

## タイド援助：DAC 全体と日本の状況

高柳彰夫

### 1. タイド援助の割合（2017 年）

Bilateral commitments (excluding administrative costs and in-donor refugee costs)	Per cent			
	Untied	Partially Untied	Tied	Not reported
Australia	100.0	-	0.0	-
Austria	50.1	-	49.9	-
Belgium	95.6	-	4.4	-
Canada	93.3	-	6.7	-
Czech Republic	55.9	-	44.1	-
Denmark	100.0	-	0.0	-
Finland	98.3	-	1.7	-
France	96.0	-	4.0	-
Germany	85.5	-	14.5	-
Greece	90.6	-	9.4	-
Hungary	86.6	-	13.4	-
Iceland	100.0	-	-	-
Ireland	100.0	-	-	-
Italy	90.9	0.3	8.8	-
Japan	82.5	1.6	4.4	11.4
Korea	50.2	-	49.8	-
Luxembourg	98.8	-	1.2	-
Netherlands	94.9	0.9	4.2	-
New Zealand	74.6	0.4	25.0	-
Norway	100.0	-	-	-
Poland	60.3	-	39.7	-
Portugal	68.6	-	31.4	-
Slovak Republic	62.2	15.0	22.7	-
Slovenia	99.6	-	0.2	0.2
Spain	83.5	0.0	16.5	-
Sweden	87.8	1.1	11.1	-
Switzerland	96.5	-	3.5	-
United Kingdom	100.0	-	-	-
United States	63.7	-	36.3	-
<b>TOTAL DAC</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>2.1</b>

（出典）OECD Development Finance Data Table 23.

日本の場合、アンタイド率はほぼ DAC 平均だが、not reported の割合が著しく高い。

## 2. DAC Peer Review における日本のタイド援助に関する記述

### (1) 2010 年

- ・ 勧告 : Continue to make progress in untying aid and improving transparency by (i) reporting the tying status of all of ODA, including technical co-operation; and (ii) ensuring its procurement guidelines make clear whether primary contractors may act as agents only or also as managers or suppliers – in the latter case, such aid should be reported as tied.
- ・ STEP に関する批判 : In 2002, Japan introduced STEP loans (Special Terms for Economic Partnership) which are explicitly tied to the procurement of Japanese goods and services. In order to adhere to the OECD Arrangement on Officially Supported Export Credits (OECD 2009I) Japan offers particularly good terms with these loans (Box 8). But it has made its tied loans more concessional than its untied loans, which can act as an incentive for partner countries to choose tied conditions. Japan should, therefore, ensure that its untied loans are as favourable as its tied loans. Further roll out of the STEP scheme could also threaten the progress Japan has made in untying. If Japan is to untie further, it will need to phase out STEP loans.

(2) 2014 年 : タイド援助の増大、技術協力の未報告、LDCs 援助案アンタイド化の合意の延長に唯一反対した国、2010 年勧告未実施を批判(下線は引用者)

Japan reports that 100% of its ODA covered by the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying ODA is untied. The DAC average is 90%. In terms of Japan's total bilateral ODA (excluding administrative and in-donor refugees costs), the share of untied aid in 2012 was 71%. This is below the DAC average of 79%. It also reflects a steady fall in Japan's untying ratio since its highest level of 84% in 2008. Japan does not report the tying status of its technical co-operation. If technical co-operation were excluded from the calculation, the share of untied aid in 2012 would have been 86%. Japan argues that tying its ODA contributes to transferring Japan's technology, knowledge and experiences. For DAC members as a whole, aid untying has held up well, even increasing since 2010 despite growing pressure on aid budgets.

In respect of the commitments made in Accra and Busan to untie more aid, Japan is one of two DAC members that have interpreted these as limited only to ODA covered by the Recommendation. It thus considers it fully meets the Accra/Busan commitments. In addition, following the review of the extension of the coverage of the Recommendation to the non-LDC Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) in late 2013, Japan was the only DAC member that did not agree to a further five year extension of that provision and now therefore reserves the right to use tied aid as part of its ODA to this group of countries.

While reporting of the tying status of technical co-operation is not mandatory, most DAC

members do so, either fully or almost fully. Japan's lack of reporting hinders a more accurate calculation of the tying status of its own aid as well as more accurate comparisons with other DAC members. Moreover, for the purposes of monitoring the Untying Recommendation, all donors agreed to report the tying status of technical co-operation to the countries covered by it, although this does not oblige members to untie it. Again Japan has not complied and is encouraged to do so. In addition, Japan reports aid that must be procured through Japanese prime contractors as untied, whereas some other DAC members report this type of aid as tied. A discussion in the DAC is needed to establish how the tying status of such aid should be reported. The above issues were all raised in the previous peer review of Japan with, however, no further progress to date.

(3) Peer Review 勧告「未実施」の割合が高い日本

	実施	部分的実施	未実施		実施	部分的実施	未実施
オーストラリア	80	20	0	ルクセンブルグ	40	60	0
カナダ	42	47	11	オランダ	36	50	14
デンマーク	75	13	13	ノルウェー	40	55	5
フィンランド	42	47	11	スペイン	47	53	0
フランス	15	75	10	スウェーデン*	26	42	16
ギリシャ	44	56	0	スイス	53	42	5
イタリア	18	59	24	アメリカ	25	75	0
日本	31	32	37				
(出典) <a href="http://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/peerreviewsofdacmembers.htm">http://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/peerreviewsofdacmembers.htm</a> をもとに筆者作成							
この表からはピア・レビューの実施時期により異なる方式で算出されている国を除いている							
*スウェーデンには「実施状況未調査」の項目が16%ある							