

Sudan Aid Factsheet 1995-2009

Trends in Overseas Development Assistance

Sudan is a major aid recipient, but also a challenging one from the perspective of government donors. The January 2011 referendum that will lead to the secession of South Sudan will create new opportunities and challenges in the complex relationship between Sudan and its donor partners.

How much has been spent on development aid to Sudan?

In 2009 Sudan received US\$2.4 billion in official development assistance (ODA) from donors, slightly less than in 2008, following a period of growth in aid flows beginning in 2003.




Figure 1. Development aid to Sudan, 1995-2009

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC (constant 2008 prices) data, excluding debt relief

Sudan poses some particular challenges as an aid recipient and much of its aid, consequently, flows outside of the state.

The United States, the largest global donor of ODA, suspended economic assistance to Sudan in 1989 following the coup which brought the current President to power and issued economic, trade and financial sanctions against Sudan in 1997.

The European Commission has been unable to programme bilateral development funds for Sudan under its 10th European Development Fund decision following Sudan's non-ratification of the Cotonou Agreement by June 2009. The Cotonou Agreement forms the legal basis for The European Commission's development partnerships with recipient countries and also contains provisions in support of the Rome Statute. The Rome Statute is the treaty establishing the International Criminal Court, which in 2009 issued an arrest warrant against Sudan's President Omar Hassan al-Bashir in connection with alleged crimes against humanity and war crimes in Darfur.

Despite political controversy, diplomatic and legal obstacles, donors have continued to channel aid and Sudan ranked the 9th largest ODA recipient in 2009. However, a large proportion of Sudan's total ODA is received in the form of humanitarian aid and in 2009 Sudan was the leading global recipient of humanitarian aid for the 5th consecutive year.

Rank	Recipient	Total ODA excluding debt (US\$bn)	Recipient	Total humanitarian aid (US\$bn)
1	Afghanistan	\$6.2	Sudan	\$1.3
2	Ethiopia	\$3.9	Palestine/OPT	\$1.2
3	Viet Nam	\$3.7	Ethiopia	\$0.7
4	Palestine/OPT	\$3.1	Afghanistan	\$0.6
5	Tanzania	\$3.0	Congo, Dem. Rep.	\$0.6
6	Pakistan	\$2.9	Pakistan	\$0.6
7	Iraq	\$2.8	Somalia	\$0.5
8	India	\$2.5	Iraq	\$0.5
9	Sudan	\$2.4	Kenya	\$0.4
10	Congo, Dem. Rep.	\$2.3	Zimbabwe	\$0.4
	All other recipients	\$55.5	All other recipients	\$3.6
	Total	\$88.2	Total	\$10.4

Figure 2. Where Sudan ranks with other recipients of ODA and humanitarian aid, 2009

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC (constant 2008 prices) data, excluding debt relief

Changing volumes and patterns of aid spending in Sudan closely follow political and humanitarian developments in Sudan's most crisis-affected regions.

A number of leading government donors began to scale up their humanitarian funding to South Sudan in the period of negotiations leading up to the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army/Movement in South Sudan.

During the same period, conflict in Darfur broke out and rapidly escalated resulting in a major humanitarian crisis, which attracted significant international political attention and humanitarian funding.




Figure 3. Trends in total humanitarian aid and other aid to Sudan from all donors reporting to the OECD DAC

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC (constant 2008 prices) data, excluding debt relief

Immediately after the signing of the CPA in January 2005, donors convened in Oslo to agree a package of funding to support the reconstruction and development of Sudan during the Interim Period (from the signing of the CPA in 2005 to the referendum to be held on its anniversary in 2011). Donors pledged US\$4.5 billion for the initial period 2005-2007.

Humanitarian assistance levelled off after a peak in 2005, while development assistance continues to show a rising trend. This increase in development funding reflects the more conducive environment for programming development assistance in South Sudan, afforded by the establishment of a development partner in the semi-autonomous regional Government of South Sudan (GoSS).

Who are the major donors?

The United States has been the largest donor in eight out of the ten years between 2000 and 2009, providing 33.9% of the total aid to Sudan in this period.

Three of the leading donors during this period, the United States, the United Kingdom and Norway are members of the ‘Sudan Troika’, the group of governments who supported the CPA negotiation process. The Sudan Troika governments have collectively provided 49.5% of ODA between 2000 and 2009.

The European Union institutions, which together make up the second largest donor, have provided 13.4% of the total ODA between 2000 and 2009.

Arab country governments (including Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates) made a large single contribution of US\$146.4 million in 2000 and a second large contribution of US\$81.8 million in 2008, but have otherwise been relatively small donors providing 2.3% of the total aid in the period 2000-2009.

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Arab countries 146.4	Netherlands 44.1	US 140.1	EU 349.3	US 423.3	US 823.4	US 776.2	US 725.6	US 848.2	US 942.6
Norway 31.3	EU 39.8	Norway 46.8	US 202.2	UK 127.8	EU 263.4	EU 359.9	EU 274.3	EU 277.8	UK 335.0
Netherlands 29.3	Norway 29.0	Netherlands 39.0	Norway 57.5	Netherlands 123.3	UK 212.9	UK 224.5	Netherlands 219.2	UK 199.2	EU 231.7

Figure 4. Top three development aid donors to Sudan 2000-2009 (US\$m)

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC (constant 2008 prices) data

Who is spending the money?

A relatively low and declining share of aid to Sudan is channelled through the public sector. This can mean money delivered through either the Sudanese government or the donor country itself.

The greatest share by far is channelled via multilateral agencies, which includes UN agencies and international financial institutions, including the World Bank. This category also includes the funds which are channelled via UN and World Bank managed and administered donor trust funds and pooled funds.




Figure 5. First-level recipients of development aid, 2006-2009

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System (CRS) (constant 2008 prices) data

Sudan is host to an array of pooled donor funding mechanisms that enable donors to support development activities in the north of the country, without channelling them directly through the government and to support development activities prioritised by the semi-autonomous GoSS in the very early stages of the government’s development, while its capacities are limited.

The largest pooled fund, the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) was established in 2006 and allocates funding to humanitarian and early recovery activities identified in the UN-led Humanitarian Work Plan for Sudan across all regions of the country. The CHF has received donor funds totalling US\$796.5 million from its establishment in 2006 to the end of 2010.




Figure 6. Pooled donor funds in support of national activities or activities in the northern states

Sources: Development Initiatives based on UNDP Multi Donor Trust Fund Development Gateway data

Two multi donor trust funds (MDTFs) were agreed at the Oslo donor conference in 2005 to receive reconstruction and development funds. The national MDTF is administered by the World Bank and the Government of Sudan and the southern MDTF by the World Bank and the Government of South Sudan. Collectively, the two MDTFs have received US\$790.8 million in donor funds between 2006

and 2010. Donors however are not the only source of funds and both governments are also required to contribute to the development projects financed by the MDTFs.

There are a further range of pooled funds which benefit South Sudan.




Figure 7. Pooled donor funds in support of activities in South Sudan¹

Sources: Development Initiatives based on UNDP Multi Donor Trust Fund Development Gateway, Mott Macdonald and KPMG data

The largest contributors to Sudan’s pooled funds are the United Kingdom (US\$666.4m, 37.0%), the Netherlands (US\$4538.6, 25.4%) and Norway (US\$231.8m, 12.9%). The United States does not channel any funds through Sudan’s pooled funds.

¹ The Capacity Building Trust Fund has been managed in two phases. Phase I is reflected here. Phase II, which runs from 2010 to 2012 is not included because donor contributions expended in 2010 are not yet disaggregated from overall commitments for the Phase II.




Figure 8. Donor contributions to Sudan's pooled funds, 2004-2010, (US\$m)

Source: Development Initiatives based on UNDP Multi Donor Trust Fund Development Gateway, Mott Macdonald and KPMG data

How is the money spent across the different regions of Sudan?

Tracking funding flows to the different regions and different crises in Sudan is surprisingly difficult. The OECD DAC's development statistics do not disaggregate by region and individual donors use a variety of different regional groupings, which do not correlate. Moreover, many donors fund programmes that operate across different regions of the country and do not disaggregate what proportion of the funds benefit respective regions.

Of the funds donors channelled via the two MDTFs, 66.5% was designated for South Sudan and the remaining 33.5% for national programmes. However, this reflects only a small proportion of the total aid and notably does not include aid from the largest donor to Sudan, the United States, nor does it include humanitarian aid.

The UN has published regionally disaggregated figures for projects funded within the UN humanitarian Workplan for Sudan for the years 2005-2008. The largest share of humanitarian funds during this period, 48.8%, went to Darfur. Moreover, Darfur received 75.5% of the funding needs expressed in the Workplan during this period, compared with funding for 57.5% of the needs in South Sudan and 47.5% of the needs in the rest of Sudan.




Figure 9. Regional allocation of humanitarian funds within the UN Workplan for Sudan, 2005-2008, (US\$bn)

Source: Development Initiatives based on UNSudanig.org data

While South Sudan has a long history of aid and the Government of South Sudan has played an active role as a recipient aid government since 2005, at secession in July 2011, the records of donor funding benefitting South Sudan will nevertheless be incomplete.

What is the money spent on?

Humanitarian aid accounts for the greatest share of funds to Sudan, at its height in 2004, accounting for 73.3% of all aid to Sudan. The proportion of humanitarian aid has fallen since 2004 to 56.5% in 2009, but is still accounts for by far the greatest share of aid.




Figure 10. Breakdown of types of aid to Sudan, 2002-2009

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC CRS (constant 2008 prices) data

Sector allocable aid has grown tenfold between 2002 and 2009 from just US\$90.8 million in 2002 to US\$946.3 million in 2009. Social infrastructure and services have consistently received the greatest share of sector allocable aid.




Figure 11. Breakdown of sector allocable aid, 2002-2009

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC CRS (constant 2008 prices) data

Within the aid category of social infrastructure and services, by far the greatest share has been for activities related to government and civil society, which has increased in volume more than twenty-fold between 2002 and 2009. This category includes activities to build the capacity of government and civil society, support elections and a range of activities in the security sector including security system management and reform, post-conflict peace-building, demining and demobilisation of child soldiers.




Figure 12. Breakdown of social infrastructure and services sector

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC CRS (constant 2008 prices) data

The growth in this sector is consistent with support for the peace process, establishment of the new Government of South Sudan as well as a new demand for funding for demobilisation of child soldiers and other peace-building activities. Of the US\$1.7 billion spent on government and civil society related activities, 29.5% was spent on activities related to peace-building, conflict prevention and resolution and 28.7% on public sector policy and administration management.

Aid dependence

Although Sudan is a major aid recipient and aid underwrites the social safety nets that support significant sections of the population, Sudan is not highly aid dependent. In 2008, ODA represented the equivalent of only 4% of Gross National Income (GNI).

Country	ODA (excluding debt relief) as % of GNI	Rank
Liberia	44%	1
Solomon Islands	36%	2
Micronesia, Fed. States	33%	3
Afghanistan	30%	4
Marshall Islands	26%	5
Rwanda	11%	12
Sierra Leone	10%	16
Congo, Dem. Rep.	10%	17
Haiti	9%	20
Sudan	4%	43

Figure 13. Aid dependence, 2008

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC data

International peacekeeping operations

From 2004, Sudan has hosted UN-mandated peacekeeping missions, with an African Union (AU) peacekeeping mission in Darfur from 2004 to 2007 which was then succeeded by a hybrid UN-AU mission. These two peacekeeping missions in Darfur have a combined total cost of US\$4.5 billion between 2004 and 2009.

A large UN peacekeeping mission was also mandated to monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, with a total cost of US\$4.7 billion from 2005-2009.




Figure 14. Cost of international peacekeeping operations

Source: Development Initiatives based on Stockholm International Peace Institute database of peacekeeping operations data

Further detailed information on humanitarian aid flows to Sudan can be found in [the GHA country profiles](#) section of the GHA website.

Written by Lydia Poole, Policy Advisor (lydia.poole@devinit.org)

Media Contact: Georgina Brereton (georgina.brereton@devinit.org)

Development Initiatives is a group of people committed to eliminating poverty.

We engage to promote better understanding and more effective use of the resources available for poverty reduction.

We try to empower by putting this information, and the capacity to use it, in the hands of those who will eliminate poverty.

**Global Humanitarian Assistance,
Development Initiatives,**

Keward Court, Jocelyn Drive,
Wells, Somerset BA5 1DB,
United Kingdom

T: +44 (0)1749 671 343

F: +44 (0)1749 676 721

Email: info@devinit.org