

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Overall structure of the program

The focus of Australia's aid program should be the reduction of poverty and inequality. Further, Australia should refrain from using the aid program as a tool to further Australia's own interests

1.1. Appropriate geographic focus of the program, taking into account partner country absorptive capacities

Australia should continue and accelerate the recent trend of decreasing the proportion of aid to the Pacific, and to some extent South-East Asia, and increasing the proportion to South Asia and Africa.

Within our immediate region of Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Australia needs to balance its focus by:

- increasing the proportion of aid to countries with low ratio of aid dollars to population living in poverty
- increasing the proportion of aid to countries with large/concentrated numbers of people living in poverty

Outside our region, increase focus on areas with greatest need, particularly in Africa and South Asia, by:

- increasing bilateral aid to countries where we already have significant relationships,
- increasing multilateral funding for portfolios/ projects within these areas,
- delegating aid to other donors who have established programs in these areas.

1.2. Appropriate sectoral focus of the program, taking into account Australia's area of comparative advantage and measured development effectiveness results

Australia should balance the proportions across and within sectors, by:

- increasing the focus on health to be a priority level with education,
- increasing the proportion of education funding going to basic education rather than tertiary education, and reducing tertiary scholarships to Australia through the Australian Development Scholarship scheme in favour of within-country activities,
- increasing funding to basic needs, including water/sanitation, food security and general rural development, to be in line with 2% of the total costs for meeting the related MDGs,
- reducing the proportion of funding for governance, and within this increasing the proportion that is directed through recipient country community organisations,
- maintaining the current proportion for disaster relief and reconstruction.

Further, the aid program should continue to increase funding for disability-inclusive development, and ensure that disability-inclusive strategies are embedded into all development activities /programs.

Finally, Australia should ensure that funding and activities relating directly to climate change adaptation and mitigation are managed separately to the aid budget, and that funding for these activities is in addition to the 0.5% increase.

1.3. Relative focus of the aid program on low and middle-income countries

Australia should increase the proportion of funding to LDCs to be 0.15% of GNI. Where aid is given to middle-income countries, programs should be developed based on evidence that the aid is effective in reaching the poorest people and communities.

1.4. Relative costs and benefits of the different forms of aid, including the role of non government organisations and the appropriate balance between multilateral and bilateral aid funding arrangements

Channels

- Increase total proportion of funds going to multilaterals and refocus distribution amongst multilaterals by decreasing the proportion of funds that are channelled through the World Bank and the ADB, while at the same time, significantly increasing the proportion of funds that go through other multilateral mechanisms.
- At the least, maintain a proportion of 5% going to Australian NGOs as the total amount of aid is scaled up and be ready to lift this proportion should evidence be provided that the NGO community can effectively use a greater proportion. Also increase the use of international NGOs and foundations.
- Increase the amount of aid channelled through the development agencies of other donors.

Mechanisms/Modalities

- Significantly increase the proportion of the aid program that is delivered as budget support.
- Arrest the increase in the number of stand-alone projects and then begin to reduce the total number of projects.
- Continue to reduce the proportion of aid given as technical assistance. In addition, continue to ensure that technical assistance is provided in line with recipient country strategies. Where technical assistance is used, Australia should prioritise the use of local consultants over Australian ones.
- Increase the proportion of aid contracts that are awarded to developing country companies. Where Australia does use an Australian corporation, the Government should require the corporation to use local people, products and systems to deliver its project.

2. The performance of the aid program, the program's approach to efficiency and effectiveness, and whether the current systems, policies and procedures in place maximise effectiveness

To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the aid program, Australia needs to:

- Increase harmonisation with other donors through delegation of aid and increased division of labour, and in its own programs, increase budget support and sector-wide approaches and reduce number of individual aid activities.
- Implement explicit incentives for AusAID management and staff to comply with the Paris Declaration. Further, Australia should ensure that the Paris Principles (particularly ownership/alignment) are integrated into all contracts with commercial aid providers, and that they demonstrate adherence in their own processes.
- Respond to the DAC Peer Reviewing finding that Australia needs to address the constraints on aid predictability of the annual allocation of funding in the budget.
- Ensure, and be able to demonstrate, its alignment to the Paris Declaration principle regarding conditionality, which calls on donors to: "Draw conditions, whenever possible, from a partner's national development strategy or its annual review of progress in implementing this strategy. Other conditions would be included only when a sound justification exists and would be undertaken transparently and in close consultation with other donors and stake holders."

SUBMISSION TO THE AID REVIEW

1. Overall structure of the program

The focus of Australia's aid program should be the reduction of poverty and inequality. While this should not be pursued in ways that are hurtful to Australia's national interest, the aid program should never be used a tool to further Australia's own interests. This should be clarified in an update to Australia's White Paper on aid. Further, government policy should ensure that activities such as negotiation of trade agreements or other foreign policy objectives are not combined with discussions of aid.

1.1. Appropriate geographic focus of the program, taking into account partner country absorptive capacities

Australia's aid program has a very strong focus on our immediate region – over 75% of all aid allocated geographically in the 2010-11 aid budget went to East Asia and the Pacific. However, while many of the Pacific Island countries are classified as Least Developed Countries, and the majority of the world's extreme poor reside in Asia, Australia's aid to these regions does not seem to correspond to the actual incidence of poverty across these regions.

According to a World Vision Report n 2006, the proportion of our region's poor residing in the Pacific is less than 10% while South-East Asia has more than 90% (see appendix 1.1a). Yet Australia gives approximately 38% of its aid program to both the Pacific (including PNG) and East Asia (including Indonesia)¹. Further, according to OECD data², Oceania (the Pacific) receives approximately \$177 of aid per capita - the highest of any region, while Asia receives just \$12 per capita -the lowest of all regions (see Appendix 1.1b). **Australia should therefore continue and accelerate the trend in the 2010-11 aid budget of decreasing the proportion of aid to the Pacific, and to some extent South-East Asia, and increasing the proportion to South Asia and Africa³.**

Within regions, aid to specific countries also seems unbalanced. For example, within Asia, almost half of world aid is directed at middle-income countries, with less than a quarter going to Least Developed Countries⁴ (see Appendix 1.1c). A report by Micah Challenge found that a number of countries in our aid program were underfunded relative to the Human Development Index rating and child mortality rate⁵ (see Appendix 1.2a). We need to ensure that our geographic distribution reflects a focus on poverty.

Within our immediate region of Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Australia needs to balance its focus by:

- **Increasing proportion of aid to countries with low ratio of aid dollars to population living in poverty**, for example Indonesia, Myanmar (Burma) and Philippines.
- **Increasing proportion of aid to countries with large/concentrated numbers of people living in poverty**, for example: Papua New Guinea, Vietnam and Cambodia.
- **Ensuring that no countries within our region become 'aid orphans'** by taking a lead role in connecting any countries to other donors. For example, in the Pacific, 98% of bilateral aid from DAC donors comes from just 5 countries⁶ (see Appendix 1.3) - while this may be appropriate given the relatively small number of people living in poverty in this region, it is important to constantly monitor the need vs. number of donors for each country.

Outside our region, increase focus on areas with greatest need, particularly in South Asia and Africa, by:

- **Increasing bilateral aid to countries where we already have significant relationships**, for example in Ethiopia, by utilising our key relationship with the Addis Ababa Fistula Hospital⁷.
- **Increasing multilateral funding for portfolios/ projects within these areas.**
- **Delegating aid to other donors who have established programs in these areas**, for example the US, UK and Canada who are all within the top 10 donors to Asia⁸ (see Appendix 1.3)

The Micah Challenge Report, *The World We Want To See*⁹, presented to Parliament last year, includes suggested proportions – see Appendix 1.4.

1.2. Appropriate sectoral focus of the program, taking into account Australia's area of comparative advantage and measured development effectiveness results

Aid budget should be guided by the MDGs, and specifically by partner country needs. This means ensuring the major focus of the aid program is on areas relating to the MDGs, and within this, particularly those MDGs that are falling behind (see Appendix 2.1) or where we are giving less than our fair share (see Appendix 2.2).

Major sectors

Australia should balance the proportions across and within sectors, by:

- **Increasing the focus on health to be a priority level with education**
- **Increasing the proportion of education funding going to basic education rather than tertiary education**, and reducing tertiary scholarships to Australia through the Australian Development Scholarship scheme in favour of within-country activities. Tertiary scholarships to Australia are very expensive and therefore an inefficient way of up-skilling recipient country populations. Investing in tertiary education within the recipient country increases the capacity of the country to educate its people, both in terms of increased infrastructure and quality of credentials.
- **Increasing funding to basic needs, including water/sanitation, food security and general rural development**
- **Reducing the proportion of funding for governance**, and within this increasing the proportion that is directed through recipient country community organisations and other grass roots approaches to be equal to that of Government-targeted approaches. A recent report by TearFund found that donors could effectively help counter corruption by placing "greater emphasis on actions designed to strengthen the capability of citizens to hold their government to account"¹⁰.
- Given the increasing "natural disasters" being experienced, focus should also be on **maintaining the current proportion for disaster relief and reconstruction**.

The World We Want To See report also includes suggested proportions for sectoral allocations – see Appendix 2.2.

It should be noted however, the Paris Declaration Evaluation found that the allocation of Australian aid in the budget to specific thematic initiatives is a source of possible conflict with the strategic and operational priorities identified by partner countries¹¹, so it is important to ensure that in determining the appropriate proportions across and within sectors, that enough flexibility is allowed in the budget to ensure that all programs maintain priorities previously agreed between Australia and recipient country.

Disability

In addition to the above sectoral distributions, **the aid program should continue to increase funding for disability-inclusive development**, over and above the \$30.2 million over four years announced in the 2010-11 aid budget¹². Further Australia should **ensure that disability-inclusive strategies are embedded into all development activities /programs** the way gender has been.

Climate Change

Finally, **Australia should ensure that funding and activities relating directly to climate change adaptation and mitigation are managed separately to the aid budget, and that funding for these activities is in addition to the already committed increase to 0.5% GNI by 2015-16**. This would reflect Australia's compliance with the principle of the 'additionality' of climate change financing (agreed in the Copenhagen Accord¹³ to which Australia is a signatory), which means that climate change funding should be over and above the commitment to 0.7% of GNI as ODA, first pledged in 1970 and repeatedly affirmed since, including in the Monterrey Financing for Development agreement in 2002¹⁴.

1.3. Relative focus of the aid program on low and middle-income countries

Of the countries to which Australia currently gives aid, 9 of these are classified as Least Developed Countries (Cambodia, Myanmar, Laos, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Tuvalu and Vanuatu)¹⁵.

According to OECD analysis¹⁶, in 2008-09 less than one-quarter of Australia's ODA was allocated to LDCs compared to about a one-third for Canada, NZ and UK (see Appendix 3.1). In 2007 this equated to 0.08% of GNI and this level has remained fairly constant since then¹⁷. The internationally agreed target, which Kevin Rudd committed to reach¹⁸, is 0.15% GNI and this is also the average of DAC countries. **Australia should therefore increase the proportion of funding to LDCs to be 0.15% of GNI.**

Where aid is given to middle-income countries, programs should be developed based on evidence that the aid is directed at the poorest people and communities.

1.4. Relative costs and benefits of the different forms of aid, including the role of non government organisations and the appropriate balance between multilateral and bilateral aid funding arrangements

Channels

Australia currently gives an exceptionally high proportion of its funding bilaterally. To scale up the aid program more effectively, Australia should decrease the proportion of aid that is delivered bilaterally, by increasing the proportion that is channelled through other arrangements, such as multilaterals, NGOs and delegation to development agencies from other countries.

- **Increase total proportion of funds going to multilaterals:** Channelling aid through multilaterals leads to greater harmonisation of aid and helps to reduce transaction costs for recipient countries. Further, as seen above, Australia can use multilateral organisations to provide funding to countries where it does not have a comparable advantage. The AusAID website¹⁹ states, "Australia commits over 30 per cent of the aid program to multilateral organisations such as United Nations organisations, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and global funds in core and non-core funding". However in the 2010-11 aid budget, only 22% of total ODA allocated to 'global programs'²⁰ and data from the OECD²¹ shows that from 2002 to 2009, Australia gave an average of just 16% of official ODA. Both these figures are notably lower than the average proportion of ODA to multilaterals of other DAC donors, which is 28% (see Appendix 4.1). The White Paper on Australian Aid²² states that this lower proportion reflects "Australia's focus on Asia and especially the Pacific, where most multilaterals are less engaged". However the White Paper also states, "Australia will look to 'buy in' IFI projects to the Pacific and facilitate greater multilateral involvement in the region".

Australia should therefore lift the proportion of the aid budget delivered in this way to 25%-30%. This would have the added advantage of lessening the pressure on AusAID as Australia moves to scale up its aid budget. Further Australia should step up efforts to increase multilateral engagement in the Pacific, which can assist in greater harmonisation of aid funds to this region.

- **Refocus distribution amongst multilaterals:** The main focus of Australia's multilateral funding goes to the WB and ADB. In the 2007-8 budget, just over half of Australia's multilateral spending went to these two organisations.²³ According to data provided in the DAC peer review²⁴, Australia provides above average to the World Bank Group and Regional Development Banks, and below average to UN agencies and other multilaterals (see Appendix 4.2 and 4.3).

Further, many major NGOs have concerns about how well the international and regional financial institutions are in providing aid that is focused on poverty reduction and in line with the Paris Declaration principle of ownership. According to AidWatch²⁵, "the World Bank and ADB in particular have been criticised for conditionality of their loans, undemocratic governing structures, and funding large-scale projects that undermine people's lives and livelihoods". For example, major analysis

undertaken by Oxfam²⁶ and EURODAD²⁷ on the IMF and WB, show that even though these institutions now use a country's own Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) to guide their efforts, most loans still come with significant conditions attached which are almost identical to the previous and much-criticised conditionality related to the structural adjustment programs of the 80s and 90s. Further, even though PRSPs are meant to be country-owned strategies, analysis by Caritas International²⁸, World Development Movement²⁹ and others³⁰ show that at best this ownership is problematic and at worst it is virtually non-existent. While this analysis does not include the regional Asian Development Bank, a comparison of the voting rights for the World Bank and ADB show similar trends (For example, in the ADB, 7 countries control more than half the vote, and of these 3 are not in Asia. The other 50% of the vote is split between the remaining 60 member countries - see Appendix 4.3).

Australia should therefore decrease the proportion of funds that are channelled through the World Bank and the ADB, until it can be shown that the World Bank has addressed the issues surrounding ownership and conditionality. Instead, **Australia should significantly increase the proportion of funds that go through other multilateral mechanisms**, such as UN development agencies such as the World Health Organisation, UNICEF and UNDP, the Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria, the Global Environment Facility and Education for All Fast Track Initiative, etc, thus balancing the multilateral portfolio.

- **Increase the use of international NGOs**, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, and NGOs within recipient countries, and investigate partnerships with international foundations such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation.

These NGOs typically have long-term experience and linkages with partner organisations and communities in their countries of operation, thus ensuring the cultural suitability of the assistance provided. They are also more likely to source goods directly from the country or region affected, which brings added benefit to the local economy.

- **At the least, maintain a proportion of 5% going to Australian NGOs as the total amount of aid is scaled up.** As the aid budget doubles, this will significantly increase the amount of aid channelled through the NGO sector. The DAC Peer Review found that "Since 2004, the percentage of ODA allocated through NGOs has remained stable, at 5%". However the 2010-11 aid budget shows only \$135 million was allocated to NGOs and community engagement programs³¹ - a mere 2.5% of the total budget. Further, according to AidWatch, of the tendered contracts shown in the Australian tenders database, less than 4% of the total value of aid contracts between 2007 and 2010 were given to NGOs (see Appendix 5.2)³²

Further, Australia should **be ready to lift this proportion to 10% should evidence be provided that the NGO community can effectively use a greater proportion.** Australian Government funding makes up only a small proportion of total funds raised by Australian NGOs, just 14% in 2008-09³³ see Appendix 5.1b). In addition, AusAID should work with the NGO sector to develop effectiveness guidelines/benchmarks and strategies to assist the sector in being able to effectively make use of a larger proportion of the aid budget, thus lessening some of the pressure on AusAID of this and future scale ups of the aid budget.

- **Increase the amount of aid channelled through the development agencies of other donors.** According the DAC 2009 Development Cooperation Report³⁴ Australia's aid is relatively fragmented, with a mix of programs that include a few large country programs with the remainder spread over a large number of partner counties. (For example, in the 2010-11 budget, the top 3 aid recipients (Indonesia, PNG and the Solomon Islands received 50% of all country-allocated ODA. The remaining 28 countries shared the other half, with 8 countries receiving less than 1% of these funds³⁵.)

According to the report, fragmentation can weaken ownership and burden the already limited institutional capacities of recipient countries. The Paris Declaration³⁶ calls for countries to increase aid effectiveness by reducing fragmentation through delegation of authority. Australia should therefore work with existing partnered donors (ie. UK and NZ) to explore the scope for increasing the amount of funds that Australia delegates to their programs. **Australia should also develop**

partnerships with new donors, particularly those that already have the capacity to deliver large sums of aid and who have good accountability and transparency.

Mechanisms

- **Significantly increase the proportion of the aid program that is delivered as budget support.** Budget support and use of other Public Financial Management systems is important in strengthening recipient country systems. It promotes greater transparency of aid money by the country's Parliament and helps reduce transaction costs for the country. Particularly, Australia should focus on increasing budget support for countries that are already demonstrating high quality systems according to the Paris Dec evaluations, as well as those countries where mechanisms can be put in place to ensure accountability for use of funds.

A key recommendation from the Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey was, "Donors should better equip themselves to meet their commitments on using and strengthening country systems. Donors should adopt clear policies and establish incentive mechanisms for using country systems"³⁷. This applies particularly to Australia who registered only average improvement, but starting from a low base and therefore still below average. The overall synthesis report from the evaluation also recommended, "the need for a "mature risk management" approach – accepting and managing the risks that may sometimes be implied in these changes, and recognising that ineffective aid is the most serious risk of all"³⁸. Australia's Annual Review of Development Effectiveness in 2009 also highlighted this, saying "Whereas AusAID's current approach tends to stress managing short-term fiduciary risk, the aid program needs to find a balance between protecting public funds and supporting partner countries to develop stronger governance frameworks. Risks need to be tackled if services are to reach the poor in a sustainable way, without dependence on donor financing and systems."³⁹

- **Arrest the increase in the number of stand-alone projects and then begin to reduce the total number of projects.** Aid proliferation (large numbers of individual programs and projects operating concurrently) has been identified as a barrier to aid effectiveness and efficiency, by increasing transaction costs for recipient countries and narrowing the potential scope for results. Aid proliferation was noted in Australia's self-assessment for the Paris Declaration evaluations as being a key challenge for Australia's aid program⁴⁰. Australia should also reduce the number of "parallel implementation units" and ensure that project-delivered aid uses country systems.
- **Continue to reduce the proportion of aid given as technical assistance.** Australia currently gives around 46% of its bilateral aid in the form of technical assistance⁴¹. The Annual Review of Development Effectiveness stated that Australia provides around double the DAC average in technical assistance⁴². This is the use of consultants to build capacity, and generally involves highly paid Australian AusAID or commercial consultants. In line with its commitments under the Accra Agenda, Australia must **continue to ensure that technical assistance is provided in line with recipient country strategies**, and generally only where requested by the recipient government. The Paris Declaration Monitoring Survey found only average improvement in the alignment of technical assistance to partner country needs (see Appendix 6.1). **Finally, where technical assistance is used, Australia should prioritise the use of local consultants over Australian ones.**
- **Increase the proportion of aid contracts that are awarded to developing country companies.** Even though Australia officially untied its aid program in 2007, it currently still delivers about 70% of its bilateral aid through 20 large Australian commercial development companies⁴³. While aligning with recipient government systems should mean less reliance on contractors in the coming years, Australia should work with its developing country partners to increase the capacity of companies in developing country to tender for and win contracts, and set a target to reach by 2015. **Where Australia does use an Australian corporation, the Government should require the corporation to use local people, products and systems to deliver its projects.** Further, all commercial aid contracts should be made publicly available.

2. The performance of the aid program, the program's approach to efficiency and effectiveness, and whether the current systems, policies and procedures in place maximise effectiveness

A number of evaluations have been carried out recently on the effectiveness of Australia's aid program, including the Paris Declaration Monitory Survey (year), Paris Declaration Evaluation Case Study on Australia (year), and a DAC Peer Review (2008)⁴⁴.

Strengths identified by these evaluations include: that: high-level commitment to Paris principles is strong, the principles have been integrated into country strategies and the Pacific Partnerships for Development, and the increased devolution of staff and responsibility to country offices, which will help increase the recipient country ownership of country programs. Further the creation of the Office for Development Effectiveness (ODE) and the publishing of an Annual Review of Development Effectiveness are seen a great step forward.

A number of challenges areas for improvement were also identified, and a number of key recommendations made, including:

- **Fragmentation of aid and proliferation of activities:** as discussed above in the section on mechanisms, Australia needs to increase harmonisation with other donors through delegation of aid and increased division of labour, and in its own programs, increase budget support and sector-wide approaches and reduce number of individual aid activities.
- **Operationalising Paris Declaration principles:** Australia needs to implement explicit incentives for AusAID management and staff to comply with the Paris Declaration, and ensure policies mitigate the implicit disincentive, which is the time-consuming nature of the Paris Declaration, which can make quick fixes tempting. Further, Australia should ensure that the Paris Principles (particularly ownership/alignment) are integrated into all contracts with commercial aid providers, and that they demonstrate adherence in their own processes.
- **Aid predictability and recording of Australia's aid in recipient country budgets:** Australia has increased its aid predictability through longer term programmes (up to 10 years in some cases). However, while country strategies cover a five year period, no indicative funding envelope is yet attached to these strategies. Further, while the annual budgeting process now allowing the commitment of funding for the next three years, funds administered by AusAID are still allocated annually by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to bilateral, regional and global programmes.

The DAC Peer Review states that, "AusAID will need to consider how to address these constraints to be able to provide timely information on budget allocations to partner governments, in line with commitments in the Accra Agenda for Action".

- **Performance-tied aid:** Performance-tied aid, while potentially increasing progress under the Managing for Results principle, can conflict with the principles of ownership, particularly where the performance conditions are determined by Australia rather than the recipient country, or by only select officials within the recipient country. According to Reality of Aid report⁴⁵, "Donors often undermine democratic accountability through secret policy dialogue with developing country government officials on aid and debt conditions, in which their citizens are largely unaware and have no role".

Australia should therefore ensure and be able to demonstrate its alignment to the Paris Declaration principles which specifically calls on donors to: "Draw conditions, whenever possible, from a partner's national development strategy or its annual review of progress in implementing this strategy. Other conditions would be included only when a sound justification exists and would be undertaken transparently and in close consultation with other donors and stake holders."

NOTES

- ¹ Calculated from [Commonwealth Government Treasury, International Development Assistance Budget 2010-11](#), Table 2
- ² [OECD, Development Aid at a Glance 2010: Statistics by Region](#) , Table 4.1.6
- ³ [Australian Council for International Development, Analysis: Aid Budget 2010/11](#), Table 2
- ⁴ [OECD, Development Aid at a Glance 2010: Statistics by Region](#), Figures 4.1.4 and 6.1.4
- ⁵ [Micah Challenge, 0.7% Report, We can meet the Challenge! 2008](#), p.43-44
- ⁶ [OECD, Development Aid at a Glance 2010: Statistics by Region](#) , Tables 4.2.1 and 6.2.1
- ⁷ [AusAID Media Release, Australia Provides Support for Maternal Health in Africa, 2008](#)
- ⁸ [OECD, Development Aid at a Glance 2010: Statistics by Region](#)
- ⁹ [Micah Challenge, The World We Want To See, 2010](#)
- ¹⁰ [TearFund, Corruption and its discontents, 2010](#), p.6
- ¹¹ [OECD, Evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, Case study of Australia](#), p.14
- ¹² [Australian Council for International Development, Analysis: Aid Budget 2010/11](#), p.21
- ¹³ [UNFCCC, Copenhagen Accord](#), Principle 8, P.6-7
- ¹⁴ [United Nations, Report of the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, 2002](#), Para 42, p.9
- ¹⁵ [UN-OHRLS, List of Least Developed Countries \(LDCs\)](#)
- ¹⁶ [OECD, Aid at a glance graphs, 2008-09](#)
- ¹⁷ [Make Poverty History, Goal 8 Report, 2009](#)
- ¹⁸ [Kevin Rudd, The Importance of Aid Effectiveness \(speech\), 2010](#)
- ¹⁹ [AusAID website, Partners > Multilaterals](#)
- ²⁰ [Commonwealth Government Treasury, International Development Assistance Budget 2010-11](#), Table 1
- ²¹ [OECD.STAT, Aggregate Aid Statistics, ODA by Donor](#)
- ²² [Commonwealth Government, Australian Aid: Promoting Growth and Stability \(White Paper\), 2006](#)
- ²³ [Aid/WATCH, Where is your aid money going? Multilateral Aid](#)
- ²⁴ [OECD, DAC Peer Review – Australia, 2008](#)
- ²⁵ [Aid/WATCH, Where is your aid money going? Multilateral Aid](#)
- ²⁶ [Oxfam International, Kicking the Habit: How the World Bank and the IMF are still addicted to attaching economic policy conditions to aid, 2006](#)
- ²⁷ [EURODAD, Critical Conditions: The IMF maintains its grip on low-income governments, 2008](#)
- ²⁸ [Caritas Internationalis, “PRSP: Are the World Bank and IMF delivering on promises?”, 2004](#)
- ²⁹ [World Development Movement, Denying Democracy: How the IMF and World Bank take power from people, 2005](#)
- ³⁰ [Stewart F. & Wang, M. Do PRSPs empower poor countries and disempower the World Bank, or is it the other way round? \(QEH Working Paper Number 108\), University of Oxford \(2003\)](#)
- ³¹ [Commonwealth Government Treasury, International Development Assistance Budget 2010-11](#), Table 13
- ³² [Aid/WATCH, Where is your aid money going? Non Government Aid](#)
- ³³ [ACFID, Facts and Figures, Total funds raised by Australian NGOs](#)
- ³⁴ [OECD DAC, Development Cooperation Report, 2009](#)
- ³⁵ Calculated from [Commonwealth Government Treasury, International Development Assistance Budget 2010-11](#), Table 2
- ³⁶ [Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, 2005](#), Principle 16, p.3
- ³⁷ [OECD, 2008 Survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration](#), p.14
- ³⁸ [Evaluation Of The Implementation Of The Paris Declaration, Phase 1 Synthesis Report, 2007](#), p.39
- ³⁹ [AusAID Office for Development Effectiveness, Annual Review of Development Effectiveness, 2009, Summary](#), p.3
- ⁴⁰ [OECD, Compendium of Donor Reports on Implementing the Paris Declaration, Vol. 2: Donor self-assessments,2008](#), Para 17, p.5
- ⁴¹ [Australian National Audit Office, AusAID's Management of the Expanding Australian Aid Program, 2009](#) , p.85-86
- ⁴² [AusAID Office for Development Effectiveness, Annual Review of Development Effectiveness, 2008](#), p.36
- ⁴³ [Australian National Audit Office, AusAID's Management of the Expanding Australian Aid Program, 2009](#) , p.87
- ⁴⁴ [OECD, DAC Peer Review – Australia, 2008](#)
- ⁴⁵ [Reality of Aid, The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Donor Commitments and Civil Society Critiques, 2007](#)