

Unclassified

English - Or. English

15 June 2022

Development Co-operation Directorate
Development Assistance Committee

DAC Working Party on Development Finance Statistics

Report on the implementation of the Clarifications on ODA reporting of in-donor refugee costs

The DAC High Level Meeting on 30-31 October 2017 endorsed five Clarifications to the reporting directives on in-donor refugee costs and encouraged members to start applying them to their calculations for reporting on 2017 ODA (2019 ODA at the latest). This paper reports on the implementation of the Clarifications in members' reporting. It describes the WP-STAT work on this topic over the last three years and highlights the lessons learnt in the course of collecting and reviewing the models used by members for calculating their ODA-eligible in-donor refugee costs. It summarises the outcome of the Secretariat's validation process and gives recommendations for improvements needed.

This final version incorporates a factual correction signalled by one member (paragraph 20). The document was approved in May 2022 and is now declassified and made available on the OECD website at: <https://oe.cd/in-donor-refugee-costs-oda>.

Valérie Gaveau – E-mail: valerie.gaveau@oecd.org

Julia Benn – E-mail: julia.benn@oecd.org

JT03497740

Report on the implementation of the Clarifications on ODA reporting of in-donor refugee costs

Introduction

1. The DAC High Level Meeting on 30-31 October 2017 endorsed five clarifications to the reporting directives on in-donor refugee costs. See DCD/DAC(2017)35/FINAL, [2017 HLM Communiqué \(Annex 2\)](#), and the Reporting Directives DCD/DAC/STAT(2020)44/FINAL and DCD/DAC/STAT(2020)44/ADD2/FINAL (paragraphs 98-108 and Annex 18).
2. The Clarifications aimed at facilitating the assessment of what costs may be included in ODA by providing members with a blueprint to use when accounting for the costs of assisting refugees in their own countries. The Clarifications address the rationale for counting in-donor refugee costs in ODA (Clarification 1), the meaning of the term “refugee” and the categories of refugees (Clarification 2), the twelve months rule to ensure that costs are counted exclusively for refugees who have stayed in the donor country for less than twelve months (Clarification 3), the eligibility of specific cost items (Clarification 4) and the methodology for assessing costs, including actual data points and detailed calculations (Clarification 5).
3. The 2017 HLM decision entailed follow-up work by the WP-STAT to support members in implementing the agreed Clarifications in their ODA reporting. This paper gives an overview of the WP-STAT’s work on this topic over the last three years (Background) and presents the main findings as well as recommendations for further improvements (Section 1). It highlights, in more detail for each Clarification, the lessons learnt in the course of collecting and reviewing the models used by members for calculating their ODA-eligible in-donor refugee costs (Section 2). Finally, it outlines the next steps to implement the recommendations (Conclusion). The WP-STAT will discuss these next steps at its meeting in March 2022.

Background

4. In 2018, the WP-STAT agreed a plan for follow-up work to implement the Clarifications¹ and has since then accomplished the following (see references in Annex 1):
 - CRS classifications (purpose codes and co-operation modalities) were adjusted to allow for disaggregated reporting of in-donor refugee expenditures by type and category of refugee.
 - Models used by members for calculating in-donor refugee costs were collected in line with the explicit request in Clarification 5: “The model used for assessing costs should be shared with the Secretariat for validation.”
 - Methods used for assessing the costs were improved through a peer-learning process. Clarification 5 states, “WP-STAT will also support members to further refine their reporting methodologies so as to facilitate more accurate reporting of actual expenditures and the collection of disaggregated data in order to enhance the quality of DAC analysis.”²

¹ See Box 1 in DCD/DAC/STAT(2018)4.

² Clarification 4 also requests that “Options for collecting data on in-donor refugee costs beyond ODA will be proposed for discussion at the WP-STAT.” This topic was discussed by the TOSSD International Task Force, which decided to create two new modalities to capture in TOSSD two types of support excluded from ODA: 1) Support to refugees/protected persons in the provider country beyond the 12-month period and 2) Support to refugees/protected

5. The Secretariat collected the methodologies from 25 members³ using an agreed template (see Annex 2) organised around the five Clarifications. The template sought to collect standardised information from members on their method at a comparable level of detail. Members were requested to share their template accompanied with an Excel file describing the detail of calculations made to reach the total figure of ODA in-donor refugee costs. The Secretariat also held bilateral consultations with members to further clarify some parts of their methodologies (see Annex 3). This process was useful for both the Secretariat – to get a better understanding of the asylum procedures and ODA calculations – and to members – to better apprehend the nature of costs to be included in or excluded from ODA on the basis of the agreed Clarifications, and ultimately to improve the method used. The Secretariat regularly reported to the WP-STAT on these exchanges, which facilitated peer learning, helped harmonise members' methodologies and align them with the Clarifications.
6. This note reports on the lessons learnt during the process, under each Clarification, and provides the Secretariat's recommendations for further improvements going forward.

Section 1. Main findings and recommendations

7. The work to implement the agreed Clarifications has been successful. Most members shared their models with the Secretariat and agreed to disseminate them [on-line](#). Members provided comprehensive replies to the Secretariat's additional questions. All in all, the exercise:
 - **Improved the understanding of the impact of applying the Clarifications.** Most members have confirmed that the Clarifications affected the way they report in-donor refugee costs in ODA.
 - **Enhanced the compliance of the methods used with the agreed Clarifications.** The consultations led members to question the inclusion of certain costs in their models. They have adjusted their methods to exclude non-eligible costs, or will do so in the near future. (See Annex 4).⁴
 - **Improved the transparency and comparability of reporting as regards the categories of refugees and types of expenditures.**
8. Bilateral consultations led to improvements in the models and greater harmonisation of reporting practices across members. On this basis, **the Secretariat has validated the final versions of the models shared by members.**
9. However, **bilateral consultations also highlighted areas where further improvements would be needed, and the Secretariat makes a number of recommendations in this regard**, see Box below.

persons/migrants for their integration in the economy of provider countries. The eligibility criteria are specified in the [TOSSD Reporting Instructions](#), Annex E.

³ Three members do not report on in-donor refugee costs in ODA (Australia, the European Union and Luxembourg). Two members (Japan and New Zealand) have not shared their methodologies.

⁴ A few members also adjusted their reporting practices to include new items in their ODA. Some members will do so in the future.

Box. Recommendations for further improvements in members' methodologies for calculating ODA in-donor refugee costs

Compliance with clarifications on eligible activities

- Members are encouraged to follow a **conservative approach** for counting in-donor refugee costs in ODA, in line with the Clarifications, given the potential impact on development co-operation budgets.
- The Clarifications outline various activities that are non-ODA eligible. While members made progress in excluding related costs from their reporting, further improvements are needed in the areas listed below.
- **Members should remove from their ODA reporting non-eligible costs** explicitly listed in the Clarifications, such as:
 - Costs incurred after the final rejection (even if amounts are minor).
 - Costs beyond a twelve-month period of stay (members should adjust their model to discount these costs, using estimates if needed).⁵
 - Costs for facilities where the right to freedom of movement is denied.
 - Costs for voluntary returns offered to rejected asylum seekers (only costs for returns of a voluntary nature, taking place before a negative decision, are eligible).
- Members are encouraged to **further align with the Clarifications on temporary sustenance vs integration costs and on administrative costs. These two areas would deserve continued discussions at the WP-STAT:**
 - **Distinguishing between temporary sustenance (eligible) and integration expenditures (non-eligible):** more detail is needed on certain types of aggregate costs included in the ODA calculation i.e. reception centres, resettlement programmes, daily costs/lump sums, as they are likely to include both temporary sustenance and integration expenditures. Members are encouraged to provide disaggregated figures on these activities so that the Secretariat can confirm ODA eligibility. If these costs comprise integration activities, members should refrain from reporting them.
 - **Administrative costs:** only overhead costs attached to the direct provision of temporary sustenance to refugees are eligible. If members are not able to explain how administrative costs are linked to the direct provision of temporary sustenance, they should refrain from reporting these costs in ODA. As regards costs of in reception centres, members should not consider them completely as temporary sustenance but should provide a detailed breakdown and only count the eligible share.

Knowledge of the model by statistical correspondents

- WP-STAT statistical correspondents rely on other government agencies for establishing the model, and it has proved challenging for some of them to receive sufficient information/justification on the different cost items. For quality assurance, it is crucial that statistical correspondents are fully aware of their country's methodology.

Transparency of the reporting

- Members are encouraged to provide **disaggregated data on in-donor refugee costs, including data by type of expenditure and category of refugees**. In line with Clarification 5, members should split the figures between categories of refugees – H03 (ultimately accepted) and H04 (ultimately rejected) – based on the share of rejected asylum seekers in the total number of applications.
- Members who have not yet agreed to **disseminate their models on the DAC website** are encouraged to do so.

Continued monitoring is required

- Continued monitoring of reporting on in-donor refugee costs is required to further improve the alignment of the methodologies with the Clarifications, especially as the methodologies may change over time.
 - Members are invited to review their methodologies internally on a regular basis, and to consult with the Secretariat in case of doubt, in order to ensure that the methodologies continue to align with the Clarifications.
 - The Secretariat will continue monitoring members' methodologies on a regular basis. This could be done through a regular review of costs and methods (e.g. every five years) and as part of the periodical Peer Reviews on Development Finance Statistics.

⁵ Related costs can be reported as TOSSD, see footnote 2.

Section 2. Lessons learnt on the reporting of in-donor refugee costs

10. This section presents lessons learnt during the process of collecting and reviewing the methodologies, under each Clarification.

Clarification 1. Rationale for counting in-donor refugee costs as ODA

11. Members generally provided sufficient information on their asylum procedures and some included links to websites for further details. The descriptions of the asylum procedures highlighted a few areas not specifically addressed in the Clarifications:

- **The Dublin Regulation in the European Union**, which aims to rapidly determine the Member State responsible for an asylum claim and provides for the transfer of the asylum seeker to that Member State. The responsible Member State will usually be the state through which the asylum seeker first entered the EU. Members have special procedures in place to deal with these cases, as it is known from the start that the persons concerned will not be eligible for a refugee status in the country, as the application will have to be processed by the responsible Member State.
- Some members have put in place **accelerated procedures** to deal with asylum seekers from “safe countries of origin”, as these persons are unlikely to be recognised as refugees. (See also Clarification 2 below.)
- There are positive or negative decisions on asylum, but members’ responses highlighted a third category of “**dismissed**”, “**discontinued**” or “**expired**” cases. (See also Clarification 2 below.)

12. Additional questions posed by the Secretariat prompted verification by members and subsequent corrections/clarifications/complements to the texts describing their models, in particular on the items listed above.

Clarification 2. Meaning of the term “refugees”

13. Before the Clarifications were agreed, members had different interpretations of the categories of refugees that could be included in ODA. Some used to report costs for all asylum seekers, while others reported costs for recognised refugees only, yet others reported costs before decision only. This Clarification has aligned/harmonised reporting.

Ultimately rejected asylum seekers

14. In line with the agreed Clarifications⁶, members generally do not include costs for rejected asylum seekers post decision. However, five members still include in their ODA minor costs after the rejection decision. In particular, the United Kingdom grants rejected asylum seekers a grace period – 28 days for individuals and possibly longer for families – during which support is provided.⁷ Slovenia grants rejected asylum seekers a few more days to stay in the asylum centre before they leave. The Netherlands and Sweden include costs for rejected asylum seekers until the deadline of a potential appeal (max. 28 days), even if the asylum seeker does not appeal against the

⁶ For asylum seekers who are ultimately rejected: i) Costs incurred after the final rejection are not reportable as ODA, as the individual no longer fits within the definition of a refugee; and ii) Any costs incurred up to the final rejection of an asylum claim or up to 12 months if the final decision is still pending (whichever comes first) may be reported as ODA.

⁷ The United Kingdom noted that, while these costs are for the moment not actively excluded from ODA reporting, the number of claimants receiving a negative decision within 12 months is small and it would create disproportionate additional burden to estimate. The United Kingdom will engage with the Secretariat to seek a solution.

negative decision. The Ministry of Health of Greece is unable to ensure that post-rejection costs are excluded but seeks to improve this aspect of its methodology.

15. There are some differences in members' treatment of costs for ultimately rejected asylum seekers before rejection. The majority of countries (20 out of 25 members that shared their methodologies⁸) include costs for rejected asylum seekers in ODA until the date of rejection. Austria, Belgium, Canada and Hungary decided to exclude these costs. For Korea, this aspect is yet to be clarified.
16. Although the Clarifications recommend transparent reporting of costs attached to the various categories of refugees, most members that include the costs for rejected asylum seekers (prior to rejection) are unable to report on these costs separately (see also Clarification 5). They explained that the share of accepted / rejected persons in previous years could not be used as a proxy to assess the costs borne to provide temporary assistance to asylum seekers in the reference year. The shares can change every year as they are affected by the numbers of asylum seekers and their countries of origin.

Refugees under a resettlement programme

17. Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom and the United States reported a resettlement programme in ODA. Persons under such programmes are eligible according to Clarification 2, but their inclusion raises specific issues discussed under Clarification 4.

Dismissed/expired/discontinued cases

18. There are positive or negative decisions on asylum, but members' responses highlighted a third category of "dismissed" or "expired" cases. France, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden include costs that are associated to this category of persons. In the case of Slovenia, the share of discontinued cases was as high as 85%.

Safe countries of origin

19. Iceland thoroughly implemented the Clarifications and adjusted its reporting practices accordingly. As regards safe countries of origin, considering that citizens of these states who apply for protection in Iceland are generally not granted protection and instead returned to their country of origin, Iceland decided to remove the related costs entirely from ODA. In the view of the Secretariat, considering that almost all applicants from safe countries are rejected, it would indeed be difficult to justify the humanitarian nature of these costs and their inclusion in ODA.

Stateless people

20. Two members (Spain and the United Kingdom) included costs for stateless persons, category not mentioned in the Clarifications. Normally, these cases arise when the persons concerned state to the asylum administration that they do not have a nationality. During the procedure, the applicant may be authorised to stay temporarily on national territory if he or she is not in the process of being expelled or returned.

⁸ The Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Clarification 3: Twelve-month rule

21. According to the Clarifications, costs beyond twelve months of stay are no longer eligible in ODA. Consultations with members revealed that this Clarification is one of the most challenging to implement, as most members do not track individual refugees in their systems and hence have to rely on heterogeneous, imperfect estimates in their methodologies.
22. To determine the start of the twelve-month period, most members do not refer to individual dates of application for asylum as they use annual budget data and make the assumption that all refugees arrive on the first day of the year (1 January). A few members distinguish between the date of application for asylum and the date of entry into a resettlement programme.
23. Finland, Greece, Poland and Spain explicitly recognise not being able to ensure that once a person has spent more than 12 months in the country, the related costs are no longer reported as ODA.⁹ Ideally and in particular when these costs are significant, members should adjust their model to discount the costs beyond twelve months (using estimates). Spain indicated that it was in the process of revising its methodology to align its reporting with the Directives and ensure compliance with the twelve-month rule for 2022 ODA (using estimates).

Clarification 4. Eligibility of specific cost items

24. Clarification 4 provided important guidance for members as it removed much of past ambiguities on the nature of eligible costs. The Reporting Directives now include a list of eligible items and examples of non-eligible items, which helped harmonise members' reporting. Major progress has been achieved in implementing this Clarification, which in some cases entailed changing members' reporting practices and removing items from their ODA (see Annex 4 for a description of the impact of implementing the Clarifications for each member). Improvements are still needed in a number of areas.

Temporary sustenance versus integration

25. For some types of expenditures, disaggregated information is not systematically available to allow distinguishing temporary sustenance (eligible) from integration (not eligible). All members that reported costs related to a **resettlement programme** (Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States) had difficulties disaggregating them. The Secretariat could not assess eligibility when only lump sums were reported. After bilateral consultations, Canada in particular excluded parts of its resettlement programme, using an estimation, as it entailed integration activities.
26. In addition, the Secretariat identified in the models of a few members portions of costs that related to economic integration. The Czech Republic (language and democratic education courses), Portugal (municipal plan for the integration of migrants in Lisbon), the Slovak Republic (costs related to integration), and Switzerland ("integration lump sums") made the decision to exclude these costs and the United States indicated it would do so in its 2020 ODA reporting.

Costs attached to reception centres, in particular administrative costs

27. Consultations held with members revealed that it is not necessarily easy to separate ODA from non ODA-eligible costs in relation to the **reception centres** in cases where the Government contracts a service provider to manage the centres. Not all costs associated to the functioning of

⁹ France indicated that while it was also not able to exclude these costs at the level of individuals, on average at the aggregated level, costs beyond 12 months were indeed excluded from its ODA reporting using estimates.

these centres are eligible. Clarification 4 prescribes counting overhead costs in ODA only when they are attached to the direct provision of temporary sustenance to refugees. This includes costs of personnel assigned to provide eligible services to refugees, but does not include costs of personnel that are not involved in the direct execution of these services (e.g. management, human resources, information technology) or the associated infrastructure provided for these personnel. Members did not necessarily share the necessary level of details for the Secretariat to assess this aspect.

28. While the majority of members report **administrative costs** in their ODA in-donor refugee costs, Austria, Greece, Finland, Iceland and the Netherlands entirely excluded these costs. A number of members also agreed to exclude part of the administrative costs previously reported in ODA: Belgium (IT costs), Norway (administration costs related to assisted returns in the Ministry of Justice and Public Security), Spain (supplies and works – equipment and adaptation of buildings), Sweden (indirect administrative costs), Switzerland (administrative lump sums), and the United Kingdom (administrative costs for processing asylum applications). The United States will remove administrative costs of the U.S. Refugee Processing Centre related to management, human resources and information technology in its 2021 reporting on 2020 flows.
29. Not all members that report administrative costs were able to provide disaggregated figures on administrative costs. Italy proactively inquired which of its items included as administrative costs would be ODA-eligible.
30. Finally, it was not clear whether some personnel costs, not explicitly mentioned as eligible or non-eligible in the Clarification, should be counted in ODA or not. For example, the Czech Republic, Norway and Poland included costs for **security guards** in reception centres. Another example relates to **cultural activities** (promotion of national cultural values).

Detention centres and other facilities where free movement is restricted

31. Costs related to facilities where the freedom of movement of refugees is restricted are explicitly listed as non-ODA eligible in Clarification 4. A few countries updated their methodologies to exclude such costs from their ODA reporting, namely the Czech Republic, Greece and Hungary (costs related to transit zones); the Secretariat sees this as major progress on ODA integrity.

Voluntary return to the country of origin

32. According to the Clarifications, expenditures for voluntary repatriation of asylum-seekers and refugees within the first twelve months are eligible; they cover support for making travel arrangements and paying for the return journey to the country of origin. Costs for forced returns are excluded. Any efforts to motivate asylum seekers with rejected applications to return to their home country should not be reported as ODA.
33. A few countries that used to report costs associated to return post rejection corrected their methodology: Finland removed these costs from its ODA reporting; Norway removed administration costs related to assisted returns; and the Netherlands removed costs for voluntary repatriation and transport costs for resettlement. For other members, based on the methodologies received, it is not necessarily clear to the Secretariat to which category of refugees voluntary returns counted in ODA are offered: if voluntary returns are offered to asylum seekers that received a negative decision, the costs for voluntary returns should indeed not be reported as ODA.

Clarification 5. Methodology for assessing costs

34. Among the 25 DAC members that shared their methodology, only Austria, Italy and Sweden track expenditures at the level of individual refugees and maintain a specific database for that purpose.

This allows them to make accurate calculations, avoid the use of estimates or imputations, and clearly identify the twelve-month period.

35. Members did not provide the same level of details on their calculations and not all of them provided an Excel file with a detailed method of calculation for each cost item included in ODA. For some members, the calculation is rather straightforward, as it is based on budget lines or lump sums (Austria, Belgium, Canada for the federal component of the calculation, the Czech Republic and Finland), while for others the calculation involves several steps and is more complex (e.g. Canada for the provincial component of the calculation, Switzerland and the United Kingdom).
36. Members not able to track individual refugees need to make some approximations in their models. The Secretariat found that the approximations made were not necessarily verifiable. For example, members sometimes use a balanced/compensating approach whereby they consider that including non-eligible costs is compensated by the fact that they exclude other potentially eligible costs elsewhere.

Use of imputations for assessing education or health costs

37. While several members do not include any imputed costs for education or health services offered to refugees (Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia and Spain), other members do so, using various methods, the complexity of which is illustrated below:
 - Canada uses an advanced method for assessing imputed health care and welfare support from Provinces and Territories, taking into account – for each Province and Territory – a per capita health and welfare cost, the number of refugees, and a waiting period before benefitting from support.
 - In Finland, costs for basic education per person are available separately for immigrants and the average cost for refugees/asylum seekers is assumed the same.
 - In the United Kingdom, the Home Office reimburses local authorities for education and health costs: for education, the calculation is based on the number and age of refugees on arrival in the country; for health it is based on a unit cost calculated by using the asylum seeker age profile and applying a specific age-related per-head cost.
 - After a thorough examination, Slovenia managed to separate costs for emergency health services rendered to applicants for international protection from those rendered to illegal immigrants and persons detained in the Centre for Foreigners, and it has decided not to use any proxies as the data can vary significantly from year to year. Slovenia also includes costs for a doctor's office in the Asylum Centre, which performs initial medical examinations and other emergency services. Otherwise, treatment is carried out by medical institutions that are in the immediate vicinity of the accommodated persons, either health centres or hospitals.

Granularity and transparency of reporting

38. Clarification 5 states that to encourage consistency and future alignment of members' reporting practices, members will strive to provide disaggregated statistics of expenditures reported as in-donor refugee costs broken down by type of expenditures and category of refugees. To allow for such disaggregated reporting, the WP-STAT agreed to introduce new voluntary purpose codes and types of aid for implementation in 2018 ODA reporting.
39. Not all members are able to provide the same level of disaggregation. Compared to the data collection for 2018 ODA on in-donor refugee costs, members provided more granularity in their 2019 reporting. However, in the Secretariat's view, as encouraged in the agreed Clarifications for

transparency purposes, members should further increase the granularity of their reporting in the years to come.

40. Annex 5 shows ODA figures for in-donor refugee costs broken down by type of expenditures and category of refugees in 2019 ODA. Ten countries (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland), compared to five countries in 2018, have provided some disaggregation both by type of expenditures and category of refugees. Five countries have provided some disaggregation by either type of expenditures (Canada, Greece, Poland, and the United Kingdom) or by category of refugees (Iceland). Still a large group of countries (twelve) have not provided any disaggregated data (Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Slovak Republic and the United States).
41. It is also worth recalling that, at the time of negotiating the Clarifications, the inclusion of the statement on transparency in Clarification 5 was key in reaching an agreement to include in ODA the costs related to rejected asylum seekers (before rejection). Among the 20 countries that include (or plan to include) costs for rejected asylum seekers in their ODA, only Denmark, Finland, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, and Switzerland provided a corresponding estimate; other members reported data related to all categories of asylum seekers combined (ultimately accepted or rejected).

Conclusion

42. The work carried out over the last three years by the Secretariat and members to implement the agreed Clarifications has been successful. Most members have shared their models with the Secretariat and agreed to disseminate them [on-line](#).¹⁰ Bilateral consultations led to improvements in the models and harmonisation of reporting practices across members (see section 1 for main findings and Annex 4 for the impact of implementing the Clarifications). On this basis, **the Secretariat has validated the final versions of the models shared by members**. However, bilateral consultations also highlighted areas where further improvements would be needed and **the Secretariat makes a number of recommendations** in this regard (see Box in section 1).
43. Moving forward, it would be important for the Secretariat to continue monitoring members' methodologies on in-donor refugee costs on a regular basis, as well as progress on implementing the recommendations. This could be done through a regular review of costs and methods (e.g. every five years), and through the periodical Peer Reviews on Development Finance Statistics.

¹⁰ Japan and New Zealand have not shared their model. In line with the Clarifications ("Members agreed with the transparency principle: they should continue to share with the Secretariat a detailed description of their methods and estimates which should allow the Secretariat or any data user to verify the final figure included in ODA reporting."), most models shared have been disseminated on the OECD DAC website: see <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/refugee-costs-oda.htm>. A few members have asked to not disseminate their method (Germany, Korea and Poland). Agreement on dissemination is pending for Denmark and the Slovak Republic.

Annex 1. WP-STAT follow-up work on the implementation of the Clarifications agreed at the 2017 HLM

- Work plan for WP-STAT follow-up work on in-donor refugee costs: implementation of the 2017 HLM decision – DCD/DAC/STAT(2018)4
- Adjustments to the CRS classifications (modalities and purpose codes) to allow for disaggregated reporting of expenditures by type and category of refugees and agreement on a template for collecting members' methodologies – DCD/DAC/STAT/RD(2018)2/RD3 and DCD/DAC/STAT(2018)53
- Compilation of the methodologies for calculating in-donor refugee costs in ODA – DCD/DAC/STAT(2019)15, REV1, ADD1 and ADD2
- Peer learning on the methodologies: Secretariat's feedback and points for discussion by the WP-STAT – DCD/DAC/STAT(2019)16, DCD/DAC/STAT(2020)12, DCD/DAC/STAT(2020)32

Annex 2. Template for collecting the model used for calculating in-donor refugee costs reported as ODA

In line with the 2017 HLM agreement, the purpose of this template is to collect detailed descriptions of members' methods and estimates used to assess ODA-eligible in-donor refugee costs. The information provided should allow the Secretariat to verify the final figure included in ODA reporting. The template should be accompanied with an Excel file which describes actual data points and the detail of calculations used to reach the total figure of ODA in-donor refugee costs, including breakdowns by purpose codes (types of expenditures) and by types of aid (categories of refugees). Members can use different formats better fitting their method, however providing as much information as needed for the Secretariat to understand the method and formulas.

Clarification 1. Rationale for counting in-donor refugee costs as ODA

Q1/ Describe in a nutshell the asylum procedure in your country. What are the main reception services and allowances offered main countries of origin of asylum seekers, recent trends, etc.

Clarification 2. Meaning of the term “refugees”

Q2/ Indicate the categories of refugees for which costs are included in your ODA reporting: asylum seekers, recognised refugees, persons granted temporary or subsidiary protection. What is the share of asylum seekers that are ultimately rejected? Specify whether you include or exclude associated costs in your ODA reporting.

Clarification 3. Twelve-month rule

Q3/ When does the twelve-month rule start (date of application, date of entry into the country, date of start of support)? How do you make sure your ODA reporting relates exclusively to refugees who have stayed for less than twelve months?

Clarification 4. Eligibility of specific cost items

Q4/ Provide the list of cost items included in ODA for each category of refugee and a justification for their inclusion. Explain in particular what justifies that expenses are considered “temporary sustenance”, and not of a more permanent nature that promote the “integration” of refugees into the economy of the donor country (e.g. for costs incurred post-recognition and language training). Describe what are the administrative costs included (e.g. salaries for staff providing medical care or advising refugees).

Clarification 5. Methodology for assessing costs

Q5/ Describe the methodology used for assessing ODA-eligible costs and provide the actual data points and detailed calculations used to reach the figures reported as ODA.

Does your domestic reporting system allow for tracking expenditures at the level of individual asylum seeker/refugee and for reporting the eligible costs for the first twelve months of stay? If yes, please describe the system used. If not, please describe the assumptions and estimates used to assess costs.

Include responses to the following questions in your description:

Is the same methodology used to assess costs for different categories of refugees?

How does your methodology ensure there is no double-counting (e.g. counting the costs for the same person for 12 months as an asylum seeker and another 12 months as a refugee granted status)?

Do you use imputations when refugees benefit from the services available to all citizens (e.g. education or health)? How do you clearly define the estimate of the number of refugees/asylum seekers benefiting from a particular service for up to 12 months?

What estimates do you use? What is their source and their frequency of updating?

How do you assess the share of rejected asylum seekers: based on real data, estimates, well founded expectations? Based on first instance or final rejection?

Provide data on the number of refugees and per capita costs (included in ODA), the average time to get a decision on status, the average time on support, the share of rejected asylum seekers.

Annex 3. Most common follow-up questions sent to members for clarifying their models

- Have the Clarifications affected the way you report? Which parts?
- Are you already reporting in accordance with the Clarifications? If yes, since when? *If not, please note that you can implement until 2019 ODA.*

Clarification 1:

Asylum procedures:

- Is the procedure the same for all applicants, including the ones from “safe countries of origin”?
- Could you describe how you follow the Dublin procedure? Are associated costs counted in ODA?
- Could you please provide the share of discontinued applications and give reasons for why they were discontinued? Do you count related costs in ODA, e.g. food and accommodation provided to the person while they were still registered in your system?

Main reception services and allowances offered: Could you please elaborate on the role of municipalities vs reception centres?

Clarification 2:

- Do you have quota refugees and are related costs reported in ODA?
- What was the share of ultimately rejected asylum seekers?

Clarification 3:

- How do you ensure that expenditures reported as ODA do not include costs beyond 12 months?

Clarification 4:

- Expenses in reception centres: Not all operating costs of the reception centres can be counted as ODA. As indicated in DCD/DAC/STAT(2019)16 (para 14, second bullet), personnel involved in management, human resources and IT must be excluded from ODA. Could you please elaborate on how your model aligns with this? Could you please confirm that no IT/staff costs are included?
- Settlement programmes: Could you please provide a list and description of cost items included in the programme that are considered temporary sustenance and reported as ODA? Provide an explanation to justify that expenses are considered temporary sustenance and not of a more permanent nature that promote integration.
- When the description of costs does not distinguish between categories of refugees: do asylum claimants benefit from the same programmes as refugees?
- When payments are made by daily rates on a lump-sum basis: could you please specify what different lump sums are offered to the different categories of asylum seekers/refugees? Are the lump sums paid to individuals?
- Could you please explain to which categories of applicants’ voluntary returns are proposed? (voluntary returns for rejected asylum seekers are not eligible as ODA)
- More clarification is needed on the nature and eligibility of specific costs mentioned in the model:
 - Employment and study activities
 - Health care: Could you clarify whether only basic health care and psychosocial support are included in ODA? How do you calculate the costs for healthcare and do you distinguish who is eligible to benefit from health care between different categories of refugees?
 - Education and training
 - Administrative costs
 - Leisure

Clarification 5: First instance vs final instance

- Until what date are costs before rejection counted: first or final instance?
- Could you please provide the following missing information:
 - data on the number of refugees and per capita costs (included in ODA),
 - the average time to get a decision on status,
 - the average time on support.

Annex 4. Impact of applying the Clarifications in members' reporting on ODA in-donor refugee costs

	Costs removed from ODA reporting	Costs added	Comments
Austria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for rejected asylum seekers post rejection. Costs beyond 12 months of stay. 	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for the eligibility of different types of costs, no changes have been made as Austria had already restricted its reporting to temporary sustenance.
Belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied the stricter definition of administrative costs and hence removed some IT costs. 	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses the new type of aid codes H03 and H05 and the new voluntary purpose codes.
Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for integration within Canada's settlement programme were removed, and only costs for temporary sustenance reported as ODA. 	/	/
Czech Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detention costs Czech language courses to prevent possible contradiction of integration-oriented activities and ODA Democratic education courses 	/	/
Denmark	/	/	/
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the administrative costs from the daily unit costs in reception centres. State subsidies to municipalities. Voluntary returns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early childhood education. Costs for rejected asylum seekers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family reunification may be hard to add in the cost calculations, as well as the legal services paid by the Ministry of Justice.
France	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included health expenses for 2019 ODA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> France has introduced a breakdown between the different cost categories and the type of refugees.
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development awareness activities. 	/	/
Greece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs incurred in detention centres (where refugees entering Greece are held for a short period). 	/	/
Hungary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for transit zones. 	/	/
Iceland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for asylum seekers from safe countries of origin. 	/	/
Ireland	/	/	/
Italy	/	/	<i>No implication.</i>
Japan	<i>Methodology has not been provided.</i>		
Korea	/	/	/
The Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voluntary repatriation Transport costs for resettlement Rescue at sea Administrative costs Social housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for unoccupied places in reception centres (this only applies to the situation where the total number of places is below the reserved number of places for that year). 	/

New Zealand	<i>Methodology has not been provided.</i>		
Norway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs related to asylum seekers with a final rejection of their application. Administration costs related to assisted returns. Efforts to motivate asylum seekers with rejected applications to return to their home country. Age assessment of minors. 	/	/
Poland	/	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No implication yet, but new purpose codes will be assigned to different budgetary expenditures.
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal Plan for the Integration of Migrants of Lisbon 	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for Immigration and Borders Service (SEF) and Temporary Installation Centre (TIC) assessed in detail according to the clarifications.
Slovak Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs related to integration 	/	/
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for integration measures Discount applied for asylum seekers waiting longer than 12 months for a decision. Emergency medical services rendered to irregular migrants. 	/	/
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supplies and works (equipment and adaptation of buildings). 	/	/
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs related to Dublin cases. Costs for people who have previously applied for asylum or have already had their asylum case examined. Indirect administrative costs. Costs beyond 12 months, compensation to municipalities according to the standard rate for resettled people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits to asylum seekers granted asylum and people in need of protection who are family members of former asylum seekers 	/
Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative lump sums. Integration lump sums. Emergency assistance lump sums (after negative decision). 	/	/
The United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative costs for processing of asylum applications. Costs for assistance to asylum seekers from non-ODA countries. Education support to Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children over 16. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early years' education support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved methodologies for estimating and applying education and health unit costs.
The United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for economic integration activities for 2020 reporting. Population Refugee and Migration Affairs (PRM) activities for "Refugee Processing Center", "Refugee Processing Center Support" and "Security Advisory Opinion" Analyst for 2020 reporting. 	/	/

Annex 5. In-donor refugee costs reported as ODA, by type of expenditures and categories of refugees

2019 disbursements, USD thousand

	93010 Type of expenditures unspecified	93011 Food and shelter	93012 Training	93013 Health	93014 Other temporary sustenance	93015 Voluntary repatriation	93016 Transport	93017 Rescue at sea	93018 Administrati ve costs	Total
Austria										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	30 727									30 727
Belgium										
H03 - Asylum-seekers ultimately accepted	478	51 486		3 597					13 373	68 934
H05 - Recognised refugees	478	51 486		3 597					13 373	68 934
Canada										
H05 - Recognised refugees	98 177	27 967		230 228	119 519					475 891
Czech Republic										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	6 112									6 112
Denmark										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	525	90		1 829					780	3 224
H03 - Asylum-seekers ultimately accepted	315	3 194	1 994	4 213	2 564		480		3 089	15 849
H04 - Asylum-seekers ultimately rejected	285	2 789	1 739	3 689	2 204		435		2 339	13 480
H05 - Recognised refugees	4 813	510	7 377	690	7 557		75		405	21 427
Finland										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	64 462		4 569							69 031
H05 - Recognised refugees	15 072						5 485			20 557
France										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	78 837	393 287	10	195 903	541 619				7	1 209 663
H05 - Recognised refugees	10									10
Germany										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	3 035 686									3 035 686
Greece										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	60 340	50 335	19 198						4 476	134 348
Hungary										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	496									496
Iceland										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	6 011									6 011
H05 - Recognised refugees	1 921									1 921
Ireland										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	83 513									83 513
Italy										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	444 835									444 835
Japan										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	331									331
Korea										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	1 410									1 410
Netherlands										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	493 770									493 770
New Zealand										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	16 140									16 140
Norway										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	42 099	1 388	5 445	14	4 739		2 700		666	57 052
H03 - Asylum-seekers ultimately accepted							2 394			2 394
H04 - Asylum-seekers ultimately rejected						89				89
Poland										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries		2 175	57	1 154	1 833	4	37		568	5 828
Portugal										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	1 475	1 102		100			8		1	2 686
H03 - Asylum-seekers ultimately accepted		9								9
H05 - Recognised refugees		4 975		5						4 981
Slovak Republic										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	872									872
Slovenia										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries				183	101				41	325
H03 - Asylum-seekers ultimately accepted		650	24	14	16		13		51	768
H04 - Asylum-seekers ultimately rejected		975	37	21	23		19		77	1 151
Spain										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	299 055	40	7	23	4		3	515		299 647
H04 - Asylum-seekers ultimately rejected									2	2
H05 - Recognised refugees	112	2	0					71		185
Sweden										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries		68 529	25 487	22 949	11 316				17 661	145 941
H05 - Recognised refugees	116 647									116 647
Switzerland										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	2 441	39 546	6 322	15 803	31 886		2 459		83 435	181 893
H03 - Asylum-seekers ultimately accepted	62 250									62 250
H04 - Asylum-seekers ultimately rejected	3 377									3 377
H05 - Recognised refugees	36 134									36 134
United Kingdom										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	46 049	442 356	26 557	30 176	8 167		4 594		51 327	609 227
United States										
H02 - Refugees/asylum seekers in donor countries	1 879 881									1 879 881
Grand Total	6 935 373	1 142 890	98 823	514 188	731 549	94	18 703	587	191 670	9 633 636