

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

**Working Party on Statistics**

**Draft Summary Record of the Informal WP-STAT meeting**

**2-3 February 2009, OECD Conference Centre**

*The attached summary record is submitted for approval under the written procedure. A list of participants is included.*

*The record will be considered FINAL unless corrections are received by 31 March 2009.*

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

**JT03261671**



**WP-STAT Informal meeting on 2 February 2009**

**Item 1. Implementing the new typology of aid: Proposal for a revised Table DAC1**

1. Members generally supported the revision of lines (new types of aid), but some were concerned with the complexity of introducing types of finance in columns. The Secretariat would send members alternative versions of the proposed new Table DAC 1 by mid-February for comment by 2 March. One version would simplify the columns to a grant/non-grant format; the other would follow the old structure of presenting ODA grants and loans in rows.<sup>1</sup> The next draft to be presented to the WP-STAT in May would also more clearly distinguish between optional memo items and compulsory main aggregates other than those based on the type of aid classification. Members were reminded that the existing Table DAC 1 and all other currently required reporting, including the Advance Questionnaire, needed to be filed until the new classification enters into force in 2011.

***Members' specific comments on the proposed revised Table DAC 1:***

*Types of aid in lines and types of finance in columns*

- Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the EC, Finland, Greece and Japan expressed their support for the revised layout of Table DAC 1. Most of these members also underlined its suitability to meet internal demands and its alignment with the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA).
- Germany and Switzerland had concerns over introducing types of finance in columns. Germany thought that, for the purpose of clarity, major aggregates should remain in lines. Switzerland noted that conversion of historical data was problematic.
- Canada and Germany requested to maintain one column for total gross disbursements.
- Several members commented on the use of Table DAC 1. Some used the table as a snapshot of their aid activities, and shared it with the outside world. Canada joined the United States in commenting that the revised table would be too technical for such use, as it added a degree of complexity which the public at large may not understand. The United States suggested that merging tables DAC 1 and DAC 5 would offer a better presentation for public use, which was seconded by Finland. Other members commented that they did not use table DAC 1 for dissemination purposes, and that different presentations had to be separately developed to meet public needs.

*Memo items*

2. Main aggregates other than those based on the type of aid classification, presented as "Memo items for bilateral ODA" in the proposal (M1.1 to M3.2), should be renamed to avoid confusion between various types of memo items. Answering a question from Japan, the Secretariat explained that reporting on "experts costs included in projects" was optional while all the other memo items were compulsory. This distinction would be made clear in the next draft.

---

<sup>1</sup> A third version was also sent to members, presenting ODA grants and loans in rows, but preserving all debt operations under one single heading.

*Humanitarian aid*

3. Belgium wished to reconsider the agreement of classifying humanitarian aid as a sector rather than as a type of aid as this conflicted with their internal reporting system. It suggested creating a new flag to catch this item. Germany was not in favour of reopening this discussion, and the Secretariat advised against the creation of a flag, as such data were less reliable than those collected based on sector codes.

*Equity, portfolio and direct investment*

4. Answering a remark from Germany, the Secretariat explained that the new column “portfolio and direct investment” was intended to cover ODA-eligible equities. The terminology used in current Table DAC 1 regarding equity, portfolio, and direct investment needed to be corrected and homogenised with existing international definitions.

*Implications of the new types of aid on the Table DAC 5*

- Austria observed that the new types of aid also needed to be reflected in the columns of table DAC 5. The Secretariat suggested these columns could simply be abolished, given the availability of the information from CRS and CRS++ reporting.
- Members signalled the need to clean up overlaps in classifications: a number of current sectors were now captured as types of aid, and would need to be removed from the list of sectors. Austria mentioned that this would allow recording “core contributions to NGOs active in humanitarian aid” under the purpose category “humanitarian aid”. Canada suggested that general budget support be recorded under “multisector” rather than “unspecified”.

*Timing*

5. Full implementation is planned for 2010 flows in 2011. Before that date, members are requested to report Table DAC 1 in its current format (although they are encouraged to also provide test reporting in the revised format).

- Germany confirmed the date of 2011;
- Greece will be able to report new types of aid in its CRS++ reporting on 2009 flows;
- The EC will report 2009 data according to new types of aid both in CRS++ and Table DAC 1.

***Members’ specific comments on the proposed validation procedure for CRS++ reporting:***

6. Members welcomed the proposed table for validating CRS++ reporting, and made suggestions to refine the procedure suggested by the Secretariat.

*Validation table*

- As for the proposed revised Table DAC 1, Germany was not in favour of having types of finance in columns. It also suggested the addition of a number of sector aggregates on this table.
- The reporting on the tying status of FTC under the memo item “Untied for LDCs and non-LDC HICPs, including FTC” was perceived as going beyond agreed reporting requirements by Greece

and Japan. The Secretariat however confirmed that this information was indeed mandatory and required for monitoring the Untying Recommendation (see paragraph 67 of the CRS Directives).

#### *Validation process*

7. Several members requested that the DAC tables that would be compiled by the Secretariat from CRS++ reporting should be sent to them in advance for comment and validation. The United States stated that they would continue producing these tables for their own internal purposes, even if they were no longer required by the Secretariat.

#### *Advance Questionnaire*

8. Members suggested that the production of the Advance Questionnaire could follow the same procedure as the main Questionnaire. Austria and the United States recalled their successful experience in reporting preliminary data through CRS++ that allowed the Secretariat to compile their advanced Questionnaire. At this point, the Secretariat was unsure how these provisional CRS++ data could be treated and if they should be entered in the database.

### **Item 2. Criteria and procedures for making changes to the List of ODA-eligible international organisations**

9. The Secretariat would revise its proposal taking account of the following points:

- Regarding agencies with normative functions, while the development of world-wide norms would normally not be reportable as ODA, help to developing countries in implementing these norms would be eligible, provided the norms served developmental objectives. Assessing the ODA-eligibility of agencies with normative functions will focus primarily on their mandate and activities, especially where they have a limited operational programme.
- Voluntary core contributions would be included in the calculation of ODA shares, and any resulting coefficient would apply equally to these contributions.
- Any procedures on calculating ODA coefficients needed to balance costs and benefits, recognising the substantial workload that coefficients implied for the Secretariat, members, and affected agencies. Coefficients should avoid giving a spurious impression of precision. Drawing on members' comments and a proposal by Spain to the meeting, the Secretariat will, by early March, send members revised suggestions on thresholds for applying coefficients.
- Whenever the new guidelines for amending the list came into effect, any revisions, including those affecting agencies already on the list, would still need to be agreed on a consensus basis. Eventual revisions would focus first on the largest agencies.
- There may need to be flexibility in the timing of implementation of decisions, especially where agencies were removed from the list, or where they changed category on the list.
- The template would be revised to ensure that proposals for changes to the list contained adequate information. Where agencies were resubmitted after a previous rejection, the proposing member would be invited to specify the reasons justifying reconsideration. Sufficient data would need to be provided on the agencies' mandates, activities and partners, and the date of creation or change of status of an organisation would be requested.

10. In discussing the ODA-eligibility of agencies with normative functions, a few members referred to UNFCCC as a developmentally highly relevant agency which should not be excluded from the List, while others stressed the relevance of human rights organisations. The Secretariat (Mr. Scott) pointed out the change in sentiment regarding the ODA eligibility of the latter. WP-STAT had previously decided that human rights organisations would not be added on the List but last year made a request for this issue to be reconsidered, given that such agencies could focus on developing countries. Germany and Austria pointed out a contradiction in DCD/DAC/STAT(2009)2, paragraph 10 with regard to the point that agencies funded with assessed contributions should in theory not qualify as fully ODA-eligible. Austria referenced UNIDO which was financed solely with assessed contributions and was currently on Annex 2 as 100 per cent ODA-eligible agency. The Secretariat noted it would take this into consideration in future drafts.

11. In response to a question raised by Japan regarding the arithmetic justification for the 75% percent threshold for applying coefficients, the Secretariat (Mr. Scott) explained that indeed the number was arbitrary but that it did have some basis in other DAC statistical methodologies (i.e. Recommendation on Terms and Conditions of Aid). He further pointed out that with a threshold, less work was needed to determine if an agency fell above or below the threshold compared to calculating a specific coefficient. Members expressed the need to weigh the cost-benefit of a complex system that would result in a proliferation of coefficients, as these were administratively time consuming to maintain. The United States supported the proposals in theory but cautioned that they may be hard to implement in practice. The UK suggested introducing a discrete set of coefficients based on more subjective assessment of the organisations development focus, irrespective of size.

12. There was a discussion around possibly examining changes to Annex 2 at the informal meeting and submitting the outcome for approval via the written procedure, but no consensus emerged on this issue.

### **Item 3. Progress in multilateral agencies' reporting to the DAC**

13. The Secretariat agreed to circulate the web links to its information notes on the methods used to calculate imputed multilateral flows<sup>2</sup>, and deflators<sup>3</sup> for resource flows. Members were urged to press the governing boards of major multilateral agencies, such as the World Bank, to provide timely and complete reporting in DAC systems. In its sector analyses, the Secretariat also imputes multilateral aid by sector. It stressed that imputed figures could only be estimates, since inter alia they applied the developmental shares of previous agency expenditure to members' current contributions. Members stressed the importance of having a standard methodology for imputing multilateral aid by sector.

### **Item 4. Purpose codes for water supply and sanitation**

Members gave wide support to the proposal. The Secretariat suggested deleting the words "Aggregated code for" from codes 14020 and 14030, and Austria wished further explanation be provided for Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM). Canada would also provide by e-mail suggestions for a few changes to the clarification notes. Norway was against keeping the mixed codes as this was in contradiction with the coding principle to record mixed projects under their main component, but it would not block consensus on this proposal. Germany stated that implementation could take place for 2010 flows only, not 2009. The proposing members (Austria and United Kingdom) will present final suggestions to the May meeting for approval.

---

2. Available at: [www.oecd.org/document/54/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_34485\\_41037110\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/54/0,3343,en_2649_34485_41037110_1_1_1_1,00.html).

3. Available at: [www.oecd.org/document/6/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_34485\\_41007110\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/6/0,3343,en_2649_34485_41007110_1_1_1_1,00.html).

**Item 5. Updates on ongoing work (for substantive discussion in May 2009)**

*Clarification of reporting directives with regard to UN peace missions*

14. The Secretariat informed members of planned next steps: i) compile existing definitions for these missions (delegated/integrated/mandated); ii) review members' 2007 reporting in this field to assess comparability of data and variations in the interpretation of definitions; iii) examine peace missions mandated by the UN and executed by others. The findings would be presented in a paper for consideration by the WP-STAT in May.

*Statistics on Tying Status of aid*

15. The Secretariat (Mr. Lammersen, DCD/PRG) reported on recent informal DAC meetings on untying during which the implementation of AAA, including donors' commitment to improve tying status reporting and their plans to further untie aid, had been discussed.

16. In the context of improving the quality of statistics on the tying status of aid, the Secretariat (Ms. Nichols, DCD/STAT) noted the need to clarify reporting instructions through a complete review and revision of the directives, taking account of linkages with the new classification of aid. Members were invited to embark on a discussion about new instructions and share their views on how to improve reporting on tying status. The Secretariat stated that it would aim to submit a basis for discussion in writing before the end of the year.

17. Members confirmed the need to clarify the directives on tying status reporting, taking into account the new classification of aid.

- Austria collected tying status on technical co-operation projects and reported it as part of its CRS++ submission, although the quality of the tying information was questionable. It felt that comparability of data between members should be improved through better guidance on definitions (Table DAC7b items "directly" and "not directly" financing imports) and on linkages between types of aid, procurement practices and tying status.
- Canada in its room document asked for a clarification of the directives on tying status reporting requirements with regard to in donor expenses, development awareness and refugee costs. In its view, the concept of tying was mainly for value for goods, and all in-donor expenditures should be exempt from tying status reporting.
- France noted the potential for confusion between the various official documents related to tying status that all led to different statistics: 2001 DAC Untying Recommendation (LDCs), AAA recommendation for untying (HIPCs), CRS Directives, DAC Directives for Table DAC7b. It requested the relations between these various documents and statistics to be clarified.
- Germany stated that 10% of its reporting did not cover tying status, adding that the concept of tying status was foreign to people not working on the development scene. It suggested that a one page explanation to the outside world and smaller reporters on the concept of tying status would help in this regard. It also suggested an inspection of types of aid could be useful to see what is tied or untied by nature and to exclude these from analysis.
- Spain also suggested the need for a paper to clarify what is tied or untied. At present they were not able to report on tying status and considered this a political problem rather than a technical one.

18. The United States expressed concerns over Table DAC 7b as a measurement of members' actual untying efforts and suggested looking at other avenues of measurement such as the ex ante untied notification Bulletin Board.

***Rio Markers***

19. Austria, Canada, Denmark<sup>4</sup>, Finland, Germany, Norway and the UK notified their intention to participate in the joint task team that would review the quality of Rio marker data and propose ways to identify activities in support of climate change adaptation. Others may also participate. The first meeting would take place on 7 May.

***Sector study on aid to agriculture***

20. The Secretariat will during the spring request members to validate their reported data on aid to agriculture so as to produce a sector study on this topic. This work would contribute to the OECD Horizontal programme on *High food prices*, and to related discussions planned this year at the DAC High Level Meeting and OECD Ministerial Council Meeting.

---

4. Denmark's participation remains to be confirmed.

## ANNEX I

### **WP-STAT Workshop on convergence and on-line databases on 3 February 2009**

#### **Action Points**

##### **Aid effectiveness, the Accra Agenda for Action and the International Aid Transparency Initiative**

The Secretariat (Mr. Mizrahi, DCD/EFF) informed members of the evolution of aid effectiveness work, especially since Accra, and suggested areas in which WP-STAT expertise might be able to contribute. The Chair reported on his contacts with Aidinfo and suggested that (i) all members needed to move to high-quality CRS++ reporting, (ii) these data might be provided to aid effectiveness co-ordinators in recipient countries, (iii) a training session could be offered on DAC statistical products for the co-ordinators and CSOs. The Secretariat (Mr Hammond) stressed the need to improve the timeliness, completeness and quality of data, improve project descriptions, and make full use of the channel of delivery codes. Some members expressed concern at a proliferation of “transparency initiatives” that they felt risked “reinventing the wheel”. More detailed information ultimately required more work and effort from desk and field officers, and the cost-benefit of this needed to be carefully considered.

##### **Convergence**

Thirteen members reported their total ODA in CRS++ format on 2007 flows. Japan and Portugal notified their intentions to move to CRS++ reporting in 2010 and 2011 respectively. Some work was necessary to clarify negative disbursements on grants, and to try to improve the links between commitment and disbursement project numbers.

##### **Secretariat missions to capitals to advance convergence and the implementation of the new typology**

Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ireland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland requested Secretariat statistical missions. All members that expressed an interest in receiving a mission should send a short note to the Secretariat specifying their needs and timing. The Chair invited all other members to consider asking for assistance in convergence and new classification by types of aid. The Secretariat announced that it would set up a SharePoint site for exchanging experience and ideas on convergence.

##### **QWIDS**

Members suggested adding “health warnings” to alert users when the system was under maintenance. The Secretariat explained that the limitations of data in QWIDS (e.g. absence of policy markers, tying status) were to keep the system simple, but that these data would remain available through OECD.Stat. The Secretariat would consider producing a flyer to promote QWIDS and orient new users.

## ANNEX 2

<b>TEMPLATE FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS FOR THE LIST OF ODA-ELIGIBLE INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS</b>			
<b>Full official name of the agency in English</b> (if exists): <b>in French</b> (if exists):			
<b>Official abbreviation in English</b> (if exists): <b>in French</b> (if exists):			
<b>Proposing DAC member:</b>			
<b>Type of proposal</b> (please highlight):	<b>Original</b>	<b>Modification</b>	<b>Resubmission</b>
<b>If this is a resubmission after a previous rejection (indicate year), please specify the reasons that justify reconsideration.</b>			
<b>Mandate/mission statement:</b>  <i>Please provide a summary of the agency's mandate and your analysis of the extent to which the agency promotes the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main or substantial objective. (Please bear in mind that mandates and mission statements as published on the agencies' Internet sites may be abbreviated and may not provide sufficient background information for discussions on ODA-eligibility.)</i>			
<b>Year in which the agency was created or changed its status:</b>			
<b>Activities:</b>  <i>What sectors, themes and partnerships is the agency mainly involved in? What are the main types of activities carried out by this agency and do these fall within the boundaries of ODA?</i>			
<b>Budget:</b>  <i>What is the total budget of the agency? Does the budget show a breakdown between core and non-core funding? Does the agency receive funds in form of voluntary or assessed contributions?</i>			
<b>Expenditures:</b>  <i>In which countries are expenditures taking place? Where is the agency active?</i>			
<b>Web references:</b>  <i>Please cite useful urls.</i>			

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

**2/2/2009 - 3/2/2009**

- M. Geert DESERRANNO**  
**Chair/Président**  
*Conseiller de la Coopération Internationale -  
Président du Groupe de travail du CAD sur les  
statistiques (GT-STAT)  
Délégation Permanente*
- Ms. Hedwig RIEGLER**  
**Austria/Autriche**  
*Head of Unit  
Austrian Development Agency - ADA*
- Belgium/Belgique**
- Mr. Antoon VAN BROECKHOVEN**
- Canada/Canada**
- Mr. Maher MAMHIKOFF**  
*Manager, Statistical Analysis  
Canadian International Development Agency*
- Mme Nicole QUEVILLON**  
*Statistical Research Analyst  
Canadian International Development Agency*
- Czech Republic/République Tchèque**
- Ms. Jana GLOGAROVA**  
*Expert  
Ministry of Finance*
- Ms. Jana VLACHOVA**  
*Advisor  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*
- Denmark/Danemark**
- Mr. Ole Jacob HJOLLUND**  
*Head of Section  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Lars Bruun RASMUSSEN**

*Head of Section  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Antti RYTKÖNEN**

**Finland/Finlande**

*Chief Administrator, Statistics  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Ramses MALATY**

*Administrator, Statistics  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs*

**Ms. Christine BERNARD-KAZANDJIAN**

**France/France**

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

**Mme Cécile COUPRIE**

*Agence Française de Développement*

**Mme Annie FAVEREAU**

*Chargée de mission  
Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes*

**Mlle. Véronique VERDEIL**

*Chargée de Mission, Eau et Assainissement  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et Européennes*

**Ms. Annika WANDSCHER**

**Germany/Allemagne**

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

**Ms. Melanie LEIDEL**

*Federal Statistical Office*

**PERIKLIS SIGALAS**

**Greece/Grèce**

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

**Mr. Michael TIERNAN**

**Ireland/Irlande**

*Financial Accountant  
Department of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Yoshitaka HOSHINO**

**Japan/Japon**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Toru YOSHIDA**

*Second Secretary  
Development  
Permanent Delegation*

**Ms. Mayako EN**

*Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Hitoshi SHOJI**

*Senior Representative  
Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA)*

**Korea/Corée**

**Mr. Jin-Kyu JEONG**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Song-Yun PARK**

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

**Luxembourg/Luxembourg**

**M. Jean-Marc LENTZ**

*Directorate for Development Cooperation  
MFA*

**M. Marc PADJAN**

*Ministère des Affaires Etrangères*

**M. Georges TERNES**

*Secrétaire de Légation  
Ministère des Affaires étrangères*

**Netherlands/Pays-Bas**

**Mr. Bert VAN GEEL**

*Deputy Permanent Representative  
Permanent Delegation*

**Norway/Norvège**

**Rasmus GEDDE-DAHL**

*Adviser  
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Sven SKAARE**

*Adviser  
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation -  
NORAD*

**Ms. Stine THOMASSEN**

*Adviser  
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation*

**Poland/Pologne**

**Mr. Piotr DERWICH**

*First Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Miss Ewa DRWAL**

*Attaché  
Department of Development Cooperation  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mrs. Magdalena PILASIEWICZ**

*Ministry of Finance*

**Mme Edite SINGENS**

**Portugal/Portugal**

*Chefe de Divisão Planeamento e Programação  
Institute for Portuguese Development Aid (IPAD)*

**Mr. Jorge SEOANE PLATAS**

**Spain/Espagne**

*Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation*

**Mr. Patrick RABE**

**Sweden/Suède**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Ms. Linn OHLSSON**

*Desk officer  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Franck RASMUSSEN**

*The Swedish International Cooperation  
Development Agency*

**Ms. Elin SUNDQVIST**

*The Swedish International Cooperation  
Development Agency*

**Mme Catherine GRAF**

**Switzerland/Suisse**

*Direction du développement et de la coopération*

**Mme Christiane SOLLBERGER**

*Direction du développement et de la Coopération*

**Ms. Lale AGUSMAN**

**Turkey/Turquie**

*First Secretary  
Permanent Delegation*

**Mr. Kenneth OSBORNE**

**United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni**

*Senior Statistics Adviser  
Department for International Development*

**Ms. Joanne MCFADDEN**

*Department for International Development*

**United States/États-Unis**

**Mr. William MCCORMICK**

*Financial Economist  
Office of Development Partners, ODP/Bilateral and  
Multilateral Donors, BMD  
US Agency for International Development (USAID)*

**Ms. Jennifer POWELL-TORRES** *Senior Economist  
US Agency for International Development*

**Mr. Vincent CARTON** **EC/CE**  
*European Commission*

**Ms. Estrella RODRIGUEZ** *European Commission*

**International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)/Fonds international pour le  
développement de l'agriculture**  
**Ms. Gelsomina VIGLIOTTI** *Head, Country Management Office  
International Fund for Agricultural Development*

**Ms. Silvana SCALZO** *IFAD*

**Mr. Simon SCOTT** **OECD/OCDE**  
*Head of Division  
DCD/STAT*

**Mr. Brian HAMMOND** *Counsellor to the Director's office on Aid  
Architecture  
DCD/DO*

**Mrs. Yasmin AHMAD** *Manager, Statistical Collections  
DCD/STAT*

**Mrs. Julia BENN** *Manager, Statistical Policy, Analysis and Outreach  
DCD/STAT*

**Mr. Simon MIZRAHI** *Senior Policy Advisor  
DCD/EFF*

**M. Remy PARIS** *Principal Administrator  
DCD/POL*

**M. Marc TOCATLIAN** *Manager, IT Co-ordination & Support  
DCD/STAT*

**Ms. Aimée NICHOLS** **Statistical Collections**  
*Administrator  
DCD/STAT*

**Mme Cécile SANGARE** *Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**Mr. Andrzej SUCHODOLSKI**

*Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**M. Olivier BOURET**

*Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**Ms. Stephanie RUIZ**

*Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**Statistical Policy, Analysis and Outreach**

**Mme Valérie GAVEAU**

*Statistical Analyst  
DCD/STAT*

**Mrs. Kimberly SMITH**

*Administrator  
DCD/STAT*

**Ms. Ann GORDON**

*Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**Mme Cécilia PIEMONTE**

*Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**Ms. Ann ZIMMERMAN**

*Statistician  
DCD/STAT*

**IT Co-ordination & Support**

**Mme Valérie THIELEMANS**

*Senior Statistical Data Management Officer  
DCD/STAT*

**Mr. Mark BALDOCK**

*Data Management Advisor  
DCD/STAT*

**Miss Meria PUHAKKA**

*IT Assistant  
DCD/STAT*

**Aid Architecture & Financing**

**Miss Emily BOSCH**

*Policy Analyst - Multilateral Aid  
DCD/STAT*

**Mr. Fredrik ERICSSON**

*Junior Statistical Policy Analyst  
DCD/STAT*