

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE  
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE**

**Working Party on Statistics**

**59TH MEETING OF THE DAC WORKING PARTY ON STATISTICS**

**Summary Record**

**12-13 June 2008**

*This summary record is issued as FINAL following approval under the written procedure.*

*Modifcatons to paragraphs 13, 23 and 39 have been incorporated at the request of the Sweden, France and Germany respectively.*

Contact: Ms. Jean McDonald [jean.mcdonald@oecd.org]

**JT03250098**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format



**59<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE DAC WORKING PARTY ON STATISTICS**

**12-13 June 2008**

**Summary Record**

**Item 1: Election of Chair and Vice-Chairs**

1. The current Bureau members, Mr. Geert Deserranno of Belgium (Chair), Ms. Hedwig Riegler of Austria and Mr. Hitoshi Shoji of Japan (Vice-Chairs), were re-elected for the period up to the end of 2009.

**Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda**

2. The Agenda was adopted.

**Item 3: DAC List [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)9/REV1]**

3. The Secretariat (Mr. Scott) explained the methodology for updating the DAC List of ODA eligible countries, about which members had no comments. Pending the finalisation of World Bank 2007 GNI figures (expected in July), the DAC List of ODA Recipients will be submitted to the DAC for approval in the fall.

**Item 4: DAC and CRS Reporting [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)14 and DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)17]**

4. The Secretariat (Ms. Ahmad and Ms. Nichols) explained that it had spent the last year working on rationalising systems, simplifying procedures and preparing the databases for migration to SQL 2005. In this context, it reviewed the quality of the data it had received. The issues raised in the paper for discussion were not exhaustive, but related to topics which the Secretariat was focussing on trying to improve.

5. Members recognised the importance of good descriptive information in the CRS and will make efforts to improve reporting and incorporate keywords in long descriptions. The Secretariat will look into extending (possibly doubling) the length of the short description field which is currently limited to 72 characters to obtain more meaningful descriptive data. It will also draw up some specific guidelines for improving reporting on descriptions.

6. Denmark and Portugal will correct their CRS data on tying status of administrative costs, and other members reporting these costs as untied are asked to do likewise as the tying status of administrative costs is not reportable. Spain will discuss bilaterally with the Secretariat differences between its CRS data on tying status and DAC7b. Other Members are also invited to address discrepancies between their DAC and CRS reporting.

7. Members were asked to submit their complete DAC Questionnaires as soon as possible, preferably by the 15 July deadline and at latest by end-September. Members were also requested to complete their CRS reporting (especially those reporting in CRS++ format which is more lengthy to process) by end-September.

8. The Secretariat will produce a similar document next year addressing various DAC and CRS data quality issues and extend this to multilateral reporting as well. Members felt this exercise was useful and that the document could also be used by Members to exert pressure on other agencies providing data.

9. Members were requested to inform the Secretariat by 30 June of any inconsistencies they find in the CRS++ Guidelines, which will then be circulated for comment with tracked changes. A final version will be issued later this summer incorporating corrections. (The final document will be translated into French.)

10. A summary of the informal Workshop on Convergence (see Annex 1) was presented and members reiterated their offer to assist colleagues who wished to report in CRS++ format.

#### **Item 5: Rio Markers [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)20]**

11. The Secretariat (Ms. Gaveau) recalled the history of data collection on aid targeting the objectives of the Rio Conventions. She presented an overview of the current status of reporting on the Rio markers and drew attention to lack of data from Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway and the United States.

12. The trial period for collecting Rio markers through the CRS came to an end in 2007, and the meeting now agreed to incorporate the Rio markers in regular CRS reporting. Several countries undertook to improve their reporting on the markers. Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain and Sweden expressed support for the Rio markers because of their political importance and their usefulness in responding to international needs.

13. Members provided several additional comments. Norway, while supporting the adoption of the three Rio markers, better understood the need for a marker on climate change than for the other two markers. Sweden and the United States indicated that their reporting on markers would improve in future (the United States were migrating to a new framework that would enable improvements in marker reporting from 2007 flows onwards, including on desertification).

14. The Netherlands proposed to set up a joint Task Team with WP-STAT and ENVIRONET members to examine definitions and provide clarifications with a view to improving marker data quality. Austria and Norway expressed their interest in joining this group which could also discuss issues around the possible recording of aid to climate change adaptation. The issues raised by Austria (application of markers to sector budget support) and Canada (possibility for creating a purpose code dedicated to desertification) could also be considered by the proposed joint Task Team.

#### **Item 6: Channels of Delivery [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)8]**

15. Members approved the proposed single table structure that combines the agencies on Annex 2 of the DAC Directives with the channels of delivery. It was agreed that the Secretariat would incorporate changes to Annex 2 in the table and make it available for members to download in spreadsheet form. Using the single table as the basis, the Secretariat would update the DAC Statistical Reporting Directives and CRS channel code list posted on the web<sup>1</sup>.

16. The European Commission requested the deletion of the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office from the list as it is a department of the European Commission. They also suggested considering a new heading for the 42000 series (currently named European Commission) since the European Investment Bank was not subsidiary to the European Commission. The Secretariat followed up with the EC bilaterally and agreed on the heading European Union Institutions.

17. The United States proposed considering a further disaggregation of the 50000 "Other" series to distinguish, for example, between universities and for-profit institutions. The United States also suggested

---

1. See [www.oecd.org/dac/stats/dac/directives](http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/dac/directives) for Annex 2 and [www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs/directives](http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs/directives) for CRS channel codes.

a formal adoption of the “multilateral utilisation” factor, to which the Secretariat (Ms. Benn) commented that there was indeed a lot of demand for data on total flows routed through the multilateral system. Such statistics would become easier to produce with the new typology of aid, which included separate categories for core and earmarked contributions to multilateral organisations.

18. Denmark suggested adding to the table a unique serial number for each channel of delivery which would not change even if the channel code changed following a reclassification of the agency. The Secretariat (Ms. Smith) responded that it would look into this possibility.

19. The Secretariat (Mr. Scott) pointed out that the use of channel codes for statistical analysis was one of the advantages of the CRS++ system. In conjunction with the review of the use of individual channel codes scheduled for next year, it was agreed that the Secretariat would review the agencies in the 47000 series to ensure that their classification was still accurate and in due course examine the possibility of introducing new sub-categories e.g., foundations, universities.

#### **Item 7: Proposed Rules on the Frequency of Updates to Purpose Codes [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)18]**

20. The Secretariat (Ms. Benn) introduced the proposal for rules on the frequency of updates to purpose codes and explained how it had been modified since the WP-STAT informal meeting in March. In response to a question from Spain, she clarified that the reference to cost-benefit assessment meant an assessment to be carried out by the WP-STAT and not by the member making the proposal. Members confirmed the validity of the argumentation in paragraphs 3-8 of the paper (role of the WP-STAT, time lag in implementing changes to the sector classification, impact on historical time series, timetable). The proposed principles for updating purpose codes were modified during the meeting to take into account members' comments as follows:

21. First, it was agreed that WP-STAT would only consider proposals made by DAC members or DAC bodies. Proposals from outside (e.g., NGOs) would be examined only if they were supported by a member. Secondly, it was noted that proposals needed to include an exact identification of changes to codes and clarification notes and also suggest a mapping from existing to proposed new codes. Third, in order to maintain some flexibility, the rule concerning the implementation of changes affecting the sector code structure was modified from “every three years” to “normally every three years”. Finally, a new principle was added concerning the need to periodically review the list of purpose codes to ensure all codes were still useful and justified. In this context, the Secretariat (Ms. Benn) recalled such an exercise had been carried out in preparation for the major review of the sector classification in 1996. Another would be welcome, but needed to take into consideration the fact that purpose codes were being used also by the OECD Trade and Agriculture Directorate.

22. The final principles are attached as Annex 2. Austria suggested that the agreed principles to govern updates to purpose codes be made available in the form of a fact sheet. The United Kingdom thought the rules could be applied to other WP-STAT processes. The Secretariat (Mr. Scott) responded by noting that a similar procedure was already in place for Annex 2 but that other aspects of the Directives could also be looked at using the same approach.

#### **Item 8: Annex 2 [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)10 and DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)15]**

23. Members agreed with the Secretariat's recommendations (effective for 2008 reporting on 2007 flows) except for:

- AVU: This agency was no longer up for consideration as Canada withdrew its proposal.
- BEAC, BCEAO were not added to the List and the ECCB was removed from the List as earmarked developmental contributions to central banks are reportable as bilateral ODA. The

Secretariat would examine whether capital subscriptions to any of these banks would justify their inclusion on the List.

- Members agreed to add the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), which the Secretariat had not recommended, as they felt that all the activities carried out by the organisation were ODA-eligible.
- UNVFTC and UNVFVT: both organisations remained on the List.

In addition, the Secretariat would seek coefficients for the following agencies to be presented to the next WP-STAT meeting in June 2009 for approval:

- UNECE: the coefficient will only apply to extra-budgetary contributions as UNECE's core budget is decided every two years by the UN General Assembly. In the interim members may report any technical co-operation activities they provide for developing countries through UNECE as bilateral ODA.
- IAEA: the Secretariat will investigate coefficients for the IAEA and its TC Fund. In the interim, the IAEA will remain on the List but the specification will be changed to "(contributions to the Technical Co-operation Fund only)".
- UNFCCC: the Secretariat will investigate the feasibility of deriving a coefficient for UNFCCC (as well as UNCBD) which do not actually carry out activities but provide a framework for negotiations. In the meantime the UNFCCC remains on the List.
- UNESCO
- UNHCHR
- WHO
- EBRD (Denmark proposed this under Item 22 "Other Business").

Denmark and the EC would discuss whether contributions to the EDF should be subject to a coefficient, since a marginal share of its outflows are for the AU Peace Facility and do not qualify as ODA. They would provide feedback to the Secretariat on the conclusions of their discussions.

On the criteria to be adopted for revising Annex 2, the Secretariat would clarify its proposed thresholds for assessing coefficients, and invited members to provide written comments on these and on the other proposals in the paper.

The Secretariat would also send members a template for proposing new organisations.

#### **Item 9: GOVNET Proposal on Governance Codes [DCD/DAC/STAT/RD(2008)2/RD3]**

24. The Secretariat (Ms. Benn) explained that the GOVNET proposal on governance codes should have been presented for members' approval, but due to delay in producing the complete document, it was for information only. Once GOVNET had approved the proposal, it would be circulated to WP-STAT members for approval under the written procedure. Meanwhile members were invited to stay in touch with their GOVNET colleagues in the capitals.

25. The GOVNET coordinator (Mr. Bartsch) described the main changes compared to the original proposal presented at the WP-STAT informal meeting in March, thanking members for their comments. Members generally welcomed the latest GOVNET proposal, but asked for a mapping and timetable for implementation as provided in the principles they had just agreed on updating CRS purpose codes. Austria, Germany and the EC stated they found the level of detail appropriate (which had been their main concern with the original proposal). Canada was disappointed by the loss of the structure originally suggested ("clusters").

**Item 10: Purpose Code for Imputed Student Costs [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)11]**

26. The Secretariat (Ms. Benn) presented a proposal for classifying imputed student costs by sector of destination. The proposal was based on the existing reporting directives and the general principles of DAC sector coding, and it took into account the fact that imputed student costs were identified as a separate type of aid in the proposed new classification. In practice, the proposal requested members to i) attribute imputed student costs to sectors to the furthest possible extent; ii) report amounts that could not be allocated to sectors under multi-sector aid; and iii) classify the expenditure under the corresponding type of aid category. It would have an impact on historical data series on aid to education, minor at total DAC level but significant for five members.

27. Portugal stated it could not move imputed student costs from the education sector as the expenditures were administered through special agreements the aim of which was to foster higher education. Germany found the proposal acceptable except for revision of past years' data (this would cause discrepancies between DAC statistics and already published national data). France was of the view that separate identification of imputed student costs was not pertinent and would lead to treating members with different educational systems in an inequitable manner.

28. There was no agreement on the proposal. Given that only three members spoke, it was decided to request members to express their views by e-mail in preparation for further discussions at the next meeting. In the meantime, members should continue to use the code 11425 in their CRS++ reporting.

**Item 11: New Classification of Aid [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)12]**

29. The Secretariat (Ms. Benn and Ms. Gaveau) recalled the process through which the proposed new classification by types of aid had been developed, and the several iterations (four since October 2007) that members had been invited to comment on. A number of members made additional comments on the categories and clarification notes of the proposal. While some of these points were taken into account in the two successive revisions of the proposal circulated by the Secretariat during the meeting, it was acknowledged that others would need to be clarified when developing the directives and during tests (see below). Members agreed on the new classification by types of aid, as shown in Annex 3 (second revision circulated during the meeting).<sup>2</sup>

30. Reporting to the CRS/DAC according to the new classification by types of aid was planned to start in 2011 on 2010 flows. Japan noted it would be in a position to confirm this date only after testing the typology. In order to be ready for implementation in 2011, the Secretariat presented a schedule of tasks over 2008-2010: the Secretariat would work on a proposal to revise reporting forms and directives, including a new Table DAC1 and a mapping with its current version. Japan advised maintaining the revised Table DAC1 aggregates for free-standing technical co-operation (FTC) and humanitarian aid.

31. Members also agreed to rename the "sector programme" flag as "programme-based approach" and modify the definition accordingly (see Annex 3 of this document). In this regard, it was agreed that the judgement of whether or not an activity would qualify as "programme-based approach" would be made only by the member countries in accordance with the given definition and would not require confirmation by the partner countries (as is the case with the Monitoring Survey of the Paris Declaration).

---

2. Germany confirmed its agreement after the meeting.

## 32. Comments on the new classification by types of aid:

*Comments taken into account in the approved version*

- Budget support: Category A's title was changed to "budget support" following a suggestion from the United Kingdom. France indicated that it would have difficulties in differentiating between general and sector budget support.
- Equities: From the EC point of view, equities could be reported under B01 while in practice the Secretariat was only aware of project-type equities. In this case, there was no direct agreement between the donor and the partner country, and the clarification notes in B01 were amended accordingly.
- Imputed student costs: France pointed out that the new typology should classify imputed student costs the same way as scholarships, since both reflected in a similar manner donors' efforts to provide foreign students with access to universities (through imputed student costs when education systems were free, or through scholarships where students needed to pay tuition fees).

*Issues to clarify when developing the directives and during tests*

- Definition of experts costs: Several comments and questions from members highlighted the need to better define the experts' costs and harmonise the language throughout the typology (experts/consultants). A number of members had difficulties in distinguishing between **expert costs** to be reported under categories "projects" and "experts and other technical assistance" on the one hand, and the salaries component of **administrative costs** on the other hand. However, Germany called for a pragmatic reporting approach based on each member's knowledge of its own budgetary organisation (which separately records administrative costs).
- Basket funds: Denmark requested further refinement of this category, and possible split. The current clarification notes well reflected the "harmonisation" aspects of basket funds arrangements (donors work together), but not much the degree of "alignment" with recipients' procedures.
- Tracking various activities undertaken with civil society organisations: The issue of classifying "pooled funds for financing NGOs" was raised by Norway; "core support to local NGOs and community-based NGOs" was raised by Sweden. As suggested by the Netherlands, the Secretariat would include in the Directives a section presenting comprehensive indications on how the reporting system captured aid to and through NGOs (based on the typology and the channel codes).

*Other comments*

- As regards administrative costs, Canada pointed out the lack of comparability of reporting among members on these costs (see also Item 22). Following their suggestion the category's title was made more specific by adding "not included elsewhere". The Secretariat confirmed to Japan that it could report "appraisals and evaluations" under "administrative costs"; in their case, administrative costs may also include "in-house consultants".
- Canada insisted that the new typology should enable the development of a standard methodology for compiling data on *Country Programmable Aid*. It noted that the current category B03 mixed both CPA (e.g. Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund) and non-CPA (e.g. Education for all) contributions. (See also Item 19.)

**Item 12: ODA Reporting of Loans in non-donor Currencies [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)7]**

33. France presented a specific example of a loan extended to a recipient country (upon the latter's request) in local currency after hedging through a cross-currency swap. It illustrated the flows extended and received by France, and the proposed method for reporting based on the financial conditions of the flows in Euros.

34. Belgium, Germany, Japan and the United States supported France's proposition. Germany argued that the grant element calculation should be based on the opportunity cost for the donor, i.e. the flow in Euros. The United States indicated that OECD participants to the Arrangement had also adopted this measure. In addition, Germany and Japan highlighted the development objective of the operation that aimed at reducing the recipient's exchange risk. However, Denmark questioned the ODA-eligibility of these operations and would need to discuss the issue further with France, before it decided whether to join the consensus on France's proposal<sup>3</sup>.

**Item 13: Update on Contacts with UN on Improving Data on UN Aid Flows [DCD/DAC/STAT/RD(2008)2/RD2]**

35. UN-DESA (Ms. Carlson) and the Secretariat (Ms. Benn) informed members of ongoing work to improve data on UN operational activities for development. A major objective for this year was to clarify a number of definitional questions and prepare specific reporting guidance applicable to data collection on UN (and other multilateral) outflows. But there was also a need to review data on contributions to the UN. A comparison of UN-DESA and DAC statistics on core contributions to specific UN entities in 2006 had revealed differences in members' reporting on earmarked contributions. Questions had been raised recently on the application of ODA coefficients to core extra-budgetary funding.

36. The European Commission found the presentation very interesting and requested that future comparisons of UN-DESA and DAC statistics also cover contributions by the EC. The Chair noted the presentation had highlighted the benefits of CRS++ and said it was important that all members started reporting on the channel of delivery of aid. UN-DESA reminded members that their representatives in New York could press for better reporting by UN agencies, and saluted the efforts of Belgium and Switzerland to promote this.

**Item 14: Online Databases [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)16]**

37. The Secretariat (Ms. Ahmad and Mr. Tocatlian) presented the new "intelligent" user interface (still under development) for accessing international development statistics on-line and invited members to test the wizard (<http://webtestdmz.oecd.org/oecd-wizard/><sup>4</sup>) and provide comments.

---

3. Denmark subsequently informed the Secretariat that AFD had given an assurance that all loans to be covered by its proposal, as with all other French ODA loans, would be concessional in character, i.e. at terms significantly softer than the terms normally available for commercial transactions with less-developed countries. Based on this assurance, Denmark lifted its reserve.

4. Username (case sensitive): IDSWizard ; Password: DCD2008

**Item 15: Horizontal Water Programme [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)19 and DCD/DAC/STAT/RD(2008)2/RD4]**

38. The Secretariat (Ms. Gaveau) presented the draft outline of the Secretariat's study on aid to the water sector, and requested comments on figures shown in its Annexes 2 through 4 by the end of June.

39. UN-Water presented the proposal to introduce separate purpose codes for "water supply" and "sanitation". Members favoured having disaggregated data on water and sanitation in principle, but felt that, for practical reasons, the existing combined code should be retained (Austria, France, Germany and the Netherlands). Several members questioned the utility of a separate hygiene code (Austria, Norway and Sweden). Additional comments were made by the Netherlands (suggestion to discontinue the distinction between "small" and "large" systems) and Sweden (difficulty of recording components of sector programmes).

40. The United Kingdom and other interested members would prepare a revised proposal. Austria observed that the principles agreed for revising purpose codes would apply to this proposal.

**Item 16: Untying – Data Quality Issues [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)13]**

41. The Secretariat (Ms. Gordon) explained the statistical reporting and other issues that had been identified during the preparation of the Comprehensive Review of the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying ODA to the Least Developed Countries (LDCs). She drew attention to the incomplete reporting on tying status of technical co-operation activities to the LDCs and asked if the abolition of the thresholds of the Recommendation would cause reporting difficulties. Members would be contacted bilaterally to resolve some of these reporting issues. They were also invited to comment on the proposal to link *ex ante* notifications data to similar data reported to the CRS.

42. The Secretariat agreed to the request from Germany to revise the wording of footnote 4 of the Reference Indicator Matrix, presented in the Comprehensive Review, to align it with other similar footnotes in the table.

43. Japan stated that it did not accept the premise that untying always improved aid effectiveness. In its opinion, technical co-operation tied to the donor could lead to better capacity development of technical skills and know-how in the recipient country. On a practical note, Japan commented that its TC statistical system did not have the capacity to collect tying status data, and with around 50 000 TC projects per year, it would prove too much of a burden to provide this information for 2006 and future years. With respect to linking *ex ante* notifications to CRS data, Japan appreciated the idea but noted that in practice the main difficulty to overcome would be the difference in the point of measurement of the two sets of data.

44. The United States drew attention to the fact that Table DAC 7b had no relevance to the monitoring of the DAC Recommendation. In its view, transparency was better achieved through the notification of untied ODA projects to the *ex ante* Bulletin Board than through CRS reporting.

**Item 17: Programme of Work and Budget (PWB)**

45. Members were invited to comment on document DCD/DAC(2008)31/REV1 by 30 June. The Netherlands requested that the output items make more explicit reference to convergence.

**Item 18: Parallel Reporting Systems**

46. The Chair indicated he would set up an e-mail alert system between members to exchange information about parallel reporting systems.

### **Item 19: Scaling up**

47. The Secretariat (Ms. Steensen) presented the results of the 2008 Survey of Aid Allocation Policies and Indicative Forward Spending Plans published in May. The Survey had indicated an increase in country programmable aid (CPA) of USD 11.7 billion between 2005 and 2010. Even combined with the increase of USD 5 billion in net ODA in 2005 and the projected increase of around USD 4 billion in payments to IDA, AfDB, AsDB in 2010 (compared with 2005), this still left nearly USD 30 billion to be programmed if donors' commitments for 2010 were to be realised. Ms. Steensen also presented the schedule for the 2009 Survey which would cover forward spending plans up to 2011.

48. Participants commended the Secretariat for the Survey. On CPA, Canada called for a standardisation of the definition and its inclusion in standard statistical reporting, and noted that in its case the number of partner countries presented in the fragmentation analyses had been too high. Sweden informed the meeting that it had reduced the number of its partner countries from 91 to 66. The United Kingdom commented on the timing of the Survey, suggesting that the publication of its results be aligned with the publication of the Advance Questionnaire data. The Secretariat concluded that the concept of CPA was new and that the ongoing improvement in the statistical reporting would improve the CPA estimates (especially with regard to the exclusion of core funding resources to NGOs).

### **Item 20: FDI – New Benchmark Definition**

49. The Secretariat (Ms. Benn) informed members of the revision of the OECD Benchmark definition of foreign direct investment (FDI) which had been adopted by the OECD Council in May. The definition of FDI had not changed, so there were no direct implications on DAC statistics. However, there could be scope for using some elements of the Benchmark definition to clarify the reporting directives, including confidentiality rules. Furthermore, Ms. Benn recalled that work on CRS++ types of finance had not been completed and the optimal level of aggregation of CRS++ data on private flows remained to be discussed. The Secretariat would examine these issues later during the year.

### **Item 21: Date of Next Meeting**

50. The next formal WP-STAT meeting will be held on 10-11 June 2009. An informal meeting may be held in February 2009; if so, the Bureau and the Secretariat will propose dates by 1 December 2008.

### **Item 22: Any Other Business**

- Peacekeeping missions [DCD/DAC/STAT/RD(2008)2/RD1]: on the proposal of Austria, the Secretariat would examine the current universe of peace operations as well as members' reporting on them to provide clarification and guidance on reporting.
- ODA-eligibility of the EBRD's Shareholder Fund [DCD/DAC/STAT/RD(2008)2/RD5]: The Secretariat would provide, for consideration by the next meeting, comments on Spain's proposal on ODA reporting of EBRD's use of its own resources for two special funds.
- Canada would consult with other members to seek best practice in the reporting of expert costs. Canada would also consult with Austria, EC and the Secretariat on the possibility of developing a global measure of administrative costs, for better comparisons among members.
- The United States informed members that two major World Bank climate funds were being established. The ODA-eligibility of contributions to these funds would need to be decided next year.

## **Annex 1**

### **Informal workshop on CRS++ reporting**

#### **How to get started?**

**Paris, 11 June 2008**

The informal workshop began with a general introduction by Yasmin Ahmad and a *tour de table* for participants to introduce themselves. Hedi Riegler, a member of the Task Team on convergence, spoke about the history of converged reporting, and Cécile Sangaré presented the basics of CRS++ reporting. Two members who have converged, Stine Thomassen of Norway and Kimberly Smith formerly representing the United States, shared their experience on the process with the group. The presentations highlighted the main differences between standard CRS reporting and CRS++ and pointed out the main advantages of converged reporting which are to harmonise DAC and CRS reporting, obtain a better coverage of activity level data and simplify CRS reporting by introducing one format (CRS++) versus two (CRS Form 1 and Form 2).

During the discussions which followed, members shared their concerns about certain technical and resource issues. Clarifications were sought on a number of issues, including the level of aggregation for different types of flows, how to deal with data from external sources, and how to report core contributions to multilateral agencies and NGOs. Questions about requirements and timeliness and frequency of reporting were also raised.

The updated Guidelines for reporting in CRS++ format [DCD/DAC/STAT(2008)17] contain detailed technical information on CRS++ reporting. The Secretariat will send participants and interested members the SQL code it developed to derive the DAC tables from the CRS++ data during the summer once it has improved the procedures in question. The Secretariat, along with members who have already converged, will be happy to work together with participants interested in embarking on CRS++ reporting.

## **Annex 2**

### ***Principles for updating purpose codes***

- Proposals by DAC members or DAC bodies for updates to purpose codes are considered by WP-STAT as and when the need arises.
- For a proposal to be submitted for approval in a formal meeting of WP-STAT in June, it should be transmitted to the Secretariat by 31 January at the latest. The proposal should clearly justify the need for change and examine the impact of the change on time series, so as to provide sufficient information to the WP-STAT for assessing the net cost-benefit. Proposals must include an exact identification of changes to codes and clarification notes, and a mapping from existing to proposed new codes.
- Purpose codes should normally not be moved from one sector to another. Changes that affect the sector code structure should remain exceptional.
- When approving a proposal, the WP-STAT decides on its date of effect. In general, this will be 1 January of the following year, except for changes that affect the structure of the list (types 4 and 5 above) that can be implemented less frequently (normally every three years).
- The WP-STAT will periodically review the list of purpose codes to ensure that all codes are still useful and justified.

### Annex 3

#### Agreed classification by types of aid for reporting to the CRS/DAC

*The proposed classification is applicable to all ODA, i.e. bilateral ODA (grants, equities, loans) and multilateral ODA contributions.*

Type	Sub-type	Description	Clarification
A		<b>Budget support</b>	For contributions under this category, the donor relinquishes the exclusive control of its funds by sharing the responsibility with the recipient.
	A01	<b>General budget support</b>	<p>Unearmarked contributions to the government budget including funding to support the implementation of macroeconomic reforms (structural adjustment programmes, poverty reduction strategies).</p> <p>Budget support is a method of financing a recipient country's budget through a transfer of resources from an external financing agency to the recipient government's national treasury. The funds thus transferred are managed in accordance with the recipient's budgetary procedures. Funds transferred to the national treasury for financing programmes or projects managed according to different budgetary procedures from those of the recipient country, with the intention of earmarking the resources for specific uses, are therefore excluded.</p>
	A02	<b>Sector budget support</b>	Sector budget support, like general budget support, is a financial contribution to a recipient government's budget. However, in sector budget support, the dialogue between donors and partner governments focuses on sector-specific concerns, rather than on overall policy and budget priorities.
B		<b>Core contributions and pooled programmes and funds</b>	For contributions under this category, the donor relinquishes the exclusive control of its funds by sharing the responsibility with other stakeholders (other donors, NGOs, multilateral institutions, Public Private Partnerships). The category covers both core contributions (B01 and B02), and pooled contributions with a specific earmarking (B03 and B04).
	B01	<b>Core support to NGOs, other private bodies, PPPs and research institutes</b>	<p>Funds are paid over to NGOs (local, national and international) for use at the latter's discretion, and contribute to programmes and activities which NGOs have developed themselves, and which they implement on their own authority and responsibility. Core contributions to PPPs, funds paid over to foundations (e.g. philanthropic foundations), and contributions to research institutes (public and private) are also recorded here.</p> <p>Annex 2 of the DAC Directives provides a list of INGOs, PPPs and networks core contributions to which may be reported under B01. This list is not exclusive.</p>
	B02	<b>Core contributions to multilateral institutions</b>	<p>These funds are classified as multilateral ODA (all other categories fall under bilateral ODA). The recipient multilateral institution pools contributions so that they lose their identity and become an integral part of its financial assets.</p> <p>See Annex 2 of the DAC Directives for a comprehensive list of agencies core contributions to which may be reported under B02 (<i>Section 1. Multilateral institutions</i>).</p>

	<b>B03</b>	<b>Contributions to specific-purpose programmes and funds managed by international organisations (multilateral, INGO)</b>	In addition to their core-funded operations, international organisations set up and raise funds for specific programmes and funds with clearly identified sectoral, thematic or geographical focus. Donors' bilateral contributions to such programmes and funds are recorded here, e.g. "UNICEF girls' education", "Education For All Fast Track Initiative", various trust funds, including for reconstruction (e.g. Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund).
	<b>B04</b>	<b>Basket funds/pooled funding</b>	The donor contributes funds to an autonomous account, managed jointly with other donors and/or the recipient. The account will have specific purposes, modes of disbursement and accountability mechanisms, and a limited time frame.  Basket funds are characterised by common project documents, common funding contracts and common reporting/audit procedures with all donors.  Donors' contributions to funds managed autonomously by international organisations are recorded under B03.
<b>C</b>		<b>Project-type interventions</b>	<b>N.B. Within this category, members able to do so are requested to report the aggregate amount used for financing donor experts/consultants on Table DAC1.<sup>1</sup> Where the activity consists solely of experts' costs, report under category D.</b>
	<b>C01</b>	<b>Project-type interventions</b>	A project is a set of inputs, activities and outputs, agreed with the partner country*, to reach specific objectives/outcomes within a defined time frame, with a defined budget and a defined geographical area. Projects can vary significantly in terms of objectives, complexity, amounts involved and duration. There are smaller projects that might involve modest financial resources and last only a few months, whereas large projects might involve more significant amounts, entail successive phases and last for many years. A large project with a number of different components is sometimes referred to as a programme, but should nevertheless be recorded here.  Feasibility studies, appraisals and evaluations are included (whether designed as part of projects/programmes or dedicated funding arrangements).  Aid channelled through NGOs or multilaterals is also recorded here. This includes payments for NGOs and multilaterals to implement donors' projects and programmes, and funding of specified NGOs projects. By contrast, core funding of NGOs and multilaterals as well as contributions to specific-purpose funds managed by international organisations are recorded under B.  * In the cases of equity investments, humanitarian aid or aid channelled through NGOs, projects are recorded here even if there was no direct agreement between the donor and the partner country.

<b>D</b>		<b>Experts and other technical assistance</b>	This category covers the provision, outside projects as described in category C, of know-how in the form of personnel, training and research.
	<b>D01</b>	<b>Donor country personnel</b>	Experts, consultants, teachers, academics, researchers, volunteers and contributions to public and private bodies for sending experts to developing countries.
	<b>D02</b>	<b>Other technical assistance</b>	Provision, outside projects as described in category C01, of technical assistance in recipient countries (excluding technical assistance performed by donor experts reported under D01, and scholarships/training in donor country reported under E01).  This includes training and research; language training; south-south studies; research studies; collaborative research between donor and recipient universities and organisations); local scholarships; development-oriented social and cultural programmes. This category also covers ad hoc contributions such as conferences, seminars and workshops, exchange visits, publications, etc.
<b>E</b>		<b>Scholarships and student costs in donor countries</b>	
	<b>E01</b>	<b>Scholarships/training in donor country</b>	Financial aid awards for individual students and contributions to trainees.
	<b>E02</b>	<b>Imputed student costs</b>	Indirect ("imputed") costs of tuition in donor countries.
<b>F</b>		<b>Debt relief</b>	
	<b>F01</b>	<b>Debt relief</b>	Groups all actions relating to debt (forgiveness, conversions, swaps, buy-backs, rescheduling, refinancing).
<b>G</b>		<b>Administrative costs not included elsewhere</b>	
	<b>G01</b>	<b>Administrative costs not included elsewhere</b>	Administrative costs of development assistance programmes not already included under other ODA items as an integral part of the costs of delivering or implementing the aid provided. This category covers situation analyses and auditing activities.  As regards the salaries component of administrative costs, it relates to in-house agency staff and contractors only; costs associated with donor experts/consultants are to be reported under category C or D01.
<b>H</b>		<b>Other in-donor expenditures</b>	Groups a number of contributions that do not give rise to a cross-border flow.
	<b>H01</b>	<b>Development awareness</b>	Funding of activities designed to increase public support, i.e. awareness in the donor country of development co-operation efforts, needs and issues.
	<b>H02</b>	<b>Refugees in donor countries</b>	Official sector expenditures for the sustenance of refugees in donor countries during the first twelve months of their stay.

1. Reporting on donor experts remains optional.

**Participants list for DAC Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT)/Liste des participants pour Groupe de travail sur les statistiques du CAD (GT-STAT)**

**12/6/2008 - 13/6/2008**

**Chair/Président**

**M. Geert DESERRANNO**

*Conseiller de la Coopération Internationale -  
Président du Groupe de travail du CAD sur les  
statistiques (GT-STAT)  
Délégation Permanente de la Belgique*

**Australia/Australie**

**Ms. Michelle HART**

*AusAID*

**Austria/Autriche**

**Ms. Hedwig RIEGLER**

*Head of Unit  
Austrian Development Agency - ADA*

**Ms. Eva BELABED**

*Counsellor for Social Affairs  
Permanent Delegation*

**Ms. Ursula HEINRICH**

*Head of the Development Information and  
Communication Unit  
Federal Ministry for European and International  
Affairs*

**Belgium/Belgique**

**Mr. Antoon VAN BROECKHOVEN**

**Canada/Canada**

**Ms. Sylvie CHARLEBOIS**

*Canadian International Development Agency*

**Mr. Hubert DROLET**

*Manager/Gestionnaire  
Canadian International Development Agency*

**Mr. Francois TURGEON**

*Gestionnaire  
Information Stratégique  
Canadian International Development Agency*

**Czech Republic/République Tchèque**

**Milan KONRAD**

**Ms. Dagmar SILNA**

*Ministry of Finance*

**Denmark/Danemark**

**Mr. Lars Bruun RASMUSSEN**

*Head of Section  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Ole CHRISTOFFERSEN**

*Chargé d'affaires  
Permanent Delegation*

**Finland/Finlande**

**Ms. Sari LEHTIRANTA**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Ramses MALATY**

*Administrator, Statistics  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Antti RYTKÖNEN**

*Chief Administrator, Statistics  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**France/France**

**Ms. Christine BERNARD-KAZANDJIAN**

*Ministère de l'Economie, de l'Industrie et de  
l'Emploi*

**M. Eric BORDES**

*Agence Française de Développement - AFD*

**Mme Annie FAVEREAU**

*Chargée de mission  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères*

**M. François MARION**

*Chef de Bureau  
Aide au développement, institutions multilatérales  
Ministère de l'Economie, de l'Industrie et de  
l'Emploi*

**Mlle. Véronique VERDEIL**

*Chargée de Mission  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et Européennes*

**Germany/Allemagne**

**Ms. Melanie LEIDEL**

*Federal Statistical Office*

**Ms. Annika WANDSCHER**

*Deputy Head of Division  
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and  
Development (BMZ)*

**Greece/Grèce**

**PERIKLIS SIGALAS**

*First Expert Counsellor  
Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs YDAS 3  
(HELLENIC AID)*

**Ms. Panagiota TSIRKA**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Ireland/Irlande**

**Mr. Keith GRISTOCK**

*Senior Development Specialist  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Italy/Italie**

**Mr. Fabio CASSESE**

*First Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Japan/Japon**

**Mr. Yoshitaka HOSHINO**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Toru YOSHIDA**

*Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Masahiro HORIUCHI**

*Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Hiroyasu MORITA**

*Deputy Director  
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI)*

**Mr. Hitoshi SHOJI**

*Advisor  
Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)*

**Korea/Corée**

**Mr. Hyunsoo YUN**

*First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Dong-Hun LEE**

*Deputy Director  
EDCF Planning Office  
The Export-Import Bank of Korea*

**Miss Eunoh CHANG**

*Manager  
Development Cooperation  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade*

**Ms. Sae-bom KWON**

*Assitant Manager  
Policy Planning Research & Int'l Organization  
Korea International Cooperation Agency*

**Mr. Song Yun PARK**

*Deputy Director  
Paris Representative Office  
The Export-Import Bank of Korea*

**Luxembourg/Luxembourg**

**M. Marc PADJAN**

*Ministère des Affaires Etrangères*

**M. Georges TERNES**

*Secrétaire de Légation  
Ministère des Affaires étrangères*

**Netherlands/Pays-Bas**

**Ms. Judith VAN DER LEUR**

*MFA*

**Mr. Pim VAN DER MALE**

*Senior Policy Officer  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

<b>Rasmus GEDDE-DAHL</b>	<b>Norway/Norvège</b> <i>Adviser</i> <i>Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs</i>
<b>Mr. Sven SKAARE</b>	<i>Adviser</i> <i>Department for Quality Assurance</i> <i>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation - NORAD</i>
<b>Ms. Stine THOMASSEN</b>	<i>Adviser</i> <i>Department for Quality Assurance</i> <i>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</i>
<b>Mr. Vegard HOLE</b>	<i>Higher Executive Officer</i> <i>Ministry of Finance</i>
<b>Mr. Piotr DERWICH</b>	<b>Poland/Pologne</b> <i>First Counsellor</i> <i>Permanent Delegation</i>
<b>Adam WOJCZULIS</b>	<i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</i>
<b>Mme Edite SINGENS</b>	<b>Portugal/Portugal</b> <i>Chefe de Divisão Planeamento e Programação</i> <i>Institute for Portuguese Development Aid (IPAD)</i>
<b>Mr. Libor GULA</b>	<b>Slovak Republic/République slovaque</b> <i>Second Secretary</i> <i>Permanent Delegation</i>
<b>Mr. Carlos ASENJO RUIZ</b>	<b>Spain/Espagne</b> <i>Acting Head, Statistics Unit</i> <i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation</i>
<b>Mr. Jorge SEOANE PLATAS</b>	<i>Directorate-General of Development Policy</i> <i>Planning and Evaluation</i> <i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation</i>
<b>Ms. Camilla GRUBBSTRÖM</b>	<b>Sweden/Suède</b> <i>Statistician</i> <i>Sida</i>
<b>Ms. Linn OHLSSON</b>	<i>Desk officer</i> <i>Ministry for Foreign Affairs</i>
<b>Mr. Franck RASMUSSEN</b>	<i>Sida</i>
<b>Ms. Karin SNELLMAN</b>	<i>Desk Officer</i> <i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</i>

<b>Mme Catherine GRAF</b>	<b>Switzerland/Suisse</b> <i>Service statistique</i> <i>Direction du développement et de la coopération</i>
<b>Mr. Hikmet OZDENOGLU</b>	<b>Turkey/Turquie</b> <i>Expert</i> <i>Permanent Delegation</i>
<b>Mr. Kenneth OSBORNE</b>	<b>United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni</b> <i>Senior Statistics Adviser</i> <i>Department for International Development</i>
<b>Mr. William MCCORMICK</b>	<b>United States/États-Unis</b> <i>Financial Economist</i> <i>US Agency for International Development (USAID)</i>
<b>Ms. Jennifer POWELL-TORRES</b>	<i>Senior Economist</i> <i>US Agency for International Development</i>
<b>M. Franco CONZATO</b>	<b>EC/CE</b> <i>Conseiller</i> <i>Délégation Permanente</i>
<b>Mr. Vincent CARTON</b>	<i>European Commission</i>
<b>Ms. Stella COSTA-SANTOS</b>	<i>Head of Sector Budget and Reporting</i> <i>European Commission</i>
<b>Ms. Estrella RODRIGUEZ</b>	<i>European Commission</i>
<b>Ms. Beverley CARLSON</b>	<b>UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)/Département des affaires économiques et sociales des Nations Unies (DAES)</b>
<b>Mr. Keith KELLEY</b>	<b>Other/Autre</b> <i>The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</i>
<b>Mr. Johan KUYLENSTIERNA</b>	<i>UN-Water</i>
<b>Mr. Simon SCOTT</b>	<b>OECD/OCDE</b> <i>Head of Division</i> <i>DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Ms. Yasmin AHMAD</b>	<i>Principal Administrator</i> <i>DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mr. Mark BALDOCK</b>	<i>Data Management Advisor</i> <i>DCD/STAT</i>

<b>Mr. Sebastian BARTSCH</b>	<i>Administrator DCD/POL</i>
<b>Ms. Julia BENN</b>	<i>Senior Policy Analyst DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mme Elena BERNALDO</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>
<b>M. Olivier BOURET</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mme Valérie GAVEAU</b>	<i>Administrator DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Ms. Ann GORDON</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mr. Brian HAMMOND</b>	<i>Counsellor to the Director's office on Aid Architecture DCD</i>
<b>Ms. Jean MCDONALD</b>	<i>Assistant DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Ms. Aimée NICHOLS</b>	<i>Administrator DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mme Cécilia PIEMONTE</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mme Cécile SANGARE</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mrs. Kimberly SMITH</b>	<i>Administrator DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Ms. Suzanne STEENSEN</b>	<i>Administrator DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mr. Andrzej SUCHODOLSKI</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Mme Valérie THIELEMANS</b>	<i>Principal Technical Assistant DCD/STAT</i>
<b>M. Marc TOCATLIAN</b>	<i>Administrator DCD/STAT</i>
<b>Ms. Ann ZIMMERMAN</b>	<i>Statistician DCD/STAT</i>