METHODOLOGY

Impact of aid cuts analysis


Dominic Raab outlined the following priority sectors in April 2021: climate and biodiversity; global health security; girls’ education; humanitarian preparedness and response; science and technology; open societies and conflict resolution; economic development and trade.

We selected countries based primarily on the UK government’s stated priorities. The Integrated Review clearly identifies countries in the Indo-Pacific region, and select African countries, particularly East African countries and Nigeria. We also included Yemen and Brazil because Yemen is a fragile state and remains the largest humanitarian crisis in the world, and because Brazil saw a massive increase in its allocation.

Based on these and the availability of data, impacts of UK aid cuts are assessed in the following 13 countries:

- Africa: Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Nigeria
- Indo-Pacific: India, Bangladesh and Nepal
- Yemen

We also estimated impacts of the budget cut on some key programme areas. These are areas that the UK has identified as priority areas and that DFID provided results estimates for. They are health, education, climate, and humanitarian.

Further notes

- FCDO provided budget data for its programmes and beneficiary countries using the financial year (2020-2021 and 2021-2022) here.

- This estimation draws on DFID’s annual Single Departmental Plan result estimates of the UK’s development interventions over April 2015-March 2020 outlined here (Please read DFID’s methodology note). The results are estimated figures which have been aggregated from across DFID’s programme results.

Assumptions

- Assume that each programme currently achieves the annual results claimed between 2015 and 2020 and there is a linear relationship between FCDO ODA spending and the results claimed.
- Use the DFID 2015-2020 aid results as a proxy for FCDO’s bilateral aid results in the programme and partner countries, with some caveats detailed below.
o DFID defined three indicator types of the estimates: cumulative, peak year, and average (mean). Therefore, to annualise:
  ▪ For peak year, use the estimate as it is.
  ▪ For cumulative, divide the estimate by the number of years as apply between April 2015 and March 2020.
  ▪ For average, use the estimate as it is.
• We estimated impacts for the key programmes generally, and also in the partner countries, based on data availability:
  o Health
    ▪ Family planning: Number of women and girls using modern methods of family planning through DFID support. The results are disaggregated by countries.
    ▪ Nutrition: Number of children under 5, women (of childbearing age), and adolescent girls reached by DFID through nutrition-related interventions. The results are disaggregated by countries.
  o Education (Indicator type: peak year): Number of children supported to gain a decent education. The results are disaggregated by gender and countries.
  o Climate:
    ▪ Energy: Level of installed capacity (megawatts) of clean energy generated as a result of ICF support
  o Humanitarian: Number of people reached with humanitarian assistance (food aid, cash, and voucher transfers) through DFID support. The results are disaggregated by countries.

Limitations and caveats

• This analysis is limited as it relies on assumptions made above and limited data availability.
• We assume a % funding cut to a programme would result in reduction of the same proportion in that programme’s results overall, and in each partner country. This may not be the case depending on a range of factors.
• This analysis is based on data from the FCDO annual report which outlines allocation to programmes, hence please note that allocation does not necessarily equal actual spend.
• For some sectors, the UK only reported estimated results of ODA spend on sectors for 2015-2020 (cumulative and not for each year) and we had to annualise impacts.
• DFID rounded down the programme totals to the nearest 100,000. We rounded down the impacts foregone to the nearest 10.
• We are assuming for the purposes of our work that the DFID reported aid results in a partner country are from UK bilateral aid. It’s not clear from DFID’s methodological notes how much UK bilateral aid or UK multilateral aid contribute to the results. For instance in education, the UK provides funding to IDA, which funds several national education programmes. It’s not clear if DFID’s share of IDA funding to education is built into these results, or whether that funding would be considered separate as part of partner government results (as it goes through national governments). Without these details we can only take DFID results as bilateral aid results.