The core contribution to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was incorrect at £82.5m – this has been corrected to £55m – a decrease of £27.5m. When compared to total UK ODA this error accounts for 0.2 per cent of UK ODA and is therefore considered minor.

This figure has been corrected for UNDP in the individual tables (Table 7 on page 41, and in Excel files for Table 7, A8 and A11) - overall totals and ODA figures / have not been revised. These will be corrected in the next release of UK ODA in the ‘Provisional ODA as a Proportion of GNI publication’ on 2nd April 2015.

For more information, please contact: statistics@dfid.gov.uk
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Key Facts

UK Official Development Assistance (ODA) up 30.2 per cent in 2013 – an increase of £2,660m

UK second largest OECD DAC donor in volume terms spending £11,462m on ODA in 2013. The largest donor in volume terms was the USA

DFID spent 87.8 per cent of UK ODA in 2013

If you base the ODA:GNI ratio on the GNI methodology used to plan spending the ratio is 0.71, if you base the ratio on the current headline measure of GNI then the ratio is 0.67

The top three recipients of UK Net Bilateral ODA in 2013 were Pakistan (£338m), Ethiopia (£329m), and Bangladesh (£272m).

Africa region received the largest amount of UK Net Bilateral ODA, £2,509 million in 2013, an increase of 15.4 per cent on 2012

Multilateral ODA up to 41.2 per cent of all UK ODA in 2013 – increase from 36.8 per cent 2012. Organisations who received most UK Multilateral ODA are:

1. International Development Association (£1,112m),
2. European Commission (£813m),
3. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (£543m)
Introduction
Statistics on International Development (SID) is an annual publication that provides an overview of official UK spend on international development. The publication is the official release of finalised 2013 estimates, updating the previous provisional estimates\(^1\) published in April 2014. The publication covers:

- Total UK spend on international development for the 2013 calendar year;
- Trends for the last five years;
- Key breakdowns by destination country or organisation, type of assistance and purpose;
- International comparisons of spend on international development.

The publication focuses on the key international measure of aid spend, known as Official Development Assistance (ODA). Box 1 explains the definition of ODA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1: Official Development Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official Development Assistance (ODA) is produced according to standardised definitions and methodologies controlled by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). ODA is defined as resource flows to developing countries and multilateral organisations, which are provided by official agencies (e.g. the UK Government) or their executive agencies, and each transaction meets the following tests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is concessional in character and conveys a grant element of at least 25 per cent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A glossary explaining key terms used throughout this report is available in Annex 1. *

Supporting Information
Annexes to the publication are available in a separate document which includes the following supporting information to help users understand and use the statistics:

- Guide to understanding aid statistics – this describes the key definitions used in the publication, such as bilateral/multilateral aid, aid types and sector expenditure (Annex 1);
- Glossary of terms used throughout the publication (Annex 2);
- Summary of data sources used to produce SID (Annex 3);

The data tables included in the publication are available to download in spreadsheet format, and a full dataset in CSV and SPSS are available on the DFID Statistics on International Development 2014 webpage.

**Changes to this Publication**

This year’s publication continues to focus on ODA in response to 2012 and 2013 user consultations. Figures showing Gross Public Expenditure (GPEX) on development will be available as additional tables. Key changes to this year’s publication include:

- Improved structure of the publication with more detailed analysis of regional and country breakdowns, sector breakdowns and official agencies.
- A new section on multilateral aid to give users more insight into the multilateral organisations that the UK funds.
- Improved graphics and data visualisation including maps.
- Refined data tables which more accurately support the commentary and analysis.
- A full ODA dataset will be released in CSV format and other formats so specialist users can analyse the microdata themselves.
- Hyperlinks to navigate between sections; reducing the size of the publication, to focus on key areas of analysis, and linking out to supporting annexes and guides; removing large tables from the publication and making available online; providing all tables in one Microsoft Excel workbook (as well as CSV versions).

These changes were made in response to the results from our user consultation and feedback received from our aid statistics seminar at the Royal Statistical Society. If there are any tables or data missing from this publication that you need for your own analysis as a consequence of these changes, or if you have any thoughts about how to improve the publication, please contact the statistics team at: statistics@dfid.gov.uk
1. UK ODA Flows

This section provides an overview of UK ODA. It covers the overall changes in value of UK ODA, changes to the Gross National Income (GNI) methodology which affect the ODA:GNI ratio, breakdown of ODA spend by channel of delivery and a breakdown of UK ODA spend by official agencies of the UK.

1.1 UK ODA 2013 and the ODA:GNI ratio

As shown in Table 2 and Figure 1, total UK ODA has increased by 30.2 per cent (£2,660 million) between 2012 and 2013, up from £8,802 million to £11,462 million – the largest increase since the ODA definition was first introduced.

The UK government has made a commitment to invest 0.7 per cent of Gross National Income on Official Development Assistance by 2013. The ODA:GNI target of 0.7 per cent was first agreed internationally in 1970 by the United Nations General Assembly. In May 2005, EU member states pledged to meet the 0.7 per cent target by 2015, with a collective EU target milestone of 0.56 per cent by 2010. In the 2004 Spending Review, the UK Government set an earlier target date, to increase total UK Overseas Development Assistance to 0.7 per cent of GNI by 2013. This target for 2013 has been re-endorsed by successive administrations with the 2010 Spending

---

2 See Table C1 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014

3 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20071204130111/http:/hm-treasury.gov.uk/spending_review/spend_sr04/spend_sr04_index.cfm
Review including funding to increase ODA to 0.7 per cent from 2013. This publication reports the latest statistics for the 2013 calendar year.

In April 2014, DFID published\(^4\) a provisional estimate that showed the ODA:GNI ratio in 2013 was 0.72 per cent. This was based on a provisional DFID estimate for ODA of £11.4 billion, and the latest Office for National Statistics (ONS) estimate for GNI of £1,593.4 billion. This estimate of GNI was based on the relevant international standards for National Accounts that applied at the time – the European System of Accounts 1995 (ESA95). Since the provisional ODA:GNI ratio was published in April, we have produced an updated estimate for ODA, taking account of new data that has become available. The new estimate for ODA in 2013 is £11.5 billion. This is 0.2 per cent higher than the provisional estimate\(^5\), although that increase, on its own, would not change the ODA:GNI ratio from 0.72 per cent.

Since the provisional ODA:GNI was published, ONS has made two types of changes to its estimate of GNI based on the ESA95 standards:

- Firstly, new data changes and other improvements have increased the estimate of GNI by £28.7\(^6\) billion, up from £1,593.4 billion to £1,622.2 billion. The higher estimate of GNI results in a lower estimate of the ODA:GNI ratio, down from 0.72 per cent to 0.71 per cent.
- Secondly, ONS has introduced a number of methodology changes to address reservations that had been placed on the GNI estimates. This increases the estimate of GNI by a further £45.6 billion, to produce a new estimate of GNI of £1,667.8 billion. This revised estimate of GNI (ESA95) produces a lower ODA:GNI ratio of 0.69 per cent.

In addition, ONS has produced a new estimate of GNI based on the updated European System of Accounts 2010 (ESA2010). ESA2010 is based on the revised international standard for National Accounts, the System of National Accounts 2008 (SNA08). ONS estimate that, according to the new ESA2010 standards, UK GNI was £1,700.2 billion in 2013. This is £32.4 billion higher than GNI based on the updated

---


\(^5\) Note: Provisional estimates are based on aggregated figures received from Official Agencies of the UK government. Finalised ODA figures are based on final outturn ODA data built up from activity level data returned from Official Agencies of the UK government and are quality assured by DFID and the OECD.

\(^6\) Note – may not add exactly due to rounding – see table 1 for more accurate figures
ESA95. Using the ESA2010 estimate for GNI produces an ODA:GNI ratio of 0.67 per cent in 2013.

Table 1 summarises the different GNI estimates that have resulted from the various changes that ONS has made since the provisional ODA:GNI ratio was published in April. It also shows the ODA:GNI ratio associated with each of the different GNI estimates.

**Table 1: GNI estimates for 2013 and implied ODA:GNI ratios; current prices, £m**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GNI (£m)</th>
<th>ODA (£m)</th>
<th>ODA:GNI ratios (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNI (ESA95) used for provisional ODA:GNI ratio, April 2014</td>
<td>1,593,448</td>
<td>11,437</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on GNI of new data changes and other improvements to the methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI (ESA95) unadjusted for (Eurostat) reservations</td>
<td>1,622,166</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on GNI of addressing GNI reservations</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI (ESA95) adjusted for (Eurostat) reservations</td>
<td>1,667,761</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of differences in definitions between ESA2010 and ESA95 on GNI</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI (ESA2010)</td>
<td>1,700,170</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This was the provisional ODA estimate for 2013 based on aggregated UK figures. This has now been replaced by the final ODA estimate for 2013 - based on activity level outturn data.


Spending decisions to meet the 0.7 per cent ODA target in 2013 were made on the basis of the GNI estimates available at the time of the Spending Review in June 2010. The measure of GNI (ESA95) unadjusted for reservations shown in Table 1 above is broadly consistent with the GNI estimate available in June 2010 and in previous years. Using this measure of GNI shows an ODA:GNI ratio of 0.71 per cent for 2013.

When spending decisions for 2013 were made neither the ESA95 adjusted for reservations nor the ESA2010 GNI estimates were available. These two measures of GNI include the methodological changes which have been made to GNI by ONS. ONS’ headline estimate of GNI is now based on ESA2010, which is aligned to the most up to date international standards for National Accounts. Using this estimate of GNI shows an ODA:GNI ratio of 0.67 per cent for 2013.

---


8 The introduction of ESA 2010 was announced in November 2013, and changes to the ESA95 methodology (addressing Eurostat reservations) was announced in May 2014.
Figure 2 above shows that in 2013 there was a large increase over the year in ODA of £2,660m compared with a small increase of £173m in 2012. In terms of ODA as a proportion on GNI, this also remained relatively constant in 2012 (0.01 percentage point increase on 2011) with a larger increase in 2013 (0.11 - 0.14 percentage point increase depending on which GNI methodology is used).

1.2 UK ODA by Delivery Channel

There are two main channels of delivery for ODA: bilateral and multilateral. Bilateral ODA is earmarked spend which the donor has control over – this is usually aid going to specific countries, regions or programmes. Multilateral ODA is funds from national governments which are pooled with other donors’ funding and spent as core aid funding to multilateral organisations. Multilateral core funding is unearmarked, and may be used as the organisation thinks best, so long as it is in line with its mandate and agreed by the governing body – the donor does not have control over what this is spent on.

---

9 See Table C2 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
10 Bilateral ODA also includes funding to multilateral organisations for specific programmes / in specific countries – referred to as ‘bilateral through a multilateral’ in this document.
• Table 2 shows that between 2012 and 2013 Multilateral ODA increased by £1,475 million (45.5 per cent) compared to Bilateral ODA which increased by £1,185 million (21.3 per cent).

• Figure 3 shows that in 2013, 41.2 per cent of UK ODA was Multilateral ODA, compared to 36.8 per cent in 2012.

• In 2013, 58.8 per cent of UK ODA was Bilateral ODA compared to 63.2 per cent in 2012.

Figure 3: UK ODA by Delivery Channel, 2012 - 2013\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{UK ODA by Delivery Channel, 2012 - 2013}
\end{figure}

1.3 Makeup of UK ODA by Official Agency

• Table 3 shows that in 2013, DFID spent 87.8 per cent of UK ODA, an increase of 1.1 percentage points on 2012.

• Between 2012 and 2013 the value of UK ODA which was spent by DFID has increased by £2,434 million.

• Between 2012 and 2013 the value of UK ODA which was spent by Official Agencies\textsuperscript{12} other than DFID has increased by £226 million.

• Figure 4 shows that in 2013 the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) overtook the Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO) as the largest ODA spender after DFID, spending £412m or 3.6 per cent of UK ODA.

\textsuperscript{11}See Table 2 for underlying data
\textsuperscript{12}Official Agencies is the OECD’s terminology that refers to all agencies which contribute to the donor countries' final ODA figure. For the UK, Official Agencies refer to UK government departments, devolved administrations and specialist agencies. For a full list of these please see table 3a.
Other Official Agencies includes Department of Health, Scottish Government, Department for Work and Pensions, Ministry of Defence, Department for Culture, Media and Sports and Welsh Government

See Table 3 for underlying data
**Table 2: Total UK Net ODA\(^1\): by Delivery Channel (Bilateral, Multilateral) 2009, 2012 and 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£m % total ODA</th>
<th>£m % total ODA</th>
<th>£m % total ODA</th>
<th>£m % total ODA</th>
<th>Change since 2009</th>
<th>Change since 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bilateral ODA</strong></td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>6,745</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: bilateral through multilateral</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Multilateral ODA</strong></td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>3,242</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ODA</strong></td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>8,802</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figures may not sum to totals due to roundings.
Table 3: Breakdown of UK Net ODA\(^1\): by official agency
2009, 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordered by 2013 ODA(^2)</th>
<th>£ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department for International Development</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>% UK ODA</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>% UK ODA</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>% UK ODA</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>% £m</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign &amp; Commonwealth Office</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Business, Innovation and Skills</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Credits Guarantee Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sports</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-48.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Sources of UK ODA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Pool (non - DFID)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Attribution (non - DFID)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Capital Partners PLC</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Aid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Pensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous(^3)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total UK Net ODA                         | 7,301| 100.0% | 8,802| 100.0% | 11,462| 100.0% | 4,161| 57.0%| 2,660| 30.2%|

1. Figures may not sum to totals due to roundings.
2. It is not possible to compare changes in Official Agencies ODA spend from 2009 other than DFID. Please see footnote 3 below for more details.
3. Prior to 2012 some official agencies listed above were categorised as ‘miscellaneous’ for the purposes of reporting to the OECD DAC. This does not include DFID spend. For 2009 it is currently not possible to identify individual agencies from the ‘miscellaneous’ category. We will consider ways to attribute spend across Official Agencies prior to the Statistics on International Development 2015.
2. Comparisons between UK and other International Donors

2.1 ODA Flows by DAC Donors

The analysis below is based on the provisional\(^\text{15}\) ODA data for 2013 from all Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Members except for the UK - where final ODA data is used. This is because the OECD has only published provisional ODA figures for other DAC Members – final data will be published around December 2014. The UK can present final ODA figures since we have collected and quality assured these numbers.

It should also be noted that all DAC donors are currently transitioning their GNI methodologies from SNA93 to SNA2008 (EU Member States use the equivalent European standards, ESA95 and ESA2010, which are based on the international SNA standards). Most DAC Members use SNA93/ESA95 for their provisional estimates. The only Members who have moved to using SNA 2008 are: Australia, Canada and the US. The impact of this change is a net increase in GNI for each of these countries due to the new methodology\(^\text{16}\) used for calculating it which will have a downward impact on their ODA:GNI ratio. Data is not currently available from the OECD on both methodologies.

Figure 5 shows that the UK gave the second highest amount of ODA in absolute terms in 2013. The largest donor in absolute terms was the USA, despite its relatively low ODA:GNI ratio. More than 60 per cent of total DAC ODA in 2013 was provided by the five largest donors in absolute terms – USA, UK, Germany, Japan and France. The UK contributed 13.3 per cent of total DAC ODA in 2013, up from 11.0 per cent in 2012\(^\text{17}\). Total ODA from DAC donors in 2013 was £86,264m, representing an increase of 7.6 per cent from £80,153m in 2012\(^\text{17}\).

\(^{15}\)To give an idea of impact of using provisional figures, DAC Members provisional net ODA for 2012 was $125.6 billion. This increased to $126.8 billion for final 2012 net ODA – around a 1 per cent increase. Therefore, provisional ODA figures is a relatively accurate proxy for final ODA figures for 2012 data.


\(^{17}\)The total DAC ODA figure for 2012 used here is based on ODA during 2012 from all current DAC donors, including those which became DAC Members during 2013. Data source: OECD DAC website (http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=TABLE1#), accessed on 10/10/14.
Figure 5: Provisional Net ODA from DAC Donors, 2013

Note: Figures for the UK are final, all others are provisional. Estimates for Australia, Canada and the US are based on the SNA2008 methodology; estimates for all other countries are based on the SNA93/ESA95 methodology.

2.2 ODA:GNI Ratios by DAC Donors

Figure 6 shows that in terms of the ODA:GNI ratio, the UK was the fifth largest donor of all DAC countries in 2013. The ODA:GNI ratio in 2013 varied widely amongst DAC donor countries. Norway has the highest GNI:ODA ratio (1.07 per cent), closely followed by Sweden, Luxembourg, Denmark and then the UK. The five countries with the lowest ODA:GNI ratio in 2013 included four countries which became new DAC members in 2013 – the Slovak Republic, Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovenia – in addition to Greece.

---

18 For all DAC donor countries except the UK, provisional 2013 ODA:GNI ratios, net ODA and proportion of bilateral and multilateral ODA were sourced from: OECD DAC website (http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=TABLE1#), accessed on 10/10/14. UK 2013 data is based on final ODA outturn 2013.

19 See Table C3 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
2.3 ODA Flows by DAC Donor and Delivery Channel

Figure 3 shows that in 2013, 58.8 per cent of the UK’s ODA was Bilateral ODA, while 41.2 per cent was Multilateral ODA. For comparison 69.1 per cent of total DAC ODA in 2013 was delivered bilaterally, and 30.9 per cent was Multilateral ODA. The percentage of ODA given as bilateral and multilateral aid varied between donors as shown in Figure 7. Some countries, such as Australia and the USA, delivered a large majority of their aid bilaterally (86.0 and 83.9 per cent respectively). In contrast, other countries channeled most of their ODA through multilaterals - for example, both the Slovak Republic and Italy gave around 80 per cent of their aid as Multilateral ODA. Generally, EU member countries give a higher percentage of their aid as Multilateral ODA than non-EU countries, in part due to their contributions to EU institutions.

---

20 Provisional ODA:GNI ratios for Australia, Canada and the USA are based on the ESA2010 GNI methodology. For the UK, ratios are shown on the basis of the ESA95, updated ESA95 and ESA2010 GNI methodologies. For all other DAC countries, ratios are based on ESA95 GNI methodology.

21 See Table C4 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
Figure 7: Bilateral and Multilateral ODA from DAC Donors as a Percentage of Provisional Net ODA, 2013

2.4 Total DAC ODA Flows by Recipient Country

Figure 8 shows that total DAC donor ODA spend is concentrated in Africa and Asia. Of the 2012 ODA which could be allocated to a specific country or region, Africa

---

22 See Table C5 for underlying data in the accompanying ‘Statistics on International Development 2014 Complete Tables’

23 The latest available data for total DAC ODA by recipient region and country is for 2012. UK ODA data by recipient region and country used here is also for 2012 for comparison. Total
received the largest percentage of both total DAC (47.7 per cent) and UK (58.0 per cent) ODA. This was followed by Asia, which received roughly the same percentage of total DAC and UK ODA (35.8 and 36.6 per cent respectively). The Americas received 10.4 per cent of total DAC ODA; more than double the percentage of UK ODA allocated to the Americas (4.4 per cent). Although Europe and the Pacific both received only a small percentage of total DAC and UK ODA, the percentage of total DAC ODA allocated to each region was more than three times the percentage of UK ODA (roughly 3 per cent total DAC ODA and less than 1 per cent of UK ODA each).

At a country level, the top five recipients of total DAC ODA in 2012 were Afghanistan, Vietnam, the Ivory Coast, Ethiopia and Tanzania. Afghanistan and Ethiopia were the second and third highest recipients of UK aid in 2012, while Tanzania was seventh highest. However, neither Vietnam nor the Ivory Coast featured in the top 20 countries receiving UK aid in 2012. India received the most ODA from the UK in 2012, and was the ninth highest recipient of total DAC ODA.

Figure 8: Map of Total DAC Members ODA Spend by Country, 2012

DAC and UK ODA data were sourced from the OECD DAC website (http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=TABLE1#, accessed on 13/10/14). See Table C6 for underlying data in the accompanying ‘Statistics on International Development 2014 Complete Tables’
3. Analysis of UK ODA spend

This section explores UK ODA in more detail and examines the UK’s bilateral and multilateral spend (please see Annex 1 for the definition of bilateral and multilateral aid). The change in the percentage of total ODA being delivered through multilateral and bilateral channels between 2009 and 2013 is first examined in section 3.1 below. The flow of bilateral spend to regions and countries is then examined in section 3.2 followed by a breakdown of bilateral spend by sector in section 3.3. Finally, section 3.4 provides more detailed analysis of core multilateral spend.

3.1. Total ODA by Delivery Channel Over Time

Figure 9 shows the breakdown of UK ODA into bilateral and multilateral delivery channels, and the percentage of total UK spending classified as multilateral ODA [Table 2 above and Additional Table A1a25].

- UK Bilateral ODA increased gradually between 2009 and 2012, before rising sharply in 2013, to £6,745 million.
- UK Multilateral ODA rose from £2,497 million in 2009 to £3,339 million in 2010; remaining at around this level until 2012. Between 2012 and 2013, UK Multilateral ODA increased by £1,475 million (45.5 per cent) to £4,717 million.
- Following a slight fall in 2012, the percentage of UK spending that was classified as multilateral ODA rose in 2013, increasing by 4.3 percentage points to 41.2 per cent.

25 Additional tables can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statistics-on-international-development-2014
3.2 Regional / Country Breakdowns of Bilateral ODA Spend

Bilateral ODA includes all spend that does not take the form of a core contribution to a multilateral organisation. This includes spend to a specific country or region as well as either spend which cannot be assigned a single benefitting country or region (for example a programme with multiple benefitting countries across multiple regions), or spend for which the benefitting country or region is not yet known (for example contributions to programmes run by multilaterals who may not report on the benefitting country until the end of the programme).

3.2.1 Bilateral ODA spend by region

In 2013, 68.7 per cent of the UK’s bilateral aid was provided to a specific country or region. The remaining 31.3 per cent of bilateral aid was made up of spend where there was no single benefitting country or region – this is discussed in section 3.2.4. Figure 10 shows UK Bilateral ODA by region in 2013 (for detailed breakdowns of spend by country (grouped by region) please see Additional Tables A4a to A4e). It is important to note that this does not capture the full UK ODA expenditure in each

---

26 See Table 2 for underlying data
region as it does not include expenditure by multilaterals or spend where we cannot
directly assign the spend to a specific country.

- In 2013 the UK provided bilateral assistance to five regions; Africa, the
  Americas, Asia, Europe and the Pacific.
- Africa received the largest percentage of UK Bilateral ODA expenditure,
  which could be assigned to a single region (54.1 per cent), equating to £2,509
  million.
- This was followed by Asia which received 42.1 per cent (or £1,950 million) of
  UK Bilateral ODA, the Americas which received 3.2 per cent (or £148 million),
  Europe which received 0.5 per cent (or £24 million) and the Pacific which
  received less than 0.5 per cent (or £6 million).
- Africa also received the largest percentage of UK Bilateral ODA spent through
  multilateral organisations in 2013, at 48.1 per cent (£736 million), followed by
  Asia (47.6 per cent), the Americas (4.1 per cent) with Europe and the Pacific
  both receiving less than 1 per cent [Additional Table A5].

**Figure 10: Percentage Breakdown of Country or Region Specific Bilateral ODA by Region, 2013**

![Percentage Breakdown of Country or Region Specific Bilateral ODA by Region, 2013](image)

27 See Table 4 for underlying data
Changes in the Regional Flow of UK Bilateral ODA
Figures 11 and 12 and Table 4 show the flows of UK bilateral ODA to the different regions over the last five years.

- UK Bilateral ODA to Africa has been on an increasing trajectory since 2009 increasing from £1,803 million to £2,509 million in 2013.
- Between 2009 and 2012 ODA to Asia remained at a similar level with small increases each year from 2010 to 2012. Between 2012 and 2013, Asia experienced the largest percentage increase in UK Bilateral ODA across all regions, where spend increased by £577 million (42.1 per cent).
- Between 2012 and 2013, the increase in Bilateral ODA to Asia was driven by an increase of £604 million (55.9 per cent) in DFID’s Bilateral ODA to Asia (compared with a £27 million (9.3 per cent) decrease in other official agency’s ODA to Asia). The Middle East region, Pakistan, Syria and Bangladesh experienced the largest increases of all countries or regions in Asia totalling £474 million (see Additional Table A4b for a full breakdown of bilateral ODA to Asia by country) and was due, in part, to the provision of humanitarian aid to Syria and the wider Middle East region, which totalled £275 million.
- Between 2009 and 2013 UK Bilateral ODA to the Americas increased from £87 million to £148 million (70.8 per cent). This was driven by an increase of £60 million in non-DFID Bilateral ODA to the region between 2009 and 2013 (compared with a £1 million increase in DFID’s ODA to the Americas). Although this represents the largest percentage increase of all regions, it is important to note that the value of ODA to the Americas was, and has remained, low relative to the value of ODA to Africa and Asia.
- Between 2012 and 2013 UK Bilateral ODA to the Americas reduced by 9.7 per cent. This was largely due to a reduction of £41 million in bilateral aid from official agencies other than DFID to Brazil.
- Bilateral ODA to the Pacific and Europe has remained at relatively low levels since 2009. Between 2009 and 2012, both Europe and the Pacific experienced a small increase of £1 million and £2 million respectively. Between 2012 and 2013 the Pacific has received the same level of ODA (around £6 million). Europe, on the other hand, has experienced a 24.5 per cent reduction between 2012 and 2013, reducing its ODA from £32 million to £24 million.
Figure 11: Country or Region Specific Bilateral ODA by region, 2009 - 2013

See Table 4 for underlying data

Figure 12: Change in UK country or region specific bilateral ODA spend since 2009 and 2012: by region

See Table 4 for underlying data
Table 4: Total UK Net Country-Specific Bilateral ODA\(^1\): by official agency and region
2009 – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change since 2009 £</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Change since 2012 £</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Country Specific Bilateral ODA</td>
<td>3,323,112</td>
<td>3,447,032</td>
<td>3,589,306</td>
<td>3,747,893</td>
<td>4,636,278</td>
<td>1,313,166</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>888,385</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1,802,937</td>
<td>1,990,243</td>
<td>2,126,292</td>
<td>2,174,060</td>
<td>2,508,622</td>
<td>705,885</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>334,762</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>86,502</td>
<td>81,528</td>
<td>102,089</td>
<td>163,624</td>
<td>147,725</td>
<td>61,223</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>-15,898</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,399,224</td>
<td>1,334,050</td>
<td>1,339,085</td>
<td>1,372,750</td>
<td>1,950,102</td>
<td>550,879</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>577,352</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>30,737</td>
<td>36,708</td>
<td>19,354</td>
<td>31,863</td>
<td>24,060</td>
<td>-6,677</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
<td>-7,862</td>
<td>-24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3,712</td>
<td>4,503</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>5,597</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Figures may not sum to totals due to roundings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: DFID Country Specific Bilateral</td>
<td>2,968,459</td>
<td>2,928,165</td>
<td>3,195,190</td>
<td>3,193,851</td>
<td>4,088,404</td>
<td>1,219,945</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>894,553</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1,626,990</td>
<td>1,824,690</td>
<td>1,915,681</td>
<td>2,060,535</td>
<td>2,340,750</td>
<td>713,760</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>280,216</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>58,518</td>
<td>51,735</td>
<td>56,754</td>
<td>45,063</td>
<td>59,545</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>14,482</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1,168,489</td>
<td>1,025,073</td>
<td>1,213,769</td>
<td>1,080,345</td>
<td>1,684,748</td>
<td>516,259</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>604,403</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>11,339</td>
<td>23,560</td>
<td>6,866</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>-11,158</td>
<td>-98.4%</td>
<td>-4,529</td>
<td>-96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Non-DFID Country Specific Bilateral</td>
<td>454,653</td>
<td>3,323,112</td>
<td>394,116</td>
<td>554,042</td>
<td>547,874</td>
<td>93,221</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>-6,167</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>175,947</td>
<td>165,553</td>
<td>210,611</td>
<td>113,526</td>
<td>168,071</td>
<td>-7,876</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>54,546</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>27,985</td>
<td>29,793</td>
<td>45,334</td>
<td>118,561</td>
<td>88,181</td>
<td>60,196</td>
<td>215.1%</td>
<td>-30,380</td>
<td>-25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>230,734</td>
<td>308,977</td>
<td>125,316</td>
<td>292,405</td>
<td>265,354</td>
<td>34,620</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>-27,051</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>19,399</td>
<td>13,148</td>
<td>12,488</td>
<td>27,153</td>
<td>23,880</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>-3,273</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>305.9%</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.2 Bilateral ODA spend by Country

In 2013, the UK provided bilateral assistance to 143 countries. Table 5 highlights the top 20 recipients of UK Bilateral ODA in 2009, 2012 and 2013. For a full breakdown of bilateral ODA by country please see Additional Tables A4a to A4e

- In 2013 71.4 per cent of the UK’s Bilateral ODA to a specific country or region was spent in the top 20 recipient countries. This is a slight reduction from 2009 and 2012 when 74.5 per cent and 74.6 per cent of specific country or region Bilateral ODA was spent in the top 20 recipient countries, respectively. This indicates a greater spread of Bilateral ODA across all countries in 2013 compared with previous years.
- In 2013 just under two thirds (64.3 per cent) of Bilateral ODA to the top 20 recipients went to low income countries. This is an increase from 2009 when 60.1 per cent of Bilateral ODA to the top 20 recipients went to low income countries but a decrease from 2012 when 70.0 per cent went to low income countries.
- In 2013 the top three recipients of UK Bilateral ODA were Pakistan (£338 million), Ethiopia (£329 million) and Bangladesh (£272 million).
- Ethiopia, Bangladesh and India were each in the top five recipients five years ago (in 2009) and remained so in 2012 and 2013. For the first time, however, India did not receive the most Bilateral ODA in 2013, dropping to fourth

Case study: Pakistan
- Approximately 66 million Pakistanis live in poverty
- The population is set to rise by 50% in less than 40 years
- In 2013, the main increase in spend was across Education and Poverty, Hunger and Vulnerability sectors.

Table 5: Top 20 Recipients by Country of UK Bilateral ODA\(^1\)
2009, 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>£ m</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>£ m</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>£ m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>West Bank &amp; Gaza Strip</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: Top 20 Recipient Countries: 2,475 £ m, 2,794 £ m, 3,312 £ m
Total: Least Developed and Low Income Countries: 1,511 £ m, 1,957 £ m, 2,130 £ m
Total: Country-Specific UK Bilateral ODA: 3,323 £ m, 3,748 £ m, 4,636 £ m
Proportion of Total Country-Specific Bilateral to Top 20: 74.5%, 74.6%, 71.4%
Proportion of Top 20 Bilateral to Low Income Countries: 61.0%, 70.0%, 64.3%

Key

- Least Developed Countries
- Lower Middle Income Countries
- Other Low Income Countries
- Upper Middle Income Countries

1. Figures may not sum to totals due to roundings.

Taking the population of each recipient country into account and examining ODA on a per capita basis provides different results. Figures 13 and 14 below map the top ten recipient countries of ODA on a total volume basis and per capital basis\(^{31,32}\).

---

• Although Pakistan received the greatest share of Bilateral ODA in 2013, its relatively large population means that it’s ODA per capita was only £1.86.
• In contrast, Afghanistan was in sixth place in terms of receiving ODA by volume but received more bilateral ODA per capita than any other country in the top ten (£6.93).
• Of the other countries in the top ten of Bilateral ODA recipients, Syria and Kenya received the second and third largest ODA per capita (£6.07 and £3.61 respectively).

Figure 13: Map of Top Ten ODA Spend Countries on a Total Volume Basis, 2013

---

32 It is important to note that there is some uncertainty around the population estimates for countries that lack recent and reliable census data. For more information please see: http://databank.worldbank.org/data/views/reports/metadataview.aspx
33 See Table C7 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
3.2.3 Bilateral ODA Spend by Country, Region and Official Agency

Figures 15, 16 and 17 illustrate the country and regional profiles of DFID’s country specific bilateral spend versus the country and regional profiles of all other UK official agencies’ country-specific bilateral spend.

- It shows that DFID ODA spend (which is much larger) is more focussed on countries in Africa and Asia.
- Other UK official agencies’ ODA spend has a greater geographical spread, with smaller amounts in each region.
Figure 15: Breakdown of DFID's Country Specific Bilateral ODA by Region, 2013

Asia, £3,685m, 41.2%
Africa, £2,341m, 57.3%
Europe, £1m, 0.1%
Pacific, £3m, 0.1%

Figure 16: Breakdown of Other Official Agencies’ Country Specific Bilateral ODA by Region, 2013

Asia, £265m, 48.4%
Africa, £168m, 30.7%
Americas, £88m, 16.1%
Europe, £24m, 4.4%
Pacific, £2m, 0.4%

See Table 4 for underlying data
Figure 17: DFID’s and Other UK Official Agencies’ Country and Regional ODA profile

Map of Country-specific **DFID** ODA spend in 2013

Map of Country-specific **Other Official Agencies’** ODA spend in 2013

Key points

- UK provides ODA bilaterally to 143 countries with the primary purpose being the promotion of the economic development and welfare of these countries
- DFID provides most of its ODA to priority countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia
- UK Other Government Departments provide ODA in smaller amounts to a much larger spread of countries across the world

---

36 See Table C8 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
Changes in Flows of ODA by Region, Country and Official Agency

Figures 18 and 19, and Table 4 (shown on page 22) show the differences between ODA flows from DFID when compared with other UK official agencies. It is important to note the different scales used in Figures 18 and 19.

- While bilateral ODA from DFID to Africa increased by £714 million (43.9 per cent) between 2009 to 2013, ODA from other official agencies in the UK to Africa decreased by £8 million (4.5 per cent).
- While bilateral ODA from DFID to Europe decreased by £11 million (98.4 per cent) between 2009 to 2013, ODA from other official agencies in the UK to Europe increased by £4 million (23.1 per cent).
- Bilateral ODA from both DFID and other official agencies in the UK to Asia increased between 2009 and 2013. Bilateral assistance from DFID increased by £516 million (44.2 per cent) while bilateral assistance from other official agencies to Asia increased by £35m (15.0 per cent).

Figure 18: Where Country or Region-Specific Bilateral DFID ODA was spent, 2009 – 2013

Figure 19: Where Country or Region-Specific Bilateral Non-DFID ODA was spent, 2009 – 2013

See Table 4 for underlying data.
3.2.4 Bilateral ODA Spend with No Single Benefitting Country or Region

In 2013 just under one third (31.3 per cent) of bilateral aid was made up of spend where there was no single benefiting country or region. Figure 20 provides a breakdown of this spend. It shows that the largest percentage of this category (35.8 per cent) consists of contributions to specific programmes or funds managed by international organisations where only the sector may be known, or the geographical beneficiary unknown until the programme is complete. The second largest percentage of spend within this category (29.6 per cent) consists of spend on project-type interventions and includes expenditure on projects which may be multi-country or multi-region and it is not possible to directly assign countries or regions in the current administrative system. Just under one fifth (18.3 per cent) of the unspecified category is made up of core support to Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) or other private bodies where, by definition, the UK government does not specify where the money is spent. Expenditure in the UK supporting development work overseas or supporting refugees in the UK accounts for 8.9 per cent of the unspecified category. The smallest percentage of unspecified region/country spend (7.3 per cent) consists of other bilateral spend which includes pooled funds with other stakeholders, debt relief and technical assistance.

38 Ways in which the current administrative system could be improved to allow multiple benefiting countries and regions to be recorded are being considered.
Figure 20: Breakdown of UK Bilateral ODA in 2013

**3.3 Broad Sector Breakdown of Bilateral ODA Spend**

**3.3.1 Bilateral ODA spend by sector in 2013**

Figure 21 provides an overview of ODA spent in the broad sectors in 2013. For a more detailed breakdown of all sectors please see Additional Table A6a.

- The highest sector-spend was Health with £1,297 million (19.1 per cent) of UK Bilateral ODA.
- Other large spending sectors of UK Bilateral ODA were: Education with £905 million (13.5 per cent), Government and Civil Society with £835 million (12.4 per cent), Humanitarian Aid with £826 million (12.3 per cent), and Economic Infrastructure & Services with £487 million (7.2 per cent).
- The most Bilateral ODA spent through multilateral organisations in 2013, was in the Humanitarian Sector with £603 million (26.1 per cent). This was followed by the Health sector with £493 million (21.3 per cent), Government

---

39 See Table C9 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014

40 These broad sectors align with the OECD DAC definition of broad sectors. For more information on DAC broad sectors please see http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm. Following the DAC methodology, where a programme works across multiple sectors, all spend is reported against the sector with the largest spend. For more information please see the background note of this document,
and Civil Society with £233 million (10.1 per cent) and Economic Infrastructure and Services with £231 million (10.0 per cent).

Figure 21: Broad Sector breakdown of UK Bilateral ODA, 2013 (£ millions)  

Changes in ODA Flows by Sector

Table 6 below provides a comparison of ODA spend on the different sectors in 2009, 2012 and 2013 and shows that:

- The same five sectors received the largest share of Bilateral ODA in 2009, 2012, namely Health, Education, Government and Civil Society, Multisector/ Cross-cutting sector and Economic Infrastructure & Services. In 2013, however, Humanitarian Aid replaced Economic Infrastructure & Services in the top five.
- The top five sectors' total share of UK Bilateral ODA spend has increased slightly since 2009, going from 62.3 per cent to 64.7 per cent in 2013.
- Over the shorter term humanitarian aid has had the greatest percentage increase (94.1 per cent), increasing from £425 million in 2012 to £826 million in 2013. This is largely due to the UK’s provision of humanitarian aid to Syria and the wider Middle East region, which totalled £275 million in 2013.

---

41 See Table C10 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
• ODA spend assisting refugees in the UK increased from £7 million in 2009 to £32 million in 2013. Despite having the largest percentage increase, expenditure on refugees in the UK in 2013 was less than expenditure on any of the other sectors in 2009, 2012 and 2013. This increase resulted from a recommendation from the UK Statistics Authority in 2009 to align the reporting of aid spent on refugees within the UK to the DAC definitions.

Table 6: Top Five Sectors in Receipt of UK Net Bilateral ODA¹
2009, 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% bilateral ODA 2009</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% bilateral ODA 2012</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>% bilateral ODA 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>Multisector / Cross-Cutting</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economic Infrastructure and Services</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>Multisector / Cross-Cutting</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multisector / Cross-Cutting</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>Economic Infrastructure and Services</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>Humanitarian Aid</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 5 sectors’ share of sector-specific bilateral ODA
65.7% 69.8% 71.7%
¹ Figures may not sum to totals due to roundings.

3.3.2 Broad Sector Breakdown of Bilateral ODA Spend by Official Agency

Figure 22 below provides a breakdown of sector spend by official agency.

• In 2013 DFID supported programmes across a wide range of sectors with the largest amount (£1,226 million) supporting the health sector.

• In 2013, the second largest contributor of UK ODA was the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). DECC’s ODA profile focussed on two main sectors, namely: energy generation and supply, which falls under the broad sector or ‘economic infrastructure and services’ and general environmental protection, which falls under the ‘multi-sector/ cross-cutting’ broad sector⁴².

• The fourth largest contributor in 2013 was the Conflict Pool. The activities carried out by the Conflict Pool support a wide range of conflict prevention activities as diverse as security sector reform, rule of law projects, training peacekeepers and supporting political settlements⁴². The majority of these activities fall under the ‘government and civil society’ broad sector.

⁴² For more detailed information on DECC’s, and the Conflict Pool’s 2013 ODA profile please see Annex 2.
Figure 22: Percentage Breakdown of Bilateral ODA by Sector, 2013

1. Official Agencies other than DFID received £6 million more than they disbursed in 2013 from the ‘Production Sectors’ (shown as a negative value). This is mainly due to the receipt of equities from the Official Agency, CDC.

See Table C11 for underlying data in the accompanying Excel Tables: Statistics on International Development 2014
3.4 Multilateral Funding

3.4.1 UK Multilateral Funding by Organisation

DFID works with a wide range of organisations with very different roles in development – for example, to respond to humanitarian need, to develop infrastructure to support economic growth, or to ensure that particular diseases are tackled in line with the best available evidence. Multilateral organisations are an essential part of the international system for humanitarian and development aid. They are able to work in a wider range of countries than individual donor governments, offer economies of scale in their operations and expertise, and often have the legitimacy to work in politically sensitive situations. In doing so, they enable donor governments, such as the UK, to support humanitarian and development work in a far wider range of countries.

Table 7 shows the 20 multilateral organisations that received the most UK Multilateral ODA in 2012 and 2013. The International Development Association (part of the World Bank Group) received the most UK Multilateral ODA in 2013, having ranked second in 2012, receiving £1,112 million. The Development Share of the European Commission Budget received the second largest amount of UK Multilateral ODA in 2013, £813 million, having ranked first in 2012. Four of the top five UK-funded organisations in 2012 remained in the top five organisations in 2013, with the African Development Fund dropping from fourth in 2012 to seventh in 2013, and the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria rising from sixth in 2012 to third in 2013.
### Table 7: Top Twenty Recipients of UK Net Multilateral ODA

2012, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Multilateral</th>
<th>Multilateral ODA</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Multilateral</th>
<th>Multilateral ODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>European Commission - Development Share of Budget</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>International Development Association</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>International Development Association</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>European Commission - Development Share of Budget</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>European Commission - European Development Fund</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>African Development Fund</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>European Commission - European Development Fund</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clean Technology Fund</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Private Infrastructure Development Group</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>African Development Fund</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strategic Climate Fund</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Private Infrastructure Development Group</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Developement</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>International Development Association - Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>International Finance Facility for Immunisation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility Trust Fund</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>International Finance Facility for Immunisation</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>International drug purchase facility (UNITAID)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Clean Technology Fund</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility Trust Fund</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asian Development Fund</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>CGIAR Fund</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility - Least Developed Countries Fund</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>United Nations Office of Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - revision UNDP figure above (less £27.5m). Totals and rankings not revised until next release.

1. Figures may not sum to totals due to roundings.

Note - revision UNDP figure below (less £27.5m). Totals and rankings not revised until next release.

£ millions
3.4.2 UK Multilateral Funding by Extending Agency

Table 8 shows that the large majority of the UK’s multilateral ODA is spent through DFID. In 2013 DFID accounted for 90.4 per cent (£4,264 million) of total UK multilateral ODA; a slight fall from 2012, when they accounted for 94.4 per cent (£3,060 million) of the UK total. The Department of Energy and Climate Change was the largest non-DFID source of UK multilateral ODA in 2013, accounting for 5.1 per cent (£238 million) of the UK total, primarily made up of core contributions to the Climate Investment Funds. In 2012 the largest non-DFID source of UK multilateral ODA came from the attribution of extending agencies’ contributions to the European Commission (EC Attribution) (see Annex 3 for more detail). This accounted for 3.4 per cent (£109 million) of the UK total.

3.4.3 The Multilateral Aid Review and Multilateral Definitions

In 2011 DFID published its ‘Multilateral Aid Review’ (MAR) which assessed the multilateral organisations that DFID gave the most funding to. This was followed in 2013, by the MAR Update, which focused on those multilateral organisations that DFID continued to fund following the MAR. The majority of these organisations are defined as ‘multilateral’ on the OECD DAC’s list of ODA-eligible international organisations. This means that funding to these organisations is classified as multilateral ODA for reporting purposes (including in this publication). A small number of organisations included in the MAR and MAR Update were not classified as multilateral on the DAC’s list, and so funding to these organisations is classified as bilateral ODA for reporting purposes.

Additional Table A8 shows DFID and UK funding to each of the organisations included in the MAR Update. As noted above, this table includes a mix of Bilateral and Multilateral ODA, depending on the status of the organisation on the DAC’s list of ODA-eligible international organisations.

---

44 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/multilateral-aid-review
46 For more information on ODA-eligible organisations, see http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/annex2.htm
47 Available as an online table at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statistics-on-international-development-2014
Table 8: Breakdown of UK Net ODA: by official agency and delivery channel

2009, 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Agency and Delivery Channel</th>
<th>2009 Bilateral through multilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2012 Bilateral through multilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2013 Bilateral through multilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2009 Other bilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2012 Other bilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2013 Other bilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2009 Multilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2012 Multilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
<th>2013 Multilateral £m</th>
<th>% ODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Developm</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-DFID</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy and Climate Change</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign &amp; Commonwealth Office</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Business, Innovation and Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Credits Guarantee Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Culture, Media and Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources of UK ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Pool (non - DFID)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Attribution (non - DFID)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Capital Partners PLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Pensions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ODA</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,681</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Prior to 2012 some official agencies were categorised as ‘miscellaneous’ for the purposes of reporting to the OECD DAC. For 2009 it is not possible to identify individual agencies from the ‘miscellaneous’ category.
3.4.4 Multilateral Core Funding and Imputed Multilateral Shares

When DFID or other UK government departments provide core funding to multilateral organisations, it is not possible to directly track the funding to the country or sector where it is spent. However, to provide an indication of the destination and sector of UK aid, the overall percentages of ODA reported by the relevant multilateral organisations are used to impute a UK contribution.

This publication uses the breakdown of ODA reported by each multilateral organisation to the DAC to estimate what percentage of DFID and UK core contributions are spent in each country and sector. Where a multilateral organisation does not report its development assistance to the DAC but the multilateral is only mandated to work in a particular country, region or sector, we allocate all of its core contributions to the relevant country, region or sector. If a multilateral organisation does not report to the DAC but works in multiple sectors and/or countries then its core contributions are not allocated to a country or sector.

Additional Tables A9 and A10 show imputed multilateral shares of UK Multilateral ODA by sector and country respectively. These shares should be taken as indicative estimates rather than exact amounts of funding, and they are dependent upon multilateral organisations returning outflow data to the DAC. The latest data available is for 2012.
SUPPORTING INFORMATION

National Statistics
The United Kingdom Statistics Authority has designated these statistics as National Statistics, in accordance with the Statistics and Registration Service Act 2007 and signifying compliance with the Code of Practice for Official Statistics. Designation can be broadly interpreted to mean that the statistics:

- meet identified user needs;
- are well explained and readily accessible;
- are produced according to sound methods; and
- are managed impartially and objectively in the public interest.

Once statistics have been designated as National Statistics it is a statutory requirement that the Code of Practice shall continue to be observed. For information on the work of the UK Statistics Authority visit: http://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk

Contact Details
For enquiries (non-media) about the information contained in this publication, or for more detailed information, please contact:

Sam Kutnick,
Department for International Development,
Eaglesham Road,
East Kilbride,
G75 8EA

Telephone: 01355 84 3210
E-mail: statistics@dfid.gov.uk
Website: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development/about/statistics

For media enquiries please contact the DFID Press Office on +44 (0) 20 7023 0600. For further information on development issues and DFID policies, please contact the Public Enquiry Point on 0845 300 4100.
We seek to continuously improve our publication and welcome feedback from users. Please send any feedback to statistics@dfid.gov.uk.

Scope
This publication presents information on the UK’s spending on Official Development Assistance (ODA). It includes data from the Devolved Administrations of the UK, as well as other extending agencies. Data relating to both Bilateral and Multilateral ODA are included in the scope of this publication. This publication does not include information on:

- **Results achieved in international development through the UK’s ODA spend.** This information is included in DFID’s Annual Report, which was most recently published in June 2014, and can be found at [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-annual-report-and-accounts-2013-to-2014](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfid-annual-report-and-accounts-2013-to-2014) Chapter 2 of the Annual Report presents development results against each pillar of DFID’s Results Framework, and Chapter 4 presents selected results for some of the larger multilateral organisations that we fund.

- **Development Tracker.** You can explore details of the individual development projects that the UK is funding by using the Development Tracker. This allows you to filter projects by country and sector, and view further details about the project as published in documents such as the business case and annual review. The tracker uses open data on development projects, compliant with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard, to show where funding by the UK Government and its partners is going and ‘trace’ it through the delivery chain.

- **The UK’s non-ODA development spend.** A separate set of tables capturing the UK’s total Gross Public Expenditure on Development (GPEX) are published in November 2014, and can be found here: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statistics-on-international-development-201314-gpex-tables](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statistics-on-international-development-201314-gpex-tables). As well as including ODA, GPEX statistics also capture other official flows of development spend, including aid to countries and organisations that are not ODA-eligible. More information on GPEX statistics can be found here:
User Engagement
DFID recently carried out a consultation with users of this publication to ensure that it was meeting their needs and continued to be fit for purpose. A summary of results and response of this consultation can be found here:


In addition to this user consultation, we recently carried out an internal quality review of this publication. A summary of the findings of this review can be found on the DFID statistics webpage at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development/about/statistics#quality-review

Data Definitions
High-level definitions of some of the key terms used in this release can be found throughout the publication. For more information on how to interpret aid expenditure statistics, please see Annex 1 of this publication, and for a more detailed glossary, please see Annex 2 of this publication, both of which can be found here:


Publication Cycle
DFID releases two National Statistics publications over the year:

- **Provisional UK ODA as a proportion of Gross National Income** will be published at the start of April 2015, and includes a provisional estimate of the UK’s ODA:GNI ratio. The latest edition of this publication can be found here:
  https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development/about/statistics

- **Statistics on International Development** is usually published around the end of October each year. This publication confirms the UK’s ODA:GNI ratio, as well
as including more detailed analysis of the UK’s Bilateral and Multilateral ODA, and includes a detailed set of additional tables, as well as the microdata used to produce the publication.

Additional Tables
A full list of additional tables related to this release can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/statistics-on-international-development-2014. These tables include breakdowns of UK ODA by delivery channel (bilateral/multilateral), recipient region and country, sector and multilateral organisation. In addition, a further set of supplementary tables disaggregating UK GPEX development spend will be published on the DFID statistics webpage following the main release.

Data Quality and Revisions
DFID spending makes up about 88 per cent of total UK ODA. Data on DFID spending is taken from ‘ARIES’ – a financial database that records information on DFID’s development projects. Information on ARIES is inputted by programme and project managers, with some quality assurance carried out centrally. Other government departments have similar databases. Other UK official agencies (mainly government departments) return detailed project level information to DFID, which is then combined with DFID data and quality assured to check all spend is in line with OECD definitions of ODA. Data is then sent onto the OECD who conduct further quality assurance of the data before this information is published. While the data included in the publication are not subject to sampling error (as we use all of the data available to us), there is a low risk of data input error. More information on the sources of data used in this publication is available in Annex 3.

The DFID data for this publication is based on an extract of the ARIES database taken in July 2014, well after the end of the calendar year 2013 and financial year 2013/14. This is to ensure that, as far as possible, any revisions to the database have taken place. Where we do have to revise information included in this publication, we will follow the procedures set out in our revisions policy, available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development/about/statistics
Related Statistics and Publications