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1 Introduction

1. This Report focuses on the work of the Committee during the parliamentary Session 2008–2009. It reviews the work of the International Development Committee in relation to the objectives and core tasks established by the Liaison Committee. As we have indicated in our previous annual reports, the core tasks do not apply equally to all committees and our Committee operates in a slightly different way from others. The Department for International Development (DFID), the Department whose area of work we monitor, has no associated public bodies; and the Secretary of State is rarely responsible for major public appointments. Much of the policy we examine is implemented jointly with other country and multilateral donors and often in conjunction with non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which are both national and international. We therefore seek to influence policy nationally and internationally, in addition to ensuring the accountability of the UK Government and we have adapted the core tasks to these particular circumstances.

Highlights of the Committee’s work in 2008–09

2. During the 2008–2009 Session, we held 30 meetings, of which 20 were public oral evidence sessions. We published eight Reports which included a number of specific recommendations to Government on a variety of DFID policy areas.

3. The economic turmoil of the last year has threatened both the economies of poor countries directly and the budgets which developed countries allocate to development assistance. There was also a risk that increased economic hardship in the UK might undermine traditionally strong public support for the aid budget. Our report into Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn examined all these potential impacts of the economic downturn.

4. Climate change is another key development challenge: its impacts threaten to reverse development gains and halt economic advances. Poor countries have not contributed to climate change, but they are likely to be affected first and most severely. Our inquiry into Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate enabled us to assess the support being provided by the UK and other donors to help developing countries mitigate and adapt to the impact of climate change. The inquiry was underpinned by the knowledge that the world was seeking to reach a new agreement on tackling climate change at the Copenhagen Conference due to take place in December 2009.

5. DFID announced early in 2009 that it intended to publish a new White Paper. Its consultation process made clear that both of the inquiries referred to above were very relevant to the issues to be covered in the White Paper. We therefore accelerated

---

2 See Annex A
3 DFID sponsors one non-departmental body, the Advisory Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the UK; and wholly owns CDC Group plc, the main arm for the Department’s interventions in private sector development.
4 See Annex C: Sessional Return. The Sessional Return includes information and statistics about the membership and work of the committee.
completion of our inquiries so that the Reports were available in time to inform DFID’s thinking. We were pleased to see that our views had been taken into account in the final document published in July. Our specific recommendations are covered in more detail in the next chapters of this Report. We intend to follow up a number of the key policy shifts set out in the White Paper in our evidence session with the Secretary of State early in the new Session.

**Committee membership**

6. We have again seen a number of changes to the membership of the Committee this Session. We repeat the point we made last year that it would greatly assist select committees in carrying out their duties if membership changes were dealt with more promptly. We also drew attention in last year’s Sessional Report to our concern about the lack of female representation on our Committee. We had no women on the Committee for the whole of the 2008-09 Session. This is a cause of embarrassment for us, particularly when we visit developing countries whom the UK exhorts to promote gender equality. We will return to this issue later in the Report when we discuss the key messages we would like to pass on to our successors.

---

5 DFID, *Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future*, Cm 7656, 6 July 2009
6 See Annex C for details
2 Inquiries into Government policy proposals

7. As referred to above, DFID’s major policy proposals in this Session were set out in the White Paper Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future published in July. Our contribution to the drafting of the White Paper took the form of publishing two reports in time to inform the consultation process. We will comment on the policy proposals in detail as part of our assessment of the DFID Annual Report 2009.

Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn

8. Our inquiry made clear that the economic downturn was threatening economic development in poor countries. Initial predictions that the developing world would be insulated from the worst of the financial turbulence did not prove to be correct. Poor countries have experienced significantly reduced income from trade, remittances and foreign investment. It is predicted that an additional 90 million people will be living in poverty by the end of 2010 and that 400,000 more children are likely to die. Progress towards MDG 1 on eradicating poverty and hunger has been set back three years.

9. In our Report, we welcomed the measures taken by DFID and the international community to assist poor countries to cope with the downturn, particularly the billions of dollars pledged at the G20 summit in April. However, we cautioned that this huge boost in funding needed to be accompanied by reform of the international financial institutions, particularly their governance, to ensure the full involvement of developing countries. We also stressed the importance of donor countries adhering to their promises on aid funding and particularly the target of allocating 0.7% of gross national income to development assistance by 2015.

10. We were concerned that the downturn might be undermining previously strong UK public support for aid. We called on DFID to do more to show the public the positive outcomes of its work in poor countries and to raise its visibility both at home and abroad. We were pleased to see that DFID launched a new UKaid logo in the White Paper which aims to make the impact of UK aid expenditure and DFID’s work more obvious to the UK public, as well as to people in developing countries. The Secretary of State had invited our views on this rebranding in his evidence to the inquiry and we supported it in our Report. We will monitor the impact of this change as part of our ongoing evaluation of DFID’s effectiveness.

11. As public support for development was such a key topic in this inquiry, we decided to be innovative in the methods we used to gauge levels of support. We conducted an on-line consultation in which we asked the public to tell us what they thought about the effectiveness of UK aid and development. We also held two public meetings, in Leeds and Bradford, where a range of development issues was discussed. This enabled us to reach out

---

beyond our normal stakeholder group of academics, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and official bodies and to provide an opportunity for members of the public to share their views with us. We are grateful to Parliament’s new Outreach service for their help in making these meetings a success. We plan to repeat this process in our inquiry into DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh (see below).

**Progress on Implementation of DFID’s HIV/AIDS Strategy**

12. It has been our practice in this Parliament to conduct an annual inquiry into different aspects of the challenges presented by HIV/AIDS and to publish a report to coincide with World AIDS Day on 1 December.

13. Last Session, we examined DFID’s new HIV/AIDS Strategy, *Achieving Universal Access*, which was published in June 2008. Our Report welcomed many of the initiatives and commitments announced in DFID’s new Strategy but we also expressed a number of concerns. We identified significant deficiencies in the detail about implementation of the Strategy which the Government did not then adequately address in its Response, despite a number of requests for specific information. In this year’s inquiry, we therefore decided to follow up some of the issues which had not been resolved in the Government’s Response, as well as assessing recent developments.

14. Our Report will be published in the new Session. The further evidence we received from DFID did nothing to change the conclusion we reached last year: that key elements of DFID’s AIDS Strategy—increased funding for health systems in developing countries and for social protection programmes—are necessary and welcome measures but are not sufficiently targeted to ensure that they deal effectively with the specific health and social challenges which HIV/AIDS presents. It is clear that the 2010 target for universal access to HIV/AIDS treatment will be missed by a wide margin. Our view is that this is very disappointing and that it must not be compounded by failure to maintain the levels of support for HIV/AIDS programmes agreed by the international community. DFID is a lead donor for and supporter of HIV/AIDS services in developing countries. We strongly believe that the UK should continue to demonstrate that its commitment to tackling this crucial development challenge has not diminished. It should also apply pressure to donor partners to show the same undiminished support, by honouring their funding pledges.

---

8 DFID, *Achieving Universal Access—the UK’s strategy for halting and reversing the spread of HIV in the developing world*, June 2008

Inquiries into areas seen as requiring examination because of deficiencies

Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate

15. The Committee published its Report on Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate in June 2009. Our inquiry followed up some of the issues raised in a report published in 2002 by a previous International Development Committee on Global Climate Change and Sustainable Development. Our new inquiry examined the potential conflict between economic development and climate change mitigation. It considered how the UK Government could best promote development which was sustainable and which promoted poverty reduction, and the steps it was taking to encourage effective adaptation strategies in developing countries.

16. We recognised that climate change threatens to destroy gains that have already been made in poverty reduction in many developing countries. We concluded that rich countries, including the UK, should provide new, substantial and predictable funding to assist poor countries to tackle climate change as a matter of urgency. We stressed that the international community needed to reach a new agreement on emissions reductions and on funding for developing countries to help them cope with climate change. The UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen in December provides the opportunity to make the necessary major commitments. We intend to take further evidence on the UK Government’s objectives for the Copenhagen Conference outcomes as part of our work on the new DFID White Paper early in the new Session.

17. We also assessed the potential impact that lifestyle choices made by people in the developed world might have on the economies of poor countries. For example, people in the UK who are concerned about climate change might decide not to take holidays involving long-haul flights or to avoid buying produce flown in from Africa. Yet tourism is a key growth sector in many poor countries; and the emissions produced by fresh produce grown in developing countries and flown to the UK might be lower overall because they are not grown in heated greenhouses. These are complex issues and there is no easy solution. We recommended that consumers should be provided with more information about the environmental and social impacts of the choices they make about travel and buying imported fresh foods to enable them to make informed choices.

Urbanisation and Poverty

18. We began our inquiry into Urbanisation and Poverty in March 2009. We were motivated by the fact that 2008 marked the point at which, for the first time, more people worldwide lived in urban centres than in rural settings and that this proportion was projected to rise to 60% within two decades. 95% of the world’s urban growth is in the developing world, where cities gain an average of 5 million new residents every month. Many of the new arrivals in towns and cities become slum dwellers, living on the physical, social and economic margins of the city in deprived and crowded living conditions. We
visited Nigeria in June 2009 to witness at first hand the challenges and opportunities posed by urbanisation in Lagos, the country’s largest city and one of Africa’s “megacities”.

19. In our Report published in October, we observed that DFID overwhelmingly focuses its efforts to address urban poverty on Asian, rather than African, countries.\(^{11}\) We believed this balance needed to be redressed because Africa is the world’s fastest urbanising region and has the highest proportion of slum dwellers. Without a new and comprehensive approach to urban development in Africa, a number of cities could face a humanitarian crisis in as little as five years’ time.

20. We found that there was a lack of focus on urban issues within DFID’s organisational structure and that its urban expertise was not sufficiently broad or well-distributed in its developing country offices. We called for a modest, but highly targeted, increase of financial resources for urban poverty which would enable DFID to support other bodies, including UN Habitat, and international initiatives, to expand their work on slum upgrading and urban development.

**Food security**

21. Our Report from last Session on the *World Food Programme and Global Food Security* was debated in Westminster Hall on 21 May 2009.\(^{12}\) We regarded it as important to continue to press the Government on the issues raised in the Report because food price rises continue to affect people in developing countries and food security remains an international concern. The G8 has recently said that agriculture and food security are “the core of the international agenda”.\(^{13}\)

22. Our Report had highlighted that DFID did not have a nutrition strategy in place and expressed concern about the negative impact this was likely to have on the effectiveness of its work towards achieving the MDG 1 targets of eradicating hunger and malnutrition. We followed this up in our examination of the DFID Annual Report 2008. The Secretary of State acknowledged in evidence to us last November that “nutrition had not been a central focus of my work” when he first arrived in the Department and he reiterated the Government’s undertaking given in its Response to our food security Report that DFID would develop a new nutrition strategy by the end of 2008. This was not achieved.\(^{14}\) Almost a year further on, there is still no nutrition strategy in place. Yet the number of malnourished people in the world reached 1 billion in 2009, up from 915 million in 2008.\(^{15}\) DFID did release an evidence paper in October 2009 and has pledged to publish the new Strategy in the coming months.\(^{16}\) We regard this as a very important policy area and we urge our successors in the new Parliament to keep a watching brief on it (see below).

---

\(^{11}\) Seventh Report of Session 2008-09, Urbanisation and Poverty, HC 511-I


\(^{13}\) *The Economist*, 21 November 2009


\(^{15}\) *The Economist*, 21 November 2009

4 Inquiries into departmental actions

DFID and China

23. Our inquiry into DFID’s support to China began in the last parliamentary Session. Our visit to China initially planned for June 2008 had to be postponed to December following the devastating earthquake that hit Sichuan in May of that year. Our itinerary included some of the poor western provinces of the country. We were very impressed with the DFID-funded projects we saw and the impact they had had in China. This supported the view expressed to us by many witnesses that DFID had built one of the most successful aid programmes of all donors in China. Its approach was very cost-effective and relied on demonstrating small-scale, innovative projects in health, education, sanitation and water which were then expanded by the targets being missed.

24. Our Report acknowledged that China presented a conundrum for DFID.\(^{17}\) It is classed as a middle-income country and it is therefore DFID’s intention to withdraw bilateral aid in 2011. Yet around 16% of its huge population (around 200 million people) still live in poverty and many still lack access to basic services such as sanitation and clean drinking water. Affordable healthcare is beyond the reach of many and, amongst vulnerable groups, HIV/AIDS is spreading fast. We believed that if DFID withdrew from China just four years before the 2015 date for achieving the Millennium Development Goals, this might contribute to several of the targets being missed.

25. There were also wider issues at stake. We found that DFID has built influential relationships with policymakers in China and believed that these were too important to lose. Crucially, the path that China chooses, in terms of carbon emissions, energy use and its sourcing of natural resources, will strongly affect the international community’s efforts to address climate change. DFID has been the lead Department in climate change work with China and we believed that other Departments would struggle to take on this role. We concluded that the UK’s aid programme in China should end as planned in 2011, but that DFID should continue to fund a “development partnership” with China until 2015. We recommended that this be based on a small funding element and a continued DFID staff presence in China.

26. Despite the Minister telling us that he “couldn’t emphasise enough our willingness” to look at the findings in our Report, the Government’s Response showed an unusual reluctance to engage with us on this topic. The response given to many of our detailed and specific recommendations on the UK’s future engagement in China was simply: “The Committee’s recommendations for China will be considered as part of the planning process for the next Comprehensive Spending Round.”\(^{18}\) We regard DFID’s engagement with middle-income countries, particularly the rapidly developing countries like India and China, to be a key development issue and, as set out in the last chapter of this Report, we would expect that our successors will wish to return to this subject in the next Parliament.

---

\(^{17}\) Third Report of Session 2008-09, *DFID and China*, HC 180-I

DFID’s Programme in Nigeria

27. Our decision to conduct an inquiry into DFID’s Programme in Nigeria arose from it being the most populous country in Africa and DFID’s fourth largest programme in the continent. Despite being a major oil producer, more than half of the 150 million Nigerian people live in poverty and the country is not on track to meet any of the Millennium Development Goals. We identified huge obstacles to promoting effective poverty reduction in Nigeria: governance, public finance management, and delivery of basic services had all suffered under 30 years of military rule and the economy has been distorted by its oil wealth, which had discouraged growth in other sectors. Corruption was identified as being endemic in all sectors of society.

28. Our Report noted that, although the challenges for DFID of operating in Nigeria should not be minimised, its work was having a significant impact in demonstrating what could be achieved, in supporting the Nigerian authorities to make necessary reforms, and in bringing much-needed basic services to the Nigerian people. We therefore believed that DFID’s programme in Nigeria should continue, based on its Country Partnership Strategy with the World Bank and other major donors. However, we stressed the importance of being realistic about the prospects for progress: change is likely to continue to be incremental and slow until the Nigerian authorities provide stronger leadership for reform. We recommended that the level of UK funding should not be significantly increased while corruption and poor governance remained such significant barriers to poverty alleviation.

DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh

29. We began an inquiry into DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh in October 2009. Bangladesh is the fourth highest recipient of bilateral aid from the UK. The country has made significant strides in poverty reduction in recent years especially in rural areas, helped by sustained economic growth rates. It has halved child mortality and increased life expectancy to 64 years. Community-led initiatives and programmes run by non-governmental organisations have been very successful in a range of sectors. However, despite these achievements Bangladesh remains one of the poorest countries in the world with nearly 60 million people living below the poverty line and income inequality is growing. It is also likely to be one of the countries worst affected by climate change.

30. We visited Bangladesh in early November and were able to see many examples of DFID-funded work, including vocational training and livelihoods programmes, support for health and education, and assistance with mitigating the impact of climate change. We were fortunate to have the opportunity to meet the Prime Minister, Sheikh Hasina and a number of other government ministers as well as a wide range of other donors, non-governmental organisations, and most importantly, local people who are the beneficiaries of UK assistance. We plan to take evidence from the DFID Minister in December and produce our Report early in the new year.
DFID’s Programme in Nepal

31. We decided to look at DFID’s programme in Nepal because it is the poorest country in south Asia. It is also emerging from a 10-year civil war in which nearly 400,000 rural families were displaced, infrastructure was destroyed and 13,000 lives were lost. Nepal is one of the fragile states on which DFID’s new White Paper said that it will increasingly focus.

32. Despite years of conflict and the difficulties in providing basic services which the mountainous topography creates, Nepal has made progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in a number of areas, particularly reducing maternal mortality and increasing access to education. DFID is the largest bilateral donor in Nepal.

33. We visited Nepal in October 2009 where we had the opportunity to travel to remote areas and to see a range of DFID-funded projects including in employment generation, road building, and women’s empowerment. We were also able to observe the impact of climate change on the glaciers of the Himalayas. We met the Prime Minister and the former (Maoist) Prime Minister as well as other international donors and civil society groups and again, many local people who shared their experiences with us. We intend to begin oral evidence sessions early in the new parliamentary Session and to report in the new year.
5 Examination of expenditure and Public Service Agreements

34. As in previous years, the overall aim of our activities in this Session was to assess DFID’s performance on the basis of the targets set under its Public Service Agreements (PSAs). DFID’s PSA targets are largely based on the Millennium Development Goals, which have the overall aim of poverty reduction. DFID leads on delivery of PSA 29: reduce poverty in poorer countries through quicker progress towards the MDGs. Its main delivery partners for this PSA are HM Treasury, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. DFID is a delivery partner on PSA 27 and PSA 30. PSA 27 is to: lead the global effort to avoid dangerous climate change (led by DECC). PSA 30 is to: reduce the impact of conflict through enhanced UK and international efforts (led by the FCO).

35. We have continued our practice of conducting an inquiry into DFID’s Annual Report. Our inquiry into the 2008 Annual Report included an assessment of the UK’s contribution to some of the Millennium Development Goals which are not on track to be achieved by 2015. We have also taken a keen interest during this Parliament in how DFID measures the impact of its expenditure and we commented in our Report on the work of the newly established Independent Advisory Committee on Development Impact and DFID’s own Evaluation Department.  

36. A second recurring theme in our annual examination of the Department’s performance has been the difficulty the Department faces in balancing a rising budget against the requirement to make efficiency savings, including staff reductions. This year we noted the Permanent Secretary’s frankness in admitting that her staff were “coping, but struggling” and cautioned that it would be perverse if administrative savings meant that the Department was spending its budget less effectively. We returned to this issue in our examination of the 2009 Annual Report (see below).

37. DFID’s Annual Report 2009 also included, for the first time, the Resource Accounts for the preceding financial year. As we have mentioned, DFID also published a new White Paper in July 2009, and we decided to include an assessment of its main policy proposals in our examination of the Annual Report. We have arranged to hold evidence sessions early in the new parliamentary Session with the DFID Permanent Secretary and the Secretary of State. In a new departure, the National Audit Office has assisted with this inquiry, including the preparation of a brief on DFID’s performance in 2008-09. We have valued this additional support for our work.

21 DFID, Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future, July 2009
22 NAO, Performance of the Department for International Development 2008-09, November 2009
6 Other areas of activity

Major appointments

38. We have not had the occasion to interview any new appointees to major posts in the last year. As DFID has a very small number of associated bodies, the Secretary of State makes very few major appointments.

Associated public bodies

39. DFID has one associated Non-Departmental Public Body: the Advisory Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the UK. CDC Group plc is a UK government-owned body which acts as DFID’s main instrument for risk finance investment in developing countries. We have not undertaken inquiries into these bodies during the period covered by this Report.

Examination of draft legislation

40. The Department has not produced draft legislation during this Session (although the publication of a draft Bill on International Development Spending was announced in the Queen’s Speech in November 2009 and we would expect to be involved in its scrutiny).

Committees on Arms Export Controls

41. We continued our contribution to the Committees on Arms Export Controls, together with members of the Business, Innovation and Skills, Defence and Foreign Affairs Committees. Together we carry out detailed scrutiny of the Government’s controls on exports of equipment and technology with a military application.

42. Our joint Report was published in August.\(^23\) We called for closer scrutiny of UK arms exports, following confirmation by the UK Government that Israeli weapons systems used in the Gaza conflict almost certainly contained British-built components. We were also concerned that UK military equipment and weapons exported to Sri Lanka during the ceasefire between the Sri Lanka government and the LTTE,\(^24\) may have been used against the civilian population when hostilities escalated in 2006. We agreed that applications for licences for exports to Israel and Sri Lanka should continue to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, but recommended a review of all existing licences relating to Sri Lanka and that the Government assess what weapons used by the Sri Lanka armed forces against the LTTE were supplied by the UK.

43. We repeated our strong recommendations from last year’s report that the Government establish a register of UK arms brokers and that the UK extend certain trade controls on activities by UK persons anywhere in the world. We called for all residents in the UK and British citizens overseas to obtain trade control licences, or be covered by a general licence,


\(^{24}\) Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam
before engaging in any trade in the goods featured on what is called “the Military List” of weapons and materiel classifications.

Conferences

44. Our Chairman attended conferences of chairmen of foreign affairs, development and co-operation committees of EU countries in Prague and Visby in 2009 organised by the Czech and Swedish EU presidencies. These conferences offer a valuable opportunity to discuss our work with our European counterparts. The Chairman also attended the first High-level Symposium to prepare for the ECOSOC 2010 Development Cooperation Forum (DCF), which was held in Vienna in November 2009. Another of our Members, Rt Hon John Battle, participated in the OECD/EU High Level Parliamentary Conference on Policy Coherence for Development and Migration, which was held in Brussels in February 2009.

Informal meetings

45. In March, we met Robert Zoellick, President of the World Bank with whom we discussed the impact of the economic downturn and the prospects for the G20 Summit meeting as part of our inquiry into Aid Under Pressure. In July we met Rt Hon Baroness Ashton, the then European Commissioner for Trade with whom we discussed the WTO Doha Round, the EU’s Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) and other trade matters which impinge on development.

46. We followed up our 2008 Report on Aid Effectiveness in a briefing from the Overseas Development Institute, looking at an aspect which that inquiry did not cover: the impact of “untying aid” on development effectiveness.25

47. We continued to maintain a watching brief on events in Afghanistan. Several of our Members have taken part in a regular series of Government briefings and round-table discussions where representatives of the FCO, MoD and DFID provide updates on the different aspects of the UK’s strategy in Afghanistan.

48. We held several meetings with representatives of international organisations, including: Helen Clark, Administrator of the UN Development Programme (and former Prime Minister of New Zealand); the UN Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO); USAID; the US Institute for Peace; and the International Medical Corps.

49. We continued our practice of supplementing our formal evidence from DFID Ministers with informal meetings. In July we met the Secretary of State and his two ministerial colleagues to discuss publication of the new White Paper and to follow up on some issues from recent reports. We also met the Chair and members of the Independent Advisory Committee on Development Impact (IACDI) to discuss progress with their work on strengthening DFID’s evaluation procedures.

---

25 When donors give tied aid, they insist that aid funds are used to purchase goods and services from suppliers based in the donor country or a limited group of countries. DFID fully “untied” its aid in 2001. Untying aid encourages procurement of goods and services within developing countries.
50. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD carries out peer reviews of donor countries every 4-5 years, and 2010 will be the turn of the UK. Two other donor countries carry out the review: the examiners of the UK will be Spain and Sweden. We met DAC representatives in November 2009 to share with them our views on DFID’s strengths and weaknesses.
7 Key messages for our successors

51. With a General Election approaching, this Report provides an opportunity for us to set out issues which we regard as meriting the particular attention of our successors on the International Development Committee in the next Parliament.

Women Members of the Committee

52. We cannot emphasise enough the negative impact on our work of the House failing to appoint women members to our Committee. Gender equality is one of the Millennium Development Goals and DFID quite rightly gives a high priority to encouraging developing countries to address inequalities which affect women’s rights, including rights to health, education and equal representation in society. It is difficult for us to put this message across convincingly when organisations we meet both here and abroad have a better gender balance than we do. It is also a real impediment to us carrying out our work effectively during visits. Many situations arise where cultural factors prevent women having contact with men who are not family members. As we cannot have direct discussions with these women, we are unable to benefit from hearing about their experiences and their views. We call on all parties to put forward the necessary nominations to ensure that there are at least two women members of this Committee throughout the next Parliament.

Trade and development

53. As we said in our Report on Aid Under Pressure, an international agreement on trade which worked in the interests of developing countries has the potential to generate three and half times as much revenue for them as they receive in aid. Throughout this Parliament we have pressed for the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Doha round of negotiations (the “development” round) to be successfully concluded. DFID’s latest White Paper says that it will “make growth and trade a central part of our support to developing countries” and that it will “press for a quick conclusion to the Doha trade talks.”

Developing countries have been waiting since 2001 for a trade agreement which responds to their needs and works in their best interests. We would encourage our successors to continue to focus on the importance of trade to development.

Middle-income countries

54. As we said in our Report on the DFID Annual Report 2008, while we support DFID’s policy of spending 90% of its bilateral funding in low-income countries and only 10% in middle-income countries (MICs), the latter countries are critical to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). DFID used to have a Middle-Income Country
Strategy but this expired in 2008 and has so far not been replaced. In our Report on *DFID and China*, we reiterated our view that DFID should publish a coherent strategy for its policy and expenditure for MICs as a matter of urgency.\(^29\) DFID’s Response to the points made in both these Reports was exactly the same: “each [middle-income country] is different and it is not clear that a single strategy can any longer adequately reflect the specific agendas we have with each of them”. It said that it would review this issue as part of its work on the White Paper.\(^30\) However, no new approach to middle-income countries is set out in the White Paper. We will not have time to conduct an inquiry into this topic but see it as a priority for the next Parliament, given its importance to the MDGs being achieved.

**The Committee’s engagement with DFID**

55. We have sought throughout this Parliament to be a “critical friend” to DFID. We are supportive of its work and have frequently praised the professionalism and dedication of its staff. We firmly believe that there is no substitute for visiting developing countries to see DFID’s programmes in operation and to talk to the beneficiaries of UK funding. A mix of country-specific inquiries and those based on sectoral themes, for example, sanitation and water and maternal health, have provided a good balance and allowed us to cover our remit effectively.

56. The influence of the Committee on DFID’s policies is often subtle yet powerful and is not reflected solely in the Government’s responses to our specific recommendations. Simply beginning an inquiry into a subject raises its profile with Ministers and increases officials’ focus on it. This was demonstrated by our prioritising of sanitation over water in our 2007 Report.\(^31\) When DFID launched a new Water and Sanitation Policy in October 2008, it paid tribute to the Committee for the role our Report had played in formulating the policy, which included additional funds for improving sanitation in Africa and Asia.\(^32\) Similarly, as we mentioned above, our work on global food security brought new attention within DFID to the importance of nutrition. The publication of DFID’s nutrition strategy has been long delayed but we hope that our successors will have an opportunity to comment on it early in the new Parliament.

57. Our 2007 inquiry into DFID’s assistance for Burmese refugees and displaced people demonstrated how policy can be influenced in the course of an inquiry as well as by the eventual report. Just as we began taking evidence, DFID announced a change of policy in relation to cross-border assistance which entailed removing the restriction on the use of its funds for assistance to refugees on the Thai-Burma border. One of the key recommendations in our Report was that DFID should quadruple its overall aid budget to Burma by 2013. While the Government Response acknowledged that overall aid levels to Burma should increase, no specific commitment was given.\(^33\) However, in a press release

---

issued later in the same month, DFID announced that aid to Burma would be doubled from £9 million to £18 million by 2010. While welcoming this change, we said at the time that we regarded it as rather dismissive on the part of the Government that no mention was made in the announcement of our contribution to the debate about aid to Burma and our specific recommendation on funding. We reiterate our view that parliamentary processes would be strengthened, and the Government’s own standing enhanced, if due acknowledgement was given to select committees for their contribution to policy-making when it may be appropriate.

58. The challenges for DFID of operating with a rising budget but a reducing staff headcount has been a recurrent theme for us during this Parliament and will continue to need careful monitoring as the UK moves closer to its commitment to spend 0.7% of Gross National Income on development by 2013. We have also pointed out that this is one of the motivating factors behind DFID’s intention to channel increasing sums of money through multilateral bodies such as the World Bank and UN agencies, which was restated in the White Paper. Although this can often increase the coherence of aid delivery, it also presents challenges in terms of ensuring that the objectives of multilateral bodies match those of the UK and in tracking the impact of UK aid expenditure. The performance of multilaterals and the effectiveness of DFID’s collaboration with them will continue to be important themes in the next Parliament.

59. The other main policy shift in the White Paper was the increased focus on fragile states. This has implications for both of the issues mentioned above: staff reductions and working through multilaterals. It will also require effective joint working between a number of Government Departments, particularly FCO, MoD and DFID. Afghanistan is a fragile state which has presented particular challenges. We hope that some lessons can be drawn from DFID’s joint work with other Departments there which can be applied generally. However, as the Permanent Secretary told us, each fragile state is “unhappy is its own way” and DFID will have to take care to tailor its programmes to the particular context. We will comment further on this in our forthcoming Report on the DFID Annual Report and White Paper 2009, but would urge our successors to monitor this emerging policy focus very carefully.

---

34 “UK will double aid to fight poverty in Burma”, DFID Press Release, 30 October 2007
36 Evidence taken on 24 November 2009 in the inquiry into the DFID Annual Report 2009, Q 12
## Annex A: Core tasks for departmental select committee established by the Liaison Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE A: TO EXAMINE AND COMMENT ON THE POLICY OF THE DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE B: TO EXAMINE THE EXPENDITURE OF THE DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE C: TO EXAMINE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE D: TO ASSIST THE HOUSE IN DEBATE AND DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex B

**Table 1: Subjects covered by the International Development Committee in Session 2008–09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Evidence sessions in 2008–09</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID Annual Report 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Report, January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID and China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Report, March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Report, June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Report, June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Nigeria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Report, October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation and Poverty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Report, October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oral evidence in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Nepal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oral evidence in progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Visits by the International Development Committee in 2008–09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Purpose of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas visits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya and Tanzania</td>
<td>Inquiry into Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Inquiries into DFID’s Programme in Nigeria and Urbanisation and Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal and Bangladesh</td>
<td>Inquiries into DFID’s Programme in Nepal and DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK visits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford and Leeds</td>
<td>Inquiry into Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visits in a representative capacity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>OECD Conference on Migration and Policy Coherence for Development (delegation — 1 Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Conference of EU Foreign Affairs and Development Committee Chairs (delegation — 1 Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visby, Sweden</td>
<td>Conference of EU Foreign Affairs and Development Committee Chairs (delegation — 1 Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
<td>High Level Symposium in preparation for the 2010 UN Development Forum (delegation — 1 Member)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Liaison Committee criteria relevant to 2008–09 inquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government and European Commission policy proposals</th>
<th>Examination of deficiencies</th>
<th>Departmental actions</th>
<th>Associated public bodies</th>
<th>Implementation of legislation</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Evidence from Minister</th>
<th>Public Service Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID Annual Report 2008</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID and China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation and Poverty</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Nigeria</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Nepal</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID Annual Report 2009 and DFID White Paper, Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Committee was nominated by the House of Commons on 13 July 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Meetings attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce, Malcolm (Chairman)</td>
<td>30 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle, John</td>
<td>24 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayley, Hugh</td>
<td>22 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bercow, John (discharged 13.7.09)</td>
<td>9 out of 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden, Richard</td>
<td>16 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabb, Mr Stephen (discharged 13.7.09)</td>
<td>1 out of 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Mr Nigel (added 13.7.09)</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrick, Mark (added 19.1.09)</td>
<td>10 out of 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawczynski, Daniel</td>
<td>7 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster, Mr Mark (added 13.7.09)</td>
<td>2 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKechin, Ann (discharged 19.1.09)</td>
<td>0 out of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, Mr Virendra (added 9.3.09)</td>
<td>13 out of 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan, Jim (discharged 9.3.09)</td>
<td>0 out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh, Mr Marsha</td>
<td>20 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Sir Robert (discharged 19.1.09)</td>
<td>1 out of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunell, Andrew (added 19.1.09)</td>
<td>29 out of 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Attendance: 55.8%

Total number of meetings: 30

Of which:
- Number of meetings at which oral evidence was taken: 20
- Number of times oral evidence was taken partly or wholly in private: 0
- Number of wholly private meetings: 10
- Number of concurrent meetings with other committees: 0

Other activities

Informal meetings (including overseas visitors): 12
Conferences/Seminars hosted: 2

Staff

Details of the permanent staff of the Committee during the Session can be found in the Committee’s publications.

Specialist Advisers during the Session

Dr Tom Downing and Dr Benito Muller.
Witnesses

Oral evidence was given during the Session by the following categories of witnesses:

Number of appearances by:
- Cabinet Ministers 2
- Other Ministers 5
- Members of the House of Lords (1 of whom was a Minister) 2

Number of appearances by officials from, or representatives of:
- Department for International Development 8
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs 1
- Foreign and Commonwealth Office 1

Number of appearances by:
- European Commission 1
- Appearances by other witnesses 59

Overseas Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-9.3.09</td>
<td>PragueA</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conference of Foreign Affairs and Development Committee Chairmen (COFACC)</td>
<td>£2,428.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25.3.09</td>
<td>Kenya and Tanzania</td>
<td>Bruce, Bayley, Burden, Hendrick,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inquiry into Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</td>
<td>£44,857.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kawczynski, Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-17.6.09</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Bruce, Bayley, Sharma, Singh,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inquiries into DFID's Programme in Nigeria and Urbanisation and Poverty</td>
<td>£35,283.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stunell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7.9.09</td>
<td>Visby, SwedenA</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conference of Foreign Affairs and Development Committee Chairman (COFACC)</td>
<td>£2,612.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.10-4.11.09</td>
<td>Nepal and Bangladesh</td>
<td>Bruce, Battle, Bayley, Evans,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inquiries into DFID's Programme in Nepal and DFID's Programme in Bangladesh</td>
<td>£50,000 (estimated outturn)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Date

**12-13.11.09**

### Destination

Vienna, Austria

### Members

Bruce

### Staff

0

### Purpose

High Level Symposium in preparation for the 2010 UN Development Forum

### Cost

£1,300 (estimated outturn)

---

* Travel in a representative capacity

---

### Visits to European Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.2.09</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Battle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OECD/EP High Level Parliamentary Conference on Migration and Policy Coherence for Development</td>
<td>£1,320.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Travel in a representative capacity

---

### UK Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.09</td>
<td>Leeds and Bradford</td>
<td>Bruce, Battle, Bayley, Singh, Stunell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inquiry into Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn</td>
<td>£1,780.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Reports and Oral and Written Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>HC No. (2008–09)</th>
<th>Date of publication</th>
<th>Government reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral and Written Evidence: <em>DFID Annual Report 2008</em></td>
<td>220-II</td>
<td>19.1.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Report: <em>DFID and China</em></td>
<td>180-I</td>
<td>12.3.09</td>
<td>Received 19.5.09: published as Third Special Report Session 2008–09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and Written Evidence: <em>DFID and China</em></td>
<td>180-II</td>
<td>12.3.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>HC No. (2008–09)</td>
<td>Date of publication</td>
<td>Government reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and Written Evidence: <em>Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn</em></td>
<td>179-II</td>
<td>2.6.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Report: <em>Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</em></td>
<td>177-I</td>
<td>3.6.09</td>
<td>Received 12.10.09: published as Fifth Special Report Session 2008–09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and Written Evidence: <em>Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</em></td>
<td>177-II</td>
<td>3.6.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Report: <em>Urbanisation and Poverty</em></td>
<td>511-I</td>
<td>22.10.09</td>
<td>Awaited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and Written Evidence: <em>Urbanisation and Poverty</em></td>
<td>511-II</td>
<td>22.10.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Report: <em>DFID’s Programme in Nigeria</em></td>
<td>840-I</td>
<td>23.10.09</td>
<td>Awaited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and Written Evidence: <em>DFID’s Programme in Nigeria</em></td>
<td>840-II</td>
<td>23.10.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Special Report: <em>Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate: Government Response to the Committee’s Fifth Report of Session 2008–09</em></td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>26.10.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncorrected Oral Evidence published on the Internet: <em>DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh</em></td>
<td>1041-i</td>
<td>27.10.09</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Title HC No. (2008–09) Date of publication Government reply


Written Evidence published on the Internet: DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh 13.10.09 Not applicable

Written Evidence published on the Internet: DFID’s Programme in Nepal 13.10.09 Not applicable

Written Evidence published on the Internet: DFID’s Annual Report 2009 and DFID White Paper 2009 13.10.09 Not applicable


Government replies to Reports for Session 2007–08

Reply to the Committee’s Twelfth Report: HIV/AIDS: DFID’s New Strategy, received 3.2.09 and published as the Committee’s First Special Report Session 2008–09.

Formal Minutes

The Formal Minutes of the Committee were published electronically after each meeting of the Committee. They are available on the Committee’s website at http://www.parliament.uk/indcom.

Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.09</td>
<td>One, on a reasoned amendment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debates

Committee reports were debated on 1 occasion in Westminster Hall. Committee reports were tagged on the Order Paper as being relevant to debates in the House of Commons or Westminster Hall on 2 occasions. Further details can be found in the Committee’s Sessional Report.

Number of oral evidence sessions for each inquiry during the Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Number of oral evidence sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development in a Global Economic Downturn</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID and China</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Bangladesh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Number of oral evidence sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID’s Programme in Nigeria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS: Progress on Implementation of DFID’s HIV/AIDS Strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation and Poverty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal Minutes

Tuesday 15 December 2009

Members present:

John Battle  Mr Marsha Singh
Mr Virendra Sharma  Andrew Stunell

In the absence of the Chairman, John Battle was called to the Chair.

Draft Report (The Work of the Committee in Session 2008-09), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman’s draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 59 read and agreed to.

Annexes agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Second Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman make the Report to the House.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 16 December at 1.15 pm.]
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

The reference number of the Government’s response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

**Session 2009-10**


**Session 2008-09**

| First Report | Work of the Committee in Session 2007-08 | HC 138 |
| Third Report | DFID and China | HC 180 (HC 535) |
| Fourth Report | Aid Under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in Global Economic Downturn | HC 179 (HC 1009) |
| Fifth Report | Sustainable Development in a Changing Climate | HC 177 (1008) |
| Seventh Report | Urbanisation and Poverty | HC 511 |
| Eighth Report | DFID’s Programme in Nigeria | HC 840 |

**Session 2007-08**

| First Report | DFID Departmental Report 2007 | HC 64–I&II (HC 329) |
| Second Report | Development and Trade: Cross-departmental Working | HC 68 (HC 330) |
| Third Report | Work of the Committee 2007 | HC 255 |
| Fourth Report | Reconstructing Afghanistan | HC 65–I&II (HC 509) |
| Fifth Report | Maternal Health | HC 66–I&II (HC 592) |
| Sixth Report | DFID and the World Bank | HC 67–I&II (HC 548) |
| Seventh Report | DFID and the African Development Bank | HC 441–I&II (HC 988) |
| Ninth Report | Working Together to Make Aid More Effective | HC 520–I&II (HC 1065) |
| Tenth Report | The World Food Programme and Global Food Security | HC 493–I&II (HC 1066) |
### The Work of the Committee in Session 2008-09

**Eleventh Report**
The Humanitarian and Development Situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territories

HC 522–I&II
(HC 1067)

**Tenth Report**
HIV/AIDS: DIFID’s New Strategy

HC 1068-1&II
(HC 235)

### Session 2006–07

**First Report**
DFID Departmental Report 2006

HC 71
(HC 328)

**Second Report**
HIV/AIDS: Marginalised groups and emerging epidemics

HC 46-I&II
(HC 329)

**Third Report**
Work of the Committee in 2005–06

HC 228

**Fourth Report**
Development Assistance and the Occupied Palestinian Territories

HC 114-I&II
(HC 430)

**Fifth Report**
EU Development and Trade Policies: An update

HC 271
(HC 622)

**Sixth Report**
Sanitation and Water

HC 126-I&II
(HC 854)

**Seventh Report**
Fair Trade and Development

HC 356-I&II
(HC 1047)

**Eighth Report**
DFID’s Programme in Vietnam

HC 732
(HC 1062)

**Ninth Report**
Prospects for sustainable peace in Uganda

HC 853
(HC 1063)

**Tenth Report**
DFID Assistance to Burmese Internally Displaced People and Refugees on the Thai-Burma Border

HC 645-I&II
(HC 1070)

### Session 2005–06

**First Report**
Delivering the Goods: HIV/AIDS and the Provision of Anti-Retrovirals

HC 708–I&II
(HC 922)

**Second Report**
Darfur: The killing continues

HC 657
(HC 1017)

**Third Report**
The WTO Hong Kong Ministerial and the Doha Development Agenda

HC 730–I&II
(HC 1425)

**Fourth Report**
Private Sector Development

HC 921-I&II
(HC 1629)

**Fifth Report**

HC 873
(Cm 6954)

**Sixth Report**
Conflict and Development: Peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction

HC 923
(HC 172)

**Seventh Report**
Humanitarian response to natural disasters

HC 1188
(HC 229)