

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

NON-DAC COUNTRIES AND THE DEBATE ON MEASURING POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT
FINANCE

DAC Meeting, 10 February 2014

This document is submitted for DISCUSSION under Item 3 of the Draft Annotated DAC Agenda [DCD/DAC/A(2014)2].

It provides members with an overview of information already available on non-DAC countries' development co-operation activities (section II), gives some insights to these countries' perspectives on the measurement of development finance (section III) and sets out the challenges for adapting the post-2015 statistical framework to these countries' needs (section IV). Members are invited to express their views in particular on the questions raised in paragraphs 19 through 24.

Contact: Willem Luijkx - Tel: +33 1 45 24 98 82 - E-mail: willem.luijkx@oecd.org

JT03351651

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

NON-DAC COUNTRIES AND THE DEBATE ON MEASURING POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

I. Introduction

1. “The increasingly important role of emerging donors” is a phrase frequently seen in publications on development co-operation over recent years. There remain, however, few reliable data to show the extent to which it is a reality. This “evidence deficit”¹ is broadly recognised as a challenge that needs to be addressed. Against this background, at the 2012 DAC High Level Meeting, *“participating governments welcomed DAC work – in close co-operation with all partners, particularly non-DAC countries – to develop the statistical categories and methods to capture all relevant official finance and facilitate reporting by all providers of development co-operation, public and private”*².

2. This paper provides members with an overview of information already available on non-DAC countries’ development co-operation activities (section II), gives some insights to these countries’ perspectives on the measurement of development finance (section III) and sets out the challenges for adapting the post-2015 statistical framework to these countries’ needs (section IV). **Members are invited to express their views in particular on the questions raised in paragraphs 19 to 24.**

II. Availability of information on non-DAC bilateral providers’ development co-operation programmes

3. Table 1 quantifies non-DAC bilateral providers’ development co-operation, indicating the available information sources. This is not an exhaustive list as countries like Bahrain, Cuba, Malaysia, Morocco and Venezuela, amongst others, are not included. Seventeen providers of development co-operation that are not members of the DAC currently report on their activities to the OECD³, of which two [the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development (KFAED) and the United Arab Emirates] at activity level. The estimates for countries not reporting to the OECD have been derived from various sources. Two countries issue annual reports on their development co-operation programmes, while others publish aggregate disbursement data or planned budget figures. Information has also been collected from regional and global multilateral organisations.

1. See for example Neissan Alessandro Besharati: *“Common goals and differential commitments: the role of emerging economies in global development”*, discussion paper commissioned by the German Development Institute in co-operation with the South African Institute of International Affairs (Johannesburg, 2013).

2. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/HLM%20Communique%202012%20final%20ENGLISH.pdf>.

3. In 2013 the number of non-DAC countries reporting to the DAC decreased from 22 to 17 because five countries joined the DAC. Statistical reporting is an important instrument for engagement with non-DAC countries and facilitates accession to the Committee.

Table 1. Concessional development finance by countries and economies reporting to the OECD/DAC and other providers of development co-operation

| Countries and economies reporting to the OECD | Format | 2012 net disbursements (USD million) | % Net ODA/GNI ratio***** |
|--|--|--|---|
| DAC member countries* | CRS (activity level data) | 126 938.8 | 0.28 |
| Non-DAC OECD members | | | |
| Estonia | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 23.2 | 0.11 |
| Hungary | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 118.4 | 0.10 |
| Israel** | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 171.2 | 0.07 |
| Turkey | All DAC tables (aggregate level data) | 2 533.3 | 0.32 |
| Non-OECD EU Member States | | | |
| Bulgaria | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 40.0 | 0.08 |
| Cyprus*** | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 25.1 | 0.11 |
| Latvia | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 21.1 | 0.07 |
| Lithuania | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 51.9 | 0.13 |
| Malta | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 18.6 | 0.23 |
| Romania | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 142.4 | 0.09 |
| Arab donors | | | |
| Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development (Kuwait) | CRS (activity level data) | 149.2 | <i>0.34</i> |
| Saudi Arabia | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 1 298.9 | <i>0.22</i> |
| United Arab Emirates | CRS (activity level data) | 1 069.7 | 0.27 |
| Other | | | |
| Chinese Taipei | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 304.5 | 0.06 |
| Liechtenstein | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 28.6 | N/A |
| Russia | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 465.0 | 0.02 |
| Thailand | DAC2a (aggregate level data) | 16.9 | 0.01 |
| Total reporting countries | | 133 416.7 | |
| Countries and economies not reporting to the OECD**** | What do they publish? | Estimated development co-operation**** (USD million) | Estimated gross ODA-like/GNI ratio***** |
| Publishing annual reports on international co-operation | | | |
| Brazil (2010 data) | Annual reports including multilateral co-operation. | 499.7 | <i>0.03</i> |
| Qatar (2011 data) | | 684.4 | <i>0.47</i> |
| Publishing (partial) budget/disbursement figures | | | |
| China (2011 data) | Bilateral co-operation. | 2 841.4 | <i>0.04</i> |
| India (2011 data) | Technical co-operation. | 789.8 | <i>0.04</i> |
| Indonesia (2011 data) | South-South co-operation. | 8.2 | <i>0.00</i> |
| South Africa (2012 data) | Including multilateral co-operation. | 151.9 | <i>0.04</i> |
| Chile (2012 data) - OECD member | The Chilean International Co-operation Agency | 42.3 | <i>0.02</i> |
| Colombia (2011 data) | South-South and Triangular co-operation. | 14.7 | <i>0.01</i> |
| Singapore | The Initiative for Asian Integration. | 26.4 | <i>0.01</i> |
| Croatia (2011 data) | Humanitarian assistance. | 3.2 | <i>0.01</i> |
| Estimates based on regional / multilateral organisations' websites. | | | |
| Mexico (2011 data) - OECD member | Only multilateral co-operation estimate | 53.9 | <i>0.01</i> |
| Argentina (2011 data) | Based on SSC report by SEGIB and multilateral co-operation estimates | 20.6 | N/A |
| Total/average non-reporting countries | | 5 136.5 | |

* In the online database the DAC average ODA/GNI ratio is 0.29, because Slovenia was not included as a DAC member yet.

** The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

*** 1. Footnote by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to « Cyprus » relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue". 2. Footnote by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognized by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

**** These figures are not comparable as they do not stem from a common definition of development co-operation. The responsibility of the reliability of the figures, lies with the institution that published them.

***** Figures may include estimates by the Secretariat of multilateral co-operation if these are not available in the documents published by the government of the country.

***** Most countries reporting to the OECD also report their GNI. For other countries (percentages in italics) nominal GNI figures are based on World Bank data. For non-reporting countries, GNI figures relate to the same year as the development co-operation estimates. For Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, GNI figures are from 2011 due to lack of availability of 2012 figures.

4. The OECD publishes comprehensive, detailed and comparable data on development co-operation. It receives data from 46 countries, accounting for about 95% of the estimated global total. It also receives reporting from over 30 multilateral organisations and one private foundation⁴, enabling the publication of comprehensive and detailed data on developing countries' resource receipts. The data are processed and validated in close dialogue with the reporting institutions, ensuring high quality and comparability across providers. The data for non-DAC providers are included in regular DAC statistical products (e.g. Statistical Annex of the DCR) and have been given more prominence in recent years through Development Briefs and on the Internet (e.g. DAC Global Relations web-pages).

5. Apart from the OECD, a number of other data collection efforts are worth mentioning here:

- a) UN-DESA published a chapter on South-South co-operation in the *International Development Cooperation Report 2010*, presenting 2008 data "based on national and OECD-DAC sources".⁵ An updated version is expected in the first semester of 2014. The "*Provisional analysis of funding of operational activities for development of the United Nations system for the year 2011*" by UN-DESA included a statistical annex on contributions from bilateral providers of development co-operation to most UN-agencies.⁶
- b) Aiddata and IATI also publish data. Aiddata uses OECD-DAC statistics complemented with estimates on development co-operation programmes of countries that do not report to the OECD. Fourteen countries, all DAC members, make (part of their) data available in IATI format.⁷
- c) The Ibero-American General Secretary (SEGIB) publishes mainly non-monetised information (number of technical co-operation mission/man hours etc.) for providers from the Latin American region. Some monetised information is also available but only for a few countries.
- d) In general, multilateral institutions publish data on contributions they receive from all bilateral providers.

6. Nevertheless, none of the above-mentioned organisations aim to capture annual, comparable and validated monetised information on development co-operation by bilateral providers. This information is available whenever non-DAC providers report their data to the OECD. However, many of them do not believe the current DAC statistical system can accurately measure the international co-operation they are undertaking and often express this as their main reason for not reporting to the OECD. A new framework for measuring development finance after 2015 would ideally include development co-operation by all providers. Therefore, it is necessary to take a closer look at the non-DAC providers' perspectives on measuring development co-operation and discuss how these could be addressed in the post-2015 framework.

4. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation already reports to the OECD/DAC. In addition, the OECD has recently concluded a Memorandum of Understanding with the US Foundations Center to set up a data exchange mechanism with this institution. It is expected that this collaboration will significantly contribute to improving the DAC statistical picture of private charitable flows to developing countries.

5. Cf. "*Development Cooperation for the MDGs, Maximizing Results*", *International Development Cooperation Report, 2010*, p74.

6. UN-DESA website, <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/oesc/funding.shtml>, consulted on 17 December 2013.

7. IATI website, <http://iatiregistry.org/publisher>, consulted on 14 January 2014.

III. Perspectives from non-DAC providers

7. Non-DAC providers are a very heterogeneous group of countries. The use of the term “*non-DAC provider*”, defining a country by what it is not a member of, already reflects the difficulty of finding an adequate way of describing this group. “*South-South co-operation providers*” is a more frequently used term but is not yet clearly defined.⁸ For some, South-South co-operation simply means international co-operation between two countries of the South. For others it also implies a certain type of development co-operation based on a set of principles. Also, are countries of the South those on the DAC List of ODA Recipients? Some Arab (high-income) countries consider their activities as South-South Co-operation as well. It is important to keep this heterogeneity in mind while discussing perspectives of non-DAC providers, as these differ from one country to the other.

8. This section describes the perspectives of non-DAC providers on development co-operation measurement by grouping the issues under four headings: (1) terminology, (2) premises, (3) content, and (4) decision-making.

Terminology

9. Some non-DAC providers do not identify themselves with terminology used by the DAC community. Concepts like “*donor*”, “*recipient*”, “*aid*”, “*ODA*” and “*DAC*” are associated with development co-operation from developed to developing countries – a vertical relationship, and with the 1970 UN resolution that “*each economically advanced country will progressively increase its official development assistance to developing countries and will exert its best efforts to reach a minimum net amount of 0.7 per cent of its gross national product (...)*”.⁹ In reality, developing countries can join the DAC and not all DAC members subscribe to the 0.7% target even though they have agreed on the ODA concept to measure the development co-operation efforts¹⁰. This suggests it is the connotation that these words have, rather than their meaning, that causes non-DAC countries’ reticence to use them. Some countries have expressed their interest to report using the ODA methodology, however with the condition that their reporting is not referred to as ODA.

Premises

10. Again there is no homogeneous set of premises upon which South-South co-operation is built. Key principles often include: (1) respect for national sovereignty/ non-interference in domestic affairs / non-conditionality, (2) national ownership and independence, (3) equality / horizontality and (4) mutual benefit. The question is whether these terms are relevant to the debate on the measurement of development finance. Both DAC and non-DAC countries have numerous ways of delivering development co-operation, but, for example, conditionality is not something found exclusively amongst DAC members, whereas national ownership is a principle from the Paris Declaration, which DAC members have adopted. Other concepts such as horizontality do not necessarily help to clarify the distinction between South-South co-

8. Although in very general terms, the UN General Assembly Resolution 64/222 (23 February 2010) describes South-South co-operation as “... *a manifestation of solidarity among peoples and countries of the South that contributes to their national well-being, their national and collective self-reliance and the attainment of internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals*”.

9. “International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade”, UN General Assembly Resolution 2626 (XXV), 24 October 1970, paragraph 43. The target is now measured in terms of gross national income, an equivalent concept to gross national product.

10. In the past, there was an implicit assumption that DAC members could not be both donors and recipients. There is no longer ambiguity in this regard. For example, in its Global Relations Strategy (2011) the DAC has stated it will “encourage countries that fulfil the accession criteria to join the Committee, independent of their status as ODA recipients”.

operation and North-South co-operation. Can the relation between China (or Brazil) and Mozambique be described as horizontal, while the relation between a DAC member and Mozambique would be described as vertical? Development co-operation statistics serve to measure development finance between one country and another, not to qualify development co-operation as good or bad. The quality aspects are addressed through other means, such as the tied aid disciplines.

11. The only principle of South-South co-operation that, at first sight, appears out of line with the ODA definition is “*mutual benefit*”. One of the three main principles of the ODA definition is that ODA “*is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective*”. Nevertheless, DAC members also frequently have a certain degree of self-interest in financing (part of their) development co-operation activities, while some South-South co-operation is clearly altruistic.

Content

12. What should be counted as development co-operation? Many of the questions raised by non-DAC providers are the same as those discussed in the DAC, e.g.: Should refugee costs be included? Should the nominal value of a concessional loan be counted? Should the rules on security expenditure become less strict? Some non-DAC providers do not include refugee costs in their data and (plan to) count the grant equivalent of concessional loans rather than the nominal value. Some also exclude tied loans and debt forgiveness. On the other hand they generally include more security expenditures, arguing that development and security are closely interrelated. It is difficult, however, to provide a complete assessment of their ideas; more consultations would be needed for this purpose.

13. There are also some issues relevant to non-DAC countries that are not usually on the agenda of DAC discussions on development finance. For example, some countries include humanitarian assistance to high-income countries in their internal reports on foreign aid. Others suggest reporting on “religious development co-operation” but as “Other Official Flows” rather than ODA. Finally, the List of ODA-eligible international organisations now mainly contains global organisations and regional organisations to which DAC members provide core contributions, excluding organisations from other regions.

14. A very specific problem for countries that are on the DAC List of ODA Recipients is accounting for contributions to pooled funds which they can benefit from themselves. Do these contributions count as development co-operation in their entirety? Or should they be considered (partially) as funding projects in their own country?

15. Lastly, an issue that is very relevant for many non-DAC providers of development co-operation is the measurement of technical co-operation. Why does a European consultant in Bolivia count for much more development co-operation than an Argentinian consultant or a seconded public servant from another developing country? For this reason many countries only want to measure technical co-operation in terms of numbers of projects or man-hours, an option that could be considered for the post-2015 measurement framework.¹¹ Another option for balancing the differences in wages between different countries could be to apply purchasing-power-parity methodology to the measurement of technical co-operation or even to total development co-operation (see annex 1). Yet another option could be for all reporting countries to use international standard wages, although these do not seem to be readily available.

11. Until 1999, data on the number of persons involved in technical co-operation activities were collected in DAC statistics, but this was discontinued due to an insufficient number of DAC members reporting on the item in a coherent way.

Decision-making

16. In addition to overcoming the differences in terminology, premises and content, it would be necessary to find a way to involve non-DAC providers in the governance of the measurement system. Currently the Working Party on Development Finance Statistics (WP-STAT) and ultimately the DAC are deciding on the rules for measuring development co-operation. Some non-DAC countries are increasingly involved in WP-STAT and DAC meetings, but ways of formalising further participation, including decision-making capability would be a necessary step for a global measurement framework to be legitimate.

IV. A more inclusive DAC statistical system

17. Pending progress with regard to participation in decision-making, the DAC statistical systems could be adjusted in several respects to non-DAC providers' needs, and this is necessary if more countries are expected to report to the OECD. There is a long tradition of the Secretariat working with non-DAC countries to include their perspectives in statistics on development finance: (1) statistical seminars – both bilateral and for groups of countries – are being held to improve mutual understanding of the measurement of development co-operation; (2) non-DAC countries participate in WP-STAT meetings; and (3) statistical engagement facilitates accession of non-DAC countries to the Committee.

18. It is necessary to continue such efforts to further integrate the perspectives of non-DAC providers described above into the DAC statistical system. The post-2015 debate on measurement of development finance gives the opportunity to adopt more structural changes to the system reflecting views from non-DAC providers. Table 2 below presents a non-exhaustive list of issues and information on the work that is already ongoing and the challenges that need to be addressed in the future. **Members are invited to give their views, especially on the challenges. Issues considered relevant for the 2015 debate on measurement finance can then be further discussed at the March 2014 Senior Level Meeting.**

Table 2. Issues related to the post-2015 debate on measurement of development finance relevant to non-DAC providers

| Issue | Realised / set in motion | Challenges |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Terminology | Using different terminology for non-DAC providers. | To what extent is this differentiation justified and desirable? Can we come up, jointly, with some new terminology that we all agree on and use, so that the information can be compared? |
| 2. Mutual benefit | | How can the idea of mutual benefit and the idea of progress in the partner country as main objective be made compatible? |
| 3. Decision-making | Inviting non-DAC partners to participate in DAC and WP-STAT meeting and engaging with them bilaterally. | How can non-DAC countries become more (and more formally) involved in decision-making on measurement of development finance? |
| 4. The impact on differences in salaries (and prices in general), especially on technical co-operation. | Introduce the idea of presenting figures at purchasing power parity (see Annex 1). Provide feedback on proposed methodologies for measuring technical co-operation. | Further develop this idea and assess its implications. What other methods could be thought of for creating a more "just" reflection of non-DAC development co-operation, especially technical co-operation? |
| 5. The list of ODA-eligible international organisations | Proposal to the WP-STAT for including several Arab and Latin-American organisations. | The WP-STAT to consider this and future proposals for the inclusion of more regional organisations on the list of ODA-eligible international organisations, if compliant with the criteria established for this procedure. |
| 6. Contributions to funds from which the providing country itself benefits. | Suggestions for a methodology to measure these contributions have been prepared for consideration by the WP-STAT. | Further develop this proposal, getting feedback from South-South providers and, finally, including it in the statistical reporting directives. |
| 7. Tracking triangular co-operation | Possible proposal to the WP-STAT for including an additional channel code (14000) to track triangular co-operation. | Other ways to improve monitoring of triangular co-operation may have to be reflected on together with triangular co-operation partners. |
| 8. Issues already included in the post-2015 development finance measurement debate (security expenditure, concessionality, refugee costs etc.). | "Southern views" included in the Expert Reference Group and through consultation with many countries. | How can we further involve these countries in the post-2015 debate? |

19. Some of the issues listed in Table 2 are political rather than technical and feedback from the DAC is therefore necessary to make further progress. This is especially the case for points 1 to 3. The Secretariat is already avoiding the use of terminology such as “*donor*”, “*aid*” and “*ODA*” when referring to non-DAC countries’ development co-operation. Using other terminology means recognising that non-DAC providers’ development co-operation programmes are embedded in a different tradition. **How can elements that the different traditions have in common be used to establish a shared terminology to refer to development co-operation activities?**

20. While the overall motivation for DAC members’ development co-operation programmes may not be entirely altruistic, the Statistical Reporting Directives require each reported individual activity to be developmental (i.e. to have the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its *main* objective). **How does the principle of mutual benefit relate to this criterion (point 2)?**

21. Point 3 may be the most complicated issue to tackle and one that goes beyond the boundaries of the development finance measurement debate. **How can non-DAC countries be more formally involved in decision-making on measurement of development finance?**

22. The other five issues have both technical and political components. The impact of showing development co-operation figures at purchasing power parity (point 4), in addition to the current presentation of the figures, is shown in Annex 1. Proposals for points 5, 6 and 7 are being prepared for consideration by the WP-STAT. **Does the DAC have any comments on the proposed way forward on these more technical issues?**

23. Finally, point 8 is about how to involve non-DAC countries in further deliberations on the possible new measures of development finance post 2015. Since June 2013 the Secretariat has participated in bilateral and regional (informal) meetings involving Brazil, Chile, China, Estonia, Hungary, Mexico, Russia, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates and Uruguay amongst others. The Expert Reference Group is a way to engage with experts from beyond the DAC community. Initial contacts have been established with regional organisations such as the Ibero-American General Secretary and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and global organisations like UN-DESA and the UN SSC unit.

24. Development finance engagement work is ongoing, but needs to be intensified in the course of the post-2015 measurement debate. Plans for a side-event at the High Level Meeting in Mexico in April are being pursued and bilateral and regional consultations will continue to take place. **What other ways of involving non-DAC countries should the Secretariat and members pursue?** DAC members are also invited to keep the Secretariat informed about their engagement activities in this area.

V. Concluding remarks

25. The importance of getting more complete and comparable information on non-DAC countries’ development co-operation is broadly recognised. The current debate on measurement of development finance is an important opportunity to involve non-DAC countries and adapt measurement concepts in a way that they can better capture the development finance of these countries. In order to do so the Secretariat and members need to engage with non-DAC countries on this subject, and resources should be made available for this purpose. In the end, adapting the DAC statistical system and measurements towards a more broadly accepted definition of development co-operation would require compromises from all countries and institutions involved.

ANNEX 1. GROSS CONCESSIONAL FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT (“ODA-LIKE FLOWS”) IN CURRENT USD BILLIONS

Grey: Non-DAC countries. In the last column (darker) green/shaded implies a (bigger) rise in the ranking when figures are presented at purchasing power parity.

| Rank | Country | ODA-like | Country | ODA-like at PPP | Implications for ranking |
|------|------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | United States | 31.40 | United States | 31.40 | |
| 2 | Japan | 18.66 | Germany | 14.35 | 1 |
| 3 | Germany | 14.57 | Japan | 14.05 | -1 |
| 4 | United Kingdom | 14.27 | United Kingdom | 13.67 | |
| 5 | France | 13.56 | France | 12.31 | |
| 6 | Canada | 5.70 | Netherlands | 5.28 | 1 |
| 7 | Netherlands | 5.63 | Canada | 4.65 | -1 |
| 8 | Australia | 5.51 | Turkey | 4.36 | 7 |
| 9 | Sweden | 5.25 | China (2011) | 4.34 | 3 |
| 10 | Norway | 4.85 | Sweden | 4.10 | -1 |
| 11 | Switzerland | 3.07 | Australia | 3.67 | -3 |
| 12 | China (2011) | 2.84 | Norway | 3.20 | -2 |
| 13 | Italy | 2.84 | Italy | 2.84 | |
| 14 | Denmark | 2.82 | Spain | 2.38 | 3 |
| 15 | Turkey | 2.53 | Korea | 2.24 | 3 |
| 16 | Belgium | 2.36 | Belgium | 2.16 | |
| 17 | Spain | 2.12 | Denmark | 2.11 | -3 |
| 18 | Korea | 1.65 | Switzerland | 2.07 | -7 |
| 19 | Saudi Arabia | 1.44 | India (2011) | 1.89 | 5 |
| 20 | Finland | 1.33 | Saudi Arabia | 1.78 | -1 |
| 21 | UAE | 1.16 | UAE | 1.20 | |
| 22 | Austria | 1.11 | Finland | 1.11 | -2 |
| 23 | Ireland | 0.81 | Austria | 1.04 | -1 |
| 24 | India (2011) | 0.79 | Portugal | 0.78 | 2 |
| 25 | Qatar (2011) | 0.68 | Russia | 0.78 | 3 |
| 26 | Portugal | 0.62 | Ireland | 0.77 | -3 |
| 27 | Brazil (2010) | 0.50 | Poland | 0.77 | 3 |
| 28 | Russia | 0.47 | Qatar (2011) | 0.62 | -3 |
| 29 | New Zealand | 0.45 | Brazil (2010) | 0.50 | -2 |
| 30 | Poland | 0.44 | New Zealand | 0.38 | -1 |
| 31 | Luxembourg | 0.40 | Greece | 0.38 | 1 |
| 32 | Greece | 0.33 | Luxembourg | 0.34 | -1 |
| 33 | Czech Republic | 0.22 | Czech Republic | 0.31 | |
| 34 | Israel** | 0.17 | Romania | 0.27 | 2 |
| 35 | South Africa | 0.15 | South Africa | 0.23 | |
| 36 | Romania | 0.14 | Hungary | 0.21 | 1 |
| 37 | Hungary | 0.12 | Israel** | 0.16 | -3 |
| 38 | Slovak Republic | 0.08 | Slovak Republic | 0.12 | |
| 39 | Slovenia | 0.06 | Bulgaria | 0.09 | 4 |
| 40 | Mexico (2011) | 0.05 | Lithuania | 0.09 | 1 |
| 41 | Lithuania | 0.05 | Mexico (2011) | 0.09 | -1 |
| 42 | Chile | 0.05 | Slovenia | 0.07 | -3 |
| 43 | Bulgaria | 0.04 | Chile | 0.07 | -1 |
| 44 | Thailand | 0.04 | Thailand | 0.06 | |
| 45 | Singapore | 0.03 | Latvia | 0.03 | 4 |
| 46 | Iceland | 0.03 | Estonia | 0.03 | 2 |
| 47 | Cyprus* | 0.03 | Singapore | 0.03 | -2 |
| 48 | Estonia | 0.02 | Cyprus* | 0.03 | -1 |
| 49 | Latvia | 0.02 | Malta | 0.03 | 1 |
| 50 | Malta | 0.02 | Iceland | 0.02 | -4 |
| 51 | Colombia (2011) | 0.01 | Colombia (2011) | 0.02 | |
| 52 | Indonesia (2011) | 0.01 | Indonesia (2011) | 0.01 | |

Note: (1) 2012 data, unless otherwise specified. (2) For calculating the figures at PPP-level, the PPP conversion factor (GDP) to exchange rate ratio (based on OECD and WB data) is applied to the gross ODA-like figures/estimates. The PPP conversion factors are from the same year as the ODA-like figures/estimates, except for Israel** and the UAE for which 2012 conversion factors were not yet available. (3) Non-DAC countries are reflected in grey. In the last column green reflects a rise in the ranking if figures are reflected at PPP.

* 1. Footnote by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to « Cyprus » relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue". 2. Footnote by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognized by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

** The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.