

Unclassified**English - Or. English****8 April 2026****DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE****Consultations on the DAC Review Process**

The present document contextualises consultations on the DAC review with external partners. DAC members approved this document and its declassification via the written procedure on 7 April 2026.

JT03584896

Consultations on the DAC Review Process

1. The DAC Review covers a number of substantive areas, all of which will need to be properly reviewed, consulted on, decided and implemented. In some areas quick wins may be possible, while other outcomes will take longer to evolve.
2. The key vision of the DAC Review remains to carefully review and improve our role, tools, and partnerships, in light of the dramatic geopolitical and geoeconomic changes taking place and as these changes affect the international development co-operation ecosystem, of which DAC is an important part. In doing so, we must explore all necessary changes to better respond to the financing and development needs of partner countries and to do so in an open and inclusive manner that will make the DAC fit for purpose and for the future.
3. Responding better to partner countries' needs is key and is being translated by the Review process to provide more predictable, forward-looking information and data, better leveraging existing data and evidence and to provide more accessible, digestible, and user-friendly outputs.
4. The Review also addresses how ODA relates to other development finance flows. It aims to develop a strategic framework and analytical tool for analysing the added value of ODA in relation to the totality of net development finance in partner countries; and to guide more strategic and catalytic allocation of ODA across goals and instruments.
5. Building on last year's decision to strengthen the ODA graduation process, as formally approved and presented at the March 2025 DAC High Level Meeting, the Review also aims at furthering this track by addressing the ODA country graduation criteria, in respect to issues related to vulnerability and fragility, and committing to support countries' development transition. Among the emerging elements being explored is adding indicators linked to vulnerability while keeping the GNI per capita indicator as the trigger.
6. Responding to the ambition for a more open and inclusive DAC and the expansion of DAC engagement with other providers of development co-operation, partner countries, and other stakeholders, several options are on the table including the establishment of a sounding board of partners for ongoing external feedback (building on the Advisory Partner Group experience), a framework for more systematic and formalised consultations on emerging DAC normative instruments (recommendations, declaration, guidelines, guidances, etc.) and an updated communication strategy.
7. In the annex, each of the four DAC review workstreams presents progress in their work along with a list of proposed questions for other providers, partners, and relevant stakeholders. The inputs and feedback received will be summarised and reflected in each of workstreams' ongoing discussions.

Annex: Inputs from DAC Review Workstreams

1. Workstream 1: Enhanced, transparent and timely data on ODA and other official and private flows

Emerging elements and a brief status of direction of travel for workstream elements

Based on the five priorities for WS1:

1. *Responding to Partner Countries' Needs*

Emerging elements are:

- Strong consensus on **systematic, structured consultation** with partner countries (e.g., Ethiopia, Nigeria) to align data with real planning and budgeting needs.
- Clear evidence of **gaps in timeliness, granularity and usability** of current DAC data for national systems.
- Growing demand for **predictability, forward-looking information**, and harmonised reporting standards.

Sense of direction:

- Move toward **formal consultation mechanisms** (e.g., advisory partner group, embedded consultations)
- Prioritise **demand-driven adjustments** to data standards and processes while safeguarding DAC governance.

2. *A Forward-Looking DAC*

Emerging elements:

- Broad support for enhancing **foresight, forecasting, and scenario analysis**, especially linked to ODA projections (FSP).
- Recognition that outputs should be **concise, pragmatic, and linked to decision-making** (e.g., dashboards, scenario briefs).

Sense of direction:

- Integrate foresight into regular DAC processes, ensuring **clear value-added**.
- Leverage existing datasets and voluntary ODA projection mechanisms to avoid additional burdens.

3. *Better leveraging DAC evidence and insights on the external environment in which we work*

Emerging elements:

- Members emphasise need to **review and better leverage existing DAC data assets (quantitative and qualitative)**, with clearer articulation of how evidence is used in country contexts.
- Call for clarity on how **external evidence** (including non-DAC providers and thematic/country typologies) should inform analysis.

Sense of direction:

- Strengthen analytical coherence by **mapping and streamlining** existing evidence.

- Improve links between DAC evidence, policy processes, and partner country priorities.

4. *Harnessing the full potential of digital technologies for timely, transparent data and analysis*

Emerging elements:

- Strong convergence around prioritising **accessibility and usability improvements first (“housekeeping”)**—dashboards, clearer interfaces, metadata.
- **AI-based data extraction** viewed as the most impactful near-term investment.
- Interoperability with **IATI, TOSSD** identified as essential but needing clearer technical pathways.

Sense of direction:

- Sequence digital work: **quick wins → interoperability → advanced tooling (possibilities being discussed include AI, geospatial)**.
- Ensure technological innovations come with **strong quality assurance and minimized reporting burdens**.

5. *More strategic communication of development co-operation data and evidence-based insights*

Emerging elements:

- Members call for **more accessible, digestible, and user-friendly outputs**, including improved dashboards and communication around revamping ODA launches.
- Recognition that enhanced communication is key to **accountability, legitimacy, and visibility**.

Sense of direction:

- Shift toward a communication model focused on **clarity, transparency, and narrative coherence**, supported by modern data tools and visualisation.
- Improve alignment across DAC products to ensure consistency of messages.

Overall Trajectory for WS1

WS1 is converging toward a DAC data ecosystem that is **partner-responsive, technologically modernised, analytically coherent, and strategically communicative**—while remaining mindful of governance boundaries and reporting burdens. The direction of travel is **incremental but ambitious**, emphasising practical improvements, structured engagement, and a future-ready data ecosystem.

Questions for consultations:

1. How does your country/institution currently draw on DAC data and evidence? In your view, what do you see as strengths? Are there specific gaps or limitations that you have identified?
2. In which particular areas might it be desirable to ensure a stronger partner country voice in the design or management of DAC data and evidence assets?
3. What might practical arrangements for strengthened partner country engagement within the DAC’s data and evidence ecosystem look like?

2. Workstream 2: Role of ODA in the totality of development finance flows

Emerging elements and a brief status of direction of travel for workstream elements:

DAC Review Workstream 2 responds to a central question facing the DAC and the broader development community:

How can ODA be used most effectively and catalytically within the wider development finance ecosystem in support of partner countries' nationally defined priorities and strategies for sustainable development impact?

The overarching goal is to support partner countries and providers with strategic and comprehensive analysis of how ODA in particular, and other development finance, are best positioned to expand partner countries' access to quality development finance. This work recognizes that development outcomes depend not only on the quantity of concessional finance (ODA), but on its quality and strategic motivations – and ultimately, how it adds value and catalyses other international and domestic development finance for sustainable development pathways, resilience and prosperity.

Achieving this goal should, in turn, help reinforce – and rebuild - political support for ODA at a time when it is under growing pressure to show its relevance domestically and internationally. The country-centred approach will strengthen DAC partnerships and help rebuild trust in development co-operation.

Emerging elements:

A strategic framework for situating and analysing the added value of ODA in relation to the totality of net development finance in each partner country. This focus on the partner country perspective rather than the provider perspective and on the totality of development finance inflows and outflows rather than a narrow tracking of ODA represents a paradigm shift for the DAC. It will incentivize a more strategic allocation of ODA in relation to each country's development needs and priorities, its fiscal space, the availability of domestic resources for national development and access to affordable long term sustainable investment.

The proposed country-centred approach should also enhance the impact, additionality and catalytic role of ODA, a unique and scarce resource, in relation to all other development finance flows. DAC member budget planning and allocation will be able to plug into data and analysis on (1) the range of public and private resources available in a country (e.g. public finance, domestic and foreign direct investment, remittances); (2) the role of ODA in addressing structural constraints, and providing and catalysing resources where they are most needed and where private finance is less likely to be invested; and (3) the fiscal and debt constraints that shape countries' financing options

Direction of travel

Four building blocks for a new DAC strategic framework for ODA in relation to other development finance flows:

1. **Development of a net development finance (NDF) analytical tool** that provides members and partners with comprehensive and timely data and evidence that situates ODA in partner countries' net development finance profile (taking into account both inflows and outflows, including the cost of debt and its servicing).
2. **Guidance on the strategic and catalytic role, and effectiveness, of ODA** in relation to the broader development finance toolkit. Building on analysis from the NDF tool, the guidance will clarify how ODA can be effective and catalytic across goals and instruments, offering evidence and good-practice examples.

3. **Improved measurement, transparency and accountability** of international concessional finance that reaches partner countries, responding to the call in Seville for more and better ODA that can be programmed at country level and aligned with national sustainable-development priorities. This could take the form of a modernised measure of country programmable aid to give a fairer representation of what is received (e.g. include humanitarian and some multilateral flows).
4. **An action plan for more impactful ODA support for mobilizing private, domestic and trade-related resources** for sustainable development pathways and mutual benefits.

Workstream 2 will develop these building blocks in a consultative way through development of conceptual and methodological notes, and country-level consultations on how ODA fits and adds value in relation to other development finance.

Questions for consultations:

1. In your view, how useful would the proposed partner country-centred strategic framework be for:
 - situating and analyzing the (current and potential) added value of ODA in relation to the totality of net development finance in the country; and
 - understanding better how the development finance ecosystem works at country level?
2. Does the proposed package provide a credible basis for leveraging the DAC's comparative advantage and further strengthening the added value and integrity of ODA in the evolving development co-operation landscape?
3. In your view, where can ODA make the biggest difference within the broader development finance system?

3. Workstream 3: Country eligibility and ODA graduation process

In late 2025, the DAC decided to review the ODA graduation criterion, and pause graduations for the duration of this review. For many decades, the eligibility of countries to ODA has been determined solely by GNI per capita (see Box). In pursuing criterion reform through the DAC Review, the DAC has recognised the longstanding view of many partners that GNI per capita is no longer a sufficient barometer of graduation readiness. There is also broad recognition that graduation should remain rules-based, transparent and predictable, while better reflecting countries' actual readiness to transition away from concessional finance. Furthermore, that the failure to consider vulnerabilities or context specific circumstances, such as access to alternative finance, may create risks to sustainable graduation.

Workstream 3 has considered a range of options to reform the ODA eligibility criterion. Support is converging on a reform direction that retains GNI per capita as the trigger for a decision on ODA graduation, but strengthens the process with a small, complementary set of additional indicators. These indicators are intended to capture non-income dimensions, including vulnerabilities, that will inform better decision-making on ODA eligibility. An emerging preference is for a model in which GNI initiates the process, while complementary indicators inform, but do not replace, DAC decision-making.

Members have expressed general caution around composite indices, with a preference for simple metrics that can be applied consistently across countries. There is commitment to further exploring a concise subset of indicators within the following broad themes: 1) financial constraints; 2) market access; 3) structural economic vulnerability; 4) climate and environmental vulnerability; 5) selected aspects of social vulnerability and inequality; and 6) conflicts. There is strongest support around climate and environmental vulnerability as well as economic and financial vulnerability, while views remain more mixed on the role of social vulnerability and inequality indicators.

Several complementary options remain on the table. Conditional transition periods could smooth the shift out of ODA eligibility in exceptional circumstances, while special windows for specific groups attract mixed support due to concerns about equal treatment. Members have also stressed the importance of coherence with MDB and UN approaches, and of ensuring that graduation does not mean disengagement.

3.1. Questions for consultations

1. Do you support a model that retains GNI per capita as a trigger for decision on ODA graduation, but complements it with a small set of additional indicators?
2. Which vulnerability themes and indicators are most appropriate in assessing graduation readiness beyond income level, and which are sufficiently robust and operationally feasible across countries?

ODA eligibility & graduation

The [DAC list of ODA Recipients](#) contains countries and territories that are eligible to receive official development assistance (ODA). These countries and territories consist of all low- and middle-income countries based on gross national income (GNI) per capita as published by the [World Bank](#), with the exception of former G8 members, EU members, and countries with a firm date for entry into the EU. The list also includes all of the least developed countries (LDCs) as defined by the [United Nations](#) (UN).

When a country exceeds the high-income threshold as defined by the World Bank, on the basis of GNI per capita, for three consecutive years, it is removed, subject to consensus among DAC members, from the DAC List, with effect at the start of the following calendar year after the DAC decision is taken.

This does not in itself prevent DAC members from continuing to provide concessional finance to the country, but flows can no longer be reported to the OECD as ODA. This may be a disincentive—for example for countries where domestic laws restrict certain budget lines to ODA on the basis of the DAC List, or in those that have a target for providing ODA as a share of their GNI.

3. Should all countries be assessed with the same indicator set or should differentiation for specific categories be applied? If differentiation appropriate, how should that be applied?
4. Taking into account the DAC's *Strengthened graduation process*, what other measures could ensure a new graduation framework is predictable and manageable for partner countries, especially those nearing graduation thresholds and help avoid abrupt "financial cliffs"?
5. How can the DAC best ensure coherence with MDB and UN approaches to eligibility and vulnerability while maintaining a simple, transparent and predictable graduation framework?
6. How can the DAC best engage partners outside of the Advisory Partner Group?

4. Workstream 4: DAC ways of working

4.1. Emerging elements and a brief status of direction of travel for workstream elements

The DAC wishes to make itself more open and inclusive to a range of stakeholders in particular developing partner countries to ensure its work is responsive to the challenges facing the world today.

To achieve this, the DAC is developing a package of options to strengthen the DAC's interaction with non-Members, increase transparency and identify governance solutions that improve the inclusivity of the committee.

The Committee has been exploring a package of options. These currently include:

- more open DAC meetings to widen participation and engagement;
- more systematic declassification of DAC meetings' documents;
- more systematic consultation on emerging policy recommendations to ensure they are responsive, fit for purpose and take on feedback throughout the design process;
- a 'Sounding Board' of partners for ongoing external feedback;
- a new communications model to raise awareness of the DAC's offer, and support feedback and dialogue;
- agreement that in future DAC Chair's should diversify the staffing in their office.

There are also ideas on the table but yet to be discussed on improving policy coherence and engagement across the OECD and revising the name and branding of the committee to better represent the DAC's current focus.

We will continue to develop these proposals responding to feedback from consultations with partners, including from discussions at ECOSOC and aligning with emerging options from other workstreams.

4.2. Questions for consultations

- Would you welcome more systematic engagement with the DAC? If so, how can the DAC become a more inclusive forum? How can we design engagement in a way that is not overly resource intensive for your system?
- Are there any changes to the governance of the DAC that would support greater engagement with the Committee and its members? E.g. on meeting formats, participation in meetings, and/or availability of documents? What do you think of the existing options for improving the inclusivity of the committee?
- Do you perceive any risks of duplication with other international organisations? If so, what ones? How can we streamline and improve coherence?