

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

Working Party on Statistics

AID TO REFUGEES IN DONOR COUNTRIES: CHRONOLOGY AND REFERENCES

14-15 June 2005

Switzerland has asked the Secretariat to prepare the attached background document on refugee costs for members' information. Noting that several members have clarified their reporting of the costs of refugees in their countries since the study it sponsored in 2000, Switzerland suggests a brief survey of members' current practices focusing on (a) their methodologies for collecting data, highlighting any major changes in coverage since 2000; (b) which costs are taken into account and how data are collected by members that have commenced reporting since 2000; (c) calculation methods (e.g. budgeted amounts, pro-rata allocations); (d) the categories of persons covered.

Switzerland will further explain its proposal and invite members' COMMENTS under item 10.4 of the agenda.

Contact: Simon Scott (simon.SCOTT@oecd.org); tel.: +33 1 45 24 15 60

JT00184427

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AID TO REFUGEES IN DONOR COUNTRIES: CHRONOLOGY AND REFERENCES	3
Summary	3
Chronology	3
ANNEX 1: CURRENT DIRECTIVES ON ODA REPORTING OF REFUGEE COSTS IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES [EXTRACT FROM DCD/DAC(2000)10].....	10
ANNEX 2: 2001 SECRETARIAT PROPOSAL FOR REVISED DIRECTIVES ON ODA REPORTING OF THE COSTS OF REFUGEES [DCD/DAC(2001)23]	11
ANNEX 3: REPORTING ON AID TO REFUGEES IN DONOR COUNTRIES, 1992-2003	13
ANNEX 4: COVERAGE OF REPORTING ON AID TO IN-DONOR REFUGEES (TABLES 1, 2 AND 3 FROM DCD/DAC(2000)22).....	14

AID TO REFUGEES IN DONOR COUNTRIES: CHRONOLOGY AND REFERENCES

Summary

1. Below is a detailed chronology of DAC members' discussions of ODA reporting of the costs of refugees in donor countries. It is primarily in the form of extracts from DAC documents. To summarise:

- Early 1980s: There are no specific instructions on reporting aid to refugees, which is included indistinguishably under "Emergency and distress relief". Members start debating which refugee costs might be covered.
- 1988: New Directives are issued that specify the coverage of ODA reporting of refugees. The first-year subsistence costs of refugees from developing countries arriving in donor countries are specifically allowed. These directives remain essentially unchanged to date, although the 2000 revision included displaced persons within the coverage of refugees.
- 1992: Large amounts of ODA (of the order of USD 1 billion annually for the DAC aggregate) start being recorded as aid to in-donor country refugees.
- 1994: Following concerns expressed by a number of members, the Secretariat recommends phasing out ODA reporting of in-donor refugee costs, but no consensus is reached.
- 1999-2001: Switzerland funds a consultants' study which reports considerable diversity in DAC members' practices and views in relation to the ODA reporting of in-donor refugee costs. The study proposes more precise instructions to help standardise reporting, but the wide divergences of view among members preclude agreement.
- 2003: Seventeen members report a record total of USD 1.5 billion in aid to refugees in donor countries.

Chronology

2. **1980** WP-STAT: "The Working Party agreed that the categories of expenditure on refugees presently included in DAC statistics of ODA should continue to be included. Most delegates wanted to go no further, but a few supported the addition of expenditures on refugees from developing countries in the reporting country if it could be shown that they are "in transit". [*Footnote in original:* It was later pointed out that the concept of "country of first asylum" was less ambiguous than "in transit".] In support of this view it was noted that UNHCR, contributions to which are eligible as ODA, undertakes expenditures in developed countries, in large part to sustain persons in their countries of first asylum. The Working Party agreed to return to this matter at its next meeting, taking account of data on the activities of UNHCR." *Ref.: DAC/STAT/M(80)2, paragraph 3.*

3. **1981:** Following members' comments on the issue during discussion of the DCD work programme, the Danish authorities write to the Secretariat stating that they view a decision as urgent and that since the matter is political as much as technical, it can be considered directly by the DAC. The Director of the DCD writes to heads of delegation. He recalls that aid to refugees is included indistinguishably under "emergency and distress relief", and circulates a blank table to obtain more detailed information. The table includes a section on costs of refugees in "donor or other industrialised countries", the reporting instructions for which read as follows:

"If the refugees are located in a developed country which is their country of first asylum (including the reporting country), the expenditures eligible for inclusion are solely those made to bring them to the country and then for their temporary sustenance. Amounts spent to promote their subsequent integration into the economy are excluded, as are expenditures for resettlement other than those made with the knowledge and intention that resettlement will be in a developing country (i.e., where resettlement is to occur in the reporting country, or the ultimate place of resettlement has not been specified, resettlement expenditures are not eligible for inclusion). Ref.: HF/4130 [Letter by H. Führer, 8 May 1981].

4. **1982 WP-STAT:** "No agreement was reached on the eligibility of additional expenditure items. Support was expressed variously for including (or excluding):

-- domestically-incurred costs of the reporting country for resettling refugees in a developing country, irrespective of the origin of the refugees [*the issue had been raised of costs incurred by Austria in respect of Jewish refugees from the Soviet Union on their way to Israel, which at the time was eligible to receive ODA*];

-- the cost of temporary sustenance in the reporting country of refugees originating only in developing countries, irrespective of their possible ultimate place of establishment; however, a refugee present for more than one year not to be deemed to be receiving temporary sustenance;

-- the cost of bringing refugees originating in developing countries to the reporting country as country of first asylum." Ref.: DAC/STAT/M(82)1, paragraph 4.

5. **1983:** Reporting commences (on 1982 flows) of aid to refugees as an "of which" item within emergency and distress relief on Table DAC1, but there is no breakdown into refugees in developed and developing countries.

6. **1988:** After protracted consideration, new DAC Statistical Reporting Directives are issued that include the following instructions on ODA reporting:

"in respect of refugees from a developing country reaching a developed country which is their country of first asylum: the expenditures made to bring them to the country, and then for their temporary sustenance (food, shelter and training). A refugee present for more than one year will be deemed no longer to be in receipt of temporary sustenance. Expenditures for resettling refugees in a developing country may be included, but should be allocated geographically only insofar as they are made in the country of resettlement. Amounts spent to promote the integration of refugees into the economy of the donor country, or to resettle them elsewhere than in a developing country are excluded." Ref.: DCD/DAC(88)10, paragraph 72(ii).

7. **1993:** Reporting commences (on 1992 flows) of aid to refugees in donor countries, as a separate item within aid to refugees on Table DAC1 (see Annex 3 for data).

8. **1994:** Following representations by a number of DAC members, the Secretariat suggests to the February meeting of the Working Party that the costs of first-year upkeep of refugees in donor countries should no longer be reportable as ODA, but that reporting as a memo item be allowed of costs incurred as long as the beneficiaries retained the administrative status of refugee. Most delegations favour the proposals but some consider that they raise policy issues outside the remit of the Working Party. *Refs.: DCD/DAC/STAT(94)2, paragraphs 8-15; DCD/DAC/STAT/M(94)1, paragraphs 6-7.*

9. The Director of the DCD writes to delegations in June observing that “Members have increasingly come to query the developmental relevance of expenditure on refugees in developed countries. Despite a perceived increase recently in the numbers of refugees returning to their countries of origin – often after many years of absence – many if not most such refugees will never return permanently to their home countries, and cannot therefore contribute to the development of those countries....Moreover, the ODA definition requires expenditures to be made ‘with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries’ as [the] main objective’. Thus ODA-eligibility depends on the intention of the donor at the time of the transaction, not on the ultimate impact of the transaction....As donor assistance to incoming refugees is designed to meet their welfare needs, and not to promote the development of their countries of origin, it falls outside the ODA definition, even though it is patently a component of humanitarian assistance...” The Director further observed that this was an internal resource flow, but that unlike all other internal resource flows recorded as ODA (e.g. student subsidies, administrative costs, development awareness), it was not incurred with the intended external consequences in mind, as evidenced by the fact that it came from domestic budgets for social security, employment, education etc. The Director suggested scaling back reporting in stages: only 75 per cent of eligible expenditures being reportable in 1995 on 1994 flows, reducing annually thereafter in tranches of 25 per cent until nothing would be reportable in 1998 on 1997 flows. *Ref.: DCD/DIR(94)16, paragraphs 20-30.*

10. Most members respond favourably to the Director’s proposal, but in the light of objections and suggestions by Austria, Germany and Japan, he instead proposes to the DAC meeting held on 13 October 1994 that “each Member decide for itself the scheduling of how to achieve by the year 2000 (i.e. reporting on 1999 flows) the elimination from ODA of official spending in Member countries on refugees from developing countries.” Canada, Germany, Japan and the Netherlands state that they are not in a position to agree to phasing out in-donor refugee costs. *Refs.: DCD/DAC(94)25; DCD/DAC/M(94)6, paragraphs 11-13.*

11. **1999:** Switzerland proposes to the Senior Level Meeting that a study be carried out, with Swiss funding, of the rules for reporting the costs of refugees arriving in donor countries. This is agreed. *Ref.: DCD/DAC/M(99)9, paragraphs 45-47.*

12. **2000:** The study is carried out under Secretariat supervision by M. Gérard Perroulaz and Ms Vanessa Peat of the Institut Universitaire d’Etudes de Développement in Geneva. Perroulaz and Peat conduct an extensive survey of members’ practices, which highlights considerable inconsistencies in reporting (see Annexes 1 and 2). They also survey members’ views, which range from support for removal of the item from ODA eligibility to a proposal to extend ODA eligibility beyond the first twelve months of a refugee’s stay in a donor country. They recommend:

- Retaining the twelve-month limit on ODA reporting of in-donor refugee costs.
- Retaining the limitation to the costs of temporary protection and sustenance, to the exclusion of costs incurred to integrate the refugee into the economy of the donor country.
- Limiting eligibility to costs incurred for persons who have been: (i) recognised by donors as refugees in conformity with the 1951 Geneva Convention; or (ii) granted temporary protection

for humanitarian or political reasons; or (iii) not accepted for asylum, but who cannot for the time being be asked to return home for valid political or humanitarian reasons.

13. Written consultations are undertaken and drafts prepared of possible new Directives covering these points. *Ref.: DCD/DAC(2000)22, DCD/DAC(2000)22/ADD, DCD/DAC(2000)30.*

14. At the Senior Level Meeting:

“The Delegate for Switzerland said that...the existing definitions were not practicable, and the proposed new ones were better and clearer. Nevertheless, Switzerland felt that helping refugees in developed countries was more a contribution to global welfare than a developmental expenditure. Counting it as ODA could divert limited aid funds away from developing countries. He therefore proposed that the Working Party on Statistics should adopt a two-stage approach. First, it should consider the case for not reporting any expenditures on refugees in donor countries. If Members could not agree to abolish such reporting, then they should examine the proposed new directives and report to the SLM on their feasibility.

“The Delegates for Belgium, the United Kingdom and the United States supported Switzerland. The Delegate for the United Kingdom stressed the need to maintain the credibility of the ODA concept. He agreed that the expenditures in question assisted developing country nationals, but he questioned whether they had a clear impact on poverty in developing countries, which was the *raison d'être* of official development assistance. The Delegate for Denmark, also mindful of maintaining the integrity of the ODA concept, opposed extending ODA eligibility, but was flexible towards proposals to curtail it.

“By contrast, the Delegate for France could not agree that ODA must exclude the costs of accepting and supporting refugees from countries in conflict. The Delegates for Canada, Finland and Spain urged caution and further study before changing the rules. The Directives should provide continuity and stability in reporting, avoiding jumps in reported levels of ODA. The Delegate for Sweden had no position yet, but advised referring the matter to the Working Party on Statistics.

“The Chair noted that on the whole, Members had not changed their views on this topic. He remanded it to the Working Party on Statistics for further consideration.”
Ref.: DCD/DAC/M(2000)8, paragraphs 46-50.

15. **2001 WP-STAT:** "The Secretariat (Mr. Scott) invited the Working Party to examine reporting on the costs of refugees in donor countries from a statistical point of view. He pointed out that the data reported were inconsistent, the total amount was insignificant and the overall results largely meaningless. He invited the Working Party to conclude that there were good statistical grounds for abolishing this item and to report this conclusion to the DAC.

“Belgium, Finland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States supported this approach. Switzerland pointed out that the difficulty in compiling statistics on refugees in donor countries was because the item focused on people rather than programmed expenditures. Switzerland provided much of its aid to refugees through NGOs, which compounded the difficulty. Both Finland and the United States observed disparities between national policies on refugees and the DAC definition.

“Australia, Austria, Canada, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden wished to maintain ODA reporting of this item, but with clearer definitions. It was statistically important for the Austrian government, and Germany considered it had

political significance. Sweden suggested postponing modification of the DAC Directives until completion of the EC's work on harmonising refugees, expected in 2004, but the Chair felt that this might be too long to wait.

"It was agreed to use the written procedure to review the reporting instructions, particularly on *de facto* refugees and economic migrants, and report back to the DAC Senior Level Meeting as it had requested." *Ref.: DCD/DAC/STAT/M(2001)1, paragraphs 54-57.*

16. The Secretariat then prepared a further document (reproduced in Annex 2) but its proposal met with the following objections:

Denmark: The proposed changes in reporting would probably be an advantage, but maintenance of the present reporting regime would not undermine the credibility of DAC statistics.

Finland: There should not be any differentiation between temporary and long-term status of refugees, as this would seem to treat different reporting countries unfairly.

France: Rejected the Secretariat's proposals.

Japan: The directives should establish a new category of "applicants for refugee recognition based on Conventions such as the Geneva Convention". The present limitation of reporting to costs incurred in the first twelve months of a refugee's stay should be abolished.

Norway: Not in a position to agree with the proposed wording, which is still too general, making it possible for different countries to report differently.

Sweden: Not willing to change the existing directives until completion of the harmonisation of EU refugee policy, planned for 2004.

United Kingdom: Remained of the view that this item should be removed from ODA reporting.

"The responses suggest that three underlying problems stand in the way of reaching consensus on this topic:

-- *Policy disagreements:* Some Members, like Austria, regard the item as a legitimate part of humanitarian aid that makes an important contribution to their ODA volume. Others, such as the UK, regard the item as domestic expenditure that has little or nothing to do with aid policy or programmes.

-- *Administrative differences:* Each country has a different system for classifying refugees and asylum seekers. These systems result in applicants receiving different types of permission to stay, ranging from semi-official "tolerance" through short or medium term permits with various conditions, to full recognition of refugee claims with the award or prospect of permanent resident status. It is virtually impossible to develop rules or principles that allow these different systems to be reflected in statistical categories that allow valid international comparisons.

-- *Compilation problems:* Switzerland and some other Members have highlighted difficulties in compiling these statistics, regardless of the wording of directives, because the expenditures are based on people, and not on programmed, budgeted amounts.

“The Secretariat retains its long-held view that donors’ expenditures on refugees who arrive in their countries -- while commendable from a humanitarian point of view -- do not make a sufficiently direct contribution to the economic development and welfare of developing countries to qualify as official development assistance. Including such data undermines the credibility of the ODA concept.

“Nevertheless, it is apparent that a majority of Members wish to retain ODA reporting of this item. It is also apparent that there is no consensus on revising the present directives. The drafts suggested by the Secretariat have in general not sought to change the coverage of the item, but to remove the current ambiguity by defining different categories of refugees and asylum seekers more precisely - as would normally be expected in Statistical Reporting Directives. However, each successive draft has given rise to an increased number of objections. This is largely because making the directives clearer and more specific increases the number of points at which they may run counter to some aspect or other of Members’ current or preferred mode of reporting. More specificity means that Members that previously reported the item may find they are no longer able to do so, while others may feel additional pressure to report expenditure which they do not believe meets the basic definition of ODA.

“In the present circumstances, the Secretariat sees little value in pursuing further negotiations on revised reporting directives on this item. Following Sweden’s suggestion, it recommends that the matter be revisited if and when EU refugee procedures have been harmonised. In the meantime, the existing provisions of DCD/DAC(2000)10 will continue to be applicable. **If the DAC agrees, it may wish to convey this advice to the Senior Level Meeting.**”
Ref.: DCD/DAC(2001)23, paragraphs 6-10.

17. At the DAC meeting on 6 November 2001 the Secretariat (Mr. Hammond) recalled its:

“...long-standing view that aid to refugees in donor countries should not be reportable as ODA...The reported data were inconsistent through time, and not comparable between Members. The total made little difference to aggregate DAC ODA, and nine Members did not report at all. It was contradictory to count aid to Afghan refugees in Pakistan as aid to Pakistan, but count aid to Afghan refugees in donor countries as aid to developing countries in general, when in practice it was an internal budget transfer. Continued reporting of this item undermined the credibility of ODA data.

“Mr Hammond stated that the considerable effort expended to try to arrive at revised rules had proved fruitless. The aim had been to remove grey areas and ambiguities. But as the drafts became clearer and more precise, they increasingly conflicted with Members’ disparate refugee procedures and reporting methods. The only glimmer of hope in the referenced document was to revisit the issue in 2004, but the chances of agreement even then were slight, since they depended not only on complex negotiations among EU Members to reform refugee procedures, but also on the willingness of other Members to fall into line.

“The Delegates for Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States agreed that assistance to refugees in donor countries should not be counted as ODA. The Delegate for the United Kingdom felt that the SLM should look at the issue from a political angle, and the United States suggested that ODA reporting of these costs might be suspended until agreement was reached on reporting rules.

“However, the Delegates for Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden accepted the conclusion in paragraph 10 of the document that no agreement was possible at

present, and that reporting should continue to be based on the current rules in the Statistical Reporting Directives.

“The Chairman concluded that there was no consensus. He said he would briefly explain to the SLM that no agreement had been possible because of the wide divergence of Members’ views. Informal discussions might take place in the new year to try to better specify the points of difference and seek avenues towards an eventual resolution. In the meantime, the Chairman commended to the Secretariat’s consideration a suggestion by the Delegate of the United States that statistical presentations should highlight the share of this item in DAC Members’ ODA.”

Ref.: DCD/DAC/M(2001)8, paragraphs 13-17.

18. **2002:** Pursuant to the DAC Chairman’s suggestion, the Secretariat adds a line on members’ reported expenditures on “Refugees in donor countries” to Tables 12, 13 and 14 of the Statistical Annex of the Development Co-operation Report.

ANNEX 1

CURRENT DIRECTIVES ON ODA REPORTING OF REFUGEE COSTS IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES [EXTRACT FROM DCD/DAC(2000)10]

1.16 A refugee is a person who is outside his home country because of a well-founded fear of persecution on account of his race, religion, nationality, social group or political opinion. Assistance to persons who for similar reasons are internally displaced within their own countries, or who have fled from their homes because of civil war or severe unrest, may also be counted under this item.

1.17 The following expenditures by the official sector for the sustenance of refugees may be recorded as ODA:

- i. **In developing countries:** payments for the transport, reception and upkeep of refugees and displaced persons, whether made to governments, multilateral organisations (in which case it should be classified as multilateral instead of under code 106), international or national non-governmental organisations, or directly to the refugees themselves.
- ii. **In developed countries (code 105):** payments for refugees' transport to the country and temporary sustenance (food, shelter and training) during the first twelve months of their stay¹. Expenditures for resettling refugees in an aid recipient country may be included, and allocated geographically, if made in the country of resettlement.

1.18 Amounts spent to promote the integration of refugees into the economy of the donor country, or resettle them elsewhere than in an aid recipient country, are excluded.

1. Contributions by one donor to another donor to cover such expenditures should be recorded as ODA by the contributing country. The receiving country should reduce the expenditure reported under this item by the same amount.

ANNEX 2

**2001 SECRETARIAT PROPOSAL FOR REVISED DIRECTIVES ON ODA REPORTING OF
THE COSTS OF REFUGEES [DCD/DAC(2001)23]**

Line I.A.1.5 Emergency and distress relief (code 070)

of which: Aid to refugees, total (code 106)

of which: Refugees in donor countries (code 105)

1. A refugee is a person who is outside his home country because of a well-founded fear of persecution on account of his race, religion, nationality, social group or political opinion. A “recognized refugee” is a person granted refugee status under the terms of the Geneva Convention. A person granted “temporary protection” is someone from a region experiencing civil war or severe unrest who has been accorded a temporary permit or temporary humanitarian permit. An “asylum-seeker” is a person who is awaiting a decision from the procedure for dealing with requests for asylum. A “de facto refugee” is an asylum-seeker whose request has not been granted but is temporarily unable to be repatriated to his or her country of origin for humanitarian or political reasons.

2. All expenditure by donor countries related to the presence of all categories of refugees and asylum-seekers (including payments recorded as ODA) are reportable as a memo in Item V.3 of the DAC tables.

3. The following expenditure by the official sector for the sustenance of refugees may be recorded as ODA:

– In developing countries (included in code 106): payments for the transport (including transport to developed countries), admission and upkeep of refugees and displaced persons, whether made to governments, multilateral organisations (in which case, if the recipient is not known, it should be classified as multilateral ODA instead of under code 106), international or national non-governmental organisations, or directly to the refugees themselves.

– In developed countries (code 105): the following expenditures for their upkeep of recognised refugees, those granted temporary protection, and de facto refugees during the first twelve months of their acquiring that status: food, shelter, pocket money, medical costs, education and vocational training.

4. ODA reporting of expenditures on refugees in developed countries should exclude:

– expenditure on frontier control or administrative procedures related to processing asylum applications

– other expenditures that do not represent direct welfare assistance or a service provided to the refugees themselves

- expenditures designed to integrate refugees into the economy of the donor country
- any assistance to recognised refugees after they have been accorded a long-term residence permit
- expenditure associated with the presence of asylum-seekers awaiting a decision who do not meet the definition of “de facto refugees” given in paragraph 1.

5. Repatriation and reintegration assistance, including transport costs, shall be included in code 105 in cases where such assistance is paid in the developed country, whereas sums paid for reintegration in the developing country shall be entered under code 106 when paid in that country. Resettlement in a country that is not an aid recipient shall not be recorded as ODA.

ANNEX 3

REPORTING ON AID TO REFUGEES IN DONOR COUNTRIES, 1992-2003

\$ million

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Australia	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	56.6	10.2	0.0	4.3	30.7
Austria	113.4	122.4	109.4	85.2	34.4	29.4	41.4	22.7	20.6	28.3	34.1
Belgium	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	0.3	0.3	0.2	79.5
Canada	183.7	153.2	111.5	120.0	112.1	104.7	105.2	143.3	137.4	125.6	145.4
Denmark	77.1	78.6	71.4	54.2	94.6	91.8	87.3	124.1	114.1	109.6	105.7
Finland	11.2	5.9	7.4	11.2	10.3	7.9	16.4	16.3	14.8	8.1	10.8
France	-	-	-	-	56.9	80.3	-	147.5	202.7	245.9	445.2
Germany	497.7	353.0	381.0	173.4	114.7	58.9	109.9	67.4	80.4	35.8	25.0
Greece	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	0.0	2.5	3.1
Ireland	-	0.9	2.1	4.4	2.2	1.6	-	-	-	0.9	1.1
Italy	52.3	0.5	-	1.9	-	-	16.5	3.3	15.9	-	43.8
Japan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	169.5	75.3	-	70.6	73.7	72.4	129.9	162.5	154.5	83.3	178.0
New Zealand	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.1	7.6
Norway	-	68.0	9.5	9.4	12.0	33.2	55.6	98.3	67.6	124.5	176.4
Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spain	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	18.1	11.3	7.3	14.2	21.2
Sweden	-	105.6	114.3	114.1	100.2	97.9	79.8	83.3	81.3	138.1	190.7
Switzerland	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	15.0	18.7	19.7	19.7	22.1
United Kingdom	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
United States	-	-	-	-	36.0	387.1	1.7	450.6	416.0	143.7	-
Total reported	1109.6	963.5	806.4	644.4	647.4	974.7	733.3	1361.0	1332.4	1090.6	1520.4

ANNEX 4

COVERAGE OF REPORTING ON AID TO IN-DONOR REFUGEES (TABLES 1, 2 AND 3 FROM DCD/DAC(2000)22)

Table 1. Group 1 – Countries already reporting official expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries

	Australia	Austria	Canada	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany	Ireland	Japan	Norway	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland	USA
Refugee categories														
1. Recognised under the Geneva Convention	*		*	*	*	*	*		*	*		*	*	*
2. Quota refugees					*			*				*		
3. Provisional admission or admission on humanitarian grounds	*	*		*	*		*			*		*		*
4. Asylum-seekers		*		*	accepted	*				*	*	*		*
5. Other							*		*					*
Limited to first 12 months of refugees' stay	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*
Types of expenditure														
1. Subsistence costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2. Transport	*		*	*	*	*		*		*		*		
3. Shelter, food clothing, pocket money	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
4. Medical care	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*		*
5. Other financial assistance						*								
6. Vocational training	*	*	*	*		*		*	*	*		*		*
7. Education	*	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*		*		*
8. Rapatiation assistance	*	*		*	*			*		*	*			
9. Resettlement assistance	*	*		*										

N.B. Items 8 and 9 only concern member countries that report such expenditure under code 105.

Table 2. Group 1 - Countries already reporting official expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries

N.B. Preference for the status quo has been entered where the country made no comment or where it expressed a preference for the status quo.

	Australia	Austria	Canada	Denmark	Finland	France	Germany	Ireland	Japan	Norway	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland	USA
Preferred options														
1. Status quo			*	*		*		*		*	*	*		
<i>Variants relating to refugees category</i>														
2. Recognised under the Geneva Convention	*		*	*	*	*	*		*		*	*	*	*
3. Asylum-seekers		*		*			*				*	*		*
4. Provisional admission or admission on humanitarian grounds	*	*		*	*		*					*		*
5. Quota refugees	*				*		*	*				*		
6. Other									*					*
<i>Variants relating to type of expenditure</i>														
7. Subsistence costs		*							*					*
8. Transport		*												
9. Repatriation assistance		*												*
10. Other		>12 months					>12 months		>12 months					
11. Item separate from ODA													*	
Official expenditure in 1999 (USD million) (except for item 5)														
1. Aid to all refugees in donor country	58.24			125.82	16.3	77.15	2 898	93.3	9.8		666.99		998.2	500 12 months
2. Aid to Kosovar refugees in donor country	51.82	17.47	48.8	38.52	6		55	11.2	0	21.83	62.4	14.6	133.09	180
3. Humanitarian aid to Kosovo & neighbouring countries	4 223	24.74		65.06	9	1.25	29 149	7.4	173.9	45.01	27.13	2.06	66.5	580
4. Expenditure reported to DAC		41.3			13		111.2			55.56	117.97		15.2	500
5. Cost per refugee (US\$)			9 410 in 1998	8 325	12 000	15	4 954	12 085	908	14 100	15 380		7 409	4 675

Table 3. Group 2 - Countries having chosen not to report expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries

	Belgium	European Comm.	Greece	Italy	Luxembourg	New Zealand	Portugal	Spain	United Kingdom
Reasons for non-inclusion									
1. Principle that it is not humanitarian aid									*
2. Difficulties on collecting data			*	*	*		*		
3. Practices & procedures differing from those recommended by DAC									
4. Other		by default/ pol. decision	directives		pol. decision				
Possibility to renew									
1. No					*				*
2. Yes				partially			*		
3. From 2001			*						
4. In x years		2002 to be seen							
Option conceivable for future inclusion									
1. Option (i)									provisional
2. Option (ii)									
3. Option (iii)							humanitarian		
4. Option (iv)			*						
5. Other			36 months	45 days					
6. No option		*			*				
Official expenditure in 1999 million USD (except for item 5)									
1. Aid to all refugees in donor country		42,6	9,5						
2. Aid to Kosovar refugees in donor country				16,52	0				16,18
3. Humanitarian aid to Kosovo and neighbouring countries		15,9	14,72	107,4	8,8		0,546		173,1
4. Expenditure reported to DAC									
5. Cost per refugee (US\$)			1 900						

