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REVIEW OF ODA REPORTING OF THE COSTS OF REFUGEES
IN DONOR COUNTRIES

1. At the 1999 DAC Senior Level Meeting Switzerland proposed, and offered to fund, a study of the rules for ODA reporting of the costs of refugees arriving in donor countries [DCD/DAC/M(99)9, paragraphs 45-47].

2. This has been carried out, under the supervision of the Secretariat, by a consultant, M. Gérard Perroulaz from the Institut Universitaire d'Études de Développement in Geneva. He has been assisted by a doctoral candidate at the Institute, Ms. Vanessa Peat.

3. The consultants have found wide variety among current reporting practices, and considerable divergence of views among Members as to what should be reported.

4. Regarding the ODA definition, the consultants essentially propose to:
   
   4.1 Add a further item to DAC statistics to record the overall effort made by countries in relation to aid to refugees in donor countries (all types of expenditure for all categories of refugees).

   4.2 Amend the DAC directives to make provision for including aid to refugees in donor countries that meets the basic definition of Official Development Assistance. In the case of expenditure relating to the presence of refugees in the donor country, ODA should include only expenditure that can be considered as equivalent to ODA expenditure on refugees in developing countries.

   4.3 Exclude from ODA reporting of costs of refugees in donor countries, all expenditures not representing welfare assistance or a service provided to refugees themselves.

   4.4 i) Record under item 105 (aid to refugees in developed countries) only payments made in the donor country before return home (subsistence costs pending repatriation, training provided under repatriation and reintegration programmes, individual and family repatriation assistance paid at departure).

   ii) Include in item 106 (total aid to refugees) payments for repatriation and reinstallation assistance when it is provided after arrival of refugees in their region of origin or in a developing country, giving the geographical distribution of the assistance in Table DAC 2a (Destination of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid).

   4.5 Restrict the payments to be reported under ODA to temporary admission of refugees from regions at war or regions experiencing severe unrest, but to exclude from ODA asylum-seekers awaiting a decision and recognised refugees accorded a long-term residence permit (and family reunification), the last category being closer to measures to assist integration in countries of the North.

   4.6 Retain the 12-month reporting rule in order to simplify calculation of the average cost of a refugee.
4.7 Adapt the DAC Directives to enable assistance provided to refugees by non-governmental organisations to be reported. Report non-governmental organisations’ own expenditure incurred in relation to the categories of refugees accorded temporary admission.

**Proposed rewording of the Statistical Reporting Directives**

5. Based on these points, the consultants further propose new reporting instructions for inclusion in the DAC Statistical Reporting Directives [DCD/DAC(2000)10] as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line I.A.1.5 Emergency and distress relief (code 070)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of which: Aid to refugees, total (code 106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Refugees in donor countries (code 105)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. An asylum-seeker is a person who is awaiting a decision from the procedure for dealing with requests for asylum and a recognised refugee is a person granted refugee status under the terms of the Geneva Convention (and thus a longer-term residence permit). Others to be included in assistance in donor countries are persons from a region experiencing civil war or severe unrest who have been granted "temporary protection" (temporary permit or temporary humanitarian permit) and asylum-seekers temporarily unable to be repatriated to their country of origin (for humanitarian or political reasons - de facto refugees).

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

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, 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): expenditure relating to the presence of refugees fleeing war or severe unrest who have been accorded temporary protection, and payments for asylum-seekers who have not been granted refugee status but who are temporarily unable to be repatriated to their countries for humanitarian or political reasons. The following payments for their upkeep may be included in ODA during the first twelve months of their stay: food, shelter, pocket money, medical costs, education and vocational training. Expenditure on frontier control or administrative procedures related to asylum may not be included in ODA.

Amounts spent on the integration of refugees recognised as such under the terms of the Geneva Convention in the economy of the donor country and expenditure associated with the presence of asylum-seekers awaiting a decision shall not be included in ODA (but shall be included in Item V.3).

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.
6. The DAC is invited to consider the advisability of the six guidelines suggested above, and the appropriateness of the suggested revisions to the reporting directives. It is proposed that the consultant be invited to present his paper to the Senior Level Meeting.
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I. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND METHODS

1. The Graduate Institute of Development Studies (Institut Universitaire d’Études du Développement - IUED) was commissioned by OECD to inquire into current practice in DAC member countries regarding the inclusion of expenditure on refugees in donor countries in aggregate ODA (Official Development Assistance).

2. The purpose of the study was to provide answers to the following questions:
   1) How do countries reporting aid to refugees in donor countries determine this expenditure?
   2) Why are there such wide differences (in absolute terms and in percentage of GNP) in the amounts reported by DAC countries under this expenditure item?
   3) Why do some countries prefer not to record such expenditure as Official Development Assistance?
   4) Statistical limitations in determining unit refugee costs.
   5) Review of which categories of refugees and types of official expenditure in donor countries should be included.
   6) Ways to make the DAC Directives on the subject more specific. Possible future approaches, including recommendations for a change in the method of reporting expenditure attributable to the presence of refugees.

Successive stages of the study:
- Review of DAC statistics relating to recording as ODA the costs relating to refugees from developing countries in donor countries between 1992 and 1998.
- Preparation and dispatch of a questionnaire to all those providing statistics from all DAC countries. Review and processing of replies.
- In the light of the replies to the questionnaire, requests for clarification by telephone or e-mail.
- Consideration of the make-up of unit refugee costs for the first year of residence (set out in detail in the reports on Germany and Switzerland).
- Case studies with more detailed statistical analysis and interviews in six DAC countries (Austria, Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Norway and Switzerland). Meetings with persons responsible for statistical data, representatives of co-operation agencies, ministries of foreign affairs and those responsible for implementing asylum policies.

3. We should like to thank all those who took the time to complete the questionnaire and to express appreciation for the helpfulness of those who arranged and attended in the meetings we held in various European towns and capital cities. We should also like to thank Mr. Simon Scott (OECD) for all the advice he provided throughout this study.

4. The study was conducted from mid-May to end August 2000, which makes plain its principal limitation. There was not enough time to give detailed consideration to the practices current in different countries. There was insufficient time to ask those who replied to the questionnaire for enough detail to
reach a better understanding of how given countries arrived at given statistics. The most detailed reports are for countries in which we were able to arrange meetings locally and thus obtain clarifications and basic documentation on refugee admission policy and types of expenditure.

5. The study focused on refugees from developing countries (Part I of the DAC List of Aid Recipients). The methods of inquiry could also be applied by analogy to countries in transition (Part II of the List) (inclusion of expenditure on refugees from such countries in aggregate Official Aid (OA) statistics).

<p>| Reminder of the current Directives [DCD/DAC(2000)10] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(extracts from the current Directives, highlighted by the authors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid to refugees, total (code 106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Refugees in donor countries (code 105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17/ The following expenditures by the official sector for the sustenance of refugees may be recorded as ODA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ 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 stay. Expenditures for resettling refugees in an aid recipient country may be included, and allocated geographically, if made in the country of resettlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The definition given by the Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951, is as follows:

"For the purposes of the present Convention, the term "refugee" shall apply to any person who: as a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it." (The 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees enabled coverage by the Convention to be extended to other refugees).

7. In addition, the definition of Official Development Assistance (ODA) is as follows.
8. Official Development Assistance is defined as those flows to countries on Part 1 of the DAC List of Aid Recipients and to multilateral institutions for flows to Part I aid recipients which are:

   i) provided by official agencies, including state and local governments, or by their executive agencies;

   ii) each transaction of which:

      a) is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective; and

      b) is concessional in character and conveys a grant element of at least 25 per cent.

9. A debate on the appropriateness or otherwise of recording expenditure on refugees in donor countries as ODA has been under way for the past 20 years and has always divided DAC countries. The option of including such expenditure under the heading "Aid to refugees" (but without specifying the expenditure in donor countries) was introduced in the early 1980s (for the first 12 months only of costs incurred in hosting refugees as defined by the 1951 Geneva Convention). However, few countries took advantage of this opportunity at the outset. It was not until 1990 that DAC member countries had the opportunity to record their expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries (code 105) as a separate item in aggregate ODA. It is notable, however, that only five member countries recorded such expenditure in 1992, namely Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands. Since 1992, a growing number of countries has taken advantage of this opportunity, even some that were initially opposed to the practice (Sweden since 1994, the United States since 1997, and Australia since 1999).

10. In view of the growing dissatisfaction with the DAC Directives covering reporting of this item, in 1994 the Secretariat submitted a proposal to member countries (endorsed by most of them) that the reporting of expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries should be gradually eliminated by the end of 1997. Some member countries would have liked the transition period to have been extended to 2000. In addition, at its meeting in February 1994, the Working Party on Statistics considered recording such expenditure outside ODA, as a memorandum item. However, both proposals were rejected.

11. Despite the rejection of these two proposals, it is of interest to note the argument, supported by some members, that it would be preferable to end reporting of Code 105 expenditure under the item "aid to refugees" because of many anomalies and inconsistencies in the practices current among member countries. In 1998, a number of countries, namely Australia, Sweden and the United States, again favoured doing away with such reporting at a meeting of the Working Party on Statistics. In addition, at the meeting of senior DAC officials held in December 1999, Switzerland reactivated the proposal (dating from 1994) that such expenditure should be recorded as an item outside ODA.

12. Some members, such as the United Kingdom, called into question the very principle of considering aid to refugees in donor countries as ODA. Other countries (notably Austria and Germany) expressed a wish on a number of occasions that reporting should be extended to other categories of refugees and beyond the 12-month limit.

13. As a result, the DAC Secretariat has been steadily amending its Directives so as to meet members’ expectations more fully. Starting in 2000, DAC Directives (DCD/DAC(2000)10) now accept the reporting of expenditure on refugees fleeing from civil war or severe unrest.

14. In view of the multiplicity of interpretations of the Directives, the lack of harmony among members’ practices and the various calls by some members for amendment of the Directives, we shall start by considering current reporting practices throughout member countries. We shall then look more
specifically at the categories of refugees in question, the types of expenditure reported and the preferred options for recording this item in future. We shall conclude with a number of recommendations to reduce anomalies and irregularities in reporting under the item "aid to refugees in donor countries", code 105.
II. REPORTING PRACTICES OF DAC MEMBER COUNTRIES

A. REPORT ON MISSION TO FINLAND, JUNE 28, 2000

*Persons present at the meeting:* Mr. Peter Parkkonen, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Simon Scott, DCD/DAC, and Ms. Vanessa Peat, consultant, IUED.

**Background information on Finland’s policy on aid to refugees and procedures for processing asylum applications**

15. During the early 1990s, Finnish development assistance underwent a sharp decline (in terms of volume) as a result of a deep economic recession in Finland. Expenditures on aid to refugees reached their peak in 1992 in terms of its share of Finnish ODA (6.6%) and in 1991 in terms of volume, (amounting to US$ 52.6 million), due mainly to the large number of Bosnian refugees in Finland. However, in 1993 reporting practices became more strict which led to a drop in the volume of aid to refugees reported as ODA.

16. During the 1990s, particularly the latter half, the Finnish administration has had to adapt its practices and procedures for processing asylum applications due to the increasing number of asylum seekers arriving in Finland. Up until 1999, the Finnish administration reported expenditures for the sustenance of Convention refugees only, including quota refugees and family reunification.

17. In 1999, a new law on refugees was adopted which also modified the classification of refugees by treating Convention refugees and persons who receive asylum as a single group. As a result of this new law and of DAC’s new reporting directives in 2000, Finland has broadened the category of refugees eligible for ODA reporting; it currently includes persons who have been granted humanitarian status as well as those who receive temporary protection on an individual or collective basis – as was the case for Kosovo Albanian refugees.

**Trend in asylum seekers arriving in Finland**

18. Since 1996, the number of asylum seekers has more than tripled in Finland, going from 711 in 1996, to 1,272 in 1998 and 3,106 in 1999. Expenditures on aid to refugees, reported as ODA, for the years 1999-2000 have therefore risen considerably, from nearly US$8 million in 1998 to over US$13 million in 1999.

19. However, one should note that the rise in asylum seekers is mainly due to persons from non-ODA eligible countries, mostly Romanies from East European countries.

20. In 1999, approximately 1,000 Kosovo Albanians received collective protection in Finland for a period of one year (renewable). Nonetheless, the majority of asylum seekers in 1999 came from Slovakia (1,516 out of 3,106).
Categories of refugees who are granted permanent or temporary asylum:

21. Finland recognises as Convention refugees those persons who fear persecution due to their race, religion, nationality or membership to a particular group or political party. One should note that only one third of asylum seekers receive asylum and even fewer are recognised as Convention refugees.

22. Moreover, Finland grants residence on humanitarian grounds when it is deemed that the general situation in the refugee’s country of origin is too unsafe for him or her to return, such as due to war or civil strife.

23. Furthermore, temporary protection may be granted to persons on a collective basis in mass exodus situations. Such was the case with the group of Kosovo Albanians who came to Finland in 1999. They were granted temporary protection for a period of 1 year (renewable).

24. Finland also has quotas for recognising Convention refugees who will be granted permanent residence. After consultation with UNHCR, the annual quota has been fixed at 800 persons for Convention refugees and at 400 for family reunification.

Procedures for processing asylum applications and organisational set-up:

25. There are altogether 6 ministries that are involved in the sustenance, budgeting or reporting of aid to refugees in Finland.

   The following 4 ministries are involved in the sustenance of asylum seekers:

   1) Ministry of Labour: responsible for the sustenance and administration of refugees; and provides a general course to asylum seekers.

   2) Ministry of Education: provides language courses and vocational training but these are not reported as ODA.

   3) Ministry of the Environment: in charge of providing housing for asylum seekers and refugees, both temporary (in the country’s 3 reception centres) and permanent.

   4) Ministry of the Interior: in charge of legal procedures and processing of applications for asylum. It decides on the granting of asylum and temporary protection and selects quota refugees in developing countries.

26. Moreover, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are both involved in the budgeting process of aid to refugees.

27. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs gathers data from the 4 ministries above, prepares the ODA budget and reports ODA-eligible expenditures on aid to refugees to the DAC.

28. The Ministry of Finance verifies the calculations made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

29. One should note that in the past - particularly in 1994 - the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs used very different methods for calculating the number of refugees and expenditures to be reported, due mainly to different definitions of refugees. For instance, the Ministry of Finance used to report - as aid to refugees in Finland - expenditures for integration as well as expenditures on sustenance of
asylum seekers whose requests for asylum were rejected. However, the gap has considerably shrunk today and there are currently few discrepancies between their calculations.

30. With regard to processing procedures, asylum seekers have the possibility to appeal if their request for asylum is rejected by the Ministry of the Interior.

31. The average time for processing requests for asylum is 6 to 12 months. However, as of July 1, 2000, Finland has adopted a streamlined procedure for processing applications for asylum, which is used particularly in the case of refugees from Slovakia and the so-called «safe countries».

Finland’s approach to ODA reporting of refugee costs

32. Throughout the 1990s, Finland has been regularly reporting expenditures on sustenance costs for refugees.

Method for calculating sustenance costs and the number of refugees:

1) Ex-ante calculation during budgetary preparations: the number of refugees is based on an estimate (provided by the Ministry of Labour) of the number of ODA-eligible refugees, who are expected to arrive during the fiscal year.

2) Ex-post calculations of the number of refugees whose sustenance costs are reported: the ex-ante estimate is verified against the number of asylum seekers whose applications have been accepted during the calendar year.

33. Total expenditures are roughly calculated by multiplying the number of ODA-eligible refugees (who arrived in Finland during the calendar year) by the average cost of sustenance per refugee.

34. Average cost of sustenance per refugee: Approximately 6,000 FIM/month per person which amounts to roughly $12,000/year per person.

35. Sustenance includes the following: housing, clothing, pocket money, medical care and education (one course which provides general information on Finland) and transport to Finland. Expenditures for sustenance are reported for the first 12 months of their stay in Finland.

36. Items NOT reported as ODA:

1) Expenditures for the sustenance of asylum seekers whose applications have been rejected are NOT reported as ODA.
2) Administration costs in general are excluded from ODA reporting due to difficulties in gathering data.
3) Voluntary repatriation costs have not been reported because no exact calculations are made.
4) Language courses, vocational training and other education which is deemed to be integrative.

37. Option which most closely matches Finland’s current reporting practice: Option (iii), reporting of sustenance costs for Convention refugees, asylum seekers and persons granted humanitarian status and temporary protection, during the first 12 months of their stay. One should specify that expenditures are reported only for the sustenance of asylum seekers whose applications for asylum or temporary protection are accepted.
38. Total expenditures for the year 1999, matching Option (iii): US$ 16.3 million of which US$ 13 million reported as ODA (0.33% ODA/GNP).

39. Breakdown of expenditures for sustenance of refugees during first 12 months of their stay:

   1) For Convention refugees: US$ 6.3 million
   2) For Kosovo Albanian refugees and others with temporary protection: US$ 10 million

40. Expenditures in 1999 on Kosovo Albanians

   1) Expenditures for humanitarian assistance to Kosovo Albanian refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries: US$ 9 million
   2) Expenditures for sustenance of Kosovo Albanians in Finland in 1999: US$ 6 million

Comments: Regarding DAC directives and reporting methods

41. Reporting expenditures on aid to refugees as ODA has been a very political issue in Finland as in most DAC member countries, where the administration has been debating whether to continue reporting the costs of sustenance for the first 12 months of asylum seekers’ stay in Finland. Finland interprets its current reporting practices as being in line with the DAC directives, particularly in terms of their interpretation of a refugee. Finland would urge the DAC to treat persons who have fled their country due to war or severe unrest in the same way as Convention refugees because they believe that there is no humanitarian difference between these types of refugees. Finland would thus favour a definition of refugees that would consider them to be a single group of refugees, by removing the distinction between Convention refugees and persons granted humanitarian status or temporary protection - which they deem to be artificial. Moreover, Finland would like to specify the terms of “severe unrest” in the DAC’s definition of ODA-eligible refugees.

42. With regard to items that can be reported under sustenance, Finland would like to exclude all administration costs tied to refugees from expenditures reported as ODA.

43. Finally, Finland does not feel that the DAC needs to change the 12-month limit for reporting although it stands as an artificial yet necessary cut-off point.
B. REPORT ON MISSION TO NORWAY, JUNE 29, 2000

Persons present at the meeting: Mr. Tom Hunstad, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ms. Jørid Almas, NORAD, 4 persons from the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development: Ms. Catharina Luraas and Mr. Aashild Wiik (Legal Section) and Ms. Bjørn Finstad and Ms. Henriette Munkebye (from the Directorate of Immigration) and Mr. Jan Olav Petterson from the Ministry of Finance, Ms. Vanessa Peat, consultant, IUED.

Background information on Norway’s policy on aid to refugees and procedures for processing asylum applications

Trend in asylum seekers arriving in Norway

44. Norwegian policy on aid to refugees has had to adapt new policies and procedures regarding their aid to refugees in Norway over the past 2 years due to the fourfold increase in arrivals of asylum seekers in 1999. More specifically, in 1999, 10,160 asylum seekers arrived in Norway, a 19% increase over the number of refugees in 1998, and over four times that in 1997. The trend in asylum seekers in Norway also stands out in that nearly 50% of refugees in 1999 were Northern Iraqi Kurds (4,073), representing an increase of 209% from 1998. The number of asylum seekers from former Yugoslavia (excluding Kosovo) has declined in 1999, unlike in most European countries, from 1,666 in 1998 to 1,152 in 1999. However last year, the Norwegian administration of aid to refugees underwent a very difficult year due to the unexpectedly high number of Kosovo Albanians who arrived in and were evacuated to Norway. Over 6,000 Kosovo Albanians were evacuated from Macedonia to Norway in 1999.

45. As a result of the sharp rise in the number of asylum seekers who arrived in Norway, the time for processing their applications has also increased since 1995, when there were approximately 2,000 new refugees annually (from 1995 to 1997).

Categories of refugees who are granted permanent or temporary asylum

46. Norway recognises as Convention refugees those persons who fear persecution due to their race, religion, nationality or membership to a particular group or political party. Moreover, Norway grants residence on humanitarian grounds when it is deemed that the general situation in the refugee’s country of origin is too unsafe for him or her to return, such as due to war or civil strife. Less than 10% of asylum seekers are recognised as refugees, under the 1951 Geneva Convention.

47. Moreover, temporary protection may be granted on a collective basis to persons in mass exodus situations, in which case applications for asylum are suspended for up to 3 years. Collective protection has been granted to Bosnian refugees up until December 31, 1998 and to Kosovo Albanians, up until August 6, 1999. For those who do not wish to return, they can apply for individual asylum.

Procedures for processing asylum applications and organisational set-up

48. There are altogether five ministries and the Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) which are involved in the administration or reporting of aid to refugees in Norway: the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Justice. In addition, the Parliament (Storting) takes the final decision regarding the total budget of aid to refugees and decides on the amount which should reported as ODA.

49. It is by and large the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development which bears the greatest responsibility for administering aid to refugees in Norway. More specifically, it is the Directorate
of Immigration, founded on January 1, 1998, that implements Norway’s immigration policy, including the regulation, control, and reception of refugees. When asylum seekers first arrive in Norway, the police interview them in order to verify information they reported in their applications and ask for further details if necessary. The police then send their application to the Directorate of Immigration, a part of the Ministry of Local Government. However, as of July 2000, the Directorate itself will interview asylum seekers as a means to speed up the time for processing applications. There is typically a delay of 34 weeks for the Directorate to process applications. In case of a negative decision, asylum seekers can appeal to the Ministry of Justice. As of 2001, a new Board of Appeals will be set up in order to deal specifically with appeals for asylum. In the case of asylum seekers who apply for asylum at Norway’s borders, if their application does not meet requirements for granting asylum, humanitarian status or temporary protection, they can be sent back to their countries of origin after 24 or 48 hours.

50. As soon as they have filed their application for asylum, asylum seekers are sent to reception centres (temporary housing schemes). The average stay in these centres is 18 months. Norway has a flexible system of reception centres which enables it to set up new centres when needed, as was the case in 1999, or on the contrary, to reduce the number of centres in operation. Due to the large number of refugees in 1999, up to 144 reception centres (during the peak period) were in operation. By the end of 1999, 131 centres were operating, with approximately 14,000 refugees. Asylum seekers usually stay in reception centres until they are settled into municipalities. However, even refugees whose applications have been rejected can remain in these centres, when it is deemed that the situation in their countries of origin is too unstable for them to return. Reception centres are not administered by the Ministry of Local Government itself but rather by its six regional offices, which delegate the administration of reception centres to private organisations.

51. During their stay in reception centres, the Ministry of Education provides language courses for all adults and primary schooling for their children. As we shall see in the next section, these costs are reported as ODA. Moreover, some refugees are granted temporary work permits during their stay in reception centres when the Directorate of Immigration deems that the processing time for their application will exceed a 3-month period.

52. Finally, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs play a role in the budgeting process of aid to refugees. Based on actual expenditures by the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development, the Ministry of Finance determines the annual budget for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and development assistance, in which is included the budget for aid to refugees. The Ministry of Finance also informs NORAD of the budget; the latter is in charge of reporting all expenditures related to development assistance (including aid to refugees) to the DAC.

53. The budget is readjusted 2-3 times a year in line with the number of asylum seekers who have arrived in Norway during the course of the year. At the end of each fiscal year (which is also the calendar year), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs reports the actual costs related to aid to refugees to the Parliament based on numbers provided by the Ministry of Finance. It is then up to the Parliament to decide how much of expenditures on aid to refugees will be reported as ODA.

Reporting practices

54. Norway began to specify costs related to the sustenance, transportation and repatriation of refugees as ODA, on an annual basis, in 1994. However, these costs were first included in ODA in 1990, for a total amount of NOK 120 million or US$ 15.4 million.
55. Since 1994, Norway has reported as ODA expenditures related to the sustenance of asylum seekers, whose nationalities meet the requirements of DAC lists as well repatriation costs to their countries of origin. In their reporting to the DAC, costs by categories of refugees are not specified and represent a global sum of sustenance for all refugees (asylum seekers and persons granted humanitarian status or temporary protection) during the first twelve months of their stay in reception centres.

56. **Average cost of sustenance per refugee**: NOK 110,000 or US$ 14,100. Sustenance includes the following: housing, pocket money, transportation between reception centres (if they move from one centre to another), healthcare and education.

57. **Method for calculating sustenance costs and the number of refugees**: The Directorate of Immigration (of the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development) calculates the number of refugees by counting the number of asylum seekers who stay in reception centres for 1 year (the first 12 months of their stay). The number of refugees is based on the number of persons who are admitted in the centres and it is verified 2-3 times a year. In 1999, when over 10,000 refugees arrived in Norway, they were obliged to modify their budget being as it had been based on a much smaller number of refugees. Sustenance costs for refugees who stay in reception centres for over 1 year are NOT reported. They do not calculate sustenance costs by categories of asylum seekers.

58. **Voluntary repatriation**: NOK 15,000 per person or US$ 1,920. An average of 400 persons voluntarily return to their countries of origin annually with a lump sum of money which they are free to spend as they wish (to cover moving expenses, reconstruction and so forth).

59. **Option which most closely matches Norway’s current reporting practice**: option (iii), reporting of sustenance costs for Convention refugees, asylum seekers and persons granted humanitarian status and temporary protection, during the first 12 months of their stay.

60. **Total amount to be reported as ODA for the year 1999**: NOK 433.2 million or US$ 55.56 million (expenditures on refugees in donor country as reported to the DAC).

61. **Expenditures in 1999 on Kosovo Albanians**

1) Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Kosovo Albanian refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries: (Includes costs for evacuation of 6,099 Kosovo Albanians who were brought to Norway)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thousands of KrN</th>
<th>Millions of $US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>13,788</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>11,208</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>325,912</td>
<td>41.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Expenditures for sustenance of Kosovo Albanians in Norway in 1999:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugees from:</th>
<th>Thousands of KrN</th>
<th>Millions of $US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>166,851</td>
<td>21.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,243</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. This is the overall sum for expenditures on sustenance of all Kosovo Albanians staying in reception centres in 1999. However, only part of this sum will be reported as ODA, excluding expenditures on sustenance of evacuated refugees which is included in humanitarian assistance in developing countries (item 105). The amount to be reported as ODA will concern expenditures for approximately 3,000 Kosovo Albanian refugees.

63. Costs for repatriation of Kosovo Albanians in 1999: NOK 55 m. approximately (US$ 7.05 million), for about 3,600 Kosovo Albanians who returned to Kosovo by winter 1999.

Comments regarding DAC Directives and reporting methods

64. Within the Norwegian government, there is a consensus regarding the methods for counting the number of refugees and calculating costs for their sustenance. However, there is no clear-cut consensus in terms of how much of these expenditures should be reported as ODA and it is the Parliament that decides annually on the amount to reported as ODA. It remains a subject of many debates and is a very political issue. One should also recall that Norway remains one of the few DAC member countries where there is a strong commitment to maintaining a 1% ratio of ODA/GNP. However, there is no such consensus, neither within the administration nor public opinion, on the degree to which aid to refugees in Norway should be considered as ODA.

65. Norway has respected DAC directives, particularly regarding the 1-year limit. The persons at the meeting expressed no wish to change these directives, nor do they have the political leverage to do so. It would have to be the Parliament that decides on changing their reporting practices. However, the persons from the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development expressed their concern for changing calculation methods for expenditures. They would undergo major feasibility problems if they had to change their reporting methods, particularly if they had to differentiate costs by categories of asylum seekers.
C. REPORT ON MISSION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, JULY 10, 2000

Persons present at the meeting: Ms. Elizabeth Robin, DFID/Statistics Department, Mr. Gary James, DFID/Finance Department and Ms. Vanessa Peat, consultant, IUED.

Background information on United Kingdom’s policy on aid to refugees and procedures for processing asylum applications

66. Please note that the content of the following section was not discussed during the meeting; it is included for information only.

Trend in asylum seekers arriving to the United Kingdom

67. Since January 2000, over 30,000 persons have submitted asylum applications in the UK. The top two countries of origin are China and Sri Lanka. Since mid-1998, there was a sharp rise in applications from Kosovan Albanians in the UK. In 1999, there were 11,465 asylum seekers (excluding dependants) from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the UK, in addition to which the UK admitted approximately 4,400 Kosovan Albanians for a period of 12 months. Overall, the number of asylum applications has been relatively stable since 1998, averaging 5,000 to 6,000 on a monthly basis. As a result, over 50,000 asylum seekers arrive in the UK on an annual basis which has given rise to a serious backlog in asylum decisions.

Procedures for processing asylum applications and organisational set-up:

68. The administration of refugees in the United Kingdom is under the responsibility of the Home Office, in particular the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND). The IND is currently developing new procedures for processing applications for asylum.

69. The Department of Social Security provides for housing, food and other benefits to refugees and asylum seekers. The Department for Education and Employment and the Department of Health also provide benefits to refugees and asylum seekers.

70. In 1999 the administration adopted the New Immigration and Asylum Act which touches on all areas of the immigration and asylum system (replacing the 1996 Asylum and Immigration Act). In terms of asylum procedures, the 1999 Act seeks to centralise the system of appeals and speed up the decision-making process of asylum decisions.

UK’s position on reporting expenditures on aid to refugees in donor countries as ODA

Reasons for not reporting this item as ODA

71. Since the early 1980s when the issue of reporting aid to refugees in donor countries as Official Development Assistance (ODA) came up for discussion in the DAC, the United Kingdom has stood firmly

against this principle. No consensus has been reached among DAC country members which resulted in the adoption of the 1994 directives, stating that reporting against this item is optional.

72. The UK has always upheld the principle that the sustenance of refugees and asylum seekers in donor countries should NOT be considered as humanitarian aid.

73. Last year, the British administration reviewed UK’s position on this issue in light of the current trend of Kosovo Albanian refugees in the UK. However, the administration upheld their principle not to report such expenditures despite the fact that if they were to report against this item, UK’s ODA volume would rise to some extent. The UK has thus decided to maintain its position as a non-reporting DAC member.

74. Option which most closely matches UK’s current reporting practice: Nil option

75. Conditions under which the UK would consider reporting this item

1) Regarding the categories of ODA-eligible refugees and asylum seekers:

In the event that the UK were to begin reporting expenditures on this item: the UK would only consider reporting costs for the sustenance of persons granted temporary protection in the UK on the condition that they return to their countries of origin (by a specific time).

2) Regarding the time limit:

The UK is strongly against extending the 12-month limit for reporting expenditures for sustenance. It would on the contrary welcome efforts to reduce the time limit.

76. Expenditures in 1999 on Kosovo Albanians. It is to be noted that the following numbers are rough estimates.

77. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance to Kosovo Albanian refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries: £107 million or $US 173,111,147 for 1999 fiscal year.

78. Please note that expenditures reported to DAC cover the calendar year and reported expenditures for Kosovo Albanians amounted to £30 million (contained in codes for Albania, FYROM, FRY, states of ex-Yugoslavia and the Balkan region).

79. Expenditures for evacuating Kosovo Albanians to the UK are not reported in ODA statistics because they are not included in the budget of the Department for International Development (DFID).

80. Expenditures for the sustenance of Kosovo Albanians in the UK: Approximately £ 10 million or $US 16,178,612 for about 4,400 persons.

Comments

81. The United Kingdom has consistently stood against the principle of reporting expenditures on aid to refugees in donor countries as humanitarian assistance. It does not plan on beginning to report against this item in the future. Moreover, public opinion has not actively participated in the debate on development assistance and aid to refugees being as there is little public awareness of this issue. The media talks more of foreign aid in general terms rather than about development assistance. One should note nonetheless that the current administration has been committed to reaching the 0.7% target and that UK’s ODA volume in absolute terms has been on the rise.
82. Considering UK’s position on this issue, it would urge the DAC to restrict the definition of ODA-eligible refugees to the absolute minimum (persons with temporary protection) and to maintain - or preferably reduce - the 12-month limit. The UK is neither in favour of reporting costs for sustenance of Convention refugees and asylum seekers nor of extending the time limit. As for the latter category (asylum seekers), the UK does not consider that they fit the DAC definition of refugees. Therefore, the UK is against reporting expenditures for the sustenance of both Convention refugees and asylum seekers as ODA.

83. Finally, DFID has expressed its concern for potential feasibility problems (for gathering data) if it were to begin reporting against this item.
D. REPORT ON MISSION TO AUSTRIA, JUNE 20 & 21, 2000
Meetings in Vienna on 20 and 21 July 2000 with the following:
Mrs Edda Weiss, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Dr. Heide-Marie Fenzl, Ministry of the Interior, official responsible for section III.15 (assistance to persons under temporary protection - "de facto refugees")
Mrs Shmira Alani, Ministry of the Interior, official responsible for section III.14 (asylum-seekers)
Mrs Hedwig Riegler, ÖFSE, Österreichische Forschungsstiftung für Entwicklungshilfe

84. The information below derives from the proceedings of the above meetings and a review of the sources provided by ÖFSE and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Difficulties in estimating expenditure on hosting refugees in Austria

85. Costs are difficult to estimate because approximately a third are met by the Bundesländer (regions) and two-thirds by central government (BMI). In reality, payments by the Bundesländer almost certainly come to more than a third of expenditure. The Bundesländer also run specific repatriation assistance programmes (local programmes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austrian Expenditure on refugees recorded as ODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to refugees in Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which: Asylum-seekers (BMI expenditure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary admissions (BMI expenditure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary admissions (paid by Länder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to refugees as % of GNP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asylum-seekers from developing countries
Expenses met by central government (BMI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Asylum-Seekers</th>
<th>Expenditure per person (Shillings)</th>
<th>Total Expenditure Million Shillings</th>
<th>Expenditure per person ($US)</th>
<th>Total expenditure million $US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1 568</td>
<td>74 000</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>6 480</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1 817</td>
<td>53 000</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>5 257</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2 244</td>
<td>53 000</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>5 010</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1 927</td>
<td>49 000</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>4 017</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3 578</td>
<td>30 000</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>2 424</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6 717</td>
<td>46 000</td>
<td>309.0</td>
<td>3 562</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OFSE

On the principle of including aid to refugees

86. Austria would like to be able to include in ODA all expenditure entailed in hosting refugees, for all categories of refugees and for the whole of their stay in Austria.

87. The 1996 and 2000 DAC Peer Reviews of Austrian aid regretted that Austria had not adhered to the DAC Directives relating to aid to refugees in that it had included aid to refugees beyond the 12 months specified in the Directives. In recent years, Austria has included in ODA expenditure on all asylum-seekers for their first 12 months and on persons accorded temporary protection for their entire stay (frequently in excess of 12 months). Expenditure on refugees in Austria accounts for a large part of the country’s total ODA (24% of ODA in 1992, 21% in 1993, 15% in 1996 and 8% in 1998).

88. Current practice in Austria (since 1999) has been to report expenditure on asylum-seekers and persons receiving temporary protection (de facto refugees) but to confine such reporting to the first 12 months of residence (see the country summary).

89. Should another compromise on the modifications to be made to the Directives have to be found, those consulted would prefer to record expenditure that had a bearing on development policy. They would therefore favour reporting expenditure on repatriation assistance (individual repatriation and local projects) and expenditure with a direct or indirect impact on the region of origin.

Enhancing the positive aspects of temporary residence by refugees

90. There are grounds for including some of the money spent on refugees in Austria in ODA, since it also represents indirect aid for the region of origin. The reasons given are as follows.

91. In regions experiencing a major crisis, temporary admission of refugees to countries of the North enables neighbouring countries or regions to be relieved of the burden of displaced persons or refugees. The crises in Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia would have been much more severe if Europe had not given temporary refuge to over 600,000 Bosnian refugees.
92. Aid to refugees is a component of humanitarian aid. It makes little sense to make ODA include aid to refugees in the South, but not when such refugees end up in the North.

93. It is important to recognise that some expenditure on refugees can be regarded as an investment in human capital (human capacity building). Refugees are not "wasting time” if they can get a job and acquire skills that can be used on return to their country (language courses, vocational training, courses on human rights and democracy, schooling for children, literacy classes, computer training) and if they can receive treatment (for example for disorders resulting from their experiences). Refugees should not be turned into jobless wanderers in the host country; their period of temporary residence should be used to give them something they will find useful after their return. Even German language courses can be given a content that can serve refugees after their return home (awareness of human rights, democracy, gender issues). Expenditure to be included in ODA should therefore be payments with development policy implications.

Problems relating to development co-operation

94. Persons working in development co-operation (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and ÖFSE) mainly voiced the concerns below:

Varying ODA from year to year

95. Opinions diverged as to how adverse an impact was produced by ODA that varied from year to year with the number of asylum-seekers. Other components of Austrian co-operation were also subject to variation, including for instance the practice of reporting contributions to multilateral financial institutions at time of commitment rather than at time of encashment (more stable). There is also the fact that migration will probably also be a continuing problem in years to come. Development co-operation thus cannot ignore matters relating to migration.

Official assistance to individuals or aid to a group of recipients

96. Aid to refugees is directed to individuals (or families) whereas development co-operation is based on projects designed to target population groups.

Co-operation in the short- and long-term

97. Development co-operation involves long-term policies, whereas aid to refugees is a policy based on admission as a short-term measure. Taking in people from regions in crisis is a policy that incompatible with the concept of focusing aid on a number of partner countries.

98. Sources:

Meetings in Vienna on 20 and 21 July 2000.
E. REPORT ON MISSION TO GERMANY, AUGUST 1, 2 & 3, 2000

Meetings on 1 August 2000 at the Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development (Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ - Bonn), on 2 August at the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung (BMA - Bonn), and on 3 August at the Ministry of the Interior (BMI - Berlin) and at the Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ - offices at Berlin).

Discussion with: Mr Michael Grewe (BMZ), Mrs Wiesenbach (BMZ), Mr Grossmann et Mrs Buck (BMA), Mr Jürgen Haberland (Ministerialrat - BMI), Mr Adling (BMI), Mr Pivetzky (BMI), Mr. Rolf Lehmann-Richter (BMZ-Berlin, Migrationsbeauftragter).

Types of refugees in Germany

99. The types of residence permit in Germany are as follows (for an estimated total of 1.24 million refugees in Germany at end 1999):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated total at 31 December 1999</th>
<th>Types of residence permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>Refugees recognised as entitled to asylum under art. 16 of the Fundamental Act). Protection against political persecution guaranteed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>Family members of persons entitled to asylum. Family reunification beneficiaries. Persons who have not requested asylum but have been allowed entry to join a recognised refugee as part of family reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>Refugees under the terms of the Convention (according to art. 51 of the Act relating to foreigners). Persons protected from expulsion because of persecution in their countries for reasons of race, religion, nationality, and membership of a particular social group or political opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>Quota refugees. Foreigners admitted as part of humanitarian action undertaken by Germany. Quotas for taking in refugees fleeing regions under threat of crisis (for example South-East Asia and South America).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,500</td>
<td>Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>Stateless foreigners. Persons accorded protected status under the Act relating to the status of stateless foreigners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264,000</td>
<td>Asylum-seekers. Awaiting a decision under art. 16 or art. 51 of the Act relating to foreigners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Refugees from the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Refugees from war and civil war allowed temporary entry (under art. 32a of the Act relating to foreigners) or persons whose expulsion has been deferred under article 54 of the Act relating to foreigners. The procedure for examining a request for asylum is precluded during the admission period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423,000</td>
<td>De facto refugees. Persons who have made no request for asylum or whose request for asylum has been rejected, but who cannot for the present be returned to their country of origin (for humanitarian or political reasons).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories of refugees included in German ODA

100. German ODA includes expenditure on recognised refugees during the past year (under art. 16 of the Constitution) and persons receiving temporary protection under articles 51 and 53 of the German Act relating to foreigners (including 15,000 refugees from the war in Kosovo taken in temporarily in the summer of 1999). Individuals are counted for the year in which the decision was made (granting of refugee status, date of provisional admission, decision to suspend deportation), which enables the 12-month limit required by DAC directives to be respected.

101. ODA does not include expenditure on other individuals accorded temporary protection or asylum-seekers awaiting a decision. Germany applies the DAC Directives in a restrictive manner by excluding asylum-seekers from their calculations, since some of them have their request for asylum dealt with fairly quickly and do not necessarily stay long in Germany.

Sharing the refugee burden among countries

102. In discussing expenditure on refugees, German, Swiss and Austrian contacts mentioned the disproportion in the burdens shouldered by different countries.

103. Of the 3.5 million Bosnian refugees, 2.5 million individuals were displaced within Bosnia itself or took refuge in Croatia or Serbia. 630,000 sought refuge in European countries, 345,000 of them in Germany, 80,000 in Switzerland and 73,000 in Austria (these three countries therefore took in over 78% of persons from this region seeking refuge in Europe). (Source: Austrian co-operation).

104. Of the 345,000 Bosnians in Germany in March 1997, over 250,000 returned voluntarily to Bosnia, 5,000 were sent back and 50,000 migrated to another country of the North (in particular the United States, Canada and Australia), while the remainder are still in Germany (status at June 2000). Source: BMI.

105. Depending on the year and since the early 1990s, Germany has been the destination of 43% to 79% of asylum-seekers throughout the European Union. Germany is still hosting 59% of the war refugees from Bosnia who were living in the European Union in March 1997. This is undoubtedly one of the reasons why Germany is one of the countries that have been asking for some time for this effort to be taken into account in DAC statistics.
### Number of asylum-seekers arriving annually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of new asylum-seekers</th>
<th>Originating mainly from:</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,063</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>35,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>22,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>22,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>256,112</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>74,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>40,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>23,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>438,191</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>122,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>103,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>31,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>322,599</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>73,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>22,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>21,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>19,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>25,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>116,367</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>23,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>104,353</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>16,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>98,644</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>95,113</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>9,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Interior

106. Between 1990 and 1999, Germany had to deal with the arrival of 1,879,589 asylum-seekers, 494,745 of whom came from regions of former Yugoslavia.

### Types of expenditure associated with the presence of refugees in Germany

107. No precise overview of official expenditure arising from the presence of asylum-seekers and refugees is obtainable because some of this expenditure is not incurred by the central government but by local authorities (communes and Länder). Furthermore, social assistance and subsistence costs differ from one Land to another.

#### Social assistance

108. Foreigners resident in Germany are eligible for some forms of assistance under the Federal Act relating to social welfare (maintenance assistance, sickness assistance, assistance for pregnant women and women giving birth and assistance for care and treatment).

109. The Act relating to the benefits to be provided to asylum-seekers, which came into force in 1993, introduced for asylum-seekers and foreigners required to leave to leave Germany, a special entitlement to

110. The Act makes provision for the following benefits: food, shelter, heating, clothing, common household utensils, pocket money (assistance provided in kind plus a financial contribution and coupons), allowance in the case of illness, pregnancy and birth.

111. The number of those receiving benefit under the Act in 1998 was 438,873, including 191,663 asylum-seekers awaiting a decision, 44,131 persons refused asylum and awaiting deportation, 105,991 persons refused asylum but for whom deportation to their country of origin was not currently feasible (Duldung) and 92,734 family members of asylum-seekers.

112. These social welfare benefits were used by Germany to determine the cost of refugee support. The unit refugee cost does not include administrative costs or the cost of schooling for refugee children.

Assistance for voluntary return and reintegration

113. Some of the mechanisms for assisting return are given below. It should be mentioned at the outset that these programmes are not directed solely to refugees but are also available to foreign workers in Germany who wish to return to their own countries. It is statistically difficult to differentiate the assistance given to different categories of foreigners.

114. The REAG Programme (Reintegration and Emigration Programme for Asylum-seekers in Germany) deals with the transport of asylum-seekers and refugees to other countries and their return home. Individuals receive this assistance on withdrawal of their request for asylum. REAG takes care of the travel costs (air, train or bus) of repatriation and supplies cash assistance for the return journey (assistance per person and a contribution if the family returns by car). Overall this support comes to DM450 per head (DM 3,000 (US$1,634) per family of four returning home in their own vehicle). 180,000 persons have benefited from this programme since 1996 (at a total cost of 162 million DM).

115. Individuals from certain countries who are willing to return home but have insufficient cash to do so are eligible for additional assistance under the GARP (Government Assisted Repatriation Programme) Programme, with further assistance under REAG (temporary allowance, baggage shipping costs and travel expenses). The REAG Programme covers asylum-seekers, persons refused a request for asylum, recognised refugees and war refugees.

116. Various ministries and agencies run assisted repatriation and reintegration programmes; it would appear that such assistance is only partially included in ODA (only expenditure on humanitarian aid and local reconstruction projects are covered). REAG, for example, was until December 1999 managed by the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) and by the Ministry of the Interior (BMI) from January 2000. The ministries have mandated the International Organisation for Migration to execute the programmes. IOM is working is collaboration with the communal authorities, voluntary organisations and UNHCR.

117. Another statistical difficulty stems from the fact that REAG and GARP receive some of their money from the Länder (approximately 50% of costs) and from some communes or cities (no overall figures are available). The amount of repatriation assistance provided can thus vary from Land to Land and from commune to commune.

118. Germany also provides support to skilled workers from developing countries for repatriation and re-entry to the job market. Repatriation assistance is not only provided to asylum-seekers and refugees but also to foreign workers resident for many years in Germany (such as Turks). Such assistance includes
counselling and information on repatriation, assistance in acquiring occupational skills and establishment of new businesses. For example, the Federal Government encourages young Turks to acquire skills in the hotel trade, catering or in medicine, fields in which they will be able to find employment on their return to Turkey.

119. The amounts allocated to the various reintegration programmes are relatively modest (DM 30 to 40 million in recent years). Most of the cost of repatriation assistance for refugees consists of the sum in DM given to the refugee at the airport on return home. In Switzerland, for example, such repatriation assistance is supplemented by assistance (in kind) locally for renovation and repair of refugee homes.

**Method for estimating costs associated with refugees for inclusion in ODA**

120. Comment: Germany was one of the countries that provided us with the most information on the process used to assess the aid to refugees to be included in ODA.

1) First stage. Calculation of average expenditure per refugee

Total expenditure on those receiving Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz in 1998
(Act relating to Benefits for Asylum-seekers) 4,318,131,800 DM
Average number of beneficiaries under this Act
(mean of the beneficiaries at end 97 and end 98)
(499,370 at end 1997 and 450,254 at end 1998) 474,812 persons
Mean benefit per refugee 9,094 DM

2) Second stage. Estimate of the number of refugees involved

Expenditure linked to the following three types of refugees was included in ODA:
Recognised refugees from developing countries 3,727
Refugees under the terms of the Convention (art. 51 of the Act relating to foreigners) 5,822
Asylum-seekers refused asylum whose repatriation is not currently feasible 1,899
(under art. 53 of the Act relating to foreigners)
Total for the 3 categories under consideration 11,448

For all three categories, reporting was for the year in which the decision was made (any given individual, in particular one belonging to one of the last two types of refugees, would therefore only be taken into account for one year).

3) Third stage. Estimate of expenditure per category of refugee for inclusion in ODA. Current practice in Germany.

The figure for aid to refugees currently included in ODA statistics is given by the number of individuals in the three refugee categories mentioned above multiplied by the average expenditure of DM 9,094 (US$ 4,954), or DM 104,118 million (US$ 56.72 million) + DM 100 million for Kosovars admitted on a temporary basis.
**Estimated total expenditure on hosting refugees**  
(variant 4 iv) of the questionnaire

121. The initial assumption was that 95% of refugees came from developing countries. The meetings revealed that this proportion was probably an overestimate, with the actual figure more likely to be of the order of 80%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of recipients</th>
<th>DM (million)</th>
<th>$US (million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure given by the Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of recipients</td>
<td>450,254</td>
<td>4,102.22</td>
<td>2,234.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipients from developing countries</td>
<td>427,741</td>
<td>2,234.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure under the Act relating to Social Assistance (Bundessozialhilfegesetz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance given for residence outside group reception facilities</td>
<td>716.15</td>
<td>390.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assistance for refugees from developing countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere than in reception facilities</td>
<td>174.59</td>
<td>95.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group reception facilities</td>
<td>157.67</td>
<td>85.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for war refugees</td>
<td>169.69</td>
<td>92.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total benefit for refugees in 1998</td>
<td>5,320.32</td>
<td>2,898.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments relating to refugee costs**

122. In dealing with asylum-seekers, the German Federation relies on the Länder. Most Länder are not in a position to provide statistics since the benefits concerned are provided by different services and figures for total expenditure are unavailable. There is no detailed information regarding the costs incurred by administrative and judicial procedures and the use of administrative infrastructures (education, police, and border controls).

**Estimated total expenditure in Germany on refugees from developing countries (question 5 on the questionnaire, variants i to iv)**

Mean expenditure per refugee DM 9,094 or US$ 4,954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
<th>DM (million)</th>
<th>$US (million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognised refugees (a)</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>33.89</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees under the Convention (b)</td>
<td>5,822</td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>28.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers whose repatriation is not currently feasible (de facto refugees)(c)</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum-seekers not recognised in 99 (d) (asylum-seekers awaiting a ruling or deportation)</td>
<td>82,997</td>
<td>754.81</td>
<td>411.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary protection (Kosovo) (e)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories | Number of individuals | DM (million) | $US (million)
---|---|---|---
Variant 4(i) | Refugees recognised under the terms of the Geneva Convention (a) x 9,094 DM | 3,737 | 33.89 | 18.46
Variant 4(ii) | Refugees and asylum-seekers. Total of a to d | 858.92 | 467.90
Variant 4(iii) | Refugees, asylum-seekers and temporary admissions | 958.92 | 522.37
Variant 4(iv) | All asylum-seekers and refugees | 5,320.32 | 2,898.25
         | Without observance of the 12-month limit | 958.92 | 522.37
Current practice (total a + b + c + e) | 11,448 | 204.12 | 111.19
         | (+ 15,000 war refugees from Kosovo taken in 99)

Aid to Kosovo in 1999

| Type of aid | DM (million) | $US (million)
---|---|---
ODA provided locally 5 (i) | 53.51 | 29.15

123. This sum of DM 53.5 million covers humanitarian aid only. The Ministry of Co-operation spent an additional DM 13.9 million on longer-term projects, while technical co-operation from the Ministry of the Interior came to DM 57.5 million in 1999 and part of 2000.

124. In all, German contributions to Kosovo came to DM 1.82 thousand million in 1999 and DM 2.24 thousand million in 2000 (when humanitarian aid, reconstruction assistance, contributions to UNMIK for international policing and military intervention are taken into account).

Expenditure associated with hosting refugees from Kosovo in Germany 5 (ii) | 100.00 | 54.48

125. This estimate is vague (other BMI documents refer to DM 245 million being spent in 1999 in hosting 15,000 war refugees from Kosovo in 1999. These 15,000 refugees were granted provisional entry to Germany in July 1999 (travelling from Macedonia). 180,000 Kosovars (most of whom came to Germany before that date) are due to return to Kosovo.

Repercussions of the above variants of 4 on German ODA

| | Aid to refugees DM (million) | ODA DM (million) | Aid to refugees as a % of ODA
---|---|---|---
German ODA without aid to refugees in the North | 0.0 | 9,852.1 | 0.0%
Current ODA situation | 204.12 | 10,056.2 | 2.0%
Variant 4 (i) | 33.89 | 9,886.0 | 0.3%
Variant 4 (ii) | 858.92 | 10,711.0 | 8.0%
Variant 4 (iii) | 958.92 | 10,811.0 | 8.9%
Variant 4 (iv) | 5,320.32 | 15,172.4 | 35.1%
126. In the current situation, the refugees aid in the donor country amounts 2% of the total ODA. To restrict accounting to the refugees recognised according to the Convention of Geneva (variant 4 i) would amount changing this share to 0.3% only of the ODA. Take all refugees, asylum seekers and temporary admissions (alternative 4 iii) into account of the ODA, would result in to make pass the assistance to the refugees to nearly 9% of the total ODA.

127. To include in ODA all refugees, asylum-seekers and temporary admissions (variant 4 iii) would increase German ODA by 51%. This would increase German ODA from 0.26% of GNP to 0.39% of GNP!

The table below shows the changes in ODA (in DM) and aid to refugees included in ODA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total ODA in DM (million)</th>
<th>Aid to refugees in Germany</th>
<th>Aid to refugees as a % of ODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>13,911.8</td>
<td>973.2</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>11,504.6</td>
<td>823.4</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>11,057.4</td>
<td>572.5</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10,787.3</td>
<td>546.3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11,437.1</td>
<td>260.9</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>10,156.3</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>9,818.7</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 (prov.)</td>
<td>10,056.2</td>
<td>204.1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BMZ

128. As the above table shows, the variations in the amount of aid to refugees included in ODA principally derive from the varying numbers of asylum-seekers (the number of asylum-seekers per year given at the beginning of this report) in Germany, in particular those from Bosnia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (including Kosovo).

Some comments on the DAC Directives

129. Most contacts reported that Germany applied the DAC Directives on a restrictive basis, even though the country has frequently indicated that it would like more scope for inclusion (extension beyond the limit of the first 12 months for example).

130. As for the proposal to exclude aid to refugees from aggregate ODA statistics in future and record it in a new statistical category, some of our contacts would find it politically difficult to agree withdrawal of such expenditure from ODA. However, they remained open to the possibility of looking into the matter further. In any event, a way would have to be found to record what efforts were being made by different countries to receive refugees.

131. The German co-operation authorities would like to separate the problems of migration from foreign policy and development co-operation policy. Development co-operation should not be used as a "tool" for repatriating refugees.

Written sources:
Arbeitsgruppe Entwicklung und Fachkräfte GmbH (AGEF), Rückkehr und Reintegration, Arbeitsmaterialien für die Beratung, October 1997.
Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ), Zehnter Bericht zur Entwicklungspolitik der Bundesregierung, BMZ (Entwicklungspolitik Materialien)
F. CASE STUDY REPORT ON SWITZERLAND

Discussions in Berne with Antonella Simonetti (DFAE), Etienne Dollfuss (DDC), Peter Spycher (Beauftragter für Migration und Entwicklung), Henri-Philippe Cart (DDC), Jörg Prieden (ODR, formerly at DDC), M. Marcello Fontana.

Policy of the Federal Office for Refugees (Federal Department of Justice and the Police)

132. The current DAC Directives are unsatisfactory for two reasons:

1) It does not make sense to include in ODA expenditure on hosting refugees accepted as such under the terms of the 1951 Geneva Convention, since such refugees will settle in Switzerland in the medium to long term (much of the relevant expenditure thus being spent on integration in Switzerland and having little impact on the country of origin).

2) The 12-month limit for reporting purposes has little justification (most Kosovars, for example, have been granted a 5-month group provisional entry permit).

133. Preference should be given to an approach detailing what expenditure may be included and what may not. It is, on the other hand, perfectly legitimate for the DAC statistics to draw attention to the efforts being made by DAC member countries.

134. Three types of expenditure should, in the Office's view, be included in ODA (this could be done fairly easily from the statistical standpoint):

1) Repatriation assistance, both individual assistance and local support projects.

2) Expenditure related to admitting individuals under a temporary group protection scheme. It seems quite legitimate to include such expenditure since temporary acceptance of such refugees helps to alleviate the situation in regions or countries in severe crisis. If the question of how to distribute refugees among the various countries of the North is to be considered by UNHCR, it would appear equally logical from the standpoint of burden sharing that such expenditure should be included in ODA. In order to harmonise practices, UNHCR and DAC should indicate which population groups might fall into this category and the length of time countries could include such expenditure in ODA.

3) For asylum-seekers in general, the expenditure eligible for inclusion in ODA needs to be determined. Some health costs (coming under humanitarian aid) and occupational programmes (which include a training element) are of their nature very close to development co-operation. It would there be wise to allow health expenditure used to care for the disabled and victims of violence to be included in ODA. On the other hand, there is little justification for including the cost of treating minor disorders or food and shelter costs in ODA.

135. The information provided by Marcello Fontana (ODR) gives a very detailed view of the money spent on hosting refugees in Switzerland.
Type of expenditure on refugees

136. The categories of foreigners living in Switzerland are as follows:

- **Asylum-seekers**
  Individuals whose consideration for asylum is in progress;
  Individuals refused asylum but not yet deported.

- **Temporary entry permit**
  (F permit)
  Individuals refused asylum but whose repatriation is neither feasible
  nor can be reasonably required;
  Refugees fleeing violence and allowed entry as a group from
territories at war.

A permit is provided for a restricted length of time in cases where repatriation is not feasible, it is
renewable, work is possible if the labour market allows it.

- **Annual residence permit**
  (B permit)
  Recognised refugees, for the first five years;
  Foreigners allowed entry for humanitarian reasons,
  for the first 10 years.

The permit is valid for a year and is renewable; renewal may be refused depending on the situation
prevailing in the country of origin, reunification of families is possible after one year.

- **Permanent residence permit**
  (C permit)
  Recognised refugees having lived in Switzerland for over 5 years.

This permit is of unlimited validity unless withdrawn; it does not confer the right to vote but otherwise
places the individual on the same footing as Swiss citizens.

137. At end 1998, persons receiving asylum came under the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>numbers at end 1998</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognised refugees</td>
<td>24,439</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian cases</td>
<td>36,499</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary admissions</td>
<td>21,071</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action deferred</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case under stay (second appeal)</td>
<td>9,597</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case under stay (first appeal)</td>
<td>35,063</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>155,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Federal Office for Refugees

Comments

138. If the current DAC definition is strictly followed, expenditure on refugees eligible for inclusion
in ODA would either be expenditure agreed during the first year of residence for recognised (B permit)
refugees and for some with temporary entry permits (F permit). Because of the way accounts are set out it
is difficult to identify the expenditure associated with the separate categories of refugees. This difficulty is
experienced in most DAC countries, where it is not generally possible to identify the expenditure on the
categories covered by the DAC definition. In Switzerland, recognised refugees receive the same residence
permit as that accorded to foreign workers who are not refugees.
Inclusion in ODA - the practice in Switzerland

139. Before 1997, Switzerland did not include expenditure relating to refugees in Switzerland. Since 1998, it has included in ODA a (modest) amount relating solely to expenditure on assistance during the first year of residence of refugees recognised as such under the terms of the Geneva Convention.

140. The policy supported by the Co-operation Development Directorate (DDC) has always been that expenditure related to the presence of asylum-seekers in Switzerland has nothing to do with development co-operation. Although it is perfectly justifiable to report on the overall effort made by countries in taking in refugees, there should be no watering down of the concept of Official Development Assistance by including such costs under that statistics item. A distinction needs to be made between protection of individuals (refugees) and development.

Recording what countries have done for refugees outside aggregate ODA

141. The Directorate for Development Co-operation proposes that all money spent on aid to refugees in donor countries should be entered under other DAC statistics items, for example in the section "Other Official Flows" or as a new memorandum item, which would enable such expenditure to be recorded without artificially inflating the ODA figure. This procedure would enable this contribution to dealing with a global problem, or international public good, to be recorded without distorting ODA.

Magnitude of expenditure on refugees in Switzerland

142. Swiss ODA is very sensitive to any change in the DAC Directives since Switzerland hosts the largest number of asylum-seekers of all the European countries (according to the indicator of number of asylum-seekers per 100,000 population). The total budget for the Federal Office for Refugees is currently the same as the development co-operation budget (approximately one thousand million dollars each).

143. Overall Swiss expenditure related to the presence of asylum-seekers and persons with temporary entry permits is given in the table below.
### Expenditure on aid to refugees in Switzerland in Swiss francs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1997 Expenditure</th>
<th>1998 Expenditure</th>
<th>1999 Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff administrative costs</td>
<td>44,380,266</td>
<td>46,935,259</td>
<td>56,737,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES: rental (ES= group residential centre)</td>
<td>1,186,737</td>
<td>1,010,289</td>
<td>1,027,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES: operating costs</td>
<td>8,567,860</td>
<td>20,482,997</td>
<td>38,569,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services provided by third parties</td>
<td>6,745,419</td>
<td>8,210,774</td>
<td>11,993,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES: compensation for supervisory staff</td>
<td>7,571,001</td>
<td>9,776,989</td>
<td>16,148,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other material expenditure</td>
<td>578,566</td>
<td>512,489</td>
<td>716,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum-seekers: lump-sum allowance to cantons to cover administrative costs (1,200.- per asylum-seeker)</td>
<td>25,378,100</td>
<td>48,496,800</td>
<td>53,119,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum-seekers: lump-sum allowance for interview costs to OSAR (NGO) as representative of voluntary support bodies</td>
<td>3,392,429</td>
<td>4,558,171</td>
<td>7,103,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees: contributions to assistance benefit paid to voluntary support bodies. Assistance to recognised refugees is provided by NGOs mandated for the purpose by the Federal Government</td>
<td>154,280,512</td>
<td>121,338,472</td>
<td>96,761,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees: contributions to voluntary support bodies for infrastructure, administrative and staff expenditure incurred in supporting refugees</td>
<td>27,227,900</td>
<td>19,543,344</td>
<td>17,991,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees: contribution to OSAR (NGO) administrative costs</td>
<td>1,426,920</td>
<td>1,621,500</td>
<td>1,626,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation and reintegration assistance to asylum-seekers and refugees. Subsidy for a network of cantonal advice services providing information on repatriation and training programmes in Switzerland to assist re-employment, individual financial assistance</td>
<td>44,630,677</td>
<td>42,988,513</td>
<td>44,717,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for refugee centre staff</td>
<td>696,686</td>
<td>669,193</td>
<td>1,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening international collaboration and research on matters relating to asylum and refugees (contributions to IOM, UNHCR, SFM (Swiss Forum on Migration), ICMPD, etc.)</td>
<td>1,621,922</td>
<td>2,258,926</td>
<td>2,420,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs, costs of detention as a preparatory measure or as a prelude to expulsion</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>5,705,985</td>
<td>5,804,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement of the cost of assistance to asylum-seekers. The central government reimburses the cantons for their out-goings on asylum-seekers and persons granted provisional entry pending the asylum procedure or during the provisional entry period up to the date of return</td>
<td>677,781,296</td>
<td>739,622,118</td>
<td>1,103,881,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assistance and shelter costs                                              | 482,623,340     | 506,936,725     | 716,232,251     |
| Departure/return costs                                                    | 6,080,125       | 10,071,047      | 12,561,000      |
| Occupational programmes                                                   | 411,821         | 643,052         | 4,281,000       |
| Medical costs                                                             | 87,367,387      | 113,343,268     | 190,784,000     |
| Supervisory costs                                                         | 93,910,619      | 108,588,197     | 179,005,000     |
| Others                                                                    | 7,389,004       | 39,829          | 1,018,000       |
| Allowance to cantons to cover officials dealing with the decision process (interviews by cantonal officials) | 705,404         | 509,512         | 483,869         |
| Special vehicles                                                          | 0               | 0               | 120,000         |
| Funding for housing asylum-seekers                                         | 7,111,479       | 2,375,812       | 11,693,445      |
| ES: Residential centre                                                    | 1,016,483,134   | 1,076,617,142   | 1,472,119,944   |

144. Taking 1999 as an example, the impact of including expenditure on given categories of refugees in the figures for official development assistance is as follows.
### Categories of refugees included in ODA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of refugees included in ODA</th>
<th>Expenditure on refugees (Million $US)</th>
<th>Overall ODA (Million $US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODA without aid to refugees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>959.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognised refugees (current practice)</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>974.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Temporary entries (refugees from violence)</td>
<td>184.4</td>
<td>1,144.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum-seekers</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>1,252.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All expenditure on aid to refugees (included after 12 months)</td>
<td>734.6</td>
<td>1,694.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All expenditure on refugees/asylum-seekers</td>
<td>979.6</td>
<td>1,939.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

145. ODA expressed as a percentage of GNP could thus vary from 0.35% to twice that figure depending on the variant chosen.

146. In the interests of development co-operation in the long term, it is not necessarily a good thing for the DDC to experience a steep rise in ODA as a result of including aid to refugees. In the budget negotiations relating to development co-operation, it would increase the risk of cuts in the bilateral development co-operation budget, since there would be greater margin for manoeuvre in cutting this form of ODA than in cutting humanitarian aid or multilateral aid (since international commitments must be met) or in cutting aid to refugees (which depends on the number of incoming asylum-seekers, a variable not under the country’s control).

147. With regard to the expenditure included under ODA, Switzerland’s view is that there is a need for greater harmony among the methods countries use to determine it. DAC could perhaps propose a suitable method and countries should when submitting questionnaires to DAC report the basic components of their determination (for example country estimates of average cost per refugee and the number of individuals concerned).

**Difficulties caused by the changeable nature of expenditure on asylum-seekers**

148. Including expenditure related to the presence of asylum-seekers in Official Development Aid is undesirable in view of the variability this would introduce in ODA. The number of new requests for asylum can vary very widely from year to year. In Switzerland, the number of requests for asylum declined from 24,739 in 1993 to 16,134 in 1994 only to rise again to 24,739 in 1997 and climb to 41,302 in 1998. It would be inadvisable to include such a variable component in ODA.
III. ANALYSIS OF THE REPLIES FROM DAC COUNTRIES
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN CURRENT PRACTICE

149. A number of comments arise from a perusal of the replies to the questionnaires sent to DAC member countries and during consideration of the outcome of consultations in countries.

150. We have set out the replies given by DAC member countries to the questionnaire in summary form, dividing them into two groups. Group 1 is made up of member countries that already include official expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries in their aggregate ODA statistics. They are: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States.

151. Group 2, a smaller group, is made up of member countries that prefer not to include such expenditure in ODA. They are: Belgium, the European Commission, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom.

A. Group 1 - Comments relating to Tables 1 and 2 for Group 1

Categories of refugees included

152. Consideration of this table shows that over half the countries in Group 1, that is 11 out of the 14, report expenditure on refugees recognised under the 1951 Geneva Convention. This is hardly surprising since this is the first category to be recognised in the DAC Directives. Second place, with 8 out of 14 countries, is taken by categories of individuals admitted on humanitarian grounds or as a temporary measure and asylum-seekers. It is notable that the reporting of expenditure relating to persons accorded temporary protection or humanitarian status is relatively recent. Most of the countries concerned did not mention these two categories of refugees until the Kosovo crisis, although a minority was already reporting expenditure incurred in hosting Bosnian refugees (such as Austria and Germany).

153. However, the principle of whether or not to include expenditure on hosting asylum-seekers remains controversial. The Netherlands is the only country to report expenditure on asylum-seekers alone. Of the eight countries that included asylum-seekers in their figures, only Austria and the Netherlands reported expenditure on asylum-seekers rather than on recognised refugees. On the other hand, five countries (Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan and Switzerland) did not include asylum-seekers in their figures but reported recognised refugees instead. Lastly, six countries, Denmark, Finland, France, Norway, Sweden and the United States, reported expenditure on both recognised refugees and asylum-seekers.

154. The impact on the developing countries from which asylum-seekers and recognised refugees came was, however, widely divergent. Many arguments could be put forward to support the inclusion of either one category or the other. However, it does not seem proper to include both (this point will be taken up again in section IV.)

155. Only three countries reported expenditure relating to quota refugees under code 105. Quota refugees are a special case since they represent a fairly small group of refugees selected by the donor country and UNHCR and are thus recognised as refugees from the outset. It therefore seems to us
legitimate to report expenditure incurred on their behalf in overall humanitarian aid (this point will be taken up again in section IV).

12-month limit on refugee stay

156. There appears to be overall consensus on this point. Since 1999, all countries in Group 1 except Japan have reported expenditure on hosting refugees during the first 12 months of their stay. Until 1999, only Austria exceeded that limit. It may thus be concluded that there is no need to alter this reporting period since most member countries do not question the 12-month limit. There remain a few countries that would like the reporting period to be unlimited, notably Austria and Greece (see the section below relating to Group 2). In addition, Japan reports expenditure on hosting refugees during the period pending a decision (on recognition of refugee status), which exceeds the first 12 months.

Type of expenditure recorded

157. All 14 Group 1 countries report expenditure on subsistence costs, which includes items that vary from country to country. However, all countries include expenditure on shelter, food, clothing, pocket money and basic medical care.

158. The most controversial items of subsistence costs are education and vocational training. According to the DAC Directives, member countries should not report expenditure on education and vocational training that is intended to facilitate integration of refugees and others in the donor country. However, nine out of 13 countries report expenditure on education and training. How can it be ascertained whether education and training offered by the donor country facilitates integration by refugees and asylum-seekers?

159. It is noteworthy that most countries do not include the cost of resettlement assistance under code 105, while only seven countries report their expenditure on repatriation assistance.

Preferred options for future reporting

160. Of the 14 countries, seven, namely Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden, expressed no desire for modification of the Directives, and would therefore be in favour of maintaining the status quo.

161. The remaining seven countries would prefer options that would take other categories of refugees into account, with some variation in the reporting period and the form of the statistical aggregate. In general, 11 of the 14 countries would like to continue to include refugees recognised under the Convention, against six countries in favour of asylum-seekers, seven for persons allowed entry on a temporary or humanitarian basis and five countries in favour of quota refugees. It may be concluded that there is very nearly unanimity on the legitimacy of considering expenditure on refugees recognised under the Convention.

162. Only Germany and Austria would like to see the reporting period extended in order to be able to report expenditure on persons allowed entry on a temporary basis for the whole of their stay. In addition, Switzerland has proposed establishment of a new statistical aggregate outside the ODA framework for reporting such expenditure.
Table 1. Group 1 – Countries already reporting official expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refugee categories</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognised under the Geneva Convention</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quota refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provisional admission or admission on humanitarian grounds</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asylum-seekers</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited to first 12 months of refugees’ stay</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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. Repatriation 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred options</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variants relating to refugees category</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognised under the Geneva Convention</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asylum-seekers</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provisional admission or admission on humanitarian grounds</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quota refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variants relating to type of expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Subsistence costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Repatriation assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Item separate from ODA</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official expenditure in 1999 (USD million) (except for item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aid to all refugees in donor country</td>
<td>58.24</td>
<td>125.82</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>77.15</td>
<td>2 898</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>666.99</td>
<td>998.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aid to Kosovar refugees in donor country</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>38.52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>133.09</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Humanitarian aid to Kosovo &amp; neighbouring countries</td>
<td>4 223</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>65.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>29 149</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>27.13</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expenditure reported to DAC</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>117.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cost per refugee (US$)</td>
<td>9 410 in 1998</td>
<td>8 325</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>4 954</td>
<td>12 085</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>14 100</td>
<td>15 380</td>
<td>7 409</td>
<td>4 675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Group 2 - Countries having chosen not to report expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for non-inclusion</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>European Comm.</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Luxembourg</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Principle that it is not humanitarian aid</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Difficulties on collecting data</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Practices &amp; procedures differing from those recommended by DAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td>by default/ pol. decision</td>
<td>directives</td>
<td>pol. decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility to renew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes</td>
<td>partially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From 2001</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In x years</td>
<td>2002 to be seen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option conceivable for future inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Option (i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Option (ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>humanitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Option (iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Option (iv)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No option</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official expenditure in 1999 million USD (except for item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aid to all refugees in donor country</td>
<td>42,6</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aid to Kosavar refugees in donor country</td>
<td>16,52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,18</td>
<td>16,18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Humanitarian aid to Kosovo and neighbouring countries</td>
<td>15,9</td>
<td>14,72</td>
<td>107,4</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>0,546</td>
<td>173,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expenditure reported to DAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cost per refugee (US$)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Group 2 - comments on Table 3 for Group 2

163. Group 2 is made up of nine countries, but replies were not received from three: Belgium, New Zealand and Spain.

Reasons for not including expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries

164. It is noteworthy that of the six countries replying to the questionnaire, three said that they did not report such expenditure because of difficulties in collecting the data. The United Kingdom was alone in refusing to include this item for reasons of principle. The three remaining members did not report their expenditure on hosting refugees as a result of policy decisions (Luxembourg) or for lack of a ruling on the matter (European Commission), or else as a result of disagreement with the Directives (Greece - see relevant sheet).

Likelihood of starting to include expenditure under this heading and the options in view

165. Only Greece has said that it will begin to report expenditure on hosting refugees from 2001. Other countries have indicated that they might embark on such reporting but have not yet specified how or when they would do so, namely Italy (partial inclusion possible, such as expenditure relating to the first 45 days of stay of asylum-seekers) and Portugal.

166. In contrast, the United Kingdom and Luxembourg have maintained their positions in relation to this option and have restated their preference not to report such expenditure.

Table 4. Reported ODA expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries (million US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>115.96</td>
<td>113.37</td>
<td>122.42</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>85.23</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>183.69</td>
<td>153.16</td>
<td>111.46</td>
<td>120.04</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>104.65</td>
<td>17.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>104.85</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>78.62</td>
<td>71.38</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>94.56</td>
<td>91.78</td>
<td>87.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>42.69</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>624.02</td>
<td>497.68</td>
<td>352.99</td>
<td>381.33</td>
<td>173.37</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>52.34</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>68.02</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>109.61</td>
<td>169.54</td>
<td>75.32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>70.58</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>72.43</td>
<td>117.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>105.63</td>
<td>114.25</td>
<td>114.06</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>387.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DAC statistics
n.a.= not available
-- = expenditure not reported
Table 5. Reported ODA expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries as a % of bilateral ODA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DAC statistics
-- = expenditure not reported

C. Comments on official expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries (Tables 4 and 5)

167. A glance at Table 4 shows that the three countries reporting the highest such expenditure in 1998 were the United States, Canada and Sweden (in descending order). Again, in 1999, the United States remained at the head of the list, followed by the Netherlands and Germany. In view of the sum reported by the United States, US$ 500 million in 1999, one might inquire as to the reporting method used. The United States reports all subsistence costs relating to hosting all refugees and asylum-seekers on its territory, namely 106,936 individuals, which explains how it manages to reach such a figure. However, living costs per refugee are relatively low in the United States (US$ 4,674) in comparison to the high figure in some Scandinavian countries (Finland, Norway) and the Netherlands (with the highest figure, US$ 15,380). Another question to be considered is that of harmonising of living costs and their reporting as they can vary enormously from country to country.

168. In looking at Table 5, quite close correlation is observed between countries with the highest figures for such expenditure in relation to bilateral ODA and countries with the highest absolute figures. In 1998, Austria was in the lead with 10.1%, followed by Sweden and Canada. However, expenditure in absolute figures and as a percentage of bilateral ODA was higher in 1999 in most countries admitting refugees from Kosovo, notably in Germany and Austria, but also in Scandinavian countries such as Finland and Norway.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE: THREE VARIANTS

169. Three variants were considered:

Variant A: retain the status quo;

Variant B: include in ODA all expenditure relating to the presence of refugees in the donor country;

Variant C: include in ODA only some of the expenditure relating to the presence of refugees in the donor country (specifying what kind of expenditure should be included in ODA).

170. Our recommendation is to reject variants A and B.

VARIANT A: keep the status quo. In this case the statistics would continue to be out of harmony with each other.

171. It should be remembered that half the countries consulted which already include aid to refugees in ODA do not want any change in current practice.

172. This variant is not satisfactory, however, because the question of harmonising the statistics from different countries remains unresolved. Part III of this report, which gives summaries for comparison, shows that practices vary widely from country to country. Most countries were found to interpret the DAC Directives differently. Different countries do not take the same categories of refugees or the same types of expenditure into account.

173. The meetings held in countries also revealed unfamiliarity with some aspects of the DAC Directives. Some contacts were still unaware that now not only refugees recognised under the terms of the Geneva Convention can be reported, but also refugees admitted provisionally from regions at war. Others did not know that under the Directives expenditure intended to integrate refugees into the economy of donor countries should be excluded.

VARIANT B: Inclusion in ODA of all expenditure related to the presence of refugees in the donor country. Including in ODA all expenditure associated with hosting refugees (for all types of refugees with no time limit, for as long as the refugees remained in a country of the North). ODA would greatly increase in this case.

174. This variant is politically very controversial, since it would result in an enormous increase in the ODA of DAC member countries.

175. Including all expenditure on all categories of refugees would result in a very significant increase in ODA for most DAC countries. This would be particularly badly viewed by some developing countries and a number of non-governmental organisations, which could regard it as a means of artificially inflating ODA. This would be particularly serious since we are in a period in which the sums allocated to long-term development co-operation are stagnating or declining.
For example, Germany included US$ 204 million of aid to refugees in ODA in 1999. US$ 2.9 thousand million would have been added if estimated total living costs for refugees in Germany had been included (in other words a 49% increase in ODA).

To take a second example, in Switzerland expenditure on hosting refugees came to a total of US$ 974.9 million in 1999, while Official Development Assistance came to almost the same sum (US$ 979.6). Including all expenditure related to the presence of refugees would lift Swiss ODA in 1999 from 0.35% of GNP to nearly 0.7% of GNP! While this would allow Switzerland to demonstrate that it was meeting the United Nations target, its development co-operation agency would certainly not be happy to reach that target by such statistical manipulation.

It is important to note in this context that any change in the DAC Directives could have an enormous impact on ODA figures for some countries.

VARIANT C: Find a means of reporting the overall effort being made by countries in the sphere of aid to refugees in donor countries and specify the types of expenditure and categories of refugees to be included in ODA.

Four points to be considered in reshaping the DAC Directives:

- Ways to report the overall effort being made by countries in relation to official expenditure on refugees.
- Identifying the types of expenditure to be included in ODA.
- Specifying the categories of refugees to include in ODA.
- Fixing the time limit for reporting as ODA.

Variant C, the variant we recommend, comes with the following seven recommendations.

Overall effort on aid to refugees

RECOMMENDATION 1:
Add a further item to DAC statistics to record the overall effort made by countries in relation to aid to refugees in donor countries (all types of expenditure for all categories of refugees). Include this expenditure under item V of the DAC questionnaire.

Several countries hold the view that it is very important to draw attention in some way to the efforts being made by countries on behalf of refugees. This is a legitimate desire considering that countries are being called upon to take steps to deal with global migration and refugee flows (in addition to other major global problems such as the environment, international crime and the drug trade).

The basic question is whether including all such expenditure in ODA is the best way to draw attention to these efforts. We believe other means would be equally, if not more, effective. Wider coverage of statistics on numbers of asylum-seekers, refugee admissions and persons accorded temporary protection would provide greater publicity. There are a number of indicators that would also allow useful international comparisons to be made. For example, refugee numbers per 100,000 population would reflect the effort made in relation to the size of the country concerned. The best statistical indicator of the effort being made by various countries is not necessarily the total level of official expenditure on hosting refugees (a figure which is incidentally difficult to estimate).

A way nevertheless needs to be found to highlight the efforts countries are making to take in refugees, for example by establishing a separate statistical aggregate on aid to refugees (new item in DAC statistics, outside the ODA framework).
181. The following items are currently included in DAC statistics:

Financial contributions to developing countries and to multilateral bodies (Table 14 of the DAC Report)

- Official Development Assistance
- Other official flows
- Private flows at market terms
- Grants from non-governmental organisations

182. At the meeting of senior DAC officials in December 1999, Switzerland proposed the addition of an item (outside the ODA framework) to include expenditure by countries on aid to refugees in donor countries. In that way ODA would include only aid to refugees and displaced persons spent in developing countries.

183. Item V of Table I of the DAC questionnaire could be used for reporting overall expenditure. All that would be needed would be to add a third item to Line V (Items only partly included in DAC resource flow statistics) to join total contributions to combating narcotics (including non-ODA) (code 203) and total participation in peace-building operations (including non-ODA) (code 207). The new item could, for example, be entitled:

"Total expenditure on aid to refugees in donor countries (including non-ODA)"

Basic principle governing expenditure to be reported in aggregate ODA

RECOMMENDATION 2:

The amended DAC directives should make provision for including aid to refugees in donor countries that meets the basic definition of Official Development Assistance. In the case of expenditure relating to the presence of refugees in the donor country, ODA should include only expenditure that can be considered as equivalent to ODA expenditure in developing countries.

ODA could thus include that part of expenditure on refugees that can be considered as humanitarian aid.

Countries could also include in ODA expenditure intended to assist repatriation refugees to developing countries and their reintegration there (expenditure on human capacity-building considered as coming under development co-operation).

Reminder of the definition of Official Development Assistance (ODA) [paragraph 32 of the DAC Directives, DCD/DAC(2000)10]:

184. Official Development Assistance is defined as those flows to countries on Part I of the DAC List of Aid Recipients and to multilateral institutions for flows to Part I aid recipients which are:

i) provided by official agencies, including state and local governments, or by their executive agencies;

ii) each transaction of which:

a) is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective; and

b) is concessional in character and conveys a grant element of at least 25 per cent.

185. If these criteria are strictly applied it is impossible to claim that all refugee-hosting expenditure in countries of the North is made principally with the aim of facilitating economic development and improving living conditions in recipient countries (developing countries).
Specifying expenditure to be included in ODA

RECOMMENDATION 3:
Of the types of expenditure associated with the presence of refugees in the donor country, those to be excluded from ODA are all expenditures not representing welfare assistance or a service provided to refugees themselves. Thus ODA would include expenditure on social welfare (food, shelter, medical costs, pocket money) and expenditure representing human capacity building (training).

ODA would not include expenditure on security measures in the donor country (for example frontier controls, expulsion or detention as a preliminary to repatriation of asylum-seekers). ODA would also not include administrative expenditure associated with the procedures for handling requests for asylum except where associated with social welfare assistance or services to refugees.

186. Under the current DAC rule, the cost of transport to and upkeep in (food, shelter and basic education on everyday matters) the country of the North may be reported but not expenditure on integration in the developed country (language courses, vocational training or university education). This distinction is only partially observed in the statistics provided by different countries (see Table 1, Chapter III)

Ideally, ODA should include only the two following types of expenditure:

1. Expenditure considered as coming under humanitarian or emergency assistance. Temporary assistance provided to a refugee from a region in major crisis may be considered as a form of humanitarian aid. Why include aid to refugees in a Kosovar refugee camp in Albania (recorded as emergency aid) and refuse to include provision in the donor country of medical care provided to the war disabled or psychological counselling for children from regions in conflict?

2. Expenditure to permit reintegration in the refugee’s country of origin. Countries such as Austria claim that some expenditure on refugees can be regarded as human capacity building and thus part of development co-operation. Teaching a foreign language, giving schooling to children from a war zone, providing vocational training and granting repatriation assistance would be considered as co-operation projects in if they were developing countries.

187. Other types of expenditure, however, have little to do with development co-operation or humanitarian aid, such as frontier protection and control or overall administration of migration. It is somewhat debatable whether ODA should cover subsistence costs in donor countries (meeting basic food needs, health care for minor ailments contracted in temperate countries, lodging in communal reception centres or payment of hotel or apartment costs, pocket money).

Difficulty in collecting statistics

188. Applying the above two rules to the letter turns out to be very difficult for practical reasons (gathering statistical data in the detail required is difficult to do). One possibility would be to estimate in each country the portion of expenditure on refugees that would meet the two criteria mentioned above and to apply this rule to expenditure over a number of years. The criteria would, however, be difficult to apply to most expenditure. While awaiting a means of determining which aid components best meet the criteria of development co-operation the simplest way to proceed would be to include all expenditure on assistance to asylum-seekers.

189. Because a clear distinction between the two types of expenditure is difficult to make, some countries have sought to have all types of expenditure considered (United States, Austria, and Germany).
190. The current practice of including subsistence costs causes two principal difficulties:

- **Official expenditure provided by central government and the part played by local authorities.** Central government expenditure may be estimated fairly accurately but data on expenditure on assistance to asylum-seekers by local authorities is often very fragmentary. The problem associated with collection of statistical data is insurmountable. The best way to arrive at a reasonable assessment of total assistance to asylum-seekers is undoubtedly to obtain an estimate of at least the proportion of total expenditure shouldered by local authorities and apply this over a number of years. Austria for example estimates that one-third of expenditure is taken care of by the Länder and two-thirds by the Bund and uses this as a means of arriving at an estimate total official expenditure.

- **Difference in the types of assistance to refugees.** The second (inevitable) problem is that figures for assistance to asylum-seekers differ greatly from country to country, a fact largely explained by differences in unit refugee costs (three times greater in some countries).

191. A recent study looked into the figures for social assistance to asylum-seekers in nine European countries. The table below shows that public expenditure per asylum-seeker can vary widely around the average an 6,000 Swiss francs a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/region or locality</th>
<th>Basic benefit in francs annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria/Salzburg</td>
<td>8,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland/Geneva</td>
<td>7,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria/Vienna</td>
<td>5,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria/Steiermark</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany/Brandenburg</td>
<td>5,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany/Hesse</td>
<td>5,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland/Berne</td>
<td>4,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources of the data used to prepare this table: Denise Efionayi-Mäder (unter der Leitung von Andreas Wimmer), Sozialhilfe für Asylsuchende im Europäischen Vergleich, Neuchatel, Swiss Forum on Migration, July 1999.*

192. In most countries it is difficult to get an exact idea of expenditure disaggregated by categories of expenditure. It is also difficult to get an accurate definition of types of expenditure that will best meet the DAC criteria.
Administrative and support staff expenditure relating to asylum-seekers

193. Including the administrative expenditure incurred in procedures for handling requests for asylum in Official Development Assistance is also highly questionable, because management of migratory flows and frontier control needs to be clearly separated from provision of assistance to refugees (which may be considered as humanitarian assistance). Although it is true that administrative expenditure by co-operation agencies may be included in ODA under DAC directives, such expenditure is primarily incurred in running co-operation programmes and in drawing up development co-operation policy.

194. It is nevertheless clear that some administrative expenses cannot be taken out of given expenditure items. For example, expenditure on running group residential centres for asylum-seekers often includes the cost of support and supervisory staff. However, there are other larger items that ought to be excluded from aggregate ODA (costs of interviewing asylum-seekers and frontier security and control costs) since the main target of such activities is not humanitarian assistance but national action to cope with the refugee and global migration problem.

Repatriation and reintegration assistance

RECOMMENDATION 4:
To record under item 105 (aid to refugees in developed countries) only payments made in the donor country before departure (subsistence costs pending repatriation, training provided under repatriation and reintegration programmes, individual and family repatriation assistance paid at departure)

To include in item 106 (total aid to refugees) payments for repatriation and reinstallation assistance when such assistance is provided after arrival of refugees in their region of origin or in a developing country, giving the geographical distribution of the assistance in DAC Table 2a (Destination of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid).

195. Some DAC countries do not record a number of these payments under ODA code 105 (although they could do so) but prefer to record them under code 106. Hence there is a need to harmonise countries’ reporting practices. Another point to note is that some repatriation assistance is difficult to identify because individual repatriation assistance, for example, is often paid by other ministries than the ministry responsible for development co-operation (the Ministry of the Interior in Austria and Germany, for instance).

Categories of refugees to be included under ODA

RECOMMENDATION 5:
To restrict the payments to be reported under ODA to temporary admission of refugees from regions at war or regions experiencing severe unrest, but to exclude from ODA asylum-seekers awaiting a decision and recognised refugees accorded a long-term residence permit (and family reunification), the last category being closer to measures to assist integration in countries of the North.

196. Currently the DAC Directives provide for inclusion of the following categories:

♦ Refugees recognised under the Geneva Conventions.
♦ Refugees allowed entry from regions experiencing civil war or severe unrest.

197. Refugees accorded refugee status and thus a longer-term residence permit (renewable annually and subsequently a long-term permit following a number of years of residence in the country) are arguably...
those most likely to remain for a very long period in the North. How then can the costs of hosting them be justifiably recorded as development assistance to the countries of the South?

198. For some contacts, it was incongruous to record the first 12 months of expenditure by the donor country on recognised refugees. The decision to grant refugee status was made some time after the request for asylum. Furthermore, taking a recognised refugee into account meant taking expenditure into account that was more of the nature of integration in the economy and society of the donor country than assistance to developing countries.

199. In order to determine the amount to be included under ODA, many countries use the following simple method. They determine average expenditure on assistance for all asylum-seekers and multiply it by the number of persons accorded refugees status during the year. In many countries, a recognised refugee can no longer receive the social assistance intended for asylum-seekers once they receive a longer-term residence permit (one renewable annually at first and later on a long-term permit). If they are in employment their "cost" to the authorities is no longer very great and if they are in a socially disadvantaged situation or in long-term unemployment they are included in the categories eligible for social assistance in the same way any worker, foreign or national (social assistance is frequently paid by local authorities). As a result, most countries have no statistics on social assistance paid to recognised refugees as such.

200. It would seem more logical to record expenditure associated with the temporary presence of refugees (temporary entry permits for persons from regions at war and asylum-seekers not accorded refugee status but whose repatriation to the country of origin is not currently feasible).

201. This definition corresponds best to "flows to developing countries". By temporarily relieving countries in crisis and their neighbours of the presence of some refugees, the same type of benefit is received as from humanitarian aid to displaced persons in refugee camps (and food aid for such persons).

We therefore recommend that only expenditure on assistance to the following categories of refugees should be included under ODA:

- Temporary group admission of refugees fleeing their homes as a result of civil war or severe unrest.
- Candidates for asylum whose request for asylum has not been granted but whose repatriation has been temporarily suspended (for humanitarian or political reasons, de facto refugees).

We therefore recommend that expenditure relating to the presence of all asylum-seekers should not be recorded in total ODA.

Inclusion in ODA of subsistence payments for asylum-seekers awaiting a decision appears questionable for the following reasons:

- Inclusion of all expenditure associated with the presence of asylum-seekers awaiting a decision would considerably inflate ODA.
- Some requests are dealt with rapidly and there is no justification for including expenditure on asylum-seekers whose request for asylum is clearly untenable, on persons who in no way meet the criteria set by the Geneva Convention and who are repatriated without delay. It should be recalled that the acceptance rate is very low for refugees from certain countries of origin.
**Why retain the 12-month limit for inclusion of expenditure on refugees?**

**RECOMMENDATION 6:**

To retain the 12-month reporting rule in order to simplify calculation of the average cost of a refugee. This permits recording of the expenditure relating to presence of the categories of refugees defined above during the year in which the decision is made (decision in favour of temporary entry or decision that expulsion to given countries not currently feasible).

202. Several countries would like the 12-month limit to be extended (Austria, Germany, Greece and Japan). Several contacts believed that the 12-month limit for inclusion has very little justification (why 12 months rather than three or 18 months?).

203. In the case of asylum-seekers submitting an individual request in a country of the North, the procedure for dealing with the request may entail a considerable lapse of time before it is known whether the host country considers that the asylum-seeker meets the conditions set by the Geneva Convention and grants refugee status.

204. In the case of temporary admission of refugees from regions in severe crisis or at war, the 12-month rule is unsatisfactory. In Europe during the 1990s, Bosnian refugees generally remained several years in the host country whereas some refugees from Kosovo returned to their region of origin no more than a few months only their arrival. However, more exact determination of the effective length of stay of refugees would mean a much heavier workload in gathering statistical data.

Retaining the 12-month rule would, on the other hand, simplify statistical procedures.

205. For many countries, the 12-month limit is not only a relatively simple way of avoiding having to determine total expenditure on refugees, which would inflate ODA, but also simplifies statistical work (determination of expenditure on a refugee in the year in which the decision on admission is taken and avoidance of complicated calculations of monthly expenditure on refugee).

**Conformity with the rules relating to balance of payment statistics**

The United States suggests that that the IMF rules applicable to balance of payment should continue to be observed:

‘IMF Balance of Payments Manual (paragraph 63):
" The conduct of economic activities and transactions over a period of one year normally implies a center of interest... " and the "center of interest" is the determinant of residency in a given economy. Refugees in the donor country for one year or more thus become residents of the donor country and, accordingly, official transfers to these residents become domestic transfers and not transfers to one of the DAC list countries.’

**Grants from private non-profit-making agencies**

**RECOMMENDATION 7:**

The DAC Directives should be adapted to enable assistance provided to refugees by non-governmental organisations to be reported.

To report non-governmental organisations’ expenditure provided such organisations report expenditure incurred in relation to the categories of refugees accorded temporary admission.

206. Although this study is concerned with official assistance to developing countries, it should be remembered that non-governmental organisations (NGOs) might in some countries play a very important part in provision of assistance to asylum-seekers. In some countries, NGOs are commissioned by the
central or local authorities to provide support during interview procedures for asylum-seekers. NGOs also have a major role to play in providing social assistance to asylum seekers.

207. The DAC Directives on grants from private non-profit-making agencies currently exclude the recording of assistance to refugees in the donor country. Furthermore, flows to NGOs from the public authorities do not currently cover work commissioned from NGOs in relation to assistance and asylum request procedures. In order to give equal treatment with procedures for recording official expenditure, some thought needs to be given to amending the Directives to take account of grants to NGOs.

Proposed rewording of the Statistical Reporting Directives

In view of the need to clarify the DAC Directives and in the light of the above recommendations, the following new wording is proposed for the DAC Directives:

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)

Paragraph 1.16

208. 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. An asylum-seeker is a person who is awaiting a decision from the procedure for dealing with requests for asylum and a recognised refugee is a person granted refugee status under the terms of the Geneva Convention (and thus a longer-term residence permit). Others to be included in assistance in donor countries are persons from a region experiencing civil war or severe unrest who have been granted "temporary protection" (temporary permit or temporary humanitarian permit) and asylum-seekers temporarily unable to be repatriated to their country of origin (for humanitarian or political reasons - de facto refugees).

Paragraph 1.17

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

210. 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, 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): expenditure relating to the presence of refugees fleeing war or severe unrest who have been accorded temporary protection, and payments for asylum-seekers who have not been granted refugee status but who are temporarily unable to be repatriated to their countries for humanitarian or political reasons. The following payments for their upkeep may be included in ODA during the first twelve months of their stay: food, shelter, pocket money, medical costs, education and vocational training.
Expenditure on frontier control or administrative procedures related to asylum may not be included in ODA.

Paragraph 1.18

211. Amounts spent on the integration of refugees recognised as such under the terms of the Geneva Convention in the economy of the donor country and expenditure associated with the presence of asylum-seekers awaiting a decision shall not be included in ODA (but shall be included in Item V.3).

212. 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.

213. The following pages provide a recapitulation of the recommendations in the relevant items of the questionnaire sent by DAC annually to the statistical correspondents of member countries.
ITEMS ON THE DAC QUESTIONNAIRE ON FINANCIAL FLOWS TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND MULTILATERAL BODIES

TABLE DAC 1
DISBURSEMENTS AND COMMITMENTS OF OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE FLOWS
Flows to countries on Part I of the DAC List of Aid Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Million US dollars</th>
<th>Type of transaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE FLOWS (I+II+III+IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (I.A + I.B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.A. Bilateral Official Development Assistance (I.A.1 + I.A.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5 Emergency and distress relief (code 070)</th>
<th>Some emergency and distress relief goes to displaced persons and refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of which:</td>
<td>- Relief food aid (code 062) Of which food aid in camps for refugees or displaced persons in ODA recipient countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aid to refugees, total (code 106) Aid to refugees in developing countries and in the donor country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Local reintegration assistance (payments made in developing countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Items detailed below (code 105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-of which: Aid to refugees in donor countries (code 105) ♦ Payments made in the donor country for persons from regions experiencing civil war or severe unrest and granted temporary entry (recipients of temporary protection), quotas making provision for temporary residence (provisional humanitarian permits) and asylum-seekers whose request for asylum has been refused but whose repatriation to their country of origin is not currently possible. Expenditure on assistance and shelter, vocational training, medical costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual repatriation assistance paid at time of departure (payment in the donor country) and return travel costs.

1.8 General (core) support to national NGOs (code 077)
Include contributions to NGOs looking after refugees in the donor country and payments made in developing countries.

1.9 General (core) support to international NGOs (code 076)
Contributions to the ICRC.

I.B. Multilateral Official Development Assistance (I.B.1 + I.B.2) (code 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 United Nations agencies (code 190)</td>
<td>Contributions to international organisations such as UNHCR - Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, UNOCHA - United Nations Office of Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs, WFP - World Food Programme (food aid to refugee camps), UNWRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 EC (code 195)</td>
<td>Of which aid to refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Other agencies (code 200)</td>
<td>IOM International Organisation for Migration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memo:
- Food aid through UN (code 220)
- Food aid through EC (code 225)

IV. NET GRANTS BY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS (NGOs)

As:
1. Gross outflow from NGOs, less
   Like official expenditure, NGO contributions in the area of aid to refugees in the donor country should be included.

   2. Support received from official sector (= code 077 above)
   Payments from official sources to meet the costs of assistance to persons accorded temporary entry (inc. asylum-seekers)
### V. ITEMS ONLY PARTLY COVERED IN DAC RESOURCE FLOW STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.1. Total contributions to combating narcotics (including non-ODA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.2. Total participation in peace-building operations (including non-ODA) (code 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3. Proposed new item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.3. Total participation in peace-building operations</strong> The total amount of official expenditure associated with the presence of refugees in the donor country. For all types of expenditure and all categories of refugees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 1: SUMMARY LISTS FOR DAC MEMBERS (GROUPS 1 AND 2)

a) Summaries for countries recording the costs of hosting refugees as Official Development Aid

List of countries in Group 1:

1. Australia
2. Austria
3. Canada
4. Denmark
5. Finland
6. France
7. Germany
8. Ireland
9. Japan
10. Norway
11. Netherlands
12. Sweden
13. Switzerland
14. United States

N.B.: Conversion of currencies into US$ has been made using the 1999 annual average dollar exchange rates for DAC Members.
1. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: AUSTRALIA

Prompted by the number of refugees arriving from Kosovo and East Timor, Australia began to report expenditures relating to refugee aid in 1999.

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:
   √ Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
   √ Persons granted humanitarian status
   √ Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
   Asylum seekers

(2) Types of expenditures considered
   √ Costs of sustenance in donor country:
     √ transport of refugees to the country
     √ housing, food, clothing, medical care
     √ vocational training and education
   √ Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
   √ Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period:
   √ Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
     Until the first 24 months of their stay
     Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:
   a. The number of refugees is the number of people admitted and enjoying temporary protection.

   b. The Department of Immigration (DIMA) is responsible for collecting data. A working party has been set up within the DIMA to deal with questions relating to refugees from Kosovo and East Timor. The costs are calculated on the basis of each project, such as the Kosovar “Operation Safe Haven” project, the financing of which is calculated on the basis of the number of people with safe haven visas.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use
   a. Preferred option for future reporting
      √ (i) adding persons admitted temporarily on humanitarian grounds.
          (ii)
          (iii)
          (iv)

   b. Option currently in use (i). For 1999, the amount was AUS$91.8 million or US$58.24 million, for more than 5,700 people.

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:
   a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
      $AUS 6.545 millions or US$ 4.223 millions

   b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
      $AUS 80.3 millions or $US 51.82 millions
(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Australia is satisfied with the present DAC Directives, while recognising that it has little experience in reporting on this item. Also, Australia does not want to broaden the definition of humanitarian refugees.
2. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: AUSTRIA

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:

- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons granted humanitarian status
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
- Asylum seekers

Austria counts expenditure in respect of the following two categories: asylum seekers (who are awaiting a decision) and “de facto refugees”

(2) Types of expenditures considered

- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - transport of refugees to the country
  - housing, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period

- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
  - Until the first 24 months of their stay
  - Until the first 36 months of their stay

As from 1999. Up until 1998, Austria reported expenditure for persons granted temporary protection beyond the first 12 months. In 1999, Austria counted 6 months’ presence of Kosovar refugees (and only 6 months for 2000). Since the distinction that the DAC wants made between costs covered for the first 12 months and costs for the subsequent period is difficult from an accounting and administrative point of view, this is only an estimate.

As regards Bosnian refugees, Austria ceased in 1999 to count sustenance costs in Austria, and took account only of individual aid for repatriation and resettlement projects.

In the case of asylum seekers, reporting was still confined to the first year.

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. The number of refugees
An estimate, since refugees granted temporary protection are registered at regional (Bundesländer) level, and it is the latter that provide the Interior Ministry with data

b. Costs
Sustenance expenditure is spread between the central government (Interior Ministry) and the Bundesländer approximately as follows: 2/3 of costs are covered by the Ministry and 1/3 by the regions. It is the Austrian Foundation for Development Research (OFSE) that calculates the expenditure on the basis of information supplied by the Interior Ministry (BMI III/15 for temporary “de facto refugees” and BMI II/14 for asylum seekers). See the mission report for figures concerning the past few years.
(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   (i) adding persons admitted temporarily on humanitarian grounds.
   (ii) 
   (iii) 
   (iv) preferred option

b. Option currently in use: (iii). As of 1999, partially (iv) up until 1998 costs of asylum seekers for 12 months and costs of temporary admissions for the whole length of their stay

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

   a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
   Humanitarian aid to Kosovo and neighbouring countries: US$22.70 million
   Contributions to UNMIK (United Nations Interim Administration Mission): US$2.04 million

   b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
   Expenditures for Kosovar refugees in Austria: US$17.47 million

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Austria would like to be able to record expenditures relating to the temporary presence of refugees on Austrian territory, or at least be able to count all expenditures which have a positive impact on the development of the region from which the refugees come (positive effects when the refugees return home, human capacity building and temporarily easing the situation in regions deep in crisis). See also the mission report.
3. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: CANADA

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:

- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention: recognised in the countries of origin of the refugees or on Canadian territory (there are two categories of refugee with different status in Canada)
- Persons granted humanitarian status
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
- Asylum seekers

(2) Types of expenditures considered:

- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - transport of refugees to the country
  - housing, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period:

- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
- Until the first 24 months of their stay
- Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. The number of refugees reported is based on the number of refugees admitted to Canada, according to the number of requests received during the current year (recorded by the Canadian Immigration and Refugee Board). The cost per refugee is then calculated according to the country of origin, procedure and sponsoring. The Resettlement Division of Citizenship and Immigration Canada then checks that there have been no major changes in the legislation concerning refugees. The cost per refugee is then adjusted for inflation if it is over 1%.

b. The costs (which can be included in ODA) are calculated at federal level (excluding Quebec). Federal expenditures are split between 6 programmes covering refugees’ sustenance and also the cost of training and language courses. Some 60% of the costs relating to these programmes are included in ODA. Lastly, the total cost of refugee aid is calculated by multiplying the number of refugees by the average cost (for each of the two categories of refugee).

By way of example, the average cost per refugee (selected abroad) in 1998 amounted to Can$13.985.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   - (i).
   - (ii)
   - (iii)
   - (iv)

b. Option currently in use (i).
(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

   a. *Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.*
   
   The figures are not available.

   b. *Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.*
   
   Canada took in 7,298 Kosovars in 1999. Total expenditure on sustenance and transport for Kosovar refugees amounted to Can$72.6 million or US$48.8 million.

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Canada did not comment on this subject.
4. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: DENMARK

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:
  √ Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
  √ Persons granted humanitarian status
  √ Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
  √ Asylum seekers

(2) Types of expenditures considered
  √ Costs of sustenance in donor country:
    √ transport of refugees to the country
    √ housing, food, clothing, medical care
    √ vocational training and education
  √ Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
  √ Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period:
  √ Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
    Until the first 24 months of their stay
    Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:
  a. The number of refugees is not used in calculating total costs.
  b. Total costs are not calculated on the basis of the number of refugees, but on the basis of annual expenditures in respect of a number of government budget lines. It is the Ministry of the Interior which is responsible for collecting data and calculating total costs, in agreement with the Ministries of Finance and of Foreign Affairs

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:
  a. Preferred option for future reporting
    STATUS QUO.
  b. Option currently in use (i). Option (iii), adding persons admitted on humanitarian grounds.
    In 1999, total expenditure amounted to US$125.82 million for 15,113 people (including Kosovar refugees).

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:
  a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
    US$65.06 million.
  b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
    US$65.06 million.

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:
  Denmark is in favour of keeping the reporting system as it is, and hence maintaining the status quo. It does not wish to change the DAC Directives.
5. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: FINLAND

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:

- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons granted humanitarian status
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
  - Asylum seekers
  - Other: Quota refugees; asylum seekers who obtain refugee status under the Geneva Convention.

(2) Types of expenditures considered

- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - transport of refugees to the country
  - housing, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education: one course giving general information about Finland
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period:

- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
- Until the first 24 months of their stay
- Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. The number of refugees is calculated *ex ante* on the basis of the expected number of refugees and asylum seekers. It is then adjusted during the year on the basis of the actual number of refugees to arrive in Finland and the number of asylum seekers to obtain refugee status under the Convention.

b. During the budget preparation phase, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs calculates the costs which multiplies estimated average expenditure on refugees by the expected number of refugees.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting

   - (i)
   - (ii)
   - (iii) specifying that it is only asylum seekers recognized as refugees, plus persons admitted on humanitarian grounds.
   - (iv)

b. Option currently in use: Ibid.

Overall expenditure by Finland - for all the categories taken into account - amounted to US$16.3 million in 1999.

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

Some US$9 million.
b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
Some US$6 million

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:
Finland believes its method of reporting on expenditures connected with refugee aid is consistent with the DAC Directives, in particular with regard to the way it interprets refugee status. It would like the DAC to change its definition of refugees in such a way that persons admitted on humanitarian grounds or temporarily may be treated in the same way as refugees (under the Geneva Convention), thus forming one single group. Also, Finland would like to see all administrative expenditures excluded from the expenditures reported as ODA. Lastly, it does not see the need to change the length of the reporting period from the first twelve months of the refugees’ stay.
6. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: FRANCE

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:
- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons granted humanitarian status
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
- Asylum seekers

(2) Types of expenditures considered:
- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - transport of refugees to the country
  - housing, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.
- Other: interim and first-job seekers allowances.

(3) Duration of reporting period:
- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
- Until the first 24 months of their stay
- Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. The number of refugees is calculated on the basis of the number of cases filed by asylum seekers with the Direction de l’action sanitaire et sociale of each prefecture.

b. The costs are calculated on the basis of annual budgetary expenditures, charged by budget item and by kind of expenditure. Data collection is the responsibility of the Ministry for Economic Affairs, Finance and Industry - Direction du Trésor - Bureau de l’aide au développement, institutions multilatérales de développement.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   - (i)
   - (ii)
   - (iii)
   - (iv)

b. Option currently in use (ii). Expenditure by France on refugees’ sustenance totalled FF475 million, or US$77.15 in 1999.

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries. FF7.7 million or US$1.25 million (in the form of contributions to the Office des migrations internationales).
b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country. The 1999 figures are not yet available.

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

No comments.
7. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: GERMANY

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum-seekers included in ODA reporting:

✓ Refugees recognised under the 1951 Geneva Convention
✓ Persons admitted for humanitarian reasons
✓ Persons afforded temporary protection (on an individual or group basis)
    Asylum-seekers

(2) Types of expenditure included:

✓ Subsistence costs for refugees:
    transport of refugees to the host country
✓ shelter, food, clothing, medical care
✓ pocket money
    vocational training and education
    Cost of assisting repatriation of refugees to the country of origin
✓ Cost of resettling refugees in aid-recipient countries. Only partial (repatriation assistance programme not confined to refugees but also open to foreign workers in Germany)

(3) Reporting period:

✓ First 12 months of residence only
    Up to the first 24 months of residence
    Up to the first 36 months of residence

(4) Method used to determine refugee numbers and costs:

a) Refugee numbers
b) Costs
Details in the Mission Report

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently employed:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   (i) 
   (ii) 
   (iii) 
   ✓ (iv) Preferred option of the former Minister of Co-operation. The current position could be somewhat different.

b. Option currently employed: between (i) and (ii). In 1999, the amount came to DM 204 million or US $111.2 million, for some 11,450 persons.
For each option the estimated expenditure for recording in ODA would have been:
   (i) $US 18.464 million
   (ii) $US 467.897 million
   (iii) $US 522 million (rough estimate)
   (iv) $US 2,900 millions (rough estimate)
(6) Estimated expenditure on Kosovar refugees in 1999:

   a. Expenditure on humanitarian assistance (food, shelter and reconstruction) for refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
      US$ 29.149 million

   b. Expenditure on subsistence costs for Kosovar refugees in the donor country.
      $US 54.5 millions

(7) Comments on the DAC Directives and suggested amendments:

Germany made no comments on this subject (but also see the mission report).
8. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: IRELAND

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum-seekers included in ODA reporting:
   
   Refugees recognised under the 1951 Geneva Convention
   Persons admitted for humanitarian reasons
   Persons accorded temporary protection (on an individual or group basis)
   Asylum-seekers
   √ Other: Programme or quota refugees (as decided by UNHCR)

(2) Types of expenditure included:
   √ Subsistence costs of refugees:
     √ transport of refugees to the host country
     √ shelter, food, clothing, medical care
     √ vocational training and education
   √ Cost of assisting repatriation of refugees to their country of origin
   Cost of resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Reporting period:
   √ First 12 months of residence only
   Up to the first 24 months of residence
   Up to the first 36 months of residence

(4) Method used to determine refugee numbers and costs:
   
   a. Refugee numbers are determined by the Refugee Agency from the numbers of refugees admitted in pursuance of government decisions. Refugee numbers are thus simple to calculate; furthermore they are under strict administrative control.
   
   b. The costs recorded reflect the cost of travel to Ireland, subsistence costs and repatriation costs for programme refugees. The Refugee Agency\(^2\) is responsible for collecting the data, which it submits to the Business Management Unit, Development Co-operation Division of the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently employed:

   a. Preferred option for future reporting
      (i)
      (ii)
      (iii)
      (iv)
      Other: (see b)

   b. Option currently employed: Option (i) but only with respect to programme (or quota) refugees

   In 1999, the subsistence costs for programme refugees came to some IR£ 16.8 million. For purposes of comparison, total expenditure for all asylum-seekers (7,724 in 1999) came to IR£ 69,000,000 or US$ 93,344,150.

\(^2\) The Refugee Agency co-ordinates the admission, reception and resettlement of programme refugees.
(6) Estimated expenditure on Kosovar refugees in 1999:

   a. Expenditure on humanitarian assistance (food, shelter and reconstruction) for refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
   £IR 5,508,000 or US$ 7,451,300

   b. Expenditure on subsistence costs for Kosovar refugees in the donor country.
   £IR 8,300,000 or US$ 11,228,300 for a total of 842 Kosovar refugees.

(7) Comments on the DAC Directives and suggested amendments:

No comments.
9. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: JAPAN

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum-seekers included in ODA reporting:

- Refugees recognised under the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons admitted for humanitarian reasons
- Persons afforded temporary protection (on an individual or group basis)
- Asylum-seekers

- Other: Japan takes two categories of refugee into account. (1) persons living below the poverty line awaiting recognition as refugees under the terms of the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol; (2) refugees from Indo-China (Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia).

(2) Types of expenditure included:

- Subsistence costs for refugees:
  - transport of refugees to the host country
  - shelter, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education: Japanese language courses, social adaptation courses and job placement (the last for refugees from Indo-China)
- Cost of assisting repatriation of refugees to the country of origin
- Cost of resettling refugees in aid-recipient countries.

(3) Reporting period:

- First 12 months of residence only
- Up to the first 24 months of residence
- Up to the first 36 months of residence
- Other: Reporting covers the entirety of the period awaiting a decision on recognition of refugee status for the two types of refugees. This period exceeds the first twelve months of residence in Japan.

(4) Method used to determine refugee numbers and costs:

a. No information on the method used to determine refugee numbers and costs.

b. Per capita costs are not determined. The expenditure reported to DAC is the total cost of commissions (a sort of subsidy) allocated by the Government to the Foundation for the Welfare and Education of Asian People (FWEAP). More specifically, the Foundation receives funds from three ministries: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture and the Ministry of Labour. The total amount is reported to the Programming and Research Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which records it in ODA.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently employed:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
   (iv)

b. Option currently employed: (iv) with type of refugees detailed.
In 1999, total expenditure for refugees from Indo-China (10,531 persons) and for persons living below the poverty line while awaiting recognition of refugee status (260 persons), was equivalent to $US 9.8 million.

(6) Estimated expenditure on Kosovar refugees in 1999:

   a. Expenditure on humanitarian assistance (food, shelter and reconstruction) for refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries. US $ 173.9 million (including multilateral contributions).

   b. Expenditure on subsistence costs for Kosovar refugees in the donor country. None.

(7) Comments on the DAC Directives and suggested amendments:

No comments.

N.B.: Japan provided two replies to the questionnaire. The first indicated that it did not include official expenditure on receiving refugees in Japan because persons accorded refugee status were automatically considered to be Japanese citizens. As a result, no expenditure on their behalf could be considered as ODA.
10. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: NORWAY

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:

- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons granted humanitarian status
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)

(2) Types of expenditures considered:

- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - transport of refugees to the country
  - housing, food, clothing, medical care, plus transport costs to and from welcome centers
  - vocational training and education
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period:

- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
- Until the first 24 months of their stay
- Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. Refugee numbers are calculated on the basis of the number of asylum seekers living in reception centres for one year (the first twelve months of their stay). The number of refugees is based on the number of persons admitted to such centres and is adjusted two to three times during the year in question.

b. The costs are the overall amount of expenditure in reception centres for the sustenance of refugees and asylum seekers. No distinction is made between the various types of refugee. Once the Ministry for Local Government and Regional Development and the Education Ministry have finished calculating the total amount of expenditure that could be reported as ODA, it is up to Parliament to decide on the final amount to be reported to DAC.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   (i) adding persons admitted temporarily on humanitarian grounds.
   (ii)
   (iii)
   (iv)
   No comment.

b. Option currently in use: (iii). Adding those admitted on humanitarian grounds

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
Albania 13.788  1.77
Macedonia 11.208  1.44
Serbia & Montenegro 325.912  41.80
**TOTAL** 350.908  45.01

*b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NKr 1000</th>
<th>US$ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia &amp; Montenegro</td>
<td>166.851</td>
<td>21.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>170.243</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:**

Norway is of the view that its reporting methods are in accordance with the DAC Directives, in particular as regards the length of the reporting period (the first twelve months of a refugee’s or asylum seeker’s stay). It did not express any wish to see the present Directives amended. Lastly, it said that it would have feasibility problems if it were to have to change its reporting methods, particularly as regards differentiating between costs by category of refugee and asylum seeker.


[11. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: NETHERLANDS]

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:

- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons granted humanitarian status
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
- Asylum seekers

(2) Types of expenditures considered:

- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - Transport of refugees to the country
  - Housing, food, clothing, medical care
  - Vocational training and education
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

(3) Duration of reporting period:

- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
- Until the first 24 months of their stay
- Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. Refugee numbers are calculated and reported by the Justice Ministry’s Department of Immigration and Naturalisation. They are based on the number of asylum seekers arriving during the year in question.

b. The method of calculating costs is not specified. Generally speaking, costs are based on expenditure for the sustenance of asylum seekers and for repatriation.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   - (i)
   - (ii)
   - ✓ (iii)
   - (iv)

b. Option currently in use: (i), replacing refugees with asylum seekers.

In 1999, the Netherlands reported a total of US$117.97 million (current US dollars) of ODA. However, total expenditure in respect of all categories of refugee was in the region of Fl1,379,530, i.e. US$666.99 million for a total of 43,361 people (on the basis of Fl31.815 per person).

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

In Kosovo - Sectors:

- Health: Fl6.9 million, i.e. US$3.34 million
- Shelter: Fl13.7 million, i.e. US$6.62 million.
- Agriculture: Fl4.5 million, i.e. US$2.18 million
Landmine removal: Fl1.3 million, i.e. US$0.63 million
Other: Fl5.8 million, i.e. US$2.85 million

In the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) - Sectors:
  Health: Fl3.8 million, i.e. US$1.84 million
  Shelter: Fl7.9 million, i.e. US$3.82 million
  Food: Fl7.1 million, i.e. US$3.43 million.

In Kosovo and Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: Fl5 million, i.e. US$2.42 million.

b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
   In 1999, the Netherlands received 4 062 Kosovar refugees. The total cost per refugee was US$15.380.

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

No comments.
[2. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: SWEDEN]

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum-seekers included in ODA reporting:

√ Refugees recognised under the 1951 Geneva Convention  
√ Persons admitted for humanitarian reasons  
√ Persons afforded temporary protection (on an individual or group basis)  
√ Asylum-seekers  
√ Other: Quota refugees

(2) Types of expenditure included:

√ Subsistence costs for refugees:  
   √ transport of refugees to the host country: only for quota refugees  
   √ shelter, food, clothing, medical care  
   √ vocational training and education  
Cost of assisting repatriation of refugees to the country of origin  
Cost of resettling refugees in aid-recipient countries.

(3) Reporting period:

√ First 12 months of residence only  
   Up to the first 24 months of residence  
   Up to the first 36 months of residence

(4) Method used to determine refugee numbers and costs:

a. The refugee numbers used to determine total expenditure is an advance estimate of the number of quota refugees and the number of asylum-seekers anticipated in the following year.

b. Total expenditure is determined in advance as part of preparation of the development co-operation budget. Costs are based on the expected number of refugees and asylum-seekers and on the mean subsistence cost (per day) of asylum-seekers (depending on the average length of time taken to process cases). As for quota refugees, the costs are based on the expected number of refugees, on travel costs to Sweden and on subsistence costs (for the first year) in the municipalities.

The expected number of refugees was 12’000 for 1999 and expenditure was estimated at Swedish kronor 543 million or US $ 65,720,199. Sweden also estimated that it could accept 1,800 quota refugees for a budget of Swedish kronor 177 million or US $ 21,422,606.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently employed:

a. Preferred option for future reporting: Option (ii)  
b. Option currently employed: Option (iii)

(6) Estimated expenditure on Kosovar refugees in 1999:

a. Expenditure on humanitarian assistance (food, shelter and reconstruction) for refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.  
   Swedish kronor 17 million or US $ 2,057,500
b. Expenditure on subsistence costs for Kosovar refugees in the donor country.
Swedish kronor 121 million or US $ 14,644,800

(7) Comments on the DAC Directives and suggested amendments:

Sweden made no comments on this subject.
DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: SWITZERLAND

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum-seekers included in ODA reporting:

- Refugees recognised under the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons admitted for humanitarian reasons
- Persons afforded temporary protection (on an individual or group basis)
- Asylum-seekers

(2) Types of expenditure included:

- Subsistence costs for refugees:
  - transport of refugees to the host country
  - shelter, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education
- Cost of assisting repatriation of refugees to the country of origin
- Cost of resettling refugees in aid-recipient countries.

(3) Reporting period:

- First 12 months of residence only
- Up to the first 24 months of residence
- Up to the first 36 months of residence

(4) Method used to determine refugee numbers and costs:

The Federal Office for Refugees submits data on subsistence costs for refugees and refugee numbers. The statistics unit of the co-operation division determines the average cost per asylum-seeker, which is multiplied by the number of recognised refugees for the current year.

(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently employed:

a. Preferred option for future reporting: Option (i)

For subsistence only (food, shelter, pocket money, vocational training, medical care) of recognised refugees by the donor country during the first year of residence.

Or:

Consideration of the proposal made by Switzerland to DAC in December 1999, that is to establish a new category in addition to those currently given in Table DAC1, a category that could include total expenditure for refugees.

b. Option currently employed: Option (i), namely Swiss francs 22.8 million in 1999 or US$ 15.2 million

Rough estimate of expenditure that might be included in ODA with respect to each variant:

- Swiss francs 22.8 million, pour 2,050 refugees accepted under the terms of the Geneva Convention (multiplied by the average per capita cost of assistance, namely Swiss francs 11,134
- Swiss francs 440 million (40,000 refugees from violence multiplied by the average cost of assistance)
- 500 million (rough estimate)
- Budget for the Refugee Office in the region of Swiss francs 1.5 thousand million, or US $ 979.6 million
(6) Estimated expenditure on Kosovar refugees in 1999:

   a. Expenditure on humanitarian assistance (food, shelter and reconstruction) for refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
   Swiss francs 100 million or US $ 66.5 million

   b. Expenditure on subsistence costs for Kosovar refugees in the donor country.
   Swiss francs 200 million or US $ 133.09 million

(7) Comments on the DAC Directives and suggested amendments:

The general ODA criteria are clear and the principal object of the activities reported as ODA is in essence development of the countries concerned. Assistance to refugees, especially in donor countries, does not meet that criterion. The prime aim is protection of persons, a goal of at least equal importance to development but one that should not considered as development. In theory, therefore, expenditure on assistance to refugees should be excluded from ODA.

In addition, a special feature with regard to Switzerland is the very high level of expenditure on refugees in relation to expenditure on ODA. Switzerland is therefore very sensitive to variations in DAC Directives and to the interpretation given them
14. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: UNITED STATES

The United States has only been reporting expenditures relating to the reception of refugees since 1998 (in 1997, only State expenditures were reported).

(1) Categories of refugees and asylum seekers which are covered in the reporting:

- Persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention
- Persons granted humanitarian status with a temporary status: with the status of parolee in the USA.
- Persons granted temporary protection (on an individual or collective basis)
- Asylum seekers
- Other: “Amerasians” and special entrants.

(2) Types of expenditures considered

- Costs of sustenance in donor country:
  - transport of refugees to the country
  - housing, food, clothing, medical care
  - vocational training and education
- Costs of repatriation to their countries of origin;
- Costs for resettling refugees in aid recipient countries.

It should be noted that, in most cases, monetary and medical assistance is confined to the first 8 months of a refugee’s stay in the United States

(3) Duration of reporting period:

- Limited to the first 12 months of persons’ stay
  - Until the first 24 months of their stay
  - Until the first 36 months of their stay

(4) Method for calculating the number of refugees and related costs:

a. Since 1996, refugee numbers have been based on the number of refugees to have entered the country during the year in question, that figure being registered with the State Department’s Bureau of Refugee Programs. The total number of refugees is adjusted during the financial year.

b. Total costs are calculated on the basis of the budgetary expenditure of three government agencies: the State Department (Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, PRM), the Department of Health and Human Services (Office of Refugee Resettlement, HHS-ORR), and the Department of Agriculture (the Food Stamps Program, USAD-Food Stamps). Refugees (the above-mentioned six categories) are entitled to State aid during the first year of their stay. However, State expenditures are not included in the DAC statistical aggregate because of the data collection problem. American government budgets cover the same period as the fiscal year.

---

3 “Amerasians” allowed to immigrate into the United States come from Cambodia, Korea, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam and have to have been born between 13 December 1950 and 22 October 1982 to a North American citizen. Family reunion is allowed. Refugees can have “special entrants” status at collective level, giving them the benefit of a temporary humanitarian permit, which is what happened in the case of the Cuban and Haitian groups.
(5) Preferred option for future reporting and option currently in use:

a. Preferred option for future reporting
   (i)
   (ii)
   √ (iii) Adding the other two refugee categories considered by the United States.
   (iv)

b. Option currently in use (iii).

For fiscal 1999, total costs going towards the sustenance of refugees in the United States amounted to US$500 million, for a total of 106,936 refugees

(6) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

   a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
   A total of US$580 million in 1999 (bilateral and multilateral aid).

   b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
   A total of US$180 million in 1999.

(7) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

The United States would like to expand the refugee categories in the DAC Directives so as to take in all refugees, asylum seekers, persons admitted on humanitarian grounds and “special entrants”.

The United States would be in favour of including all official expenditures by the donor country in the DAC statistical aggregate. The argument raised here is that all the expenditures incurred during the first year of the refugees’ stay could in fact contribute to their integration; consequently, these expenditures ought not to be reported. In the United States’ view, ALL expenditures should either be included or excluded.

The United States wishes to keep the duration of the reporting period to the first twelve months of the refugees’ stay; in no way does it want DAC Member countries to be allowed to report expenditures after the first year. The US argument is that refugees become residents of the country in question after the first twelve months of their stay, with the result that expenditures incurred on their behalf after that period no longer constitute transfers to recipient countries.
b) Summaries for countries that have chosen not to record costs related to hosting refugees as Official Development Aid

*List of Group 2 countries:*

15. Belgium (no reply yet)
16. European Commission
17. Greece
18. Italy
19. Luxembourg
20. New Zealand (no reply yet)
21. Portugal
22. Spain (no reply yet)
23. United Kingdom
[15. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: BELGIUM]

No reply yet

[16. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: EUROPEAN COMMISSION]

(1) Reasons for not reporting on this item:

- Principle that aid to refugees in donor countries is neither humanitarian aid nor ODA.
- Data collection and feasibility problems for reporting these costs as ODA.
- Practices and procedures for the reception of refugees do not correspond to those recommended in the DAC Directives.
- Other: the decision not to report this aid was adopted by default because the expenditures to be included as ODA have not yet been analysed where refugee aid is concerned.

(2) Possibility to begin reporting in the future:

- No
- Yes √
- As of 2001
- In several years

(3) Option currently in use:

- Nil option √
- Option (i), (ii), (iii), but not on a regular basis

It should be noted that the total budget for all these categories of refugee combined was EUR40 million or US$46,621 204 for 1999.

(4) Foreseeable option in the event of future reporting:

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)
- (iv) √
- Other option: Nothing will be done pending the policy decision to be taken during the course of 2001.

(5) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

The total 1999 budget for Kosovar refugees was in the region of EUR15 million or US$15,982 951

b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.

No accurate data.
(6) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

The Commission commented on the fact that asylum seekers and refugees in receipt of assistance from the Commission are often nationals of Member countries rather than developing countries. When that is the case, expenditure relating to their sustenance cannot be included in ODA.
(1) Reasons for not reporting on this item:

- Principle that aid to refugees in donor countries is neither humanitarian aid nor ODA.
- Data collection and feasibility problems for reporting these costs as ODA.
- Practices and procedures for the reception of refugees do not correspond to those recommended in the DAC Directives.
- Other: The 1994 DAC Directives were too restrictive, in particular with regard to the recommended length of the accounting period.

(2) Possibility to begin reporting in the future:

- No
- Yes
- √ As of 2001: probably as soon as the reporting system they are in the process of setting up is operational.
- In several years

(3) Option currently in use:

- √ Nil option
- Option (i), (ii), (iii), but not on a regular basis

(4) Foreseeable option in the event of future reporting:

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)
- √ (iv) In 1999, this probably corresponded to Dr2.900 00 million, i.e. US$9.50 million, for 5000 people.

(5) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

- a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries. Dr4.500 00 million, i.e. US$14.72 million in 1999.

- b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country. The figures are not available.
(6) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Greece would like the 2000 DAC Directives to be amended as follows:

a. Include all categories of refugee and asylum seeker;

b. To be able to extend the eligibility period for costs relating to refugee aid up to the first 36 months of their stay.

c. Specify that the reporting of expenditures relating to taking in refugees begins from the moment of their arrival in the donor country.
18. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: ITALY

(1) Reasons for not reporting on this item:

- Principle that aid to refugees in donor countries is neither humanitarian aid nor ODA.
- √ Data collection and feasibility problems for reporting these costs as ODA.
- Practices and procedures for the reception of refugees do not correspond to those recommended in the DAC Directives.
- Other:

(2) Possibility to begin reporting in the future:

- No
- √ Yes. To some extent, by reporting just a portion of effective expenditure or an estimate thereof.
- As of 2001
- In several years

(3) Option currently in use:

- √ Nil option
- Option (i), (ii), (iii), but not on a regular basis

(4) Foreseeable option in the event of future reporting:

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)
- (iv)
- √ Other option: The reporting of sustenance costs for asylum seekers during the first 45 days of their stay.

(5) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

- Aid to Kosovar refugees: US$0.56 million.
- Emergency aid to Albania: Total: US$75.28 million
- Aid to Albanian refugees: US$0.16 million

b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.

- For Kosovar refugees: US$16.52 million

(6) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Italy does not classify expenditure relating to refugee aid in Italy as ODA because of various feasibility problems. First, it does not have the manpower needed to collect the data. Second, data collection would be all the more difficult in that expenditure is divided between central government and municipal
authorities. Third, it would be difficult for Italy to single out the costs relating to the first twelve months in which refugees and asylum seekers are in the country.

So it is important to note that if Italy has not so far reported expenditure relating to refugees as ODA, it is not for reasons of principle, but more because of feasibility problems. Also, Italy has in the past reported refugee-related expenditure to the DAC on an irregular basis, in 1993 and 1996. In its reply to the questionnaire, it mentions the possibility beginning soon to report on that part of the expenditure it can separate out at present, and even that relating to the sustenance of asylum seekers during the first 45 days of their stay.


[19. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: LUXEMBOURG]

(1) Reasons for not reporting on this item:

- Principle that aid to refugees in donor countries is neither humanitarian aid nor ODA.
- Data collection and feasibility problems for reporting these costs as ODA.
- Practices and procedures for the reception of refugees do not correspond to those recommended in the DAC Directives.
- √ Other: Political decision.

(2) Possibility to begin reporting in the future:

- √ No
- Yes
- As of 2001
- In several years

(3) Option currently in use:

- √ Nil option
- Option (i), (ii), (iii), but not on a regular basis

(4) Foreseeable option in the event of future reporting:

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)
- (iv)
- √ Other option: Nil.

(5) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

Lux F333.845 259, i.e. US$8.817 539

Under the heading of humanitarian aid to refugees, Luxembourg includes every form of humanitarian assistance, aid for reconstruction and renovation, support for agriculture, management by a local office in Pristina and the cost of repatriating the personal belongings of refugees coming to Luxembourg. In 1999, repatriation costs amounted to Lux F140.900, i.e. US$3.721.

b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.

None.

(6) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Luxembourg would have feasibility problems if it had to start reporting these costs, given that refugee aid is the responsibility of several different Ministries and departments. Also, it would not have the human resources needed to collect the data.
20. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: NEW ZEALAND

Not reply yet

21. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: PORTUGAL

(1) Reasons for not reporting on this item:
- Principle that aid to refugees in donor countries is neither humanitarian aid nor ODA.
- Data collection and feasability problems for reporting these costs as ODA.
- Practices and procedures for the reception of refugees do not correspond to those recommended in the DAC Directives.
- Other

(2) Possibility to begin reporting in the future:
- No
- Yes. Portugal is not against reporting on this item, but has not done so for reasons to do with the feasibility of collecting data.
  - As of 2001
  - In several years

(3) Option currently in use:
- Nil option
- Option (i), (ii), (iii), but not on a regular basis

(4) Foreseeable option in the event of future reporting:
- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii) Adding those admitted on humanitarian grounds.
- (iv)
- Other option:

(5) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

  a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.
  - Contributions to multilateral organisations: US$502,131
  - Contributions to non-governmental organisations: US$44,109

  b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.
  - The numbers are not available.

(6) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

Portugal has not expressed any wish for the DAC Directives to be modified.
22. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: SPAIN

Not reply yet

23. DAC MEMBER COUNTRY SUMMARY: UNITED KINGDOM

(1) Reasons for not reporting on this item:

√ Principle that aid to refugees in donor countries is neither humanitarian aid nor ODA. Data collection and feasibility problems for reporting these costs as ODA. Practices and procedures for the reception of refugees do not correspond to those recommended in the DAC Directives. Other

(2) Possibility to begin reporting in the future:

√ No

Yes. Portugal is not against reporting on this item, but has not done so for reasons to do with the feasibility of collecting data.

As of 2001

In several years

(3) Option currently in use:

√ Nil option

Option (i), (ii), (iii), but not on a regular basis

(4) Foreseeable option in the event of future reporting:

(i)
(ii)
(iii)
(iv)

√ Other option: Only sustenance costs for persons admitted on a temporary basis for the first twelve months of their stay.

(5) Estimates on expenditures in 1999 on Albanian Kosovo refugees:

a. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Albanian Kosovo refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

£107 million or US$173,111,147 for fiscal 1999.

b. Expenditures on sustenance of Albanian Kosovo refugees in your country.

Some £10 million or US$16,178,612 FOR 4,400 Kosovars.
(6) Comments on DAC Directives and on how they could be modified:

The United Kingdom would like the definition of a refugee that is used in reporting to be reduced to a strict minimum, so that only persons admitted on a temporary basis are included. It is not in favour of including in the DAC’s statistical aggregate expenditure for the sustenance of recognised refugees or asylum seekers. Also, it does not want to see any increase in the length of the reporting period (the first twelve months of a refugee’s stay), and in fact would be in favour of it being reduced.
ANNEX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE REPORTING OF EXPENDITURE ON REFUGEES IN DONOR COUNTRIES AS OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

1. Do you currently report expenditure on refugees residing in your country (on a temporary or permanent basis) as Official Development Assistance?

1 a. If so, please specify which categories of persons are covered: e.g. only persons recognised as refugees by the 1951 Geneva Convention, persons granted a humanitarian status or temporary protection, and/or asylum-seekers.

1 b. How do you calculate total costs for each person? Total costs may include payments for ensuring the transport of refugees to your country, costs for temporary sustenance, for repatriation and for resettling refugees in their countries of origin or other developing countries.

1 c. Which goods and/or services are counted, e.g. accommodation, food, clothing, spending money, vocational training and education?

1 d. Describe the process of data collection, specifying sources of data and indicate if you are the person who calculates that final total to be reported. If not, please specify which ministry or agency provides you with the final total to be reported.

2. For reporting members, are expenditures limited to the first year of a refugee’s or asylum seeker’s stay in your country?

2 a. If so, specify the methods used for counting the number of refugees.

2 b. If reported expenditures go beyond the first year, please explain your reasons and procedures used for reporting costs for stays exceeding one year. Until when do you continue to report the costs for refugees (all categories - e.g. 18 or 24 months)?

3 a. For non-reporting members, why have you chosen not to report expenditure on refugees in your country?

3 b. Do you intend to start reporting these costs in the near future?

3 c. Would it be feasible for you to report these costs? If not, please specify.

4. Which of the following most closely matches your preferred option for future reporting of this item?

   i. Only sustenance (providing food, shelter, pocket money, vocational training, medical care) of refugees, recognised by the donor country, during the first year of stay;
ii. Only sustenance of refugees and asylum seekers during the first year of stay;

iii. Only sustenance of refugees, asylum seekers and persons with temporary protection, during the first year of stay;

iv. All sustenance of refugees, asylum seekers and persons offered temporary protection, for a period exceeding the first year, until they can be repatriated to their countries of origin or granted resident status in the receiving country.

5 a. For each of the above alternatives (4. i-iv), please give us a rough estimate of expenditures you would have reported as ODA in 1999.

5 b. Could you please estimate your expenditures in 1999 on Kosovar refugees:

   i. Expenditures for humanitarian assistance (food aid, shelter and reconstruction) to Kosovar refugees and displaced persons in Kosovo and neighbouring countries.

   ii. Expenditures on sustenance of Kosovar refugees in your country.

Please specify total costs, if possible for all categories of refugees (see question no. 1) and the number of refugees who reached your country.

***

6. Comments and suggestions: