

Appendix for: 'The swarm principle':  
A sub-national spatial analysis of  
aid targeting and donor coordination in sub-Saharan Africa

*Appendix: Table 1A: Correlation of Poverty and Sectoral Aid Commitments*

	Pooled Poverty Correlation	DRC	Malawi	Nigeria	Senegal	Uganda
Administrative costs	-0.1657	-0.3555	.	.	.	.
Agriculture	-0.157	0.572	-0.4717	0.192	0.1477	-0.3659
Banking	-0.0955	-0.1877	.	0.047	.	.
Business	-0.2853	.	.	.	-0.5538	.
Communication	-0.0903	-0.1077	.	.	-0.7749	0.7655
Education	-0.2701	-0.1336	-0.2295	0.3648	-0.8099	0.1126
Emergency aid	-0.1517	-0.204	.	.	.	.
Energy	-0.1544	-0.4194	.	-0.1413	-0.3481	-0.0089
Environment	-0.0874	-0.0905	0.0314	.	.	.
Fishing	-0.0802	-0.102	.	.	.	.
Forestry	-0.2784	-0.3204	.	.	-0.3575	.
Gender	0.2346	.	0.1272	.	.	.
Government and civil society	-0.1588	-0.1454	-0.4185	0.0233	-0.856	0.5606
Health	-0.2179	-0.4282	-0.1216	0.579	-0.8441	0.9461
Industry	-0.3142	-0.1442	-0.2941	.	-0.7107	.
Information	0.1561	.	0.3666	.	.	.
Mining	-0.2047	-0.3666	.	.	.	.
Other	-0.3313	-0.4336	.	0.2065	-0.7428	0.8068
Population	-0.2842	-0.6741	.	.	.	.
Risk management	0.259	.	-0.0366	.	.	.
Rural development	0.2058	.	-0.196	.	.	.
Tourism	-0.0362	.	-0.0419	.	.	.
Trade policy	-0.2615	-0.8361	.	0.1717	0.2272	-0.6747
Transportation	-0.3946	-0.2239	-0.1396	.	-0.6936	-0.6714
Water supply and sanitation	-0.3347	-0.3391	-0.2768	-0.0857	-0.8121	-0.6919

Table 2A: Correlations of Donor Aid Commitments and Poverty

	Poverty	DRC	Malawi	Nigeria	Senegal	Uganda
Austria	0.046	.	.	0.002	.	0.8197
Belgium	-0.2525	0.1231	.	.	0.11	-0.4344
Canada	-0.0035	-0.4115	0.1786	0.1386	-0.2068	.
China	-0.2781	.	-0.3985	.	-0.7749	-0.6124
France	-0.3562	.	.	.	-0.7913	-0.6123
Japan	-0.074	-0.3701	-0.3743	0.1249	-0.8176	0.2099
Germany	-0.2372	-0.0318	0.1124	.	-0.2773	0.2762
Italy	-0.142	-0.102	.	.	0.2021	.
Ireland	0.0739	.	-0.2698	.	.	0.844
Iceland	0.0495	.	0.0146	.	.	-0.5272
Kuwait	0.0879	.	0.3369	.	0.2101	.
Luxembourg	-0.2534	.	.	.	-0.3631	.
Netherlands	-0.0971	-0.2239	.	-0.323	.	0.9882
Norway	-0.2193	-0.102	-0.4055	.	.	-0.8316
Saudi Arabia	-0.3545	.	.	.	-0.7749	0.2179
South Korea	-0.1253	0.4752	.	.	0.4294	0.2179
Spain	-0.1634	-0.102	.	.	-0.0499	.
Sweden	-0.0537	-0.3834	.	-0.1702	0.4294	0.2151
Switzerland	-0.3436	-0.102	.	-0.1702	-0.7749	.
UK	0.2937	-0.0709	.	.	.	.
US	-0.0343	-0.0674	-0.2005	.	-0.1444	0.8671
ACBF	-0.22	.	.	.	.	-0.6123
AfDB	-0.3878	-0.3307	-0.3738	.	-0.6242	-0.9374
BADEA	-0.3652	.	0.1247	.	-0.6914	-0.7323
EIB	-0.2135	.	.	.	-0.3323	.
EU	-0.2743	-0.497	-0.4689	0.0385	-0.1141	-0.8523
FAO	0.1368	.	-0.1191	0.1747	.	.
GAVI	-0.2725	.	.	.	.	.
GEF	-0.1777	0.3337	.	.	0.392	.
IBDC	-0.2074	.	.	.	-0.2265	.
IFAD	-0.0922	.	-0.3321	.	0.0924	-0.4468
IDB	-0.2049	.	.	.	-0.1565	0.2115
OPEC	-0.2498	.	0.2228	.	-0.8382	-0.6123
UNAIDS	.	.	.	.	.	.
UNICEF	-0.2821	.	.	.	-0.2179	.
UNCDF	-0.2593	.	.	.	-0.3136	.
UNDP	-0.1988	-0.3034	-0.1026	-0.1047	-0.1314	-0.2007
UNFPA	-0.2241	.	.	.	-0.1783	.
UNOPS	0.0125	.	.	0.0127	.	.
WADB	-0.2264	.	.	.	-0.1524	.
WFP	0.2611	.	0.1214	.	.	.
WHO	-0.209	.	.	.	-0.1183	.
World Bank	-0.2726	-0.3517	-0.001	.	-0.7751	0.1664

## Geo-coding methodology

The datasets, produced by AidData, represent the most thorough and accurate geo-coded data produced to date. Each project was hand-coded by two individuals based off of multiple project documents - including Project Appraisal Documents, Environmental Impact Assessments, Project Papers, and project data provided directly by donors. After two initial rounds of coding, the work of both geo-coders was arbitrated into one final data set, resulting in data that is both exhaustive and quality-controlled. For all data, Task Team Leaders and Project Managers were contacted for clarification when locations could not be determined from available project documentation. The use of such extensive and varied documentation represents a substantial improvement over previous geo-coding efforts, which gathered location information exclusively from project titles and abstracts (Findley et al. 2011).

The UCDP/AidData methodology distinguishes between coordinates based on a precision-coding system that ranges from point locations - i.e. cities or dams - through first and second administrative divisions - such as provinces and districts, respectively - to the country level. National projects are further differentiated between projects intended to benefit an entire country - such as a national anti-HIV campaign - and aid money granted directly to the central government - e.g. budget support (Strandow, et al. 2010). Three additional precision categories are used to differentiate between levels of certainty. The precision categories are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

**1-2:** Used when a location lies within (1) or near (2) a specific populated place or object.

**3:** Used for a district or municipality.

**4-5:** Used for a specific province (4) or a greater region (5)

**6:** Used when a project is national in scope.

**7:** Used when no location is given or location is unclear.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper only uses projects with a precision code of 4 or lower.

**8:** Used when aid flows directly to a government entity.

The geo-codes for each project are linked to all other project data, including commitment amount, dispersal amounts and dates - when available - primary, secondary and tertiary sectors, approval and closing dates etc. This extensive project data allows us to examine not only project locations, but also intensity and type of locational aid commitment for each donor. Thus, aid targeting can be investigated spatially. Finally, because the UCDP/AidData methodology also captures the administrative divisions governing each point location, we can examine the effects of geographic coordination in a more rigorous, standardized way.

## References

**Strandow, D, Findley, M, Nielson, D, and Powell, J** 2011 *The UCDP and AidData*

*Codebook on Geo-referencing Aid. Version 1.1.* Uppsala Conflict Data Program, Paper No. 4.

Available at [http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/publications/ucdp\\_papers/](http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/publications/ucdp_papers/).