the design and implementation of these initiatives, including in the selection of pilot countries, and that civil society is engaged in the discussion of aid effectiveness in health. The Country Coordination Mechanism used by the GFATM or the Multi HIV/AIDS action plans of the World Bank include participation of civil society organisations, but more remains to be done in this area.

**Appropriate change is needed in countries in fragile situations** – Countries in fragile situations are often donor orphans: they receive, on average, 40% less aid per capita than other aid recipient countries. It is often difficult for donors to engage in fragile states, and progress can be slow and easily reversed. It is important that new initiatives in health face up to this challenge and pay special attention to the needs of countries in fragile situations.

### **The Accra High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: An agenda for action**

The Accra HLF will draw on the experience of the health sector as participants debate and define an agenda for further action on aid effectiveness. Health can contribute to – and benefit from – the discussions in Accra, by reporting and sharing lessons on the successes and challenges of implementing the Paris Declaration in this complex sector. The DAC will play an active role with its partners in the health sector to ensure that the work already

underway to address aid effectiveness bottlenecks in health can inform development practitioners at Accra and help them agree on concrete actions to deliver better development outcomes in the future.

Progress on the issues identified in this chapter is essential to mobilise political support for more – and better – aid for health. Ultimately, the success of the Paris Declaration will depend on whether it can change behaviour and deliver results. Results in health are central to this: improving health is at the core of poverty reduction, and political backing for increased donor aid budgets will be influenced by whether the health of the poorest improves. If the health sector can address the many aid effectiveness challenges it faces, and begin to deliver better health for poor people, it will provide powerful evidence in support of both the Paris principles and the Monterrey Consensus on financing for development.

### Lessons learned from implementing the Paris Declaration in human rights, environmental sustainability and gender equality

*Whilst achieving gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability are worthy goals of development in their own right, each is at the same time functionally essential to achieving the overall goal of the Paris Declaration. (Richard Carey, Director, OECD Development Co-operation Directorate, at the Dublin workshop.)*

The overarching partnership commitments of the **Paris Declaration** have become major reference points for guiding policy dialogue and shaping development co-operation programmes in all sectors. The way they are put into practice presents both challenges and opportunities for development efforts in the key so-called “cross-cutting” policy areas of human rights, environmental sustainability, gender equality and women’s empowerment. For over two decades most DAC member countries’ policies have included a strong commitment to using development co-operation to address environmental issues and gender inequalities. Both issues have proven to be difficult to address, not responsive to “quick fixes”, and there has often been a gap between “what we say we do” and “what we actually do”. Although the focus on human rights in development is more recent, its integration into development agendas has been subject to similar challenges to those experienced with gender equality and the environment.

In April 2007, the Government of Ireland hosted a workshop entitled “Development Effectiveness in Practice”. Its aim was to increase mutual knowledge and understanding of how practitioners are applying the Paris Declaration to these three critical areas.<sup>11</sup>

#### **Key messages from the Dublin workshop**

##### ***Gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability***

- are fundamental cornerstones for achieving good development results;
- can be advanced through implementing the principles and partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration;
- must be harnessed to advance the implementation of the Paris Declaration.

##### ***National ownership is about genuine collective ownership by society as a whole***

The principle of ownership, a central tenet of the Paris Declaration, extends beyond national governments – the main counterparts of donors in development co-operation. Parliaments, civil society organisations and the wider public, as well as political institutions at the sub-national level, are important “owners” of development strategies

and policies, and drivers of change. Genuine ownership requires political leverage and space as well as a legal-institutional framework that ensures that citizens – including the poor and the most marginalised women and men – are able to engage in decision-making processes and hold their governments accountable. Broad consultative processes which engage and give voice to civil society will often open up a dialogue and debate where concerns about addressing human rights, gender differences and environmental sustainability are likely to emerge as development priorities.

***Alignment works best when environmental sustainability, human rights and gender equality are institutionalised in legal frameworks, national strategies and robust policies***

In many countries, human rights, gender equality, access to health care, safe water and a clean environment are enshrined in constitutional and other legal instruments, which often reflect and incorporate international legal obligations deriving from agreements to which both partners and donors are party. This provides a basis for dialogue as well as mechanisms and modalities for donors to align their efforts and to monitor progress.

***Harmonisation can bring gender equality, human rights and environment to the centre of Paris Declaration implementation***

Harmonisation requires trust, transparency and changes in the ways donors do business. Increased harmonisation of donors' efforts in relation to gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability will improve effectiveness, avoid fragmentation of donor efforts and help bring these issues from the margins to the centre of the implementation of the Paris Declaration. Joint Assistance Strategies (JAS) have proven to be a valuable mechanism to advance these critical policy issues as development priorities. JASs provide the basis for enhanced harmonisation and a more effective division of labour among donors at country level, based on donors' comparative advantages and competencies. In some cases, human rights, environmental sustainability and gender equality are considered as a sector, while in other cases they are integrated into other priority areas such as water, governance or health and HIV/AIDS. Experience suggests that these two approaches are not mutually exclusive but can reinforce one another. The Country Harmonisation and Alignment Tool (CHAT) for HIV/AIDS and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) have proven to be useful harmonisation instruments. Such tools need to be adapted to the country context, embedded in national processes and understood and used by local stakeholders.

***Managing for results provides ready entry points for integrating human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability***

Human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability are objectives in themselves. Without results in these key policy areas, short-term achievements in aid effectiveness will have little meaning. It is essential to include monitorable objectives linked to human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability in existing national and sub-national data collection and monitoring systems and performance assessment frameworks. Domestic civil society demands for improved performance can complement traditional top-down and technical approaches to monitoring. Making accurate information available to individuals and organisations is essential for both measuring the impact of

development initiatives and for holding government agencies to account. Transparency, participation and the right to information are key elements of such an approach.

### **Meeting environmental, gender equality and human rights objectives gives substance to mutual accountability**

A capable state needs a capable civil society. The Paris Declaration seeks to promote a model of partnership that improves transparency and provides stronger accountability mechanisms for the use of development resources. Strengthened domestic accountability through engagement with civil society is essential to democratic ownership, as is support for representative government, an independent judiciary and an independent media. Accountability is neither a technical exercise nor an end in itself but a dynamic socio-political process that is critical to achieving key development objectives and results. It is not just provided by states to citizens; it also has to be demanded by citizens.

Developing countries have a responsibility to create and sustain “home-grown” accountability institutions and mechanisms, and donors need to do a better job of supporting them. This includes both strengthening independent oversight systems and public institutions to ensure checks and balances, and supporting performance frameworks (horizontal accountability) and civil society and citizen-led initiatives, the independent media and electoral processes (vertical accountability).

At the same time, donors need to be accountable for their undertakings and commitments. This is likely to require some “rebalancing” of the partnership so that partners and civil society actors are better equipped to hold donors to account. Human rights frameworks and instruments play a particularly important role in strengthening the implementation of accountability commitments.

### **Next steps**

Since the Dublin workshop the DAC Networks on Gender Equality, Governance and Environmental Sustainability have continued to focus on improving joint work at partner country level by:

- gathering the evidence base;
- sharing good practice;
- strengthening the development impact of the Paris Declaration.

The progress and findings of the respective work streams will be presented at a further joint workshop scheduled for March 2008, hosted by the United Kingdom.

### **Notes**

1. This survey is now available in detail and published as *2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration: Overview of the Results*.
2. Three of the MDG targets relate directly to health: MDG 4 on reducing child mortality, MDG 5 on improving maternal health and MDG 6 on combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. Health is also an important component of all the other MDG targets.
3. See [www.hlfhealthmdgs.org](http://www.hlfhealthmdgs.org), accessed October 2007.
4. Global Forum on Development: Pre-meeting on Aid Effectiveness in Health, OECD, 4 December 2006.
5. Catherine Michaud, Harvard School of Public Health.
6. Rwanda, meeting of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and Ministry of Health: “Scaling up to Reach the MDGs in Rwanda”. Post-HLF on the Health MDGs, Tunis, 12-13 June 2006.

7. UNAIDS, the GFATM and development partners have committed to better harmonisation and alignment in HIV/AIDS through the framework of the “Three Ones”: one agreed HIV/AIDS action framework; one national HIV/AIDS co-ordinating body; and one HIV/AIDS country-level monitoring and evaluation system.
8. IFFIm: The International Finance Facility (IFF) is designed to accelerate the availability, and increase the predictability of, funds for development. It converts donor pledges of off-budget commitments of future resources into funds available for near-term disbursements through bond markets. The first pilot has been launched for immunisation which is a very cost-effective intervention and where front loading is particularly relevant.
9. Unitaid aims to scale up access to HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria drugs and also supports the strengthening of the WHO prequalification system. It is financed through an airline ticket tax and other long-term and firm commitments in order to ensure sustainable and predictable funding for long-term interventions.
10. *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2007*, United Nations.
11. The workshop, organised jointly by the DAC Networks on Environment and Development, Governance and Gender Equality and the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, was held in Dublin on 26-27 April 2007. The workshop documentation can be found at: [www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/inpractice](http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/inpractice).

## ANNEX 3.A

## Best Practice Principles for Global Health Partnership Activities at Country Level

### OWNERSHIP

- 1 To respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it.  
GHPs will *i)* work, as relevant, with donor partners to help countries fulfil their commitment to develop and implement national development strategies through broad consultative processes; *ii)* translate these strategies into prioritised results-oriented operational programmes as expressed in medium-term expenditure frameworks and annual budgets; and *iii)* take the lead in co-ordinating aid at all levels in conjunction with other development resources, in dialogue with donors, and encourage the participation of civil society and the private sector.

### ALIGNMENT

- 2 To base their support on partner countries' national development and health sector strategies and plans, institutions and procedures. Where these strategies do not adequately reflect pressing health priorities, to work with all partners to ensure that they are included.
- 3 To progressively shift from project to programme financing.
- 4 To use country systems as far as possible. Where use of country systems is not feasible, to establish safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen, rather than undermine, country systems and procedures.  
*Country systems in this context would include mechanisms such as sector-wide approaches, and national planning, budgeting, procurement and monitoring and evaluation systems.*
- 5 To avoid, as far as possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of GHP projects and programmes (*e.g. Project Management Units*).
- 6 To align analytic, technical and financial support with partners' capacity development objectives and strategies; make effective use of existing capacities; and harmonise support for capacity development accordingly.
- 7 To provide reliable indicative commitments of funding support over a multi-year framework and disburse funding in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules.
- 8 To rely, as far as possible, on transparent partner government budget and accounting mechanisms.
- 9 To progressively rely on country systems for procurement when the country has implemented mutually agreed standards and processes; to adopt harmonised approaches when national systems do not meet agreed levels of performance.<sup>1</sup> To ensure that donations of pharmaceutical products are fully in line with WHO Guidelines for Drug Donations.

### HARMONISATION

- 10 To implement, where feasible, simplified and common arrangements at country level for planning, funding, disbursing, monitoring, evaluating and reporting to government on GHP activities and resource flows.
- 11 To work together with other GHPs and donor agencies in the health sector to reduce the number of separate, duplicate missions to the field and diagnostic reviews assessing country systems and procedures. To encourage shared analytical work, technical support and lessons learned; and to promote joint training (*e.g. common induction of new Board members*).
- 12 To adopt harmonised performance assessment frameworks for country systems.

1. Countries themselves may choose to take advantage of procurement pooling mechanisms or third-party procurement, in order to obtain economies of scale.

- 
- 13 To collaborate at global level with other GHPs, donors and country representatives to develop and implement collective approaches to cross-cutting challenges, particularly in relation to strengthening health systems and including human resource management.
- 

#### MANAGING FOR RESULTS

- 14 To link country programming and resources to results and align them with effective country performance assessment frameworks; avoid requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with partners' national development strategies.
- 15 To work with countries to rely, as far as possible, on countries' results-oriented reporting and monitoring frameworks.
- 16 To work with countries in a participatory way in order to strengthen country capacities and demand for results-based management, including joint problem-solving and innovation, based on monitoring and evaluation.
- 

#### ACCOUNTABILITY

- 17 To deliver timely, clear and comprehensive information on GHP assistance, processes and decisions (especially decisions on unsuccessful applications) to partner countries requiring GHP support.
- 

#### GOVERNANCE

*The governance principles are intended for larger partnerships with formalised governance arrangements.  
Partnership activities must be consistent with the regulatory framework of their host arrangements.*

- 18 To make clear and public the allocation of roles and responsibilities within the management structure of the partnership or fund. The governing board or steering committee should have broad representation and a strong developing country voice.
- 19 To make clear and public the respective roles of the partnership and relevant multilateral agencies, including how the partnership relates to the host organisation.
- 20 In the interest of public accountability, to ensure that the purpose, goals and objectives of GHPs are clear, that procedures are transparent, and timely and comprehensive information is provided publicly.
- 21 There should be a strong commitment to minimising overhead costs and achieving value for money; each partnership should have an evaluation framework.
- 22 To be subject to regular external audit. For hosted partnerships, the auditing procedures of the host UN organisation would apply. A copy of the relevant portion of the external auditors' certification of accounts and audit report should be made available to the partnership board.
-



## Chapter 4

# Efforts and Policies of Bilateral Donors

*The Millennium Development Goals remain central to donor policies. By supporting country-led national poverty reduction strategies, donors contribute to reducing poverty – in the poorest as well as in middle-income countries. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness impacts the way in which donors do their business: they have developed action plans to implement the agenda and many are undertaking significant reforms. Donors pay particular attention to ownership, alignment and harmonisation, and some efforts are also being made in managing for development results. Several report on their aid effectiveness achievements, showing that some individual donor progress has been achieved. Securing gender equality is a priority for all donors: many have developed specific gender equality policies, action plans and guidance for field level implementation. Gender equality is both a horizontal issue and a sector issue with funding allocated for this purpose. Violence against women, women in conflict situations, and rights of girls and women are key areas of intervention.*

## Introduction: DAC members' aid performance in 2006

In 2006, total official development assistance (ODA) from DAC member countries of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) fell by 4.5% to USD 104.4 billion. This represents 0.31% of members' combined gross national income (GNI). In real terms this is the first fall in ODA since 1997, though the level is still the highest recorded with the exception of 2005.

The fall was predicted. ODA was exceptionally high in 2005 due to large Paris Club debt relief operations (notably for Iraq and Nigeria) which boosted ODA to its highest level ever at USD 107.1 billion. In 2006, net debt relief grants still represented a substantial share of net ODA, as members implemented further phases of the Paris Club agreements, providing USD 3.3 billion for Iraq and USD 9.4 billion for Nigeria. Excluding debt relief, ODA fell by 0.8%.

Bilateral net ODA to sub-Saharan Africa rose by 27% in real terms, to USD 29.2 billion. However, most of the increase was due to debt relief grants. If debt forgiveness is excluded, then aid to the region increased by nearly 13%.

The only countries to reach or exceed the United Nations' target of 0.7% of GNI were Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden. The largest donor in 2006 was the United States, followed by the United Kingdom, Japan, France and Germany. The combined ODA of the 15 members of the DAC that are also EU members accounted for 57% of total net ODA.

In 2006, net ODA by the United States was USD 23.5 billion, a fall of 18.2% in real terms. Its ODA/GNI ratio also fell to 0.18% from 0.23% in 2005. The fall was mostly due to debt relief which was exceptionally high in 2005 as the United States forgave all its outstanding debt with Iraq in 2005 rather than spreading it over several years. United States disbursements to sub-Saharan Africa (USD 5.6 billion) reached a record high mainly due to debt relief grants (about USD 1.6 billion, of which Nigeria accounted for USD 0.6 billion) and increased disbursements for education, HIV/AIDS and malaria programmes. Net ODA flows to Iraq remained substantial (USD 4.8 billion); those to Afghanistan increased (USD 1.4 billion) and flows to the least developed countries were at their highest level ever (USD 5.3 billion).

Japan's net ODA totalled USD 11.2 billion, representing 0.25% of its GNI. The 9.1% fall in real terms since 2005 was partly due to the declining ODA budget and also to exceptionally large expenditures in 2005, including humanitarian relief for the Indian Ocean tsunami and debt relief grants to Iraq. Japan's net ODA has been on a downward trend since 2000, except for an increase in 2005 due to debt relief. The 2006 ODA total includes an increase in Japan's contributions to the International Financial Institutions. On a gross basis Japan's ODA was USD 17.1 billion, down by 2% in real terms.

The combined ODA of the 15 DAC-EU members rose slightly by 2.9% in real terms, from USD 55.8 billion in 2005 to USD 59.0 billion in 2006. This represented 0.43% of their combined GNI, surpassing the EU collective ODA/GNI target of 0.39%. The increase in 2006 was mainly due to debt relief grants.

In real terms, aid rose in 11 DAC-EU member countries as follows:

- Ireland (+36.9%), reflecting increasing bilateral aid as well as large multilateral contributions.
- Spain (+20.7%), due to a large increase in contributions to the UN and other multilateral organisations, as well as an increase in disbursements by AECI, the Spanish co-operation agency.
- Sweden (+14.7%), due to general scaling-up of its aid and debt relief.
- United Kingdom (+11.7%), due to a substantial increase in contributions to international organisations.
- Aid also rose in Denmark (+3.0%), France (+2.9%), Germany (+1.7%), Greece (+5.9%), Luxembourg (+4.8%), Netherlands (+4.2%) and Portugal (+2.0%).

A decline was noted in Austria (−6.9%), Belgium (−2.2%), Finland (−9.0%) and Italy (−30.6%, mainly due to the timing of its contributions to international organisations).

Aid provided by the European Commission rose by 6.2% to USD 10.2 billion, reflecting increased budget support and improved disbursement capacity from the higher level of commitments made in recent years.

Official development assistance from other DAC countries rose, or fell, from 2005 to 2006 as follows:

- Australia (+22.5%), primarily due to debt relief, notably to Iraq and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.
- Canada (−9.9%), due to the decline in debt relief and lower levels of humanitarian aid compared to the extraordinary response to the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2005.
- New Zealand saw practically no change (+0.5%).
- Norway (−1.9%).
- Switzerland (−7.4%), due to the lower volume of debt relief grants provided.

### Did members meet their 2006 targets?

In 2002, before or during the Monterrey International Conference on Financing for Development, DAC members announced various plans to increase their aid in 2006 from the levels in 2000 (Table 4.1).

At the 2002 Barcelona Summit, the then 15 EU members committed to collectively reach an ODA level of 0.39% of their combined GNI, with a minimum country target of 0.33% by 2006. Most members reached the country target, except for Greece, Italy and Portugal. Spain just missed the target due to recent changes in its national accounting system. The combined GNI result in 2006 was 0.43%, well above the target of 0.39% set in 2002, mainly due to debt relief grants.

Since 2002, some EU members set, and reached, even higher goals for 2006. Belgium met its ODA target of 0.5% of GNI; Sweden surpassed its target of 1%. Denmark committed to maintain a minimum ODA/GNI ratio of 0.8%, and Ireland attained a higher than anticipated level of expenditure of EUR 734 million in 2006.

Net ODA from the United States in 2006 reached higher levels than expected due to large debt relief programmes and increased aid to sub-Saharan Africa, Afghanistan and Iraq. Due to severe budget restrictions, Japan did not make any announcement of a target

Table 4.1. ODA performance in 2006 against the Monterrey targets set in 2002

	Targets set in 2002			Actual ODA in 2006		Was the target met?
	Commitment/Announcement/Assumption	Year to be attained	ODA/GNI in 2006 (per cent)	Total Net ODA (USD million)	ODA/GNI (per cent)	
Austria	0.33%	2006	0.33	1 498	0.47	x
Belgium <sup>1</sup>	0.70%	2010	..	1 978	0.50	x
Denmark <sup>1</sup>	> 0.7%	n.a.	..	2 236	0.80	x
Finland <sup>1</sup>	0.40%	2007	..	834	0.40	x
France <sup>1</sup>	0.50%	2007	..	10 601	0.47	x
Germany	0.33%	2006	0.33	10 435	0.36	x
Greece	0.33%	2006	0.33	424	0.17	
Ireland <sup>1</sup>	0.70%	2007	..	1 022	0.54	x
Italy	0.33%	2006	0.33	3 641	0.20	
Luxembourg <sup>1</sup>	1.00%	2005 <sup>5</sup>	..	291	0.89	x
Netherlands	0.80%	Already	0.80	5 452	0.81	x
Portugal	0.33%	2006	0.33	396	0.21	
Spain <sup>2</sup>	0.33%	2006	0.33	3 814	0.32	
Sweden	1.00%	2006	1.00	3 955	1.02	x
United Kingdom	0.40%	2005-06	0.40	12 459	0.51	x
<b>EU members, total</b>	<b>0.39%</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>59 035</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>x</b>
Australia	3% real increase	in 2002-03	0.27	2 123	0.30	x
Canada	8% annual increase	to 2010	0.29	3 684	0.29	x
Japan	No target set		..	11 187	0.25	
New Zealand	Static ODA/GNI		0.25	259	0.27	x
Norway	1.00%	2005	..	2 954	0.89	
Switzerland <sup>3</sup>	0.40%	2010	..	1 646	0.39	x
United States <sup>4</sup>	Increase by USD 5 bn	2006	0.12	23 532	0.18	x
<b>DAC members, total</b>				<b>104 421</b>	<b>0.31</b>	

1. Met or exceeded the EU minimum country target of 0.33% of GNI or remaining above 0.7%.

2. Spain just missed due to a change in GNI accounting.

3. Switzerland on track for its 2010 target.

4. USD 5 billion increase from its level in 2000, equal to USD 15 billion in 2006.

5. Subsequently postponed to 2012.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176258877756>

for its ODA in 2006. Norway's strong growth in GNI in recent years made it impossible to meet its target of 1% ODA/GNI by 2005.

## Future prospects

Official development assistance is expected to fall back slightly again in 2007 as debt relief for Nigeria and Iraq tapers off. It is expected that other types of aid should increase as donors fulfil their more recent pledges.


DAC-EU countries agreed in 2005 to scale up their aid to a minimum country target of 0.51% of GNI by 2010, or 0.56% overall. The overall EU target takes into account commitments of some DAC-EU members to increase or maintain aid levels beyond the minimum country target, as well as pledges by the non-DAC EU countries to participate in the scaling up of aid by moving to specified minimum aid levels.

Australia expects to continue increasing its ODA. Funding has been set aside in Australia's budget to allow Australia to increase its ODA to about AUD 4.3 billion

by 2010-11, equivalent to 0.36% ODA/GNI, and Australia intends to reach an ODA/GNI target of 0.5% by 2015-16; Canada estimates its ODA will be CAD 5.1 billion in 2010; Japan has indicated it will increase its ODA volume by USD 10 billion in aggregate over 2005-09, compared to its ODA levels in 2004; New Zealand has announced its commitment to reach 0.35% ODA/GNI in 2010-11; Norway is to attain a target of 1% ODA/GNI over 2006-09 and Switzerland's ODA is to reach 0.4% of GNI in 2010.

## Notes on DAC members

Notes on DAC members are presented in alphabetical order and include a box on each member reviewed in 2007 (Canada, Denmark, European Community, Finland and Spain). In the country charts, the data on net ODA (top left-hand corner) refer to 2006; other data are 2005-06 averages unless otherwise indicated.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174487245012>


## Australia

In 2006, Australia's total net ODA amounted to USD 2.12 billion, a rise of 22.5% in real terms over 2005, representing 0.30% of GNI. This large increase was primarily due to debt relief, notably to Iraq and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.

**Commitment to the MDGs.** Australia is committed to achieving progress towards the MDGs, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region. Australia works closely with partner governments to improve the enabling environment for country-led poverty reduction strategies and to build the growth, governance and stability essential to achieving the MDGs. Australia has committed to deliver increased and more effective aid and intends to reach an ODA/GNI target of 0.5% by 2015-16. This includes paying greater attention to gender equality and scaling up and better co-ordinating investments, particularly in health, education, environment and essential infrastructure.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** Australia has a leading role in the Asia Pacific region, and is committed to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Its Office of Development Effectiveness monitors the quality and impact of Australia's aid programme and produces an "Annual Review of Development Effectiveness". In 2007, a new quality reporting system was implemented to improve the collection and management of activity-level performance information. The results contribute to annual programme performance updates for country (and other) programmes, and state-of-the-sector reports.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** Gender equality is integral to Australian government aid policies and programmes and is one of three overarching principles of Australia's aid programme. A new policy "Gender equality in Australia's aid program – why and how" was launched in March 2007 and will be fully integrated into country and regional programmes. Country programmes will develop gender equality strategies at the project level, and emphasise results through strengthened monitoring and evaluation. The policy underlines the importance of supporting country-owned and -driven priorities on advancing gender equality; engaging both men and women to advance gender equality; strengthening accountability mechanisms to increase effectiveness; and collecting and analysing information to improve gender equality results.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173608162341>


## Austria

**In 2006, Austria's net ODA fell by 6.9% in real terms over 2005, to reach USD 1.5 billion. The ODA/GNI ratio also fell from 0.52% in 2005 to 0.47% in 2006.**

**Commitment to the MDGs.** Austria's commitment to the Millennium Declaration, the Monterrey Consensus on Financing for Development, and the 2005 World Summit remains unchanged. The Federal Act on Development Cooperation passed by parliament in 2002 (amended in 2003) established poverty reduction as one of three guiding principles of Austria's development co-operation. As Austria committed to reach 0.51% of GNI by 2010, its policy objective is to focus efforts on the poorest countries and regions.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** Austria has taken several steps to integrate the principles of the Paris Declaration into its development co-operation. Austria has developed an Action Plan based on the five principles of the Declaration. The latter has been disseminated to field offices and embassies, and these have been advised to act in accordance with it. Austria is increasing the share of its programme aid, such as general budget support or sector-wide approaches, and seeks to integrate its assistance into jointly co-ordinated programmes led by partner countries. Austria is also helping several of the new EU Member States set up their aid structures in line with the principles for effective aid.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** In 2006, a new policy paper "Policy on Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women in Development Cooperation" was released. This policy focuses on human rights and human security and also aims to enhance economic opportunities for women. All Austrian projects are screened against the policy, and resources for gender-relevant projects have been increased. As a result, close to 50% of projects and programmes now aim directly at improving women's conditions and opportunities. Austria also considers budget programming at country level an important method to meet the aims of international declarations and conventions regarding women's rights.




## Belgium

**In 2006, Belgium's ODA fell by 2.2% in real terms over 2005, to reach USD 1.98 billion. The ODA/GNI ratio fell from 0.53% in 2005 to 0.50% in 2006.**

**Commitment to the MDGs.** The MDGs, as translated into developing countries' development plans, constitute a key guide for Belgian co-operation policy. For Belgium, measures combating poverty prevent conflicts and are vital to promote sustainable human development, therefore a large proportion of its aid goes to least developed countries. Belgium also has numerous co-operation activities in a number of fragile states in Central Africa. As it recognises the importance of economic growth to combat poverty and the need to manage sufficient resources to be distributed in the most equitable manner possible, Belgian support for private actors in developing countries is an important aspect of its co-operation policy.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** Belgium subscribes to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. On 8 June 2007 it approved a plan for improving the effectiveness of Belgian aid, with specific measures proposed against each indicator of the Declaration. Belgium aligns its co-operation policy with the development strategies of its partner countries and encourages co-ordination and harmonisation among donors in each country. Belgium also aims to be more supportive of programme-based approaches and is expanding its budget support within sectors. Belgium continues to further the coherence of European policies in discussions on division of work, as proposed in the newly approved European Union code of conduct.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** Belgium is increasingly concerned about the coherence of development policies relating to international trade, migration, security and gender-related issues. Regarding the latter, Belgian co-operation focuses on: i) combating gender-based violence as well as gender disparity in primary education; and ii) increasing women's contributions to conflict resolution, sexual and reproductive health, and rights for girls and women.




## Canada

In 2006, Canada's ODA fell by 9.9% in real terms over 2005 to reach USD 3.68 billion, mainly due to a decline in debt relief and lower levels of humanitarian aid compared to the extraordinary response to the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2005. The ODA/GNI ratio fell from 0.34% in 2005 to 0.29% in 2006.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Canada's development assistance is focused on democratic governance, basic education (in particular primary education), health (including HIV/AIDS), private sector development, equality between men and women, and environment; the latter two are also cross-cutting themes. Activities in these sectors represent Canada's efforts to scale up aid in support of the MDGs. Commitments to basic social services placed Canada in the top list of DAC donors in 2005.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* Aid effectiveness is at the heart of the Canadian government's commitment to Canadian citizens and parliament. In its 2007 budget, the government stated its intention to concentrate aid in fewer countries, to strive to be among the five largest donors in core countries, to increase field presence and to inform the Canadian public and parliament about development results. The government is committed to internal reforms to strengthen financial management, accountability, audit and service delivery. This, along with annual funding increases of 8% to international assistance, has put Canada in a position to implement the aid effectiveness principles identified in the Paris Declaration. At the same time, programme-based approaches have increased from 5% of bilateral disbursements in 2001-02 to approximately 30% in 2006-07.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Equality between women and men is systematically and explicitly integrated across all policies, programmes and projects. CIDA supports programming that specifically targets gender equality and women's empowerment. This topic represents a significant part of CIDA's bilateral aid: funds are allocated primarily to social infrastructure and women in development, girls' education, and reproductive activities and health, including HIV/AIDS. CIDA's support to multilateral institutions and civil society organisations likewise integrates this internationally agreed agenda. In 2005, CIDA completed its Framework for Assessing Gender Equality Results, which is used as a tool to strengthen the agency's accountability for, and focus on, achieving results.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173657285485>

**Box 4.1. DAC peer review of Canada, 10 October 2007***Examiners: Belgium and Switzerland*

In 2006, Canada's net official development assistance amounted to USD 3.68 billion. Its official assistance fell from 0.34% of gross national income (GNI) in 2005 to 0.29% in 2006, ranking Canada ninth out of 22 DAC members in terms of aid volume and fifteenth in terms of aid as a share of GNI. Canada's ODA has risen in step with the DAC average since 2001 but is nevertheless significantly lower than the UN 0.7% ODA/GNI target.

The DAC commended Canada's renewed commitment to Africa; its promising approach towards fragile states such as Haiti and Afghanistan; initiatives to make Canada's aid more effective, focusing on accountability and explaining results to the Canadian public and parliament; and its strong commitment to good humanitarian donorship. The Committee encouraged the authorities i) to strengthen the mandate for development co-operation and for the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA); ii) to produce a policy for development co-operation focusing on reducing poverty; iii) to articulate an approach to policy coherence for development; iv) to continue to increase aid to meet Canada's commitments made at Monterrey; v) to focus its aid on fewer partner countries in order to generate stronger impact and voice; and vi) to galvanise the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The Committee argued that these steps were needed if Canada's performance was to match its ambition to become a leading player in the donor community.

The peer review also recommended that Canada:

- Draft a communication strategy that strengthens CIDA's outreach to the public and promotes a wider understanding of the efforts and outcomes of development co-operation and the reform agenda embodied in the Paris Declaration.
- Fulfil its aid objectives for 2010-11, draw up a timetable for achieving the UN 0.7% ODA/GNI target and scale up development aid to help achieve the MDGs.
- Provide appropriate incentives to strengthen Canada's commitment to implementing the Paris Declaration and commit firmly to working with other donors at field level.
- Review CIDA's organisation and adapt structures that enable increased management and financial authority to field directors/heads of aid.
- Streamline and simplify the monitoring and reporting system for results-based management as part of the performance management reforms.
- Be more strategic in allocating multilateral aid and harmonising initiatives for multilateral aid effectiveness with existing frameworks.
- Encourage CIDA to build on the International Development Research Centre's unique approach to capacity building in developing countries, and draw further on the Centre's research to enhance its policy formulation and evidence-based programming.
- Broaden its perspective on aid effectiveness in order to strengthen the focus on outcomes in partner countries.
- Integrate environmental sustainability more systematically into programming.
- Formalise Canada's humanitarian action framework to help ensure a consistent institutional response and to implement Canada's commitment to good humanitarian donorship.


## Denmark

In 2006, Denmark's net ODA amounted to USD 2.24 billion, representing a 3% increase in real terms over 2005. Its ODA/GNI ratio fell however, from 0.81% in 2005 to 0.80% in 2006.

**Commitment to the MDGs.** The overarching objectives of Danish development assistance are poverty reduction through sustainable development and achieving the MDGs. Danish bilateral assistance targets these goals through a geographic allocation of resources and a sector focus. The greatest share of Danish bilateral assistance goes to sub-Saharan Africa where poverty is most severe and widespread, and programmes are strongly focused on infrastructure and social services. In addition to maintaining its long-term assistance to social sectors, Denmark is strengthening its action on environmental issues, gender equality and combating HIV/AIDS.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** Denmark is highly committed to the aid effectiveness agenda. Denmark has a decentralised aid administration conducive to fostering recipient country ownership and to supporting partnership around sector programmes at the country level. Results of recent efforts include: i) a significant reduction in the provision of technical assistance along with a renewed approach to capacity development; ii) a shift away from projects to long-term sector programmes; iii) significant improvements in performance measurement and avoiding input targets; iv) active engagement in donor co-ordination and joint approaches; and v) considerable progress on aid untying.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** The Danish government is strongly committed to gender equality and women's rights and empowerment. A matrix-based institutional arrangement has been established to further facilitate, systematise and document Danish efforts. Skills development is being improved by means of compulsory training and the development of a new toolbox, and monitoring systems have been reinforced. Other important issues are the economic empowerment of women, and the linkages between the aid effectiveness agenda and gender, as well as aid effectiveness and women, peace and security.



**Box 4.2. DAC peer review of Denmark, 8 June 2007***Examiners: Greece and the Netherlands*

The key strengths of Denmark's development co-operation system are its legal basis, strategic framework, institutional system and emphasis on quality assurance. These assets derive from long-standing support for development assistance. In 2003, the government reaffirmed this support and backed it up with real improvements to the system and a special emphasis on quality assurance. Denmark's bilateral programme is strategically shaped around 16 "programme countries", most of which are least developed countries. The DAC noted in particular that the combination of a decentralised, but highly integrated, system within Ministry of Foreign Affairs headquarters and in the field has proved effective.

The review suggested that Denmark should share its approaches with the donor community on the following issues: gender equality and environmental sustainability, and policy guidance for capacity development in partner countries. It also made several recommendations to help Denmark address the important challenges of the near future. These include: i) continuing efforts to meet the commitments of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness; and ii) the challenge of balancing the short-term need to demonstrate results in order to reinforce public and political support with the need to be innovative, take risks and engage in difficult environments.

Other main findings and recommendations from the peer review included:

- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was invited to continue its efforts to raise public understanding of, and support for, approaches to aid that are in line with the aid effectiveness agenda.
- The DAC encouraged Denmark to build on its existing inter-governmental co-ordination committees to promote policy coherence in areas that go beyond the foreign affairs mandate. It could also make better use of the analytical capacity in its system to inform high-level discussions of development-related issues.
- In terms of aid management, the DAC encouraged the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to evaluate its decentralisation exercise in order to provide useful input to the DAC aid management experience and allow donors to improve on current practices. Denmark needs to consider how to maintain the right level of human resources with the right skills, including its locally recruited staff.
- In the light of the aid effectiveness agenda, the DAC suggested that Denmark pursue the trend towards a reinforced country strategy process that supports joint assistance strategies and that is conducive to mutual accountability.
- While recognising the substantial progress made on aid untying, the DAC asked Denmark to consider other instruments to get both development and public support benefits currently achieved through its tied Mixed Credits Programme.
- The DAC commended Denmark's work in fragile states and the way it links relief to rehabilitation and development. Based on this, Denmark was encouraged to develop a coherent strategic framework for engagement in fragile states and to build on its experience by updating its 2002 humanitarian policy statement in light of progress with the Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative.

Denmark is one of the DAC members which has consistently exceeded the United Nations' 0.7% ODA/GNI target (gross national income allocated to official development assistance). In 2005, it devoted USD 2.11 billion to official assistance, accounting for 0.81% of its gross national income. The DAC commended Denmark's decision to maintain ODA at a minimum of 0.8% of GNI, and encouraged it to continue this policy.


## European Community

In 2006, net ODA by the EC amounted to USD 10.24 billion, an increase of 6.2% in real terms over 2005.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* The overarching objectives of the 2005 European Consensus for Development are poverty reduction and the pursuit of the MDGs. Delivering more and better aid is at the heart of the Commission's development policy. The 10th European Development Fund programme cycle for 2008-13 includes large "incentive amounts" linked to governance and general or sectoral budget support, representing an increase of over 40% of programmed aid in ACP states. Policy coherence for development is being sought in 12 policy areas that can potentially contribute to the MDGs, and the first biennial report on EU policy coherence for development is being prepared.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* The Community aims to ensure that both the Commission and Member States implement the Paris Declaration and improve the quality of their aid programmes. The Communication "EU Aid: Delivering more, better and faster" includes a calendar of aid effectiveness outputs, both for the Community and the Member States. These initiatives are being implemented by the Commission as a donor and by the EU Member States. The best example is the recent code of conduct on division of labour adopted by the Council. The Commission also encourages the EU Member States to respect their ODA targets and, to this end, published the fifth annual report on EU progress on 4 April 2007.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Support has been provided to delegations and geographical desks to mainstream gender equality into the 10th EDF country and regional strategy programmes. Furthermore, the EC UN Partnership on Gender Equality for Development and Peace aims to ensure the inclusion of the gender dimension in aid programmes supported by the EC in 12 pilot countries. Gender commitments are also included in the European Consensus, and in May 2007 the Council adopted a Communication on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Cooperation.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174548407146>

**Box 4.3. DAC peer review of the European Community, 26 June 2007***Examiners: Australia and the United States*

The European Commission, on behalf of the European Community, disbursed some USD 10 billion in official development assistance (ODA) in 2006, making it the sixth largest DAC donor. The European Commission also plays a “federating” role for the institutions of the 27 Member States of the European Union, which together account for more than half of all ODA.

European development co-operation has evolved in parallel with Member States’ construction of a collective vision for Europe, its treaties, conventions and agreements. Current development policy draws its shape and direction from this ever-evolving historical mosaic of action, ranging from assistance to Member States’ former colonies to stabilisation of the European “neighbourhood”. The Community now seeks to move its development programme and system beyond the lingering influences of history, towards a more proactive and strategic European vision for development co-operation. Increasingly, the European Union views development action as an instrument of foreign policy and this means that European development institutions now work in a more complex and political environment. In 2005, European development policy was updated in the European Consensus on Development, which provides a common vision for the Community and Member States alike. It highlights the Commission’s dual development role by clarifying its added value in relation to the Member States (its federating role) and by seeking improvements in its role as a donor.

The DAC commended both the role of the Commission in reshaping its development co-operation and the progress it has made since the 2002 peer review in delivering Community assistance. Because of the risk that the ambitious, multiple objectives of the Consensus, including broader political ones, could dilute the focus on development and undermine longer-term strategic priorities, the Commission was encouraged to maintain the integrity of the development agenda. It should emphasise the effective implementation of priority policies, including a clear focus on results.

Other main findings and recommendations from the peer review included:

- The Commission and Member States were urged to use recent Council conclusions on division of labour to further clarify their respective operational roles and ensure the strategic use of comparative advantages to manage and deliver European development co-operation in country as well as across countries and sectors. The DAC recognised the Commission’s special role in promoting progress towards agreed targets for scaling up ODA and in implementing Paris Declaration aid effectiveness objectives.
- Member States and parliament were encouraged to streamline the different levels of oversight they exercise over development operations to enable the Commission to further improve its effectiveness and performance. Oversight should be strategic and should not attempt to micromanage Commission operations.
- The Commission and Member States were asked to use upcoming evaluations to develop an improved work programme for policy coherence for development. This should result in a better allocation of resources, facilitate monitoring of progress and strengthen synergies among competing policies. The Commission and Member States should also examine ways to bring policy coherence issues effectively to the decision-making level.
- The Commission was encouraged to continue building on past successes. It should further work to simplify procedures, decentralise authority, build field delegation capacity, continue to promote policies of untied aid and intensify consultations with partners from civil society.


## Finland

In 2006, Finland's ODA fell by 9.0% in real terms over 2005 to USD 834 million, representing 0.40% of its GNI compared to 0.46% in 2005.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* According to Finland's new government programme (2007), the most important objective of international development policy is to reach the UN Millennium Development Goals. The government has reconfirmed its commitment to improve policy coherence for development in various policy sectors. Finland will increase its emphasis on environment and climate issues, crisis prevention and support for peace processes.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* Complementarity and division of labour were two of the issues on Finland's European Union Presidency agenda in 2006. In 2007, Finland contributed actively to the formulation and adoption of the European Union code of conduct on these topics. The results of the Paris Declaration baseline survey were used to improve the management practices of Finland's development co-operation, and Finland participates in the independent evaluation of the implementation of the Declaration. The 2007 government programme places emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness in development co-operation, on division of labour between various donors and on recipient countries' ownership.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Finland promotes gender equality and women's empowerment through the Strategy and Action Plan for Promoting Gender Equality in Finland's Policy for Developing Countries 2003-07. In addition, gender equality is one of the cross-cutting themes in Finnish development policy. In order to integrate gender equality effectively into the aid effectiveness modalities, in May 2007 Finland organised an international workshop on gender in the context of the aid effectiveness agenda. In order to promote gender issues in conflict situations, Finland is in the process of preparing a national action plan to implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173740845035>

**Box 4.4. DAC peer review of Finland, 27 November 2007***Examiners: Germany and Norway*

In its peer review, the DAC found Finland to be a committed development co-operation actor that works within the EU and with other like-minded groups, and generally adheres to international best practice. The Committee was pleased to observe that the new development policy (2007) maintains the overarching goal of poverty reduction and commitment to the MDGs, while also prioritising sustainable, economic, social and ecological development. Since the peer review in 2003, Finland has taken steps to improve its aid; it is a keen proponent of policy coherence for development, and is committed to making its aid more effective through supporting long-term planning, country ownership, alignment, harmonisation, division of labour and joint donor efforts.

The Committee also noted some challenges for Finland, including making sure progress is made on its commitment to allocate 0.7% ODA/GNI by 2015, that its policy coherence for development and aid effectiveness policies bring real results, and that the Ministry for Foreign Affairs' development activities are properly resourced and efficiently organised.

The main findings and recommendations from the peer review included:

- The DAC welcomed Finland's renewed commitment in the new development policy to reach the EU agreed targets of 0.51% by 2010 and 0.7% ODA/GNI by 2015. The Committee urged that the commitment be kept even if economic growth is greater than predicted, and also proposed that Finland would benefit from a plan for reaching the target in 2015.
- Despite the good intention of focusing its aid by successfully reducing the number of its long-term partners from 11 to 8, other pressures have meant that in reality aid has not been as geographically concentrated as expected. The Committee therefore suggested that Finland should retain its earlier target of allocating 60% of bilateral funding to long-term partners, and should monitor the share of bilateral country and regional co-operation in order to avoid fragmentation.
- Finland was seen to have run a successful EU Presidency, and the Committee commended it for using the EU to take forward certain policy priorities such as the work on the EU Code of Conduct on the Division of Labour and encouraged it to remain at the forefront of practical implementation of the code. As a modest-sized donor, Finland was advised to continue to lean towards the EU and Nordic Plus groups and support joint initiatives (such as shared analysis and joint ventures) in order to reduce duplication of activities and transaction costs across donors.
- Whilst the Committee recognised that a commitment to policy coherence for development has been made in the new development policy, it stated that this needs to be translated into clear mandates for bodies dealing with policy co-ordination between ministries. The Committee also noted that structures for policy coherence have been put in place, but urged Finland to ensure that these structures help bring real improvements.
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has 12 departments, 9 of which handle some aid. The MFA was encouraged to ensure that the development co-operation structure provides clear lines of accountability, reduces high transaction costs and clarifies the policy and implementation functions among, and within, departments. Finland was also advised to delegate more decision making for project approval and results reporting to embassies and to build upon, and simplify, earlier efforts to develop results-based management systems.
- The newly released development policy includes a commitment to produce, and implement, a multi-annual public awareness strategy, and the DAC encouraged the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to fulfil this objective.

Finland disbursed USD 834 million in official development assistance in 2006, making it the eleventh largest aid donor amongst OECD Development Assistance Committee countries.


## France

**In 2006, net ODA disbursements by France rose by 2.9% in real terms over 2005 to reach USD 10.6 billion. Its ODA/GNI ratio remained unchanged at 0.47%.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* France has developed sectoral strategies to enhance its role in achieving the MDGs. French aid goes primarily to Africa, and almost one-third of grants to poor countries are allocated to education and health. France's efforts are an integral part of measures to protect global public goods (GPGs), especially combating transmittable and emerging diseases, combating climate change and preserving biodiversity. France contributed to the launch of the International Finance Facility for Immunisation (IFFIm) and has introduced a solidarity tax on airplane tickets in order to provide additional funding for health-oriented programmes. This aid complements France's commitments in the framework of the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. In addition, the updated strategy on health confirms France's engagement on the three health MDGs and its support for national health systems.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* An action plan for implementing the commitments embodied in the Paris Declaration was ratified in December 2006. This plan also includes two recommendations: the predictability, complementarity and division of labour between donors, and the decentralisation of human and financial resources. Partnership framework documents constitute the basis for dialogue between all players in French development co-operation and the countries in the priority solidarity zone, the main aim being to enhance the latter's ownership of development policies. France's strategy for democratic governance (December 2006) also highlights the notion of ownership.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* In accordance with the international community's priorities, France has confirmed its intention to make women's rights and gender issues an explicit component of its international co-operation and development programmes. Instructions stipulate that gender issues must be systematically included in partnership framework documents. A "Gender and Development" platform was set up in October 2006; its first output was a strategic orientation document.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173744788538>


## Germany

**Germany's ODA amounted to USD 10.44 billion in 2006, a rise of 1.7% in real terms over 2005. Its ODA/GNI ratio remained unchanged at 0.36%.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Germany's ambition to achieve the Millennium Declaration goals is set out in Germany's Programme of Action 2015. Its main objectives are to reduce poverty, build peace, promote democracy and equitable forms of globalisation and protect the environment. Germany also aims to improve general international conditions and national structures, which links with the goal of sustainable development, including economic efficiency, social justice, ecological sustainability and political stability.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* In 2006, Germany adopted a reform agenda to enhance effectiveness in its development co-operation ministry. In 2005, BMZ adopted an action plan to implement the Paris Declaration which translates the 12 Declaration indicators into specific, time-bound actions. BMZ further disseminated operational guidance to headquarter staff, embassies and implementation agencies, and revised its guidelines on using a programme-based approach and other effectiveness issues. To promote better division of labour, aid portfolios were limited to one priority area in small partner countries and to a maximum of three in larger ones. The number of partner countries is being reduced from 80 to 60. Germany favours country-led poverty reduction strategies as a basis for joint programming of donor assistance; it also uses multi-year commitments and participates in joint financing with other donors.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Germany has long embraced concepts and political directives aimed at gender equality. BMZ priority themes in this area include economic and political empowerment of women, the fight against gender-based violence, the use of gender-sensitive modalities and the promotion of gender-responsive solutions to HIV/AIDS. The ministry recognises that implementing gender policies and strategies remains a challenge and is seeking to better mainstream these policies into its bilateral and multilateral portfolios, including assigning greater resources to this task.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173752435577>


## Greece

**Net ODA by Greece rose by 5.9% in real terms over 2005, amounting to USD 424 million in 2006. Its ODA/GNI ratio remained unchanged at 0.17%.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Greece fully subscribes to the MDGs and has adopted the following objectives in its development co-operation policy: i) help victims in emergency situations; ii) contribute to poverty alleviation; iii) ensure sustainable development; iv) empower the disadvantaged; v) support human rights, the rule of law and democracy; and vi) foster understanding between cultures. Greece is about to adopt its third Five-Year Development Cooperation Plan (2007-11). On this basis, it will undertake a concerted effort for an effective development co-operation strategy that responds to its partners' needs and reflects its comparative advantages.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* Greece is continuing work to implement the Paris Declaration's commitments and to fulfil the Hellenic Aid Action Plan for Coordination and Harmonization. In this regard, Greece attaches particular importance to co-operation with other donors, and is preparing country strategy papers which will cover 2008-11, in consultation with their respective governments and civil society. Eight of its priority countries are concerned: Armenia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Jordan, Moldova, Syria and Ukraine. This will result in a greater concentration of aid, which is conducive to aid effectiveness. In the case of Sri Lanka and Ethiopia, Greece has embarked on a joint development co-operation strategy with other donors.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Among Hellenic Aid's key priorities for action are gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability, although these cross-cutting issues need to be further mainstreamed into the Greek aid programme. Greece has been particularly active in the fight against human trafficking. Through its national action plan, it has strengthened its work in a variety of ways including legislative reforms, enhanced co-operation among law enforcement agencies, prosecution and judiciary, extensive protection of victims, and tracing smuggling routes and forms of exploitation of victims. Increased co-operation with countries of origin, transit and destination has given encouraging results.




## Ireland

In 2006, net ODA by Ireland was USD 1 billion, a 36.9% increase in real terms over 2005. This was mainly due to an increase in bilateral aid as well as large multilateral contributions. Its ODA/GNI ratio rose from 0.42% in 2005 to 0.54% in 2006.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Ireland published its first White Paper on Irish Aid in 2006. This states that the MDGs will guide Ireland's development co-operation policy. With its increase in aid, Ireland is firmly on course to reach the UN target of 0.7% by 2012.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* The White Paper stresses the importance of aid effectiveness. The commitments and indicators agreed in the Paris Declaration are being used as a practical guide to improve the quality of Ireland's aid programme. Ireland participated in the 2006 baseline survey on monitoring the Declaration and worked with the Nordic+ donors and the European Union to promote a more harmonised response at country level. Ireland's country strategies, developed in 2006 in Tanzania and Uganda, are linked to the joint assistance strategies which support a government-led poverty reduction strategy in those countries. The multi-annual programme scheme, which facilitates a more programmatic relationship with NGOs, was renewed in 2006. This means predictable funding for an agreed programme of work. Irish Aid is also developing multi-annual framework agreements with all of its partners, including UN funds and programmes.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Gender equality is a priority issue for Ireland and cuts across and informs all Irish Aid's work. Irish Aid has adopted a two-pronged approach to achieving gender equality: i) mainstreaming; and ii) specific interventions to address inequalities and empower women. Irish Aid has also prioritised addressing gender-based violence (GBV) as a specific manifestation of inequality and human rights abuse. Irish Aid has developed a mainstreaming strategy and is carrying out training on mainstreaming for staff at HQ and in country. Irish Aid supports national women's defence groups and women's organisations in programme countries and contributes to civil society organisations. Core funding is also provided for UN agencies working on empowering women.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173802585276>


## Italy

Italy's net ODA was USD 3.64 billion in 2006, a fall of 30.6% in real terms over 2005, mainly due to the timing of its contributions to international organisations. The ODA/GNI ratio also fell from 0.29% in 2005 to 0.20% in 2006.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Since the adoption of its official guidelines in 1999, poverty reduction has been a principal objective of Italian development co-operation. However, Italy has yet to establish a coherent approach to mainstreaming this goal. A proposal to reform the structure of development co-operation and focus commitments on the MDGs is currently being examined by the Italian parliament.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* Italy played an important role as facilitator of the 2003 Forum on Harmonisation in Rome and is committed to the 2005 Paris Declaration agenda. It supports the principle of recipient ownership and attempts to align its programmes with local strategies when possible. Its ability to carry out its commitments, however, is hampered by a lack of staff, organisational support and operational flexibility. The 2004 peer review encouraged Italy to build upon its efforts to streamline administration in order to address the parallel need for a clear strategy on harmonisation. Italy aims to reinforce the quality of evaluation feedback, including improved evaluation planning and operational guidance.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* The 2007 guidelines for Italian development co-operation maintain gender equality and women's empowerment as a priority. The Directorate-General for Development Co-operation intends to increase its commitment to the MDGs on gender through new forms of North-South partnerships that will involve institutions and civil society. Specific action in favour of gender equality in 2007 included: i) a major seminar on the empowerment of women in West Africa and a new Italian programme on this topic; ii) a workshop on implementing the UN resolution concerning the participation of women in peace building and post-conflict reconstruction in Somalia; iii) specific programmes for the empowerment of women in Afghanistan, Lebanon and Palestine.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173813830257>


## Japan

**In 2006, net ODA by Japan was USD 11.19 billion, a fall of 9.1% in real terms over 2005. The ODA/GNI ratio fell from 0.28% in 2005 to 0.25% in 2006.**

**Commitment to the MDGs.** Japan actively contributes to achieving the MDGs through the use of its bilateral and multilateral funds from a “pro-poor growth” and “human security” perspective. At the 2005 Gleneagles summit it announced its intent to increase its ODA volume by USD 10 billion in aggregate by the end of 2009. At the Asian-African Summit earlier that year it announced that it would double its ODA to Africa in three years. In 2005, Japan committed USD 5 billion to be spent on its Health and Development Initiative by March 2010.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** To fulfil its commitment to the Paris Declaration, Japan launched an action plan which stressed the importance of: i) further aligning Japan’s ODA with partner country national development strategies; ii) capacity development; iii) public financial management; iv) untying; v) rationalising aid procedures; vi) managing for development results; and vii) enhancing the planning and implementation framework of Japanese ODA. The Japanese government and implementing agencies are in the process of major organisational reforms so as to strengthen the strategic focus and effectiveness of their ODA.

**Advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment.** Japan supports a series of international commitments that promote women’s empowerment and gender equality. In 2005, it launched the Initiative on Gender and Development, which seeks to enhance gender mainstreaming across its aid efforts. It is also working to revise JICA’s guidelines and introduce gender-responsive project formulation, monitoring and evaluation. Current priority issues include gender and poverty reduction, gender and human security, gender and infrastructure and human trafficking in the Greater Mekong area.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173877246773>


## Luxembourg

**In 2006, net ODA by Luxembourg rose by 4.8% in real terms over 2005, to reach USD 291 million. This represented an increase in the ODA/GNI ratio from 0.86% in 2005 to 0.89% in 2006.**

**Commitment to the MDGs.** Luxembourg has aligned its development co-operation efforts with the MDGs since 2000. Scaling up its aid is but one aspect of these efforts. Luxembourg's objective is to align its bilateral aid with partner countries' national poverty reduction strategies at the planning stage. Luxembourg's programming documents for bilateral aid are closely co-ordinated with partner countries and designed to focus on implementing the MDGs. Aid to partner countries channelled through multilateral agencies follows the same rule.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** Luxembourg's aid has increased significantly over the last few years and its development co-operation emphasises the quality of aid irrespective of the channel. Luxembourg is involved in the European Community's initiative to improve donor co-ordination and the division of labour. At the same time, it has implemented a number of recommendations from past DAC peer reviews including decentralising aid to field offices and improving *ex ante* quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation. The Development Co-operation Directorate is also implementing an external audit's recommendations to make aid management more effective. Finally, Luxembourg is participating in the joint evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration from which it expects further guidance for carrying out its activities in the field.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** This topic is one of the priorities of Luxembourg's development co-operation. The government integrates women's empowerment in its bilateral and multilateral activities and through NGOs. Fourteen national NGOs are currently implementing 26 projects in 17 different countries; women's empowerment is the main objective. The gender equality dimension is taken into account mainly in health and educational programmes, and Lux-Development is required to evaluate the impact of its interventions from a gender equality perspective. Most efforts in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment are carried out by UNFPA, UNICEF and WHO, and focus on water and sanitation in addition to health and education.




## Netherlands

**In 2006, net ODA from the Netherlands amounted to USD 5.45 billion, a rise of 4.2% in real terms over 2005. However, the ODA/GNI ratio fell from 0.82% in 2005 to 0.81% in 2006.**

**Commitment to the MDGs.** Project 2015 is an initiative launched by the government to improve the Dutch contribution to achieve the MDGs. In June 2007, the ministries' programmes for the coming years were submitted to parliament. The 2007 Policy Letter "Working together in Development" is the basis for strengthening the policy focus on fragile states, economic growth and distribution, women's rights and sexual and reproductive health and sustainability, climate and energy.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** The Paris Declaration is the guiding principle for the Netherlands' relationships with its partner countries, and embassies actively engage in aid effectiveness good practice such as the division of labour. Aid continues to be focused on a limited number of partner countries and sectors. Sector-wide approaches stress the need for ownership by partner countries and are used to identify areas where national capacity can be strengthened. Budget support and other programmatic aid is preferred whenever there is sufficiently effective local capacity. The Netherlands has started to implement a planning, monitoring and evaluation system that supports feedback for learning and decision making at all administrative levels.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** Political reform is necessary for sustainable, equitable development, especially to attain MDG 3. Gender equality is a key priority of the new policy and the document "From good intentions to concrete steps" embodies the goals of the Ministry's Centre of Gender Expertise on equal rights and equal opportunities for girls and women. All departments and embassies should formulate goals and demonstrate specific results to illustrate their performance on gender equality and rights.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174112635465>


## New Zealand

In real terms there was practically no change in net ODA from New Zealand (+0.5%), which amounted to USD 259 million in 2006, representing 0.27% of GNI.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Support for achieving the MDGs is reflected in all key NZAID policy papers and strategies. In 2007, the government announced the single largest increase ever in the aid budget, with the ODA/GNI ratio due to reach 0.35% by 2010/11. Support is increasing to countries in the Pacific region, especially in Melanesia which faces the greatest MDG challenges, and in a number of South-East Asian countries. Additional assistance is also going to NGOs, multilateral agencies, and in response to humanitarian situations. Special attention is given to the rights of the poor and to helping communities fulfil basic needs and reduce their vulnerability to poverty.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* The key focus of NZAID's five-year strategic plan is on improving aid effectiveness. Efforts within NZAID include reviewing and simplifying operational procedures, internal capacity building, and a much-increased accent on management for development results. Implementing the Paris Declaration is a priority for all NZAID's programmes, including engagement with the UN reform process and multilateral agencies. NZAID participates in the DAC-led evaluation of the implementation of the Declaration, contributes to several sector-wide approaches, and has agreed a delegated co-operation arrangement in one country with Australia.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* In April 2007, NZAID published an updated policy for achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women. The policy seeks to: i) enhance capacity of the poor, particularly women and girls, to realise their capabilities and fulfil their potential; ii) reduce gender disparities in access to, control of and benefit from resources, opportunities and services – economic, social, cultural and political; and iii) reduce violence and conflict and protect human rights, so that all people, particularly women and girls, can live free of fear and with dignity. To support the policy, NZAID is developing an updated gender mainstreaming action plan.




## Norway

In 2006, Norway's net ODA was USD 2.95 billion, a fall of 1.9% in real terms over 2005. This represented 0.89% of GNI, compared to 0.94% in 2005.

**Commitment to the MDGs.** Norway actively participates in international fora to promote awareness of the MDGs, to review progress made and to identify ways to overcome obstacles to their achievement. In 2005, 39% of Norwegian bilateral aid was allocated to least developed countries. Norway supports country-led poverty reduction strategies, with a strong focus on achieving the MDGs. Special emphasis has been placed on the follow-up of MDGs 4 and 5. The Norwegian government actively promotes the reform One UN, as well as the creation of a new, consolidated and strengthened UN gender entity.

**Aid effectiveness agenda.** Norway participates in international aid effectiveness fora. The Norwegian aid administration emphasises national ownership, results and improved capacity to measure the impact of aid interventions. Norway actively supports division of labour within locally identified priorities. Priority areas for Norway are environment and climate change, energy, women and gender equality, peace building and reconciliation and humanitarian assistance. Within the Nordic+ group, it has led discussions on new aid modalities for support to civil society. Norway continues to play an active part in the implementation of new aid modalities such as delegated co-operation and silent partnership.

**Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.** The Norwegian government has listed women and gender equality among the top five priorities for its international development work. A government action plan for the implementation of UN Security Council resolution 1325 on women, peace and development was launched in 2006. In addition, the Action Plan on Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Co-operation 2007–09 was launched in 2007. A government report on this subject will be presented to the Norwegian parliament by the end of 2007. In order to ensure necessary follow-up and implementation of the action plans, a budget line was opened for gender in the development budget for 2007.




## Portugal

**Net ODA by Portugal was USD 396 million in 2006, a rise of 2% in real terms over 2005. The ODA/GNI ratio was unchanged at 0.21%.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Both the strategic document “Uma Visão Estratégica para a Cooperação Portuguesa” and the Governmental Programme 2005-09 fully endorse the MDGs. Poverty reduction is one of the major objectives of Portuguese co-operation. Portugal concentrates on six Portuguese-speaking countries (5 from Africa and 1 from South-East Asia) and focuses on the sectors that are relevant to achieving the MDGs: education, health, basic infrastructure and capacity/institutional building. All co-operation programmes and projects have to be MDG-oriented, each country programme must indicate how it contributes to the MDGs and a database linking aid to MDGs was put in place to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the international goals.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* Portugal’s Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness has been disseminated to all development staff. Portuguese country programmes are harmonised with the European Common Framework for Country Strategy Papers and aligned with national poverty reduction strategies or similar frameworks. The proportion of aid being channelled through national budgets and sectors has increased. Since Portuguese aid is concentrated in fragile states, specific activities are undertaken to help reform national systems and thus improve partner countries’ capacity to manage their development. The recent EU Code of Conduct on Complementarity and Division of Labour was also adopted and disseminated.

*Advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment.* Portuguese co-operation recognises that policies which take into account gender equality tend to have multiplier effects for society as a whole, as well as increasing linkages between poverty reduction and development. In this respect, Portuguese development co-operation contributes to the goals of The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and to the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action.




## Spain

**Net ODA rose by 20.7% in real terms in 2006, amounting to USD 3.81 billion. This increase was due to large contributions to the UN and other multilateral agencies as well as an increase in disbursements by the Spanish Co-operation Agency (AECI). The ODA/GNI ratio rose from 0.27% in 2005 to 0.32% in 2006.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Spain pursues its goals for development co-operation within the international framework of the MDGs. As stated in the Master Plan for International Co-operation (2005-08), the ultimate objective of Spanish development co-operation is to reduce poverty, which Spain recognises as a multi-dimensional challenge. Spain has also sharpened the poverty focus of its aid, notably by targeting aid to middle-income countries to the poorest and most underprivileged parts of society. Spain is in a good position to reach 0.5% of GNI in 2008 and 0.7% in 2012, three years before the target set by the European Union, thanks to a strong national commitment to development co-operation.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* Spain has adopted a holistic perspective to implementing the Paris Declaration, linking it to a comprehensive reform process of its aid system. Recent annual development co-operation plans have established strategic priorities for advancing the implementation of the Declaration. The Spanish government is working to identify the changes implied by the aid effectiveness agenda at the strategic and operational level, focusing in particular on results-based management and mutual accountability. The aid effectiveness principles will also be integrated into the legal status of the Spanish aid agency, whose organisational reform will be completed by end-2007.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* Gender equality is both a cross-cutting priority and a priority sector for Spanish aid. As a consequence, all aid interventions need to be designed to have a positive impact on gender objectives, reflecting an integral approach to development. Gender is being mainstreamed into development interventions through guidance on priority lines of action, instruments, and feedback channels with other sectors so as to facilitate implementation at the field level. The policy approach has also shifted in recent years from a traditional focus on women in development to a focus on gender in development. It considers that an unequal distribution of power and assets are factors of inequality.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174217624887>

### Box 4.5. DAC peer review of Spain, 15 November 2007

*Examiners: Austria and France*

Spain is in the process of increasing its aid programme significantly as the country aspires to reach an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.7% by 2012, three years ahead of the EU target date of 2015. From 2005 to 2006, Spanish aid grew from USD 3 018 million to USD 3 643 million (constant 2005 USD), an increase of 20.7%. For 2007 and 2008, the budget projections foresee additions of more than USD 1.5 billion and USD 1.3 billion respectively at 2006 exchange rates, to reach the intermediary target of an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.5% in 2008, up from 0.27% in 2005.

The ambitious plans for increasing aid, together with a commitment to enhance the quality and impact of assistance, have been driving a comprehensive reform process of Spanish development co-operation. The Master Plan for 2005-08, which is based on an extensive consultation process, sets out a significantly improved policy framework for Spain's assistance programme. With strong public and cross-party political support, the government is now regarding development policy as a state policy that commits all development stakeholders to a common approach and is able to withstand political change – which is particularly important given the substantial share of aid provided by Spain's autonomous regions and local administrations.

The DAC commended Spain for the impressive progress it has made in its aid programme, suggesting that in building on its achievements, it pay particular attention to the following areas for advancing with its reform efforts:

- Spain should continue its efforts to enhance overall co-ordination and coherence in order to be able to implement its strategic vision for aid. All development co-operation actors should operate within the strategic policy framework created by the Master Plan, country strategies and sector strategies. At the field level, Spain would benefit from better co-ordination among its co-operation actors and instruments during the planning, implementation and evaluation of their work.
- As Spain continues to increase its aid rapidly, it should back up its quantitative targets with an operational strategy, taking account of its own goals for stronger concentration of aid as well as assistance to least developed countries. This strategy should cover assistance from all Spanish development actors and should also aim for greater predictability for its development partners.
- Spain is aware that it needs to enhance its capacity to deliver bilateral assistance, and is addressing this by reforming the Spanish development co-operation agency (AECI). The DAC suggested that the reform establish clear lines of decision making and that Spain consider increased delegation of authority to country offices. Spain will also need to improve its human resource system and include incentives for field experience.
- Given Spain's strong comparative advantage in Latin America, and its ambition to scale up aid in sub-Saharan Africa, it has good opportunities for partnering with other donors. Spain could take a stronger leadership role among donors in Latin America, while in sub-Saharan Africa it could make good use of other donors' existing capacities. Spain should also aim to capitalise on its proven capacity and experience of engaging with various stakeholders, and the specific value added by decentralised actors working with government at the regional or local levels.

Spain's development co-operation has made a quantitative and qualitative leap since the last peer review in 2002. Though its ambitious objectives mean that Spain will have to sustain its significant efforts and complete the reform process, the country seems well placed to achieve its goals for development co-operation.


## Sweden

**Net ODA disbursements by Sweden rose by 14.7% in real terms over 2005 to reach USD 3.96 billion. This increase was due to a general scaling up of Sweden's aid as well as debt relief. The ODA/GNI ratio rose from 0.94% in 2005 to 1.02% in 2006.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* Sweden's Policy for Global Development made the MDGs a specific objective of national policy. The recent report "Together towards 2015" lists the actions already taken in favour of the MDGs, including the launch of a major awareness campaign. Sweden supports international donor reporting on the MDGs and is one of the few industrialised countries to fulfil its responsibilities to do so. MDG 8 reporting will include the results of Sweden's development co-operation efforts, as well as periodic collaborative assessments of the impact of aid on poverty.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* The Policy for Global Development makes clear commitments to harmonisation and alignment and provides the political rationale for this approach. In 2005, the Paris Declaration was integrated into Sweden's guidelines for co-operation strategy, which stress the need for flexible implementation procedures. Sweden has had a long-standing commitment to the principles of ownership and policy coherence to promote aid effectiveness. It supports the increased use of programme-based approaches and funding for capacity building. Together with the Nordic+ group, it has developed a common action plan for harmonisation, division of labour and complementarity. Sweden plays a lead role in promoting harmonisation and alignment in the DAC, the European Union and other multilateral fora. In 2007, Sweden narrowed down the number of partner countries which receive bilateral aid from 70 to 33.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* The Policy for Global Development identifies gender equality as one of eight central components of development policy. Activities are carried out both by Sida and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Current priorities include women's economic empowerment, sexual and reproductive health and rights, gender-based violence, the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, women's political participation and the promotion of gender equality across bilateral and multilateral development initiatives, including those of civil society.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174254136832>


## Switzerland

**Net ODA by Switzerland fell in 2006 by 7.4% in real terms over 2005, and amounted to USD 1.65 billion. This fall was due to a lower level of debt relief grants provided in comparison to 2005. The ODA/GNI ratio fell from 0.44% in 2005 to 0.39% in 2006.**

*Commitment to the MDGs.* In the 2006 “Foreign Policy Report” the MDGs were one of the three overarching goals of Swiss development co-operation, along with maintaining human security and contributing to an inclusive globalisation process that provides a framework for development. In 2006, Switzerland contributed CHF 21 million toward meeting MDG 1 and CHF 33 million toward meeting MDG 8, through multilateral development agencies. Switzerland considers the MDGs to be the universal framework for development.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* For Switzerland, more effective aid contributes to the MDGs and the Swiss government commits fully to implementing the Paris Declaration. The government has conducted its first internal review of how it is implementing the Paris agenda and has identified measures and action that have been taken and what remains to be done. A work plan is being drafted to prepare for the 2008 High Level Forum in Ghana. To promote harmonisation, Switzerland has been involved in joint donor programmes and diagnostic tools such as the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability Programme, in addition to adapting internal rules and procedures and further concentrating its assistance on its priority countries.

*Advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment.* In 2006, Switzerland confirmed gender equality as a cross-cutting theme in Swiss development co-operation. The same year the government launched a pilot project on gender-responsive budgeting, and trained staff at headquarters as well as NGOs on how to use a gender mainstreaming checklist to assess project documents. It also addressed human trafficking from a women’s empowerment perspective in line with the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. Switzerland also intensified support to its field offices to institutionalise gender mainstreaming and elaborated policies for the workplace on this topic. An SDC report on capitalising on gender mainstreaming is available.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174278342834>


## United Kingdom

In 2006, net ODA by the United Kingdom rose by 11.7% in real terms over 2005, to reach USD 12.46 billion. This rise was due to a substantial increase in contributions to international organisations. The ODA/GNI ratio rose from 0.47% in 2005 to 0.51% in 2006.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* The UK's aim is to eliminate extreme poverty by 2015, in particular through achieving the MDGs. The Department for International Development (DfID) Public Service Agreement contains objectives and targets by which progress towards this aim is measured. The Department concentrates its resources on the poorest countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and south Asia, and is increasing its assistance to fragile and under-aided states, especially those vulnerable to conflict.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* The 2006 White Paper on International Development features specific commitments on aid effectiveness. These include working with others to implement the Paris Declaration, supporting the DAC to promote greater collaboration among donors and partner countries and monitoring international progress against agreed targets. DfID has updated its medium-term action plan to respond to the findings of a 2006 DAC survey and has set priorities for improving the effectiveness of its bilateral and multilateral aid. The UK is working with others on innovative ways of financing development, improving the overall effectiveness of the international aid system, increasing the medium-term predictability of aid flows and strengthening country and global mechanisms for mutual accountability.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* The Department is implementing a 2007 gender equality action plan. It seeks to make long-term changes in organisational practice and impact on gender equality and on women's empowerment through the way it allocates resources, works with partners, and holds itself accountable for performance. Specific actions include: analysis of women's and girls' issues in country assistance plans; policy work on economic growth and gender equality; improved monitoring of impact; and working with partners to build international consensus on gender equality and women's rights, including reform of UN gender architecture.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174436201748>


## United States

In 2006, net ODA by the United States was USD 23.53 billion, a fall of 18.2% in real terms over 2005. The ODA/GNI ratio also fell from 0.23% in 2005 to 0.18% in 2006. The fall was mostly due to debt relief which was exceptionally high in 2005.

*Commitment to the MDGs.* The United States subscribes to the challenge of halving extreme poverty by 2015. US foreign assistance objectives (peace and security, governing justly and democratically, investing in people, economic growth and humanitarian assistance) are seen as essential to sustainable poverty reduction and meeting the MDGs, although the MDG targets are not used operationally in the programming system of either USAID or the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). The Corporation considers economic growth to be of vital importance in the fight to reduce poverty.

*Aid effectiveness agenda.* The 2003 paper "A New Compact for Global Development" advocates collaboration among development actors, both international and American. Field agencies engaged in development co-operation are asked to work with local partners to avoid overlap, to increase overall effectiveness, and to support host country ownership. The government actively supports implementation of the Paris Declaration and is pursuing major reforms of its own foreign assistance. USAID sponsors a global development alliance that promotes public-private partnerships among US organisations working in development. USAID has several international partnerships on themes such as HIV/AIDS. Since 1993, USAID has used a system that tracks results through a co-ordinated planning-implementation-monitoring process. The Millennium Challenge Corporation programme uses local ownership and performance-based results as its operational focus.

*Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.* All institutions of US development co-operation officially support gender equality and women's empowerment. The operational focal point at USAID is the Office of Women in Development, although responsibility for addressing gender concerns is agency-wide. Key current issues are violence against women, gender-related aspects of international trade, trafficking in persons, girls' education and gender and conflict.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174472467765>


## Notes on other OECD donors

### Czech Republic

In 2006, Czech ODA increased by 10.4% in real terms to reach USD 160.9 million, representing 0.12% of GNI. The increase was primarily due to the Czech contribution to the EU development budget, debt forgiveness, reconstruction relief in Asia and the Middle East, as well as to an increase in the core budget for bilateral projects. All assistance was provided in the form of grants.

In 2006, long-term programmes with eight priority countries (Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Mongolia, Serbia and Montenegro, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia) came into effect.

At the request of the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the DAC agreed in May 2006 to conduct a Special Review of Czech international development co-operation. The Review's main objective was to contribute good practice and lessons learned to the Czech reform process of their foreign assistance at a time of important legal and institutional changes. In April 2007, the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs hosted a roundtable conference on the subject of Czech ODA at which some DAC delegates and other experts participated.



### Hungary

Net ODA by Hungary was USD 149.5 million, representing an increase of 52.1% in real terms over 2005. The ODA/GNI ratio rose from 0.11% in 2005 to 0.13% in 2006. There was an increase in both bilateral and multilateral aid, with debt relief to Iraq accounting for nearly 80% of bilateral flows.

Hungary's ODA programme focuses its bilateral assistance on the Western Balkan and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries. Its main partners in 2006 included Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kyrgyz Republic, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine. Hungary provided assistance to Cambodia, Laos, Palestine, Viet Nam and Yemen. Hungary also took part in international efforts and dedicated ODA resources to help the political stabilisation and economic recovery of Afghanistan and Iraq.

Hungary's sectoral priorities are political and economic transformation and EU accession in view of its comparative advantage in these fields. Hungary defined these priorities so as to ensure high added value to the EU objectives for development. Other priority sectors for Hungary's aid programme include knowledge transfer, training and education, health services, agriculture and water management.

## Iceland

In 2006, ODA by Iceland amounted to USD 41.5 million, an increase of 60.1% in real terms over 2005. This represented 0.27% of GNI, an increase from 0.18% in 2005. Bilateral assistance accounted for 67% of total ODA flows, while multilateral contributions nearly doubled their 2005 volume, reaching USD 13.8 million.


The government of Iceland has set a target to reach the ODA level of 0.35% of GNI by 2009. Budget allocations in 2005 and 2006, as well as the budget proposals for 2008, are on track towards reaching this target.

The Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA), an autonomous agency attached to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, disbursed nearly 35% of Iceland's ODA in 2006. ICEIDA operates in six countries; Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka and Uganda. The Icelandic Crisis Response Unit (ICRU) of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs provides support to peacebuilding operations. In 2006, ICRU provided assistance to operations in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Liberia, Serbia, Sri Lanka and Tanzania, and disbursed 20% of Iceland's overall aid.

The government's overall policy is outlined in "Iceland's Policy on Development Co-operation 2005-09" and ICEIDA's work is outlined in its "New Policy and Plan of Operations", adopted in 2004.

## Korea

In 2006, decreases in both bilateral and multilateral assistance contributed to a drop in Korean ODA to USD 455 million. This marked a 43.5% decrease in real terms from 2005, as the ODA/GNI ratio fell from 0.10% to 0.05%.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174560368648>

Much of the decrease in bilateral ODA, which constitutes 83% of total ODA, is explained by significantly reduced grants to Iraq. Excluding Iraq, bilateral ODA rose slightly. Multilateral ODA decreased from USD 289 million in 2005, when it had been boosted by large contributions to the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank's Special Fund, to USD 79 million in 2006 (in 2005 constant dollars).

A major share of bilateral ODA (61%) was channelled to the Asian region. Geographical proximity and the interest of many Asian countries to emulate Korea's experience partially explain this concentration. Social and economic infrastructure sectors accounted for 60% and 25% respectively of bilateral ODA. More specifically, government and civil society accounted for 21%, followed by education (20%), transportation and storage (15%) and water supply and sanitation (12%).

In 2006, Korea's "Initiative for Africa's Development" was launched to support basic human needs on the continent. It will triple Korea's aid to Africa by 2008. Korea remains firmly committed to increasing its ODA to USD 1 billion by 2009 and furthering its efforts to reach 0.25% of GNI by 2015.

Korea is preparing to seek full membership of the DAC by 2010.

### Mexico

**Mexico recognises the importance of international co-operation towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals through its contribution to the development of national capabilities and social and economic stability.**

In 2006, Mexican international co-operation included 155 projects in sectors such as education, environment, science, social development, agriculture, energy, health and culture. The beneficiaries were institutions from Central America, the Caribbean and South America. Work is in progress to establish a monitoring and evaluation system for development co-operation and improve tracking of Mexican ODA.

### Poland

**In 2006, Poland's ODA increased by 38.2% in real terms over 2005, reaching USD 297 million. This represented 0.09% of GNI. Bilateral ODA stood at USD 119 million, more than twice the volume of 2005 bilateral flows. USD 178 million in aid was channeled through multilateral institutions, mainly through the EC.**

In 2006, least developed countries received 79% of the Polish bilateral aid effort. Debt relief to Angola totalled USD 92.4 million. Other main recipients of Polish aid were Ukraine (USD 7.1 million), Belarus (USD 6.8 million), Uzbekistan (USD 4.5 million), Moldova (USD 1.3 million) and Kazakhstan (USD 1.1 million).

As in 2005, Polish bilateral ODA was delivered mainly in the form of technical assistance. China and Uzbekistan also received aid in the form of concessional lending. Humanitarian aid was provided to Lebanon, Indonesia and Ecuador. The remainder of Polish ODA consisted of short-term aid to refugees in Poland as well as scholarship programmes.

With a new strategy for its aid programme, Poland aims to respond to current international priorities such as the aid effectiveness agenda. Polish development assistance will focus on areas such as the enhancement and promotion of democracy and civil society building, where Poland feels it has a comparative advantage.

### Slovak Republic

**ODA disbursements in 2006 from the Slovak Republic totalled USD 55.1 million, representing an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.10% of GNI, down from 0.12% in 2005. Bilateral flows constituted 45% of the Slovak Republic's total ODA, whereas multilateral aid accounted for 55% of total ODA flows. Over half of bilateral aid was in the form of debt relief to Sudan and Afghanistan.**

In April 2006, the government approved a new Annual Programme which provided USD 5.4 million for new projects. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the co-ordinator of the Programme and participants include the Ministries of Education, Interior, Agriculture and Environment. The new projects included USD 1.6 million for bilateral aid to Serbia and Montenegro and USD 3.8 million for 13 priority countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Mongolia, Mozambique, Sudan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

The Slovak ODA programme supports the MDGs by focusing on social infrastructure, including health care and education, sustainable economic development and the environment, as well as the development of democratic institutions. According to current plans, future annual programmes will grow in line with the EU commitment of reaching an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.17% by 2010.


## Turkey

In 2006, Turkish ODA flows amounted to USD 714.2 million, corresponding to 0.18% of GNI. This represented an increase of 12.2% in real terms over 2005.

The steady increase in Turkish assistance in recent years is mainly due to the strategy applied by the Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency (TIKA) as well as to the comprehensive data collection methods from line ministries and other institutions which provide technical assistance to partner countries. Other factors which contributed to the increased ODA figures are debt rescheduling to the Kyrgyz Republic and reporting of refugee assistance.

Most recipient countries of Turkish ODA are located in Central Asia, the Caucasus, the Balkans, Africa, the Middle East and the Far East. Bilateral contributions made up 90% of Turkish ODA. Turkey's multilateral aid efforts include contributions and co-operation with multilateral donors through participation in, and co-financing of, multilateral projects and activities.

In 2006, information on Turkish private flows to partner countries were collected and reported to the DAC for the first time. These flows total nearly USD 1 billion. Turkish NGOs also granted some USD 78 million to countries in need. In total, 2006 Turkish total resource flows for developing countries amounted to USD 1.7 billion.



StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174606847564>

## Notes on non-OECD donors

The DAC brings together the major OECD aid donors, but non-OECD members have long played an important role in development co-operation. They often bring their own unique experience as recipients of ODA and have an impressive track record with development over recent years.

Thus far, only limited information is available on development co-operation from economies outside the OECD membership. Together with other international development stakeholders, the DAC is working to improve this information, as the international development community has highlighted its strong interest in improved statistical information on development co-operation from non-members of the OECD. As the authoritative source on development co-operation statistics, the DAC aims to provide a comprehensive overview of world-wide ODA on the basis of comparable data, so that donors as well as partner countries can share more comprehensive information on aid volume and allocation, and thus improve the effectiveness and impact of development co-operation as a whole. To fully meet this objective, the DAC hopes that all non-members with significant development co-operation activities will begin to report ODA data on a comparable basis, both to receive due recognition for their important efforts and to provide a more complete picture of global aid flows.

Several Arab states have a long history of donor assistance and have sophisticated mechanisms for co-ordinating and harmonising their efforts. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates report their ODA to the DAC. The majority of their aid is distributed bilaterally. The Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development provided financial and technical assistance of USD 158 million in net ODA terms in 2006, with 60% of assistance going to Africa and 33% to Asian countries. Saudi Arabia's net aid was 2 billion in 2006, disbursed by the Saudi Fund and comprised mostly of bilateral grants to other Arab countries for humanitarian and development assistance. The United Arab Emirates total net ODA in 2006 was USD 249 million, with almost 50% attributed to countries north of the Sahara and 34% to countries in Asia.

European Union members who are not members of the OECD are increasing their development aid budgets substantially. They have committed to reach ODA targets of 0.17% of GNI by 2010 and 0.33% by 2015, and Estonia (USD 13 million), Latvia (USD 12 million), Lithuania (USD 25 million) and Slovenia (USD 35 million) reported their net ODA to the DAC in 2006. At the same time, building up capacity to execute a comprehensive bilateral aid programme is a challenge especially for small administrations. Much of the development contribution from this group is multilateral contributions to the European Community.

Other donors that have reported net ODA to the DAC in 2006 are Israel (USD 90 million), Thailand (USD 74 million) and Chinese Taipei (USD 514 million). All three have a strong bilateral focus in their aid. In Israel, the main body responsible for the technical co-operation programme is Mashav, the Centre for International Co-operation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, although a high share of Israel's reported ODA is accounted for by aid to first-year refugees in Israel. Thailand has launched a technical co-operation programme through the Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency (TICA) which focuses on capacity and shared responsibility with developing countries. However, 70% of the ODA budget was provided through a concessional loans programme, mostly for infrastructure. Thailand's aid focuses on neighbouring countries, including Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Viet Nam, which accounted for 83% of Thai ODA. Chinese Taipei's development assistance is

implemented primarily through the International Cooperation and Development Fund (ICDF), with an emphasis on human resources training, business development, agricultural diversification, capacity building and humanitarian assistance.

Although no other economies reported on aid flows to the DAC in 2006, several have increasingly important development co-operation programmes and are planning to establish aid agencies.

China has extended development co-operation since the 1950s, which it considers as co-operation between developing countries – South-South Co-operation. In 1964, China established eight principles for its aid which have continued to guide its policies until today. One of them is to provide assistance to developing countries – those that adhere to the one-China principle – with no political conditions.

China does not publish official time series data on development assistance, nor data according to ODA definitions. The focus on mutual benefit in China's economic co-operation currently renders impractical a calculation of the ODA element in China's foreign economic co-operation as against trade and investment promotion. Several studies, including by Chinese research institutions, estimate that China's aid budget amounted to USD 1-1.5 billion in 2006, but these figures have not been confirmed by the Chinese government. However, major commitments and projects give a clear indication of the rapid growth of China's development co-operation programme in recent years. China provides development co-operation on a global scale, and the co-operation programme in Africa has attracted particular attention. The "Beijing Action Plan", agreed in November 2006, includes a broad range of commitments, including a doubling of aid from China to Africa from 2006 to 2009. China has also forgiven debt to HIPC and LDC countries, which amounted to a total of USD 1.3 billion by end-2006, while the government announced further debt forgiveness to HIPCs and LDCs.

China's aid is disbursed in the form of grants, interest-free loans and preferential loans. Grants are used primarily for infrastructure related to social services as well as technical co-operation and humanitarian assistance. Interest free loans usually finance other non-productive public infrastructure projects. Preferential loans are extended to finance revenue-generating projects, principally for joint ventures of Chinese and local enterprise, where the assistance element takes the form of the differential between the People's Bank of China base rate and the preferential interest rate. Among the range of government entities involved in delivering development co-operation, a central role falls to the Ministry of Commerce, which co-ordinates aid provided to China as well as China's own grants and interest-free loans for projects in developing countries; China EXIM Bank extends preferential loans to foreign countries.

Among other countries, Russia is creating a foreign aid system to deliver increasing bilateral assistance. Russia estimated its annual bilateral ODA budget at USD 100 million in 2006, not including debt forgiveness which is stated at USD 11.3 billion for African countries in recent years. Russia plans to start reporting to the DAC once the necessary capacity has been established. In India, annual development co-operation is estimated to total USD 1 billion – although it is not clear what portion of this is ODA. The two most important government agencies involved in development are the Indian Technical and Economic Co-operation Division (ITEC) of the Ministry of External Affairs, and the Ministry of Finance's Department of Economic Affairs. In the future, India intends to establish an aid agency to bring its diverse development co-operation activities under one umbrella.

Other major emerging economies, including Brazil and South Africa, are playing an increasing role as providers of development co-operation. Through the Agency for Brazilian Co-operation (ABC), Brazil delivers aid in the form of technical co-operation in the areas of HIV/AIDS prevention, social protection, as well as assistance to African governments via cash transfers. South African development co-operation is regionally focused so as to promote joint African development, and much of it is channelled through the African Renaissance Fund. Both in its technical and financial assistance, South Africa prioritises support for capacity development, especially to countries in the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

## The DAC at Work

## Development Assistance Committee

The OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is the key forum in which the major bilateral donors work together to co-ordinate development co-operation and to increase the effectiveness of their efforts to support sustainable development.

The DAC is one of the main committees of the OECD, and has 23 members. The DAC, however, has three features which distinguish it from other committees within the OECD Secretariat. First, it meets more frequently than other OECD committees (about 15 times a year) and the Chair is based at OECD headquarters in Paris. Second, the DAC has the power to make binding recommendations in matters within its competence, to countries on the Committee as well as to the Council (*e.g.* DAC Recommendation on Untying ODA to the Least Developed Countries, 2001). Third, the Chair issues an annual report on the efforts and policies of DAC members. This report is the key annual reference document for statistics and analyses on the latest trends in international aid.

The DAC holds an annual High Level Meeting and the participants are ministers or heads of aid agencies. Once a year, a Senior Level Meeting is also convened at the OECD to review the Committee's work on current policy issues. Ordinary DAC meetings are attended by Paris-based delegates of DAC members and by officials from member capitals.

The mandate of the DAC (which is shown on the next page, followed by DAC permanent representatives in 2007) has been unchanged from its inception in 1961. The work of the DAC, which is a unique and neutral forum which brings governments together, seeks to:

- be the leading source of good practice and review on priority development issues;
- mobilise more ODA financing for development, especially for poverty reduction;
- be the definitive source of statistics on the global development co-operation effort;
- help change behaviour in the international aid system to achieve the best possible results;
- develop effective ways to assist poor-performing, conflict-prone countries; and
- support increased attention by OECD members, and within OECD, to policy coherence for development.

### **Mandate of the Development Assistance Committee**

*(Paragraph 14 of the Report by the Preparatory Committee)*

As decided by the Ministerial Resolution of 23 July 1960 [OECD(60)13], the Development Assistance Group shall, upon the inception of the OECD, be constituted as the Development Assistance Committee, and given the following mandate:

- a) The Committee will continue to consult on the methods for making national resources available for assisting countries and areas in the process of economic development and for expanding and improving the flow of long-term funds and other development assistance to them.
- b) The Development Assistance Committee will acquire the functions, characteristics and membership possessed by the Development Assistance Group at the inception of the Organisation.
- c) The Committee will select its Chairman, make periodic reports to the Council and its own members, receive assistance from the Secretariat as agreed with the Secretary-General, have power to make recommendations on matters within its competence to countries on the Committee and to the Council, and invite representatives of other countries and international organisations to take part in particular discussions as necessary.
- d) The Development Assistance Committee may act on behalf of the Organisation only with the approval of the Council.
- e) In case the responsibilities of the Development Assistance Committee were to be extended beyond those set forth under a), any member country not represented in the Development Assistance Committee could bring the matter before the Council.

## *The Development Assistance Committee Representatives in 2007 (as at 31 December 2007)*

### Chair and Vice-Chairs of the DAC

Mr. Richard MANNING, Chair (United Kingdom)

Ms. Kristin LANGSHOLT, Vice-Chair (Norway)

Mr. José Manuel ALBARES, Vice-Chair (Spain)

Mr. George CARNER, Vice-Chair (United States)

Member	Name
Australia	Mr. Peter WADDELL-WOOD
Austria	Ms. Sabine FASCHING
Belgium	Mr. Guy BERINGHS
Canada	Ms. Nicole GESNOT
Denmark	Mr. Ole CHRISTOFFERSEN
European Commission	Mr. Franco CONZATO
Finland	Ms. Sari LEHTIRANTA
France	Mr. Dominique BOCQUET
Germany	Mr. Josef FÜLLENBACH
Greece	Ms. Panagiota TSIRKA
Ireland	Ms. Kathryn NWAJIAKU-DAHOU
Italy	Mr. Fabio CASSESE
Japan	Mr. Yoshitaka HOSHINO
Luxembourg	Mr. Georges TERNES
Netherlands	Mr. Bert van GEEL
New Zealand	Ms. Stephanie LEE
Norway	Ms. Kristin LANGSHOLT
Portugal	Ms. Alda MEDEIROS FERNANDES
Spain	Mr. José Manuel ALBARES
Sweden	Ms. Kristin PÅLSSON
Switzerland	Mr. Anton STADLER
United Kingdom	Mr. Roland FOX
United States	Mr. George CARNER

### Observers to the DAC

IMF	Mr. Pierre EWENCZYK
UNDP	Ms. Gisèle MOUSSALLI
World Bank	Ms. Barbara GENEVAZ

### Other OECD Delegates

Czech Republic	Mr. Roman HOLY
Hungary	Ms. Agnes JANSZKY
Iceland	Mr. Jón G. JÓHANNESSON
Korea	Mr. Noh-wan PARK
Mexico	Mr. Gerardo BRACHO Y CARPIZO
Poland	Mr. Piotr DERWICH
Slovak Republic	Mr. Libor GULA
Turkey	Ms. Burcu ÇEVİK

## Selected Activities of the DAC in 2008


The work programme of the DAC and its subsidiary bodies for 2007-08 covers a broad range of topics which are detailed in the following pages. A selection of the DAC's activities in 2008 include:

- **Aid for Trade:** The 2005 WTO Ministerial Meeting in Hong Kong mandated the operationalisation of Aid for Trade. Subsequently, the OECD, in partnership with the WTO, established a monitoring system that encourages enhanced scrutiny and dialogue with the objective of delivering more and better Aid for Trade. The first global monitoring report "Aid for Trade at a Glance: 2007" was presented at the first WTO Aid for Trade Global Review in November 2007. It takes stock of trends and developments in aid flows and policies that are most closely related to Aid for Trade. Monitoring will start tracking progress in the implementation and impact of Aid for Trade against the backdrop of rising and more effective aid. In addition, guidance will be published on how to use aid most effectively to address binding constraints to trade capacity and how to strengthen the links between trade, economic growth and poverty reduction. For more information, visit [www.oecd.org/dac/trade/aft](http://www.oecd.org/dac/trade/aft).
- **Scaling up of aid:** The DAC Secretariat has been monitoring the delivery of commitments to increase ODA since the Monterrey Conference in 2002. It provides a biannual update on members' performance against their commitments at the UN and Gleneagles summits in 2005. In 2007, as a further service to individual members' aid allocation decisions and predictability of aid delivered at country level, members agreed on a survey methodology to collect information on donors' aid allocation policies and future spending intentions by partner country. Following discussion in the Policy Workshop of the 2007 Global Forum on Development and the DAC Senior Level Meeting, the DAC will publish the results of the survey during the first half of 2008. This will constitute a new contribution to improving predictability for medium-term expenditure planning in partner countries in the run up to Accra. It will also contribute to the work of the UN Secretary-General's MDG Africa Initiative. For more information, visit [www.oecd.org/development/globalforum](http://www.oecd.org/development/globalforum).
- **Aid Effectiveness:** The Government of Ghana will host the third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness on 2-4 September 2008. At this event, ministers and senior officials from over 100 developed and developing countries, including the heads of most development agencies, will meet to decide on the Accra Action Agenda – a compact designed to improve the way aid is globally managed and delivered. The Accra Action Agenda is intended to step up implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (March 2005) with a view to meeting the Paris Declaration targets for 2010. It is also expected to deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration in areas that call for strong international resolve – and action.
- **Climate Change:** The OECD Declaration on Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation, adopted by Development Co-operation and Environment Ministers at their joint meeting in May 2006, calls upon the OECD "To promote meaningful co-ordination and sharing of good practices on integrating climate change in development co-operation, with the aim of developing guidance for integrating climate change adaptation in the context of development co-operation, in order to facilitate climate risk management and the sharing of tools and experiences". In response to this

request, a joint task team, led by the Netherlands and Switzerland, will issue a report on progress achieved towards mainstreaming climate adaptation into development co-operation. This task team comprises members of the DAC Network on Environment and Development Co-operation and the Environment Policy Committee's Working Party on Global and Structural Policies. This report will be submitted for formal endorsement by the DAC High Level Meeting in May 2008 and brought to the attention of participants in the G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit in July 2008.

## The DAC's Subsidiary Bodies

The committee architecture of the DAC's subsidiary bodies is shown in this organigramme. The key topics of the work programmes of the nine DAC subsidiary bodies are provided in the following pages.



## *DAC Subsidiary Bodies' Mandates and Work Programmes*

### **DAC Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT)**

<b>Date created</b>	<b>1968</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Geert Deserranno (Belgium)</b>
<b>Vice-Chairs</b>	<b>Ms. Hedwig Riegler (Austria); Mr. Hitoshi Shoji (Japan)</b>

The mandate of the DAC Working Party on Statistics is to keep under review, and propose improvements to, the statistical reporting of resource flows to developing and transition countries and multilateral agencies.

It makes recommendations to the DAC about: ODA eligibility; guidelines and definitions for reporting; data comparability; and the use of DAC statistics.

It proposes, for decision by the DAC, amendments to the statistical reporting directives; deals with related subjects referred to it by the DAC; and reports to the DAC as appropriate.

#### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

Maintain and improve DAC's regular statistical products and better meet user requirements. Co-operate with members and UN on MDG reporting. Routine updates to Statistical Reporting Directives.

Statistical policy issues: update policy relevance and timeliness of data collections; DAC List; Peace and Security; Humanitarian Aid; Clean Development Mechanism; innovative financing mechanisms.

Dialogue with non-DAC donors to improve access to, and completeness of, aid statistics.

Use of the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) for special reporting, *e.g.* targeting of MDGs, trade capacity building, gender, environment, health, HIV/AIDS.

Co-operate with WP-EFF on indicators for monitoring the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, using DAC statistical definitions as appropriate. Produce policy papers on the use of aid management systems and extend implementation of the "Aid Management Platform".

Provide data and analysis on trends and issues in the international aid system: monitor donors' commitments to scale up aid; inform discussion of aid allocation and aid architecture.

Continue to share development information with AiDA.

Maintain the joint OECD/WTO effort to monitor Aid for Trade.

## DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>April 2003</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Jan Cedergren (Sweden)</b>
<b>Vice-Chairs</b>	<b>Mr. Christopher Hall (World Bank); to be confirmed (Ghana)</b>

The DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness is the international **Partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC** which works on improving the effectiveness of aid for greater impact on development and poverty reduction. Its current mandate is to promote, facilitate and monitor the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness endorsed by over 100 donors and developing countries at the High Level Forum held in March 2005.

The Working Party relies on the expertise of its four specialised Joint Ventures:

- Joint Venture on Monitoring the Paris Declaration.
- Joint Venture on Public Financial Management.
- Joint Venture on Procurement.
- Joint Venture on Managing for Development Results.

A dialogue with civil society organisations is co-ordinated by the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, chaired by Canada.

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

- Support implementation of the Paris Declaration commitments on ownership, alignment, harmonisation, results and mutual accountability.
- Respond to the mandate entrusted by the Paris Declaration on monitoring the internationally agreed indicators of progress.
- Act as a focal point to which institutions engaged in implementing the Paris Declaration can report back on progress for experience-sharing and formulate policy guidance in areas critical for improving aid effectiveness.
- Lay the groundwork for the 3rd High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness to be held in Accra, Ghana in September 2008.

As part of its work towards the third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness oversees relevant work on deepening implementation of the Paris Declaration, including:

- Involving non-DAC providers of development assistance.
- Drawing lessons from applying the Paris Declaration in health and other sectors.
- Co-ordinating policy work aimed at improving division of labour and complementarity between donors at country level.

## DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EVALUATION NETWORK)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>March 2003</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Finbar O'Brien (Ireland)</b>
<b>Vice-Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Dominique de Crombrughe de Looringhe (Belgium)</b>

The mandate of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation is to:

Strengthen the exchange of information, experience and co-operation on evaluation among Network members and, as appropriate, with development evaluation partners, with a view to: a) improving the evaluation activities of individual members; b) encouraging harmonisation and standardisation of methodological and conceptual frameworks; c) facilitating co-ordination of major evaluation studies; d) encouraging development of new methods in evaluation and best practice.

Contribute to improved development effectiveness by a) synthesising and extracting policy, strategic and operational lessons from evaluations for consideration by the DAC and the wider development community; b) promoting joint or co-ordinated evaluations and studies undertaken by individual members.

Provide advice and support to the DAC and its subsidiary bodies, notably on peer reviews, development results and aid effectiveness.

Promote and support evaluation capacity development in partner countries.

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

Evaluate the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

Facilitate and co-ordinate joint evaluations.

Promote and support evaluation capacity development in partner countries.

Develop guidance on evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities.

Review the follow-up to the joint evaluation of general budget support.

Expand the DAC Evaluation Resource Centre (DEReC) to promote knowledge sharing.

Review impact evaluation methodologies.

Apply the DAC evaluation quality standards during a three-year test phase.

## DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>1984</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Ms. Dorthea Damkjær (Denmark)</b>
<b>Bureau members</b>	<b>Ms. Kathy Blakeslee (USA); Ms. Angela Langenkamp (Germany); Ms. Ineke van de Pol (Netherlands)</b>

The DAC Network on Gender Equality:

Contributes to improving the quality and effectiveness of development co-operation. The GENDERNET works to ensure that practice and implementation match global and national commitments to gender equality and women's empowerment in advancing economic, social and political development in partner countries. It is responsive to changing contexts and development priorities.

Provides strategic support to the policy priorities of the DAC. The GENDERNET plays a catalytic role, provides professional expertise for integrating gender equality perspectives into the DAC's work, reinforces this priority in members' programmes, and supports partner countries' development efforts. It collaborates with the other DAC subsidiary bodies.

Provides members with a unique forum for sharing experiences and disseminating good practice and innovative approaches for integrating gender perspectives and women's empowerment into key aspects of development co-operation in support of partners' own efforts.

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

Update the DAC Guidelines for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Co-operation by preparing complementary guidelines, drawing on lessons learned from gender equality work in the contexts of changing aid modalities, the partnership commitments of the Paris Declaration and the experience of implementing gender mainstreaming.

Share good practice and lessons learned on scaling up harmonised approaches to gender equality work and women's empowerment.

Actively engage with other DAC subsidiary bodies (including through peer reviews), the OECD at large, development partners and multilateral agencies on the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment into development co-operation programmes.

With the UN Interagency Network on Women and Gender Equality, host the 2008 biennial workshop on "Enhancing partnerships between Multilateral and Bilateral Agencies to support partner country efforts to achieve gender quality and women's empowerment".

## **DAC Network on Environment and Development Co-operation (ENVIRONET)**

<b>Date created</b>	<b>March 2003</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Co-Chairs</b>	<b>Mr. Paul Hassing (Netherlands); Mr. Paul Samson (Canada)</b>
<b>Bureau members</b>	<b>Mr. Jonathan Hobbs (United Kingdom); Mr. Matti Nummellin (Finland); Ms. Linda Ghanime (UNDP)</b>

The DAC Network on Environment and Development Co-operation:

Contributes to the formulation of coherent approaches to sustainable development in the context of the OECD cross-sectoral approach to sustainable development.

Formulates specific guidance for development co-operation efforts in support of environment and sustainable development.

Provides its members with a policy forum for sharing experience and disseminating good practice with regard to the integration of environmental concerns in development co-operation.

### ***Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08***

Integrate development co-operation and environment through policy and good practice in the context of new aid modalities (follow-up of the DAC-EPOC Ministerial Meeting of April 2006).

Promote meaningful co-ordination and share good practices on integrating climate change into development co-operation, with the aim of developing guidance for such integration in the context of development co-operation. Identify, adapt, scale up and expand implementation of “good practices” at the interface of environment and development, and supporting harmonised capacity development for environment-development integration and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

Provide inputs to the DAC and WP-STAT, POVNET, CPDC, peer reviews, as well as to WP-EFF in respect to monitoring progress towards the implementation of the environmental dimension of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (para. 40/41). Provide input to other OECD bodies on issues related to the environment in development co-operation.

## DAC Network on Poverty Reduction (POVNET)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>June 1998</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Pierre Jacquet (France)</b>
<b>Vice-Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Hitoshi Shoji (Japan)</b>

The DAC Network on Poverty Reduction focuses on the multidimensionality of poverty and on the relationship between inequality, economic growth and poverty reduction in developing countries. POVNET provides a forum for the exchange of experience and best practice on pro-poor growth, i.e. involving the poor in generating growth and benefiting from it. It promotes the pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals and a central role for broad-based growth and its determinants within the strategic framework of national poverty reduction strategies.

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

Compile good practices in implementing pro-poor growth policies, with particular reference to the roles of investment and private sector development, agriculture and infrastructure.

Strengthen the contributions of social protection and empowerment and of employment and labour markets to pro-poor growth and explore synergies between these areas.

Manage and integrate the “broader” agenda, including aid for trade and how ODA can promote investment for development.

## DAC Network on Governance (GOVNET)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>April 2001</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Eduard Westreicher (Germany)</b>
<b>Vice-Chairs</b>	<b>Mr. Tarik Khan (Canada); Mr. Sanjay Pradhan (World Bank)</b>

The DAC Network on Governance aims to improve the effectiveness of donor assistance in support of democratic governance\* in developing countries. It provides members with a forum to exchange experiences and lessons, identify and disseminate good practice, and develop policy and analytical tools relating the reform of institutions, the dynamics of change and the interplay of checks and balances, and issues surrounding domestic accountability and respect for human rights. Consistent with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), the GOVNET promotes partner country ownership, aligned and co-ordinated donor approaches, results and mutual accountability.

The GOVNET's work on governance spans a range of issues, including human rights, transparency, accountability, participation and equality, anti-corruption and capacity development in support of these elements of democratic governance. The GOVNET is a resource for DAC members, the DAC and its subsidiary bodies, providing a perspective on the interface between states and societies and the challenges of state-building in developing countries.

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

**Anti-corruption:** implement the proposed collective action agenda for donors agreed at the 2007 High Level Meeting of the DAC and look into the possibility of developing joint responses to corruption; support donor efforts to improve their governance assessments; look into supply side issues in particular through collaboration with the OECD Working Group on Bribery; support donors in their efforts to assist partner countries implement the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC).

**Taxation and accountability:** increase awareness of the importance of domestic resource mobilisation for governance, especially in an environment where aid is being scaled up; identify "governance-enhancing" actions that partner countries could take to increase domestic revenue; provide guidance to donors on how best to strategically support partner countries to improve their domestic resource mobilisation.

**Human rights and development:** promote dialogue and collaboration between human rights practitioners and other development practitioners and integrate human rights more consistently into donor policies and practice in the areas of aid effectiveness, peace and security and growth strategies.

**Governance assessments:** focus on peer learning among donors, with an emphasis on the involvement of partner countries when assessing governance.

\* Democratic governance is taken to encompass the broad principles of supporting human rights, transparency, accountability, legitimacy, participation and equality, without being narrowly prescriptive about formal or procedural forms of democratic government.

## DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>1995</b> (Task Force became a Network in 2001)
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Acting co-Chairs</b>	<b>Ms. Inger Buxton (EC); Ms. Cristina Hoyos (Switzerland)</b>
<b>Vice-Chair</b>	<b>Mr. Peter Batchelor (UNDP)</b>

The DAC, through its Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation, strives to improve the effectiveness of development co-operation and the coherence of members' policies by promoting the principles and agreements in the DAC guidelines *Helping Prevent Violent Conflict* and subsequent policy guidance on *Security System Reform and Governance*. The Network enhances donors' work with developing country actors – especially in conflict-prone and conflict affected countries – to promote structural stability and peace, prevent and manage violent conflict, and provide reconstruction assistance in crises.

The Network's objectives are thus to enhance donors' efforts as they work with developing country actors – especially in fragile, difficult or crisis countries – to: integrate a conflict prevention lens and create a culture of prevention in all government branches; help prevent and manage violent conflict by promoting structural stability and peace; and provide humanitarian and reconstruction assistance. By sharing best practices and lessons learned and providing policy guidance, the Network aims to mainstream conflict prevention; encourage information sharing; build capacity in donor agencies; and promote partnerships within and between OECD and partner countries and other external actors.

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

Improve evaluation of conflict prevention and peacebuilding interventions. The draft guidance developed in 2005 and 2006 will be finalised and a partner country perspective will be sought by piloting/applying it at field level for a 1-2 year trial period (undertaken in partnership with the DAC Network on Evaluation).

Finalise (further to consultation with members in late 2007) guidance on armed violence reduction and development.

Continue in-country consultations with donors and partners based on the SSR handbook, to underpin behavioural change on the ground.

Improve the integration of early warning analysis and response into donor agencies' programming and into planning frameworks. The well-recognised gap in triggering effective and timely response to early warning will be addressed through: a) mapping and inventory of existing early warning tools and case studies in a few countries in order to collect lessons learned and to consider ways to improve early warning; b) the development of guidance for donor agencies (and other government departments) on early warning, preventative action and collective response (undertaken in partnership with the Fragile States Group).

Promote the integration of policy and operational messages on conflict, peace and security into agencies' work. To this end, CPDC will develop joint donor training packages, pilot test the new assessment framework for peer reviews on conflict prevention, peacebuilding, security and fragile states as well as engage regional organisations, partner countries and other development organisations in a dialogue on conflict prevention, peacebuilding and security issues.

CPDC will also continue to conduct horizontal work with GOVNET (on human rights, peace and security) with the Working Party on Statistics (case book on ODA reporting on conflict prevention, peacebuilding and security) as well as with GENDERNET.

## Fragile States Group (FSG)

<b>Date created</b>	<b>June 2003</b>
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Current mandate through 2008</b>
<b>Co-Chairs</b>	<b>Ms. Sarah Cliffe (World Bank); Mr. Jean-Marc Châtaigner (France)</b>

The objective of the Fragile States Group (FSG, formerly the Learning and Advisory Process on Difficult Partnerships) is to facilitate co-ordination among bilateral and multilateral donors to improve aid effectiveness in fragile states. It is designed to help increase the focus and effectiveness of donor assistance to countries facing weak governance and violent conflict and to avoid the “cost of neglect”. The work of the Group is characterised by innovation with an emphasis on practical, field-level implementation of global policy issues. The FSG forms a bridge between the DAC Network on Governance (GOVNET) and the Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation Network (CPDC). The Group also benefits from links with the DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF).

### **Key Topics in the Work Programme for 2007-08**

Extend the application and implementation of the DAC Principles of Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations to all fragile states.

Policy recommendations on state building: refine definitions and develop practical guidance for donor strategies in fragile states.

Promote whole-of-government approaches and integrated planning models and mechanisms across development, security, diplomacy and humanitarian sectors.

Analyse resource allocations to fragile states.

Broaden partnerships: cross-cutting issues and work with other DAC and non-DAC groups.

Early warning, preventive action and collective response (joint work with CPDC).

## OECD's Development Co-operation Directorate

The Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) is one of a dozen directorates in the OECD Secretariat working on substantive themes. The role of the DCD is to assist members with policy formulation, policy co-ordination and information systems for development. In so doing, it supports the work of both the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and of the OECD as a whole. So close is the relationship with the DAC that DCD is generally identified with the DAC itself.

DCD is part of the “**Development Cluster**”, under the authority of a Deputy Secretary-General. Within this framework, DCD works closely with other OECD directorates on issues of **Policy Coherence for Development** (PCD). The aim of PCD is to avoid impacts from policies introduced by OECD countries that could adversely affect the prospects of developing countries and to exploit the potential of positive synergies across different policies. The programme has resulted in concrete analysis of the impacts of OECD country policies in some priority areas and policy recommendations – including identification of policy alternatives. PCD also involves collaborating and identifying joint projects and focusing on common results in the programme of work.

In addition to DCD, the cluster includes the following units:

- The **Development Centre**, the OECD's knowledge base and research arm on development issues.
- The **Sahel and West Africa Club**, which is a facilitator and leader of informed action-oriented debates within West Africa and between that region and OECD members.
- The **Africa Partnership Forum Support Unit** (APF SU) provides a bridge between G8/OECD and African agendas and through its monitoring work seeks to catalyse action at a high political level in favour of African development.
- **Partnership for Democratic Governance** (PDG) Unit aims to support developing countries – including fragile states, post-conflict states and emerging democracies – in building their governance capacity and improving service delivery to their citizens.
- In 2007, the G8 chose the OECD as the platform for the **Support Unit for the Heiligendamm Dialogue Process** (HDP), an independent political dialogue process of the G8 with Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa. The unit's focus will be on the following four work topics: innovation and intellectual property rights, investment, climate change and development co-operation (particularly in Africa).
- The **Centre for Co-operation with Non-Members** (CCNM), provides strategic co-ordination to the development of OECD's relations with non-members and with other international organisations.

The DCD organigramme is shown on the next page. The Office of the Director oversees the work of some 100 staff in the following areas:

The **Policy Co-ordination Division (DCD/POL)** covers a significant range of policy issues, engaging members and observers through corresponding networks. Issues include: governance, accountability, human rights and anti-corruption; capacity development; conflict prevention, peacebuilding and security issues; fragile states and situations; environment and sustainable development; and gender equality and women's empowerment.

The **Poverty Reduction and Growth Division (DCD/PRG)** concentrates on increasing the impact of economic growth on poverty reduction (treated in the POVNET) through work on agriculture, private sector development, as well as infrastructure, social protection, employment and labour markets. Aid for Trade, private investment for development and the untying of aid are also important parts of its work programme.

The **Aid Effectiveness Division (DCD/EFF)** supports the implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, endorsed in March 2005. It services the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, i.e. the international partnership, hosted by the DAC, of bilateral and multilateral donors and partner countries which monitors the Paris commitments and reports on progress achieved against set targets. The division also supports specific work on public financial management, procurement and management for development results.

The **Review and Evaluation Division (DCD/PEER)** manages, on average, five peer reviews per year of individual DAC members, including their humanitarian aid. Through this process, the division monitors changes in the way aid is administered, and promotes learning across systems. It also promotes good practices in evaluation, notably through the Network on Development Evaluation, which supports work on effectiveness and results-based management. Further, the division supports the DAC in engaging with non-members in a dialogue around approaches to development assistance.

The **Statistics and Monitoring Division (DCD/STAT)** collects and compiles statistics on flows of aid and other resources, including their type, terms, sectoral breakdown, and geographical distribution among developing countries. It tracks members' ODA pledges and collects information on their future aid allocations.

**Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21).** PARIS21 was established in 1999 by the UN, OECD, World Bank, IMF and the EC and its Secretariat is hosted in the DCD. PARIS21's main output over the next few years will be well designed national and international statistical programmes, centred on implementing National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDSs) which both build statistical capacity and provide data for high priority needs. The objective is for countries to have better nationally produced data by the time of the next major review of the MDGs in 2010. PARIS21 also oversees the implementation of two "satellite programmes": the **International Household Survey Network (IHSN)** and the **Accelerated Data Program (ADP)** in pilot countries. The IHSN has two primary objectives: to promote the better use of survey microdata and to improve the quality of future surveys. The ADP aims to strengthen country capacity in producing statistical data relevant for policy design, monitoring and evaluation. **Metagora** is a pilot project implemented under the auspices of PARIS21. It focuses on methods, tools and frameworks for measuring democracy, human rights and governance.

Development Co-operation Directorate (as at 31 December 2007)

**Office of the DAC Chair**  
Richard Manning  
Jeannette Dargaville

**Director's Office (DCD/DO)**  
Richard Carey  
Aline Renet  
Stephen Groff  
Doris Cachin  
**Aid Architecture and Financing**  
Brian Hammond  
Charlotte Moeller  
**DAC Meetings, Special Issues**  
Kaori Miyamoto  
John Noonan  
Françoise Zekri

**Communication and Management (DCD/CM)**  
Hilary Balbuena  
**Administration**  
Alison Hurdleby  
Joanna McGrath  
**Communications**  
Christine Graves  
Stephanie Coic  
Carola Miras

**Policy Co-ordination (DCD/POL)**  
Alexandra Trzeciak-Duval  
Maria Consolati  
Phyllis Flick  
Julie Seif  
Marie-Paule Huang

**Poverty Reduction and Growth (DCD/PRG)**  
Bill Nicol  
Susan Hodgson  
Sall Forrest

**Aid Effectiveness (DCD/EEF)**  
WP-EFF  
Brenda Killen  
Kjerstin Andraessen  
Sara-Jayne Moss

**Review and Evaluation (DCD/PEER)**  
Kaven Jorgensen  
Madelaine Paris  
Kate Taylor

**Statistics and Monitoring (DCD/STAT)**  
WP-STAT  
Simon Scott  
Jean McDonald

**Governance, Peace and Security**  
Ben Dickinson  
**GOVNET**  
Bathylle Missika  
Sebastian Bartsch  
**CPDC**  
Rory Keane  
Asbjorn Wee  
**FSG**  
Juana de Cathou  
Stephan Massing  
Alexandra Jonas

**Pro-Poor Growth**  
Michael Laird  
Solveig Buhl  
Peter Bieler

**Co-ordination**  
Stephanie Baile  
Hubert de Willy

**Aid for Trade**  
Frans Lammerse  
Masato Hayashikawa  
\* Policy Analyst

**Dissemination and Implementation**  
\* Advisor

**Investment for Development**  
Michael Laird  
Peter Bieler

**Monitoring and Public Financial Management**  
Simon Mizrahi  
Sara Fyson  
Misaki Watanabe

**Aid Untying**  
Frans Lammerse

**Health**  
Elisabeth Sandor

**Procurement**  
Micheal Lawrence

**Management for Development Results**  
Stefan Schmitz

**NEPAD/Africa**  
Gabrielle Chailleux

**Peer Reviews**  
James Hradsky  
Chantal Verger  
Elisabeth Tholeron  
Neil Patrick  
Genny Bonomi  
Steve Darvill

**Humanitarian Assistance**

**Non-DAC Donors**  
Jens Sedemund

**Evaluation**  
**EVALUATION NETWORK**  
Hans Lundgren  
Anna Hellström  
Nathalie Bienvenu

**Statistical Collections**  
Yasmin Ahmad  
Aimée Nichols  
Elena Bernaldo  
Andrzej Suchodoliski  
Cécile Sangaré  
Cecilia Piemonte  
Olivier Bourret

**Statistical Policy, Methods and Outreach**  
\* Policy Analyst  
Valérie Gaveau  
\* Statistician

**Aid for Trade Database and Untying**  
Ann Gordon  
Non-DAC Donors  
Kimberly Smith  
Ann Lucas-Zimmerman

**Scaling Up and Aid Architecture**  
Julia Benn  
**Aid Management Platform**  
Suzanne Steensen

**IT Co-ordination and Support, DAC Website**  
Marc Tocatlan  
Mark Baldock  
Valérie Thielemans  
Meria Puhakka  
Nigel Wilkie

**DAC Subsidiary Bodies**  
WP-STAT  
Working Party on Statistics  
WP-EFF  
Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices  
EVALUATION NETWORK  
Working Party on Environment and Development Co-operation  
GENDERNET  
Network on Gender Equality  
ENVIROMET  
Network on Poverty Reduction  
POVNET  
Network on Governance  
CPDC  
Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation  
FSG  
Fragile States Group

**PARIS21**  
Antoine Simonpieri  
Eric Bensef  
Samuel Blazyk  
Gérard Chemaïs  
Adriana de Leva  
Jenny Gattelli  
Susan Gray  
Geoffrey Greenwell  
Emer Heenan  
Brigitte Jule-Denmarke  
Anna Sarrotte  
Marc Tocatlan  
Tony Williams  
Jean-Marc Landais  
François Fonteneau  
Claire Naval  
Anna Cambao  
Raul Suarez  
Sylvie Walter

\* Positions with an asterisk are under recruitment.

## DAC Website Themes and Aliases

Themes and sub-themes	Direct URL to themes and sub-themes
<b>DAC Home Page</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac">www.oecd.org/dac</a>
<b>Aid Statistics</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats">www.oecd.org/dac/stats</a>
Aid Activities	● <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs">www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs</a>
Aid from DAC members	● <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/dac">www.oecd.org/dac/stats/dac</a>
<b>Aid Effectiveness</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness">www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness</a>
Managing for Development Results	● <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/results">www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/results</a>
Monitoring the Paris Declaration	● <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring">www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring</a>
Procurement	● <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/procurement">www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/procurement</a>
Public Financial Management	● <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/pfm">www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/pfm</a>
<b>Conflict and Peace</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict">www.oecd.org/dac/conflict</a>
<b>Development Effectiveness in Fragile States</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/fragilestates">www.oecd.org/dac/fragilestates</a>
<b>Environment and Development</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment">www.oecd.org/dac/environment</a>
<b>Evaluation of Development Programmes</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation">www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation</a> <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork">www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork</a> <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork/derec">www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationnetwork/derec</a>
<b>Gender Equality and Development</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender">www.oecd.org/dac/gender</a>
<b>Governance and Capacity Development</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance">www.oecd.org/dac/governance</a>
<b>Millennium Development Goals</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/mdg">www.oecd.org/dac/mdg</a>
<b>Peer Reviews of DAC Members</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews">www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews</a>
<b>Poverty Reduction</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/poverty">www.oecd.org/dac/poverty</a>
<b>Trade, Development and Capacity Building</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/trade">www.oecd.org/dac/trade</a>
<b>Untied Aid</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/untiedaid">www.oecd.org/dac/untiedaid</a>



## Statistical Annex



### Overview of Resource Flows

Table 1. DAC Members' Net Official Development Assistance in 2006 .....	134
Table 1a. Share of Debt Relief Grants in DAC Members' Net Official Development Assistance .....	135
Figure 1. DAC Members' Net Official Development Assistance in 2006 .....	137
Table 2. Total Net Flows from DAC Countries by Type of Flow .....	138-139
Table 3. Total Net Flows by DAC Country .....	140-141
Table 4. Net Official Development Assistance by DAC Country .....	142-143
Table 5. Total Net Private Flows by DAC Country .....	144-145
Table 6. Total Net Official Flows from DAC Member Countries and Multilateral Agencies by Type of Flow .....	146-147

### Aid Performance by DAC Members

Table 7. Burden Sharing Indicators .....	149
Table 8. ODA by Individual DAC Countries at 2005 Prices and Exchange Rates ...	150
Table 9. Long-term Trends in DAC ODA .....	151
Table 10. Technical Co-operation Expenditure .....	152
Table 11. Non-ODA Financial Flows to Developing Countries in 2006 .....	153

### Detailed Data on Financial Flows from DAC Countries

Table 12. Comparison of Flows by Type in 2005 .....	154-155
Table 13. Comparison of Flows by Type in 2006 .....	156-157
Table 14. The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations .....	158-173

### Multilateral Aid

Table 15. ODA from DAC Countries to Multilateral Organisations in 2006 .....	174-175
Table 16. Capital Subscriptions to Multilateral Organisations on a Deposit and an Encashment Basis .....	177
Table 17. Concessional and Non-concessional Flows by Multilateral Organisations ...	178-179

### Sectoral Allocation of ODA

Table 18. Major Aid Uses by Individual DAC Donors .....	180-181
Table 19. Aid by Major Purposes in 2006 .....	182-183

### Terms and Conditions

Table 20. Financial Terms of ODA Commitments .....	184
Table 21. DAC Members' Compliance in 2005 and 2006 with the 1978 DAC Terms Recommendations .....	185
Table 22. Other Terms Parameters, 2006 .....	186
Table 23. Tying Status of ODA by Individual DAC Members, 2006, percentages .....	187
Table 24. Tying Status of ODA by Individual DAC Members, 2006, USD million .....	189

**Geographical Distribution of ODA**

Table 25. ODA Receipts and Selected Indicators for Developing Countries and Territories . . . . .	190-193
Table 26. Distribution of ODA by Income Group . . . . .	195
Table 27. Regional Distribution of ODA by Individual DAC Donors and Multilateral Agencies . . . . .	196-197
Table 28. Regional Distribution of ODA by Individual DAC Donors . . . . .	198-199
Table 29. Net Disbursements of ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa by Donor . . . . .	200-201
Table 30. Net Disbursements of ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa by Recipient . . . . .	202
Table 31. Aid from DAC Countries to Least Developed Countries. . . . .	203
Table 32. Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid . . . . .	204-219

**Aid by Non-DAC Donors**

Table 33. ODA from Non-DAC Donors. . . . .	221
--	-----

**Key Reference Indicators for DAC Countries**

Table 34. Share of Debt Relief in DAC Members' Total Net ODA in 2006 . . . . .	222
Table 35. Economic Indicators for DAC Member Countries in 2006 . . . . .	223
Table 36. Deflators for Resource Flows from DAC Donors (2005 = 100) . . . . .	224-225
Table 37. Annual Average Dollar Exchange Rates for DAC Members . . . . .	226
Table 38. Gross National Income and Population of DAC Member Countries. . . . .	227

**For more information on DAC statistics, please refer to our  
WORLD WIDE WEBSITE  
[www.oecd.org/dac](http://www.oecd.org/dac)  
See “Statistics”**

Notes: This report incorporates data submitted up to 23 November 2007. All data in this publication refer to calendar years, unless otherwise stated. The data presented in this report reflect the DAC List as it was in 2006 (for a complete list of countries, please refer to the end of this volume).

**Signs used**

<b>()</b>	Secretariat estimate in whole or in part
<b>0 or 0.00</b>	Nil or negligible
<b>- or . .</b>	Not available
<b>n.a.</b>	Not applicable
<b>p</b>	Provisional

Slight discrepancies in totals are due to rounding.

More detailed information on the source and destination of aid and resource flows is contained in the statistical report on the *Geographical Distribution of Financial Flows to Developing Countries 2002-06* and the CD-ROM *International Development Statistics*.

Table 1

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174847103013>

## DAC Members' Net Official Development Assistance in 2006

	2006		2005		Percent change 2005 to 2006 in real terms <sup>a</sup>
	ODA USD million current	ODA/GNI %	ODA USD million current	ODA/GNI %	
Australia	2 123	0.30	1 680	0.25	22.5
Austria	1 498	0.47	1 573	0.52	-6.9
Belgium	1 978	0.50	1 963	0.53	-2.2
Canada	3 684	0.29	3 756	0.34	-9.9
Denmark	2 236	0.80	2 109	0.81	3.0
Finland	834	0.40	902	0.46	-9.0
France	10 601	0.47	10 026	0.47	2.9
Germany	10 435	0.36	10 082	0.36	1.7
Greece	424	0.17	384	0.17	5.9
Ireland	1 022	0.54	719	0.42	36.9
Italy	3 641	0.20	5 091	0.29	-30.6
Japan	11 187	0.25	13 147	0.28	-9.1
Luxembourg	291	0.89	256	0.86	4.8
Netherlands	5 452	0.81	5 115	0.82	4.2
New Zealand	259	0.27	274	0.27	0.5
Norway	2 954	0.89	2 786	0.94	-1.9
Portugal	396	0.21	377	0.21	2.0
Spain	3 814	0.32	3 018	0.27	20.7
Sweden	3 955	1.02	3 362	0.94	14.7
Switzerland	1 646	0.39	1 772	0.44	-7.4
United Kingdom	12 459	0.51	10 772	0.47	11.7
United States	23 532	0.18	27 935	0.23	-18.2
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>104 421</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>107 099</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>-4.5</b>
Average Country Effort		0.46		0.47	
<i>Memo Items:</i>					
EC	10 245		9 390		6.2
DAC-EU countries	59 035	0.43	55 750	0.44	2.9
G7 countries	75 539	0.27	80 809	0.30	-8.0
Non-G7 countries	28 882	0.51	26 290	0.50	6.3

a) Taking account of both inflation and exchange rate movements.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174883132708>

Table 1a

## Share of Debt Relief Grants in DAC Members' Net Official Development Assistance

	2006 ODA USD million current	of which: Debt relief grants	Percent change 2005 to 2006 <sup>a</sup> Without debt relief grants
Australia	2 123	277	7.8
Austria	1 498	757	8.3
Belgium	1 978	396	2.9
Canada	3 684	260	-4.7
Denmark	2 236	113	-0.8
Finland	834	-	9.2
France	10 601	3 433	2.3
Germany	10 435	2 722	14.2
Greece	424	-	5.9
Ireland	1 022	-	37.0
Italy	3 641	1 596	-42.0
Japan	11 187	3 003	-8.9
Luxembourg	291	-	4.8
Netherlands	5 452	312	4.9
New Zealand	259	0	0.6
Norway	2 954	23	-2.6
Portugal	396	0	2.8
Spain	3 814	503	31.5
Sweden	3 955	292	7.9
Switzerland	1 646	98	-0.3
United Kingdom	12 459	3 503	19.5
United States	23 532	1 585	-10.6
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>104 421</b>	<b>18 874</b>	<b>-0.8</b>
<i>Memo Items:</i>			
EC	10 245	-	6.2
DAC-EU countries	59 035	13 629	6.7
G7 countries	75 539	16 102	-4.1
Non-G7 countries	28 882	2 772	7.5

a) Taking account of both inflation and exchange rate movements.



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/173583010234>

**Figure 1**

**DAC Members' Net Official Development Assistance in 2006**





Table 2

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174883874267>**Total Net Flows from DAC Countries by Type of Flow**

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

	USD million						
	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>I. Official Development Assistance (a)</b>	54 574	57 277	58 297	69 065	79 432	107 099	104 421
1. Bilateral grants and grant-like flows	34 419	36 394	39 818	50 888	57 246	83 453	79 450
of which: Technical co-operation	12 023	14 229	15 452	18 352	18 672	20 753	22 252
Developmental food aid (b)	1 609	1 087	1 086	1 196	1 169	887	956
Humanitarian aid (b)	1 738	2 153	2 779	4 360	5 193	7 110	6 751
Debt forgiveness	5 167	3 561	4 538	8 317	7 134	24 999	18 600
Administrative costs	2 059	2 873	3 046	3 545	4 032	4 115	4 250
2. Bilateral loans	6 250	3 404	939	-1 153	-2 942	-1 008	-2 490
3. Contributions to multilateral institutions	15 614	17 479	17 540	19 330	25 127	24 653	27 461
of which: UN (c)	4 351	4 379	4 739	4 828	5 129	5 469	5 239
EC (c)	3 807	5 112	5 695	6 946	8 906	9 258	9 931
IDA (c)	4 467	4 702	3 279	3 120	5 690	4 827	6 787
Regional development banks (c)	1 480	1 440	1 813	1 734	2 274	2 096	2 466
<b>II. Other Official Flows</b>	7 890	7 861	- 45	- 348	-5 601	1 430	-9 774
1. Bilateral	7 746	7 731	2 401	- 818	-5 349	2 262	-9 598
2. Multilateral	144	130	-2 446	470	- 252	- 832	- 177
<b>III. Private Flows at market terms</b>	17 792	108 610	5 621	46 573	75 262	179 559	194 779
1. Direct investment	24 584	55 681	35 655	49 340	76 901	100 622	129 291
2. Bilateral portfolio investment	-7 701	50 364	-26 902	-6 164	-3 544	73 335	60 507
3. Multilateral portfolio investment	1 821	- 869	-3 146	1 083	-4 657	40	2 798
4. Export credits	- 912	3 433	14	2 313	6 561	5 563	2 183
<b>IV. Net grants by NGOs</b>	5 240	5 871	8 768	10 239	11 320	14 712	14 648
<b>TOTAL NET FLOWS</b>	<b>85 496</b>	<b>179 619</b>	<b>72 640</b>	<b>125 529</b>	<b>160 412</b>	<b>302 800</b>	<b>304 074</b>
<b>Total net flows at 2005 prices and exchange rates (d)</b>	<b>111 239</b>	<b>198 431</b>	<b>92 303</b>	<b>139 994</b>	<b>163 897</b>	<b>302 800</b>	<b>296 669</b>

a) Excluding debt forgiveness of non-ODA claims in 1990 and 1991. See Technical Notes on Definitions and Measurement.

b) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

c) Grants and capital subscriptions, does not include concessional lending to multilateral agencies.

d) Deflated by the total DAC deflator.

Source of private flows: DAC members' reporting to the annual DAC Questionnaire on total official and private flows.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/174883874267>

Table 2

**Total Net Flows from DAC Countries by Type of Flow**  
(continued)  
Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	Per cent of total					
		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
64	32	80	55	50	35	34	<b>I. Official Development Assistance (a)</b>
40	20	55	41	36	28	26	1. Bilateral grants and grant-like flows
14	8	21	15	12	7	7	of which: Technical co-operation
2	1	1	1	1	0	0	Developmental food aid (b)
2	1	4	3	3	2	2	Humanitarian aid (b)
6	2	6	7	4	8	6	Debt forgiveness
2	2	4	3	3	1	1	Administrative costs
7	2	1	-1	-2	-0	-1	2. Bilateral loans
18	10	24	15	16	8	9	3. Contributions to multilateral institutions
5	2	7	4	3	2	2	of which: UN (c)
4	3	8	6	6	3	3	EC (c)
5	3	5	2	4	2	2	IDA (c)
2	1	2	1	1	1	1	Regional development banks (c)
9	4	-0	-0	-3	0	-3	<b>II. Other Official Flows</b>
9	4	3	-1	-3	1	-3	1. Bilateral
0	0	-3	0	-0	-0	-0	2. Multilateral
21	60	8	37	47	59	64	<b>III. Private Flows at market terms</b>
29	31	49	39	48	33	43	1. Direct investment
-9	28	-37	-5	-2	24	20	2. Bilateral portfolio investment
2	-0	-4	1	-3	0	1	3. Multilateral portfolio investment
-1	2	0	2	4	2	1	4. Export credits
6	3	12	8	7	5	5	<b>IV. Net grants by NGOs</b>
<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>TOTAL NET FLOWS</b>

**Table 3**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175004301765>**Total Net Flows by DAC Country**

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

	USD million						
	1990-1991 average <sup>a</sup>	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	- 297	908	834	3 010	2 466	5 366	9 120
Austria	440	1 448	1 910	1 445	1 352	4 837	3 215
Belgium	815	2 690	1 337	1 221	816	3 142	5 309
Canada	3 736	6 203	2 044	4 949	5 986	13 373	14 234
Denmark	1 072	1 874	1 577	1 896	2 634	2 215	2 686
Finland	1 015	875	- 180	- 44	1 338	1 642	1 413
France	6 092	14 981	4 729	6 936	12 599	15 744	22 329
Germany	13 329	21 106	7 207	5 224	15 251	30 683	27 203
Greece	..	184	322	403	328	709	2 896
Ireland	133	309	1 469	2 334	3 851	5 298	5 237
Italy	5 368	3 756	1 399	4 218	3 239	4 103	5 512
Japan	20 860	40 191	4 659	6 335	11 368	23 259	26 230
Luxembourg	36	81	148	201	242	265	299
Netherlands	4 193	8 155	-1 487	15 196	14 106	22 781	28 616
New Zealand	110	157	164	208	271	401	338
Norway	1 289	1 669	2 279	3 306	2 785	4 630	4 304
Portugal	214	670	175	1 145	676	1 109	666
Spain	1 163	3 142	8 171	6 667	12 762	6 801	11 146
Sweden	2 317	2 114	2 232	1 255	2 954	3 545	4 175
Switzerland	3 320	- 176	1 603	3 225	1 406	8 103	11 306
United Kingdom	6 075	17 926	7 638	18 541	31 702	31 269	26 941
United States	15 925	51 358	24 410	37 860	32 283	113 526	90 897
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>85 496</b>	<b>179 619</b>	<b>72 640</b>	<b>125 529</b>	<b>160 412</b>	<b>302 800</b>	<b>304 074</b>
<i>of which:</i>							
DAC-EU countries	42 262	79 310	36 648	66 636	103 848	134 143	147 643

a) Including debt forgiveness of non-ODA claims in 1990 and 1991, except for total DAC. See Technical Notes on Definitions and Measurement.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175004301765>

Table 3

## Total Net Flows by DAC Country

(continued)

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

		Per cent of GNI					
1990-1991 average <sup>a</sup>	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
-0.11	0.24	0.22	0.61	0.41	0.79	1.27	Australia
0.27	0.63	0.94	0.58	0.46	1.60	1.01	Austria
0.41	1.00	0.54	0.40	0.23	0.84	1.34	Belgium
0.66	1.11	0.28	0.58	0.62	1.20	1.14	Canada
0.86	1.11	0.93	0.91	1.10	0.85	0.96	Denmark
0.82	0.70	-0.14	-0.03	0.72	0.84	0.67	Finland
0.51	0.97	0.32	0.39	0.61	0.74	0.99	France
0.81	0.88	0.36	0.22	0.56	1.10	0.93	Germany
..	0.15	0.24	0.23	0.16	0.32	1.18	Greece
0.36	0.55	1.49	1.83	2.47	3.09	2.77	Ireland
0.48	0.33	0.12	0.29	0.19	0.23	0.30	Italy
0.66	0.80	0.11	0.14	0.24	0.50	0.58	Japan
0.29	0.44	0.78	0.84	0.86	0.89	0.91	Luxembourg
1.49	2.05	-0.36	3.04	2.46	3.65	4.23	Netherlands
0.27	0.28	0.30	0.28	0.30	0.40	0.35	New Zealand
1.25	1.11	1.19	1.49	1.11	1.56	1.29	Norway
0.33	0.64	0.15	0.79	0.41	0.62	0.36	Portugal
0.23	0.56	1.25	0.79	1.25	0.61	0.92	Spain
1.01	0.92	0.93	0.42	0.84	0.99	1.08	Sweden
1.39	-0.06	0.54	0.96	0.37	2.02	2.69	Switzerland
0.62	1.57	0.48	1.01	1.45	1.37	1.11	United Kingdom
0.29	0.69	0.23	0.34	0.28	0.92	0.69	United States
<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
0.63	0.93	0.42	0.63	0.85	1.05	1.09	<i>of which:</i> DAC-EU countries

**Table 4**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175012603861>**Net Official Development Assistance by DAC Country**

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

	USD million						
	1990-1991 average <sup>a</sup>	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	1 002	1 134	989	1 219	1 460	1 680	2 123
Austria	231	573	520	505	678	1 573	1 498
Belgium	860	974	1 072	1 853	1 463	1 963	1 978
Canada	2 537	1 931	2 004	2 031	2 599	3 756	3 684
Denmark	1 186	1 698	1 643	1 748	2 037	2 109	2 236
Finland	888	398	462	558	680	902	834
France	7 275	7 947	5 486	7 253	8 473	10 026	10 601
Germany	6 605	7 562	5 324	6 784	7 534	10 082	10 435
Greece	..	184	276	362	321	384	424
Ireland	65	166	398	504	607	719	1 022
Italy	3 371	2 019	2 332	2 433	2 462	5 091	3 641
Japan	10 011	11 964	9 283	8 880	8 922	13 147	11 187
Luxembourg	34	74	147	194	236	256	291
Netherlands	2 527	3 236	3 338	3 972	4 204	5 115	5 452
New Zealand	98	122	122	165	212	274	259
Norway	1 191	1 278	1 696	2 042	2 199	2 786	2 954
Portugal	174	238	323	320	1 031	377	396
Spain	1 113	1 300	1 712	1 961	2 437	3 018	3 814
Sweden	2 062	1 851	2 012	2 400	2 722	3 362	3 955
Switzerland	806	1 055	939	1 299	1 545	1 772	1 646
United Kingdom	2 919	3 200	4 929	6 262	7 905	10 772	12 459
United States	11 328	8 372	13 290	16 320	19 705	27 935	23 532
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>54 574</b>	<b>57 277</b>	<b>58 297</b>	<b>69 065</b>	<b>79 432</b>	<b>107 099</b>	<b>104 421</b>
<i>of which:</i>							
DAC-EU countries	29 310	31 420	29 974	37 109	42 789	55 750	59 035

a) Including debt forgiveness of non-ODA claims in 1990, except for total DAC. See Technical Notes on Definitions and Measurement.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175012603861>

Table 4

## Net Official Development Assistance by DAC Country

(continued)

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

1990-1991 average <sup>a</sup>	1995-1996 average	Per cent of GNI					
		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
0.36	0.31	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.30	Australia
0.14	0.25	0.26	0.20	0.23	0.52	0.47	Austria
0.43	0.36	0.43	0.60	0.41	0.53	0.50	Belgium
0.45	0.35	0.28	0.24	0.27	0.34	0.29	Canada
0.95	1.00	0.96	0.84	0.85	0.81	0.80	Denmark
0.72	0.32	0.35	0.35	0.37	0.46	0.40	Finland
0.61	0.51	0.37	0.40	0.41	0.47	0.47	France
0.40	0.31	0.27	0.28	0.28	0.36	0.36	Germany
..	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.16	0.17	0.17	Greece
0.17	0.30	0.40	0.39	0.39	0.42	0.54	Ireland
0.30	0.18	0.20	0.17	0.15	0.29	0.20	Italy
0.32	0.24	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.28	0.25	Japan
0.27	0.40	0.77	0.81	0.83	0.86	0.89	Luxembourg
0.90	0.81	0.81	0.80	0.73	0.82	0.81	Netherlands
0.24	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.23	0.27	0.27	New Zealand
1.15	0.85	0.89	0.92	0.87	0.94	0.89	Norway
0.27	0.23	0.27	0.22	0.63	0.21	0.21	Portugal
0.22	0.23	0.26	0.23	0.24	0.27	0.32	Spain
0.90	0.80	0.84	0.79	0.78	0.94	1.02	Sweden
0.34	0.34	0.32	0.39	0.41	0.44	0.39	Switzerland
0.30	0.28	0.31	0.34	0.36	0.47	0.51	United Kingdom
0.20	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.17	0.23	0.18	United States
<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
							<i>of which:</i>
0.44	0.37	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.44	0.43	DAC-EU countries
							<i>Memo:</i>
0.46	0.39	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.47	0.46	Average country effort

**Table 5**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175018410625>**Total Net Private Flows<sup>a</sup> by DAC Country**

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

	USD million						
	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	-1 529	- 405	- 433	1 374	482	2 786	6 074
Austria	- 4	472	1 369	824	815	2 814	2 045
Belgium	- 285	1 497	86	-1 752	- 735	539	3 514
Canada	413	3 581	188	2 711	3 542	9 178	9 093
Denmark	- 169	91	- 63	106	518	33	454
Finland	102	251	- 656	- 622	647	723	553
France	-2 103	7 014	-1 392	-3 123	4 342	7 107	13 116
Germany	3 976	11 829	-2 650	995	7 619	12 023	21 149
Greece	..	..	40	33	- 14	325	2 454
Ireland	42	86	986	1 547	3 010	4 271	3 877
Italy	915	204	- 563	2 044	221	44	2 705
Japan	7 739	24 758	- 573	- 731	4 392	12 278	12 290
Luxembourg	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	1 386	4 491	-5 310	9 946	9 339	17 091	22 544
New Zealand	..	17	17	21	25	26	24
Norway	- 34	306	131	1 264	586	1 839	1 345
Portugal	8	359	- 150	823	335	728	286
Spain	- 29	1 914	6 404	4 633	10 300	3 716	7 333
Sweden	115	231	199	-1 153	266	159	210
Switzerland	2 396	-1 415	458	1 645	- 455	5 999	9 241
United Kingdom	2 231	14 145	2 360	11 840	23 562	19 870	14 127
United States	2 622	39 184	5 173	14 147	6 465	78 010	62 345
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>17 792</b>	<b>108 610</b>	<b>5 621</b>	<b>46 573</b>	<b>75 262</b>	<b>179 559</b>	<b>194 779</b>
<i>of which:</i>							
DAC-EU countries	6 186	42 584	659	26 141	60 225	69 444	94 366

a) Excluding grants by NGOs.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175018410625>

Table 5

Total Net Private Flows<sup>a</sup> by DAC Country

(continued)

Net disbursements at current prices and exchange rates

1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	Per cent of GNI					
		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
- 0.55	- 0.11	- 0.11	0.28	0.08	0.41	0.84	Australia
- 0.00	0.20	0.67	0.33	0.28	0.93	0.64	Austria
- 0.14	0.56	0.03	- 0.57	- 0.21	0.14	0.89	Belgium
0.07	0.64	0.03	0.32	0.36	0.82	0.73	Canada
- 0.14	0.05	- 0.04	0.05	0.22	0.01	0.16	Denmark
0.08	0.20	- 0.50	- 0.39	0.35	0.37	0.26	Finland
- 0.18	0.45	- 0.10	- 0.17	0.21	0.34	0.58	France
0.24	0.49	- 0.13	0.04	0.28	0.43	0.72	Germany
..	..	0.03	0.02	- 0.01	0.14	1.00	Greece
0.11	0.15	1.00	1.21	1.93	2.49	2.05	Ireland
0.08	0.02	- 0.05	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.15	Italy
0.24	0.49	- 0.01	- 0.02	0.09	0.26	0.27	Japan
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Luxembourg
0.49	1.13	- 1.29	1.99	1.63	2.74	3.33	Netherlands
..	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	New Zealand
- 0.03	0.20	0.07	0.57	0.23	0.62	0.40	Norway
0.01	0.34	- 0.13	0.57	0.20	0.41	0.15	Portugal
- 0.01	0.34	0.98	0.55	1.01	0.33	0.61	Spain
0.05	0.10	0.08	- 0.38	0.08	0.04	0.05	Sweden
1.01	- 0.46	0.15	0.49	- 0.12	1.49	2.19	Switzerland
0.23	1.24	0.15	0.65	1.08	0.87	0.58	United Kingdom
0.05	0.53	0.05	0.13	0.06	0.63	0.47	United States
<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
0.09	0.50	0.01	0.25	0.49	0.54	0.69	<i>of which:</i> DAC-EU countries

**Table 6**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175043110503>**Total Net Official Flows from DAC Member Countries and Multilateral Agencies<sup>a</sup> by Type of Flow**

	Current USD billion							
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>I. OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE (ODF)</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>58.2</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>63.6</b>	<b>68.9</b>	<b>110.2</b>	<b>93.5</b>
1. Official development assistance (ODA)	52.0	48.9	50.5	57.4	67.1	75.3	104.0	100.4
of which: DAC countries (b)	37.8	36.1	35.1	40.8	49.7	54.3	82.4	77.0
Multilateral organisations	14.1	12.9	15.4	16.6	17.4	21.0	21.6	23.4
2. Other ODF	27.6	5.7	7.6	-1.4	-3.6	-6.4	6.2	-6.9
of which: DAC countries (b)	13.8	-3.1	-0.5	3.6	0.5	-2.7	5.1	-5.8
Multilateral organisations	13.8	8.9	8.2	-5.0	-4.0	-3.7	1.1	-1.0
<b>II. OFFICIAL EXPORT CREDITS</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>-1.3</b>	<b>-2.7</b>	<b>-2.8</b>	<b>-3.8</b>
<b>TOTAL NET OFFICIAL FLOWS (I+II)</b>	<b>80.4</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>57.9</b>	<b>54.8</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>66.2</b>	<b>107.4</b>	<b>89.7</b>
<b>Memorandum items (not included):</b>								
Non-DAC donors (ODA) (b)	0.5	0.8	0.9	2.7	3.2	3.2	3.0	4.5
Net Use of IMF Credit (c)	-9.5	-7.0	23.2	15.0	4.1	-12.1	-35.8	-26.9
Gross ODF	117.6	88.5	89.7	102.7	124.7	123.2	164.4	196.2
of which: IBRD loans	13.3	11.8	10.7	8.4	10.6	9.2	8.5	11.5
<b>For cross reference</b>								
Total DAC net ODA (d)	53.2	53.7	52.4	58.3	69.1	79.4	107.1	104.4
of which: Bilateral grants	33.9	33.0	33.5	39.8	50.9	57.2	83.5	79.4

a) Excluding Arab agencies.

b) Bilateral flows.

c) Non-concessional flows from the IMF General Resources Account.

d) Comprises bilateral ODA as above plus **contributions to** multilateral organisations in place of ODA **disbursements from** multilateral organisations shown above.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175043110503>

Table 6

**Total Net Official Flows from DAC Member Countries and Multilateral Agencies<sup>a</sup> by Type of Flow**  
(continued)

1999	2000	2001	Per cent of total		2004	2005	2006	
			2002	2003				
98.9	102.2	100.5	102.2	102.1	104.0	102.6	104.2	<b>I. OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE (ODF)</b>
64.6	91.5	87.3	104.7	107.8	113.7	96.9	111.9	1. Official development assistance (ODA)
47.1	67.4	60.7	74.4	79.9	82.0	76.8	85.8	of which: DAC countries (b)
17.6	24.1	26.6	30.3	27.9	31.7	20.1	26.1	Multilateral organisations
34.3	10.7	13.2	-2.5	-5.7	-9.6	5.7	-7.6	2. Other ODF
17.1	-5.8	-0.9	6.6	0.8	-4.0	4.7	-6.5	of which: DAC countries (b)
17.2	16.6	14.1	-9.1	-6.5	-5.6	1.0	-1.2	Multilateral organisations
1.1	-2.2	-0.5	-2.2	-2.1	-4.0	-2.6	-4.2	<b>II. OFFICIAL EXPORT CREDITS</b>
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	<b>TOTAL NET OFFICIAL FLOWS (I+II)</b>



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175127080535>

Table 7

**Burden Sharing Indicators**  
**2005-2006 average**  
 Net disbursements

	Grant equivalent of total ODA <sup>a</sup> as % of GNI	Multilateral ODA as % of GNI <sup>b</sup>		of which:		ODA per capita of donor country 2005 USD		Aid by NGOs as % of GNI	
				Aid to LICs <sup>c</sup>	Aid to LDCs <sup>d</sup>	Memo:		Memo:	
				as % of GNI		1995-1996	2005-2006	1995-1996	2005-2006
Australia	0.27	0.04	n.a.	0.12	0.06	80	92	0.02	0.10
Austria	0.50	0.05	(0.12)	0.18	0.08	74	184	0.02	0.04
Belgium	0.53	0.07	(0.17)	0.27	0.17	104	185	0.02	0.07
Canada	0.32	0.09	n.a.	0.14	0.10	89	110	0.05	0.09
Denmark	0.83	0.21	(0.28)	0.45	0.31	378	394	0.02	0.03
Finland	0.43	0.10	(0.17)	0.19	0.13	84	164	0.00	0.01
France	0.53	0.04	(0.12)	0.26	0.11	151	164	0.01	0.00
Germany	0.40	0.03	(0.11)	0.16	0.08	92	123	0.05	0.05
Greece	0.17	0.02	(0.09)	0.05	0.04	22	36	0.00	0.00
Ireland	0.48	0.11	(0.17)	0.30	0.25	67	207	0.10	0.18
Italy	0.25	0.05	(0.12)	0.12	0.06	46	74	0.00	0.01
Japan	0.36	0.07	n.a.	0.12	0.06	78	98	0.00	0.01
Luxembourg	0.87	0.17	(0.25)	0.50	0.37	203	577	0.04	0.03
Netherlands	0.85	0.13	(0.20)	0.35	0.23	244	319	0.09	0.05
New Zealand	0.27	0.05	n.a.	0.10	0.07	42	66	0.03	0.07
Norway	0.91	0.24	n.a.	0.43	0.34	437	592	0.06	0.00
Portugal	0.21	0.03	(0.09)	0.14	0.12	31	37	0.00	0.00
Spain	0.32	0.05	(0.12)	0.11	0.07	43	76	0.02	0.00
Sweden	0.99	0.24	(0.30)	0.42	0.30	220	397	0.01	0.01
Switzerland	0.42	0.09	n.a.	0.17	0.10	152	228	0.06	0.09
United Kingdom	0.52	0.08	(0.13)	0.32	0.14	80	190	0.04	0.03
United States	0.21	0.02	n.a.	0.06	0.04	38	85	0.03	0.07
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>(0.08)</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.04</b>

a) Equals grant disbursements plus grant equivalent of new loan commitments calculated against a 10% discount rate.

b) In brackets, including EC. Capital subscriptions are on a deposit basis.

c) Low-income countries (LICs) comprise LDCs and all other countries with per capita income (World Bank Atlas basis) of USD 825 or less in 2004. Includes imputed multilateral ODA.

d) Least developed countries (LDCs) are countries on the United Nations' list. Includes imputed multilateral ODA.

**Table 8**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175205877610>**ODA by Individual DAC Countries at 2005 Prices and Exchange Rates**

Net disbursements

USD million

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	1 362	1 453	1 437	1 545	1 477	1 547	1 550	1 582	1 680	2 058
Austria	610	574	640	645	937	719	573	688	1 573	1 465
Belgium	969	1 113	996	1 219	1 302	1 501	2 132	1 494	1 963	1 921
Canada	2 768	2 486	2 446	2 400	2 175	2 853	2 494	2 881	3 756	3 385
Denmark	2 147	2 240	2 335	2 523	2 487	2 316	2 016	2 092	2 109	2 173
Finland	463	482	525	527	552	615	623	686	902	820
France	7 890	7 174	7 353	6 094	6 290	7 632	8 265	8 632	10 026	10 313
Germany	6 808	6 546	6 726	7 140	7 201	7 200	7 573	7 584	10 082	10 257
Greece	226	242	263	354	322	404	427	333	384	407
Ireland	275	290	362	378	451	567	584	629	719	984
Italy	1 691	3 025	2 477	2 139	2 527	3 330	2 811	2 514	5 091	3 533
Japan	9 298	11 444	11 535	12 335	10 262	10 128	9 111	8 638	13 147	11 946
Luxembourg	128	154	162	191	221	216	227	247	256	269
Netherlands	3 980	4 108	4 344	4 833	4 784	4 607	4 475	4 276	5 115	5 329
New Zealand	193	200	208	200	204	201	214	231	274	275
Norway	2 059	2 239	2 249	2 020	2 175	2 472	2 571	2 494	2 786	2 732
Portugal	351	359	387	426	420	461	371	1 059	377	385
Spain	1 800	1 997	2 016	1 974	2 835	2 546	2 336	2 538	3 018	3 643
Sweden	1 973	1 853	1 974	2 386	2 445	2 732	2 659	2 707	3 362	3 854
Switzerland	1 114	1 101	1 243	1 254	1 270	1 193	1 410	1 540	1 772	1 641
United Kingdom	4 613	4 999	4 441	6 156	6 423	6 457	7 309	8 013	10 772	12 034
United States	8 127	10 267	10 535	11 223	12 583	14 381	17 291	20 301	27 935	22 863
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>58 843</b>	<b>64 346</b>	<b>64 654</b>	<b>67 961</b>	<b>69 342</b>	<b>74 077</b>	<b>77 022</b>	<b>81 157</b>	<b>107 099</b>	<b>102 287</b>
<i>of which:</i>										
DAC-EU countries	33 921	35 156	35 002	36 985	39 196	41 303	42 382	43 490	55 750	57 387
<i>Memo:</i>										
<b>Total DAC at current prices and exchange rates</b>	<b>48 465</b>	<b>52 087</b>	<b>53 233</b>	<b>53 749</b>	<b>52 423</b>	<b>58 297</b>	<b>69 065</b>	<b>79 432</b>	<b>107 099</b>	<b>104 421</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175246185275>

Table 9

## Long-term Trends in DAC ODA

	Volume of net ODA (USD million at 2005 prices and exchange rates)			Share of total DAC (at current prices and exchange rates, per cent)			Two-year averages, net disbursements ODA as per cent GNI		
	1985-1986	1995-1996	2005-2006	1985-1986	1995-1996	2005-2006	1985-1986	1995-1996	2005-2006
Australia	1 587	1 460	1 869	2.3	2.0	1.8	0.47	0.31	0.27
Austria	540	599	1 519	0.7	1.0	1.5	0.28	0.25	0.49
Belgium	1 184	1 057	1 942	1.5	1.7	1.9	0.51	0.36	0.51
Canada	3 017	2 637	3 570	5.1	3.4	3.5	0.49	0.35	0.31
Denmark	1 367	1 980	2 141	1.8	3.0	2.1	0.85	1.00	0.80
Finland	499	429	861	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.43	0.32	0.43
France	7 822	8 777	10 169	11.1	13.9	9.8	0.58	0.51	0.47
Germany	7 312	7 487	10 170	10.5	13.2	9.7	0.45	0.31	0.36
Greece	..	230	396	..	0.3	0.4	..	0.15	0.17
Ireland	129	241	852	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.27	0.30	0.48
Italy	4 076	2 618	4 312	5.4	3.5	4.1	0.34	0.18	0.24
Japan	8 443	9 829	12 546	14.6	20.9	11.5	0.29	0.24	0.27
Luxembourg	25	84	263	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.17	0.40	0.87
Netherlands	3 332	3 783	5 222	4.5	5.7	5.0	0.97	0.81	0.81
New Zealand	166	154	274	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.28	0.22	0.27
Norway	1 692	1 912	2 759	2.1	2.2	2.7	1.10	0.85	0.91
Portugal	51	304	381	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.06	0.23	0.21
Spain	532	1 695	3 331	0.6	2.3	3.2	0.09	0.23	0.29
Sweden	1 866	1 948	3 608	3.0	3.2	3.5	0.85	0.80	0.99
Switzerland	826	1 074	1 706	1.1	1.8	1.6	0.30	0.34	0.42
United Kingdom	4 357	4 698	11 403	5.1	5.6	11.0	0.32	0.28	0.49
United States	15 169	10 140	25 399	29.4	14.6	24.3	0.23	0.11	0.20
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>63 992</b>	<b>63 135</b>	<b>104 693</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.32</b>
<i>of which:</i>									
DAC-EU countries	33 091	35 929	56 569	45.1	54.9	54.3	0.45	0.37	0.44

**Table 10**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175308628378>**Technical Co-operation Expenditure**

Net disbursements

USD million at current prices and exchange rates

	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	243	388	424	559	692	740	860
Austria	73	155	89	114	133	150	162
Belgium	190	290	291	324	414	500	580
Canada	490	363	328	345	414	335	530
Denmark	122	102	93	111	112	115	110
Finland	117	49	93	129	178	98	81
France	2 101	2 514	1 525	1 934	2 340	2 364	2 805
Germany	1 957	2 438	1 781	2 299	2 486	2 865	3 116
Greece	..	18	22	117	53	77	89
Ireland	11	60	13	11	12	13	20
Italy	363	70	102	148	140	121	171
Japan	1 354	2 291	1 812	1 880	1 914	1 873	1 858
Luxembourg	0	2	3	3	4	4	6
Netherlands	876	950	512	684	663	609	464
New Zealand	35	44	36	40	46	41	49
Norway	104	172	178	236	287	319	366
Portugal	36	62	127	142	114	114	117
Spain	174	128	239	313	340	483	438
Sweden	191	248	68	92	112	140	132
Switzerland	0	368	154	177	117	144	161
United Kingdom	772	816	874	993	751	845	860
United States	2 815	2 701	6 690	7 701	7 347	8 803	9 278
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>12 023</b>	<b>14 229</b>	<b>15 452</b>	<b>18 352</b>	<b>18 672</b>	<b>20 753</b>	<b>22 252</b>
<i>of which:</i>							
DAC-EU countries	6 983	7 902	5 831	7 415	7 855	8 498	9 151

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175324428212>

Table 11

## Non-ODA Financial Flows to Developing Countries in 2006

Per cent of reporting country's GNI

	<i>Memo:</i> Total net flows	<i>of which:</i>							
		Total non-ODA flows	Export credits	OOF excl. export credits	Direct investment	Bank lending	Non-bank portfolio	Multi-lateral private flows	NGOs net
Australia	1.27	0.97	0.02	0.04	0.69	0.05	0.09	-	0.09
Austria	1.01	0.54	0.12	-0.12	0.50	-	-	-	0.04
Belgium	1.34	0.84	-0.00	-0.11	0.89	-	-	-	0.06
Canada	1.14	0.84	0.14	-0.04	0.62	0.03	-	-	0.09
Denmark	0.96	0.16	-	-0.03	0.16	-	-	-	0.03
Finland	0.67	0.27	0.01	-	0.19	-0.05	0.12	-	0.01
France	0.99	0.52	-0.06	-0.06	0.47	0.13	0.05	-	-
Germany	0.93	0.57	-0.02	-0.18	0.42	0.14	0.12	0.04	0.05
Greece	1.18	1.01	-	0.00	1.00	-	-	-	0.00
Ireland	2.77	2.23	-	-	-	2.05	-	-	0.18
Italy	0.30	0.10	0.14	-0.05	0.06	-0.02	-0.04	-	0.01
Japan	0.58	0.34	-0.02	0.08	0.32	-0.03	-	-0.02	0.01
Luxembourg	0.91	0.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03
Netherlands	4.23	3.43	0.84	0.05	0.94	1.08	0.51	-0.04	0.04
New Zealand	0.35	0.08	-	0.01	0.02	-	-	-	0.05
Norway	1.29	0.41	-0.00	0.00	0.41	-	-	-	-
Portugal	0.36	0.14	0.13	-0.01	0.02	-	-	-	0.00
Spain	0.92	0.61	-0.02	-	0.63	-	-	-	-
Sweden	1.08	0.06	-0.03	-0.00	0.09	-	-0.00	-	0.00
Switzerland	2.69	2.29	-0.12	0.00	2.38	-	-	-0.06	0.10
United Kingdom	1.11	0.60	-0.19	-0.01	0.31	0.47	-	-	0.02
United States	0.69	0.51	-0.03	-0.01	0.28	0.05	0.12	0.02	0.07
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>-0.00</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.04</b>
<i>of which:</i>									
DAC-EU countries	1.09	0.65	0.01	-0.06	0.40	0.21	0.06	0.01	0.02

Table 12

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175338651128>

## Comparison of Flows by Type in 2005

USD million

	Total DAC Countries	Australia	Austria	Belgium	Canada	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>									
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	107 099	1 680	1 573	1 963	3 756	2 109	902	10 026	10 082
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.36</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	82 445	1 449	1 232	1 308	2 833	1 357	597	7 239	7 447
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	83 453	1 449	1 244	1 328	2 853	1 414	591	7 707	8 248
of which: Technical co-operation	20 753	740	150	500	335	115	98	2 364	2 865
Developmental food aid	887	55	1	0	3	0	-	39	23
Humanitarian aid	7 110	194	26	66	166	155	74	28	317
Contributions to NGOs	1 779	4	0	20	31	56	7	40	-
Administrative costs	4 115	76	31	47	250	116	34	334	206
2. Development lending and capital	-1 008	-	-12	-20	-20	-57	6	-468	-801
of which: New development lending	883	-	-5	-15	-20	-	-	-333	-447
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	24 653	231	341	655	923	751	305	2 787	2 635
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	24 670	231	341	655	924	751	305	2 747	2 635
of which: EC	9 258	-	221	368	-	196	140	1 811	2 205
IDA	4 827	105	46	184	190	77	38	296	-
Regional Development Banks	2 096	28	36	23	213	51	20	206	54
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	1 430	74	310	391	-534	-8	-	-1 390	7 055
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	2 262	-91	310	391	-534	-8	-	-1 390	7 055
1. Official export credits (a)	-2 812	-175	-120	0	46	-	-	-	-192
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	5 074	84	430	391	-580	-8	-	-1 390	7 247
D. Multilateral Institutions	-832	165	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	14 712	825	139	249	973	81	16	-	1 523
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	179 559	2 786	2 814	539	9 178	33	723	7 107	12 023
1. Direct investment	100 622	1 588	2 712	1 422	6 647	33	149	6 856	14 069
2. Private export credits	5 563	132	102	-884	787	-	-161	-911	-131
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-411
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	73 335	1 066	-	-	1 744	-	736	1 163	-1 505
V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)	<b>302 800</b>	<b>5 366</b>	<b>4 837</b>	<b>3 142</b>	<b>13 373</b>	<b>2 215</b>	<b>1 642</b>	<b>15 744</b>	<b>30 683</b>
Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>1.10</b>
<i>For reference:</i>									
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>									
Official Development Assistance (b)	117 749	1 680	1 587	2 015	3 777	2 174	907	11 530	11 595
New development lending	7 492	-	-	25	0	-	-	554	551
Food aid, Total bilateral	3 069	66	4	22	125	9	16	39	106
Other Official Flows	25 148	269	563	462	1 309	26	-	1 891	10 910
of which: Official export credits	2 386	1	75	0	1 254	-	-	-	68
Private export credits	24 400	132	648	158	1 954	-	3	-	4 349
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>									
Official Development Assistance, Total (b)	122 321	2 058	1 621	2 104	3 740	2 352	1 140	12 131	12 521
Bilateral grants, Total	84 769	1 431	1 260	1 554	2 816	1 574	683	7 634	7 493
Debt forgiveness	24 382	4	874	501	455	66	-	3 498	3 905
Bilateral loans, Total	12 209	-	-	24	-	32	11	1 228	1 743
<i>Memo items:</i>									
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	25 164	20	911	477	455	50	150	3 498	3 905
of which: debt forgiveness	24 999	19	911	477	455	50	150	3 498	3 905
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (c)	22 733	20	904	472	455	30	150	3 212	3 441
Refugees in donor countries	2 069	75	62	58	175	70	17	585	17

a) Including funds in support of private export credits.

b) Including debt reorganisation.

c) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175338651128>

Table 12

## Comparison of Flows by Type in 2005

(continued)

USD million

Greece	Ireland	Italy	Japan	Luxembourg	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	United Kingdom	United States
384	719	5 091	13 147	256	5 115	274	2 786	377	3 018	3 362	1 772	10 772	27 935
<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.23</b>
206	482	2 270	10 406	187	3 683	224	2 033	218	1 863	2 256	1 405	8 169	25 582
207	482	2 213	9 195	187	3 696	224	1 968	201	2 020	2 247	1 385	8 250	26 344
77	13	121	1 873	4	609	41	319	114	483	140	144	845	8 803
1	19	12	58	1	-	2	0	-	10	-	-	-	662
17	64	67	516	16	408	53	344	13	114	261	190	628	3 392
-	130	53	129	33	674	14	-	6	7	134	47	394	-
30	31	40	702	11	245	15	137	16	103	126	52	427	1 084
-0	-	57	1 212	-	-13	-	64	17	-157	9	20	-82	-762
-0	-	45	1 533	-	-28	-	-	17	121	9	-6	12	-
178	237	2 821	2 740	69	1 432	50	754	159	1 155	1 106	367	2 603	2 353
178	237	2 821	2 740	69	1 432	50	754	159	1 155	1 106	367	2 649	2 363
158	112	1 261	-	25	432	-	-	128	784	198	-	1 221	-
5	23	679	750	6	245	9	113	12	123	274	142	665	843
0	-	168	487	10	163	6	88	4	134	104	54	28	219
-	-	-1 125	-2 421	-	152	7	5	-3	67	-4	-	-99	-1 048
-	-	-1 125	-1 423	-	152	7	5	-3	67	-4	-	-99	-1 048
-	-	5	-1 202	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	-1 212
-	-	-1 130	-222	-	152	7	5	-3	67	-4	-	-135	164
-	-	-	-997	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	308	94	255	8	422	94	-	6	-	29	332	726	8 629
325	4 271	44	12 278	-	17 091	26	1 839	728	3 716	159	5 999	19 870	78 010
325	-	951	14 472	-	2 348	26	1 847	556	4 158	430	7 451	14 812	19 770
-	-	1 451	-3 433	-	10 614	-	-8	172	-442	-271	-729	-625	-100
-	-	-	81	-	-474	-	-	-	-	-	-722	-	1 566
-	4 271	-2 358	1 158	-	4 604	-	-	-	-	-0	-	5 683	56 774
<b>709</b>	<b>5 298</b>	<b>4 103</b>	<b>23 259</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>22 781</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>4 630</b>	<b>1 109</b>	<b>6 801</b>	<b>3 545</b>	<b>8 103</b>	<b>31 269</b>	<b>113 526</b>
<b>0.32</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>0.92</b>
384	719	5 264	18 640	256	5 201	274	2 786	383	3 518	3 362	1 778	11 168	28 750
-	-	218	5 763	-	-	-	-	23	331	9	1	17	-
3	26	12	58	9	76	9	74	1	33	10	28	66	2 277
-	-	142	8 508	-	152	7	5	-	67	41	-	52	745
-	-	55	753	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	142
-	-	-	4 487	-	10 912	-	14	186	-	1 347	211	-	-
384	719	5 636	19 363	256	4 435	370	2 831	383	3 518	3 732	1 754	11 162	30 109
207	482	2 233	9 353	187	3 443	314	2 058	201	2 020	2 517	1 344	8 244	27 719
-	-	1 670	4 776	-	-	-	-	3	763	53	224	3 515	4 076
-	-	452	7 912	-	87	-	19	23	342	9	30	265	33
-	0	1 670	4 776	-	330	0	2	3	903	53	224	3 540	4 196
-	-	1 670	4 776	-	330	-	-	3	763	53	224	3 521	4 194
-	0	1 670	3 553	-	324	0	2	3	613	53	224	3 530	4 078
9	2	0	-	7	94	11	68	0	20	143	129	-	525

Table 13

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175341663366>

## Comparison of Flows by Type in 2006

USD million

	Total DAC Countries	Australia	Austria	Belgium	Canada	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>									
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	104 421	2 123	1 498	1 978	3 684	2 236	834	10 601	10 435
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.36</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	76 960	1 796	1 092	1 357	2 531	1 464	455	7 919	7 034
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	79 450	1 773	1 101	1 365	2 573	1 525	442	8 422	7 576
of which: Technical co-operation	22 252	860	162	580	530	110	81	2 805	3 116
Developmental food aid	956	3	1	-	3	1	-	34	25
Humanitarian aid	6 751	191	17	86	231	151	70	48	357
Contributions to NGOs	2 008	1	0	21	27	122	9	42	-
Administrative costs	4 250	78	32	54	228	111	33	342	227
2. Development lending and capital	-2 490	23	-9	-7	-42	-61	13	-503	-542
of which: New development lending	-944	23	-4	-4	-42	-15	-	-321	-425
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	27 461	327	407	620	1 153	772	380	2 681	3 401
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	28 040	327	407	620	1 153	772	380	3 193	3 401
of which: EC	9 931	-	236	393	-	218	153	1 938	2 148
IDA	6 787	181	98	102	281	71	46	456	591
Regional Development Banks	2 466	72	36	39	163	49	20	207	304
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	-9 774	308	-448	-434	356	-77	-	-1 388	-5 728
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	-9 598	190	-448	-434	356	-77	-	-1 388	-5 728
1. Official export credits (a)	-3 781	-	-64	0	831	-	-	-	-466
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	-5 817	190	-384	-434	-474	-77	-	-1 388	-5 262
D. Multilateral Institutions	-177	118	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	14 648	615	119	251	1 100	73	25	-	1 348
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	194 779	6 074	2 045	3 514	9 093	454	553	13 116	21 149
1. Direct investment	129 291	4 968	1 613	3 533	7 717	454	402	10 589	12 401
2. Private export credits	2 183	129	433	-19	950	-	14	-1 456	19
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	2 798	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 057
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	60 507	978	-	-	427	-	137	3 983	7 672
V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)	<b>304 074</b>	<b>9 120</b>	<b>3 215</b>	<b>5 309</b>	<b>14 234</b>	<b>2 686</b>	<b>1 413</b>	<b>22 329</b>	<b>27 203</b>
Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI	<b>0.89</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.93</b>
<b>For reference:</b>									
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>									
Official Development Assistance (b)	117 112	2 123	1 510	2 047	3 730	2 315	838	12 764	12 049
New development lending	7 454	23	-	34	-	-	-	744	674
Food aid, Total bilateral	2 876	44	2	21	118	11	-	39	103
Other Official Flows	16 933	308	149	30	2 210	47	-	311	115
of which: Official export credits	2 975	-	76	0	2 198	-	-	-	91
Private export credits	38 563	-	1 078	531	2 572	-	14	-503	4 705
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>									
Official Development Assistance, Total (b)	131 264	2 123	1 519	2 413	3 831	2 110	964	15 026	13 230
Bilateral grants, Total	89 683	1 773	1 083	1 499	2 678	1 369	588	8 595	7 853
Debt forgiveness	18 261	277	718	401	245	256	-	3 683	3 015
Bilateral loans, Total	10 307	23	-	46	-	-	19	1 349	1 624
<b>Memo items:</b>									
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	20 195	277	761	401	260	146	-	3 683	3 015
of which: debt forgiveness	18 600	277	761	401	245	146	-	3 683	3 015
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (c)	18 874	277	757	396	260	113	-	3 433	2 722
Refugees in donor countries	1 823	0	41	73	158	42	11	471	18

a) Including funds in support of private export credits.

b) Including debt reorganisation.

c) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175341663366>

Table 13

## Comparison of Flows by Type in 2006

(continued)

USD million

Greece	Ireland	Italy	Japan	Luxembourg	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	Switzerland	United Kingdom	United States
424	1 022	3 641	11 187	291	5 452	259	2 954	396	3 814	3 955	1 646	12 459	23 532
<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.18</b>
189	632	2 001	7 313	205	4 282	203	2 198	211	2 092	2 852	1 254	8 718	21 162
189	632	2 147	7 660	205	4 415	203	2 119	198	2 012	2 838	1 241	8 809	22 005
89	20	171	1 858	6	464	49	366	117	438	132	161	860	9 278
0	10	6	84	8	1	1	7	-	29	-	-	-	743
19	87	74	183	37	397	21	309	7	137	295	175	835	3 022
-	100	10	102	3	977	15	-	7	6	152	49	365	-
19	34	56	668	13	255	16	164	13	101	193	52	477	1 084
-	-	- 146	- 347	-	- 133	-	79	14	80	14	13	- 92	- 843
-	-	- 155	- 7	-	- 133	-	-	14	138	14	- 11	- 15	-
235	389	1 640	3 874	86	1 169	56	756	185	1 722	1 103	392	3 741	2 370
235	389	1 640	3 874	86	1 169	56	756	185	1 722	1 103	392	3 798	2 380
164	122	1 316	-	24	432	-	-	124	852	246	-	1 565	-
42	122	30	2 385	12	16	8	119	14	228	47	163	946	827
-	19	16	454	11	55	6	87	30	139	109	57	354	240
8	-	- 957	2 438	-	343	7	5	- 20	-	- 2	17	- 187	- 4 017
8	-	- 957	2 732	-	343	7	5	- 20	-	- 2	17	- 187	- 4 017
-	-	38	- 1 305	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	- 2 817
8	-	- 995	4 038	-	343	7	5	- 20	-	- 2	17	- 189	- 1 200
-	-	-	- 294	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	339	123	315	8	277	48	-	4	-	12	402	543	9 037
2 454	3 877	2 705	12 290	-	22 544	24	1 345	286	7 333	210	9 241	14 127	62 345
2 454	-	1 151	14 144	-	6 351	24	1 351	44	7 608	333	10 001	7 530	36 624
-	-	2 602	275	-	5 713	-	- 6	243	- 275	- 123	- 521	- 4 696	- 1 097
-	-	-	- 928	-	- 248	-	-	-	-	-	- 239	-	3 156
-	3 877	- 1 049	- 1 201	-	10 728	-	-	-	0	- 0	0	11 292	23 662
<b>2 896</b>	<b>5 237</b>	<b>5 512</b>	<b>26 230</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>28 616</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>4 304</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>11 146</b>	<b>4 175</b>	<b>11 306</b>	<b>26 941</b>	<b>90 897</b>
<b>1.18</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>0.69</b>
424	1 022	4 003	17 115	291	5 889	259	2 954	402	4 160	3 955	1 657	13 075	24 532
-	-	207	5 324	-	-	-	-	20	415	14	-	1	-
0	14	14	84	18	48	3	76	-	35	4	36	140	2 064
8	-	174	12 585	-	343	7	5	-	-	81	17	11	531
-	-	53	436	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	118
-	-	1 572	20 667	-	6 327	-	5	273	-	1 147	175	-	-
424	1 022	4 138	17 344	291	12 626	356	3 404	402	4 160	4 249	1 880	13 075	26 678
189	632	2 159	7 861	205	10 831	297	2 595	198	2 012	3 089	1 215	8 809	24 151
-	-	1 379	3 212	-	8	-	-	-	538	292	98	2 557	1 583
-	-	349	5 751	-	-	-	53	20	427	14	28	465	142
-	-	1 596	3 544	-	312	0	23	0	573	292	98	3 511	1 704
-	-	1 379	3 212	-	294	-	-	-	538	292	98	2 557	1 703
-	-	1 596	3 003	-	312	0	23	0	503	292	98	3 503	1 585
5	1	0	-	-	112	10	67	0	28	164	132	-	488

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

USD million

	1995-96	2003	Australia 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	1 134	1 219	1 460	1 680	2 123
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.30</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	889	975	1 191	1 449	1 796
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	889	975	1 191	1 449	1 773
of which: Technical co-operation	388	559	692	740	860
Developmental food aid (a)	22	19	40	55	3
Humanitarian aid (a)	34	108	113	194	191
Contributions to NGOs	7	1	-	4	1
Administrative costs	43	55	65	76	78
2. Development lending and capital	-	-	-	-	23
of which: New development lending	-	-	-	-	23
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	245	244	270	231	327
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	245	244	270	231	327
of which: EC	-	-	-	-	-
IDA	88	90	85	105	181
Regional Development Banks	62	69	74	28	72
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	110	80	35	74	308
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	110	- 6	- 79	- 91	190
1. Official export credits (b)	110	- 118	- 166	- 175	-
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	-	110	87	84	190
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	86	114	165	118
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	68	336	489	825	615
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	- 405	1 374	482	2 786	6 074
1. Direct investment	- 639	239	506	1 588	4 968
2. Private export credits	783	-	-	132	129
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	-	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	- 549	1 135	- 24	1 066	978
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>3 010</b>	<b>2 466</b>	<b>5 366</b>	<b>9 120</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>1.27</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	1 134	1 219	1 460	1 680	2 123
New development lending	-	-	-	-	23
Food aid, Total bilateral	30	37	52	66	44
Other Official Flows	110	199	210	269	308
of which: Official export credits	110	2	4	1	-
Private export credits	783	-	-	132	-
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	1 393	1 242	1 327	2 058	2 123
Bilateral grants, Total	1 093	1 140	1 239	1 431	1 773
Debt forgiveness	-	3	7	4	277
Bilateral loans, Total	-	-	-	-	23
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	6	7	12	20	277
of which: debt forgiveness	6	6	10	19	277
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	7	12	20	277
Refugees in donor countries	0	31	55	75	0

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)  
USD million

Austria					Belgium				
1995-96	2003	2004	2005	2006	1995-96	2003	2004	2005	2006
573	505	678	1 573	1 498	974	1 853	1 463	1 963	1 978
<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.50</b>
397	228	353	1 232	1 092	522	1 468	902	1 308	1 357
386	266	380	1 244	1 101	530	1 496	953	1 328	1 365
155	114	133	150	162	290	324	414	500	580
3	2	2	1	1	17	11	3	0	-
6	2	7	26	17	20	31	58	66	86
3	0	0	0	0	3	7	23	20	21
16	26	30	31	32	49	57	41	47	54
11	- 37	- 28	- 12	- 9	- 9	- 27	- 50	- 20	- 7
11	- 35	- 4	- 5	- 4	- 4	- 23	- 46	- 15	- 4
176	276	325	341	407	452	385	561	655	620
176	276	325	341	407	454	385	561	655	620
89	169	200	221	236	199	282	335	368	393
29	42	46	46	98	156	-	92	184	102
2	27	30	36	36	8	24	26	23	39
353	44	- 229	310	- 448	159	955	- 93	391	- 434
256	44	- 229	310	- 448	159	955	- 93	391	- 434
244	48	- 175	- 120	- 64	29	0	0	0	0
12	- 4	- 55	430	- 384	130	955	- 93	391	- 434
96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	71	89	139	119	61	165	181	249	251
472	824	815	2 814	2 045	1 497	- 1 752	- 735	539	3 514
166	765	924	2 712	1 613	295	-	- 169	1 422	3 533
306	59	- 109	102	433	- 227	- 1 752	- 566	- 884	- 19
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	1 429	-	-	-	-
<b>1 448</b>	<b>1 445</b>	<b>1 352</b>	<b>4 837</b>	<b>3 215</b>	<b>2 690</b>	<b>1 221</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>3 142</b>	<b>5 309</b>
<b>0.63</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>1.34</b>
581	545	708	1 587	1 510	1 014	1 887	1 555	2 015	2 047
16	1	-	-	-	29	6	28	25	34
3	2	2	4	2	19	17	19	22	21
376	162	138	563	149	254	1 000	24	462	30
268	162	138	75	76	29	0	0	0	0
391	217	294	648	1 078	140	-	258	158	531
763	570	727	1 621	1 519	1 014	1 761	2 199	2 104	2 413
447	277	385	1 260	1 083	530	1 564	1 280	1 554	1 499
34	8	83	874	718	62	753	211	501	401
93	-	-	-	-	29	4	28	24	46
41	41	117	911	761	62	757	211	477	401
19	41	117	911	761	62	757	211	477	401
-	39	93	904	757	-	753	206	472	396
97	34	52	62	41	-	79	42	58	73

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

**Table 14**

 StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>
**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

(continued)

USD million

	1995-96	2003	Canada 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	1 931	2 031	2 599	3 756	3 684
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.29</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	1 371	1 348	1 991	2 833	2 531
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	1 410	1 681	2 022	2 853	2 573
of which: Technical co-operation	363	345	414	335	530
Developmental food aid (a)	83	116	28	3	3
Humanitarian aid (a)	54	101	119	166	231
Contributions to NGOs	164	1	1	31	27
Administrative costs	117	202	209	250	228
2. Development lending and capital	- 39	- 333	- 31	- 20	- 42
of which: New development lending	- 21	- 333	- 31	- 20	- 42
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	560	683	608	923	1 153
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	560	683	608	924	1 153
of which: EC	-	-	-	-	-
IDA	101	164	177	190	281
Regional Development Banks	56	102	102	213	163
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	397	- 358	- 794	- 534	356
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	397	- 358	- 794	- 534	356
1. Official export credits (b)	494	- 277	- 664	46	831
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	- 97	- 81	- 130	- 580	- 474
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	294	566	639	973	1 100
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	3 581	2 711	3 542	9 178	9 093
1. Direct investment	3 889	2 626	3 613	6 647	7 717
2. Private export credits	- 50	3	0	787	950
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	-	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	- 257	82	- 71	1 744	427
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>6 203</b>	<b>4 949</b>	<b>5 986</b>	<b>13 373</b>	<b>14 234</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>1.14</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	1 989	2 368	2 631	3 777	3 730
New development lending	19	4	1	0	-
Food aid, Total bilateral	83	116	89	125	118
Other Official Flows	1 667	721	653	1 309	2 210
of which: Official export credits	1 667	655	650	1 254	2 198
Private export credits	152	272	1 210	1 954	2 572
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	2 224	2 558	3 013	3 740	3 831
Bilateral grants, Total	1 523	1 865	2 404	2 816	2 678
Debt forgiveness	126	96	74	455	245
Bilateral loans, Total	61	11	-	-	-
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	126	96	74	455	260
of which: debt forgiveness	126	96	74	455	245
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	96	74	455	260
Refugees in donor countries	116	145	177	175	158

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)  
USD million

1995-96	Denmark				1995-96	Finland			
	2003	2004	2005	2006		2003	2004	2005	2006
1 698	1 748	2 037	2 109	2 236	398	558	680	902	834
<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.40</b>
976	1 032	1 202	1 357	1 464	217	309	402	597	455
1 075	1 144	1 192	1 414	1 525	230	300	397	591	442
102	111	112	115	110	49	129	178	98	81
-	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	-	-
-	11	10	155	151	21	34	34	74	70
8	77	11	56	122	3	6	7	7	9
83	97	102	116	111	20	25	31	34	33
-99	-113	11	-57	-61	-13	8	5	6	13
-31	-103	-16	-	-15	-3	2	-5	-	-
721	717	835	751	772	181	250	278	305	380
721	717	835	751	772	181	250	278	305	380
95	146	179	196	218	45	108	129	140	153
75	61	67	77	71	34	35	32	38	46
19	57	50	51	49	21	15	16	20	20
51	41	21	-8	-77	222	7	-3	-	-
48	41	21	-8	-77	222	7	-3	-	-
46	-	-	-	-	227	-	-	-	-
2	41	21	-8	-77	-4	7	-3	-	-
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	-	58	81	73	3	13	14	16	25
91	106	518	33	454	251	-622	647	723	553
106	106	518	33	454	160	78	600	149	402
-15	-	-	-	-	29	-297	96	-161	14
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	62	-403	-49	736	137
<b>1 874</b>	<b>1 896</b>	<b>2 634</b>	<b>2 215</b>	<b>2 686</b>	<b>875</b>	<b>-44</b>	<b>1 338</b>	<b>1 642</b>	<b>1 413</b>
<b>1.11</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>-0.03</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.67</b>
1 828	1 890	2 100	2 174	2 315	419	560	689	907	838
2	-	-	-	-	6	3	1	-	-
-	1	0	9	11	4	9	9	16	-
257	51	47	26	47	458	21	15	-	-
182	-	-	-	-	458	-	-	-	-
66	-	-	-	-	57	-	7	3	14
1 875	1 558	2 497	2 352	2 110	433	659	824	1 140	964
1 037	823	1 523	1 574	1 369	218	381	491	683	588
-	-	-	66	256	13	-	25	-	-
65	23	119	32	-	9	8	12	11	19
101	-	-	50	146	13	-	25	150	-
101	-	-	50	146	13	-	25	150	-
-	-	-	30	113	-	-	25	150	-
63	106	85	70	42	9	11	26	17	11

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

(continued)

USD million

	1995-96	2003	France 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	7 947	7 253	8 473	10 026	10 601
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.47</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	6 091	5 213	5 567	7 239	7 919
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	5 762	5 725	6 067	7 707	8 422
of which: Technical co-operation	2 514	1 934	2 340	2 364	2 805
Developmental food aid (a)	66	40	50	39	34
Humanitarian aid (a)	117	31	19	28	48
Contributions to NGOs	23	28	35	40	42
Administrative costs	310	256	366	334	342
2. Development lending and capital	329	- 511	- 500	- 468	- 503
of which: New development lending	835	- 798	- 293	- 333	- 321
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	1 856	2 040	2 906	2 787	2 681
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	1 856	2 048	2 885	2 747	3 193
of which: EC	914	1 311	1 863	1 811	1 938
IDA	477	291	395	296	456
Regional Development Banks	151	156	164	206	207
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	- 120	2 806	- 216	- 1 390	- 1 388
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	- 120	2 806	- 216	- 1 390	- 1 388
1. Official export credits (b)	146	-	-	-	-
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	- 266	2 806	- 216	- 1 390	- 1 388
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	140	-	-	-	-
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	7 014	- 3 123	4 342	7 107	13 116
1. Direct investment	2 578	681	1 534	6 856	10 589
2. Private export credits	975	- 2 345	- 23	- 911	- 1 456
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	- 201	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	3 662	- 1 460	2 831	1 163	3 983
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>14 981</b>	<b>6 936</b>	<b>12 599</b>	<b>15 744</b>	<b>22 329</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.99</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	8 998	9 156	9 800	11 530	12 764
New development lending	1 247	447	508	554	744
Food aid, Total bilateral	66	71	50	39	39
Other Official Flows	751	4 236	410	1 891	311
of which: Official export credits	320	-	-	-	-
Private export credits	-	-	224	-	- 503
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	8 119	10 151	9 864	12 131	15 026
Bilateral grants, Total	4 666	5 805	6 128	7 634	8 595
Debt forgiveness	541	569	1 960	3 498	3 683
Bilateral loans, Total	1 459	1 399	870	1 228	1 349
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	1 527	2 432	1 961	3 498	3 683
of which: debt forgiveness	1 527	2 329	1 960	3 498	3 683
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	2 127	1 701	3 212	3 433
Refugees in donor countries	-	445	544	585	471

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)  
USD million

1995-96	Germany					1995-96	Greece				
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2003		2004	2005	2006		
7 562	6 784	7 534	10 082	10 435	184	362	321	384	424		
<b>0.31</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.17</b>		
4 675	4 060	3 823	7 447	7 034	27	228	161	206	189		
4 449	4 737	4 513	8 248	7 576	27	228	161	207	189		
2 438	2 299	2 486	2 865	3 116	18	117	53	77	89		
85	26	24	23	25	8	-	0	1	0		
89	157	191	317	357	1	7	10	17	19		
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-		
281	237	247	206	227	-	16	17	30	19		
226	- 678	- 690	- 801	- 542	-	-	-	- 0	-		
258	- 585	- 334	- 447	- 425	-	-	-	- 0	-		
2 887	2 724	3 712	2 635	3 401	156	134	160	178	235		
2 902	2 734	3 720	2 635	3 401	156	134	160	178	235		
1 466	1 604	1 881	2 205	2 148	128	116	144	158	164		
949	491	1 148	-	591	6	4	4	5	42		
43	146	170	54	304	-	-	-	0	-		
537	-3 564	-1 051	7 055	-5 728	-	-	4	-	8		
843	-3 564	-1 051	7 055	-5 728	-	-	4	-	8		
453	- 444	- 236	- 192	- 466	-	-	-	-	-		
390	-3 120	- 815	7 247	-5 262	-	-	4	-	8		
- 306	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
1 178	1 008	1 148	1 523	1 348	-	8	17	1	10		
11 829	995	7 619	12 023	21 149	-	33	- 14	325	2 454		
3 895	1 908	6 761	14 069	12 401	-	33	- 14	325	2 454		
2 463	249	949	- 131	19	-	-	-	-	-		
241	- 25	24	- 411	1 057	-	-	-	-	-		
5 230	-1 137	- 115	-1 505	7 672	-	-	-	-	-		
<b>21 106</b>	<b>5 224</b>	<b>15 251</b>	<b>30 683</b>	<b>27 203</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>2 896</b>		
<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>1.18</b>		
9 008	8 029	8 957	11 595	12 049	184	362	321	384	424		
1 591	474	674	551	674	-	-	-	-	-		
173	69	79	106	103	8	0	4	3	0		
2 689	-1 092	922	10 910	115	-	-	4	-	8		
1 119	126	372	68	91	-	-	-	-	-		
6 189	4 964	-	4 349	4 705	-	-	-	-	-		
11 112	8 567	9 335	12 521	13 230	184	362	321	384	424		
5 039	5 031	4 833	7 493	7 853	27	228	161	207	189		
582	1 337	814	3 905	3 015	-	-	-	-	-		
2 266	616	1 282	1 743	1 624	-	-	-	-	-		
582	1 337	814	3 905	3 015	-	-	-	-	-		
582	1 337	814	3 905	3 015	-	-	-	-	-		
-	1 220	552	3 441	2 722	-	-	-	-	-		
277	25	15	17	18	-	3	3	9	5		

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations***(continued)*

USD million

	1995-96	2003	Ireland 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	166	504	607	719	1 022
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.54</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	101	352	410	482	632
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	101	352	410	482	632
of which: Technical co-operation	60	11	12	13	20
Developmental food aid (a)	0	1	1	19	10
Humanitarian aid (a)	9	25	36	64	87
Contributions to NGOs	0	74	95	130	100
Administrative costs	10	25	28	31	34
2. Development lending and capital	-	-	-	-	-
of which: New development lending	-	-	-	-	-
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	65	152	198	237	389
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	65	152	198	237	389
of which: EC	42	73	93	112	122
IDA	7	7	20	23	122
Regional Development Banks	-	-	-	-	19
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	-	-	-	-	-
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	-	-	-	-	-
1. Official export credits (b)	-	-	-	-	-
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	-	-	-	-	-
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	57	283	234	308	339
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	86	1 547	3 010	4 271	3 877
1. Direct investment	-	-	-	-	-
2. Private export credits	24	-	-	-	-
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	-	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	62	1 547	3 010	4 271	3 877
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>2 334</b>	<b>3 851</b>	<b>5 298</b>	<b>5 237</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>2.77</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	166	504	607	719	1 022
New development lending	-	-	-	-	-
Food aid, Total bilateral	1	4	5	26	14
Other Official Flows	-	-	-	-	-
of which: Official export credits	-	-	-	-	-
Private export credits	24	-	-	-	-
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	166	504	607	719	1 022
Bilateral grants, Total	101	352	410	482	632
Debt forgiveness	-	-	-	-	-
Bilateral loans, Total	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	-	-	0	0	-
of which: debt forgiveness	-	-	-	-	-
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	-	0	0	-
Refugees in donor countries	3	1	2	2	1

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)

USD million

		Italy				Japan				
1995-96	2003	2004	2005	2006	1995-96	2003	2004	2005	2006	
2 019	2 433	2 462	5 091	3 641	11 964	8 880	8 922	13 147	11 187	
<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.25</b>	
808	1 061	704	2 270	2 001	9 313	6 334	5 917	10 406	7 313	
569	1 126	855	2 213	2 147	5 868	4 443	7 131	9 195	7 660	
70	148	140	121	171	2 291	1 880	1 914	1 873	1 858	
55	51	33	12	6	63	65	48	58	84	
91	45	75	67	74	66	30	657	516	183	
20	34	45	53	10	251	188	248	129	102	
43	48	63	40	56	729	679	671	702	668	
239	- 65	- 151	57	- 146	3 445	1 891	- 1 213	1 212	- 347	
131	- 105	- 153	45	- 155	-	1 262	990	1 533	- 7	
1 211	1 372	1 757	2 821	1 640	2 651	2 545	3 005	2 740	3 874	
1 211	1 372	1 757	2 821	1 640	2 651	2 545	3 005	2 740	3 874	
593	942	1 186	1 261	1 316	-	-	-	-	-	
211	2	-	679	30	947	713	764	750	2 385	
170	33	169	168	16	526	480	450	487	454	
1 505	- 285	507	- 1 125	- 957	3 245	- 2 149	- 2 372	- 2 421	2 438	
1 508	- 285	507	- 1 125	- 957	2 906	- 2 533	- 2 006	- 1 423	2 732	
88	-	- 33	5	38	349	- 130	- 130	- 1 202	- 1 305	
1 419	- 285	540	- 1 130	- 995	2 557	- 2 404	- 1 876	- 222	4 038	
- 3	-	-	-	-	339	384	- 366	- 997	- 294	
28	27	49	94	123	224	335	425	255	315	
204	2 044	221	44	2 705	24 758	- 731	4 392	12 278	12 290	
395	505	808	951	1 151	8 985	7 016	9 171	14 472	14 144	
- 1 379	1 644	1 682	1 451	2 602	757	3 643	1 667	- 3 433	275	
-	-	-	-	-	- 275	371	- 3 020	81	- 928	
1 189	- 106	- 2 269	- 2 358	- 1 049	15 289	- 11 760	- 3 426	1 158	- 1 201	
<b>3 756</b>	<b>4 218</b>	<b>3 239</b>	<b>4 103</b>	<b>5 512</b>	<b>40 191</b>	<b>6 335</b>	<b>11 368</b>	<b>23 259</b>	<b>26 230</b>	
<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.58</b>	
2 251	2 670	2 749	5 264	4 003	15 194	12 971	16 176	18 640	17 115	
243	132	135	218	207	-	5 304	5 931	5 763	5 324	
58	56	35	12	14	63	65	48	58	84	
2 541	411	2 055	142	174	10 058	10 152	7 303	8 508	12 585	
680	-	-	55	53	2 095	1 266	1 840	753	436	
1 392	1 951	2 029	-	1 572	-	7 688	6 717	4 487	20 667	
2 669	3 614	3 040	5 636	4 138	19 863	17 568	15 531	19 363	17 344	
663	1 140	817	2 233	2 159	5 966	4 085	7 651	9 353	7 861	
84	558	115	1 670	1 379	-	158	2 448	4 776	3 212	
348	375	125	452	349	11 305	11 120	5 340	7 912	5 751	
84	558	115	1 670	1 596	469	162	2 413	4 776	3 544	
84	558	115	1 670	1 379	469	162	2 413	4 776	3 212	
-	558	115	1 670	1 596	-	162	158	3 553	3 003	
1	44	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

(continued)

USD million

	1995-96	2003	Luxembourg 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	74	194	236	256	291
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.89</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	50	150	171	187	205
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	50	150	171	187	205
of which: Technical co-operation	2	3	4	4	6
Developmental food aid (a)	1	2	4	1	8
Humanitarian aid (a)	8	14	22	16	37
Contributions to NGOs	9	26	28	33	3
Administrative costs	1	3	4	11	13
2. Development lending and capital	-	-	-	-	-
of which: New development lending	-	-	-	-	-
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	24	44	64	69	86
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	24	44	64	69	86
of which: EC	13	19	20	25	24
IDA	5	4	8	6	12
Regional Development Banks	-	2	11	10	11
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	-	-	-	-	-
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	-	-	-	-	-
1. Official export credits (b)	-	-	-	-	-
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	-	-	-	-	-
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	7	7	6	8	8
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	-	-	-	-	-
1. Direct investment	-	-	-	-	-
2. Private export credits	-	-	-	-	-
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	-	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	-	-	-	-	-
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>299</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.91</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	74	194	236	256	291
New development lending	-	-	-	-	-
Food aid, Total bilateral	2	2	6	9	18
Other Official Flows	-	-	-	-	-
of which: Official export credits	-	-	-	-	-
Private export credits	-	-	-	-	-
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	78	194	236	256	291
Bilateral grants, Total	50	150	171	187	205
Debt forgiveness	-	-	-	-	-
Bilateral loans, Total	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	-	-	-	-	-
of which: debt forgiveness	-	-	-	-	-
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	-	-	-	-
Refugees in donor countries	-	-	-	7	-

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)  
USD million

1995-96	Netherlands				1995-96	New Zealand			
	2003	2004	2005	2006		2003	2004	2005	2006
3 236	3 972	4 204	5 115	5 452	122	165	212	274	259
<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.27</b>
2 260	2 829	2 670	3 683	4 282	100	129	159	224	203
2 527	2 963	3 217	3 696	4 415	100	129	159	224	203
950	684	663	609	464	44	40	46	41	49
25	18	2	-	1	0	0	1	2	1
310	133	220	408	397	3	9	17	53	21
299	602	658	674	977	3	11	12	14	15
142	226	247	245	255	8	10	13	15	16
- 267	- 133	- 547	- 13	- 133	-	-	-	-	-
- 267	- 135	- 532	- 28	- 133	-	-	-	-	-
976	1 143	1 534	1 432	1 169	23	36	53	50	56
976	1 143	1 534	1 432	1 169	23	36	53	50	56
286	362	383	432	432	-	-	-	-	-
257	162	358	245	16	4	7	8	9	8
46	59	73	163	55	-	6	7	6	6
74	899	151	152	343	-	3	5	7	7
74	899	151	152	343	-	3	5	7	7
-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
74	899	151	152	343	-	3	5	7	7
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
354	379	412	422	277	17	18	29	94	48
4 491	9 946	9 339	17 091	22 544	17	21	25	26	24
4 025	3 448	1 986	2 348	6 351	17	21	25	26	24
- 206	2 451	3 708	10 614	5 713	-	-	-	-	-
444	659	559	- 474	- 248	-	-	-	-	-
228	3 388	3 086	4 604	10 728	-	-	-	-	-
<b>8 155</b>	<b>15 196</b>	<b>14 106</b>	<b>22 781</b>	<b>28 616</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>338</b>
<b>2.05</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.35</b>
3 506	4 223	4 898	5 201	5 889	122	165	212	274	259
2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	51	42	76	48	0	2	2	9	3
74	1 368	151	152	343	-	3	5	7	7
-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
535	2 549	-	10 912	6 327	-	-	-	-	-
3 085	2 401	3 427	4 435	12 626	122	185	241	370	356
2 151	2 088	2 805	3 443	10 831	100	144	184	314	297
175	237	29	-	8	-	-	-	-	-
5	20	0	87	-	-	-	-	-	-
197	255	231	330	312	-	-	-	0	0
197	255	231	330	294	-	-	-	-	-
-	249	216	324	312	-	-	-	0	0
35	174	118	94	112	-	8	11	11	10

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

(continued)

USD million

	1995-96	2003	Norway 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	1 278	2 042	2 199	2 786	2 954
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.89</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	926	1 462	1 536	2 033	2 198
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	918	1 455	1 496	1 968	2 119
of which: Technical co-operation	172	236	287	319	366
Developmental food aid (a)	8	4	-	0	7
Humanitarian aid (a)	182	173	149	344	309
Contributions to NGOs	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative costs	53	99	118	137	164
2. Development lending and capital	8	7	41	64	79
of which: New development lending	8	-7	-6	-	-
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	352	580	662	754	756
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	352	580	662	754	756
of which: EC	-	-	-	-	-
IDA	82	100	119	113	119
Regional Development Banks	22	72	74	88	87
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	-0	0	0	5	5
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	-0	0	0	5	5
1. Official export credits (b)	-	-	-	-	-
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	-0	0	0	5	5
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	86	-	-	-	-
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	306	1 264	586	1 839	1 345
1. Direct investment	283	1 199	635	1 847	1 351
2. Private export credits	23	65	-49	-8	-6
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	-	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	-	0	-	-	-
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>1 669</b>	<b>3 306</b>	<b>2 785</b>	<b>4 630</b>	<b>4 304</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>1.29</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	1 281	2 049	2 204	2 786	2 954
New development lending	11	-	-	-	-
Food aid, Total bilateral	24	19	14	74	76
Other Official Flows	-	0	0	5	5
of which: Official export credits	-	-	-	-	-
Private export credits	136	156	3	14	5
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	1 259	2 018	2 104	2 831	3 404
Bilateral grants, Total	877	1 398	1 415	2 058	2 595
Debt forgiveness	29	-	-	-	-
Bilateral loans, Total	10	39	26	19	53
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	43	22	12	2	23
of which: debt forgiveness	43	-	-	-	-
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	22	12	2	23
Refugees in donor countries	9	176	111	68	67

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)

USD million

1995-96	Portugal				1995-96	Spain			
	2003	2004	2005	2006		2003	2004	2005	2006
238	320	1 031	377	396	1 300	1 961	2 437	3 018	3 814
<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.32</b>
161	182	873	218	211	852	1 151	1 400	1 863	2 092
112	183	179	201	198	548	938	1 227	2 020	2 012
62	142	114	114	117	128	313	340	483	438
0	-	-	-	-	9	6	12	10	29
5	1	18	13	7	16	68	77	114	137
2	1	4	6	7	-	7	7	7	6
4	10	10	16	13	37	77	83	103	101
49	-1	694	17	14	304	213	173	- 157	80
-2	-1	-4	17	14	304	251	233	121	138
76	137	158	159	185	448	810	1 037	1 155	1 722
76	137	158	159	185	448	810	1 037	1 155	1 722
57	88	112	128	124	300	525	628	784	852
3	11	12	12	14	62	63	180	123	228
1	24	17	4	30	15	85	131	134	139
73	-2	-692	-3	-20	-190	73	25	67	-
73	-2	-692	-3	-20	-190	73	25	67	-
-24	-	-	-	-	-190	-	-	-	-
98	-2	-692	-3	-20	-	73	25	67	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-0	4	3	6	4	119	-	-	-	-
359	823	335	728	286	1 914	4 633	10 300	3 716	7 333
308	680	187	556	44	1 914	4 737	10 503	4 158	7 608
81	143	148	172	243	-	- 104	- 203	- 442	- 275
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>670</b>	<b>1 145</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>1 109</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>3 142</b>	<b>6 667</b>	<b>12 762</b>	<b>6 801</b>	<b>11 146</b>
<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.92</b>
242	321	1 036	383	402	1 386	2 217	2 684	3 518	4 160
1	1	0	23	20	390	454	413	331	415
0	-	-	1	-	10	13	19	33	35
120	-	-	-	-	2	80	25	67	-
-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
163	165	160	186	273	-	-	-	-	-
151	321	1 036	383	402	1 390	2 217	2 684	3 518	4 160
44	183	179	201	198	548	938	1 227	2 020	2 012
38	5	5	3	-	91	116	198	763	538
53	1	698	23	20	394	469	420	342	427
34	6	6	3	0	91	144	277	903	573
31	5	5	3	-	91	116	198	763	538
-	6	6	3	0	-	91	210	613	503
-	-	1	0	0	-	21	20	20	28

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

(continued)

USD million

	1995-96	2003	Sweden 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	1 851	2 400	2 722	3 362	3 955
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.78</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>1.02</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	1 292	1 779	2 076	2 256	2 852
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	1 292	1 753	2 066	2 247	2 838
of which: Technical co-operation	248	92	112	140	132
Developmental food aid (a)	-	-	-	-	-
Humanitarian aid (a)	155	196	206	261	295
Contributions to NGOs	110	105	137	134	152
Administrative costs	89	125	147	126	193
2. Development lending and capital	-	26	10	9	14
of which: New development lending	-	26	10	9	14
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	559	621	646	1 106	1 103
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	559	621	646	1 106	1 103
of which: EC	102	123	225	198	246
IDA	126	-	25	274	47
Regional Development Banks	35	133	48	104	109
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	2	- 15	- 64	- 4	- 2
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	2	- 15	- 64	- 4	- 2
1. Official export credits (b)	-	-	-	-	-
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	2	- 15	- 64	- 4	- 2
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	30	23	31	29	12
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	231	-1 153	266	159	210
1. Direct investment	299	- 337	594	430	333
2. Private export credits	- 67	- 816	- 328	- 271	- 123
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	- 1	-	-	-	-
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	0	0	- 0	- 0	- 0
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>2 114</b>	<b>1 255</b>	<b>2 954</b>	<b>3 545</b>	<b>4 175</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>1.08</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	1 851	2 400	2 722	3 362	3 955
New development lending	-	26	10	9	14
Food aid, Total bilateral	-	20	14	10	4
Other Official Flows	3	68	32	41	81
of which: Official export credits	-	-	-	-	-
Private export credits	921	758	1 037	1 347	1 147
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	1 965	2 388	2 723	3 732	4 249
Bilateral grants, Total	1 413	1 953	2 072	2 517	3 089
Debt forgiveness	92	165	26	53	292
Bilateral loans, Total	-	28	6	9	14
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	38	165	26	53	292
of which: debt forgiveness	11	165	26	53	292
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	165	26	53	292
Refugees in donor countries	114	191	178	143	164

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)  
USD million

1995-96	Switzerland				2006	1995-96	United Kingdom				2006
	2003	2004	2005	2006			2003	2004	2005		
1 055	1 299	1 545	1 772	1 646	3 200	6 262	7 905	10 772	12 459		
<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>0.51</b>		
751	945	1 187	1 405	1 254	1 753	3 841	5 361	8 169	8 718		
755	929	1 173	1 385	1 241	1 764	3 556	5 262	8 250	8 809		
368	177	117	144	161	816	993	751	845	860		
17	-	-	-	-	27	-	-	-	-		
89	136	151	190	175	188	565	523	628	835		
61	47	50	47	49	65	268	429	394	365		
24	28	29	52	52	118	464	508	427	477		
- 4	16	14	20	13	- 11	285	98	- 82	- 92		
- 2	- 5	- 6	- 6	- 11	- 89	129	64	12	- 15		
304	355	359	367	392	1 448	2 421	2 544	2 603	3 741		
304	355	359	367	392	1 449	2 456	2 540	2 649	3 798		
-	-	-	-	-	782	1 078	1 529	1 221	1 565		
131	135	146	142	163	324	737	250	665	946		
12	66	42	54	57	33	129	130	28	354		
-	0	-	-	17	147	50	- 155	- 99	- 187		
-	0	-	-	17	147	50	- 155	- 99	- 187		
-	-	-	-	-	18	94	21	36	2		
-	0	-	-	17	129	- 44	- 176	- 135	- 189		
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
184	280	316	332	402	433	389	390	726	543		
- 1 415	1 645	- 455	5 999	9 241	14 145	11 840	23 562	19 870	14 127		
- 600	1 592	273	7 451	10 001	6 338	9 745	18 092	14 812	7 530		
- 341	54	238	- 729	- 521	197	- 679	- 356	- 625	- 4 696		
- 474	- 1	- 966	- 722	- 239	-	-	-	-	-		
-	-	-	-	0	7 610	2 774	5 826	5 683	11 292		
<b>- 176</b>	<b>3 225</b>	<b>1 406</b>	<b>8 103</b>	<b>11 306</b>	<b>17 926</b>	<b>18 541</b>	<b>31 702</b>	<b>31 269</b>	<b>26 941</b>		
<b>-0.06</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>1.11</b>		
1 059	1 305	1 556	1 778	1 657	3 320	6 471	8 229	11 168	13 075		
-	-	4	1	-	6	167	80	17	1		
17	24	25	28	36	70	94	64	66	140		
-	0	-	-	17	309	243	68	52	11		
-	-	-	-	-	18	94	21	36	2		
986	455	723	211	175	957	-	-	-	-		
1 036	1 393	1 744	1 754	1 880	3 252	6 491	8 206	11 162	13 075		
738	869	1 252	1 344	1 215	1 696	3 576	5 239	8 244	8 809		
98	30	8	224	98	83	81	759	3 515	2 557		
-	33	14	30	28	105	454	381	265	465		
45	37	8	224	98	106	110	819	3 540	3 511		
29	30	8	224	98	106	60	785	3 521	2 557		
-	37	8	224	98	-	106	812	3 530	3 503		
-	22	194	129	132	-	-	-	-	-		

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

Table 14

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>**The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations**

(continued)

USD million

	1995-96	2003	United States 2004	2005	2006
<b>NET DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
I. Official Development Assistance (ODA) (A + B)	8 372	16 320	19 705	27 935	23 532
<b>ODA as % of GNI</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.18</b>
A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (1 + 2)	6 266	14 659	16 250	25 582	21 162
1. Grants and grant-like contributions	7 030	16 359	17 027	26 344	22 005
of which: Technical co-operation	2 701	7 701	7 347	8 803	9 278
Developmental food aid (a)	596	834	921	662	743
Humanitarian aid (a)	687	2 478	2 483	3 392	3 022
Contributions to NGOs	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative costs	698	779	1 004	1 084	1 084
2. Development lending and capital	- 764	- 1 701	- 777	- 762	- 843
of which: New development lending	- 865	-	-	-	-
B. Contributions to Multilateral Institutions	2 107	1 661	3 455	2 353	2 370
Grants and capital subscriptions, Total	2 121	1 671	3 466	2 363	2 380
of which: EC	-	-	-	-	-
IDA	629	-	1 752	843	827
Regional Development Banks	218	48	490	219	240
II. Other Official Flows (OOF) net (C + D)	1 296	1 068	- 679	- 1 048	- 4 017
C. Bilateral Other Official Flows (1 + 2)	1 296	1 068	- 679	- 1 048	- 4 017
1. Official export credits (b)	- 239	- 459	- 1 287	- 1 212	- 2 817
2. Equities and other bilateral assets	1 535	1 527	607	164	- 1 200
D. Multilateral Institutions	-	-	-	-	-
III. Grants by Private Voluntary Agencies	2 506	6 326	6 792	8 629	9 037
IV. Private Flows at Market Terms (long-term) (1 to 4)	39 184	14 147	6 465	78 010	62 345
1. Direct investment	23 268	14 298	20 355	19 770	36 624
2. Private export credits	82	- 6	- 293	- 100	- 1 097
3. Securities of multilateral agencies	- 604	78	- 1 255	1 566	3 156
4. Bilateral portfolio investment	16 438	- 224	- 12 343	56 774	23 662
<b>V. Total Resource Flows (long-term) (I to IV)</b>	<b>51 358</b>	<b>37 860</b>	<b>32 283</b>	<b>113 526</b>	<b>90 897</b>
<b>Total Resource Flows as a % of GNI</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.69</b>
<i>For reference:</i>					
<b>GROSS DISBURSEMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance (c)	9 340	18 257	20 604	28 750	24 532
New development lending	10	-	-	-	-
Food aid, Total bilateral	726	2 498	2 164	2 277	2 064
Other Official Flows	3 256	3 068	927	745	531
of which: Official export credits	767	805	194	142	118
Private export credits	5 538	-	-	-	-
<b>COMMITMENTS</b>					
Official Development Assistance, Total (c)	9 932	22 521	26 991	30 109	26 678
Bilateral grants, Total	7 658	20 715	23 394	27 719	24 151
Debt forgiveness	64	2 400	141	4 076	1 583
Bilateral loans, Total	158	221	127	33	142
<i>Memo items:</i>					
Gross ODA debt reorganisation grants	64	2 406	143	4 196	1 704
of which: debt forgiveness	64	2 400	141	4 194	1 703
Net ODA debt reorganisation grants (d)	-	1 314	114	4 078	1 585
Refugees in donor countries	-	344	512	525	488

a) Emergency food aid included with developmental food aid up to and including 1995.

b) Including funds in support of private export credits.

c) Including debt reorganisation.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175420158552>

Table 14

## The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries and Multilateral Organisations

(continued)  
USD million

Total DAC Countries					EC				
1995-96	2003	2004	2005	2006	1995-96	2003	2004	2005	2006
57 277	69 065	79 432	107 099	104 421	5 426	7 173	8 704	9 390	10 245
<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.31</b>	-	-	-	-	-
39 798	49 735	54 304	82 445	76 960	4 992	6 445	8 068	8 687	9 489
36 394	50 888	57 246	83 453	79 450	4 703	6 197	7 794	8 539	9 367
14 229	18 352	18 672	20 753	22 252	222	403	479	446	444
1 087	1 196	1 169	887	956	285	317	263	398	276
2 153	4 360	5 193	7 110	6 751	678	691	960	1 166	1 156
1 032	1 483	1 792	1 779	2 008	185	-	1	1	1
2 873	3 545	4 032	4 115	4 250	117	459	660	652	723
3 404	-1 153	-2 942	-1 008	-2 490	289	248	274	147	122
261	-461	-133	883	-944	289	248	274	147	122
17 479	19 330	25 127	24 653	27 461	434	728	636	703	756
17 511	19 393	25 122	24 670	28 040	434	728	636	703	756
5 112	6 946	8 906	9 258	9 931	-	-	-	-	-
4 702	3 120	5 690	4 827	6 787	-	236	-	-	100
1 440	1 734	2 274	2 096	2 466	-	-	-	18	-
7 861	-348	-5 601	1 430	-9 774	227	1 146	1 856	1 595	1 855
7 731	-818	-5 349	2 262	-9 598	227	1 146	1 856	1 595	1 855
1 752	-1 285	-2 668	-2 812	-3 781	-	-	-	-	-
5 979	465	-2 681	5 074	-5 817	227	1 146	1 856	1 595	1 855
130	470	-252	-832	-177	-	-	-	-	-
5 871	10 239	11 320	14 712	14 648	-	-	-	-	-
108 610	46 573	75 262	179 559	194 779	-	-	-	-	-
55 681	49 340	76 901	100 622	129 291	-	-	-	-	-
3 433	2 313	6 561	5 563	2 183	-	-	-	-	-
-869	1 083	-4 657	40	2 798	-	-	-	-	-
50 364	-6 164	-3 544	73 335	60 507	-	-	-	-	-
<b>179 619</b>	<b>125 529</b>	<b>160 412</b>	<b>302 800</b>	<b>304 074</b>	<b>5 653</b>	<b>8 319</b>	<b>10 559</b>	<b>10 985</b>	<b>12 101</b>
<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.89</b>	-	-	-	-	-
64 947	79 761	92 133	117 749	117 112	5 654	7 393	8 971	9 726	10 678
3 573	7 017	7 786	7 492	7 454	517	468	541	483	555
1 401	3 170	2 743	3 069	2 876	285	514	391	596	461
22 925	20 692	12 989	25 148	16 933	449	1 547	2 391	2 618	3 286
7 716	3 109	3 220	2 386	2 975	-	-	-	-	-
18 428	19 175	12 661	24 400	38 563	-	-	-	-	-
72 084	89 243	98 675	122 321	131 264	7 692	9 651	9 649	12 023	13 070
36 584	54 705	65 260	84 769	89 683	6 106	8 270	8 815	10 875	11 585
2 113	6 515	6 904	24 382	18 261	-	-	-	-	-
16 360	14 821	9 448	12 209	10 307	1 005	320	284	480	726
3 628	8 534	7 266	25 164	20 195	-	-	-	-	-
3 561	8 317	7 134	24 999	18 600	-	-	-	-	-
-	6 951	4 342	22 733	18 874	-	-	-	-	-
725	1 860	2 146	2 069	1 823	-	-	-	-	-

d) Comprises bilateral grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved. Available only from 1998.

**Table 15**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175422185755>**ODA from DAC Countries to Multilateral Organisations in 2006**

Net disbursements

USD million

	Total	World Bank Group	of which:	Regional Development Banks	of which:		
			IDA		African Dev. Bank	Asian Dev. Bank	Inter-American Dev. Bank
Australia	327	182	181	72	-	72	-
Austria	407	98	98	36	28	7	0
Belgium	620	103	102	39	27	11	0
Canada	1 153	282	281	162	83	51	15
Denmark	772	90	71	49	27	10	1
Finland	380	46	46	20	13	6	1
France	2 681	456	456	207	167	38	2
Germany	3 401	591	591	304	234	49	1
Greece	235	42	42	-	-	-	-
Ireland	389	125	122	19	-	19	-
Italy	1 640	97	30	16	10	-	2
Japan	3 874	2 576	2 385	454	121	321	12
Luxembourg	86	19	12	11	-	11	-
Netherlands	1 169	88	16	55	54	-	-
New Zealand	56	8	8	6	-	6	-
Norway	756	136	119	87	70	9	1
Portugal	185	14	14	30	20	10	-
Spain	1 722	229	228	139	73	21	15
Sweden	1 103	47	47	109	70	12	-
Switzerland	392	163	163	57	46	11	1
United Kingdom	3 741	977	943	354	226	105	1
United States	2 370	828	827	230	138	99	2
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>27 461</b>	<b>7 200</b>	<b>6 784</b>	<b>2 456</b>	<b>1 405</b>	<b>868</b>	<b>53</b>
<i>of which:</i>							
DAC-EU countries	18 532	3 025	2 820	1 387	948	301	22

a) IMF PRGF and PRGF-HIPC Trust.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175422185755>

Table 15

## ODA from DAC Countries to Multilateral Organisations in 2006

(continued)

USD million

## Net disbursements

United Nations Agencies	of which:					of which:		Other of which:		
	IFAD	UNDP	WFP	UNICEF	UNHCR	EC	EDF	Multilateral	IMF <sup>a</sup>	
38	2	4	-	-	6	-	-	36	2	Australia
27	-	7	1	2	1	236	89	10	5	Austria
51	4	18	-	4	1	393	124	34	-	Belgium
318	-	62	28	24	13	-	-	390	40	Canada
311	4	89	34	38	23	218	72	104	0	Denmark
131	2	21	8	18	9	153	50	30	0	Finland
205	10	30	5	18	18	1 938	832	- 124	- 511	France
222	15	34	-	6	6	2 148	783	136	15	Germany
14	-	2	-	0	1	164	42	15	-	Greece
111	1	21	6	15	12	122	23	12	1	Ireland
115	25	1	13	3	1	1 316	423	97	6	Italy
588	16	78	13	85	4	-	-	257	37	Japan
26	0	2	-	2	1	24	9	5	1	Luxembourg
444	8	116	34	36	51	432	175	150	-	Netherlands
23	-	5	2	3	2	-	-	18	-	New Zealand
470	10	95	32	131	27	-	-	63	-	Norway
10	0	2	0	0	0	124	31	6	-	Portugal
286	5	58	15	26	18	852	196	215	10	Spain
517	34	107	56	60	68	246	92	184	-	Sweden
121	6	41	2	14	9	-	-	52	5	Switzerland
575	12	127	5	49	37	1 512	429	325	44	United Kingdom
637	15	104	-	126	-	-	-	675	-	United States
<b>5 239</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>1 024</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>660</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>9 877</b>	<b>3 369</b>	<b>2 690</b>	<b>- 345</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
										<i>of which:</i>
3 044	122	634	177	277	248	9 877	3 369	1 199	- 429	DAC-EU countries



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175461201738>

Table 16

Capital Subscriptions to Multilateral Organisations<sup>a</sup> on a Deposit and an Encashment Basis

Net disbursements

USD million

	Deposit basis					Encashment basis				
	1996	2003	2004	2005	2006	1996	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	-	-	-	134	264	148	161	161	134	264
Austria	3	80	91	86	133	71	67	78	91	116
Belgium	-	-	24	212	133	143	112	71	192	85
Canada	190	103	315	347	448	431	504	420	451	512
Denmark	66	107	107	116	99	64	304	198	164	119
Finland	64	47	49	60	69	66	20	34	53	47
France	627	495	813	193	7	-	857	469	535	-
Germany	1 378	792	1 446	109	904	917	634	739	742	778
Greece	-	9	7	13	33	-	-	-	-	24
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	760	18	206	951	97	308	265	-	499	242
Japan	452	847	886	883	2 510	-	1 916	1 218	1 057	2 694
Luxembourg	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	327	329	631	476	1	48	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	-	14	16	17	16	13	16	19	17	17
Norway	108	195	195	273	223	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	1	3	4	3	1	10	23	41	27	34
Spain	21	128	199	14	17	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	-	219	23	354	237	189	188	272	133	326
Switzerland	145	197	190	202	226	149	154	181	182	181
United Kingdom	468	901	459	822	1 462	-	692	703	690	1 134
United States	1 300	177	2 365	1 160	1 144	1 700	1 435	2 034	1 345	1 778
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>5 909</b>	<b>4 661</b>	<b>8 029</b>	<b>6 423</b>	<b>8 024</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>
<i>of which:</i>										
DAC-EU countries	3 714	3 128	4 062	3 408	3 192	..	..	..	..	..

a) World Bank, IMF-PRGF, IDB, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank and Caribbean Development Bank.  
**Note:** Not all contributions to these agencies are in the form of capital subscriptions.

Table 17

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175461852556>**Concessional and Non-concessional Flows by Multilateral Organisations<sup>a</sup>**

USD million, at current prices and exchange rates

	Gross disbursements						
	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>CONCESSIONAL FLOWS</b>							
<i>International Financial Institutions</i>							
AfDF <sup>b</sup>	638	623	741	586	1 057	988	6 041
AsDF	1 130	1 259	1 168	1 138	1 084	1 293	1 488
Caribbean Dev. Bank	36	22	113	37	60	45	47
Council of Europe	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
EBRD	-	17	44	53	53	50	11
IDA <sup>b</sup>	4 393	5 893	7 270	7 348	9 188	8 673	40 219
IDB	404	618	425	593	560	535	514
IMF <sup>c</sup>	864	1 600	1 741	1 187	1 204	596	744
Nordic Dev. Fund	-	60	35	55	74	68	73
<b>Total IFIs</b>	<b>7 468</b>	<b>10 092</b>	<b>11 536</b>	<b>10 997</b>	<b>13 280</b>	<b>12 247</b>	<b>49 137</b>
<i>United Nations<sup>d</sup></i>							
IFAD	248	217	250	264	281	317	348
UNDP	923	530	275	296	374	399	437
UNFPA	175	223	310	271	312	386	388
UNHCR	626	580	633	534	347	322	289
UNICEF	586	737	567	629	650	711	740
UNRWA	300	293	392	430	449	508	600
UNTA	257	401	466	504	434	580	371
WFP	1 134	732	351	319	253	555	473
<b>Total UN</b>	<b>4 248</b>	<b>3 712</b>	<b>3 244</b>	<b>3 247</b>	<b>3 098</b>	<b>3 777</b>	<b>3 647</b>
EC	3 079	5 220	5 494	6 665	8 335	9 022	9 922
Global Environment Facility	-	-	109	107	138	181	190
GFATM	-	-	1	216	586	995	1 252
Montreal Protocol Fund	-	-	60	66	59	83	81
Arab Funds	353	103	298	202	536	491	680
<b>Total concessional</b>	<b>15 149</b>	<b>19 127</b>	<b>20 743</b>	<b>21 501</b>	<b>26 032</b>	<b>26 796</b>	<b>64 908</b>
<b>NON-CONCESSIONAL FLOWS</b>							
African Dev. Bank	1 361	1 033	679	969	979	851	825
Asian Dev. Bank	1 878	2 502	3 067	2 688	2 508	3 498	4 420
Caribbean Dev. Bank	23	29	108	37	60	35	33
Council of Europe	450	82	-	-	-	-	-
EBRD	-	333	627	854	1 698	1 547	1 349
EC	423	449	1 435	1 547	2 391	2 618	3 286
IBRD	12 290	11 009	8 381	10 628	9 214	8 462	11 533
IFC	1 406	1 598	1 409	2 126	2 301	2 478	3 768
IDB	2 467	3 975	5 508	8 409	3 764	4 894	6 080
IFAD	-	11	20	23	31	27	39
<b>Total non-concessional</b>	<b>20 297</b>	<b>21 021</b>	<b>21 234</b>	<b>27 283</b>	<b>22 945</b>	<b>24 410</b>	<b>31 333</b>

a) To countries and territories on the DAC List of ODA Recipients.

b) In 2006, data include debt forgiveness grants made under the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative.

c) IMF Trust Fund and PRGF.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175461852556>

Table 17

Concessional and Non-concessional Flows by Multilateral Organisations<sup>a</sup>

(continued)

USD million, at current prices and exchange rates

	Net disbursements						2006
	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	
<b>CONCESSIONAL FLOWS</b>							
<i>International Financial Institutions</i>							
AfDF <sup>b</sup>	615	580	616	483	919	852	1 541
AsDF	1 080	1 130	906	826	694	859	1 020
Caribbean Dev. Bank	32	- 12	63	19	40	28	32
Council of Europe	- 0	-	-	-	-	-	-
EBRD	-	17	44	53	53	50	11
IDA <sup>b</sup>	4 118	5 325	5 753	5 701	7 283	6 611	5 996
IDB	121	320	166	292	261	231	216
IMF <sup>c</sup>	647	967	567	9	- 179	- 714	- 12
Nordic Dev. Fund	-	60	33	52	70	63	68
<b>Total IFIs</b>	<b>6 611</b>	<b>8 388</b>	<b>8 147</b>	<b>7 435</b>	<b>9 142</b>	<b>7 979</b>	<b>8 871</b>
<i>United Nations<sup>d</sup></i>							
IFAD	181	119	148	155	165	199	226
UNDP	923	530	275	296	374	399	437
UNFPA	175	223	310	271	312	386	388
UNHCR	626	580	633	534	347	322	289
UNICEF	586	737	567	629	650	711	740
UNRWA	300	293	392	430	449	508	600
UNTA	257	401	466	504	434	580	371
WFP	1 134	732	351	319	253	555	473
<b>Total UN</b>	<b>4 182</b>	<b>3 614</b>	<b>3 143</b>	<b>3 138</b>	<b>2 982</b>	<b>3 659</b>	<b>3 525</b>
EC	3 021	4 992	5 150	6 445	8 068	8 687	9 489
Global Environment Facility	-	-	109	107	138	181	190
GFATM	-	-	1	216	586	995	1 252
Montreal Protocol Fund	-	-	60	66	59	83	81
Arab Funds	114	- 29	139	44	282	253	440
<b>Total concessional</b>	<b>13 928</b>	<b>16 965</b>	<b>16 749</b>	<b>17 452</b>	<b>21 257</b>	<b>21 838</b>	<b>23 847</b>
<b>NON-CONCESSIONAL FLOWS</b>							
African Dev. Bank	1 100	381	- 675	- 530	- 589	- 167	- 238
Asian Dev. Bank	1 347	682	- 251	- 2 407	- 1 416	1 723	2 685
Caribbean Dev. Bank	18	22	58	19	40	18	17
Council of Europe	310	- 88	-	-	-	-	-
EBRD	-	323	92	218	855	36	463
EC	209	227	883	1 146	1 856	1 595	1 855
IBRD	3 385	- 390	- 6 528	- 5 000	- 3 541	- 2 147	- 4 853
IFC	939	779	32	1 253	534	364	1 544
IDB	1 212	1 398	1 413	1 266	- 1 431	- 326	- 2 529
IFAD	-	- 0	- 5	- 8	- 10	1	11
<b>Total non-concessional</b>	<b>8 520</b>	<b>3 334</b>	<b>- 4 980</b>	<b>- 4 042</b>	<b>- 3 700</b>	<b>1 097</b>	<b>- 1 044</b>

d) The data for UN agencies have been reviewed to include only regular budget expenditures. This has led to revisions of UNDP data since 1990. For WFP and UNHCR revisions have only been possible from 1996 onwards, while for UNICEF the data are revised from 1997. Since 2000, UNHCR operates an Annual Programme Budget which includes country operations, global operations and administrative costs under a unified budget. However, data shown for UNHCR as of 2004 cover expenditures from unrestricted or broadly earmarked funds only.

**Table 18**

 StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175546767154>
**Major Aid Uses by Individual DAC Donors**

Per cent of total bilateral commitments

	Social and administrative infrastructure		Economic infrastructure		Agriculture		Industry and other production	
	1985-1986	2005-2006	1985-1986	2005-2006	1985-1986	2005-2006	1985-1986	2005-2006
Australia	30.0	49.5	3.7	3.6	10.0	4.7	2.5	0.8
Austria	37.0	17.2	41.9	1.0	4.1	0.9	4.8	0.9
Belgium	46.6	35.7	14.4	5.9	11.7	4.1	6.8	1.0
Canada	15.5	41.0	14.4	3.5	18.8	4.8	7.8	1.2
Denmark	24.4	36.1	25.9	11.7	15.2	10.1	15.8	3.8
Finland	36.3	37.6	18.1	7.4	15.1	5.2	12.5	2.6
France	39.8	27.5	18.4	7.9	9.9	1.6	6.6	0.5
Germany	35.9	26.5	25.5	13.3	10.2	3.1	6.1	1.1
Greece	..	57.0	..	8.8	..	0.8	..	0.6
Ireland	40.1	55.4	0.9	1.3	18.2	3.9	4.6	0.5
Italy	19.9	11.3	25.3	10.7	14.4	1.0	11.8	0.6
Japan	20.2	20.9	36.9	24.3	14.3	5.2	11.1	2.8
Luxembourg	..	49.1	..	3.1	..	3.2	..	1.6
Netherlands	30.3	35.8	15.7	6.8	19.1	1.9	4.2	0.6
New Zealand	16.6	39.7	22.8	2.9	19.7	2.6	2.0	2.4
Norway	36.9	44.5	19.5	8.1	14.3	4.0	12.6	1.4
Portugal	..	60.3	..	12.6	..	1.0	..	1.1
Spain	..	29.8	..	11.3	..	3.0	..	1.8
Sweden	15.7	34.5	18.8	5.3	6.0	3.3	10.2	2.0
Switzerland	19.6	20.7	10.0	6.4	24.5	4.5	9.9	3.6
United Kingdom	26.8	26.7	14.9	2.4	10.2	1.6	10.4	1.2
United States	17.8	43.1	3.9	11.0	11.2	2.7	2.4	3.0
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>1.9</b>

a) On a net disbursements basis.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175546767154>**Table 18****Major Aid Uses by Individual DAC Donors***(continued)*

Per cent of total bilateral commitments

Commodity aid and programme assistance		Humanitarian aid		Other		Memo: Share of total ODA to / through NGOs <sup>a</sup> 2005-2006	
1985-1986	2005-2006	1985-1986	2005-2006	1985-1986	2005-2006		
45.0	1.9	1.5	11.9	7.2	27.6	4.5	Australia
3.7	0.1	3.1	2.2	5.5	77.7	4.1	Austria
7.2	0.6	0.6	5.5	12.6	47.2	9.4	Belgium
19.2	1.7	3.5	9.4	20.9	38.6	11.0	Canada
-	5.5	-	4.9	18.8	28.0	6.5	Denmark
2.3	5.6	2.5	15.0	13.3	26.6	3.8	Finland
6.5	3.0	0.1	0.9	18.7	58.7	0.4	France
3.2	1.0	0.7	3.8	18.3	51.2	7.4	Germany
..	1.2	..	9.5	..	22.1	3.1	Greece
-	7.0	2.5	18.3	33.7	13.7	15.7	Ireland
9.0	1.2	8.0	2.8	11.8	72.5	0.7	Italy
4.9	1.5	0.1	3.0	12.7	42.3	0.9	Japan
..	2.0	..	13.4	..	27.7	6.6	Luxembourg
6.4	4.5	2.4	5.9	21.9	44.5	19.5	Netherlands
27.1	9.7	2.0	17.4	9.9	25.3	13.7	New Zealand
5.8	4.2	2.7	15.4	8.1	22.4	9.9	Norway
..	1.9	..	4.4	..	18.6	2.4	Portugal
..	1.2	..	5.2	..	47.6	15.9	Spain
0.5	4.2	8.7	10.9	40.2	39.9	11.9	Sweden
14.2	2.5	11.8	13.7	10.1	48.6	17.2	Switzerland
3.9	1.1	3.9	8.2	30.0	58.7	7.5	United Kingdom
54.6	4.7	2.3	12.9	7.9	22.7	-	United States
<b>22.3</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>

Table 19

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175557574827>

## Aid by Major Purposes in 2006

## Commitments

	Per cent of total bilateral ODA											
	Australia	Austria	Belgium	Canada	Den- mark	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Ireland	Italy	Japan
Social and administrative												
infrastructure	53.2	19.8	39.0	44.6	32.4	39.5	29.5	34.5	59.1	56.2	12.1	22.6
Education <sup>a</sup>	8.6	9.8	11.0	11.9	1.2	5.7	18.0	14.5	12.5	10.1	1.7	6.8
of which : Basic												
education	1.9	0.3	1.8	8.1	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.1	0.0	5.8	0.1	0.8
Health	11.5	1.7	6.7	8.0	7.8	8.3	2.7	2.6	12.7	12.1	3.8	2.3
of which : Basic health	8.4	1.5	4.2	6.1	3.1	2.3	1.8	1.6	11.7	6.8	1.1	1.2
Population <sup>b</sup>	2.5	0.4	1.7	1.9	2.2	1.4	0.0	2.4	4.2	12.6	0.2	0.1
Water supply and												
sanitation	0.4	1.9	4.0	0.7	10.8	7.6	2.4	5.3	0.5	2.7	2.2	9.4
Government and civil												
society	24.8	5.3	10.4	18.3	9.0	14.8	1.4	7.2	24.7	13.2	1.6	2.8
Other social												
infrastructure/service	5.3	0.7	5.1	3.6	1.4	1.8	5.0	2.6	4.5	5.5	2.7	1.2
Economic infrastructure	3.4	1.4	5.9	2.8	10.0	5.6	6.5	14.6	8.6	1.1	10.5	26.0
Transport and												
communications	1.8	0.2	2.1	1.0	4.5	1.6	4.3	3.2	7.6	0.6	5.9	16.4
Energy	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.7	2.6	2.9	1.0	5.3	0.2	0.0	2.6	9.3
Other	1.1	0.5	3.5	1.1	2.9	1.1	1.1	6.1	0.9	0.5	1.9	0.3
Production	4.6	1.6	5.5	6.8	7.6	8.5	1.9	5.3	1.5	4.8	1.8	8.5
Agriculture	4.1	0.9	4.5	5.5	5.3	4.1	1.7	3.8	1.2	4.3	1.2	4.5
Industry, mining and												
construction	0.2	0.4	0.9	0.7	2.2	3.6	(0.5)	1.3	0.1	0.3	0.5	1.1
Trade and tourism	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	2.9
Multisector	7.5	2.0	3.1	7.3	5.2	14.0	9.5	5.7	5.7	5.0	4.7	4.0
Programme assistance	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.9	10.4	10.5	4.0	1.3	1.8	4.9	1.1	1.4
Action relating to debt <sup>c</sup>	15.5	67.0	28.9	9.7	19.0	0.4	39.3	32.1	-	-	64.0	28.5
Humanitarian aid	10.7	1.2	6.2	11.7	9.4	10.6	0.6	3.7	10.7	22.2	3.0	2.4
Administrative expenses	4.3	2.9	3.9	9.1	0.3	6.9	3.4	2.4	10.2	5.5	2.6	5.0
Unspecified	0.6	4.0	6.8	7.1	5.7	3.8	5.3	0.4	2.4	0.2	0.4	1.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<i>Memo item:</i>												
Food aid, total	0.2	0.1	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.3	0.2	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.6

a) Including students and trainees.

b) Population and reproductive health.

c) Including forgiveness of non-ODA debt.

d) Including the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank and Inter-American Development Bank.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175557574827>

Table 19

## Aid by Major Purposes in 2006

(continued)

Commitments

Luxem- bourg	Nether- lands	New Zealand	Norway	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	Switzer- land	United Kingdom	United States	TOTAL DAC	EC	Per cent of total Multilateral finance (ODF)	
												World Bank	Regional Dev. Banks <sup>d</sup>
50.2	35.7	45.1	45.6	65.1	33.2	35.2	22.1	30.5	44.1	34.9	42.8	30.6	39.6
16.0	17.5	20.5	9.2	30.3	9.6	4.6	3.8	4.9	2.0	8.7	5.4	5.0	3.7
2.8	13.4	8.5	4.2	2.9	2.0	1.5	0.6	2.6	1.1	2.9	1.8	2.2	1.4
15.9	5.3	5.5	8.6	4.8	4.6	5.8	3.3	4.6	5.6	4.7	4.3	6.8	0.6
9.5	2.4	2.6	2.8	1.0	3.2	3.4	1.5	1.7	4.9	2.9	3.1	5.1	0.2
6.3	1.8	3.3	2.5	0.0	1.8	3.5	0.2	3.3	11.7	4.1	1.0	1.9	0.3
5.4	4.3	1.4	1.3	0.3	3.0	2.4	2.5	0.6	3.4	4.0	6.7	6.2	10.4
3.1	6.0	12.8	20.1	20.6	8.1	15.5	11.4	15.8	11.1	8.9	22.0	7.9	13.1
3.4	0.9	1.6	4.0	9.2	6.3	3.4	0.9	1.3	10.4	4.5	3.3	2.8	11.4
3.4	6.2	4.8	8.3	12.2	14.9	5.3	6.7	2.4	13.4	11.4	15.3	28.4	39.5
1.2	0.2	2.8	1.2	11.8	8.4	1.6	1.0	0.8	3.8	4.7	10.3	17.0	19.9
0.2	1.0	0.7	4.8	-	2.1	2.0	2.0	0.9	5.7	3.9	4.9	9.6	15.0
2.0	5.0	1.3	2.4	0.4	4.3	1.7	3.7	0.7	3.9	2.8	0.1	1.8	4.6
4.6	1.9	6.0	5.4	1.5	5.4	5.9	8.8	2.9	5.2	4.8	14.4	6.6	10.5
2.9	1.2	3.0	4.0	0.7	3.2	3.8	4.7	1.6	2.6	2.9	3.5	6.0	3.3
1.1	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.7	1.8	1.3	1.2	0.7	1.3	0.8	6.8	0.6	6.1
0.7	0.6	2.1	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.8	2.9	0.6	1.3	1.1	4.1	-	1.2
9.2	3.3	3.7	10.3	6.7	7.6	7.8	14.7	1.7	6.7	5.8	12.3	5.5	8.6
4.1	2.9	6.6	4.5	1.6	1.7	4.4	2.8	1.4	5.4	3.1	7.9	28.8	1.8
-	13.9	0.0	1.0	0.2	25.3	11.0	7.8	41.3	6.9	22.6	-	0.1	-
19.1	3.5	10.6	14.3	3.2	5.9	11.1	14.0	9.8	11.4	6.9	13.0	0.1	-
6.9	0.1	8.1	7.6	5.9	4.4	7.2	4.1	5.6	4.7	4.1	7.3	-	-
2.5	32.5	15.1	3.1	3.6	1.6	12.2	19.0	4.3	2.1	6.4	0.0	-	-
<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
4.1	0.0	0.6	0.3	-	1.3	-	-	-	3.0	1.0	3.7	-	-

Table 20

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175567716537>

### Financial Terms of ODA Commitments<sup>a</sup> 2005-2006 average

	Grant element of total ODA Norm: 86% <sup>b</sup>		Grant share of:		Grant element of ODA loans	Grant element of ODA to LDCs <sup>c</sup>	Grant element of bilateral ODA to LDCs
	1995-1996	2005-2006	Bilateral ODA	Total ODA			
Australia	100.0	100.0	99.2	99.4	-	100.0	100.0
Austria	92.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Belgium	99.5	99.5	97.0	98.1	74.2	99.9	99.9
Canada	99.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Denmark	100.0	100.0	98.8	99.2	-	100.0	100.0
Finland	100.0	100.0	97.7	98.6	-	100.0	100.0
France	91.8	94.8	81.2	86.9	55.1	99.2	98.6
Germany	92.1	97.4	71.8	82.4	63.6	100.0	100.0
Greece	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Ireland	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Italy	98.6	97.1	59.0	87.9	60.3	94.5	84.4
Japan	79.7	88.4	41.5	54.1	74.8	98.9	98.0
Luxembourg	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Netherlands	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
New Zealand	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0	100.0
Norway	99.5	100.0	98.4	86.3	-	100.0	100.0
Portugal	99.7	97.3	90.2	94.5	66.8	95.1	95.1
Spain	91.1	95.0	77.4	87.9	68.5	98.8	98.0
Sweden	100.0	100.0	99.6	99.7	-	100.0	100.0
Switzerland	100.0	100.0	97.5	98.2	-	100.0	100.0
United Kingdom	100.0	100.0	93.2	95.7	-	100.0	100.0
United States	99.3	100.0	99.9	99.9	69.5	100.0	100.0
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>91.8</b>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>99.5</b>	<b>99.3</b>

a) Excluding debt reorganisation. Equities are treated as having 100% grant element, but are not treated as loans.

b) Countries whose ODA Commitments as a percentage of GNI is below the DAC average are not considered as having met the terms target. This provision disqualified Greece, Italy, Portugal and the United States in 2006.

c) Including imputed multilateral grant element. See note a) to Table 31.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175634262623>

Table 21

## DAC Members' Compliance in 2005 and 2006 with the 1978 DAC Terms Recommendations

	ODA commitments <sup>a</sup> USD million		Grant element of ODA commitments <sup>a</sup> Norm: 86% <sup>b</sup>		Volume test: ODA commitments <sup>a</sup> as per cent of GNI		Grant element of bilateral ODA commitments <sup>a</sup> to LDCs (two alternative norms)		
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005 Norm:	2006 Norm:	Annually for all LDCs		3-year average
					0.22%	0.24%	Norm: 90%		for each LDC
									Norm: 86%
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2004-2006 <sup>d</sup>
Australia	2 051	1 846	100.0	100.0	0.30	0.26	100.0	100.0	c
Austria	746	801	100.0	100.0	0.25	0.25	100.0	100.0	c
Belgium	1 602	2 010	99.7	99.4	0.43	0.51	99.9	100.0	c
Canada	3 270	3 586	100.0	100.0	0.29	0.29	100.0	100.0	c
Denmark	2 285	1 854	100.0	100.0	0.88	0.66	100.0	100.0	c
Finland	1 139	961	100.0	100.0	0.58	0.46	100.0	100.0	c
France	8 369	11 129	95.0	94.7	0.40	0.49	98.9	98.3	c
Germany	8 575	10 196	99.7	95.7	0.31	0.35	100.0	100.0	c
Greece <sup>c</sup>	384	424	100.0	100.0	0.17	0.17	100.0	100.0	c
Ireland <sup>c</sup>	719	1 022	100.0	100.0	0.42	0.54	100.0	100.0	c
Italy	3 956	2 533	95.5	100.0	0.23	0.14	77.7	100.0	c
Japan	13 675	13 563	87.3	89.6	0.29	0.30	98.2	97.9	c
Luxembourg <sup>c</sup>	256	291	100.0	100.0	0.86	0.89	100.0	100.0	c
Netherlands <sup>c</sup>	4 349	11 149	100.0	100.0	0.70	1.65	100.0	100.0	c
New Zealand	370	356	100.0	100.0	0.37	0.37	100.0	100.0	c
Norway	2 829	3 178	100.0	100.0	0.95	0.96	100.0	100.0	c
Portugal <sup>c</sup>	380	402	94.9	100.0	0.21	0.21	91.4	100.0	c
Spain <sup>c</sup>	2 604	3 576	95.7	94.5	0.23	0.30	98.5	97.1	c
Sweden	3 679	3 956	100.0	100.0	1.03	1.03	100.0	100.0	c
Switzerland	1 531	1 782	100.0	100.0	0.38	0.42	100.0	100.0	c
United Kingdom <sup>c</sup>	7 628	9 564	100.0	100.0	0.33	0.39	100.0	100.0	c
United States	26 009	24 992	100.0	100.0	0.21	0.19	100.0	100.0	c
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>96 406</b>	<b>109 171</b>	<b>97.3</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>99.1</b>	<b>99.6</b>	<b>c</b>

a) Excluding debt reorganisation. Equities are treated as having 100% grant element, but are not treated as loans.

b) Countries whose ODA as a percentage of GNI is below the DAC average are not considered as having met the terms target. This provision disqualified Greece, Italy, Portugal and the United States in 2006.

c) Gross disbursements.

d) c = compliance, n = non-compliance.

Table 22

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175663441022>Other Terms Parameters,<sup>a</sup> 2006

## Commitments

	Loan share of total ODA (per cent)	Terms of total bilateral loans				Terms of the bilateral loan with the lowest grant element			
		Average maturity (years)	Average grace period (years)	Average interest rate (per cent)	Grant element (per cent)	Maturity (years)	Grace period (years)	Interest rate (per cent)	Grant element (per cent)
Australia	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belgium	1.8	29.3	10.3	1.2	72.9	29.1	10.1	2.0	66.3
Canada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
France	7.6	21.5	7.1	2.4	53.1	10.0	5.1	5.0	25.2
Germany	12.1	31.2	6.1	2.1	60.7	12.0	6.0	5.3	26.3
Greece	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	8.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Japan	31.8	33.1	9.6	1.0	74.5	9.1	6.1	4.0	30.5
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Zealand	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norway	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	4.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	10.0	23.2	9.4	0.5	70.9	15.0	4.1	1.0	51.3
Sweden	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Switzerland	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United States	0.1	30.0	5.0	1.0	68.9	30.0	5.0	1.0	68.7
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>51.2</b>

a) Excluding debt reorganisation. Equities are treated as having 100% grant element, but are not treated as loans.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175675407777>

Table 23

## Tying Status of ODA by Individual DAC Members, 2006

Commitments (excluding technical co-operation and administrative costs)

Per cent

	Bilateral ODA				Memo: Reporting Rate <sup>b</sup>
	Untied	Partially Untied	Tied	Total	
Australia	..	..	..	..	Not reported
Austria	89.5	-	10.5	100.0	100.0
Belgium	90.7	-	9.3	100.0	100.0
Canada	62.9	0.2	36.9	100.0	100.0
Denmark	95.3	-	4.7	100.0	100.0
Finland	86.5	-	13.5	100.0	99.5
France	95.6	-0.7	5.1	100.0	100.0
Germany	93.3	-	6.7	100.0	100.0
Greece (a)	39.1	-	60.9	100.0	100.0
Ireland (a)	100.0	-	-	100.0	100.0
Italy	77.0	2.5	20.5	100.0	100.0
Japan	95.6	-	4.4	100.0	100.0
Luxembourg (a)	100.0	-	-	100.0	100.0
Netherlands	100.0	-	0.0	100.0	100.0
New Zealand	90.2	0.0	9.8	100.0	100.0
Norway	99.8	-	0.2	100.0	100.0
Portugal (a)	61.3	20.5	18.3	100.0	100.0
Spain (a)	82.8	-	17.2	100.0	100.0
Sweden	100.0	-	-	100.0	100.0
Switzerland	96.3	-	3.7	100.0	100.0
United Kingdom (a)	100.0	-	-	100.0	79.5
United States	..	..	..	..	Not reported
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>(94.5)</b>	<b>(0.1)</b>	<b>(5.4)</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>(79.5)</b>

a) Gross disbursements.

b) Reporting rate is the percentage of bilateral ODA covered by tying status reporting (excluding technical co-operation and administrative costs).



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175680335633>

Table 24

## Tying Status of ODA by Individual DAC Members, 2006

Commitments (excluding technical co-operation  
and administrative costs)

USD million

	Bilateral ODA				Memo: Technical Co-operation
	Untied	Partially Untied	Tied	Total	
Australia	..	..	..	..	860
Austria	800	-	94	894	158
Belgium	783	-	80	863	629
Canada	1 111	4	651	1 766	683
Denmark	1 232	-	61	1 292	73
Finland	361	-	56	417	147
France	6 494	- 46	348	6 797	2 806
Germany	5 701	-	408	6 109	3 140
Greece (a)	32	-	49	81	89
Ireland (a)	578	-	-	578	20
Italy	1 734	56	462	2 251	192
Japan	10 592	-	487	11 079	1 865
Luxembourg (a)	186	-	-	186	6
Netherlands	10 206	-	2	10 208	610
New Zealand	181	0	20	201	80
Norway	2 042	-	4	2 045	438
Portugal (a)	54	18	16	87	117
Spain (a)	1 572	-	327	1 899	438
Sweden	2 826	-	-	2 826	94
Switzerland	1 041	-	40	1 081	124
United Kingdom (a)	6 311	-	-	6 311	860
United States	..	..	..	..	10 958
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>(53 838)</b>	<b>( 32)</b>	<b>(3 104)</b>	<b>(56 974)</b>	<b>24 386</b>

a) Gross disbursements.

Table 25

 StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175720728675>

 ODA Receipts<sup>a</sup> and Selected Indicators for Developing Countries and Territories

	Net ODA Receipts (USD million)					GNI/CAP (e) 2006 USD	Population 2006 million	Current GNI 2006 USD million	ODA/GNI 2006 per cent
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006				
<b>AFRICA</b>									
<i>NORTH OF SAHARA</i>									
Algeria	328	234	314	371	209	3 030	33.35	107 324	0.19
Egypt	1 237	987	1 456	995	873	1 350	75.40	108 015	0.81
Libya (d)	-	-	-	24	37	7 380	5.97	50 365	0.07
Morocco	486	539	707	694	1 046	1 900	30.50	56 974	1.84
Tunisia	265	298	328	365	432	2 970	10.13	28 660	1.51
North of Sahara, regional	29	112	181	141	144				
<b>North of Sahara, Total</b>	<b>2 346</b>	<b>2 170</b>	<b>2 986</b>	<b>2 591</b>	<b>2 740</b>	..	<b>155.35</b>	<b>351 338</b>	<b>0.78</b>
<i>SOUTH OF SAHARA</i>									
Angola	414	493	1 145	437	171	1 980	16.39	38 765	0.44
Benin	216	295	386	346	375	540	8.69	4 709	7.96
Botswana	37	28	47	48	65	5 900	1.76	9 665	0.67
Burkina Faso	471	507	624	681	871	460	13.59	6 227	13.98
Burundi	172	227	362	365	415	100	7.83	785	52.83
Cameroon	656	895	773	417	1 684	1 080	16.68	18 050	9.33
Cape Verde	92	143	143	162	138	2 130	0.52	1 099	12.58
Central African Rep.	60	51	110	96	134	360	4.10	1 485	9.02
Chad	228	247	329	382	284	480	9.99	5 184	5.47
Comoros	32	24	25	25	30	660	0.61	401	7.59
Congo, Dem. Rep.	1 175	5 416	1 824	1 827	2 056	130	59.34	8 143	25.24
Congo, Rep.	57	69	115	1 444	254	..	4.11	..	..
Côte d'Ivoire	1 068	254	161	110	251	870	18.47	15 974	1.57
Djibouti	78	79	64	76	117	1 060	0.81	838	13.99
Equatorial Guinea	20	21	30	38	27	8 250	0.51	5 253	0.51
Eritrea	230	316	264	355	129	200	4.54	1 079	11.96
Ethiopia	1 297	1 594	1 806	1 910	1 947	1 180	72.71	13 277	14.66
Gabon	72	- 11	40	52	31	5 000	1.41	7 511	0.41
Gambia	60	63	55	61	74	310	1.55	499	14.83
Ghana	648	950	1 375	1 125	1 176	520	22.53	12 813	9.17
Guinea	249	240	272	199	164	410	9.20	3 274	4.99
Guinea-Bissau	59	145	77	79	82	190	1.63	295	27.91
Kenya	391	521	654	767	943	580	35.14	20 936	4.51
Lesotho	76	79	96	69	72	1 030	1.79	1 783	4.02
Liberia	52	107	213	233	269	140	3.38	494	54.38
Madagascar	369	539	1 248	914	754	280	19.09	5 419	13.92
Malawi	376	513	501	578	669	170	13.16	2 194	30.47
Mali	466	543	568	699	825	440	13.91	6 142	13.44
Mauritania	344	238	181	196	188	740	3.15	2 769	6.77
Mauritius	24	- 15	32	34	19	5 450	1.25	6 477	0.29
Mayotte	125	166	208	201	338	..	0.19	..	..
Mozambique	2 201	1 037	1 235	1 277	1 611	340	20.14	6 930	23.25
Namibia	134	146	173	115	145	3 230	2.05	6 344	2.29
Niger	297	457	541	511	401	260	14.42	3 647	11.00
Nigeria	294	308	578	6 416	11 434	640	144.75	103 277	11.07
Rwanda	354	335	486	571	585	250	9.24	2 475	23.63
Sao Tome & Principe	26	38	33	32	22	780	0.16	120	17.95
Senegal	445	447	1 037	672	825	750	11.93	8 868	9.30
Seychelles	8	9	10	15	14	8 650	0.09	711	1.96
Sierra Leone	353	304	354	344	364	240	5.64	1 414	25.73
Somalia	191	174	200	237	392	..	8.49	..	..
South Africa	505	641	628	680	718	5 390	47.39	249 711	0.29
St. Helena	14	18	26	23	28	..	0.01	..	..
Sudan	343	613	992	1 832	2 058	810	37.00	34 212	6.02
Swaziland	22	34	22	46	35	2 430	1.13	2 664	1.30
Tanzania	1 236	1 704	1 751	1 481	1 825	350	39.48	12 624	14.46
Togo	51	50	64	83	79	350	6.30	2 181	3.61
Uganda	710	976	1 194	1 177	1 551	300	29.87	9 162	16.92
Zambia	639	589	1 125	935	1 425	630	11.86	9 961	14.30
Zimbabwe	199	186	186	376	280	..	13.09	..	..
South of Sahara, regional	969	1 362	1 424	1 116	1 581				
<b>South of Sahara, Total</b>	<b>18 605</b>	<b>24 166</b>	<b>25 790</b>	<b>31 867</b>	<b>39 922</b>	..	<b>771.07</b>	<b>(655 838)</b>	<b>(6.09)</b>
Africa, regional	416	449	564	698	740				
<b>AFRICA, TOTAL</b>	<b>21 367</b>	<b>26 784</b>	<b>29 341</b>	<b>35 156</b>	<b>43 402</b>	..	<b>926.42</b>	<b>(1 007 176)</b>	<b>(3.49)</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175720728675>

Table 25

ODA Receipts<sup>a</sup> and Selected Indicators for Developing Countries and Territories  
(continued)

	Net ODA Receipts (USD million)					GNI/CAP (e) 2006 USD	Population 2006 million	Current GNI 2006 USD million	ODA/GNI 2006 per cent
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006				
<i>AMERICA</i>									
<i>NORTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA</i>									
Anguilla	1	4	3	4	4	..	0.01	..	..
Antigua and Barbuda	14	5	2	8	3	11 210	0.08	911	0.36
Barbados	3	20	29	- 2	- 1	..	0.27	..	..
Belize	22	12	8	12	8	3 650	0.30	1 082	0.70
Costa Rica	5	28	15	30	24	4 980	4.39	21 367	0.11
Cuba	61	75	97	89	78	..	11.29	..	..
Dominica	30	11	29	21	19	3 960	0.07	278	6.96
Dominican Republic	145	69	85	77	53	2 850	9.61	28 775	0.18
El Salvador	233	192	217	200	157	2 540	6.99	17 686	0.89
Grenada	10	10	15	53	27	4 420	0.11	475	5.64
Guatemala	248	247	220	254	487	2 640	12.90	35 290	1.38
Haiti	156	212	260	502	581	480	8.65	4 331	13.42
Honduras	471	391	650	679	587	1 200	7.35	8 922	6.58
Jamaica	24	5	83	39	37	3 480	2.66	9 389	0.39
Mexico	133	99	116	189	247	7 870	104.22	830 657	0.03
Montserrat	44	36	44	28	32	..	0.01	..	..
Nicaragua	517	833	1 235	740	733	1 000	5.25	5 259	13.93
Panama	22	29	24	20	30	4 890	3.28	15 686	0.19
St. Kitts-Nevis	28	- 0	- 0	3	5	8 840	0.05	426	1.21
St. Lucia	34	15	- 22	10	18	5 110	0.17	842	2.19
St. Vincent and Grenadines	5	6	10	4	5	3 930	0.12	466	1.02
Trinidad & Tobago	- 9	- 3	- 2	- 2	13	13 340	1.31	19 028	0.07
Turks & Caicos Islands	4	2	3	5	- 0	..	0.02	..	..
West Indies, regional	43	47	44	16	56	..	..	..	..
N. & C. America, regional	126	191	232	233	223	..	..	..	..
<b>North &amp; Central America, Total</b>	<b>2 369</b>	<b>2 536</b>	<b>3 397</b>	<b>3 211</b>	<b>3 429</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>179.11</b>	<b>(1 000 871)</b>	<b>(0.34)</b>
<i>SOUTH AMERICA</i>									
Argentina	82	106	93	97	114	5 150	39.12	208 618	0.05
Bolivia	680	929	770	632	581	1 100	9.34	10 799	5.38
Brazil	202	194	157	196	82	4 730	188.69	1 038 443	0.01
Chile	- 8	79	57	152	83	6 980	16.45	129 845	0.06
Colombia	440	801	519	626	988	2 740	45.56	129 978	0.76
Ecuador	216	175	158	228	189	2 840	13.41	38 946	0.48
Guyana	65	87	134	138	173	1 130	0.75	862	20.06
Paraguay	57	51	22	51	56	1 400	6.02	9 131	0.61
Peru	489	497	473	477	468	2 920	28.37	85 559	0.55
Suriname	12	11	24	44	64	3 200	0.45	1 550	4.11
Uruguay	13	17	22	15	21	5 310	3.31	18 801	0.11
Venezuela	57	81	45	49	58	6 070	27.02	180 390	0.03
South America, regional	44	85	461	104	99	..	..	..	..
<b>South America, Total</b>	<b>2 347</b>	<b>3 112</b>	<b>2 934</b>	<b>2 806</b>	<b>2 976</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>378.49</b>	<b>1 852 923</b>	<b>0.16</b>
America, regional	311	385	428	533	505	..	..	..	..
<b>AMERICA, TOTAL</b>	<b>5 027</b>	<b>6 032</b>	<b>6 759</b>	<b>6 550</b>	<b>6 910</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>557.60</b>	<b>(2 853 794)</b>	<b>(0.23)</b>

Table 25

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175720728675>

### ODA Receipts<sup>a</sup> and Selected Indicators for Developing Countries and Territories (continued)

	Net ODA Receipts (USD million)					GNI/CAP (e) 2006 USD	Population 2006 million	Current GNI 2006 USD million	ODA/GNI 2006 per cent
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006				
<i>ASIA</i>									
<i>MIDDLE EAST</i>									
Bahrain (c)	70	77	57	-	-	..	0.74	..	-
Iran	115	130	186	104	121	3 000	69.15	220 773	0.05
Iraq	106	2 250	4 650	22 052	8 661	..	..	..	..
Jordan	537	1 248	601	668	580	2 660	5.59	14 695	3.94
Lebanon	452	225	264	244	707	5 490	4.06	22 006	3.21
Oman	40	38	54	- 5	35	..	2.62	..	..
Palestinian Adm. Areas	1 616	972	1 116	1 116	1 449	..	3.74	4 190	34.58
Saudi Arabia	17	12	20	26	25	..	23.68	..	..
Syria	76	117	106	79	27	1 570	19.50	33 865	0.08
Yemen	583	234	253	336	284	760	21.63	17 611	1.61
Middle East, regional	59	175	201	326	2 056	..	..	..	..
<b>Middle East, Total</b>	<b>3 672</b>	<b>5 477</b>	<b>7 509</b>	<b>24 944</b>	<b>13 945</b>	..	<b>( 150.71)</b>	<b>(313 140)</b>	<b>(4.45)</b>
<i>SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIA</i>									
Afghanistan	1 300	1 591	2 171	2 752	3 000	..	..	8 405	35.69
Armenia	293	249	254	193	213	1 930	3.01	6 505	3.28
Azerbaijan	349	301	176	225	206	1 850	8.47	17 405	1.18
Bangladesh	909	1 394	1 412	1 336	1 223	480	144.35	65 440	1.87
Bhutan	73	77	78	90	94	1 410	0.65	925	10.17
Georgia	313	226	314	309	361	1 560	4.44	7 293	4.94
India	1 441	900	694	1 728	1 379	820	1 109.81	900 950	0.15
Kazakhstan	188	270	268	225	172	3 790	15.31	67 918	0.25
Kyrgyz Rep.	186	200	261	268	311	490	5.20	2 644	11.77
Maldives	27	21	27	77	39	2 680	0.34	878	4.39
Myanmar	119	125	124	145	147	..	50.96	..	..
Nepal	361	463	428	425	514	290	27.66	8 227	6.25
Pakistan	2 128	1 062	1 424	1 626	2 147	770	159.00	126 155	1.70
Sri Lanka	344	677	520	1 192	796	1 300	19.77	26 574	2.99
Tajikistan	168	148	243	251	240	390	6.65	2 718	8.82
Turkmenistan	41	27	37	29	26	..	4.90	9 870	0.26
Uzbekistan	189	195	246	169	149	610	26.54	17 164	0.87
South Asia, regional	121	320	417	374	391	..	..	..	..
<b>South and Central Asia, Total</b>	<b>8 551</b>	<b>8 243</b>	<b>9 093</b>	<b>11 414</b>	<b>11 405</b>	..	<b>(1 587.06)</b>	<b>(1 269 069)</b>	<b>(0.90)</b>
<i>FAR EAST ASIA</i>									
Cambodia	484	514	483	541	529	480	14.35	6 906	7.66
China	1 471	1 333	1 685	1 802	1 245	2 010	1 311.80	2 694 845	0.05
Indonesia	1 301	1 773	130	2 522	1 405	1 420	223.04	348 715	0.40
Korea, Dem.Rep.	265	131	161	87	55	..	22.57	..	..
Laos	278	301	270	296	364	500	5.77	2 999	12.14
Malaysia	86	107	297	28	240	5 490	25.77	144 198	0.17
Mongolia	208	250	255	221	203	880	2.58	2 603	7.79
Philippines	550	710	447	564	562	1 420	84.59	127 832	0.44
Thailand	294	- 944	46	- 165	- 216	2 990	64.72	202 098	-0.11
Timor-Leste	219	175	161	185	210	840	1.03	848	24.73
Viet Nam	1 274	1 765	1 840	1 907	1 846	690	84.11	59 362	3.11
Far East Asia, regional	48	104	177	339	171	..	..	..	..
<b>Far East Asia, Total</b>	<b>6 480</b>	<b>6 219</b>	<b>5 953</b>	<b>8 325</b>	<b>6 614</b>	..	<b>1 840.33</b>	<b>(3 590 406)</b>	<b>(0.18)</b>
Asia, regional	302	249	269	917	921	..	..	..	..
<b>ASIA, TOTAL</b>	<b>19 004</b>	<b>20 187</b>	<b>22 824</b>	<b>45 600</b>	<b>32 885</b>	..	<b>(3 578.10)</b>	<b>(5 172 615)</b>	<b>(0.88)</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175720728675>

Table 25

### ODA Receipts<sup>a</sup> and Selected Indicators for Developing Countries and Territories (continued)

	Net ODA Receipts (USD million)					GNI/CAP (e) 2006 USD	Population 2006 million	Current GNI 2006 USD million	ODA/GNI 2006 per cent
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006				
<b>EUROPE</b>									
Albania	308	349	299	319	321	2 960	3.14	9 312	3.45
Belarus (d)	-	-	-	54	73	3 380	9.72	36 025	0.20
Bosnia and Herzegovina	563	540	684	553	494	2 980	3.91	11 758	4.20
Croatia	131	122	121	127	200	9 330	4.44	41 463	0.48
Macedonia/FYROM	275	266	250	229	200	3 060	2.04	6 214	3.21
Malta (b)	11	-	-	-	-	..	0.40	..	-
Moldova	142	118	120	191	228	1 100	3.84	3 782	6.03
Montenegro	-	-	-	-	96	3 860	0.61	2 314	4.15
Serbia	1 930	1 318	1 170	1 136	1 586	3 910	7.44	31 413	5.05
Slovenia (b)	53	-	-	-	-	18 890	2.00	36 989	-
Turkey	410	165	286	459	570	5 400	72.94	402 334	0.14
Ukraine (d)	-	-	-	396	484	1 950	46.57	104 389	0.46
States Ex-Yugoslavia Unsp.	837	117	99	57	146				
Europe, regional	357	493	572	520	635				
<b>EUROPE, TOTAL</b>	<b>5 017</b>	<b>3 487</b>	<b>3 600</b>	<b>4 040</b>	<b>5 032</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>157.05</b>	<b>(685 992)</b>	<b>(0.78)</b>
<b>OCEANIA</b>									
Cook Islands	4	6	9	8	32	..	0.02	..	..
Fiji	34	51	64	64	56	3 300	0.85	2 735	2.04
Kiribati	21	18	17	28	-45	1 230	0.10	120	-37.60
Marshall Islands	62	56	51	57	55	3 000	0.07	193	28.50
Micronesia, Fed. States	112	115	86	106	109	2 380	0.11	262	41.35
Nauru	12	16	14	9	17	..	0.01	..	..
Niue	4	9	14	21	9	..	..	..	..
Palau	31	26	20	23	37	7 990	0.02	159	23.52
Papua New Guinea	203	220	268	266	279	770	6.00	5 070	5.50
Samoa	37	33	31	44	47	2 270	0.19	417	11.28
Solomon Islands	26	60	121	198	205	680	0.49	338	60.55
Tokelau	5	6	8	16	11	..	..	..	..
Tonga	22	27	19	32	21	2 170	0.10	223	9.62
Tuvalu	12	6	8	9	15	..	0.01	..	..
Vanuatu	27	32	38	39	49	1 710	0.22	358	13.64
Wallis & Futuna	53	56	73	72	102	..	0.02	..	..
Oceania, regional	43	76	96	152	127				
<b>OCEANIA, TOTAL</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>815</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>1 144</b>	<b>1 127</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>(8.21)</b>	<b>(9 874)</b>	<b>(11.42)</b>
Developing countries unspecified	9 112	13 035	15 332	14 802	15 936				
<b>Developing countries, TOTAL</b>	<b>60 235</b>	<b>70 340</b>	<b>78 793</b>	<b>107 292</b>	<b>105 292</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>(5 227.38)</b>	<b>(9 729 452)</b>	<b>(1.09)</b>
<b>By Income Group (f)</b>									
LDCs	18 015	23 860	25 216	25 882	28 181	..	737.42	(319 509)	(8.82)
Other LICs	10 035	9 005	10 589	18 111	23 592	..	1 686.32	(1 296 755)	(1.82)
LMICs	17 615	18 209	19 963	40 340	26 109	..	2 408.56	(5 712 728)	(0.46)
UMICs	2 455	2 108	2 567	2 689	3 825	..	391.94	(2 363 471)	(0.16)
Part I unallocated	11 981	17 082	20 400	20 270	23 586				
MADCTs	134	77	57	-	-	..	..	..	-

a) ODA receipts are total net ODA flows from DAC countries, multilateral organisations, and non-DAC countries (see Table 33 for the list of non-DAC countries for which data are available).

b) These countries left the DAC List of ODA recipients on 1 January 2003.

c) This country left the DAC List of ODA recipients on 1 January 2005.

d) These countries joined the DAC List of ODA recipients on 1 January 2005.

e) World Bank Atlas basis.

#### Definition of country categories:

f) *Least developed countries* (LDCs) are the 50 countries in the United Nations list. For details on other income groups see the DAC List of ODA Recipients at the end of this volume. *More advanced developing countries and territories* (MADCTs) comprise countries which left the DAC List of ODA Recipients in 2003 and 2005, as per notes b) and c) above.

**Source:** World Bank, Secretariat estimates. Group totals and averages are calculated on available data only.



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175728670121>

Table 26

Distribution of ODA by Income Group<sup>a</sup>

Net disbursements as per cent of total ODA

	ODA to LDCs		ODA to Other LICs		ODA to LMICs		ODA to UMICs	
	1995-1996	2005-2006	1995-1996	2005-2006	1995-1996	2005-2006	1995-1996	2005-2006
Australia	23.2	29.8	39.6	27.0	33.8	41.3	3.5	1.9
Austria	26.6	18.0	13.0	23.1	53.3	54.9	7.2	4.0
Belgium	43.9	43.7	16.4	24.7	35.5	26.3	4.2	5.3
Canada	38.0	46.1	19.7	21.6	37.7	28.9	4.6	3.4
Denmark	51.9	52.8	23.7	23.8	19.4	19.4	5.0	4.0
Finland	43.8	43.6	21.9	17.7	33.1	33.0	1.2	5.7
France	34.5	26.9	24.6	34.6	31.6	29.6	9.2	8.9
Germany	31.2	26.8	23.3	28.8	40.6	40.1	4.9	4.3
Greece	31.2	30.1	11.4	10.2	52.6	49.3	4.7	10.4
Ireland	66.9	67.2	11.9	14.1	15.8	13.4	5.4	5.3
Italy	39.2	29.4	17.9	28.9	38.8	36.3	4.1	5.4
Japan	22.0	27.4	21.7	25.9	53.4	44.3	3.0	2.3
Luxembourg	45.9	51.8	15.5	19.6	29.4	25.3	9.2	3.3
Netherlands	43.6	47.1	20.3	23.3	31.2	25.4	4.8	4.2
New Zealand	32.0	41.2	15.0	16.4	42.3	37.2	10.7	5.2
Norway	51.3	57.0	14.6	14.8	29.8	24.6	4.3	3.6
Portugal	90.9	69.4	2.0	7.0	6.0	19.0	1.1	4.6
Spain	21.1	29.8	16.8	16.2	50.9	47.9	11.1	6.2
Sweden	42.8	47.8	22.5	17.8	28.7	30.6	6.0	3.7
Switzerland	44.9	38.2	20.1	23.8	30.7	35.3	4.3	2.6
United Kingdom	42.3	34.1	26.6	44.9	25.4	18.2	5.8	2.8
United States	35.7	28.9	10.8	9.3	48.2	59.6	5.2	2.2
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>
<i>of which:</i>								
DAC-EU countries	37.3	33.7	22.3	30.5	34.1	30.6	6.3	5.2

a) Including imputed multilateral ODA. Excluding MADCTs and amounts unspecified by country.

Table 27

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175737888725>Regional Distribution of ODA by Individual DAC Donors and Multilateral Agencies<sup>a</sup>

Per cent of total gross disbursements

	Sub-Saharan Africa			South and Central Asia			Other Asia and Oceania		
	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006
Australia	7.6	4.5	3.9	7.0	7.9	8.5	83.8	85.3	74.4
Austria	23.6	39.1	30.5	3.3	6.6	3.3	10.6	7.1	1.7
Belgium	49.8	61.0	64.8	1.9	3.1	2.7	13.3	13.9	5.3
Canada	33.6	31.4	39.9	14.9	17.1	16.8	15.1	16.1	9.9
Denmark	55.7	52.2	56.4	15.0	15.1	14.9	10.7	12.6	12.3
Finland	42.6	41.2	38.3	9.6	11.6	13.7	21.4	18.5	11.6
France	51.4	52.1	59.2	2.1	3.4	2.2	21.2	10.6	7.4
Germany	24.1	23.8	39.7	11.9	13.1	9.3	21.4	20.4	12.8
Greece	22.9	2.1	7.6	15.2	6.1	17.1	0.2	0.1	1.1
Ireland	80.8	79.0	80.8	3.7	4.2	5.9	3.5	2.9	6.0
Italy	48.3	46.7	44.7	1.9	5.2	2.2	3.4	4.1	3.7
Japan	11.4	10.0	19.2	19.3	20.5	12.7	51.0	50.4	39.2
Luxembourg	56.8	44.3	54.5	6.0	7.2	5.8	7.0	12.5	13.4
Netherlands	37.1	42.9	54.8	16.8	13.5	12.6	5.1	13.7	12.5
New Zealand	3.9	6.4	7.8	2.6	4.7	8.7	91.8	86.0	78.8
Norway	52.0	41.5	48.5	14.6	14.5	19.4	7.2	7.1	7.2
Portugal	97.7	74.8	64.8	0.0	0.2	3.8	0.0	22.6	20.7
Spain	19.8	12.0	25.2	2.3	1.6	2.0	13.0	12.2	6.3
Sweden	44.4	42.5	47.1	13.3	12.1	11.7	12.0	12.2	9.1
Switzerland	40.0	33.0	32.8	17.4	19.2	17.5	8.2	7.8	6.7
United Kingdom	45.3	55.9	63.0	26.1	19.9	16.5	10.3	7.6	4.3
United States	16.6	20.5	24.1	9.8	18.4	13.5	8.6	8.7	4.2
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>13.8</b>
<i>of which:</i>									
DAC-EU countries	40.4	42.3	51.2	9.1	10.4	8.4	16.2	12.9	8.1
EC	44.6	33.6	42.2	9.8	7.4	10.4	6.3	5.9	5.3
IFIs <sup>b</sup>	43.2	40.0	71.7	27.9	32.3	13.5	15.6	13.8	4.0
Multi. Trust Funds <sup>c</sup>	-	13.5	56.9	-	20.0	8.0	-	46.3	16.6
UN Agencies <sup>d</sup>	43.1	38.9	41.0	14.8	16.8	15.4	11.0	10.6	10.2
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>30.6</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>10.6</b>

a) Excluding amounts unspecified by region.

b) International financial institutions. Includes IDA, regional banks' soft windows and IMF (PRGF).

c) Multilateral trust funds. Includes GEF, GFATM and Montreal Protocol.

d) Includes UNDP, UNICEF, UNRWA, WFP, UNHCR, UNFPA, UNTA and IFAD.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175737888725>

Table 27

Regional Distribution of ODA by Individual DAC Donors and Multilateral Agencies<sup>a</sup>

(continued)

Per cent of total gross disbursements

Middle East and North Africa			Europe			Latin America and Caribbean			
1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	
1.1	1.7	13.0	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	Australia
13.5	11.4	50.5	40.4	21.1	11.9	8.6	14.7	2.1	Austria
8.6	6.3	16.5	1.6	3.7	2.7	24.8	12.0	8.0	Belgium
15.1	5.9	15.1	2.8	8.7	4.2	18.5	20.8	14.1	Canada
8.1	5.8	6.5	0.4	4.4	2.0	10.2	9.8	7.9	Denmark
6.0	6.8	23.7	6.4	12.4	4.2	14.1	9.4	8.4	Finland
18.7	25.8	23.1	0.8	2.1	3.7	5.9	6.1	4.3	France
16.5	15.7	23.3	9.9	12.3	7.3	16.2	14.5	7.7	Germany
8.2	6.3	15.6	53.4	84.9	57.6	0.1	0.5	1.1	Greece
3.0	1.5	2.3	5.9	8.2	1.2	3.1	4.3	3.9	Ireland
18.2	13.9	37.9	13.2	17.7	6.1	15.0	12.3	5.5	Italy
6.1	6.6	19.5	1.1	2.0	2.1	11.1	10.4	7.3	Japan
4.6	7.7	4.5	5.0	10.4	6.8	20.5	17.9	15.0	Luxembourg
8.2	5.1	6.6	6.4	10.9	4.4	26.6	13.9	9.1	Netherlands
0.1	0.2	2.1	0.2	0.1	-	1.4	2.6	2.6	New Zealand
8.3	9.0	9.6	9.2	17.6	9.0	8.7	10.3	6.3	Norway
1.2	0.5	1.8	0.4	1.4	7.9	0.6	0.5	1.0	Portugal
11.5	12.4	22.3	1.4	6.9	4.8	52.0	54.8	39.4	Spain
8.6	5.6	12.7	7.7	9.9	9.4	14.0	17.6	10.0	Sweden
5.8	5.2	14.5	10.5	21.2	16.6	18.2	13.5	11.9	Switzerland
3.2	2.3	11.5	4.7	5.3	2.3	10.4	9.0	2.3	United Kingdom
45.3	19.2	45.4	4.2	8.8	3.4	15.5	24.5	9.4	United States
<b>15.3</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
									<i>of which:</i>
14.0	12.1	19.7	5.9	8.5	5.1	14.4	13.9	7.5	DAC-EU countries
16.0	15.9	18.1	9.0	26.9	15.1	14.2	10.3	9.0	EC
1.7	2.1	0.7	1.5	2.1	0.8	10.1	9.7	9.4	IFIs <sup>b</sup>
-	3.1	1.5	-	1.4	3.0	-	15.7	14.0	Multi. Trust Funds <sup>c</sup>
15.6	20.1	23.4	6.9	6.2	3.7	8.7	7.5	6.2	UN Agencies <sup>d</sup>
<b>13.0</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>

**Table 28**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175742054488>**Regional Distribution of ODA by Individual DAC Donors<sup>a</sup>**

Per cent of total net disbursements

	South of Sahara			South & Central Asia			Other Asia and Oceania		
	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006
Australia	13.2	9.7	10.9	9.6	15.1	11.4	73.1	69.6	64.9
Austria	29.5	38.8	35.1	6.3	9.2	5.3	10.4	7.7	2.6
Belgium	49.5	54.0	60.4	8.7	7.8	6.4	12.9	11.2	5.0
Canada	37.2	34.9	45.2	15.7	17.1	16.8	15.3	15.8	9.4
Denmark	53.4	50.3	55.2	17.1	15.7	14.8	11.7	11.0	10.9
Finland	46.6	41.3	43.0	14.3	15.0	14.0	18.7	13.8	9.7
France	47.6	46.9	57.3	4.5	6.6	5.2	22.0	9.5	6.5
Germany	34.0	34.6	45.8	13.3	13.2	8.6	18.9	12.8	8.8
Greece	33.4	14.9	28.6	14.5	8.7	13.5	5.1	3.1	3.3
Ireland	72.5	65.7	70.9	6.8	7.4	9.3	5.3	4.4	6.3
Italy	44.8	46.1	48.2	8.4	12.0	8.1	7.4	4.0	2.6
Japan	19.3	18.2	33.5	20.0	22.0	13.1	39.5	41.1	24.4
Luxembourg	53.8	42.2	51.1	8.5	8.8	10.2	8.0	11.6	12.7
Netherlands	40.6	42.6	54.0	16.9	13.8	14.1	5.0	13.2	10.5
New Zealand	7.6	10.7	12.4	4.5	7.3	11.4	84.2	76.8	70.3
Norway	50.0	43.1	51.6	16.1	16.6	19.1	9.1	8.1	7.6
Portugal	91.5	58.0	56.5	1.5	3.3	7.9	1.0	25.1	15.0
Spain	24.4	17.9	35.0	5.9	5.5	6.9	13.6	10.7	5.4
Sweden	44.1	42.5	48.8	15.4	14.7	13.5	12.3	11.5	8.9
Switzerland	40.5	38.6	40.2	19.4	20.7	17.7	10.6	8.5	6.5
United Kingdom	44.3	48.4	61.7	25.2	19.6	15.5	11.5	7.9	4.3
United States	25.5	29.9	26.6	10.5	19.7	13.2	8.2	9.8	4.2
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>42.8</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>9.5</b>
<i>of which:</i>									
DAC-EU countries	42.3	42.4	52.5	11.6	12.6	10.0	15.4	10.5	6.6

a) Including imputed multilateral flows, i.e. making allowance for contributions through multilateral organisations, calculated using the geographical distribution of multilateral disbursements for the year of reference. Excluding amounts unspecified by region.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175742054488>**Table 28****Regional Distribution of ODA by Individual DAC Donors<sup>a</sup>***(continued)*

Per cent of total net disbursements

Middle East and North Africa			Europe			Latin America and Caribbean			
1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	1995-1996	2000-2001	2005-2006	
1.9	2.5	11.4	1.1	1.6	0.3	1.1	1.6	1.1	Australia
13.1	11.2	42.0	31.2	19.9	11.5	9.5	13.2	3.6	Austria
7.6	7.9	15.1	1.7	8.2	4.9	19.6	10.9	8.2	Belgium
13.3	6.2	11.3	3.3	7.4	3.5	15.2	18.6	13.7	Canada
6.4	7.2	7.4	2.2	5.9	3.6	9.2	9.9	8.0	Denmark
6.9	8.4	19.2	5.6	12.1	6.0	8.0	9.5	8.0	Finland
18.1	23.4	19.9	1.4	7.1	5.9	6.4	6.6	5.3	France
11.7	13.2	22.5	6.8	12.9	7.3	15.3	13.3	7.0	Germany
12.3	9.5	15.4	27.1	58.1	33.6	7.5	5.7	5.6	Greece
4.8	5.2	4.7	6.1	10.9	3.5	4.6	6.4	5.4	Ireland
15.8	10.3	26.6	12.0	20.5	7.9	11.6	7.2	6.5	Italy
7.3	6.0	21.5	1.2	1.9	1.5	12.6	10.7	6.0	Japan
5.7	9.4	6.3	5.2	11.1	6.8	18.8	16.9	12.9	Luxembourg
8.3	6.8	7.6	6.4	10.9	5.3	22.8	12.6	8.5	Netherlands
0.9	0.9	2.3	0.6	0.6	0.3	2.2	3.7	3.2	New Zealand
8.6	9.1	8.5	7.8	13.4	7.1	8.5	9.8	6.2	Norway
2.4	3.7	7.0	1.4	6.6	9.6	2.1	3.2	4.0	Portugal
11.3	9.0	19.1	2.4	11.1	7.7	42.4	45.8	25.9	Spain
9.2	7.3	11.6	6.8	9.4	8.2	12.2	14.5	9.0	Sweden
6.3	5.8	12.1	8.0	15.3	12.7	15.2	11.2	10.8	Switzerland
4.9	6.0	11.6	4.7	8.7	3.9	9.4	9.4	3.0	United Kingdom
39.9	15.3	44.1	4.0	7.7	3.3	11.9	17.7	8.6	United States
<b>14.4</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>12.6</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
									<i>of which:</i>
12.0	11.2	17.5	5.3	10.9	6.3	13.2	12.4	7.1	DAC-EU countries

Table 29

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175744021488>

## Net Disbursements of ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa by Donor

	USD million at 2005 prices and exchange rates						
	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>DAC BILATERAL</b>							
Australia	80	78	40	46	54	54	47
Austria	83	89	166	78	127	125	515
Belgium	349	216	499	1 179	528	570	788
Canada	540	373	508	569	628	665	767
Denmark	420	478	551	494	515	561	690
Finland	264	85	98	114	126	136	163
France	4 039	2 832	2 919	3 390	3 019	3 906	4 158
Germany	1 747	1 232	1 224	2 115	1 212	2 400	3 130
Greece	..	4	2	4	8	10	12
Ireland	25	100	272	286	300	308	374
Italy	1 078	448	1 147	800	316	874	1 022
Japan	1 051	1 009	635	543	626	1 136	2 717
Luxembourg	14	32	70	65	82	86	92
Netherlands	755	806	1 254	1 100	1 175	1 331	1 256
New Zealand	2	5	10	15	15	18	11
Norway	602	579	580	652	614	650	655
Portugal	217	194	138	131	825	123	121
Spain	166	190	242	188	188	561	264
Sweden	675	448	492	679	613	737	805
Switzerland	295	209	224	266	244	299	293
United Kingdom	977	903	1 271	1 669	2 313	3 770	5 213
United States	1 340	1 024	2 567	4 919	3 610	4 065	5 444
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>14 719</b>	<b>11 334</b>	<b>14 907</b>	<b>19 301</b>	<b>17 137</b>	<b>22 384</b>	<b>28 536</b>
<b>MULTILATERAL <sup>a</sup></b>							
AfDF	782	618	746	524	917	851	1 499
EC	2 140	2 131	2 514	2 862	2 967	3 201	3 286
GFATM	-	-	1	135	358	668	758
IDA	2 501	2 605	3 671	3 297	3 905	3 576	3 149
Nordic Dev. Fund	-	22	23	35	41	41	34
IFAD	91	78	82	87	110	113	115
UNDP	430	223	169	173	191	197	224
UNHCR	318	318	356	273	174	170	146
UNICEF	282	328	215	216	205	246	287
UNTA	79	100	135	129	105	128	74
WFP	782	453	275	227	155	344	213
Other UN	57	74	119	99	102	105	119
Arab Agencies	17	- 8	113	45	197	155	229
Other Multilateral	604	919	512	- 383	- 274	- 472	33
<b>TOTAL MULTILATERAL</b>	<b>8 082</b>	<b>7 860</b>	<b>8 930</b>	<b>7 718</b>	<b>9 153</b>	<b>9 322</b>	<b>10 168</b>
Other Countries <sup>b</sup>	406	64	443	86	101	160	301
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>23 207</b>	<b>19 258</b>	<b>24 280</b>	<b>27 104</b>	<b>26 392</b>	<b>31 867</b>	<b>39 005</b>

a) The data for UN agencies have been reviewed to include only regular budget expenditures. This has led to revisions of UNDP data since 1990. For WFP and UNHCR revisions have only been possible from 1996 onwards, while for UNICEF the data are revised from 1997. Since 2000, UNHCR operates an Annual Programme Budget which includes country operations, global operations and administrative costs under a unified budget. However, data shown for UNHCR from 2004 onwards cover expenditures from unrestricted or broadly earmarked funds only.

b) See Table 33 for the list of non-DAC countries for which data are available.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175744021488>

Table 29

### Net Disbursements of ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa by Donor

(continued)

	As percentage of donor's ODA						
	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>DAC BILATERAL</b>							
Australia	8.1	6.8	3.3	3.7	4.2	3.7	2.7
Austria	49.4	21.5	32.9	29.9	35.4	10.2	48.2
Belgium	48.8	38.1	50.0	69.8	57.3	43.6	59.8
Canada	24.9	19.9	23.8	34.4	28.5	23.5	33.0
Denmark	43.9	42.0	37.6	41.5	41.7	41.3	48.5
Finland	46.6	36.5	29.4	33.2	31.1	22.8	36.5
France	53.4	42.1	58.0	57.1	53.2	54.0	54.0
Germany	30.1	26.6	27.2	46.7	31.5	32.2	45.3
Greece	..	10.9	1.3	1.3	5.0	4.7	6.7
Ireland	56.8	68.0	71.3	70.1	70.7	63.8	61.5
Italy	39.2	42.3	79.8	65.3	44.0	38.5	52.7
Japan	11.5	13.1	8.7	8.4	10.9	10.9	34.8
Luxembourg	46.2	55.3	40.8	37.2	46.0	46.2	48.8
Netherlands	28.9	30.5	37.1	34.5	43.2	36.1	30.0
New Zealand	1.4	3.7	6.8	9.3	8.7	8.1	4.9
Norway	50.3	41.8	34.8	35.4	35.2	32.0	32.2
Portugal	98.5	94.5	51.8	61.9	92.1	56.2	58.8
Spain	17.4	17.1	16.3	13.7	12.9	30.1	13.2
Sweden	44.8	33.0	28.5	34.4	29.7	32.7	29.0
Switzerland	35.3	27.4	23.1	25.9	20.7	21.3	23.4
United Kingdom	39.1	35.1	27.6	37.2	42.6	46.2	61.9
United States	11.1	13.5	22.4	31.7	21.6	15.9	26.5
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>37.9</b>
<b>MULTILATERAL <sup>a</sup></b>							
AfDF	97.6	96.5	95.4	97.3	97.6	99.9	99.7
EC	51.7	37.5	35.0	38.9	36.1	36.9	35.6
GFATM	-	-	100.0	56.0	59.8	67.2	62.1
IDA	46.6	44.3	50.2	51.9	52.5	54.1	53.8
Nordic Dev. Fund	-	32.8	55.5	59.4	57.2	64.6	52.0
IFAD	38.4	59.4	43.4	50.4	65.4	56.8	52.3
UNDP	35.7	38.1	48.3	52.3	50.0	49.4	52.6
UNHCR	39.1	50.3	44.3	45.9	49.2	52.8	51.7
UNICEF	36.9	40.4	29.8	30.7	30.9	34.6	39.7
UNTA	23.6	22.8	22.7	22.9	23.7	22.0	20.5
WFP	53.1	56.8	61.7	63.9	59.9	62.1	46.1
Other UN	9.2	13.0	13.3	12.7	13.1	11.8	12.3
Arab Agencies	11.5	24.6	63.8	91.9	68.4	61.1	53.4
Other Multilateral	24.7	34.8	21.5	- 26.0	- 26.5	- 70.7	2.2
<b>TOTAL MULTILATERAL</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>42.8</b>	<b>43.8</b>
Other Countries <sup>b</sup>	7.5	7.2	12.7	2.4	3.1	5.3	6.9
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>30.3</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>32.8</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>37.9</b>

**Table 30**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175757575654>**Net Disbursements of ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa by Recipient**

USD million at 2005 prices and exchange rates

	1990-1991 average	1995-1996 average	2003	2004	2005	2006
Angola	357	517	549	1 175	437	165
Benin	352	307	332	394	346	366
Botswana	186	93	31	48	48	63
Burkina Faso	494	503	572	637	681	849
Burundi	343	221	255	370	365	405
Cameroon	638	473	1 009	788	417	1 633
Cape Verde	141	130	162	147	162	134
Central African Rep.	278	175	58	112	96	130
Chad	379	293	277	336	382	277
Comoros	71	44	28	26	25	30
Congo, Dem. Rep.	896	198	6 053	1 861	1 827	1 998
Congo, Rep.	231	321	78	118	1 444	247
Côte d'Ivoire	869	1 196	285	165	110	245
Djibouti	197	106	88	65	76	114
Equatorial Guinea	82	38	24	31	38	26
Eritrea	0	180	352	272	355	126
Ethiopia	1 377	967	1 763	1 852	1 910	1 895
Gabon	181	153	- 13	41	52	30
Gambia	132	46	69	56	61	73
Ghana	932	707	1 068	1 400	1 125	1 146
Guinea	438	390	266	277	199	160
Guinea-Bissau	159	169	166	79	79	80
Kenya	1 362	710	584	667	767	925
Lesotho	175	125	90	98	69	70
Liberia	179	164	120	219	233	263
Madagascar	555	357	605	1 274	914	738
Malawi	696	529	580	515	578	649
Mali	617	567	610	583	699	804
Mauritania	280	270	266	184	196	184
Mauritius	101	25	- 17	33	34	18
Mayotte	88	131	189	212	201	328
Mozambique	1 369	1 124	1 171	1 268	1 277	1 573
Namibia	200	209	164	178	115	141
Niger	497	290	514	552	511	391
Nigeria	343	223	343	592	6 416	11 271
Rwanda	426	668	378	497	571	570
Sao Tome & Principe	74	77	43	34	32	21
Senegal	943	674	503	1 057	672	805
Seychelles	39	17	10	10	15	14
Sierra Leone	106	222	341	362	344	359
Somalia	440	161	199	208	237	379
South Africa	0	444	726	642	680	699
St. Helena	31	20	21	27	23	27
Sudan	1 115	258	688	1 023	1 832	1 995
Swaziland	71	49	38	22	46	35
Tanzania	1 463	977	1 928	1 791	1 481	1 775
Togo	300	189	56	66	83	77
Uganda	874	866	1 098	1 224	1 177	1 508
Zambia	879	1 465	668	1 152	935	1 388
Zimbabwe	475	485	212	191	376	272
South of Sahara Unall.	774	736	1 505	1 461	1 116	1 534
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>23 207</b>	<b>19 258</b>	<b>27 104</b>	<b>26 392</b>	<b>31 867</b>	<b>39 005</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175778536412>**Table 31****Aid from DAC Countries to Least Developed Countries<sup>a</sup>**

## Net disbursements

	1995-1996			2005			2006		
	USD million	Per cent of donor's total	Per cent of donor's GNI	USD million	Per cent of donor's total	Per cent of donor's GNI	USD million	Per cent of donor's total	Per cent of donor's GNI
Australia	205	18	0.06	419	25	0.06	451	21	0.06
Austria	125	22	0.05	245	16	0.08	252	17	0.08
Belgium	253	26	0.09	609	31	0.16	729	37	0.18
Canada	380	20	0.07	1 048	28	0.09	1 244	34	0.10
Denmark	550	32	0.33	814	39	0.31	878	39	0.31
Finland	115	29	0.09	245	27	0.13	296	35	0.14
France	1 679	21	0.11	2 392	24	0.11	2 624	25	0.12
Germany	1 680	22	0.07	1 884	19	0.07	2 642	25	0.09
Greece	9	5	0.01	79	21	0.04	103	24	0.04
Ireland	71	43	0.13	365	51	0.21	524	51	0.28
Italy	443	22	0.04	1 407	28	0.08	789	22	0.04
Japan	2 086	17	0.04	2 326	18	0.05	3 340	30	0.07
Luxembourg	25	34	0.14	106	41	0.35	123	42	0.38
Netherlands	933	29	0.23	1 658	32	0.27	1 395	26	0.21
New Zealand	26	22	0.05	70	25	0.07	74	29	0.08
Norway	523	41	0.35	1 029	37	0.35	1 129	38	0.34
Portugal	156	66	0.15	210	56	0.12	240	61	0.13
Spain	181	14	0.03	817	27	0.07	767	20	0.06
Sweden	548	30	0.24	1 101	33	0.31	1 152	29	0.30
Switzerland	333	32	0.11	405	23	0.10	453	27	0.11
United Kingdom	823	26	0.07	2 709	25	0.12	3 827	31	0.16
United States	1 597	19	0.02	4 661	17	0.04	6 416	27	0.05
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>12 741</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>24 597</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>29 448</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0.09</b>
<i>of which:</i>									
DAC-EU countries	7 591	24	0.09	14 639	26	0.11	16 342	28	0.12

a) Including imputed multilateral flows, i.e. making allowance for contributions through multilateral organisations, calculated using the geographical distribution of multilateral disbursements for the year of reference.

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

## Gross disbursements

## Per cent of total ODA

			Australia						Austria		
1985-86		1995-96		2005-06		1985-86		1995-96			
Papua New Guinea	29.9	Papua New Guinea	21.3	Indonesia	13.0	Algeria	34.0	Bosnia-Herzegovina	17.7		
Indonesia	5.9	Indonesia	8.5	Papua New Guinea	12.5	Egypt	8.2	Egypt	4.5		
Malaysia	5.8	Philippines	4.9	Iraq	7.9	Turkey	2.9	Uganda	2.8		
Thailand	2.7	Viet Nam	3.8	Solomon Islands	7.6	Iran	2.4	Turkey	2.4		
China	2.1	China	3.4	Viet Nam	2.6	Philippines	2.3	Indonesia	2.4		
Philippines	1.7	Cambodia	2.4	Philippines	2.5	India	1.6	Ghana	2.2		
Fiji	1.6	Thailand	2.0	Timor-Leste	2.2	Nicaragua	1.2	Iran	1.8		
Hong Kong, China	1.2	Bangladesh	1.4	China	1.8	States Ex-Yugoslavia	0.8	Nicaragua	1.7		
Ethiopia	1.1	India	1.3	Sri Lanka	1.7	Mozambique	0.8	Slovenia	1.5		
Myanmar	1.0	Malaysia	1.3	Cambodia	1.6	Tunisia	0.8	Tanzania	1.5		
Solomon Islands	1.0	Fiji	1.2	Pakistan	1.2	Cape Verde	0.7	China	1.5		
Bangladesh	0.9	Laos	1.1	Fiji	1.1	Ethiopia	0.6	Croatia	1.2		
Singapore	0.7	Vanuatu	1.0	Vanuatu	1.1	Kenya	0.6	Guatemala	1.0		
Vanuatu	0.6	Mozambique	0.8	Afghanistan	1.0	Guatemala	0.6	Korea	1.0		
Tonga	0.6	Sri Lanka	0.8	Samoa	0.7	Angola	0.5	Serbia	0.9		
<b>Total above</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>55.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>58.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>58.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>44.2</b>		
Multilateral ODA	30.2	Multilateral ODA	21.6	Multilateral ODA	14.7	Multilateral ODA	28.8	Multilateral ODA	30.4		
Unallocated	6.0	Unallocated	13.0	Unallocated	20.9	Unallocated	5.9	Unallocated	7.6		
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 134</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 902</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>579</b>		
LDCs	11.6	LDCs	15.9	LDCs	18.8	LDCs	7.0	LDCs	17.4		
Other LICs	45.2	Other LICs	35.0	Other LICs	20.1	Other LICs	6.0	Other LICs	9.3		
LMICs	22.4	LMICs	29.2	LMICs	34.9	LMICs	71.5	LMICs	51.0		
UMICs	9.1	UMICs	3.1	UMICs	1.6	UMICs	5.3	UMICs	6.5		
MADCT	3.1	MADCT	0.2	MADCT	-	MADCT	1.9	MADCT	4.9		
Unallocated	8.6	Unallocated	16.6	Unallocated	24.5	Unallocated	8.3	Unallocated	10.9		
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
Sub-Saharan Africa	5.7	Sub-Saharan Africa	6.8	Sub-Saharan Africa	3.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	8.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	21.2		
S. and C. Asia	4.5	S. and C. Asia	6.3	S. and C. Asia	6.9	S. and C. Asia	2.6	S. and C. Asia	2.9		
Other Asia and Oceania	83.1	Other Asia and Oceania	75.7	Other Asia and Oceania	61.2	Other Asia and Oceania	6.3	Other Asia and Oceania	9.6		
Middle East and North Africa	0.9	Middle East and North Africa	1.0	Middle East and North Africa	10.6	Middle East and North Africa	65.1	Middle East and North Africa	12.1		
Latin America and Caribbean	0.4	Latin America and Caribbean	0.0	Latin America and Caribbean	0.1	Latin America and Caribbean	4.1	Latin America and Caribbean	7.7		
Europe	0.0	Europe	0.4	Europe	0.0	Europe	7.1	Europe	36.2		
Unspecified	5.5	Unspecified	9.7	Unspecified	18.0	Unspecified	6.2	Unspecified	10.3		
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06		1985-86		Belgium 1995-96		2005-06	
Iraq	33.7	Congo, Dem. Rep.	22.3	Bolivia	5.3	Congo, Dem. Rep.	9.6
Cameroon	14.6	Rwanda	4.5	Congo, Dem. Rep.	2.6	Nigeria	8.4
Serbia	2.9	Burundi	3.8	Rwanda	2.2	Iraq	6.2
Madagascar	1.8	Indonesia	1.8	Viet Nam	1.3	Cameroon	2.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.8	Niger	1.5	Tanzania	1.2	Rwanda	1.6
Turkey	1.4	Ethiopia	1.4	China	1.1	Burundi	1.4
Egypt	1.3	Bangladesh	1.2	Indonesia	1.0	South Africa	1.1
Ethiopia	0.8	Cameroon	1.1	Ecuador	0.9	Senegal	1.0
Uganda	0.7	Turkey	1.0	Senegal	0.9	Ecuador	1.0
China	0.7	Senegal	1.0	Algeria	0.9	Viet Nam	0.9
Nicaragua	0.6	Morocco	1.0	Tunisia	0.9	Peru	0.9
Sri Lanka	0.5	Tunisia	0.9	Burundi	0.9	Niger	0.9
Rwanda	0.4	Thailand	0.9	Togo	0.8	Palestinian Adm. Areas	0.8
Guatemala	0.4	China	0.9	Côte d'Ivoire	0.8	Algeria	0.8
Ukraine	0.4	Tanzania	0.7	Niger	0.8	Burkina Faso	0.7
<b>Total above</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>37.2</b>
Multilateral ODA	24.2	Multilateral ODA	35.2	Multilateral ODA	44.7	Multilateral ODA	31.7
Unallocated	5.7	Unallocated	8.7	Unallocated	17.2	Unallocated	16.3
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 546</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 013</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>2 014</b>
LDCs	8.9	LDCs	64.0	LDCs	29.4	LDCs	31.2
Other LICs	22.6	Other LICs	5.2	Other LICs	7.4	Other LICs	20.7
LMICs	58.4	LMICs	13.5	LMICs	27.7	LMICs	20.9
UMICs	2.6	UMICs	3.8	UMICs	4.3	UMICs	3.3
MADCT	-	MADCT	0.2	MADCT	0.1	MADCT	-
Unallocated	7.5	Unallocated	13.4	Unallocated	31.1	Unallocated	23.9
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	28.6	Sub-Saharan Africa	67.6	Sub-Saharan Africa	36.4	Sub-Saharan Africa	51.1
S. and C. Asia	3.1	S. and C. Asia	3.4	S. and C. Asia	1.4	S. and C. Asia	2.1
Other Asia and Oceania	1.6	Other Asia and Oceania	6.9	Other Asia and Oceania	10.4	Other Asia and Oceania	4.3
Middle East and North Africa	47.3	Middle East and North Africa	3.8	Middle East and North Africa	6.3	Middle East and North Africa	13.0
Latin America and Caribbean	2.0	Latin America and Caribbean	5.4	Latin America and Caribbean	18.4	Latin America and Caribbean	6.4
Europe	11.2	Europe	1.6	Europe	1.1	Europe	2.2
Unspecified	6.2	Unspecified	11.4	Unspecified	25.9	Unspecified	21.0
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>**Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid**

(continued)

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

		Canada					Denmark		
		1985-86	1995-96	2005-06			1985-86	1995-96	
Bangladesh	4.4	Egypt	4.5	Iraq	5.4	Tanzania	13.8	Tanzania	4.1
Pakistan	3.3	China	2.3	Cameroon	3.2	Bangladesh	7.6	Uganda	3.5
India	3.2	Bangladesh	2.3	Afghanistan	3.1	India	5.0	Egypt	3.4
Indonesia	2.7	India	2.0	Haiti	2.4	Kenya	4.0	Zimbabwe	2.7
Tanzania	1.7	Peru	1.5	Indonesia	1.9	China	2.1	Mozambique	2.5
Ethiopia	1.6	Ghana	1.1	Ethiopia	1.7	Mozambique	1.5	Ghana	2.1
Kenya	1.5	Haiti	1.1	Bangladesh	1.4	Cameroon	1.4	Nicaragua	2.1
Sri Lanka	1.3	Côte d'Ivoire	1.1	Ghana	1.4	Zambia	1.3	India	2.1
Jamaica	1.2	Indonesia	1.0	Mozambique	1.4	Morocco	1.2	Bangladesh	1.9
Sudan	1.1	Rwanda	0.9	Sudan	1.3	Zimbabwe	1.2	South Africa	1.4
Niger	1.1	Philippines	0.9	Pakistan	1.3	Thailand	1.1	Zambia	1.4
Ghana	1.1	Pakistan	0.9	Tanzania	1.0	Senegal	1.1	Kenya	1.3
China	1.0	Tanzania	0.9	China	0.9	Burkina Faso	0.9	Viet Nam	1.3
Senegal	0.9	Mali	0.8	Sri Lanka	0.9	Niger	0.9	Nepal	1.3
Thailand	0.9	Cameroon	0.8	Mali	0.8	Bolivia	0.9	Thailand	1.1
<b>Total above</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>44.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>32.4</b>
Multilateral ODA	37.6	Multilateral ODA	28.2	Multilateral ODA	27.7	Multilateral ODA	42.2	Multilateral ODA	39.5
Unallocated	18.5	Unallocated	33.6	Unallocated	25.0	Unallocated	3.7	Unallocated	16.2
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 695</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 989</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>3 751</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 828</b>
LDCs	28.3	LDCs	17.0	LDCs	27.0	LDCs	58.7	LDCs	34.7
Other LICs	18.9	Other LICs	10.9	Other LICs	13.6	Other LICs	20.9	Other LICs	20.7
LMICs	18.2	LMICs	22.3	LMICs	22.5	LMICs	11.8	LMICs	14.5
UMICs	4.8	UMICs	2.9	UMICs	2.3	UMICs	2.0	UMICs	3.4
MADCT	0.1	MADCT	0.1	MADCT	-	MADCT	0.0	MADCT	-
Unallocated	29.6	Unallocated	46.7	Unallocated	34.6	Unallocated	6.5	Unallocated	26.7
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	30.0	Sub-Saharan Africa	19.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	27.6	Sub-Saharan Africa	57.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	41.9
S. and C. Asia	20.5	S. and C. Asia	8.5	S. and C. Asia	11.7	S. and C. Asia	25.0	S. and C. Asia	11.3
Other Asia and Oceania	9.2	Other Asia and Oceania	9.6	Other Asia and Oceania	14.1	Other Asia and Oceania	6.4	Other Asia and Oceania	9.3
Middle East and North Africa	2.0	Middle East and North Africa	8.6	Middle East and North Africa	10.5	Middle East and North Africa	4.5	Middle East and North Africa	6.1
Latin America and Caribbean	13.3	Latin America and Caribbean	10.7	Latin America and Caribbean	13.7	Latin America and Caribbean	2.0	Latin America and Caribbean	7.6
Europe	0.1	Europe	1.6	Europe	2.9	Europe	-	Europe	0.3
Unspecified	25.0	Unspecified	41.9	Unspecified	19.5	Unspecified	5.0	Unspecified	23.6
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06		1985-86		Finland 1995-96		2005-06	
Tanzania	4.0	Tanzania	8.7	China	3.8	Iraq	8.9
Uganda	3.2	Zambia	5.4	Peru	3.2	Mozambique	3.0
Viet Nam	3.2	Kenya	4.3	Zambia	2.8	Tanzania	2.7
Mozambique	3.0	Ethiopia	3.7	Mozambique	2.7	Viet Nam	2.2
Ghana	2.7	Sri Lanka	3.1	Viet Nam	2.5	Afghanistan	1.7
Zambia	2.2	Viet Nam	3.0	Tanzania	2.2	South Africa	1.6
Bangladesh	2.1	Egypt	2.4	Zimbabwe	2.2	Nicaragua	1.5
Nigeria	1.9	Somalia	2.4	Bosnia-Herzegovina	2.0	Sudan	1.4
Burkina Faso	1.9	Sudan	2.1	Thailand	2.0	Ethiopia	1.4
Nicaragua	1.8	Nicaragua	2.0	Namibia	1.9	Pakistan	1.3
Kenya	1.7	Nepal	1.7	Ethiopia	1.8	Kenya	1.1
Benin	1.5	Zimbabwe	1.7	Nepal	1.4	Serbia	1.0
Sri Lanka	1.4	Mozambique	1.6	Nicaragua	1.4	Zambia	1.0
Nepal	1.3	Bangladesh	1.2	Kenya	1.2	Nepal	1.0
Sudan	1.3	Myanmar	1.0	Egypt	1.1	Indonesia	0.8
<b>Total above</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>30.7</b>
Multilateral ODA	33.9	Multilateral ODA	39.7	Multilateral ODA	43.2	Multilateral ODA	39.3
Unallocated	15.4	Unallocated	9.6	Unallocated	13.4	Unallocated	17.9
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>2 244</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>873</b>
LDCs	39.7	LDCs	49.4	LDCs	27.7	LDCs	28.3
Other LICs	20.6	Other LICs	18.7	Other LICs	15.4	Other LICs	12.0
LMICs	13.9	LMICs	14.9	LMICs	31.3	LMICs	26.4
UMICs	2.4	UMICs	1.1	UMICs	2.1	UMICs	3.7
MADCT	-	MADCT	0.0	MADCT	0.0	MADCT	-
Unallocated	23.4	Unallocated	15.9	Unallocated	23.5	Unallocated	29.5
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	45.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	54.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	34.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	28.5
S. and C. Asia	11.9	S. and C. Asia	12.7	S. and C. Asia	7.7	S. and C. Asia	10.2
Other Asia and Oceania	10.3	Other Asia and Oceania	7.4	Other Asia and Oceania	18.9	Other Asia and Oceania	12.0
Middle East and North Africa	5.2	Middle East and North Africa	4.7	Middle East and North Africa	4.9	Middle East and North Africa	17.6
Latin America and Caribbean	6.3	Latin America and Caribbean	6.1	Latin America and Caribbean	11.4	Latin America and Caribbean	6.2
Europe	1.6	Europe	-	Europe	5.1	Europe	3.1
Unspecified	19.5	Unspecified	14.5	Unspecified	17.5	Unspecified	22.3
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

	France			Germany					
	1985-86	1995-96	2005-06	1985-86	1995-96				
French Polynesia	5.7	Côte d'Ivoire	6.3	Nigeria	14.3	India	4.6	China	6.9
New Caledonia	4.9	French Polynesia	5.1	Iraq	5.9	Indonesia	3.8	Egypt	3.6
Morocco	4.3	New Caledonia	4.8	Congo, Rep.	5.6	Egypt	3.1	Nicaragua	3.2
Senegal	3.2	Egypt	4.5	Morocco	2.9	Turkey	2.9	India	3.1
Mali	2.5	Cameroon	3.4	Cameroon	2.4	China	2.6	Turkey	2.6
Côte d'Ivoire	2.4	Morocco	3.4	Mayotte	2.2	Pakistan	2.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina	2.1
India	2.0	Senegal	2.9	Algeria	2.1	Israel	2.0	Indonesia	2.0
Madagascar	2.0	Algeria	2.4	Senegal	2.1	Morocco	1.8	Israel	1.5
Egypt	1.8	Congo, Rep.	2.1	Tunisia	1.8	Sri Lanka	1.7	Pakistan	1.3
Cameroon	1.8	Gabon	1.9	China	1.5	Sudan	1.6	Bolivia	1.1
Congo, Rep.	1.7	Madagascar	1.6	Viet Nam	1.2	Togo	1.6	Philippines	1.1
Mexico	1.6	Burkina Faso	1.3	Egypt	1.1	Brazil	1.5	Brazil	1.0
Tunisia	1.6	Mayotte	1.3	Côte d'Ivoire	1.0	Bangladesh	1.5	Viet Nam	1.0
Central African Rep.	1.6	Tunisia	1.2	Burkina Faso	1.0	Myanmar	1.3	Morocco	0.9
Niger	1.4	Guinea	1.1	South Africa	0.9	Peru	1.3	Ethiopia	0.9
<b>Total above</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>43.3</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>46.1</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>32.1</b>
Multilateral ODA	22.5	Multilateral ODA	20.6	Multilateral ODA	26.3	Multilateral ODA	27.1	Multilateral ODA	32.2
Unallocated	15.4	Unallocated	13.7	Unallocated	7.7	Unallocated	10.2	Unallocated	8.4
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>3 726</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>8 998</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>12 147</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>3 999</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>9 008</b>
LDCs	29.9	LDCs	22.9	LDCs	17.6	LDCs	26.2	LDCs	18.5
Other LICs	12.5	Other LICs	18.6	Other LICs	35.5	Other LICs	15.7	Other LICs	18.4
LMICs	16.1	LMICs	20.9	LMICs	28.1	LMICs	31.7	LMICs	39.2
UMICs	7.5	UMICs	7.4	UMICs	8.3	UMICs	8.1	UMICs	8.0
MADCT	14.2	MADCT	13.0	MADCT	-	MADCT	4.3	MADCT	3.6
Unallocated	19.9	Unallocated	17.2	Unallocated	10.4	Unallocated	14.0	Unallocated	12.4
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	47.3	Sub-Saharan Africa	45.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	54.2	Sub-Saharan Africa	27.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	21.2
S. and C. Asia	4.2	S. and C. Asia	1.8	S. and C. Asia	2.1	S. and C. Asia	16.5	S. and C. Asia	10.5
Other Asia and Oceania	16.8	Other Asia and Oceania	18.8	Other Asia and Oceania	7.6	Other Asia and Oceania	13.1	Other Asia and Oceania	19.3
Middle East and North Africa	14.2	Middle East and North Africa	16.5	Middle East and North Africa	21.1	Middle East and North Africa	13.3	Middle East and North Africa	14.5
Latin America and Caribbean	6.0	Latin America and Caribbean	5.2	Latin America and Caribbean	4.1	Latin America and Caribbean	11.6	Latin America and Caribbean	14.7
Europe	0.8	Europe	0.7	Europe	3.4	Europe	6.9	Europe	8.7
Unspecified	10.6	Unspecified	11.3	Unspecified	7.5	Unspecified	11.1	Unspecified	11.0
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

	2005-06	Greece				
		1985-86	1995-96	2005-06		
Nigeria	12.9		Bosnia-Herzegovina	3.9	Serbia	10.4
Iraq	10.2		Albania	2.6	Albania	5.3
China	3.7		Armenia	1.8	Afghanistan	3.5
Cameroon	1.9		Ethiopia	1.5	Lebanon	1.7
Indonesia	1.8		Eritrea	1.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.5
Zambia	1.7		Palestinian Adm. Areas	0.8	Turkey	1.0
Ghana	1.6		Cyprus	0.5	Palestinian Adm. Areas	0.9
India	1.6		Georgia	0.4	Sri Lanka	0.9
Egypt	1.3		Lebanon	0.2	Egypt	0.9
Serbia	1.2		Jordan	0.1	Iraq	0.8
Morocco	1.1		Macedonia (FYROM)	0.1	Syria	0.7
Afghanistan	0.9		Iraq	0.1	Macedonia (FYROM)	0.7
Viet Nam	0.9		Cameroon	0.1	Pakistan	0.5
Turkey	0.9		South Africa	0.1	Georgia	0.5
Senegal	0.9		Syria	0.0	Ukraine	0.5
<b>Total above</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>29.9</b>
Multilateral ODA	25.5	Multilateral ODA	Multilateral ODA	85.1	Multilateral ODA	51.0
Unallocated	11.2	Unallocated	Unallocated	1.1	Unallocated	13.8
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>11 822</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>404</b>
LDCs	13.7		LDCs	20.8	LDCs	10.4
Other LICs	28.6		Other LICs	0.7	Other LICs	3.5
LMICs	39.2		LMICs	65.6	LMICs	51.0
UMICs	3.4		UMICs	1.9	UMICs	6.9
MADCT	-		MADCT	3.7	MADCT	-
Unallocated	15.1		Unallocated	7.3	Unallocated	28.2
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	35.3		Sub-Saharan Africa	21.8	Sub-Saharan Africa	5.6
S. and C. Asia	8.2		S. and C. Asia	14.4	S. and C. Asia	12.7
Other Asia and Oceania	12.5		Other Asia and Oceania	3.5	Other Asia and Oceania	1.4
Middle East and North Africa	20.7		Middle East and North Africa	7.8	Middle East and North Africa	11.6
Latin America and Caribbean	7.4		Latin America and Caribbean	0.1	Latin America and Caribbean	0.9
Europe	6.5		Europe	50.8	Europe	42.8
Unspecified	9.4		Unspecified	1.5	Unspecified	24.9
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>**Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid***(continued)*

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

			Ireland			Italy			
			1985-86	1995-96	2005-06	1985-86	1995-96		
Lesotho	6.5	Ethiopia	6.6	Uganda	6.1	Ethiopia	6.7	Mozambique	5.0
Tanzania	5.5	Tanzania	5.3	Mozambique	5.9	Somalia	6.2	Ethiopia	4.4
Zambia	5.1	Zambia	5.3	Ethiopia	5.4	Sudan	4.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina	2.5
Sudan	3.1	Lesotho	4.7	Tanzania	4.3	Mozambique	2.4	Morocco	2.3
Zimbabwe	1.0	Rwanda	3.5	Zambia	3.4	Pakistan	2.0	Malta	1.7
Rwanda	0.9	Uganda	3.0	South Africa	2.1	Tanzania	1.8	Jordan	1.6
Kenya	0.5	South Africa	2.2	Sudan	1.9	Tunisia	1.8	Argentina	1.4
Burundi	0.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.8	Lesotho	1.6	Chad	1.4	Congo, Rep.	1.1
Ethiopia	0.3	Mozambique	1.4	Kenya	1.3	Turkey	1.4	Egypt	1.1
Djibouti	0.2	Zimbabwe	1.3	Sierra Leone	1.1	Angola	1.4	Algeria	1.0
Sierra Leone	0.2	Kenya	1.3	Congo, Dem. Rep.	1.1	Senegal	1.3	Eritrea	1.0
Gambia	0.2	Sudan	1.2	Zimbabwe	0.9	China	1.3	Guinea-Bissau	1.0
Bangladesh	0.2	Cambodia	1.2	Malawi	0.9	India	1.3	Albania	0.9
China	0.2	States Ex-Yugoslavia	1.2	Timor-Leste	0.9	Cape Verde	1.3	Brazil	0.8
India	0.1	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.1	Pakistan	0.9	Uganda	1.2	Tunisia	0.8
<b>Total above</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>26.7</b>
Multilateral ODA	58.2	Multilateral ODA	39.2	Multilateral ODA	36.0	Multilateral ODA	34.8	Multilateral ODA	53.8
Unallocated	16.4	Unallocated	10.1	Unallocated	14.6	Unallocated	8.0	Unallocated	4.1
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 772</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>2 251</b>
LDCs	54.5	LDCs	60.9	LDCs	58.4	LDCs	58.0	LDCs	35.9
Other LICs	4.6	Other LICs	7.9	Other LICs	8.4	Other LICs	9.7	Other LICs	10.6
LMICs	1.4	LMICs	9.8	LMICs	6.8	LMICs	14.6	LMICs	34.0
UMICs	0.4	UMICs	4.6	UMICs	3.7	UMICs	5.0	UMICs	7.0
MADCT	-	MADCT	0.1	MADCT	-	MADCT	0.4	MADCT	3.7
Unallocated	39.2	Unallocated	16.6	Unallocated	22.8	Unallocated	12.2	Unallocated	8.8
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	58.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	68.0	Sub-Saharan Africa	62.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	61.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	44.1
S. and C. Asia	1.0	S. and C. Asia	3.1	S. and C. Asia	4.5	S. and C. Asia	5.5	S. and C. Asia	1.8
Other Asia and Oceania	0.8	Other Asia and Oceania	3.0	Other Asia and Oceania	4.6	Other Asia and Oceania	3.6	Other Asia and Oceania	3.1
Middle East and North Africa	0.1	Middle East and North Africa	2.5	Middle East and North Africa	1.7	Middle East and North Africa	7.3	Middle East and North Africa	16.7
Latin America and Caribbean	0.5	Latin America and Caribbean	2.6	Latin America and Caribbean	3.0	Latin America and Caribbean	9.0	Latin America and Caribbean	13.7
Europe	-	Europe	4.9	Europe	0.9	Europe	3.2	Europe	12.1
Unspecified	39.2	Unspecified	15.9	Unspecified	22.7	Unspecified	10.4	Unspecified	8.6
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06		1985-86		Japan 1995-96		2005-06	
Iraq	15.5	China	8.2	Indonesia	9.5	Iraq	12.1
Nigeria	13.9	Philippines	7.5	China	8.9	China	8.6
Ethiopia	2.1	Indonesia	5.8	Thailand	5.8	Indonesia	6.6
Serbia	1.6	Thailand	5.7	Philippines	5.3	Nigeria	6.2
China	1.1	Myanmar	4.0	India	5.0	Philippines	4.2
Congo, Rep.	1.1	Bangladesh	3.6	Pakistan	2.7	Viet Nam	3.7
Nicaragua	0.9	India	3.4	Bangladesh	2.4	India	3.3
Tunisia	0.8	Pakistan	2.7	Korea	2.0	Thailand	2.7
Cameroon	0.7	Egypt	2.3	Sri Lanka	1.8	Zambia	2.2
Afghanistan	0.6	Malaysia	2.2	Mexico	1.8	Sri Lanka	1.9
Morocco	0.6	Sri Lanka	2.1	Malaysia	1.8	Honduras	1.6
Argentina	0.6	Korea	1.9	Egypt	1.5	Malaysia	1.4
Zambia	0.6	Nepal	1.1	Kenya	1.1	Congo, Dem. Rep.	1.1
Mozambique	0.6	Turkey	1.0	Viet Nam	1.0	Bangladesh	1.1
Madagascar	0.6	Brazil	0.9	Jordan	1.0	Pakistan	1.0
<b>Total above</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>57.7</b>
Multilateral ODA	48.1	Multilateral ODA	28.2	Multilateral ODA	17.5	Multilateral ODA	18.5
Unallocated	3.2	Unallocated	3.6	Unallocated	9.0	Unallocated	7.1
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>4 633</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>5 386</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>15 194</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>17 878</b>
LDCs	12.3	LDCs	20.5	LDCs	13.9	LDCs	12.9
Other LICs	33.1	Other LICs	11.6	Other LICs	16.3	Other LICs	20.2
LMICs	45.2	LMICs	52.3	LMICs	49.6	LMICs	54.1
UMICs	3.1	UMICs	7.2	UMICs	6.7	UMICs	4.1
MADCT	-	MADCT	3.5	MADCT	2.6	MADCT	-
Unallocated	6.3	Unallocated	5.0	Unallocated	11.0	Unallocated	8.7
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	42.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	9.9	Sub-Saharan Africa	10.3	Sub-Saharan Africa	17.6
S. and C. Asia	2.1	S. and C. Asia	23.8	S. and C. Asia	17.3	S. and C. Asia	11.6
Other Asia and Oceania	3.6	Other Asia and Oceania	45.9	Other Asia and Oceania	46.0	Other Asia and Oceania	36.1
Middle East and North Africa	36.0	Middle East and North Africa	6.4	Middle East and North Africa	5.5	Middle East and North Africa	17.9
Latin America and Caribbean	5.2	Latin America and Caribbean	7.9	Latin America and Caribbean	10.0	Latin America and Caribbean	6.7
Europe	5.8	Europe	1.6	Europe	0.9	Europe	1.9
Unspecified	4.9	Unspecified	4.4	Unspecified	10.0	Unspecified	8.2
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>**Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid**

(continued)

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

Luxembourg				Netherlands				
1985-86	1995-96	2005-06		1985-86	1995-96			
	Cape Verde	7.0	Cape Verde	5.6	India	6.5	India	3.6
	Namibia	3.9	Senegal	4.6	Indonesia	6.0	Netherlands Antilles	3.2
	Niger	3.8	Viet Nam	4.4	Netherlands Antilles	4.4	Bosnia-Herzegovina	2.4
	Senegal	3.3	Burkina Faso	3.9	Tanzania	3.3	Suriname	2.3
	Nicaragua	3.1	Mali	3.8	Bangladesh	2.7	Tanzania	2.2
	Mauritius	2.5	Nicaragua	3.4	Sudan	2.7	Bangladesh	1.8
	Viet Nam	2.1	Niger	3.3	Kenya	2.3	Bolivia	1.6
	Rwanda	2.0	El Salvador	3.1	Zambia	2.1	Zimbabwe	1.5
	Chile	1.9	Laos	2.8	Mozambique	2.0	Mozambique	1.4
	India	1.8	Serbia	2.4	Aruba	1.7	Ethiopia	1.4
	States Ex-Yugoslavia	1.8	Namibia	2.3	Pakistan	1.5	Nicaragua	1.4
	Tunisia	1.8	Benin	1.2	Zimbabwe	1.4	Kenya	1.3
	Burundi	1.6	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.2	Egypt	1.3	Rwanda	1.3
	Congo, Dem. Rep.	1.5	Sudan	1.1	Yemen	1.2	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.2
	Burkina Faso	1.3	Pakistan	1.0	Mali	1.2	South Africa	1.2
<b>Total above</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>27.7</b>
Multilateral ODA	Multilateral ODA	32.6	Multilateral ODA	28.4	Multilateral ODA	31.0	Multilateral ODA	27.8
Unallocated	Unallocated	7.4	Unallocated	12.4	Unallocated	10.0	Unallocated	16.4
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 508</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>3 506</b>
LDCs	LDCs	42.2	LDCs	44.6	LDCs	33.1	LDCs	27.3
Other LICs	Other LICs	12.1	Other LICs	15.1	Other LICs	20.1	Other LICs	15.9
LMICs	LMICs	25.8	LMICs	21.0	LMICs	20.6	LMICs	24.4
UMICs	UMICs	9.0	UMICs	2.0	UMICs	2.6	UMICs	3.9
MADCT	MADCT	-	MADCT	-	MADCT	9.2	MADCT	5.7
Unallocated	Unallocated	11.0	Unallocated	17.3	Unallocated	14.4	Unallocated	22.8
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>						
Sub-Saharan Africa	Sub-Saharan Africa	55.3	Sub-Saharan Africa	47.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	34.6	Sub-Saharan Africa	29.2
S. and C. Asia	S. and C. Asia	5.9	S. and C. Asia	5.0	S. and C. Asia	17.7	S. and C. Asia	13.2
Other Asia and Oceania	Other Asia and Oceania	6.8	Other Asia and Oceania	11.6	Other Asia and Oceania	11.4	Other Asia and Oceania	4.4
Middle East and North Africa	Middle East and North Africa	4.5	Middle East and North Africa	3.9	Middle East and North Africa	4.8	Middle East and North Africa	6.4
Latin America and Caribbean	Latin America and Caribbean	20.0	Latin America and Caribbean	13.1	Latin America and Caribbean	19.1	Latin America and Caribbean	21.1
Europe	Europe	4.8	Europe	5.9	Europe	0.5	Europe	5.0
Unspecified	Unspecified	2.7	Unspecified	12.8	Unspecified	11.8	Unspecified	20.8
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>						

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06	New Zealand			
	1985-86	1995-96	2005-06	2005-06
Nigeria 4.3	Cook Islands 22.8	Cook Islands 5.6	Solomon Islands 5.3	
Indonesia 3.0	Samoa 5.5	Fiji 5.4	Niue 4.9	
Sudan 2.3	Niue 5.5	Niue 5.4	Papua New Guinea 4.4	
Tanzania 1.9	Fiji 4.4	Samoa 5.3	Tokelau 4.2	
Ghana 1.6	Tonga 3.7	Papua New Guinea 4.5	Indonesia 4.1	
Afghanistan 1.6	Papua New Guinea 3.5	Tonga 4.4	Afghanistan 2.4	
Uganda 1.5	Indonesia 3.0	Solomon Islands 3.3	Vanuatu 2.3	
Mali 1.2	Tokelau 2.6	Tokelau 3.3	Samoa 2.2	
Bangladesh 1.2	Vanuatu 1.6	Vanuatu 2.9	Tonga 2.1	
Mozambique 1.2	Solomon Islands 1.5	Indonesia 2.8	Cook Islands 1.8	
Iraq 1.2	Kiribati 1.4	Philippines 1.8	Fiji 1.8	
Viet Nam 1.1	Philippines 1.3	Viet Nam 1.7	Philippines 1.6	
Zambia 1.0	Thailand 1.3	Kiribati 1.5	Timor-Leste 1.5	
Burkina Faso 1.0	Tuvalu 1.2	China 1.1	Cambodia 1.3	
South Africa 1.0	Malaysia 0.3	Tuvalu 1.1	Viet Nam 1.1	
<b>Total above 25.1</b>	<b>Total above 59.5</b>	<b>Total above 49.9</b>	<b>Total above 40.8</b>	
Multilateral ODA 24.2	Multilateral ODA 19.9	Multilateral ODA 18.5	Multilateral ODA 19.8	
Unallocated 33.0	Unallocated 19.1	Unallocated 21.9	Unallocated 25.1	
<b>Total ODA USD mill. 5 367</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 65</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 122</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 266</b>	
LDCs 24.9	LDCs 14.7	LDCs 22.0	LDCs 27.2	
Other LICs 14.1	Other LICs 4.7	Other LICs 10.0	Other LICs 9.8	
LMICs 15.7	LMICs 27.5	LMICs 32.1	LMICs 27.9	
UMICs 1.8	UMICs 29.1	UMICs 8.5	UMICs 3.8	
MADCT -	MADCT 0.2	MADCT 0.5	MADCT -	
Unallocated 43.6	Unallocated 23.9	Unallocated 26.9	Unallocated 31.3	
<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	
Sub-Saharan Africa 32.7	Sub-Saharan Africa 1.0	Sub-Saharan Africa 3.7	Sub-Saharan Africa 6.6	
S. and C. Asia 7.5	S. and C. Asia 0.7	S. and C. Asia 2.4	S. and C. Asia 7.3	
Other Asia and Oceania 8.0	Other Asia and Oceania 90.0	Other Asia and Oceania 86.9	Other Asia and Oceania 72.1	
Middle East and North Africa 3.9	Middle East and North Africa 0.0	Middle East and North Africa 0.1	Middle East and North Africa 1.8	
Latin America and Caribbean 5.7	Latin America and Caribbean 0.5	Latin America and Caribbean 1.4	Latin America and Caribbean 2.3	
Europe 2.6	Europe -	Europe 0.1	Europe -	
Unspecified 39.5	Unspecified 7.8	Unspecified 5.4	Unspecified 10.0	
<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>**Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid**

(continued)

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

			Norway				Portugal		
			1985-86	1995-96	2005-06			1985-86	1995-96
Tanzania	8.5	Tanzania	4.2	Sudan	3.6			Mozambique	24.3
Bangladesh	4.8	Mozambique	4.1	Palestinian Adm. Areas	2.8			Sao Tome & Principe	12.2
Mozambique	3.9	Palestinian Adm. Areas	3.5	Tanzania	2.4			Angola	11.9
Kenya	3.8	Bangladesh	3.2	Mozambique	2.3			Guinea-Bissau	9.1
India	3.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina	3.1	Afghanistan	2.3			Cape Verde	5.8
Zambia	3.3	Zambia	2.6	Zambia	2.0			Namibia	0.7
Pakistan	1.8	Angola	2.1	Sri Lanka	1.8			Egypt	0.6
Zimbabwe	1.8	Nicaragua	2.0	Pakistan	1.8			Turkey	0.2
Botswana	1.7	Sri Lanka	1.8	Malawi	1.7			Brazil	0.2
Sri Lanka	1.6	Ethiopia	1.8	Uganda	1.7			Algeria	0.1
Ethiopia	1.6	States Ex-Yugoslavia	1.6	Ethiopia	1.4			Senegal	0.1
Sudan	1.2	Uganda	1.6	Serbia	1.2			Morocco	0.1
Nicaragua	1.2	Rwanda	1.6	Somalia	1.1			States Ex-Yugoslavia	0.1
Madagascar	0.6	Zimbabwe	1.5	Indonesia	1.0			Zimbabwe	0.1
China	0.6	Indonesia	1.4	Bangladesh	0.9			Haiti	0.1
<b>Total above</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>Total above</b>	-	<b>Total above</b>	<b>65.5</b>
Multilateral ODA	41.1	Multilateral ODA	27.5	Multilateral ODA	26.3	Multilateral ODA	-	Multilateral ODA	31.6
Unallocated	10.8	Unallocated	15.6	Unallocated	27.3	Unallocated	-	Unallocated	2.6
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 281</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>2 870</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	-	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>242</b>
LDCs	48.8	LDCs	41.1	LDCs	35.5	LDCs	-	LDCs	92.9
Other LICs	21.0	Other LICs	9.2	Other LICs	7.1	Other LICs	-	Other LICs	0.2
LMICs	7.9	LMICs	24.4	LMICs	17.7	LMICs	-	LMICs	2.7
UMICs	3.9	UMICs	3.8	UMICs	2.6	UMICs	-	UMICs	0.4
MADCT	0.0	MADCT	0.0	MADCT	-	MADCT	-	MADCT	0.0
Unallocated	18.3	Unallocated	21.5	Unallocated	37.1	Unallocated	-	Unallocated	3.8
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	-	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	55.3	Sub-Saharan Africa	41.7	Sub-Saharan Africa	32.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	-	Sub-Saharan Africa	94.6
S. and C. Asia	22.2	S. and C. Asia	11.7	S. and C. Asia	12.8	S. and C. Asia	-	S. and C. Asia	0.0
Other Asia and Oceania	4.0	Other Asia and Oceania	7.0	Other Asia and Oceania	7.3	Other Asia and Oceania	-	Other Asia and Oceania	0.0
Middle East and North Africa	0.6	Middle East and North Africa	6.6	Middle East and North Africa	6.4	Middle East and North Africa	-	Middle East and North Africa	1.2
Latin America and Caribbean	4.7	Latin America and Caribbean	7.2	Latin America and Caribbean	4.4	Latin America and Caribbean	-	Latin America and Caribbean	0.6
Europe	0.3	Europe	7.4	Europe	6.0	Europe	-	Europe	0.4
Unspecified	12.9	Unspecified	18.4	Unspecified	31.1	Unspecified	-	Unspecified	3.2
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	-	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06	Spain				
	1985-86	1995-96	2005-06		
Cape Verde	13.3	Argentina	5.1	Iraq	5.0
Timor-Leste	9.3	Congo, Rep.	3.9	Honduras	3.5
Mozambique	5.6	China	3.4	Guatemala	3.4
Angola	5.2	Ecuador	3.4	Madagascar	2.3
Guinea-Bissau	3.6	Indonesia	3.2	Peru	2.2
Sao Tome & Principe	2.9	Nicaragua	2.4	Morocco	1.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.9	Colombia	2.2	Congo, Rep.	1.8
Serbia	1.9	Angola	2.1	Nigeria	1.8
Afghanistan	1.5	Morocco	2.0	Ecuador	1.8
Indonesia	0.6	Bolivia	2.0	Nicaragua	1.7
Iraq	0.5	Peru	1.8	Bolivia	1.6
Brazil	0.3	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.6	Colombia	1.6
Congo, Dem. Rep.	0.3	Haiti	1.6	Algeria	1.6
Sudan	0.2	Honduras	1.5	Senegal	1.5
Sri Lanka	0.2	Mozambique	1.3	China	1.5
<b>Total above</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>37.6</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>33.0</b>
Multilateral ODA	43.8	Multilateral ODA	32.3	Multilateral ODA	37.5
Unallocated	7.1	Unallocated	11.6	Unallocated	10.7
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 386</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>3 839</b>
LDCs	75.7	LDCs	12.9	LDCs	14.7
Other LICs	0.3	Other LICs	12.0	Other LICs	11.7
LMICs	10.7	LMICs	43.7	LMICs	51.4
UMICs	0.6	UMICs	14.2	UMICs	5.1
MADCT	-	MADCT	0.0	MADCT	-
Unallocated	12.7	Unallocated	17.1	Unallocated	17.1
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	58.6	Sub-Saharan Africa	17.0	Sub-Saharan Africa	21.6
S. and C. Asia	3.4	S. and C. Asia	2.0	S. and C. Asia	1.7
Other Asia and Oceania	19.0	Other Asia and Oceania	11.1	Other Asia and Oceania	5.4
Middle East and North Africa	1.6	Middle East and North Africa	9.8	Middle East and North Africa	19.1
Latin America and Caribbean	1.1	Latin America and Caribbean	47.1	Latin America and Caribbean	36.7
Europe	7.2	Europe	1.2	Europe	4.1
Unspecified	9.1	Unspecified	11.7	Unspecified	11.3
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>**Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid**

(continued)

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

			Sweden			Switzerland			
			1985-86	1995-96	2005-06	1985-86	1995-96		
Tanzania	8.0	Mozambique	3.1	Iraq	4.0	Tanzania	3.5	Mozambique	2.6
India	6.3	Tanzania	3.0	Tanzania	2.8	India	3.3	India	2.2
Mozambique	5.3	India	2.8	Mozambique	2.3	Rwanda	2.6	Bolivia	1.8
Viet Nam	5.2	Nicaragua	2.2	Uganda	1.5	Nepal	2.3	Rwanda	1.7
Zambia	3.5	Viet Nam	2.2	Ethiopia	1.5	Madagascar	2.3	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.7
Ethiopia	3.1	Ethiopia	2.1	Kenya	1.3	Indonesia	2.2	Tanzania	1.6
Sri Lanka	3.0	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.8	Sudan	1.3	Senegal	2.1	Nepal	1.4
Zimbabwe	2.3	Zimbabwe	1.8	Afghanistan	1.2	Bolivia	1.9	Nicaragua	1.4
Bangladesh	2.0	Zambia	1.7	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.2	Burundi	1.9	Madagascar	1.4
Kenya	1.8	Iraq	1.7	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.2	Mali	1.9	Burkina Faso	1.3
Angola	1.7	Angola	1.7	Viet Nam	1.2	Cameroon	1.8	Pakistan	1.3
Nicaragua	1.6	Uganda	1.6	Zambia	1.1	Ghana	1.8	Benin	1.3
Botswana	1.2	Bangladesh	1.5	Nicaragua	1.1	Honduras	1.5	Albania	1.1
Guinea-Bissau	1.0	South Africa	1.4	Serbia	1.1	Kenya	1.4	Bangladesh	1.1
China	0.9	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.2	Sri Lanka	1.0	Ethiopia	1.3	Indonesia	1.1
<b>Total above</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>23.1</b>
Multilateral ODA	29.6	Multilateral ODA	30.2	Multilateral ODA	30.2	Multilateral ODA	23.7	Multilateral ODA	28.7
Unallocated	18.2	Unallocated	20.1	Unallocated	29.4	Unallocated	20.5	Unallocated	23.7
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>967</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 851</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>3 658</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 059</b>
LDCs	39.3	LDCs	29.6	LDCs	26.8	LDCs	40.8	LDCs	30.2
Other LICs	24.6	Other LICs	15.9	Other LICs	9.3	Other LICs	15.1	Other LICs	11.4
LMICs	8.1	LMICs	20.5	LMICs	20.2	LMICs	15.0	LMICs	21.0
UMICs	2.2	UMICs	5.1	UMICs	1.6	UMICs	2.0	UMICs	3.8
MADCT	0.0	MADCT	0.1	MADCT	-	MADCT	0.2	MADCT	0.4
Unallocated	25.8	Unallocated	28.8	Unallocated	42.1	Unallocated	26.9	Unallocated	33.2
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	47.5	Sub-Saharan Africa	33.0	Sub-Saharan Africa	30.6	Sub-Saharan Africa	45.9	Sub-Saharan Africa	27.3
S. and C. Asia	16.5	S. and C. Asia	9.8	S. and C. Asia	7.6	S. and C. Asia	13.0	S. and C. Asia	11.8
Other Asia and Oceania	10.2	Other Asia and Oceania	9.2	Other Asia and Oceania	6.8	Other Asia and Oceania	6.0	Other Asia and Oceania	6.7
Middle East and North Africa	1.7	Middle East and North Africa	6.4	Middle East and North Africa	8.2	Middle East and North Africa	2.2	Middle East and North Africa	3.9
Latin America and Caribbean	5.9	Latin America and Caribbean	10.9	Latin America and Caribbean	7.0	Latin America and Caribbean	13.8	Latin America and Caribbean	13.0
Europe	0.0	Europe	5.7	Europe	6.1	Europe	0.6	Europe	7.1
Unspecified	18.1	Unspecified	25.0	Unspecified	33.7	Unspecified	18.6	Unspecified	30.2
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06	United Kingdom			
	1985-86	1995-96	2005-06	2005-06
Iraq 4.8	India 9.9	India 5.2	Nigeria 22.2	
Serbia 4.3	Bangladesh 3.1	Zambia 2.3	Iraq 6.3	
Nigeria 2.9	Sudan 2.6	Bangladesh 2.3	India 4.2	
Tanzania 1.5	Kenya 2.5	Uganda 2.1	Afghanistan 1.9	
Mozambique 1.4	Malaysia 2.4	Malawi 2.1	Tanzania 1.8	
India 1.3	Zambia 2.0	Pakistan 1.8	Sudan 1.7	
Burkina Faso 1.2	Indonesia 1.5	States Ex-Yugoslavia 1.6	Bangladesh 1.6	
Pakistan 1.1	Pakistan 1.5	Indonesia 1.6	Pakistan 1.3	
Viet Nam 1.1	Ethiopia 1.4	China 1.6	Ghana 1.2	
Afghanistan 1.0	Gibraltar 1.4	Tanzania 1.5	Malawi 1.1	
Bosnia-Herzegovina 1.0	Egypt 1.4	Kenya 1.2	Serbia 1.1	
Palestinian Adm. Areas 1.0	Ghana 1.2	Zimbabwe 1.1	Uganda 1.1	
Nepal 1.0	Zimbabwe 1.2	Mozambique 1.1	Zambia 1.0	
Bolivia 0.9	Tanzania 1.2	Ghana 0.9	Ethiopia 1.0	
Peru 0.9	Malawi 1.0	Ethiopia 0.9	Congo, Dem. Rep. 0.9	
<b>Total above 25.4</b>	<b>Total above 34.3</b>	<b>Total above 27.4</b>	<b>Total above 48.6</b>	
Multilateral ODA 22.1	Multilateral ODA 39.8	Multilateral ODA 43.7	Multilateral ODA 26.6	
Unallocated 30.2	Unallocated 11.0	Unallocated 13.7	Unallocated 12.7	
<b>Total ODA USD mill. 1 718</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 1 758</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 3 319</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 12 121</b>	
LDCs 18.4	LDCs 28.2	LDCs 31.0	LDCs 22.2	
Other LICs 14.4	Other LICs 28.3	Other LICs 20.5	Other LICs 43.7	
LMICs 26.6	LMICs 10.1	LMICs 18.1	LMICs 14.7	
UMICs 1.7	UMICs 10.3	UMICs 5.9	UMICs 2.2	
MADCT -	MADCT 4.0	MADCT 0.2	MADCT -	
Unallocated 38.8	Unallocated 19.0	Unallocated 24.3	Unallocated 17.3	
<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	
Sub-Saharan Africa 22.1	Sub-Saharan Africa 32.5	Sub-Saharan Africa 35.0	Sub-Saharan Africa 52.5	
S. and C. Asia 11.8	S. and C. Asia 27.4	S. and C. Asia 20.2	S. and C. Asia 13.8	
Other Asia and Oceania 4.8	Other Asia and Oceania 9.2	Other Asia and Oceania 8.2	Other Asia and Oceania 4.7	
Middle East and North Africa 9.8	Middle East and North Africa 3.8	Middle East and North Africa 2.5	Middle East and North Africa 9.6	
Latin America and Caribbean 8.2	Latin America and Caribbean 6.1	Latin America and Caribbean 8.1	Latin America and Caribbean 2.1	
Europe 11.2	Europe 3.4	Europe 3.6	Europe 1.9	
Unspecified 32.1	Unspecified 17.7	Unspecified 22.4	Unspecified 15.4	
<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	

Table 32

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

	United States			Total DAC Countries		
	1985-86	1995-96	2005-06	1985-86	1995-96	
Israel	19.1	Israel 14.3	Iraq 30.0	Israel 5.8	China 3.7	
Egypt	12.8	Egypt 7.6	Afghanistan 5.1	Egypt 5.0	Indonesia 3.2	
El Salvador	2.8	Haiti 2.4	Sudan 2.8	India 3.1	Egypt 3.0	
Philippines	2.6	India 1.5	Colombia 2.2	Indonesia 2.4	India 2.6	
Sudan	2.4	Iraq 1.3	Egypt 1.9	Philippines 2.1	Israel 2.3	
Pakistan	2.3	Philippines 1.2	Ethiopia 1.9	Bangladesh 2.1	Philippines 1.8	
Northern Marianas	1.8	Bosnia-Herzegovina 1.1	Congo, Dem. Rep. 1.8	Pakistan 1.9	Thailand 1.6	
Honduras	1.7	Jordan 1.1	Nigeria 1.7	China 1.9	Bangladesh 1.3	
Bangladesh	1.6	El Salvador 1.0	Pakistan 1.5	Sudan 1.6	Côte d'Ivoire 1.2	
Costa Rica	1.6	Palau 1.0	Jordan 1.3	Tanzania 1.4	Pakistan 1.2	
India	1.5	Bolivia 1.0	Zambia 1.0	Thailand 1.3	Mozambique 1.1	
Peru	1.4	South Africa 1.0	Uganda 0.9	Ethiopia 1.2	Bosnia-Herzegovina 1.0	
Ethiopia	1.2	Peru 1.0	Indonesia 0.8	Sri Lanka 1.1	Nicaragua 1.0	
Jamaica	1.1	Turkey 0.9	Kenya 0.8	Kenya 1.1	Tanzania 0.9	
Indonesia	1.0	Micronesia, Fed. States 0.8	Peru 0.7	Morocco 1.0	Bolivia 0.9	
<b>Total above</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>Total above 37.2</b>	<b>Total above 54.6</b>	<b>Total above 33.0</b>	<b>Total above 26.8</b>	
Multilateral ODA	15.7	Multilateral ODA 22.8	Multilateral ODA 8.9	Multilateral ODA 26.2	Multilateral ODA 26.9	
Unallocated	11.6	Unallocated 22.3	Unallocated 19.0	Unallocated 10.8	Unallocated 13.9	
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>10 148</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 9 291</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 26 641</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 34 706</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill. 64 805</b>	
LDCs	15.0	LDCs 13.4	LDCs 21.1	LDCs 25.3	LDCs 20.2	
Other LICs	6.1	Other LICs 5.0	Other LICs 7.1	Other LICs 12.8	Other LICs 14.9	
LMICs	34.6	LMICs 29.2	LMICs 48.9	LMICs 29.5	LMICs 33.4	
UMICs	5.4	UMICs 4.9	UMICs 2.0	UMICs 6.1	UMICs 6.2	
MADCT	25.1	MADCT 18.6	MADCT -	MADCT 11.6	MADCT 6.3	
Unallocated	13.8	Unallocated 28.9	Unallocated 20.9	Unallocated 14.6	Unallocated 19.0	
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	
Sub-Saharan Africa	13.3	Sub-Saharan Africa 11.9	Sub-Saharan Africa 20.4	Sub-Saharan Africa 26.0	Sub-Saharan Africa 23.5	
S. and C. Asia	7.8	S. and C. Asia 7.0	S. and C. Asia 11.4	S. and C. Asia 13.0	S. and C. Asia 10.3	
Other Asia and Oceania	7.4	Other Asia and Oceania 8.4	Other Asia and Oceania 3.6	Other Asia and Oceania 16.7	Other Asia and Oceania 22.5	
Middle East and North Africa	40.4	Middle East and North Africa 32.3	Middle East and North Africa 38.3	Middle East and North Africa 19.0	Middle East and North Africa 12.7	
Latin America and Caribbean	18.0	Latin America and Caribbean 22.9	Latin America and Caribbean 8.3	Latin America and Caribbean 11.8	Latin America and Caribbean 13.0	
Europe	2.5	Europe 3.0	Europe 2.9	Europe 2.3	Europe 3.5	
Unspecified	10.7	Unspecified 14.5	Unspecified 15.3	Unspecified 11.2	Unspecified 14.4	
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral 100.0</b>	

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/175788261260>

Table 32

## Major Recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid

(continued)

## Gross disbursements

Per cent of total ODA

2005-06		EC					
		1985-86	1995-96		2005-06		
Iraq	13.0	Ethiopia	6.7	Morocco	2.9	Turkey	3.9
Nigeria	7.5	Sudan	5.3	States Ex-Yugoslavia	2.0	Morocco	3.1
China	2.2	India	4.6	Bangladesh	2.0	Sudan	2.5
Indonesia	2.0	Turkey	3.6	Egypt	2.0	Egypt	2.5
Afghanistan	2.0	Senegal	2.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.9	Serbia	2.4
India	1.4	Tanzania	2.4	Palestinian Adm. Areas	1.8	Afghanistan	2.3
Sudan	1.3	Mozambique	2.1	Jordan	1.6	Palestinian Adm. Areas	2.3
Viet Nam	1.2	Egypt	2.0	Côte d'Ivoire	1.6	Congo, Dem. Rep.	2.1
Zambia	1.2	Niger	1.9	Uganda	1.5	India	1.9
Congo, Dem. Rep.	1.1	Côte d'Ivoire	1.9	Tunisia	1.5	Ethiopia	1.8
Cameroon	1.0	Ghana	1.8	India	1.5	Tanzania	1.7
Ethiopia	1.0	Mali	1.6	Angola	1.5	Mozambique	1.7
Philippines	0.9	Zambia	1.6	Mauritania	1.4	South Africa	1.5
Pakistan	0.9	Congo, Dem. Rep.	1.6	Haiti	1.4	Madagascar	1.5
Egypt	0.9	Thailand	1.5	Mali	1.3	Nigeria	1.4
<b>Total above</b>	<b>37.4</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>41.1</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>Total above</b>	<b>32.8</b>
Multilateral ODA	22.7	Multilateral ODA	0.0	Multilateral ODA	7.7	Multilateral ODA	7.2
Unallocated	14.9	Unallocated	22.2	Unallocated	20.0	Unallocated	17.9
<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>117 232</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>1 418</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>5 654</b>	<b>Total ODA USD mill.</b>	<b>10 202</b>
LDCs	19.9	LDCs	44.4	LDCs	29.8	LDCs	32.7
Other LICs	20.1	Other LICs	13.6	Other LICs	11.9	Other LICs	10.8
LMICs	37.5	LMICs	12.9	LMICs	28.7	LMICs	26.9
UMICs	3.3	UMICs	6.3	UMICs	6.3	UMICs	10.3
MADCT	-	MADCT	0.6	MADCT	1.7	MADCT	-
Unallocated	19.2	Unallocated	22.2	Unallocated	21.7	Unallocated	19.3
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Sub-Saharan Africa	30.9	Sub-Saharan Africa	53.9	Sub-Saharan Africa	38.1	Sub-Saharan Africa	36.6
S. and C. Asia	9.3	S. and C. Asia	7.7	S. and C. Asia	8.3	S. and C. Asia	9.0
Other Asia and Oceania	12.3	Other Asia and Oceania	4.9	Other Asia and Oceania	7.1	Other Asia and Oceania	6.2
Middle East and North Africa	21.9	Middle East and North Africa	5.8	Middle East and North Africa	13.7	Middle East and North Africa	15.6
Latin America and Caribbean	7.1	Latin America and Caribbean	6.1	Latin America and Caribbean	13.0	Latin America and Caribbean	8.9
Europe	3.5	Europe	4.6	Europe	7.7	Europe	13.1
Unspecified	14.9	Unspecified	17.0	Unspecified	12.1	Unspecified	10.7
<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total Bilateral</b>	<b>100.0</b>



StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176032217110>

Table 33

## ODA from Non-DAC Donors

## Net disbursements

USD million

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Memo : 2006 ODA/GNI (%)
OECD Non-DAC						
Czech Republic	45	91	108	135	161	0.12
Hungary	..	21	70	100	149	0.13
Iceland	13	18	21	27	41	0.27
Korea	279	366	423	752	455	0.05
Poland	14	27	118	205	297	0.09
Slovak Republic	7	15	28	56	55	0.10
Turkey	73	67	339	601	714	0.18
Arab countries						
Kuwait	20	138	161	218	158	..
Saudi Arabia	2 478	2 391	1 734	1 005	2 095	..
United Arab Emirates	156	188	181	141	249	..
Other donors						
Chinese Taipei	..	..	421	483	513	0.14
Israel <sup>a</sup>	131	112	84	95	90	0.06
Thailand	..	..	..	..	74	0.04
Other donors	3	4	22	86	121	0.10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3 218</b>	<b>3 436</b>	<b>3 712</b>	<b>3 905</b>	<b>5 172</b>	<b>..</b>
<i>of which: Bilateral</i>						
OECD Non-DAC						
Czech Republic	31	80	63	64	78	
Hungary	..	14	35	40	84	
Iceland	5	14	16	20	28	
Korea	207	245	331	463	376	
Poland	9	19	25	48	119	
Slovak Republic	4	9	11	31	25	
Turkey	27	26	292	532	643	
Arab countries						
Kuwait	20	114	99	218	157	
Saudi Arabia	2 146	2 340	1 691	883	2 050	
United Arab Emirates	156	188	181	141	249	
Other donors						
Chinese Taipei	..	..	410	465	494	
Israel <sup>a</sup>	125	104	75	80	75	
Thailand	..	..	..	..	65	
Other donors	0	1	2	23	43	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2 728</b>	<b>3 154</b>	<b>3 232</b>	<b>3 008</b>	<b>4 484</b>	

a) These figures include USD 87.8 million in 2002, USD 68.8 million in 2003, USD 47.9 million in 2004, USD 49.2 million in 2005 and USD 45.5 million in 2006 for first year sustenance expenses for persons arriving from developing countries (many of which are experiencing civil war or severe unrest), or individuals who have left due to humanitarian or political reasons.

**Note:** The above table does not reflect aid provided by several major emerging non-OECD donors, as information on their aid has not been disclosed.

Table 34

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176064632487>

## Share of Debt Relief in DAC Members' Total Net ODA in 2006

	Net ODA (USD million)	Net ODA Debt Relief <sup>(a)</sup> (USD million)	of which: <i>Bilateral</i> (USD million)	Debt Relief as per cent of Net ODA	Net ODA Debt Relief for HIPC Countries <sup>(b)</sup> (USD million)	HIPC Debt Relief as per cent of Net ODA
Australia	2 123	277	277	13.1	1	0.1
Austria	1 498	761	757	50.8	477	31.8
Belgium	1 978	398	398	20.1	179	9.1
Canada	3 684	260	260	7.1	219	5.9
Denmark	2 236	113	113	5.1	12	0.5
Finland	834	7	-	0.8	7	0.8
France	10 601	3 647	3 647	34.4	606	5.7
Germany	10 435	2 755	2 742	26.4	425	4.1
Greece	424	-	-	-	-	-
Ireland	1 022	1	-	0.1	1	0.1
Italy	3 641	1 604	1 604	44.1	166	4.6
Japan	11 187	3 260	3 260	29.1	372	3.3
Luxembourg	291	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	5 452	327	312	6.0	31	0.6
New Zealand	259	0	0	0.0	-	-
Norway	2 954	23	23	0.8	14	0.5
Portugal	396	0	0	0.1	-	-
Spain	3 814	515	515	13.5	0	0.0
Sweden	3 955	307	292	7.8	43	1.1
Switzerland	1 646	102	98	6.2	4	0.3
United Kingdom	12 459	3 533	3 503	28.4	303	2.4
United States	23 532	1 787	1 686	7.6	1 008	4.3
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>104 421</b>	<b>19 679</b>	<b>19 488</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>3 869</b>	<b>3.7</b>

a) Comprises: 1) *Bilateral*: grants for forgiveness of ODA, Other Official Flows (OOF) or private claims; other action on debt such as debt conversions, debt buybacks or service payments to third parties; and new ODA resulting from concessional rescheduling operations; net of offsetting entries for the cancellation of any ODA principal involved; and 2) *Multilateral*: contributions to the HIPC Trust Fund (source: World Bank).

b) Bilateral debt relief to HIPC countries [includes all items described in footnote a)], plus multilateral contributions to the HIPC Initiative.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176073046673>

Table 35

## Economic Indicators for DAC Member Countries in 2006

	GNI per capita (USD)	Real GDP growth (%)	Inflation <sup>a</sup> (%)	Unemployment rate (%)	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (-) as % of GDP	Current external balance as % of GDP	Total government receipts as % of GDP
Australia	35 100	2.5	4.9	4.8	1.2	-5.4	35.3
Austria	38 600	3.1	1.9	5.4	-1.5	3.2	47.8
Belgium	37 600	2.9	2.0	8.2	0.2	2.7	48.6
Canada	38 300	2.8	2.4	6.3	1.0	1.6	40.3
Denmark	51 400	3.5	2.2	3.9	4.7	2.4	55.9
Finland	40 100	4.9	1.5	7.7	3.7	5.1	52.4
France	35 800	2.2	2.3	8.8	-2.6	-1.3	50.8
Germany	35 600	3.1	0.6	8.1	-1.6	4.9	43.8
Greece	22 100	4.3	3.3	9.3	-2.8	-11.1	39.5
Ireland	44 500	5.7	2.5	4.4	2.9	-4.2	37.0
Italy	31 400	1.9	1.8	6.8	-4.5	-2.6	45.6
Japan	35 100	2.2	-0.9	4.1	-2.9	3.9	33.7
Luxembourg	71 200	6.0	6.3	4.4	0.7	10.3	39.7
Netherlands	41 300	3.0	1.9	4.1	0.5	8.6	46.7
New Zealand	23 200	1.8	2.3	3.8	3.8	-8.7	45.2
Norway	71 100	2.8	7.7	3.4	18.0	16.4	58.8
Portugal	18 100	1.3	2.9	7.7	-3.9	-9.4	42.5
Spain	27 100	3.9	4.0	8.5	1.8	-8.6	40.4
Sweden	42 400	4.5	1.5	5.3	2.3	7.1	57.9
Switzerland	56 100	3.2	1.6	3.8	1.1	15.1	35.4
United Kingdom	40 300	2.8	2.6	5.5	-2.8	-3.1	41.9
United States	44 300	2.9	3.2	4.6	-2.6	-6.2	34.0
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>38 500</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>-1.8</b>	<b>-1.8</b>	<b>38.8</b>

a) GDP deflators.

Source: OECD Economic Outlook, December 2007 and country submissions.

**Table 36**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176084754666>**Deflators for Resource Flows from DAC Donors<sup>a</sup> (2005 = 100)**

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Australia	73.43	74.96	71.61	67.08	72.83	74.97	81.01	77.91
Austria	74.86	75.82	83.35	81.00	84.51	97.50	93.71	81.18
Belgium	72.60	73.08	80.32	77.72	81.92	94.07	90.05	78.82
Canada	77.86	81.63	78.41	74.53	71.21	72.47	74.11	73.85
Denmark	72.41	71.94	77.44	72.62	75.15	86.37	85.14	76.24
Finland	97.74	94.34	85.81	68.52	76.16	95.38	90.41	81.92
France	75.85	74.78	81.21	77.23	80.33	90.88	90.17	79.93
Germany	79.73	78.57	87.58	85.83	89.52	103.28	98.86	86.03
Greece	59.79	62.25	68.31	64.99	68.33	78.47	81.09	76.36
Ireland	60.89	60.30	65.57	59.32	61.55	68.00	69.41	68.13
Italy	77.75	80.77	84.91	69.16	69.80	72.53	80.56	74.85
Japan	80.99	89.75	96.83	110.91	119.93	129.60	111.35	100.64
Luxembourg	66.16	65.91	72.65	71.64	76.59	88.90	86.83	73.80
Netherlands	68.68	68.80	74.86	72.22	75.40	87.19	83.99	74.05
New Zealand	64.33	62.78	59.14	61.11	67.78	76.74	82.45	79.61
Norway	62.70	61.86	64.15	57.48	57.74	66.13	67.54	63.45
Portugal	56.50	61.32	73.18	65.93	68.44	78.38	78.18	71.46
Spain	71.52	75.02	81.25	68.35	67.44	76.04	77.42	68.59
Sweden	91.71	97.86	102.60	78.92	81.85	91.54	98.29	87.71
Switzerland	75.52	77.30	80.55	78.46	86.10	100.42	95.98	81.71
United Kingdom	63.82	67.58	69.95	61.43	63.62	67.36	68.91	74.42
United States	72.37	74.90	76.63	78.40	80.06	81.70	83.25	84.63
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>75.47</b>	<b>78.01</b>	<b>82.38</b>	<b>80.19</b>	<b>83.80</b>	<b>92.84</b>	<b>88.63</b>	<b>82.36</b>
EC	72.64	73.30	80.03	74.93	78.25	88.27	87.42	79.11

a) Including the effect of exchange rate changes, i.e. applicable to US dollar figures only.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176084754666>**Table 36****Deflators for Resource Flows from DAC Donors<sup>a</sup> (2005 = 100)**  
(continued)

1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	
66.08	68.32	63.89	59.11	63.92	78.63	92.32	100.00	103.15	Australia
80.01	76.89	68.16	67.60	72.32	88.03	98.47	100.00	102.31	Austria
79.27	76.25	67.22	66.61	71.39	86.95	97.93	100.00	102.98	Belgium
68.65	69.76	72.66	70.47	70.25	81.42	90.23	100.00	108.85	Canada
76.08	74.22	65.97	65.73	70.96	86.73	97.37	100.00	102.90	Denmark
82.21	79.39	70.36	70.47	75.14	89.69	99.15	100.00	101.71	Finland
80.03	76.69	67.35	66.74	71.89	87.76	98.16	100.00	102.79	France
85.26	82.00	70.45	69.29	73.95	89.58	99.34	100.00	101.73	Germany
74.28	73.91	63.91	62.51	68.29	84.72	96.37	100.00	104.18	Greece
68.55	67.80	61.96	63.53	70.16	86.26	96.60	100.00	103.78	Ireland
75.31	72.91	64.33	64.38	70.04	86.53	97.93	100.00	103.06	Italy
92.98	105.44	109.50	95.96	91.66	97.47	103.29	100.00	93.65	Japan
72.41	73.11	64.52	62.74	67.83	85.33	95.44	100.00	108.21	Luxembourg
74.04	72.14	64.86	66.32	72.46	88.76	98.32	100.00	102.30	Netherlands
65.03	64.44	56.68	54.65	60.74	77.35	91.82	100.00	94.05	New Zealand
59.03	60.92	62.56	61.88	68.61	79.43	88.14	100.00	108.13	Norway
72.08	71.26	63.51	63.98	69.98	86.15	97.38	100.00	103.06	Portugal
68.89	67.63	60.52	61.28	67.26	83.98	96.02	100.00	104.68	Spain
84.86	82.55	75.41	68.13	73.63	90.25	100.54	100.00	102.61	Sweden
81.51	79.15	71.02	71.51	78.72	92.17	100.33	100.00	100.32	Switzerland
77.29	77.16	73.12	71.09	76.33	85.67	98.65	100.00	103.53	United Kingdom
85.57	86.81	88.70	90.83	92.42	94.38	97.06	100.00	102.93	United States
<b>80.95</b>	<b>82.34</b>	<b>79.09</b>	<b>75.60</b>	<b>78.70</b>	<b>89.67</b>	<b>97.87</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>102.50</b>	<b>TOTAL DAC</b>
79.32	76.25	66.88	66.53	71.76	87.71	98.23	100.00	102.77	EC

**Table 37**StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176085657768>**Annual Average Dollar Exchange Rates for DAC Members**

1 USD =		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Australia	Dollars	1.8413	1.5415	1.3592	1.3128	1.3279
Austria	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Belgium	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Canada	Dollars	1.5700	1.4001	1.3011	1.2117	1.1343
Denmark	Kroner	7.8843	6.5766	5.9876	5.9961	5.9430
Finland	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
France	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Germany	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Greece	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Ireland	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Italy	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Japan	Yen	125.2	115.9	108.1	110.1	116.4
Luxembourg	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Netherlands	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
New Zealand	Dollars	2.1633	1.7240	1.5090	1.4208	1.5416
Norway	Kroner	7.9856	7.0791	6.7393	6.4414	6.4148
Portugal	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Spain	Euro	1.0611	0.8851	0.8049	0.8046	0.7967
Sweden	Kroner	9.7210	8.0781	7.3460	7.4724	7.3733
Switzerland	Francs	1.5568	1.3450	1.2427	1.2459	1.2532
United Kingdom	Pound Sterling	0.6665	0.6124	0.5457	0.5501	0.5434
EC-12	<i>EURO</i>	<i>1.0611</i>	<i>0.8851</i>	<i>0.8049</i>	<i>0.8046</i>	<i>0.7967</i>

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/176240514772>

Table 38

## Gross National Income and Population of DAC Member Countries

	Gross National Income (USD billion)				Population (thousands)			
	1995-1996 average	2004	2005	2006	1995-1996 average	2004	2005	2006
Australia	371	596	679	720	18 190	20 110	20 330	20 510
Austria	231	291	302	320	8 055	8 140	8 230	8 280
Belgium	268	357	373	396	10 165	10 400	10 430	10 540
Canada	557	971	1 113	1 254	29 510	32 040	32 380	32 730
Denmark	169	240	260	280	5 245	5 410	5 430	5 450
Finland	124	185	196	211	5 120	5 240	5 260	5 260
France	1 546	2 059	2 117	2 267	58 260	62 000	60 740	63 400
Germany	2 409	2 729	2 798	2 931	81 780	82 490	82 490	82 440
Greece	123	204	224	245	10 470	11 040	11 090	11 110
Ireland	56	156	171	189	3 615	4 000	4 000	4 240
Italy	1 147	1 669	1 756	1 847	56 790	57 550	58 530	58 750
Japan	5 038	4 759	4 675	4 486	125 715	127 720	127 610	127 740
Luxembourg	18	28	30	33	415	450	450	460
Netherlands	398	573	625	676	15 490	16 290	16 340	16 360
New Zealand	56	91	101	97	3 685	4 060	4 090	4 170
Norway	151	252	297	333	4 370	4 610	4 640	4 680
Portugal	105	164	179	187	9 925	10 340	10 340	10 340
Spain	564	1 018	1 110	1 210	39 240	43 200	43 210	44 710
Sweden	231	350	357	386	8 835	9 010	9 050	9 110
Switzerland	310	377	402	421	7 055	7 360	7 450	7 500
United Kingdom	1 143	2 180	2 279	2 424	58 705	60 000	60 000	60 200
United States	7 438	11 656	12 359	13 260	263 980	293 910	296 410	299 400
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>22 454</b>	<b>30 906</b>	<b>32 401</b>	<b>34 170</b>	<b>824 615</b>	<b>875 370</b>	<b>878 500</b>	<b>887 380</b>
<i>of which:</i>								
DAC-EU countries	8 533	12 205	12 775	13 601	372 110	385 560	385 590	390 650



## Technical Notes

## Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts

(Cross-references are given in CAPITALS)

**AID:** The words “aid” and “assistance” in this publication refer only to flows which qualify as OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (ODA).

**AMORTISATION:** Repayments of principal on a LOAN. Does not include interest payments.

**ASSOCIATED FINANCING:** The combination of OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE, whether GRANTS or LOANS, with other official or private funds to form finance packages. Associated Financing packages are subject to the same criteria of concessionality, developmental relevance and recipient country eligibility as TIED AID credits.

**BILATERAL:** See TOTAL RECEIPTS.

**CLAIM:** The entitlement of a creditor to repayment of a LOAN; by extension, the loan itself or the outstanding amount thereof.

**COMMITMENT:** A firm obligation, expressed in writing and backed by the necessary funds, undertaken by an official donor to provide specified assistance to a recipient country or a multilateral organisation. Bilateral commitments are recorded in the full amount of expected transfer, irrespective of the time required for the completion of DISBURSEMENTS. Commitments to multilateral organisations are reported as the sum of: i) any disbursements in the year in question which have not previously been notified as commitments, and ii) expected disbursements in the following year.

**CONCESSIONALITY LEVEL:** A measure of the “softness” of a credit reflecting the benefit to the borrower compared to a LOAN at market rate (cf. GRANT ELEMENT). Technically, it is calculated as the difference between the nominal value of a TIED AID credit and the present value of the debt service as of the date of DISBURSEMENT, calculated at a discount rate applicable to the currency of the transaction and expressed as a percentage of the nominal value.

**DAC (DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE):** The committee of the OECD which deals with development co-operation matters. A description of its aims and a list of its members are given at the front of this volume. Further details are given in the DAC at Work section of this volume.

**DAC LIST OF ODA RECIPIENTS:** For statistical purposes, the DAC uses a List of ODA Recipients which it revises every three years. The “Notes on Definitions and Measurement” below give details of revisions in recent years. As at 1 January 2006, the List is presented in the following categories (the word “countries” includes territories):

- **LDCs:** Least Developed Countries. Group established by the United Nations. To be classified as an LDC, countries must fall below thresholds established for income, economic diversification and social development. The DAC List is updated immediately to reflect any change in the LDC group.

- **Other LICs:** Other Low-Income Countries. Includes all non-LDC countries with per capita GNI USD 825 or less in 2004 (World Bank Atlas basis).
- **LMICs:** Lower Middle-Income Countries, i.e. with GNI per capita (Atlas basis) between USD 826 and USD 3 255 in 2004. LDCs which are also LMICs are only shown as LDCs – not as LMICs.
- **UMICs:** Upper Middle-Income Countries, i.e. with GNI per capita (Atlas basis) between USD 3 256 and USD 10 065 in 2004.

**DEBT REORGANISATION** (also: **RESTRUCTURING**): Any action officially agreed between creditor and debtor that alters the terms previously established for repayment. This may include **forgiveness** (extinction of the LOAN), or **rescheduling** which can be implemented either by revising the repayment schedule or extending a new **refinancing** loan. See also “Notes on Definitions and Measurement” below.

**DISBURSEMENT:** The release of funds to – or the purchase of goods or services for – a recipient; by extension, the amount thus spent. Disbursements record the actual international transfer of financial resources, or of goods or services valued at the cost to the donor. In the case of activities carried out in donor countries, such as training, administration or public awareness programmes, disbursement is taken to have occurred when the funds have been transferred to the service provider or the recipient. They may be recorded **gross** (the total amount disbursed over a given accounting period) or **net** (the gross amount less any repayments of LOAN principal or recoveries on GRANTS received during the same period).

**EXPORT CREDITS:** LOANS for the purpose of trade and which are not represented by a negotiable instrument. They may be extended by the official or the private sector. If extended by the private sector, they may be supported by official guarantees.

**GRACE PERIOD:** See GRANT ELEMENT.

**GRANTS:** Transfers made in cash, goods or services for which no repayment is required.

**GRANT ELEMENT:** Reflects the **financial terms** of a COMMITMENT: interest rate, MATURITY and grace period (interval to first repayment of capital). It measures the concessionality of a LOAN, expressed as the percentage by which the present value of the expected stream of repayments falls short of the repayments that would have been generated at a given reference rate of interest. The reference rate is 10% in DAC statistics. This rate was selected as a proxy for the marginal efficiency of domestic investment, i.e. as an indication of the opportunity cost to the donor of making the funds available. Thus, the grant element is nil for a loan carrying an interest rate of 10%; it is 100% for a GRANT; and it lies between these two limits for a loan at less than 10% interest. If the face value of a loan is multiplied by its grant element, the result is referred to as the **grant equivalent** of that loan (cf. CONCESSIONALITY LEVEL). (Note: in classifying receipts, the grant element concept is not applied to the operations of the multilateral development banks. Instead, these are classified as concessional if they include a subsidy (“soft window” operations) and non-concessional if they are unsubsidised (“hard window” operations).

**GRANT-LIKE FLOW:** A transaction in which the donor country retains formal title to repayment but has expressed its intention in the COMMITMENT to hold the proceeds of repayment in the borrowing country for the benefit of that country.

**IMPUTED MULTILATERAL FLOWS:** Geographical distribution of donors' core contributions to multilateral agencies, based on the geographical breakdown of multilateral agencies' disbursements for the year of reference.

**LOANS:** Transfers for which repayment is required. Only loans with MATURITIES of over one year are included in DAC statistics. The data record actual flows throughout the lifetime of the loans, not the **grant equivalent** of the loans (cf. GRANT ELEMENT). Data on net loan flows include deductions for repayments of principal (but not payment of interest) on earlier loans. This means that when a loan has been fully repaid, its effect on total NET FLOWS over the life of the loan is zero.

**LONG-TERM:** Used of LOANS with an original or extended MATURITY of more than one year.

**MATURITY:** The date at which the final repayment of a LOAN is due; by extension, the duration of the loan.

**MULTILATERAL AGENCIES:** In DAC statistics, those international institutions with governmental membership which conduct all or a significant part of their activities in favour of development and aid recipient countries. They include multilateral development banks (e.g. World Bank, regional development banks), United Nations agencies, and regional groupings (e.g. certain European Community and Arab agencies). A contribution by a DAC member to such an agency is deemed to be multilateral if it is pooled with other contributions and disbursed at the discretion of the agency. Unless otherwise indicated, capital subscriptions to multilateral development banks are presented on a **deposit basis**, i.e. in the amount and as at the date of lodgement of the relevant letter of credit or other negotiable instrument. Limited data are available on an encashment basis, i.e. at the date and in the amount of each drawing made by the agency on letters or other instruments.

**NET FLOW:** The total amount disbursed over a given accounting period, less repayments of LOAN principal during the same period, no account being taken of interest.

**NET TRANSFER:** In DAC statistics, NET FLOW minus payments of interest.

**OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (ODA):** GRANTS or LOANS to countries and territories on the DAC List of ODA Recipients and multilateral agencies that are undertaken by the official sector at concessional terms (i.e. with a GRANT ELEMENT of at least 25%) and that have the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as their main objective. In addition to financial flows, TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION is included in aid. Grants, loans and credits for military purposes are excluded. For the treatment of the forgiveness of loans originally extended for military purposes, see "Notes on Definitions and Measurement" below.

**OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE (ODF):** Used in measuring the inflow of resources to recipient countries: includes: a) bilateral ODA; b) GRANTS and concessional and non-concessional development lending by multilateral financial institutions; and c) those OTHER OFFICIAL FLOWS which are considered developmental (including refinancing LOANS) but which have too low a GRANT ELEMENT to qualify as ODA.

**OFFSHORE BANKING CENTRES:** Countries or territories whose financial institutions deal primarily with non-residents.

**OTHER OFFICIAL FLOWS (OOF):** Transactions by the official sector with countries on the DAC List of ODA Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as OFFICIAL

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE, either because they are not primarily aimed at development, or because they have a GRANT ELEMENT of less than 25%.

**PARTIALLY UNTIED AID:** Official Development Assistance for which the associated goods and services must be procured in the donor country or among a restricted group of other countries, which must however include substantially all recipient countries. Partially untied aid is subject to the same disciplines as TIED AID credits and ASSOCIATED FINANCING.

**PRIVATE FLOWS:** Consist of flows at market terms financed out of private sector resources (i.e. changes in holdings of private LONG-TERM assets held by residents of the reporting country) and private grants (i.e. grants by **non-governmental organisations**, net of subsidies received from the official sector). In presentations focusing on the receipts of recipient countries, flows at market terms are shown as follows:

- **Direct investment:** Investment made to acquire or add to a lasting interest in an enterprise in a country on the DAC List of ODA Recipients. “Lasting interest” implies a long-term relationship where the direct investor has a significant influence on the management of the enterprise, reflected by ownership of at least 10% of the shares, or equivalent voting power or other means of control. In practice it is recorded as the change in the net worth of a subsidiary in a recipient country to the parent company, as shown in the books of the latter.
- **International bank lending:** Net lending to countries on the DAC List of ODA Recipients by banks in OECD countries. LOANS from central monetary authorities are excluded. Guaranteed bank loans and bonds are included under OTHER PRIVATE or BOND LENDING (see below) in these presentations.
- **Bond lending:** Net completed international bonds issued by countries on the DAC List of ODA Recipients.
- **Other private:** Mainly reported holdings of equities issued by firms in aid recipient countries.

In data presentations which focus on the outflow of funds from donors, private flows other than direct investment are restricted to credits with a MATURITY of greater than one year and are usually divided into:

- **Private export credits:** See EXPORT CREDITS.
- **Securities of multilateral agencies:** This covers the transactions of the private non-bank and bank sector in bonds, debentures, etc., issued by multilateral institutions.
- **Bilateral portfolio investment and other:** Includes bank lending and the purchase of shares, bonds and real estate.

**SHORT-TERM:** Used of LOANS with a MATURITY of one year or less.

**TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION:** Includes both: a) GRANTS to nationals of aid recipient countries receiving education or training at home or abroad; and b) payments to consultants, advisers and similar personnel as well as teachers and administrators serving in recipient countries (including the cost of associated equipment). Assistance of this kind provided specifically to facilitate the implementation of a capital project is included indistinguishably among bilateral project and programme expenditures, and is omitted from technical co-operation in statistics of aggregate flows.

**TIED AID:** Official GRANTS or LOANS where procurement of the goods or services involved is limited to the donor country or to a group of countries which does not include substantially all aid recipient countries. Tied aid loans, credits and ASSOCIATED FINANCING packages are subject to certain disciplines concerning their CONCESSIONALITY LEVELS, the countries to which they may be directed, and their developmental relevance so as to avoid using aid funds on projects that would be commercially viable with market finance, and to ensure that recipient countries receive good value. Details are given in the *Development Co-operation Reports* for 1987 (pp. 177-181) and 1992 (pp. 10-11).

**TOTAL RECEIPTS:** The inflow of resources to aid recipient countries includes, in addition to ODF, official and private EXPORT CREDITS, and LONG- and SHORT-TERM private transactions (see PRIVATE FLOWS). Total receipts are measured net of AMORTISATION payments and repatriation of capital by private investors. **Bilateral** flows are provided directly by a donor country to an aid recipient country. **Multilateral** flows are channelled via an international organisation active in development (*e.g.* World Bank, UNDP). In tables showing total receipts of recipient countries, the outflows of multilateral agencies to those countries is shown, not the contributions which the agencies received from donors.

**UNDISBURSED:** Describes amounts committed but not yet spent. See also COMMITMENT, DISBURSEMENT.

**UNTIED AID:** Official Development Assistance for which the associated goods and services may be fully and freely procured in substantially all countries.

**VOLUME (real terms):** The flow data in this publication are expressed in US dollars (USD). To give a truer idea of the volume of flows over time, some data are presented in constant prices and exchange rates, with a reference year specified. This means that adjustment has been made to cover both inflation in the donor's currency between the year in question and the reference year, and changes in the exchange rate between that currency and the United States dollar over the same period. A table of combined conversion factors (deflators) is provided in the Statistical Annex (Table 36) which allows any figure in the Report in current USD to be converted to dollars of the reference year ("constant prices").

## Notes on Definitions and Measurement

The coverage of the data presented in this Report has changed in recent years. The main points are:

### **Changes in the ODA concept and the coverage of GNI**

While the definition of Official Development Assistance has not changed since 1972, some changes in interpretation have tended to broaden the scope of the concept. The main ones are the recording of administrative costs as ODA (from 1979), the imputation as ODA of the share of subsidies to educational systems representing the cost of educating students from aid recipient countries (first specifically identified in 1984), and the inclusion of assistance provided by donor countries in the first year after the arrival of a refugee from an aid recipient country (eligible to be reported from the early 1980s but widely used only since 1991).

Precise quantification of the effects of these changes is difficult because changes in data collection methodology and coverage are often not directly apparent from members' statistical returns. The amounts involved can, however, be substantial. For example, reporting by Canada in 1993 included for the first time a figure for in-Canada refugee support. The amount involved (USD 184 m) represented almost 8% of total Canadian ODA. Aid flows reported by Australia in the late 1980s, it has been estimated, were some 12% higher than had they been calculated according to the rules and procedures applying fifteen years earlier.\*

The coverage of national income has also been expanding through the inclusion of new areas of economic activity and the improvement of collection methods. In particular, the 1993 System of National Accounts (SNA) co-sponsored by the OECD and other major international organisations broadens the coverage of GNP, now renamed GNI – Gross National Income. This tends to depress donors' ODA/GNI ratios. Norway's and Denmark's ODA/GNI ratios declined by 6 to 8% as a result of moving to the new SNA in the mid-1990s. Finland and Australia later showed smaller falls of 2 to 4%, while some other countries showed little change. The average fall has been about 3%. All DAC members are now using the new SNA.

### **Recipient country coverage**

Since 1990, the following entities have been added to the list of ODA recipients at the dates shown: the Black Communities of South Africa (1991 – now simply South Africa); Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan (1992); Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan (1993), Palestinian Administered Areas (1994), Moldova (1997); Belarus, Libya and Ukraine (2005).

\* S. Scott, "Some Aspects of the 1988/89 Aid Budget", in *Quarterly Aid Round-up*, No. 6, AIDAB, Canberra, 1989, pp. 11-18.

Over the same period, the following countries and territories were removed from the list of ODA recipients at the dates shown: Portugal (1991); French Guyana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Réunion and St Pierre and Miquelon (1992); Greece (1994); Bahamas, Brunei, Kuwait, Qatar, Singapore and United Arab Emirates (1996); Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Chinese Taipei, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Hong Kong (China), and Israel (1997); Aruba, the British Virgin Islands, French Polynesia, Gibraltar, Korea, Libya, Macao, Netherlands Antilles, New Caledonia and the Northern Marianas (2000); Malta and Slovenia (2003); Bahrain (2005).

From 1993 to 2004, several CEEC/NIS countries in transition and more advanced developing countries were included on a separate list of recipients of "Official Aid". This list has now been abolished.

### ***Donor country coverage***

Spain and Portugal joined the DAC in 1991, Luxembourg joined in 1992 and Greece joined in 1999. Their assistance is now counted within the DAC total. ODA flows from these countries before they joined the DAC have been added to earlier years' data where available. The accession of new members has added to total DAC ODA, but has usually reduced the overall ODA/GNI ratio, since their programmes are often smaller in relation to GNI than those of the longer-established donors.

### ***Treatment of debt forgiveness***

The treatment of the forgiveness of loans not originally reported as ODA varied in earlier years. Up to and including 1992, where forgiveness of non-ODA debt met the tests of ODA it was reportable as ODA. From 1990 to 1992 inclusive it remained reportable as part of a country's ODA, but was excluded from the DAC total. The amounts so treated are shown in the table below. From 1993, forgiveness of debt originally intended for military purposes has been reportable as "Other Official Flows", whereas forgiveness of other non-ODA loans (mainly export credits) recorded as ODA is included both in country data and in total DAC ODA in the same way as it was until 1989.

The forgiveness of outstanding loan principal originally reported as ODA does not give rise to a new net disbursement of ODA. Statistically, the benefit is reflected in the fact that because the cancelled repayments will not take place, net ODA disbursements will not be reduced.

**Debt forgiveness of non-ODA claims<sup>1</sup>**

USD million

	1990	1991	1992
Australia	–	–	4.2
Austria	–	4.2	25.3
Belgium	–	–	30.2
France	294.0	–	108.5
Germany	–	–	620.4
Japan	15.0	6.8	32.0
Netherlands	12.0	–	11.4
Norway	–	–	46.8
Sweden	5.0	–	7.1
United Kingdom	8.0	17.0	90.4
United States	1 200.0	1 855.0	894.0
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>1 534.0</b>	<b>1 882.9</b>	<b>1 870.2</b>

1. These data are included in the ODA figures of individual countries but are excluded from DAC total ODA in all tables showing performance by donor. See Notes on Definitions and Measurement.

**Reporting Year**

All data in this publication refer to calendar years, unless otherwise stated.

### DAC List of ODA Recipients – As at 1 January 2006

Least Developed Countries	Other Low Income Countries (per capita GNI < \$825 in 2004)	Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories (per capita GNI \$826-\$3 255 in 2004)	Upper Middle Income Countries and Territories (per capita GNI \$3 256-\$10 065 in 2004)
Afghanistan	Cameroon	Albania	•Anguilla
Angola	Congo, Rep.	Algeria	Antigua and Barbuda
Bangladesh	Côte d'Ivoire	Armenia	Argentina
Benin	Ghana	Azerbaijan	Barbados
Bhutan	India	Belarus	Belize
Burkina Faso	Kenya	Bolivia	Botswana
Burundi	Korea, Dem.Rep.	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Chile
Cambodia	Kyrgyz Rep.	Brazil	Cook Islands
Cape Verde	Moldova	China	Costa Rica
Central African Rep.	Mongolia	Colombia	Croatia
Chad	Nicaragua	Cuba	Dominica
Comoros	Nigeria	Dominican Republic	Gabon
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Pakistan	Ecuador	Grenada
Djibouti	Papua New Guinea	Egypt	Lebanon
Equatorial Guinea	Tajikistan	El Salvador	Libya
Eritrea	Uzbekistan	Fiji	Malaysia
Ethiopia	Viet Nam	Georgia	Mauritius
Gambia	Zimbabwe	Guatemala	•Mayotte
Guinea		Guyana	Mexico
Guinea-Bissau		Honduras	•Montserrat
Haiti		Indonesia	Nauru
Kiribati		Iran	Oman
Laos		Iraq	Palau
Lesotho		Jamaica	Panama
Liberia		Jordan	Saudi Arabia <sup>1</sup>
Madagascar		Kazakhstan	Seychelles
Malawi		Macedonia, former Yugoslav Rep. of	South Africa
Maldives		Marshall Islands	•St. Helena
Mali		Micronesia, Fed. States	St. Kitts-Nevis
Mauritania		Montenegro	St. Lucia
Mozambique		Morocco	St. Vincent and Grenadines
Myanmar		Namibia	Trinidad and Tobago
Nepal		Niue	Turkey
Niger		Palestinian Adm. Areas	•Turks and Caicos Islands
Rwanda		Paraguay	Uruguay
Samoa		Peru	Venezuela
Sao Tome and Principe		Philippines	
Senegal		Serbia	
Sierra Leone		Sri Lanka	
Solomon Islands		Suriname	
Somalia		Swaziland	
Sudan		Syria	
Tanzania		Thailand	
Timor-Leste		•Tokelau	
Togo		Tonga	
Tuvalu		Tunisia	
Uganda		Turkmenistan	
Vanuatu		Ukraine	
Yemen		•Wallis and Futuna	
Zambia			

• Territory.

1. Saudi Arabia passed the high income country threshold in 2004. In accordance with the DAC rules for revision of this List, it will graduate from the List in 2008 if it remains a high income country in 2005 and 2006.

As of October 2007, the **Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs)** are: Afghanistan, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo (Dem. Rep.), Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Kyrgyz Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda and Zambia.

OECD PUBLICATIONS, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16  
PRINTED IN FRANCE  
(43 2008 01 1 P) ISBN 978-92-64-04147-9 – No. 55999 2008

**OECD Journal on Development, Volume 9, No. 1**

## **Development Co-operation Report 2007**

The *Development Co-operation Report*, issued by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), is the key annual reference document for statistics and analysis on the latest trends in international aid.

Five years ago, in his first Report as DAC Chair, Richard Manning proposed a dozen indicators to measure the development community's efforts to reduce poverty. This year, in his last year as Chair of the DAC, Manning takes a step back and assesses how the world has actually fared: "Overall, we are seeing clear signs of robust though uneven progress in many countries [...]; the annual number of infant and child deaths appears finally to have fallen below 10 million." How did this come about? Manning explores the reasons for this encouraging news, pointing to lessons to be learned about strategy, organisational management and the way aid is delivered. The Report also describes ongoing efforts to put the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness into practice, with a particular focus on health.

The DAC prides itself on being the definitive source of bilateral statistics on the global aid effort, including DAC members and other donors. This Report offers an overview of the full scope of the work undertaken by the DAC, demonstrating why this is the place "where governments come together to make aid work".

This issue is also published on line as part of our efforts to improve the accessibility of key OECD DAC work. This way, we can respond to the needs of the aid community by giving prompt and easy access to the best available analyses and statistics.

This book is available via SourceOECD: [www.SourceOECD.org/developmentreport](http://www.SourceOECD.org/developmentreport).

SourceOECD is the OECD's online library of books, periodicals and statistical databases.

For more information about this award-winning service and free trials ask your librarian, or write to us at [SourceOECD@oecd.org](mailto:SourceOECD@oecd.org).

**Volume 9, No. 1**

**OECD** publishing  
[www.oecd.org/publishing](http://www.oecd.org/publishing)

ISBN 978-92-64-04147-9  
43 2008 01 1 P

