

1-28-2011

Does Global Health Funding Respond to Recipients' Needs? Comparing Public and Private Donors' Allocations in 2005–2007

Daniel E. Esser
American University

Kara Keating Bench
University of Massachusetts Medical School

Follow this and additional works at: <http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/oapubs>

 Part of the [Health Policy Commons](#), [International Economics Commons](#), [International Public Health Commons](#), [Life Sciences Commons](#), and the [Virus Diseases Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Esser, Daniel E. and Keating Bench, Kara, "Does Global Health Funding Respond to Recipients' Needs? Comparing Public and Private Donors' Allocations in 2005–2007" (2011). *Open Access Articles*. 2238.
<http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/oapubs/2238>

This material is brought to you by eScholarship@UMMS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Articles by an authorized administrator of eScholarship@UMMS. For more information, please contact Lisa.Palmer@umassmed.edu.

**Does Global Health Funding Respond to Recipients' Needs?
Comparing Public and Private Donors' Allocations in 2005-2007**

DANIEL E. ESSER

American University, Washington, DC, USA

and

KARA KEATING BENCH

University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

Corresponding author:

Daniel E. Esser, PhD

Assistant Professor of International Development

School of International Service, American University

SIS-221, 4400 Massachusetts Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20016, USA

Telephone: +1 (646) 250-4393

E-mail: esser@american.edu

Kara Keating Bench, MPH, cand. MD

University of Massachusetts Medical School

55 Lake Avenue North

Worcester, Massachusetts 01655, USA

Summary. — Adding to official development assistance (ODA), private foundations have emerged as important donors to the global health agenda. Amid this increasing funder diversity and growing global health budgets, responsiveness to recipients' needs is a central concern. Merging datasets on ODA flows in 2005-2007, over 2,800 foundation grants, disease burden, and perceived priorities in 27 low- and middle-income countries, this study offers the first comprehensive national-level analysis of global health aid responsiveness. The analysis shows that national patterns of disease burden explain neither public nor private aid flows during this period. While ODA committed during these years was weakly yet significantly correlated with health priorities, private grants' responsiveness was even weaker and did not achieve ODA significance levels either.

Key words — global health, HIV-AIDS, official development assistance, private donors, aid effectiveness, sub-Saharan Africa

Acknowledgements

* The authors especially thank Rachel Sullivan Robinson as well as Jo Beall, Robert Bench, Tom Bossert, Bill Brandon, Cassandra Maria Gallese, Miriam Laugesen, William J. Long, Peter Muennig, Thomas R. Oliver, Jeffrey O'Malley, Michael Reich and Jeremy Shiffman for helpful feedback and advice on several versions of the manuscript. Tim Kustusch and Ben Williams provided outstanding research and editorial support. Detailed comments by the editors and three anonymous reviewers proved pivotal in strengthening analysis and argument. All errors and omissions are entirely the authors' responsibility.

**Does Global Health Funding Respond to Recipients' Needs?
Comparing Public and Private Donors' Allocations in 2005-2007**

Adding to official development assistance (ODA), private foundations have emerged as important donors to the global health agenda. Amid this increasing funder diversity and growing global health budgets, responsiveness to recipients' needs is a central concern. Merging datasets on ODA flows in 2005-2007, over 2,800 foundation grants, disease burden, and perceived priorities in 27 low- and middle-income countries, this study offers the first comprehensive national-level analysis of global health aid responsiveness. Our analysis shows that national patterns of disease burden explain neither public nor private aid flows during this period. While ODA committed during these years was weakly yet significantly correlated with health priorities, private grants' responsiveness was even weaker and did not achieve ODA significance levels either.

Key words — global health, HIV-AIDS, official development assistance, private donors, aid effectiveness, sub-Saharan Africa

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past five decades, bilateral as well as multilateral donors' approaches to and rationales for funding health related development challenges have varied significantly. Aid policy during the 1960s focused on macroeconomic growth and public sector capital investment projects, while the 1970s saw a move toward human development initiatives.

Structural adjustment of the 1980s refocused the aid community's attention on economics, this time with an emphasis on privatization and deregulation, only to be replaced in the new millennium by a return to human development with public-private partnerships taking center stage (Périn & Attaran, 2003). During the 1990s, globalization and the framing of health as a global public good with the potential to impact the national security and economic and political interests of both developed and developing countries (MacKellar, 2005; Archibugi & Bizzarri, 2005; Barrett, 2004) increasingly turned health policy making into a supranational, rather than domestic, process (McMichael & Beaglehole, 2000).

At the turn of the millennium, awareness that the WHO's ambitious proclamation of 'Health for All by 2000' would not be achieved, coupled with disillusionment of the effectiveness of aid to low- and middle-income countries, prompted a renewed prioritization of health. Official development assistance (ODA) for health given by member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has since doubled in real terms from 2000 to 2005 (Kates & Lief, 2007). US Government funding for HIV/AIDS programs in 2007 alone was around \$2.3 billion, about eight times more than in 2000 (Ravishankar et al., 2009). In addition, major multilateral and bilateral funding mechanisms such as the US President's Emergency Plan for HIV/AIDS (PEPFAR) and The Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (GFATM) were established in 2003 and 2005, respectively, to respond to growing political recognition of health needs of low- and middle-income countries. At the same time, sources of aid diversified further through increased involvement of non-

state donors: “From the [Bill and Melinda] Gates Foundation [BMGF] to the Clinton Global Initiative to the Millennium Project to the Make Poverty History Campaign to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, there is now a flurry of global activities that tackle ‘banner’ diseases” (Pearlman & Roy, 2009: 18). Ravishankar et al. (2009: 2122) also observe that “[t]he role of NGOs in terms of spending funds from the public and private sectors has expanded tremendously, as has direct bilateral assistance to governments in low-income and middle-income countries. The shift is not only towards a smaller relative role for the UN system and the World Bank, but also for the changed status of these organizations.” Also during this decade, high level policy initiatives such as the Paris Declaration and the Disease Control Priorities Project have called for aid alignment with national priorities and disease burdens to meet a common goal of achieving important and sustainable gains in the health of people living in low- and middle- income countries (Shiffman, 2006; OECD, 2005; Jamison et. al., 2006). Based on “disability-adjusted life-year” (DALY) calculations designed to measure morbidity and mortality, the *Global Burden of Disease Estimates* from 2002 was the first global attempt to inform related policy-making (Murray & Lopez, 1996; Pearson & Rawlings, 2005). Although the DALY methodology is not without critics (Arnesen & Nord, 1999), its applicability for defining and comparing disease burden across diseases and countries is apparent, and some authors have argued that the prioritization of maternal, newborn, and child health (Powell-Jackson et al., 2006) and HIV/AIDS (Shiffman, 2006) provide evidence that in some areas, needs do indeed trigger international financial flows. However, existing data on health expenditures equally suggests persistent imbalances and inconsistencies both globally and at the national level. Benatar et al. (2009: 349) find that

“[a]lmost 90% of world expenditure on health is spent on people bearing less than 10% of the global burden of disease, and 90% of expenditure on medical research is spent on diseases that account for a mere 10 percent of the global burden of disease.” Among the first publications to focus on allocations to developing country recipients specifically, MacKellar’s (2005) research identified wide gaps between health needs in developing countries and international funding priorities. Shiffman’s (2006) work provided further evidence that development assistance for communicable diseases and measures of disease burden are largely unaligned, and Wecker has argued that attention to diarrheal diseases, a major killer of infants, had waned dramatically since the 1980s partly as a result of changing donor priorities, which has allowed them to creep back (quoted in: Mason, 2009). At the same time, HIV/AIDS receives a seemingly disproportionate share of funding (Shiffman, 2006). This is illustrated by AIDS-related mortality figures in Nigeria and Ethiopia—Africa’s two most populous nations—in 2007 (237,000) which were “less than half the 540,000 children under 5 [in the same countries] who died of pneumonia and diarrhea” (Dugger, 2009). Yet in the same year, the US government’s budget for HIV-AIDS related interventions in Nigeria and Ethiopia “was more than the \$646 million it is spending on maternal and child health in all the world’s countries combined” (ibid.). An additional complication arises when considering that a recent World Bank report alerts that seven out of ten Bank-financed HIV/AIDS projects fail to reach their objectives while nine out of ten projects targeting diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis, and leprosy performed satisfactorily or better (IEG, 2009).

Clearly then, donor allocations cannot be informed primarily by concerns about existing needs and the desire to improve health status in recipient countries in the most effective manner. Ravishankar et al. (2009: 2121) hypothesize “that country allocation of DAH [development assistance for health] is driven by many considerations, including income, burden of disease, political stability, and historical and political relations between specific donors and recipient countries,” thus echoing some of the arguments made by Shiffman (2006). Yet this does not imply that these factors have equal weight. Indeed, Périn and Attaran (2003) were among the first to argue that aid allocation for health is predominantly a political process determined by donor ideologies. Crane and Dusenberry (2004) emulated this point and emphasized religious underpinnings in the context of family planning and HIV prevention. More recently, Pearlman and Roy (2009: xiv) have reiterated this argument: “The practice of international health is political rather than technical, political rather than bureaucratic, political rather than academic. [...] The choice between interventions is presented as a question of efficacy that can be measured and scientifically evaluated. But the world is not that simple. Choices are often based on ideology, values, and national and organizational interests.” An important process in this context is the manipulation of recipient agendas by donors (Walt et al., 1999) that may result from one party controlling significant resources while the other party is in serious need (Sewell, 1992). Reflecting these concerns and based on their finding that “the focus on [...] quick results [by donors] discourages investment in health systems,” Sridhar and Rajaie (2008) hypothesize that either different governance structures of the World Bank, national governments, the BMGF and the Global Fund or ostensible comparative advantages between these agencies could explain differences in priority-setting processes.

That decision making structures matter is considered by other authors as well. Within private foundations, “the focus has been on amounts of money raised for high-visibility health problems. A large share of the new donor funding is being provided through channels earmarked for specific diseases or interventions” (Eichler et al., 2009: 42). The BMGF specifically has been characterized as “emphasiz[ing] breakthrough technologies and cost-effective interventions instead of investing in health-system strengthening and in addressing the underlying causes of disease” (Pearlman & Roy, 2009: 174). Another foundation has been singled out as pursuing a specific accomplishment in the health field to celebrate an important anniversary: “Rotary International had been looking for a global target to be achieved by the centennial of its foundation in 2005” (De Quadros, 2009: 62). Measurability plays an important role in this content because it facilitates resource mobilization as well as the production of easily attributable success stories (Esser, 2009), which causes Eichler et al. (2009: 4) to argue rather bluntly that “[y]ou get what you pay for. And it is easier to pay for what you can easily measure.” Finally, where shifts in donor priorities can neither be traced compellingly to shifts in recipient needs nor to provider interests, Shiffman (2006) argues that processes of socialization occurring within the global policy environment could provide an alternative explanation for these shifts.” Taking a social constructivist perspective and fielding the example of emerging health alliances during the past ten years, he posits that the decisions of one actor influences the decisions of other donors, ultimately creating a kind of global peer pressure [1].

Although at least in part still hypothetical, this literature has nonetheless contributed in important ways to a deeper understanding of aid allocation. Yet the question remains *to what extent* both epidemiological profiles and subjective perceptions in recipient countries matter to different types of funders, if at all. Previous research into this aspect either did not break data down to the country level (Sridhar & Rajaie, 2008) or suffered from methodological problems. The authors of a recent BMGF-funded study that looks at both public and private sources, Ravishankar et al. (2009: 2113) argue that “[t]otal DAH received by low-income and middle-income countries was positively correlated with burden of disease.” They also find that “[t]he correlation between health aid and disease burden has risen from 0.6% to 0.8% between 1997 and 2007” (2121). However, the absence of per capita calculations in their approach constitutes a major limitation; asserting a direct correlation between DAH and DALYs without adjusting for population size is problematic since more populous countries are likely going to have larger disease burdens as well. What follows is that the statistical analysis offered by Ravishankar et al. is prone to type-I errors, i.e., detecting correlations where, in reality, there are none. Covering the period from 2005 until 2007, our research design merges datasets on ODA and private funding to nine major areas of health in 27 developing countries with disease burden indicators and data on recipients’ priority areas. While methods to measure country-specific disease burdens are widely used, public perceptions of health related challenges in local contexts are a relatively new area of measurement. The Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey *A Global Look at Public Perceptions of Health Problems, Priorities, and Donors* (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2007) is the first attempt that allows for a comparative analysis of felt needs with indicators driven by epidemiological rather

than opinion data. On this basis, our study develops the first country-specific analysis of public and private donors regarding their responsiveness to two different conceptualizations of recipient needs, and thus offers a fresh look at the responsiveness of development aid more broadly.

2. METHOD

The Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2007) served as the benchmark for country selection as it covered 27 developing countries for which all other data sources also provided detailed information. The Survey is based on face-to-face interviews of sample sizes between 500 and 3142 people with national representation except Bolivia, Brazil, China, India, Pakistan, South Africa, and Venezuela in which largely urban populations were sampled. Participants were surveyed between April and May 2007 and the responses were ranked on a scale from 1 to 9 (1 being highest priority) for current global health priorities comprising Access to Care, Build/Improve Facilities, Chronic Disease, Clean Water, HIV/AIDS, Hunger/Malnutrition, Immunizations, Prenatal Care, and TB/Malaria/Other Infectious Diseases according to the percentage of people who cited each issue as “one of the most important” public health priorities for government to address. The limitation of the ranking is that it is relative. For instance, gaining top priority for an issue in a country can range between obtaining near universal support at 95% (HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia) to much more dispersed results like 43% (Immunizations in China) of the response. Nonetheless, this survey represents the first comprehensive look at the perceived global health priorities of people living in low and

middle income countries. In addition to our country-level analysis, we also form regional clusters as another analytical dimension. Regions are broken down into sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East. Sub-Saharan Africa includes Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda. Latin America includes Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela. Asia includes Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Pakistan. The Middle East includes Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, and Turkey [2].

Official development assistance committed between 2005 and 2007 was obtained from the OECD online Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of total ODA including bilateral and multilateral sources (SourceOECD, 2009). Commitments only were chosen to represent the priorities as postulated by donor agencies, unadulterated by extraneous factors such as budgeting shortfalls that may impact disbursements but may have little to do with the intended level of priority (cf. Sridhar & Rajaie, 2008). US private foundations' grant authorizations made during the period from 2005 until 2007 were obtained from the Foundation Center website (Foundation Directory Online 2008a), which provides a detailed overview of large-scale non-governmental giving from US-based accounts. Based on a ranking of all US-based foundations and their cumulative funding of global health issues in the first of the three years studied (2005), the top five foundations in global health in terms of their individual grants were identified (Foundation Directory Online 2008b). These are the BMGF, the Ford Foundation, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation. Taken together, these five sources account for 95, 92, and

89 per cent of total funding by U.S. foundations between 2005 and 2007, respectively (see Table 1). Multi-year grants were included in the analysis in their entirety whereas grants with a regional focus—instead of a country—were excluded. Since ODA data are often also multiyear commitments, multi-year grants were taken as a lump grant and not imputed over the years of the grant in order to capture the signalling function of the commitment at a given point in time.

[add table 1 about here]

All grants (n=2,847) from these top five foundations (n=5) in terms of health commitments for countries included in the study (n=27) were searched for “health”, “hunger”, “nutrition”, then read individually and placed in most relevant Kaiser category. “Reproductive health” grants in the Foundation Center database (a separate keyword in the foundation center database) were categorized as “Prenatal Care” unless more appropriate in another category (for instance, HIV/AIDS). Because of the difficulty of capturing solely Prenatal Care in both ODA and Private Foundation Data, Prenatal Care is characterized as a more general “Reproductive Health Care.” For this reason, in this analysis, Prenatal Care is likely to be overestimated in terms of funding and is better seen as a proxy variable. A similar challenge, hunger and malnutrition are, in practice, linked across several disease categories, for instance HIV/AIDS, yet such multiple attribution cannot be accounted for in this type of analysis (cf. Anabwani and Navario, 2005). ODA and private grant and loan commitments for 2005, 2006, and 2007 were grouped into categories consistent with the Kaiser/Pew Survey (see Figure 1). The purpose codes

Basic Health Care (12220) and Infectious Disease Control (12250) were searched individually for reference to immunization, vaccination and relegated accordingly.

[add figure 1 about here]

DALY data for the 27 countries were obtained through the Global Burden of Disease Estimates (WHOSIS; cf. WHO 2002) database. All categories in the WHOSIS database were included except Injuries. With the exception of ‘Access to Care’ and ‘Build/Improve Facilities’ which had no direct attributable DALYs and were therefore excluded, estimated disease burden was attributed to each of the categories found in the Kaiser/Pew Survey. Clean Water comprised all DALYs attributable to diarrheal disease. Chronic disease included all DALYs attributed to non-communicable disease. Immunizations included all DALYs attributable to the childhood cluster diseases (poliomyelitis, measles, pertussis, tetanus, and diphtheria). HIV/AIDS included all DALYs attributable to HIV/AIDS and STDs. Prenatal care included perinatal conditions and maternal conditions. TB/Malaria/Other Infectious diseases included communicable diseases including tuberculosis, malaria, intestinal nematode infections, dengue, hepatitis, meningitis, trachoma, tropical cluster diseases (Chagas disease, lymphatic filariasis, etc.), Japanese encephalitis, leprosy, and respiratory infections. Hunger and Malnutrition comprised all nutritional deficits including Vitamin A, iodine, iron and protein [3]. We collapsed the aid variable into ordinal categories and used Spearman’s rho to test the relationship. It is worth noting that because of the reverse demarcation of priorities (1— not 9—being the highest), a negative algebraic sign denotes a positive correlation.

Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ were calculated using SPSS 16.0 to analyze correlations between official development assistance and private foundation giving to disease burden (r) and perceived priority (ρ). Significance was determined at 95% and 99% confidence intervals (2-tailed). Since the application of Spearman's ρ to denote correlation between one ordinal and one interval-ratio set of data may seem problematic, we also converted aid figures into ordinal variables by forming nine categories for ODA amounts and five for private grants and then recalculated the coefficient. This produced virtually identical results, rendering Spearman's ρ remarkably robust with only one ordinal variable. In addition, we calculated Pearson's r . While producing lower values of the statistic overall, this computation rendered substantially similar results.

3. RESULTS

Alignment of donor aid commitments and private funding by the leading five US-based private foundations between 2005 and 2007, public priorities in 27 recipient countries, and country-level disease burden varied greatly across regions. Looking first at total international funding to countries included in the study, India and China received by far the highest total amounts of health aid from both types of funders. Ethiopia was the third most-funded recipient country and first among the nine African countries sampled. Bangladesh, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, South Africa and Indonesia follow on ranks four to ten. With an increase from over \$2.6bn to just shy of \$4.7bn, the nine countries in sub-Saharan Africa also represent the greatest absolute expansion in ODA health funding during the three-year period covered. The greatest relative increase can be registered for

the seven countries located in Latin America; however, funding for health purposes also fluctuated most within this region, with Mexico experiencing the sharpest decline in health ODA received among all 27 countries included in the study, from over \$265m in 2005 down to \$13m in 2007. The only regional group to undergo a decline in health-related ODA between 2005 and 2007, the five Middle Eastern countries saw their share reduced from just under \$1bn in 2005 to \$620m in 2006 and still only \$725m in 2007.

For the five foundations whose grants were analyzed for this study, Nigeria was the most prominent target country, receiving almost \$100m over a three-year period. India, Kenya, and Ghana follow on ranks two to four. However, private grants for health projects located in India nonetheless also registered the sharpest absolute decline, from over \$44m in 2005 to under \$17m in 2007. Conversely, Pakistan experienced the greatest relative expansion, seeing private health aid increase from \$1.3m in 2005 to over \$21m in 2007. In absolute terms, this ranking is led by private grants for aid projects in Nigeria where overall private funding jumped from \$9.3m in 2005 to just under \$60m one year later. Notably, whereas ODA for health purposes committed to the Asian region between 2005 and 2007 was 40% higher than commitments to Africa, private foundation giving actually showed a reverse pattern, with African countries receiving over 60% more than private grants authorized for projects located in Asia. No grants from foundations covered in the analysis were given to Bolivia, Jordan, Lebanon, or Venezuela (see Table 2).

[add table 2 about here]

Regarding the responsiveness of ODA and private funding to national disease burdens, our calculations rendered weak statistical correlations for both sources and all three years reported, none of which were estimated to be significant at the .95 confidence level. With respect to perceived priorities, we found stronger correlations between ODA and priorities as reported by the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey, which were also estimated to be highly significant. Lower indicators of association resulted for private foundation giving and national priorities, and only one of the coefficients—i.e., private grants awarded in 2005—was estimated to be significant at the .95 confidence level.

[add table 3 about here]

The absence of strong correlations between funding streams and disease burden also hints at a similarly weak correlation between priority ranks and disease burden. This was indeed the case. For instance, despite contributing 24 per cent and 12 per cent, respectively, to disease burdens in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, tuberculosis, malaria and other infectious disease were ranked among the lowest priorities by respondents in the 15 countries included from these two regions. At the other end of extremes, HIV/AIDS was ranked the most important health priority in Asia even though this category contributed to only 3 per cent of the total disease burden. Still, following Clean Water, HIV/AIDS was the next most highly funded health category in Asia overall and the most highly funded one by the five private foundations included in the study (see Table 4).

[add table 4 about here]

In order to examine to what extent funding by both types of sources was aligned with disease burden at the country-level, we also created an index of per capita disease burden for each country by dividing the total disease burden for each country by the national population as specified in the Global Burden of Disease Estimates. The total amount of aid given to that country was then divided by this index. We did not find strong evidence of responsiveness at this level either. Among the sub-Saharan countries included in the study, Mali had the highest DALYs-per-capita index (0.68) but received the lowest relative amounts of aid within the sub-Saharan sample from each type of source. Only Venezuela—whose DALYs-per-capita index score was less than 25 per cent of Mali’s—received less funding per capita and disease burden. The highest private flows, relative to disease burden, went to Kenya, which ranks seventh out of nine countries in terms of per capita disease burden. Kenya also came out second in the ODA ranking, topped only by Ethiopia, which in terms of per capita disease burden ranks fifth within the sub-Saharan sample. The situation was similar for the six Asian and five Middle Eastern countries sampled. China, with a DALYs-per-capita index score of 0.15, received eleven times the amount of grant and loan commitments compared to Pakistan, which bears twice the per capita disease burden. Egypt and Lebanon ranked at the top of their region’s per capita disease burden index but together received less funding than Turkey, ranked fourth out of five. Cross-regional comparisons complement this picture further; although Bolivia had a slightly higher per capita burden than Bangladesh, the latter country received more than five times the financial aid on a per capita basis than the Andean state (see Table 5).

[add table 5 about here]

4. DISCUSSION

The results described in the previous section allow us to revisit the alternative drivers of health aid allocation already discussed above, with a view to assessing their relative explanatory power. To begin with, Ravishankar's et al. (2009, op.cit.) hypothesis "that country allocation of DAH is driven by many considerations, including income, burden of disease, political stability, and historical and political relations between specific donors and recipient countries" finds some support. While our study does not test the relevance of donor incomes to this context, we do observe that private foundations seem to prefer politically stable recipient countries (see table 2). At the same time, countries that have been relatively stable in the recent past—at least when compared to some countries included in the sub-Saharan sample—but during the period of 2005 to 2007 were led by interventionist and redistributive governments were either shunned completely, as in the case of private foundations, or received markedly less ODA (both in absolute terms and when compared on the basis of per capita disease burden). This supports arguments about the highly politicized nature of health aid allocation as fielded by both Périn and Attaran (2003) and Pearlman and Roy (2009). The finding also resonates with the literature on aid distribution more generally (Barnebeck Anderson et al., 2006).

Conversely, we find very little evidence for disease burdens as allocative drivers. Rather, the focus in 2005-07 seems to indeed have "been on [...] high-visibility health problems"

(Eichler et al., op.cit.). Despite being more of a logical extension than an actual finding from our analysis, it also seems that measurability of outputs (Esser, 2009)—a necessary yet insufficient condition for the subsequent attribution of successful intervention to specific agencies or foundations—may well constitute another important component of the equation to explain prioritization among public and private donors.

The above pattern is substantiated further by the dearth of funding for the prevention and treatment of chronic diseases (see table 4) even though these diseases comprised the highest contributor to overall disease burden in all regions except sub-Saharan Africa, where chronic disease was a close second at 19% to HIV/AIDS (which accounted for 20%). This finding confirms the concern that “[a]bout half of the global burden of disease is attributable to chronic conditions and exceeds the burden of communicable diseases in all countries except the poorest.” (Eichler et al., 2009: 32) However, whereas the OECD dataset does not even include codes applicable to this category (explaining the absence of ODA commitments to this group of diseases), it should be noted that private foundations did in fact make small investments in this area. For 2005, the Foundation Center database recorded a total of \$214,000 spent on such diseases in Kenya and South Africa. In 2006, private donors allocated \$465,000 in this category to a Chinese project and \$70,000 to a Pakistani scheme. An additional \$120,000 was granted to China during the following year, together with \$50,000 for a project in Nigeria and \$10,000 in support of a Kenyan program. While far from sufficient, these figures may nonetheless be a reason for hope.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We would like to see this study being used as a starting point for follow-up investigations of two types of agencies, namely donors and ministries in recipient countries, in order to contribute to a better understanding of decision making dynamics within organizations pivotal for the improvement of health systems and outcomes in developing countries. For instance, while our study considers official aid commitments as well as private funding from the top five US-based private foundations, we do not account for in-country funding sources. Inclusion of such data strikes us as a promising extension of this research in that it would add to the existing literature assessing the degree of ‘crowding out’ of national funding by international aid (Lu et al., 2010; Sridhar, 2009; Waddington, 2004; cf. Michaud & Murray, 1994). To illustrate, large amounts of international aid targeted at a specific disease may drive up public prioritization as people become more aware of the issue. This argument has been particularly salient in the context of funding for HIV/AIDS and its critique (Shiffman, 2008). At the same time, the only way to test Sridhar and Rajaie’s (2008) hypothesis that either the governance structures of donor agencies or their internal perception of comparative advantages might explain differences in priority-setting would be to actually engage with these organizations in depth and for a substantial amount of time. Moving beyond generalized statements or even conspiracy theories, this approach would focus on uncovering the actual political economies at different levels of policy making through embedded observation (cf. Esser, 2009; Sridhar and Rajaie, 2008). It then seems to us that such inquiries into formal as well as informal processes of prioritization require a research design which is quite different from the currently

dominant macro-level large-n studies of development assistance for health, and that the emerging literature on political ethnographies (cf. Schatz, 2009) is likely to lead the way.

NOTES

[1] Donor partnerships such as the GFATM as well as World Bank-led investment alliances command considerable amounts of money and can provide an important opportunity for donor coordination. At the same time, such alliances have raised concerns over ‘reverticalizing’ health systems and further complicating the administrative requirements of international health assistance (Buse & Harmer, 2007: 263). Investment alliances in particular are monitored with skepticism regarding their ownership structures and the role of private companies with little healthcare knowledge beyond their domestic markets (Lethbridge, 2005; Attaran et al., 2006).

[2] Although Eastern and Central European countries were included in the Kaiser/Pew Survey, no official development assistance for health was reported for this region and it was therefore omitted from the analysis.

[3] One might argue that international aid in absolute terms is a limited variable since some interventions may cost more than others but also lead to greater gains in DALYs. To this effect, a comparison of the cost-effectiveness of interventions would be necessary as this would enable comparisons based on the cost per DALY averted.

REFERENCES

- Anabwani, G., & Navario, P. (2005). Nutrition and HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa: An overview. *Nutrition, 21*(1), 96–99.
- Archibugi, D., & Bizzarri, K. (2005). The global governance of communicable diseases: The case for vaccine R&D. *Law and Policy, 27*(1), 33–51.
- Arneson, T., & Nord, E. (1999). The value of DALY life: problems with ethics and validity of disability adjusted life years. *BMJ, 319*(7222), 1423–1425.
- Attaran, A., Barnes, K., Bate, R., Binka, F., d'Alessandro, U., Fanello, C., Garrett, L., Mutabingwa, T., Roberts, D., Hopkins Sibley, C., Talisuna, A., Van Geertruyden, J., & Watkins, W. (2006). The World Bank: False financial and statistical accounts and medical malpractice in malaria treatment. *The Lancet, 368*, 247–252.
- Barnebeck Anderson, T., Hansen, H., & Markussen, T. (2006). US Politics and World Bank IDA–Lending. *Journal of Development Studies, 42*(5), 772–794.
- Barrett, S. (2004). Eradication versus control: The economics of global infectious disease policies. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 82*(9), 683–688.
- Benatar, S. R., Gill, S., & Bakker, I. (2009). Making progress in global health: The need for new paradigms. *International Affairs, 85*(2), 347–371.
- Buse, K., & Harmer, A. (2007). Seven habits of highly effective global public–private health partnerships: Practice and potential. *Social Science & Medicine, 64*(2), 259–271.
- Crane, B., & Dusenberry, J. (2004). Power and politics in international funding for reproductive health: The US global gag rule. *Reproductive Health Matters, 12*(24), 128–137.

- De Quadros, C. A. (2009). The whole is greater: how polio was eradicated from the western hemisphere. In D. Perlman, & A. Roy (Eds.), *The practice of international health* (pp. 54-69). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dugger, C. W. (2009). As donors focus on AIDS, child illnesses languish. *NY Times*. Retrieved Oct 29, 2009, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/30/world/30child.html>
- Eichler, R., Levine, R., & the Performance-Based Incentives Working Group. (2009). *Performances incentives for global health: Potential and pitfalls*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Esser, Daniel E. (2009). More money, less cure: Why global health assistance needs restructuring. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 23(3), 225–234.
- Foundation Directory Online (2008a). Grants database. Washington, DC: Foundation Center. Retrieved May 16, 2008, from <http://foundationcenter.org/>
- Foundation Directory Online (2008b). Top 50 U.S. foundations awarding international grants for health. Washington, DC: Foundation Center. Retrieved May 17, 2008, from <http://foundationcenter.org/findfunders/statistics/>
- IEG (2009). *Improving effectiveness and outcomes for the poor in health, nutrition, and population: An evaluation of world bank group support since 1997*. Washington, DC: The World Bank Group.
- Jamison, D. T., Breman, J. G., Measham, A. R., Alleyne, G., Claeson, M., Evans, B. Jha, P., Mills, A., & Musgrove, P. (2006). *Disease control priorities in developing countries, 2nd ed.* New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kaiser Family Foundation (2007). A global look at public perceptions of health problems, priorities, and donors: The Kaiser/Pew global health survey. Menlo Park, CA: The Kaiser Family Foundation and Pew Global Attitudes Project, December.
Retrieved May 2, 2008, from <http://www.pewglobal.org>
- Kates, J., & Lief, E. (2007). Donor funding for health in low- & middle-income countries 2001–2005. Menlo Park, CA: The Kaiser Family Foundation, August. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from <http://www.kff.org>
- Lethbridge, J. (2005). The promotion of investment alliances by the World Bank: implications for national health policy. *Global Social Policy, 5*(2), 203–225.
- Lu, C., Schneider, M., Gubbins, P., Leach-Kemon, K., Jamison, D., Murray, C. J. L. (2010), Public financing of health in developing countries: a cross-national systematic analysis. *The Lancet, 375*, 1375–1387.
- MacKellar, L. (2005). Priorities in global assistance for health, AIDS, and population. *Population and Development Review, 31*(2), 293–312.
- McMichael, A. J., & Beaglehole, R. (2000). The changing global context of public health. *The Lancet, 356*, 495–499.
- Michaud, C., & Murray, C. J. L. (1994). External assistance to the health sector in developing countries: A detailed analysis 1972–1990. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 72*, 639–651.
- Mason, M. (2009) AIDS, malaria eclipse biggest child-killers. *Associated Press*. 19 Nov.
- Murray C. J. L., & Lopez A. D. (1996). The global burden of disease: A comprehensive assessment of mortality and disability from diseases, injuries, and risk factors in

- 1990 and projected to 2020. Global burden of disease and injury series, Cambridge, MA: Harvard School of Public Health/WHO/World Bank.
- OECD (2005). Paris declaration on aid effectiveness: Ownership, harmonization, alignment results, and mutual accountability. Paris: Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation, March. Retrieved Jul 30, 2008, from <http://www.oecd.org>
- Perlman, D., & Roy, A. (Eds.). (2009). *The practice of international health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pearson S. D., & Rawlings, M. D. (2005). Quality, innovation, and value for money: NICE and the British National Health Service. *JAMA*, *294*(20), 2618–2622.
- Périn, I., & Attaran, A. (2003). Trading ideology for dialogue: An opportunity to fix international aid for health? *The Lancet*, *361*, 1216–1219.
- Powell-Jackson, T., Borghi, J., Mueller, D., Patouillard, E., & Mills, A. (2006). Countdown to 2015: Tracking donor assistance to maternal, newborn, and child health. *The Lancet*, *368*, 1077–1087.
- Ravishankar, N., Gubbins, P., Cooley, R., Leach-Kemon, K., Michaud, M., Jamison, D., & Murray, C. J. L. (2009) Financing global health: Tracking development assistance for health. *The Lancet*, *373*, 2113–2124.
- Schatz, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sewell, W. H., Jr. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *98*(1), 1–29.

- Shiffman, J. (2006). Donor funding priorities for communicable disease control in the developing world. *Health Policy and Planning*, 21(6), 411–420.
- Shiffman, J. (2008). Has donor prioritization of HIV/AIDS displaced aid for other health issues? *Health Policy and Planning*, 23, 95–100.
- SourceOECD (2009). Creditor reporting system (CRS). Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Retrieved May 12-13, 2009, from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/50/17/5037721.htm>
- Sridhar, D. (2009). Post-Accra: Is there space for country ownership in global health? *Third World Quarterly*, 30(7), 1363–1377.
- Sridhar, D., & Rajaie, B. (2008). Misfinancing global health: A case for transparency in disbursements and decision making. *The Lancet*, 372, 1185-1191.
- Waddington, C. (2004). Does Earmarked Donor Funding Make It More or Less Likely That Developing Countries Will Allocate Their Resources Towards Programmes That Yield the Greatest Health Benefits?" *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 82, 703–08.
- Walt, G., Pavignani, E., Gilson, L., & Buse, K. (1999). Health sector development: From aid coordination to resource management. *Health Policy and Planning*, 14(3), 207–218.
- WHO (2002). Global burden of disease estimates. Geneva: World Health Organization. Retrieved May 3-6, 2008, from <http://www.who.int>
- WHO (2008). World health statistics 2008. Geneva: World Health Organization. Retrieved Jul 30, 2008, from <http://www.who.int>

1.1. Country Level View of Official Development Assistance, US Private Foundation Aid, Total Donor Aid, Disability-Adjusted Life Years, and Perceived Priority per Disease-specific Category, 2005–2007

Region/Country/Disease-specific Category	Official Development Assistance, 2005 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2005 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2005 USD ('000)	Official Development Assistance, 2006 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2006 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2006 USD ('000)	Official Development Assistance, 2007 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2007 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2007 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, Cumulative USD ('000)	Disability-Adjusted Life-Years	Percent Disease Burden	Perceived Priority
Asia													
Bangladesh													
Access to Care	208,281	0	208,281	40,791	0	40,791	18,859	500	19,359	268,430	-	-	7
Build/Improve Facilities	4,701	0	4,701	1,557	0	1,557	894	0	894	7,152	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,042	41%	8
Clean Water	87,004	0	87,004	339,055	0	339,055	286,773	0	286,773	712,832	2,298	6%	9
HIV/AIDS	4,895	23	4,918	18,596	0	18,596	23,046	0	23,046	46,559	350	1%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	381,303	0	381,303	82,201	14,967	97,168	106,950	5,250	112,200	590,671	1,306	4%	5
Immunizations	285	0	285	184	0	184	658	0	658	1,127	1,459	4%	4
Prenatal Care	31,780	75	31,855	63,324	25,501	88,825	43,739	0	43,739	164,418	4,505	12%	2
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	35,950	0	35,950	20,321	0	20,321	56,271	5,924	16%	6
China													
Access to Care	6,284	292	6,577	9,331	489	9,820	16,637	270	16,907	33,305	-	-	5
Build/Improve Facilities	22,103	0	22,103	39,393	0	39,393	28,563	0	28,563	90,059	-	-	7
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	465	465	0	120	120	585	133,056	66%	8
Clean Water	1,149,058	0	1,149,058	879,284	0	879,284	934,379	0	934,379	2,962,722	5,055	3%	2
HIV/AIDS	37,112	3,787	40,900	135,679	552	136,231	143,118	21,406	164,524	341,654	1,425	1%	4
Hunger and Malnutrition	486	0	486	0	0	0	3,911	0	3,911	4,396	2,553	1%	9
Immunizations	843	0	843	376	0	376	4,516	0	4,516	5,735	1,039	1%	1
Prenatal Care	3,456	671	4,127	4,355	1,041	5,395	3,789	607	4,396	13,919	13,585	7%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	59,019	120	59,139	44,780	0	44,780	45,079	70	45,149	149,067	12,650	6%	3
India													
Access to Care	41,134	24,746	65,880	219,299	15,937	235,236	288,709	1,710	290,419	591,534	-	-	8

Build/Improve Facilities	22,455	145	22,601	102,305	0	102,305	1,205	0	1,205	126,110	-	-	5
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124,099	41%	2
Clean Water	544,397	0	544,397	732,737	0	732,737	912,871	0	912,871	2,190,005	15,254	5%	4
HIV/AIDS	237,264	11,916	249,180	32,551	6,254	38,806	819,252	8,340	827,592	1,115,578	13,110	4%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	42,630	300	42,930	48,710	0	48,710	41,579	200	41,779	133,419	8,120	3%	6
Immunizations	26,811	0	26,811	54,546	0	54,546	134,206	0	134,206	215,563	10,323	3%	7
Prenatal Care	26,189	7,465	33,654	835,919	5,989	841,907	514,882	6,352	521,233	1,396,795	37,863	13%	3
TB/Malaria/OID	116,512	0	116,512	155,840	0	155,840	69,508	0	69,508	341,860	42,643	14%	9
Indonesia													
Access to Care	33,544	250	33,794	25,761	0	25,761	4,332	349	4,680	64,236	-	-	2
Build/Improve Facilities	36,015	0	36,015	63,961	0	63,961	16,841	0	16,841	116,817	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,959	56%	9
Clean Water	187,557	0	187,557	290,641	0	290,641	65,388	0	65,388	543,586	1,264	3%	7
HIV/AIDS	99,806	465	100,271	28,535	1,300	29,835	23,274	0	23,274	153,379	462	1%	5
Hunger and Malnutrition	23,166	0	23,166	11,491	0	11,491	64,338	0	64,338	98,995	1,375	3%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,451	3%	6
Prenatal Care	49,048	1,521	50,569	6,468	1,496	7,965	18,847	1,525	20,372	78,905	3,894	8%	4
TB/Malaria/OID	65,464	0	65,464	45,276	0	45,276	25,993	207	26,199	136,940	5,325	11%	8
Malaysia													
Access to Care	341	0	341	58	79	137	25	0	25	503	-	-	5
Build/Improve Facilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	1
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,440	70%	4
Clean Water	745,582	0	745,582	164	0	164	1,020	0	1,020	746,766	28	1%	3
HIV/AIDS	156	0	156	144	0	144	310	0	310	609	112	3%	2
Hunger and Malnutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	3%	9
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0%	8
Prenatal Care	0	670	670	0	772	772	130	811	941	2,383	121	3%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	0	0	0	450	0	450	450	244	7%	7
Pakistan													
Access to Care	26,458	0	26,458	180,652	0	180,652	16,796	574	17,371	224,481	-	-	8
Build/Improve Facilities	13,579	0	13,579	33,100	0	33,100	954	0	954	47,634	-	-	7
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	70	70	0	0	0	70	15,326	34%	1
Clean Water	46,923	0	46,923	24,590	0	24,590	27,117	0	27,117	98,629	3,904	9%	4

HIV/AIDS	317	0	317	6,957	0	6,957	9,271	0	9,271	16,545	1,116	2%	3
Hunger and Malnutrition	16,901	0	16,901	31,319	0	31,319	22,653	4,251	26,904	75,125	1,405	3%	2
Immunizations	19,036	0	19,036	18,071	0	18,071	48,326	0	48,326	85,433	2,890	6%	6
Prenatal Care	34,848	1,300	36,148	45,062	1,080	46,142	31,022	2,579	33,600	115,891	5,919	13%	5
TB/Malaria/OID	15,507	0	15,507	15,536	0	15,536	32,552	14,129	46,681	77,724	6,866	15%	9
Latin America													
Argentina													
Access to Care	19,534	0	19,534	301,959	0	301,959	1,791	0	1,791	323,284	-	-	4
Build/Improve Facilities	295	0	295	92	0	92	42,435	0	42,435	42,822	-	-	2
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,774	76%	8
Clean Water	108	0	108	40,376	0	40,376	354,560	0	354,560	395,044	49	1%	3
HIV/AIDS	17,170	0	17,170	406	150	556	440	50	490	18,217	101	2%	7
Hunger and Malnutrition	102	0	102	273	0	273	240	0	240	616	46	1%	1
Immunizations	330	0	330	0	156	156	0	0	0	486	12	0%	5
Prenatal Care	178	0	178	209	0	209	170	0	170	557	299	5%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	3%	9
Bolivia													
Access to Care	21,927	0	21,927	33,156	0	33,156	7,757	0	7,757	62,840	-	-	7
Build/Improve Facilities	18,338	0	18,338	7,716	0	7,716	5,727	0	5,727	31,781	-	-	6
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,086	46%	8
Clean Water	16,138	0	16,138	66,585	0	66,585	48,920	0	48,920	131,643	142	6%	3
HIV/AIDS	1,063	0	1,063	3,595	0	3,595	10,475	0	10,475	15,133	16	1%	5
Hunger and Malnutrition	19,628	0	19,628	42,154	0	42,154	27,687	0	27,687	89,469	78	3%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	1%	4
Prenatal Care	2,616	0	2,616	909	0	909	7,520	0	7,520	11,046	326	14%	2
TB/Malaria/OID	1,761	0	1,761	5,283	0	5,283	6,999	0	6,999	14,043	304	13%	9
Brazil													
Access to Care	6,443	441	6,884	6,674	1,206	7,880	4,939	200	5,139	19,902	-	-	2
Build/Improve Facilities	915	25	940	667	0	667	290	25	315	1,922	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23,112	63%	4
Clean Water	78,422	0	78,422	197,455	0	197,455	50,137	0	50,137	326,013	735	2%	8
HIV/AIDS	3,799	200	3,999	2,847	125	2,972	5,666	2,391	8,056	15,027	612	2%	7
Hunger and Malnutrition	303	0	303	119	0	119	111	0	111	533	399	1%	1

Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	0%	5
Prenatal Care	334	979	1,312	279	3,064	3,343	511	800	1,311	5,965	3,510	10%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	1,860	0	1,860	15,021	0	15,021	2,753	0	2,753	19,635	1,910	5%	9
Chile													
Access to Care	1,985	0	1,985	440	0	440	281	0	281	2,706	-	-	2
Build/Improve Facilities	165	0	165	18	0	18	40	0	40	222	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,668	76%	4
Clean Water	191	0	191	89	0	89	140,986	0	140,986	141,267	19	1%	6
HIV/AIDS	24,592	0	24,592	28	0	28	71	0	71	24,690	51	2%	8
Hunger and Malnutrition	57	0	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	10	0%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0%	5
Prenatal Care	158	0	158	87	14,517	14,603	147	425	572	15,334	78	4%	7
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	10	69	3%	9
Mexico													
Access to Care	5,679	0	5,679	7,857	0	7,857	1,061	0	1,061	14,597	-	-	2
Build/Improve Facilities	18	0	18	138	0	138	25	0	25	181	-	-	6
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,301	67%	8
Clean Water	257,255	0	257,255	54,487	0	54,487	7,561	0	7,561	319,303	254	2%	3
HIV/AIDS	1,582	350	1,932	4,365	60	4,425	2,200	300	2,500	8,857	241	2%	7
Hunger and Malnutrition	0	0	0	0	5,800	5,800	190	150	340	6,140	262	2%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	36	0%	5
Prenatal Care	728	938	1,666	486	560	1,046	455	1,414	1,869	4,581	1,306	8%	4
TB/Malaria/OID	4	0	4	4	0	4	1,500	0	1,500	1,508	661	4%	9
Peru													
Access to Care	15,998	0	15,998	14,424	0	14,424	3,892	0	3,892	34,314	-	-	5
Build/Improve Facilities	1,238	0	1,238	1,674	0	1,674	5,894	0	5,894	8,805	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,912	57%	9
Clean Water	12,456	0	12,456	30,637	0	30,637	208,772	0	208,772	251,865	171	3%	2
HIV/AIDS	1,746	0	1,746	18,146	0	18,146	26,842	0	26,842	46,734	167	3%	4
Hunger and Malnutrition	7,701	0	7,701	33,608	0	33,608	7,453	0	7,453	48,762	139	3%	1
Immunizations	2,100	0	2,100	0	0	0	4	0	4	2,104	23	0%	7
Prenatal Care	1,343	0	1,343	1,917	0	1,917	7,311	310	7,621	10,882	461	9%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	730	0	730	19,591	599	20,191	1,379	1,695	3,074	23,995	536	10%	8

Venezuela													
Access to Care	327	0	327	271	0	271	1,205	0	1,205	1,802	-	-	6
Build/Improve Facilities	122	0	122	30	0	30	251	0	251	403	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,473	60%	5
Clean Water	14,669	0	14,669	256	0	256	89	0	89	15,015	71	2%	8
HIV/AIDS	129	0	129	210	0	210	370	0	370	709	150	4%	2
Hunger and Malnutrition	40	0	40	10	0	10	120	0	120	170	47	1%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0%	7
Prenatal Care	1,054	0	1,054	651	0	651	303	0	303	2,008	289	7%	4
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	0	150	150	127	3%	9
Middle East													
Egypt													
Access to Care	6,740	150	6,890	7,805	0	7,805	32,615	0	32,615	47,310	-	-	4
Build/Improve Facilities	168	0	168	235	0	235	1,689	0	1,689	2,091	-	-	1
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,153	67%	6
Clean Water	119,315	0	119,315	54,412	168	54,580	127,253	0	127,253	301,148	464	3%	3
HIV/AIDS	589	332	921	839	300	1,139	3,059	320	3,379	5,440	106	1%	5
Hunger and Malnutrition	452	0	452	1,371	0	1,371	1,371	0	1,371	3,194	322	2%	2
Immunizations	588	0	588	1,451	0	1,451	227	0	227	2,266	88	1%	9
Prenatal Care	2,393	605	2,998	1,548	1,050	2,598	13,998	26	14,024	19,620	1,131	8%	7
TB/Malaria/OID	3,330	0	3,330	1,417	0	1,417	20,208	0	20,208	24,955	1,197	9%	8
Jordan													
Access to Care	497	0	497	815	0	815	1,560	0	1,560	2,872	-	-	6
Build/Improve Facilities	26	0	26	4,493	0	4,493	493	0	493	5,012	-	-	2
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	488	58%	3
Clean Water	138,360	0	138,360	101,146	0	101,146	58,102	0	58,102	297,608	26	3%	4
HIV/AIDS	711	0	711	10	0	10	3,756	0	3,756	4,477	6	1%	5
Hunger and Malnutrition	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	9	0	9	10,009	32	4%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0%	7
Prenatal Care	146	0	146	343	0	343	7,495	0	7,495	7,984	41	5%	8
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	1,073	0	1,073	0	0	0	1,073	51	6%	9
Lebanon													
Access to Care	4,168	0	4,168	11,114	0	11,114	7,582	0	7,582	22,864	-	-	1

Build/Improve Facilities	589	0	589	258	0	258	451	0	451	1,297	-	-	2
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439	67%	6
Clean Water	91,741	0	91,741	17,377	0	17,377	26,626	0	26,626	135,744	11	2%	5
HIV/AIDS	75	0	75	1	0	1	120	0	120	196	6	1%	9
Hunger and Malnutrition	2,470	0	2,470	12,847	0	12,847	190	0	190	15,507	11	2%	3
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	0	180	180	1	0%	4
Prenatal Care	247	0	247	272	0	272	1,251	0	1,251	1,771	23	4%	7
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	4%	8
Morocco													
Access to Care	4,283	0	4,283	2,173	0	2,173	10,229	0	10,229	16,686	-	-	5
Build/Improve Facilities	6,378	0	6,378	9,785	0	9,785	5,999	0	5,999	22,162	-	-	9
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,939	57%	3
Clean Water	199,829	0	199,829	336,788	0	336,788	235,385	0	235,385	772,002	232	4%	6
HIV/AIDS	5,500	0	5,500	420	0	420	12,093	170	12,263	18,183	49	1%	2
Hunger and Malnutrition	7	0	7	386	0	386	80	0	80	473	195	4%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,490	0	1,490	1,490	70	1%	7
Prenatal Care	2,682	0	2,682	3,804	0	3,804	5,451	0	5,451	11,937	666	13%	4
TB/Malaria/OID	0	0	0	10	0	10	2,220	0	2,220	2,230	380	7%	8
Turkey													
Access to Care	444	0	444	549	0	549	326	0	326	1,319	-	-	2
Build/Improve Facilities	50	0	50	79	0	79	2,464	0	2,464	2,593	-	-	3
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,492	65%	4
Clean Water	321,355	0	321,355	208	0	208	140,529	0	140,529	462,092	236	2%	6
HIV/AIDS	3,984	0	3,984	84	0	84	220	0	220	4,288	46	0%	7
Hunger and Malnutrition	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	0	70	70	276	2%	1
Immunizations	0	0	0	125	0	125	105	0	105	230	221	2%	8
Prenatal Care	519	0	519	316	575	891	287	600	887	2,297	949	8%	5
TB/Malaria/OID	6,844	0	6,844	45,881	0	45,881	0	0	0	52,725	904	8%	9
Sub-Saharan Africa													
Ethiopia													
Access to Care	39,327	45	39,372	66,004	1,246	67,250	57,486	15,049	72,535	179,157	-	-	8
Build/Improve Facilities	1,454	0	1,454	3,958	0	3,958	4,238	0	4,238	9,649	-	-	7
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,339	20%	6

Clean Water	19,193	0	19,193	176,680	0	176,680	186,707	0	186,707	382,580	2,100	6%	4
HIV/AIDS	115,689	0	115,689	177,772	15,214	192,986	599,695	240	599,935	908,610	4,528	12%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	211,139	0	211,139	100,569	0	100,569	81,788	0	81,788	393,496	1,388	4%	2
Immunizations	7,030	0	7,030	3,910	0	3,910	28,010	0	28,010	38,950	2,198	6%	9
Prenatal Care	4,024	3,261	7,285	39,180	4,600	43,780	10,409	5,362	15,771	66,836	4,407	12%	3
TB/Malaria/OID	17,176	0	17,176	172,114	0	172,114	14,106	0	14,106	203,397	7,780	21%	5
Ghana													
Access to Care	4,585	1,012	5,597	5,436	16,693	22,128	4,669	10,484	15,153	42,879	-	-	8
Build/Improve Facilities	1,187	0	1,187	1,817	0	1,817	13,857	0	13,857	16,861	-	-	5
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,911	27%	6
Clean Water	35,991	0	35,991	103,192	0	103,192	89,345	0	89,345	228,527	329	5%	2
HIV/AIDS	37,726	250	37,976	67,049	22,102	89,151	19,211	1,940	21,151	148,278	955	13%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	19,156	0	19,156	23,077	0	23,077	20,065	0	20,065	62,298	152	2%	3
Immunizations	2,027	0	2,027	0	0	0	528	0	528	2,555	86	1%	9
Prenatal Care	1,379	0	1,379	3,586	0	3,586	5,549	0	5,549	10,514	863	12%	4
TB/Malaria/OID	41,558	0	41,558	28,435	0	28,435	89,088	0	89,088	159,080	1,858	26%	7
Kenya													
Access to Care	8,391	1,369	9,761	30,606	490	31,096	11,776	4,239	16,015	56,872	-	-	3
Build/Improve Facilities	1,645	0	1,645	18,920	0	18,920	12,814	0	12,814	33,379	-	-	5
Chronic Disease	0	197	197	0	0	0	0	10	10	207	2,720	20%	9
Clean Water	45,132	0	45,132	92,071	9,502	101,574	300,269	0	300,269	446,974	818	6%	7
HIV/AIDS	148,210	1,944	150,154	279,854	974	280,828	438,713	35,344	474,056	905,038	4,159	31%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	17,847	19,532	37,379	37,759	0	37,759	25,389	0	25,389	100,526	230	2%	2
Immunizations	2,036	0	2,036	1,017	0	1,017	34	0	34	3,086	181	1%	8
Prenatal Care	3,870	1,187	5,056	14,274	1,885	16,159	3,416	663	4,078	25,294	1,037	8%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	127,418	404	127,822	40,559	375	40,934	46,675	275	46,950	215,706	2,717	20%	4
Mali													
Access to Care	16,890	0	16,890	42,797	0	42,797	3,002	0	3,002	62,689	-	-	8
Build/Improve Facilities	1,319	0	1,319	820	0	820	1,680	0	1,680	3,819	-	-	4
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,224	14%	9
Clean Water	39,198	0	39,198	35,663	0	35,663	25,449	0	25,449	100,310	750	9%	3
HIV/AIDS	35,997	0	35,997	5,697	0	5,697	40,755	0	40,755	82,449	419	5%	6
Hunger and Malnutrition	7,493	0	7,493	28,236	0	28,236	24,612	0	24,612	60,341	414	5%	2

Immunizations	1,790	0	1,790	352	0	352	1,569	0	1,569	3,711	243	3%	5
Prenatal Care	2,167	0	2,167	3,841	0	3,841	6,357	0	6,357	12,364	997	12%	1
TB/Malaria/OID	11,685	0	11,685	916	5,056	5,973	21,297	1,496	22,793	40,451	2,719	31%	7
Nigeria													
Access to Care	7,078	60	7,138	22,522	238	22,760	2,819	1,999	4,818	34,716	-	-	8
Build/Improve Facilities	2,346	0	2,346	515	0	515	265	0	265	3,126	-	-	6
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	50	12,429	18%	4
Clean Water	206,537	0	206,537	125,902	0	125,902	8,597	0	8,597	341,036	4,382	6%	2
HIV/AIDS	83,165	5,300	88,465	182,344	600	182,944	323,608	3,040	326,648	598,057	9,902	15%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	2,019	0	2,019	3,752	0	3,752	37,787	19,897	57,684	63,455	1,360	2%	3
Immunizations	104,061	0	104,061	45,183	0	45,183	72,482	0	72,482	221,727	6,321	9%	9
Prenatal Care	11,889	3,950	15,839	1,380	8,755	10,135	9,914	4,880	14,794	40,768	5,344	8%	5
TB/Malaria/OID	54,679	0	54,679	83,734	49,773	133,508	114,779	0	114,779	302,966	19,527	29%	7
Senegal													
Access to Care	19,180	180	19,360	69,372	0	69,372	10,835	0	10,835	99,567	-	-	3
Build/Improve Facilities	1,845	0	1,845	5,693	0	5,693	1,118	0	1,118	8,656	-	-	4
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	875	23%	7
Clean Water	63,827	0	63,827	53,547	0	53,547	67,018	0	67,018	184,391	248	7%	6
HIV/AIDS	7,467	32	7,499	14,515	0	14,515	23,666	750	24,416	46,431	158	4%	5
Hunger and Malnutrition	4,733	0	4,733	14,076	0	14,076	10,818	0	10,818	29,628	90	2%	1
Immunizations	615	0	615	135	0	135	193	0	193	943	121	3%	8
Prenatal Care	1,859	560	2,419	2,004	0	2,004	4,347	0	4,347	8,770	478	13%	2
TB/Malaria/OID	21,596	3,212	24,808	1,846	0	1,846	21,608	3,965	25,573	52,226	1,292	34%	9
South Africa													
Access to Care	19,396	55	19,451	71,160	531	71,691	4,811	3,530	8,341	99,483	-	-	3
Build/Improve Facilities	9,865	0	9,865	930	0	930	141	0	141	10,936	-	-	4
Chronic Disease	0	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5,161	25%	8
Clean Water	16,566	0	16,566	58,138	0	58,138	152,715	0	152,715	227,420	479	2%	5
HIV/AIDS	160,303	2,678	162,981	239,968	1,720	241,688	488,717	2,473	491,189	895,859	10,601	52%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	8,707	283	8,990	25	607	631	1,254	0	1,254	10,875	443	2%	2
Immunizations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	1%	9
Prenatal Care	1,103	2,439	3,542	750	814	1,564	1,824	1,770	3,594	8,700	585	3%	6
TB/Malaria/OID	956	0	956	549	0	549	4,766	0	4,766	6,271	1,221	6%	7

Tanzania													
Access to Care	49,374	72	49,446	29,861	3,325	33,186	38,227	240	38,467	121,099	-	-	6
Build/Improve Facilities	6,062	0	6,062	7,757	0	7,757	3,317	0	3,317	17,137	-	-	4
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,154	16%	9
Clean Water	83,689	0	83,689	116,272	0	116,272	354,571	0	354,571	554,533	1,059	5%	7
HIV/AIDS	235,838	300	236,138	147,257	475	147,732	264,303	58	264,361	648,232	5,306	26%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	3,294	0	3,294	2,215	0	2,215	19,697	0	19,697	25,206	663	3%	5
Immunizations	909	0	909	389	0	389	488	0	488	1,786	159	1%	8
Prenatal Care	3,937	200	4,137	61,975	200	62,175	4,766	155	4,921	71,234	1,933	10%	3
TB/Malaria/OID	56,381	0	56,381	23,045	4,158	27,203	60,672	3,763	64,435	148,019	5,423	27%	2
Uganda													
Access to Care	23,848	800	24,648	6,096	250	6,346	7,958	586	8,543	39,538	-	-	3
Build/Improve Facilities	37,801	0	37,801	9,357	0	9,357	2,963	0	2,963	50,122	-	-	2
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,097	16%	9
Clean Water	45,490	0	45,490	77,690	0	77,690	65,374	0	65,374	188,554	989	7%	7
HIV/AIDS	127,992	733	128,725	187,908	4,221	192,128	228,071	110	228,181	549,035	2,820	21%	1
Hunger and Malnutrition	40,895	0	40,895	29,632	0	29,632	41,540	839	42,379	112,906	397	3%	5
Immunizations	0	0	0	1,250	0	1,250	570	0	570	1,820	739	6%	8
Prenatal Care	2,544	0	2,544	2,780	198	2,978	5,840	500	6,340	11,862	1,029	8%	4
TB/Malaria/OID	78,675	459	79,134	3,385	0	3,385	27,563	0	27,563	110,081	3,609	27%	6

Notes: Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Private Foundation are analyzed in US 2006 dollars from aid committed in 2006. ODA data was obtained from the Creditor Reporting System (2008) through Source OECD for the year 2006 at a country level (n=27). Total Donor Aid is the sum of ODA and Private Foundation Giving for the designated categories. Disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) were obtained from the WHO Global Burden of Disease Estimates (2002). Percent Disease Burden was calculated as a percentage of total DALYs; percentage totals will not add to 100% due to the exclusion of DALYs due to injuries. Perceived Priorities represent the perceived priority of people surveyed within each country, are ranked (1-9, 1 the highest priority), and were obtained from the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey (2007). Attributable DALYs were not assigned to Access to Care or Build/Improve Facilities. Countries in Eastern Europe, although included in the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey, did not have sufficient ODA to include in the analysis.

Figure 1: Kaiser Categories and corresponding ODA Purpose Codes

Access to Care	12181: Medical education/training 12182: Medical research 12220: Basic health care (non-immunizations) 12261: Health education
Build/Improve Facilities	12230: Basic health infrastructure 12191: Medical services
Chronic Disease	no applicable category
Clean Water	14010: Water resources policy/admin. mgmt 14015: Water resources protection 14020: Water supply & sanit. - large syst. 14030: Basic drinking water supply and basic sanitation 14040: River development 14050: Waste management/disposal 14081: Educ./training: water supply & sanitation
HIV/AIDS and STIs	13040: STD control including HIV/AIDS 16064: Social mitigation of HIV/AIDS
Hunger and Malnutrition	12240: Basic nutrition 52010: Food security programs/food aid
Immunizations	12220: Basic health care (immunizations) 12250: Infectious disease control (immunizations)
Prenatal Care	13020: Reproductive health care
TB/Malaria/OID	12262: Malaria control 12263: Tuberculosis control 12250: Infectious disease control (non-immunizations)

Table 1: *Top 5 Private US Foundations Awarding International Health Grants in 2005 with 2006, 2007 totals*

Foundation Name	International Grants Awarded for Health 2005 (USD)	No. of Grants	International Grants Awarded for Health 2006 (USD)	No. of Grants	International Grants Awarded for Health 2007 (USD)	No. of Grants
The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	895,011,143	145	1,536,990,217	136	1,619,838,672	212
The Ford Foundation	23,910,827	125	29,780,425	136	35,105,892	138
Rockefeller Foundation	22,389,260	75	15,921,769	34	14,393,835	55
The David and Lucille Packard Foundation	17,937,038	34	22,535,408	52	26,370,722	57
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation	12,624,000	38	20,342,417	34	18,434,500	35
Top Five Total	971,872,268	417	1,625,570,236	392	1,714,143,621	497
Percent Total*	95%	70%	92%	38%	89%	44%
Total Giving Top 50 Foundations	1,019,535,087	594	1,767,606,650	1043	1,928,962,978	1126

Source: See text

* 2005 Data is only Top 10

Table 2: Regional distribution of health-related funding including official development assistance and top five US private foundations

Region/Country/Disease-specific Category	Official Development Assistance, 2005 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2005 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2005 USD ('000)	Official Development Assistance, 2006 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2006 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2006 USD ('000)	Official Development Assistance, 2007 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2007 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2007 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, Cumulative USD ('000)
Asia										
India	1,057,392	44,572	1,101,964	2,181,906	28,180	2,210,086	2,782,211	16,602	2,798,813	6,110,863
China	1,278,361	4,871	1,283,232	1,113,198	2,546	1,115,745	1,179,993	22,473	1,202,466	3,601,443
Bangladesh	718,248	98	718,346	581,656	40,468	622,124	501,240	5,750	506,990	1,847,460
Indonesia	494,600	2,236	496,836	472,133	2,796	474,930	219,012	2,080	221,092	1,192,858
Malaysia	746,079	670	746,749	365	852	1,217	1,935	811	2,745	750,711
Pakistan	173,570	1,300	174,870	355,287	1,150	356,437	188,690	21,533	210,223	741,531
Latin America										
Argentina	37,717	0	37,717	343,316	306	343,622	399,635	50	399,685	781,024
Peru	43,312	0	43,312	119,997	599	120,596	261,547	2,005	263,552	427,460
Brazil	92,075	1,645	93,719	223,061	4,395	227,456	64,406	3,416	67,822	388,997
Bolivia	81,472	0	81,472	159,400	0	159,400	115,085	0	115,085	355,957
Mexico	265,267	1,288	266,554	67,336	6,420	73,756	13,002	1,864	14,866	355,177
Chile	27,147	0	27,147	671	14,517	15,188	141,525	425	141,950	184,285
Venezuela	16,341	0	16,341	1,428	0	1,428	2,487	0	2,487	20,256
Middle East										
Morocco	218,679	0	218,679	353,367	0	353,367	272,946	170	273,116	845,161
Turkey	333,197	0	333,197	47,242	575	47,817	144,001	600	144,601	525,614
Egypt	133,576	1,087	134,663	69,079	1,518	70,597	200,420	346	200,766	406,026
Jordan	149,740	0	149,740	107,880	0	107,880	71,415	0	71,415	329,035
Lebanon	99,291	0	99,291	41,870	0	41,870	36,399	0	36,399	177,560
Sub-Saharan Africa										
Ethiopia	415,032	3,306	418,337	740,187	21,061	761,248	982,439	20,651	1,003,089	2,182,675
Kenya	354,548	24,633	379,181	515,059	13,227	528,286	839,085	40,530	879,615	1,787,081
Nigeria	471,775	9,310	481,084	465,333	59,366	524,699	570,251	29,866	600,117	1,605,900

Tanzania	439,484	572	440,056	388,773	8,158	396,931	746,043	4,216	750,259	1,587,246
South Africa	216,897	5,472	222,369	371,520	3,672	375,191	654,228	7,773	662,000	1,259,560
Uganda	357,246	1,992	359,238	318,097	4,669	322,766	379,879	2,034	381,914	1,063,918
Ghana	143,610	1,262	144,872	232,591	38,795	271,386	242,311	12,424	254,735	670,993
Senegal	121,121	3,984	125,105	161,188	0	161,188	139,605	4,715	144,319	430,613
Mali	116,539	0	116,539	118,323	5,056	123,379	124,721	1,496	126,217	366,134

Notes: Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Private Foundation are analyzed in US 2005/6/7 dollars from aid committed in 2005/6/7. ODA data was obtained from the Creditor Reporting System (2008) through Source OECD for the years 2005/6/7 at a country level (n=27). Total Donor Aid is the sum of ODA and Private Foundation Giving for the designated categories. Disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) were obtained from the WHO Global Burden of Disease Estimates (2002). Percent Disease Burden was calculated as a percentage of total DALYs; percentage totals will not add to 100% due to the exclusion of DALYs due to injuries. Perceived Priorities represent the perceived priority of people surveyed within each country, are ranked (1-9, 1 the highest priority), and were obtained from the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey (2007). Attributable DALYs were not assigned to Access to Care or Build/Improve Facilities. Countries in Eastern Europe, although included in the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey, did not have sufficient ODA to include in the analysis.

Table 3: Comparing the correlation of official development assistance and private foundation giving to disease burden and perceived priorities for 2005/6/7 aid

Donor Aid	DALYs		Perceived Priorities			
	Pearson's coefficient	Spearman's rho (\$/rank)	Spearman's rho (categories/rank)	Pearson's coefficient		
Official Development Assistance (commitments)						
2005	0.015	-0.194 **	-0.198 **	-0.14	*	
2006	0.126	-0.202 **	-0.195 **	-0.114		
2007	0.088	-0.21 **	-0.213 **	-0.189	**	
Private Foundation Grants						
2005	0.059	-0.144 *	-0.146 *	-0.063		
2006	0.067	-0.12	-0.122	-0.026		
2007	0.02	-0.063	-0.059	-0.073		

Notes: The correlation technique for disability-adjusted life years was standard Pearson's correlation; technique for perceived priorities (an ordinal rank) was Spearman's rho. Since the application of Spearman's rho to denote correlation between one ordinal and one interval-ratio set of data may seem problematic, we also converted aid figures into ordinal variables by forming nine categories for ODA amounts and five for private grants. In addition, we report Pearson's r for completeness. Each observation for disability-adjusted life-years represents the attributable disease burden to Clean Water, Chronic Disease, Immunizations, HIV/AIDS and STIs, Malnutrition, Reproductive Health, and TB/Malaria/Other Infectious Disease and the committed ODA and US private giving in 2005-07. Each observation for perceived priorities represents the rank in perceived priority (1-9, 1 the highest) for Access to Care, Build/Improve Facilities, Clean Water, Chronic Disease, Immunizations, HIV/AIDS and STIs, Malnutrition, Reproductive Health, and TB/Malaria/Other Infectious Disease and the committed ODA and US private giving in 2006 at country level (n=27). Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Private Foundation are analyzed in US 2005-07 dollars from aid committed in 2005-07. ODA data was obtained from the Creditor Reporting System (2008) through Source OECD for the years 2005-07 at a country level (n=27). Disability-adjusted life-years were obtained from the WHO Global Burden of Disease Estimates (2002). Perceived Priorities were obtained from the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey (2007). (*) (**) indicate significance at the 5% and 1% levels, respectively (2-tailed).

Table 4: Regional View of Official Development Assistance, US Private Foundation Giving, Disability-Adjusted Life-Years, Percent Disease Burden, and Perceived Priority, 2005–2007

Region/Country/Disease-specific Category	Official Development Assistance, 2005 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2005 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2005 USD ('000)	Official Development Assistance, 2006 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2006 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2006 USD ('000)	Official Development Assistance, 2007 USD ('000)	US Private Foundation Aid, 2007 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, 2007 USD ('000)	Total Donor Aid, Cumulative USD ('000)	Disability-Adjusted Life-Years	Percent Disease Burden	Perceived Priority
Asia													
Clean Water	2,760,521	0	2,760,521	2,266,470	0	2,266,470	2,227,549	0	2,227,549	7,254,539	27,803	4%	4
Prenatal Care	145,321	11,702	157,023	955,128	35,880	991,007	612,408	11,873	624,281	1,772,311	65,887	10%	3
HIV/AIDS	379,548	16,191	395,740	222,462	8,106	230,568	1,018,270	29,746	1,048,016	1,674,324	16,574	3%	1
Access to Care	309,758	24,996	334,754	466,560	16,016	482,576	328,721	3,133	331,853	1,149,184	-	-	8
Hunger and Malnutrition	464,486	300	464,786	173,721	14,967	188,688	239,431	9,701	249,132	902,606	14,865	2%	5
TB/Malaria/OID	256,502	120	256,622	297,381	0	297,381	193,903	14,406	208,308	762,312	73,651	12%	9
Build/Improve Facilities	98,854	145	98,999	240,316	0	240,316	48,457	0	48,457	387,772	-	-	2
Immunizations	46,975	0	46,975	73,178	0	73,178	187,705	0	187,705	307,858	17,178	3%	7
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	535	535	0	120	120	655	315,922	50%	6
Latin America													
Clean Water	379,238	0	379,238	389,885	0	389,885	811,026	0	811,026	1,580,149	1,442	2%	4
Access to Care	71,892	441	72,333	364,781	1,206	365,987	20,925	200	21,125	459,445	-	-	3
Hunger and Malnutrition	27,830	0	27,830	76,165	5,800	81,965	35,801	150	35,951	145,746	981	1%	1
HIV/AIDS	50,082	550	50,632	29,596	335	29,931	46,063	2,740	48,804	129,366	1,339	2%	7
Build/Improve Facilities	21,091	25	21,116	10,334	0	10,334	54,661	25	54,686	86,136	-	-	2
TB/Malaria/OID	4,356	0	4,356	39,910	599	40,509	12,781	1,695	14,476	59,342	3,783	5%	9
Prenatal Care	6,412	1,916	8,328	4,538	18,140	22,678	16,417	2,949	19,366	50,372	6,269	9%	5
Immunizations	2,430	0	2,430	0	156	156	14	0	14	2,600	172	0%	6
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46,326	64%	8
Middle East													
Clean Water	870,600	0	870,600	509,932	168	510,100	587,895	0	587,895	1,968,595	970	3%	5
Access to Care	16,133	150	16,283	22,456	0	22,456	52,313	0	52,313	91,052	-	-	3
TB/Malaria/OID	10,174	0	10,174	48,381	0	48,381	22,428	0	22,428	80,983	2,559	8%	9
Prenatal Care	5,988	605	6,593	6,283	1,625	7,908	28,482	626	29,108	43,609	2,811	9%	6

Build/Improve Facilities	7,211	0	7,211	14,850	0	14,850	11,095	0	11,095	33,156	-	-	2
HIV/AIDS	10,859	332	11,191	1,355	300	1,655	19,247	490	19,737	32,583	212	1%	7
Hunger and Malnutrition	2,929	0	2,929	14,604	0	14,604	1,711	0	1,711	19,244	804	3%	1
Immunizations	588	0	588	1,577	0	1,577	2,002	0	2,002	4,167	383	1%	8
Chronic Disease	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,511	64%	4
Sub-Saharan Africa													
Immunizations	2,878,989	0	2,878,989	2,318,706	0	2,318,706	2,331,423	0	2,331,423	7,529,117	37,998	5%	9
HIV/AIDS	952,388	11,237	963,625	1,302,363	45,306	1,347,669	2,426,739	43,954	2,470,693	4,781,988	38,849	20%	1
Clean Water	555,623	0	555,623	839,157	9,502	848,659	1,250,045	0	1,250,045	2,654,327	11,153	6%	5
TB/Malaria/OID	410,124	4,075	414,199	354,583	59,362	413,945	400,554	9,499	410,052	1,238,197	46,146	24%	7
Hunger and Malnutrition	315,283	19,815	335,098	239,340	607	239,947	262,951	20,735	283,686	858,731	5,136	3%	2
Access to Care	188,069	3,593	191,662	343,854	22,773	366,627	141,584	36,126	177,710	735,999	-	-	6
Prenatal Care	32,772	11,596	44,368	129,770	16,452	146,221	52,421	13,330	65,751	256,340	16,674	9%	3
Build/Improve Facilities	63,525	0	63,525	49,768	0	49,768	40,393	0	40,393	153,686	-	-	4
Chronic Disease	0	214	214	0	0	0	0	60	60	274	36,909	19%	8

Notes: Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Private Foundation are analyzed in US 2006 dollars from aid committed in 2006. ODA data was obtained from the Creditor Reporting System (2008) through Source OECD for the year 2006 at a regional level. Total Donor Aid is the sum of ODA and Private Foundation Giving for the designated categories. Disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) were obtained from the WHO Global Burden of Disease Estimates (2002). Percent Disease Burden was calculated as a percentage of total DALYs; percentage totals will not add to 100% due to the exclusion of DALYs due to injuries. Perceived Priorities represent the perceived priority of people surveyed within each country, are ranked (1-9, 1 the highest priority), and were obtained from the Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey (2007). Attributable DALYs were not assigned to Access to Care or Build/Improve Facilities. Eastern Europe, although included in the Kaiser/Pew Global Health survey, did not have sufficient ODA to include in the analysis.

Table 5: *Index comparing aid allocations per capita disease burden*

Region/Country	Per Capita Disease Burden Index (DALYs/Population)	Private Foundation Giving per Capita Disease Burden	Official Development Assistance per Capita Disease Burden	Total Aid per Capita Disease Burden
Asia				
Pakistan	0.30	80,214	2,399,941	2,480,155
India	0.29	312,697	21,072,588	21,385,285
Bangladesh	0.26	180,153	7,005,819	7,185,972
Indonesia	0.21	33,295	5,550,546	5,583,842
China	0.15	194,365	23,224,577	23,418,942
Malaysia	0.15	15,945	5,116,888	5,132,834
Latin America				
Bolivia	0.27	0	1,316,327	1,316,327
Brazil	0.21	45,630	1,831,690	1,877,320
Peru	0.19	13,527	2,206,758	2,220,285
Argentina	0.17	2,147	4,711,418	4,713,565
Venezuela	0.16	0	124,328	124,328
Mexico	0.15	63,427	2,290,278	2,353,705
Chile	0.14	106,626	1,208,473	1,315,099
Middle East				
Egypt	0.19	15,197	2,075,615	2,090,812
Lebanon	0.18	0	978,437	978,437
Morocco	0.17	983	4,888,448	4,889,431
Turkey	0.16	7,216	3,220,820	3,228,036
Jordan	0.16	0	2,079,964	2,079,964
Sub-Saharan Africa				
Mali	0.68	9,571	525,268	534,839
Nigeria	0.56	174,888	2,675,215	2,850,103
South Africa	0.56	30,327	2,227,754	2,258,081
Uganda	0.53	16,275	1,974,970	1,991,245
Ethiopia	0.53	85,551	4,062,437	4,147,988
Tanzania	0.46	28,183	3,427,179	3,455,363
Kenya	0.42	185,926	4,052,694	4,238,620
Senegal	0.39	22,505	1,091,611	1,114,116
Ghana	0.35	151,466	1,785,105	1,936,571