

Unclassified

English - Or. English

24 December 2024

Development Co-operation Directorate  
Development Assistance Committee

## DAC Working Party on Development Finance Statistics

### Summary record of the WP-STAT meeting 11-13 September 2024

11-13 September 2024

OECD Boulogne Conference Centre. 46, quai Alphonse Le Gallo, 92100 Boulogne-Billancourt, France

This summary record was approved by a written procedure on non-objection basis on 23 December 2024.

It is issued as final and unclassified.

Valerie Gaveau: Valerie.Gaveau@oecd.org  
Giorgio Gualberti: Giorgio.Gualberti@oecd.org

JT03557906

## Summary Record

### Item 1. Welcome and adoption of the agenda

1. The WP-STAT Chair, Ms. Katrine Heggedal, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants in person and online. She greeted the participation of the bureau members Mr. Hubert Drolet (Canada) and Mr. Tomoharu Otake (Japan) and the DAC facilitators Ms. Niamh Fallon (Ireland) and Ms. Beth Yates (United Kingdom).
2. Ms. Niamh Fallon, informed members on recent developments at the DAC. Among various topics she mentioned the adoption of the recommendation on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of All Women and Girls In Development Co-operation and Humanitarian Assistance, the launch of the partnership for action on SIS, the Arab DAC dialogue, the peer reviews of Korea, France and Slovenia, the launch of the Development Cooperation Report and the Tidewater meeting.
3. Ms. Beth Yates indicated upcoming issues that the DAC will discuss in the near future. These include the participation and contribution to an intense calendar of meetings and events, such as the Summit of the Future, UNGA, Hamburg Sustainability Conference, FfD4, UN Ocean Conference. Furthermore, she informed members of the commitment to update the OECD Development Strategy, taken during the Ministerial Council Meeting of 2024, and of the upcoming peer reviews of Finland and Luxembourg. Other topics that the DAC will discuss include the initial findings of the GPEDC exercise in October, the Untying Aid Recommendation as well Locally-Led Development in November. Finally, the DAC will also discuss the accession of Latvia, and the status of DAC participant of Thailand, while it has already approved Croatia as a DAC participant in July and transmitted the decision to ERC and Council.
4. Participants adopted the agenda.

### Item 2. Designation of the bureau for 2025

5. Mr. Haje Schütte, deputy director of the Development Co-operation Directorate chaired this session. He recalled that – according to the rules and procedures of the Organisation - the bureaus of the subsidiary bodies are elected at the last formal meeting of the year. He also recalled that:
  - On 31 May 2024, the Secretariat invited members to notify of any nominations for either the Chair or the Vice-Chair positions, in writing by 21 June 2024.
  - On 5 June 2024, the current bureau members - Ms. Katrine Heggedal (Norway, Chair), Mr. Tomoharu Otake (Japan) and Mr. Hubert Drolet (Canada) (Vice-Chairs) - expressed their availability to continue in their roles for 2025, pending members' approval, in an email circulated to all members.
  - The Secretariat has not received any additional nominations by the deadline.
6. Mr. Schütte asked members if there were any objections to confirm the current holders of the bureau for the year 2025. No member expressed objection. Members nominated per acclamation the WP-STAT bureau with a round of applause.

### Action items

The current Bureau members Ms. Katrine Heggedal (Chair), Mr. Tomoharu Otake and Mr. Hubert Drolet (Vice-Chairs) were renewed in their positions for 2025.

### Item 3. Recap of the documents submitted for approval via the written procedure

7. The Secretariat informed members that the following documents were approved via the written procedure on a non-objection basis:

- Statistical reporting Directives
  - Main text - (chapters 1-6): DCD/DAC(2024)40/FINAL
  - Addendum 1: DCD/DAC(2024)40/ADD1/FINAL
  - Addendum 2: DCD/DAC(2024)40/ADD2/FINAL
  - Addendum 3: DCD/DAC(2024)40/ADD3/FINAL
- Summary Records
  - March 2024 – approved in revised form – DCD/DAC/STAT/M(2024)1/FINAL
  - June 2024 – untying session – approved, minor edits incorporated directly in the final version DCD/DAC/STAT/M(2024)1/FINAL
- June 2024 - Members’ Reporting Practices on Biodiversity-related Development Finance - DCD/DAC/ENV(2024)1/REV1/FINAL
- May 2024 - Clarification on the treatment of reimbursable grants in relation to multilateral organisations - DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)8/REV2
- May 2024 - Refined classification of reimbursable grants and guarantees - DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)10/REV1
- May 2014 - Administrative costs: classification of evaluations in CRS - DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)3/REV1
- April 2024 - Members’ methodologies for calculating ODA in-donor refugee costs specifically in relation to Ukrainian refugees - DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)5/REV1

### Item 4. Review of the Untying Recommendation

8. In a session restricted to DAC participants only, the WP-STAT discussed the review of the DAC Recommendation on Untying ODA. The Chair presented her introductory remarks highlighting the decision by the DAC in December 2022 to launch a review of the Untying Recommendation and expressing optimism about reaching consensus to strengthen the transparency and integrity of ODA statistics, as well as the effectiveness of ODA itself.

9. The Secretariat (Mr. Haje Schütte) outlined the goal of transmitting the draft revised DAC Untying Recommendation to the DAC for final approval in November. It was therefore essential to seek agreement on as many items as possible.

#### Item 4a. Untying and level playing field in aid procurement

10. The Secretariat (Mr. Aussama Bejraoui) presented a proposal on strengthening the provisions on sustainable procurement (SP) and on developing complementary SP guidance to assist members in their implementation of the Recommendation.

11. Members generally agreed with the spirit of the proposed provisions on SP and welcomed the new narrative on SP as a strategic tool to both level the playing field and seek a more sustained development impact, taking into account the three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, environmental and social. However, two members stated that while they welcomed the greater focus on SP, which can address some distortive practices such as environmental and social dumping, they were less convinced that SP would alone be sufficient to fully level the playing field. They requested that discussions continue at

the political level at the DAC to solve the issue that some donors continue to tie large volumes of their own aid while their companies are able to benefit from untied aid contracts funded by other donors.

12. One member underscored an additional dimension of SP, security, which is now part of its procurement regulations. The procurement regulations of the member allow now to restrict eligible nationalities based on security threats. Another member launched ideas for future reflection for the guidance (e.g. use of quality standards, application of best price/quality ratio as award criteria instead of the lowest price).

13. Several members suggested some edits to the proposed provisions:

- Two members requested to include a direct reference to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD MNE Guidelines), as the Responsible Business Conduct standard applicable to OECD countries.
- One member requested to include the possibility to have exemption clauses in tenders for local companies that may not be able to meet sustainability criteria.
- One member proposed to clarify that SP was introduced as a means to ensure that the principles of efficient, open and fair competition can continue to function, and therefore does not necessarily conflict with untying objectives.
- One member underscored that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which will soon become out of date and suggested to have a broader reference to sustainable development.

14. Two members requested the possibility to have flexible timelines to implement the SP provisions, since some donors are still in the early stages of implementing SP policies.

Regarding the proposal to develop a complementary guidance on SP, several members expressed a preference for option A (light and generic guidance) – emphasizing its expediency and adaptability to existing regulations in donor countries. Other members favored option B (more developed and tailor-made guidance)– highlighting the usefulness to have more practical and utilizable guidance. Several members did not have a strong preference and could consider both options.

15. Some members suggested to start with option A to identify overarching principles, and then based on this, re-discuss whether the more in-depth guidance presented in option B would be needed. Members also stressed that the guidance should be developed primarily with their procurement experts. One member also requested to include workers' associations in the stakeholder consultations foreseen under option B.

16. The Secretariat answered comments and questions:

- While RBC is an important aspect of SP, it is only one of many approaches and considerations that can be included (examples of other considerations include taking into account life cycle cost, using local labour, etc.). The Secretariat also clarified that the OECD MNE Guidelines are indirectly referenced in the proposed provisions by referring to the RBC standards developed by the OECD. The OECD legal department advises to avoid referring to individual standards which may quickly become out of date and require regular updates of the DAC Recommendation. However, if members have a strong preference for making an explicit reference to the OECD MNE guidelines, the Secretariat could try to seek an alternative solution.
- Regarding the costs associated with option B, the Secretariat clarified that it would be funded partly from core contributions made to the PWB, which covers the core work related to the DAC Recommendation on Untying ODA, and partly from additional voluntary contributions made by interested members.
- The Secretariat also clarified that the guidance would not be a binding instrument but rather a tool to support members in implementing SP. The guidance would be reviewed and

potentially updated every two years (in the context of the biennial untying reviews) with inputs from members (in particular their procurement experts), to assess its relevance based on experience and to ensure it is still fit-for-purpose, including in terms of levelling the playing field.

17. The Chair concluded the discussion by noting that the committee was very close to reach a consensus and that a slightly revised version of the proposal would be needed.

#### Action items

- Members generally welcomed the proposed provisions to strengthen the focus on sustainable procurement in the Untying Recommendation.
- Some members made suggestions for edits to these provisions. They will send their comments in writing by 20 September. The Secretariat will integrate them in the REV1 version of the revised draft Recommendation (see item 4d).
- Regarding the two options on developing a complementary guidance on sustainable procurement, based on members' reactions, the Secretariat will work on option A as a first step, after which the usefulness of a more in-depth guidance could be considered by the WP-STAT.

#### 4.b. Modernising the reporting and implementation framework

18. The Secretariat (Mr. Aussama Bejraoui) delivered a presentation on the proposals to modernize the reporting and implementation framework of the DAC Recommendation to address the questions raised by the DAC in the terms of reference for the review.

19. Members approved the following items: 1.1 (excluding some tied-by-definition modalities from tying status reporting), 1.2 (exclusion of humanitarian assistance from the DAC Untying Recommendation), 1.3 (clarifying the tying status of multi-donor funding mechanisms and pooled funds) and 3.2 (using the channel of delivery data in the CRS to monitor *de facto* untying of PSI).

20. For the following items, some members would confirm their approval in writing : 2.1 (capture additional information on contract awards), 2.3 (publication of contract awards data) and 3.1 (tying status of PSI). One member will propose clarifications on 3.1, one member awaits an official decision from its development agency on 2.3, and one member needs to further consult with its capital experts on 3.1 (in particular on the footnote related to Public Private Partnerships).<sup>1</sup> Items 1.5, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5 were presented only for discussion, not for approval.

21. While most members noted the usefulness of tracking aid in-kind (proposal 1.4), they emphasised that it is too early to agree on a method for doing so. Some members questioned the inclusion of services in the proposed definition and stated their preference for restricting in-kind aid to the provision of goods. Some members also wondered whether a new modality would be more appropriate than a financial instrument to track in-kind aid. Members called for further discussing the issue of in-kind aid by jointly addressing the issues of tracking and eligibility (see item 5 of the agenda). The meeting decided to pursue this work in 2025.

22. In follow-up to the request by several members for a transition period to implement the new rules, the implementation for the mandatory reporting items (e.g., tying status) will start in 2026 on 2025 data. In response to concerns raised by some members regarding the reporting burden of the proposed pilots to test new methods to capture data on subcontract awards, the Secretariat clarified that this work will only be carried out with interested members (a few members have expressed interest so far) and there is no obligation for any member to participate. One member expressed interest in contributing to the pilot that

---

<sup>1</sup> The items were subsequently approved with amendments for items 2.1 and 3.1, see DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)4/FINAL.

is based on IATI data. One member requested that any results from the follow-up work planned by the Secretariat in 2025 be first discussed and agreed by the DAC before being published in the untying reports.

#### Action items

- Items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 3.2 were approved.
- Item 1.4 was not approved. The discussion on aid in kind will continue next year, both on the ODA-eligibility and tracking aspects (see agenda item 5).
- A few members would to confirm in writing whether they are able to approve items 2.1, 2.3 and 3.1.<sup>2</sup>
- The Secretariat will share the outcome of the approval process in the Community space.

#### 4.c Localisation of aid procurement

23. In this session, both the recommendations to promote local procurement and the use of possible metrics for locally led procurement were discussed.

24. A consultant (Mr. Peter Trepte) presented the final report on its research study on the localization of aid procurement. The report concludes there is no need to amend the DAC Recommendation, given that the objective of promoting local procurement is already included, but recommends: (i) issuing guidance on localisation to help members implement this objective more effectively, (ii) retaining local incorporation as the criterion to define local suppliers, and (iii) considering a new tying status category for contracts restricted to local companies, which now fall under tied aid.

25. Some members welcomed the recommendations from the report, which are in line with their policies and practices. One member highlighted the importance of building the capacity of partner country organisations. Members provided the following comments:

- Several members agreed with the definition of local suppliers based on incorporation, which is consistent with many existing policies and practices across members. One member emphasised the opacity of non-publicly traded companies, which makes it difficult to assess the extent to which they are truly local.
- One member supported the creation of a new tying status category to cover contracts that are restricted to local competition in partner countries.
- Regarding the proposed guidance on local procurement, one member emphasised the conflation between contract awards and grant awards.

26. The Secretariat clarified that the research study was funded by the UN Joint SDG Fund (with support from Spain) and would therefore be published under the flagship of the UN, not the OECD, after review by members and factual corrections.

27. The Secretariat (Mr. Aussama Bejraoui) delivered a presentation on the possible metrics for locally led procurement (LLP, practice of giving local actors the responsibility and control over procurement in development projects). The Secretariat (the Peer reviews team) also briefly presented the parallel DAC Peer Learning exercise on locally led development (LLD), which looked at localisation from a more holistic approach (not specifically related to procurement). As part of this exercise, indicative metrics similar to those being explored for locally led procurement have been developed, specifically on the quantity and quality of funding to local actors.

28. One member demonstrated support for the metrics being proposed and added that it had taken a broader perspective on how to measure locally led development. During a learning phase, it has looked at

---

<sup>2</sup> Subsequently approved with amendments for items 2.1 and 3.1, see DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)4/FINAL

individual programmes and projects, as well as institutional-level policies through case studies and thematic deep dives to understand how to support local development more effectively. The member also reiterated its intention to continue discussions on this issue. Another member underlined the need to only consider new metrics if they do not involve additional workload for members. The member also suggested to consider other implementations methods, such as the one used by the EC, whereby the implementation is sub-delegated to other entities (“indirect management”).

29. The meeting discussed the components included in the proposed metrics and the Secretariat provided some clarifications:

- Regarding contributions to NGOs (B01), only those to developing country-based NGOs are proposed to be considered as contributions to LLP.
- As for the treatment of multilateral ODA in the metrics, the Secretariat clarified that untying metrics have traditionally focussed on bilateral ODA, where donor have the actual capacity to influence the design and implementation of projects, including in terms of procurement. However, the Secretariat recognised the specific case raised by one member (ODA envelope covering both bilateral and multilateral ODA and looking only at bilateral part only could lead to results that are too volatile and misleading). It will explore whether, and how, multilateral ODA could potentially be considered in the metrics.
- Members commented on the too restrictive use of channel codes as a proxy for measuring LLP, given the multilevel chains of interventions in development co-operation projects (e.g. contributions to UN humanitarian trust funds can support projects implemented by local actors, but would not be captured in the LLP metrics; indirect management where funds management and procurement authority are delegated to third party organisations). The Secretariat recalled the reasons for using readily available data from the CRS despite it only tracks the first level implementation: (i) limit reporting burden; and (ii) reflect actual decisions made by the donor. However, as discussed under item 4.b of the agenda, the Secretariat will carry out a pilot in 2025 to test mechanisms to capture data on sub-contracts (from prime grantees and contractors) that can inform this discussion, although the pilot will not look at the entire implementation chain beyond the subcontract level.
- The Secretariat explained that partner country organisations in the context of the proposed metrics would include any local entity, whether governmental, non-governmental or private. Responding to a question from a member on whether organisations from third developing countries would be considered local, the Secretariat clarified that the metrics are based on the channel of delivery classification, which currently allows for different geographical breakdowns depending on the channel category. Some channel categories (e.g., NGOs) allow to identify developing countries as a group (*Developing country-based NGOs*), other channel categories (e.g., the private sector) distinguish between organisations located in the donor country, in the recipient country and in third countries, but it is not possible to break down the third country category between developing countries and donor countries.
- Several members raised questions about the use of the Programme-Based Approaches (PBA) flag due to the lack of active verification of this field by the Secretariat, and possible variations in terms of how members use it in their reporting. They invited the Secretariat to develop guidance to ensure a more standardised and comparable reporting across members.

30. Regarding the potential use of the proposed LLP metrics to inform policy discussions, one member requested more analysis: Would there be any targets for donors, and if so, what would be an appropriate target (It is not realistic, nor desirable, to consider a 100% target, as is the case for the untying objective)? Or should one rather assess progress made by donors compared to a baseline? The Secretariat would take this aspect into consideration in its future work on the metrics.

**Action items**

- The discussions on the metric on locally led procurement will resume next year, possibly in the context of the DAC normative work in follow-up to the peer learning exercise on locally led development. Future analysis should reflect the policy use of the metrics and provide a review and guidance on how to report on the PBA flag.
- Regarding the consultant study on procurement localisation:
  - Members will send written comments and factual corrections on the research study on procurement localisation by 30 September, after which the report will be published by the UN SDG Fund.
  - Based on this feedback, the Secretariat may issue a proposal on classifying contracts restricted to local suppliers under a different category.

**Item 4.d. Draft revised DAC Recommendation on Untying ODA**

31. The Secretariat (Mr. Aussama Bejraoui) delivered a brief presentation on the overall update of the DAC Recommendation, in particular to align its structure with current OECD recommendations. Based on the Review, members continue to view the Recommendation as highly relevant, preferring a cautious and gradual approach in updating the DAC Recommendation, rather than a fundamental change.

32. The Review has found that while most provisions remain valid, some require further consideration. For example, much of the DAC's Good Procurement Practices document, agreed upon in 1986, remains relevant, but the content needs to be updated in an integrated fashion with the foreseen guidance on SP, with support from members' procurement experts. Additionally, the derogation procedure has very rarely been used and the OECD legal department emphasises that it is at odds with the spirit of OECD recommendations, which are not legally binding.

33. Due to time constraints, the Chair moved to close the discussion and asked members to rather post their comments on the community space.

**Action items**

- Members will send written comments on the draft revised DAC Untying Recommendation by 20 September.
- The Secretariat will prepare a REV1 version on that basis and will invite members to approve its transmission to the DAC (the draft revised Recommendation is tabled for approval at the DAC meeting on 4 November).

**Item 5. ODA-eligibility of aid in kind**

34. The Secretariat (Mr. Aussama Bejraoui) delivered a presentation on assessing the ODA-eligibility of in-kind contributions. Members were invited to share their views on the findings and indicate whether they wish the Secretariat to develop specific eligibility criteria for ODA reporting of in-kind contributions or goods and services originating from surpluses.

35. The Secretariat thanked members for their substantive inputs on how to assess the ODA eligibility of in-kind aid and will incorporate these in the next iteration of the analysis:

- While several members confirmed the need to include further clarifications on the eligibility of aid in kind in the Reporting Directives, others did not support expanding the Directives, highlighting that specific situations always arise and should be treated individually rather than through amendments to the general rules.
- Most members were of the view that the fact that donations would be provided in-excess of domestic supply does not raise, in itself, an eligibility issue. Two members stated that the ODA eligibility of in-kind aid should generally not be challenged and called for

focussing the rules rather on the issue of ensuring uniform pricing. Several members called for analyzing the eligibility of in-kind aid from an inefficiency perspective (e.g., excessive demand for COVID-19 vaccines from advanced countries may lead to higher prices for everyone; aid in-kind can also lead to dumping) and suggested to consider in the eligibility assessment the principle of *do no harm* and the notion of policy coherence for sustainable development. One member recommended basing the criteria on the question of scarcity.

- One member reiterated its position that donations can be eligible only if they have been procured for the specific objective of benefiting developing countries, additional criteria are required in the Reporting Directives on this topic. In its view, donations of COVID-19 vaccines in excess of domestic supply are not eligible. It would send some suggestions in writing.
- Referring to the moral questioning of the inclusion of donations of excess COVID-19 vaccines in ODA, one member stressed that advanced countries had at the time financed vaccines that did not even exist and would have otherwise not been available.

36. Most members expressed interest for tracking in-kind aid, but one member did not support this. One member stressed the distinction between traditional ad-hoc in-kind donations and in-kind aid in the context of global programmes (e.g., COVAX).

37. Responding to a question about the inclusion of services in the scope of in-kind aid, the Secretariat explained that there was no specification in the Reporting Directives to limit the scope to the provision of goods. For reference, the Total Official Support for Sustainable Development (TOSSD) tracks in-kind technical co-operation.

38. It was clarified that in-kind aid should not be considered tied by default, the tying status determination should be based on the restrictions put to the procurement of goods being given.

39. The Chair concluded the discussion by noting that a majority of members expressed interest in pursuing the discussions on the ODA eligibility of aid in-kind and invited the Secretariat to present an updated document in 2025, covering both the issues of eligibility and tracking (see item 4b).

#### **Action items**

- Members are invited to share written comments by 18 October. On that basis, the Secretariat will prepare a document for discussion at the next meeting, including an updated proposal for tracking aid in kind.

#### **Item 6. Grant equivalent monitoring report**

40. The Secretariat (Mr. Anthony Kiernan) presented the impact of the grant equivalent system on the composition and allocation of ODA in 2022. The analysis confirmed previous years' conclusions on the grant equivalent system: since its introduction in 2018, the grant equivalent measure had a significant impact on ODA figures of a few members but little impact on the ODA figures overall. Importantly, the grant equivalent system did not lead to significant changes in terms of members' lending practices. This year's report also confirms the trend that, on average, the terms of loans to LDCs hardened during the period 2015-22.

41. The Secretariat also presented its assessment on the adherents' (all DAC members) status of the implementation of the 1978 DAC Recommendation on Terms and Conditions of Aid for 2022. This year the Secretariat included a new section on the Recommendation on Untying of ODA with respect to the grant equivalent system.

42. Members that expressed their views agreed that the report offers valuable insight into the decisions made on the modernisation of ODA and the grant equivalent specifically. Members noted the importance of the paper with regards to responding to external criticisms and that this paper should provide a clear narrative to respond to these criticisms, as has been the case in previous years.

43. Members emphasized the need to provide further context around trends through multiple year rolling average calculations, providing donors individual contexts, accounting for issues in certain years as well as using disbursements to complement the analysis made on a commitment basis. One member also suggested the Secretariat to analyse whether the grant equivalent methodology for the loans to the public sector has encouraged donors to extend loans with softer terms or not.

44. Members agreed that the 1978 DAC recommendation was indeed outdated. While they generally favoured a revision, one member asked to discuss the added value of doing so, and one supported a discontinuation of the recommendation.

### Action items

- Members are invited to share written comments and signal any factual errors by 30 September. The report will then be considered approved, declassified and posted on the OECD website.
- Certain members expressed the need for further analysis in the next versions of the report (e.g. commitments vs. disbursements). Members are invited to include such suggestions as part of their written comments.
- The Secretariat will prepare a draft revised Terms recommendation for consideration by the WP-STAT in the second half of 2025.

### Item 7. Report on the ODA-eligibility assessments of members' PSI vehicles

45. The Secretariat (Mr. Tomáš Hos and Mr. Nicolas Bau) presented the report on the 2024 round of ODA-eligibility assessments of vehicles extending private sector instruments (PSI) in developing countries. The ODA-eligibility assessment is a key ODA-integrity safeguard in the context of PSI – only PSI provided by vehicles assessed as ODA-eligible may be included in ODA. The report included assessment outcomes, including ODA coefficients of individual institutions and vehicles, as well as Secretariat's analytical insight and observations, and presented potential areas of further work to ensure ODA integrity of relevant PSI. This output was based on assessments or self-assessments of 36 PSI vehicles. The report was accompanied by a compendium, compiling templates submitted by members in the assessment round.

46. Members generally appreciated the assessment process and outcomes, as well as the thorough analysis provided in the report. In particular, certain members underlined the informative character and learning potential of the report for relevant stakeholders.

47. Concerning the presented areas of further work, many members welcomed the ambition but also cautioned about capacity constraints going forward. Such members considered that the implementation of revised directives and subsequent consolidation of data reporting mechanisms should be prioritised. One member expressed interest in pursuing work on additionality in the future. Several members suggested coordinating the future work with other OECD workstreams on private finance and/or involving the European Development Finance Institutions (EDFI). Moreover, another member emphasised that future work, such as on additionality, should not create constraints to the performance of PSI.

48. One member encouraged the Secretariat to continue coordinating its work on PSI with the Export Credit Group (ECG) and its Secretariat, in particular on potential co-operation in the future as outlined in several paragraphs of the report. A few members also requested edits to the report, including the removal of paragraph 22. Several members would share their comments in writing after the meeting.

49. As inputs by one member were pending, the Secretariat could not include its PSI vehicle (EIB) in the 2024 round of ODA-eligibility assessments. Previously, PSI of that member were included in ODA, both loans to the private sector and equities. A representative of the PSI vehicle explained the institution's data sensitivity concerns, and the resulting legal and reputational risks, when it comes to reporting certain pieces of information on PSI to the OECD. The member expected to be able to provide full clarity on this

topic in the last quarter of 2024. The Secretariat (Mr. Haje Schütte, Ms. Valérie Gaveau, and Mr. Tomáš Hos) pointed out that the OECD, and the Development Co-operation Directorate in particular, are used to working with sensitive data.

#### Action items

- Members are invited to share written comments on the report by 20 September. The Secretariat will then prepare an updated version of the report and the compendium to be presented at the forthcoming meeting of the DAC (10 October) – DCD/DAC(2024)46 and DCD/DAC(2024)47. Following the Directives, the report and compendium will be declassified one month after the DAC meeting.
- If the member that did not provide inputs in the 2024 assessment round wish to report its PSI in 2023 ODA, it must submit the assessment template by end October 2024. Such a timeline would still allow for concluding the assessment process by the end of November 2024. Members' comments on this conclusion are welcome by 20 September.

#### Item 8. Guarantees on loans by multilateral organisations

50. The Secretariat (Mr. Tomáš Hos) presented an update of the methodological work on the treatment of guarantees on loans by multilateral organisations. This included an analysis of members' written comments received after the meeting of the WP-STAT in March 2024, and statistical evidence requested by the Secretariat on both issued and called guarantees. The Secretariat outlined the divergent views across the WP-STAT members on the options proposed by the Secretariat and explained the need for a uniform measurement of donor guarantees in ODA. The Secretariat also emphasized the value of real-life statistical inputs on called guarantees to allow for assessing the risk that donors face when providing such guarantees. The Secretariat proposed to revisit this topic in 2025, based on comprehensive statistical evidence yet to be received, maintaining the status quo by then, i.e. cash flow measurement of activated guarantees.

51. Members generally confirmed the imperative of this topic, in particular in the context of their support to Ukraine during Russia's war of aggression. One member shared its view on the likely increase of calls on guarantees in the coming years which would confirm the move from DFIs to higher risks projects. Several of them did not see a merit in extending the discussion to 2025 and found it important to find a solution as soon as possible.

52. However, members continued expressing differing views on this topic. One member suggested to allow for using any of the three options proposed, namely the grant-equivalent measurement of donor effort, continued cash flows and the fee subsidy model. Another member proposed a hybrid measurement, combining grant-equivalent measurement of donor effort for guarantee issuances, adjusted with cash flows if/when activated.

#### Action items

- Members are invited to share written comments by 18 October. Until a potential change in the accounting methodology in the future, this type of guarantees continues to be measured on a cash-flow basis. Additional substantive inputs are needed from members for advancing this work.

#### Item 9. Contributions to MDBs' hybrid capital

53. The Secretariat (Mr. Tomáš Hos) presented an emerging methodological framework for treating MDB hybrid capital in DAC statistics, including possible ODA-eligibility criteria, four options for measuring donor effort in ODA-eligible MDB hybrid capital instruments and potential parameters for calculating grant elements, particularly a discount rate. The document also included a potential reporting guidance. The Secretariat's proposal embedded and reconfirmed its ODA-eligibility assessment of the World Bank Perpetual Hybrid Equity Capital Instrument offered to shareholders that seek ODA treatment, and sought to provide clarity on cases beyond that specific MDB hybrid capital product, especially MDB hybrid capital instruments that generate capital reflows to donors.

54. Overall, members welcomed the Secretariat's work on this topic and appreciated its thoroughness and timeliness. Although some members argued that they only expect to use the World Bank Instrument offered to shareholders that seek ODA treatment, they considered it important to have one standard for treating all types of MDB hybrid capital instruments in ODA.

55. As regards the proposed ODA-eligibility criteria, members generally considered them acceptable although one member could consider MDB hybrid capital instruments that generate capital reflows to donors as excluded from ODA. Regarding the calculation of the ODA figure for eligible instruments, members preferred the option 3, i.e. donor effort measured ex ante with an ex-post adjustment or option 2, i.e. donor effort measured ex post. Although rather complex, the option 3 was considered well aligned with the grant equivalent standard, whereas option 2 was deemed more mathematically accurate and simpler. One member would appreciate simulations showing the impact of each option on real-life examples. Concerning the parameters for calculating grant elements, one member considered the 1.5% surcharge to the 5% base rate justified and possibly too conservative, while two other members argued there was no need for a surcharge. One member asked if the Secretariat could provide more information, backed by statistical evidence, on how a fixed interest rate equivalent will be determined when floating interest will be received for hybrid purchasers.

56. Members also expressed their appreciation of the emerging reporting guidance. Two members would prefer using the existing financial instrument code 433 (other hybrid instruments) with some adjustments, while two others would appreciate a new code.

57. Finally, two members considered it premature to conclude the ODA-eligibility discussion on special drawing rights (SDRs) in the context of the MDB hybrid capital already at this stage while another member insisted SDRs should not be counted in ODA.

#### **Action items**

- Members favoured options 2 or 3. They are invited to share written comments by 18 October. The Secretariat will develop simulations on ODA volumes and prepare an updated version of the document.

### **Item 10. Reporting issues**

#### **Item 10.a Follow-up on reporting issues for 2022 and progress update on 2023 CRS data collection**

58. The Secretariat (Ms. Madeleine Lessard) presented the progress update on 2023 CRS data collection. Twenty-eight members reported as of the time of the WP-STAT, and of these, 12 had received a first round of feedback from the Secretariat. This is the first time that as many files were received by mid-September, however data from all providers are needed to enable the Secretariat to publish complete and coherent statistics in December. The Secretariat aims to publish 2-3 members' data in the September update and encourages members who have received feedback to reply as soon as possible. Some members that had not yet reported indicated when they intended to do so.

59. Regarding the non-DAC countries, multilaterals and philanthropies, 11 non-DAC countries have reported as of the WP-STAT, as well as 42 multilateral institutions, including 15 UN agencies. In addition, 23 private philanthropic foundations have reported.

60. Overall, the Secretariat expects to receive reporting from approximately 150 CRS reporters this year (including private philanthropic reporters).

61. The Secretariat (Ms. Gabrielle Germe and Ms. Lou Turroques) presented the paper summarizing the issues encountered in 2023 on 2022 CRS reporting and the ranking of members' reporting based on a revised methodology [DCD/DAC/STAT(2024)25]. It informed members that the paper had been revised and reissued on 12 September, in particular to include an update of Table 2 (to capture activities using multiple keywords). Members appreciated this paper and found it useful to prioritize areas of improvement. However, some members expressed reserves on the principle of ranking, and some would like further detail

on different aspects of the evaluation. Some also expressed disagreement on the weight that the timing of reporting has in the ranking as it does not consider the size of the team nor the volume of data.

62. The main reporting challenge expressed by members related to the application of the coherence rules for multiple purpose codes with other fields. In particular, for policy markers, the rules could lead to an overestimation. Some members expressed that the coherence rules should continue not to be binding. Some other members made proposals to evaluate more precisely the policy makers of these activities not to overestimate the results.

63. The Secretariat (Ms. Jenny Hedman) highlighted the importance for GENDERNET and other groups working on the issue of aligning the application of the SDG 5, gender equality policy maker and gender related purpose codes. Members recognised that harmonization efforts were needed as the SDG 5 was generally less well reported. Some members indicated trying to improve the descriptive information of their projects and expressed interest in a workshop to be organized by the Secretariat on this topic.

### Action items

- Members welcomed the thorough review of the Secretariat. Members are invited to pay particular attention to the specific reporting issues raised in the paper.
- The Secretariat will send a link to the R code which verifies the integrity of CRS data. It will present members with a prototype of the platform it is developing to facilitate the reporting of CRS data in Q1/Q2 next year. A workshop will be organized in the margins of a WP-STAT meeting in 2025 on how to report better descriptive data.
- Members are encouraged to participate in the WP-STAT network on Data Quality and Innovation to discuss data quality challenges and collaborate on solutions.
- Members were invited by the Secretariat to pursue the discussions in WP-STAT and potentially together with the GENDERNET to contribute to enhanced tracking of activities towards gender equality, ensuring that reporting against SDG5 and the gender marker are aligned. This is essential to maintain consistency and credibility of the OECD data.

### Item 10.b. Anonymisation of activities for Afghanistan and Ukraine

64. The Secretariat (Ms. Yasmin Ahmad) asked members if they were able to revert back to the publication of their detailed CRS data for Afghanistan and Ukraine.

65. Data for Afghanistan and Ukraine have been anonymised in the CRS at the request of members to address concerns around the security of development partners. Following the Secretariat's guidance on this topic [DCD/DAC/STAT(2022)9], a review on the anonymisation of data for these countries is conducted every 6 months.

66. Although some members indicated they could revert back to granular publication of some or all of their activities for Afghanistan and Ukraine, many indicated that these data still required anonymisation in order to protect individuals.

67. The anonymisation takes place at the stage of dissemination. The Secretariat requested that members refrain from anonymizing the descriptions of activities in their reporting, particularly to Ukraine and Afghanistan, and provide full details to facilitate the Secretariat's review. The Secretariat also indicated that it cannot handle the anonymisation of records on a case-by-case basis.

68. A few members raised the issue of activities beyond Afghanistan and Ukraine that were anonymized in their systems due to their domestic confidentiality and security requirements when the publication of granular data could harm or put in danger individuals.

### Action items

- A workshop will be organised in the margins of the next WP-STAT to explore whether some data in CRS activities can be published either in granular form, or in a less anonymous fashion.
- Pending these discussions, the current arrangement on anonymisation of CRS data for Afghanistan and Ukraine remains in place [see DCD DCD/DAC/STAT(2022)9].

### Item 11. Peer review on development finance statistics of Estonia

69. Ireland, peer reviewer in the statistical peer review of Estonia together with Greece, presented the main highlights and recommendations from the review carried out in May 2024 and reiterated the usefulness of the experience from their perspective. The presentation also included three proposals for further discussion by the WP-STAT: better tracking of digitalization activities in the CRS; clarifications on the ODA-eligibility of cybersecurity activities (Estonia could share its expertise on cybersecurity); a learning toolbox that would collate one-pagers on specific recurring issues faced by members with concrete lessons learnt. Lithuania, as observer to the review, also shared its positive experience.

70. Estonia thanked the Secretariat as well as the Review Team, highlighted the well-structured process and its already visible positive impact on the country's statistical function. Key takeaways from its perspective include the need to improve its data life cycle and its quality assurance processes. The review raised the profile of Estonia's statistics across government entities, already helped improve relationships with CSOs, and will support enhanced data accessibility for the public and data users.

71. Estonia also highlighted digitalisation as a key priority for its development co-operation and suggested opening a discussion on how to better track contributions to this policy area. It has already introduced a policy marker domestically and proposed to introduce a digitalization keyword in CRS reporting. Several members intervened in support of this topic and one recalled a previous discussion within the WP-STAT for a digitalization keyword. Another member would soon share a draft proposal (see AOB) and a page would be opened in the WP-STAT Community Space for collecting members' feedback, preference for using a keyword, a purpose code, or both, and share their experience in monitoring this policy area.

72. One member explicitly supported the idea of the learning toolbox. The Chair suggested to hold a discussion on this topic at a future WP-STAT and to rely on existing formal and informal networks that are available to members.

#### Action items

- Some topics discussed during the review have been identified as of interest to all members and will be discussed at future meetings: ODA-eligibility of cybersecurity, how to better track digitalisation (see AOB) and the development of one-pagers to share learning.

### Item 12. Stock-take on statistical peer reviews and next steps

73. The Secretariat (Mr. Guillaume Delalande) presented the recommendations of improvement to the Statistical Peer Review methodology. These recommendations emerged from a stocktake of 7 years of Statistical Peer reviews that was prepared through a desk review and a large number of interviews of WP-STAT members.

74. Members expressed appreciation for the analysis in the stocktake, as well as for the proposed new methodology guide, notably highlighting the well-formulated recommendations and the increased alignment of the new proposed methodology with the objectives and needs of members. Members also reiterated the usefulness of the statistical peer reviews and expressed support for maintaining this workstream, seeing the reviews as valuable tools for peer learning, raising the profile of statistics, and strengthening the sense of community within WP-STAT.

75. Members also offered the following comments:

- One member proposed to include in the methodology a mapping of members' other external commitments that impact the CRS data collection process and puts pressure on their statistical function, such as commitments to provide data to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) or to the OCHA Financial Tracking System (FTS).
- Two members expressed reservations about the proposal to hold hybrid sessions to lighten the review process, arguing that in-person interactions provide significant added value to the exercise.
- One member welcomed the merge of the former dimensions 5, 6 and 7, but suggested adding the "use of data" in dimension 5 of the new methodology.
- Regarding the duration of the review, one member suggested that it should not depend on the size or aid volumes of the reviewed member but rather on the complexity of its statistical system and budget architecture. The member also volunteered to pilot the proposed monitoring process of the reviews.
- Two members supported the idea of being more selective about the topics covered during the review, allowing the reviewers to focus on key areas. It was also proposed that the title of the exercise includes both the term "review", to emphasize the profile of the exercise, and "capacity-building".

76. Czechia, as the next country to be reviewed, thanked the Secretariat for its assistance in preparing the review and expressed its appreciation for the exercise.

77. The United Kingdom volunteered to participate in a review as an examiner in 2025 and to be peer-reviewed in 2026, preferably, or in 2027.

#### **Action items**

- Members are invited to share written comments by 30 September. A revised guide for statistical peer reviews will be prepared on that basis and, depending on the nature of comments, either shared for approval under the written procedure or tabled for discussion at a subsequent meeting.
- The United Kingdom volunteered for participating in statistical peer reviews, as a peer reviewer and later (2026 or 2027) as a reviewed country. Austria volunteered to test the proposed process for monitoring reviews. More members are welcome to signal to the Secretariat their interest to take part in statistical peer reviews or pilots in 2025 and 2026.

### **Item 13. Transparency of climate-related development finance data**

#### **Item 13a. Results of the survey on the coefficients applied to Climate Change Rio marker data when reporting to the UNFCCC**

78. The Secretariat (Ms. Sandie Xu) presented the results of the 2024 survey on coefficients applied to Rio marker data when reporting to the UNFCCC. The note updated the results of previous editions of the survey.

79. Members welcomed the detailed and informative paper and found this exercise useful as it sheds light on different methodologies applied and enhances transparency on development and climate finance, as requested by the DAC Declaration. No member objected to the declassification on the paper, one member affirmed that it would formally provide its approval after the meeting, and a few members will send in writing minor adjustments requested prior the declassification.

80. Members discussed also some questions for further work included in the document. Several expressed support for further analysis comparing the climate-specific data submitted to the UNFCCC and the climate-related data submitted to the CRS, noting that such analysis would be good for educational purposes and would enhance credibility. Those members suggested further analysis on the different measurement bases, private capital mobilised, reasons behind the different reporting practices, and how different assumptions impact results. Other members did not see the need for further analysis at this

moment. Reasons noted included that the two types of flows are not directly comparable due to the qualitative nature of Rio markers, that negotiations on the topic of climate finance are currently undergoing at the UNFCCC, and that according to the rules decided at the UNFCCC each reporter can choose the modalities to report climate finance, including the eventual use of coefficients. One member commented that WP-STAT should focus its efforts on ensuring a clear and accurate narrative of the climate figures rather than reporting figures that communicate a false degree of precision; that member welcomed discussing how to best caveat climate finance estimations based on the Rio marker methodology. Several members also shared information on their internal coordination and marking practices when reporting climate information to the OECD and to the UNFCCC.

### **Item 13b. Increasing transparency between climate and development finance: draft questions and answers**

81. The Secretariat (Mr. Giorgio Gualberti - Development Co-operation Directorate and Ms. Chiara Falduto, Environment Directorate) presented a draft FAQ on climate and development finance. The objective is to provide accessible explanation for the general public on how climate and development finance figures published by the OECD relate. The Secretariat asked for comments on the note in view of its publication as a communication product.

82. Members welcomed the methodological note, claimed it to be a useful explanatory document to increase transparency and the readability of the figures published, and supported its publication. Some members proposed minor adjustments to the text, while others would send them as written comments. One member suggested to treat the FAQ as a living document to be adjusted to reflect future decisions on climate finance.

#### **Action items**

- 13.a) Members are invited to provide any factual correction to the report by 30 September and approve its declassification.
- 13.b) Members are invited to provide written comments or factual corrections by 30 September. The Secretariat will further refine the FAQ and use it for communication purposes.

### **Item 14. Review of the definition and eligibility criteria of the Rio marker on Biodiversity**

83. The Secretariat (Mr. Juan Casado Asensio) presented the revised definition and eligibility criteria for the biodiversity Rio marker, which reflected the discussions and feedback received from members during 2024, through a series of workshops and round of comments from both WP-STAT and ENVIRONET members.

84. The revised definition and eligibility criteria for the biodiversity marker were approved by members.

85. Members also expressed appreciation for the inclusive process that led to the revision proposal. Members welcomed the next steps in the work on the Rio marker on biodiversity, notably to update the indicative table and the preparation of guidance on the use of all Rio markers for statistical reporters and data users. Members also encouraged the Secretariat to prepare imputed shares for biodiversity for multilateral development banks and major environmental funds and to continue co-ordinating this work with the CBD Secretariat.

#### **Action items**

- The revised definition and eligibility criteria for the biodiversity marker were approved. The Secretariat will further work to implement the joint WP-STAT/ENVIRONET work programme on biodiversity.

### Item 15. Tracking pandemic preparedness and response

86. The World Health Organisation (WHO) presented a proposal to track pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) in the CRS, based on ongoing demands for more precise methods and granular data on PPR for analytical and public health monitoring purposes. Two options were proposed to members: A) create four new keywords (solution used in TOSSD) and B) create two keywords and use a combination of existing purpose codes and DRR marker.

87. Members thanked the WHO for its proposal. Several members agreed that tracking PPR would be useful, considering the need for data expressed by the WHO and their important contribution to PPR funding. However, they generally expressed concerns about the additional reporting burden and the complexity of the proposals (also raised by the Secretariat in discussions with WHO), in particular in relation to the tracking of four sub-categories that was considered too complex and would likely be prone to significant data quality issues.

88. Several members did therefore not agree with the proposed options and warned against continued addition of new categories in the CRS. They called for leveraging existing descriptive fields, for example through Artificial Intelligence (AI)-based solutions. The Vice-chair supported this idea as AI-based solutions had already been used in Canada to track nutrition-related funding. He suggested that the WP-STAT Informal Network on Data Quality and Innovation could support in this area. The Secretariat informed that the AI specialist it recently hired would be able to help with this topic and look at potential solutions to reduce the reporting burden.

89. Members highlighted some definitional challenges. To start with, some emphasized the difficulty in distinguishing between the two overarching PPR categories (preparedness and response), since programmes generally aim at addressing both. One member also highlighted that, in its case, a preparedness category would include much of its broader health programmes (e.g., on sexual and reproductive health) while for other members this may not be the case; another issue is the distinction between PPR response and health emergency response.

90. One member provided a general warning on the trend towards a more formalised use of keywords to track certain categories of aid, while keywords were originally created as an informal tool for labelling activities. The member noted that the role and scope of keywords might in this light need to be re-evaluated in the future.

91. Members also made specific comments on the two proposed options:

- One member supported option A.
- One member supported option B, on a voluntary basis, but excluding purpose codes 123XX and 130XX from pandemic response as they may contain DRR activities not related to pandemics (e.g., demographic research or reproductive health care).
- Some members called for a simplified proposal based on option B, which involves a lesser reporting burden, and stressed some methodological issues that should be addressed: one member stressed that its PPR funding is channelled through both its health and humanitarian programmes so both sectors should be included; another member expressed reservations about the use of the DRR flag to track pandemic preparedness, since in its case the flag does not cover the health sector; one member recommended a combination of the DRR marker and single-level keywords (DRR plus a keyword for preparedness, DRR plus a keyword for response).
- One member viewed the keywords as inappropriate given that they are voluntary and welcomed the first part of option B (combination of DRR flag and purpose codes to track preparedness and response). In addition, the member proposed the introduction of a new CRS purpose code for 'Prevention and Preparedness of Epidemics and Pandemics' (to distinguish with the existing codes on the control of infectious diseases).

92. Some members called for joint discussions on the tracking of PPR in both CRS and TOSSD to avoid potential divergences between the two systems. The Secretariat highlighted that keywords remain a voluntary but useful tool that have already been implemented through TOSSD.

#### Action items

- Members provided mixed feedback on the usefulness/capacity to track pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) in the CRS and advocated for a simpler method, proposing a wide range of possible solutions (keywords, new purpose codes, Artificial Intelligence).
- Members are invited to provide written comments by 18 October. The Secretariat will then work on a new proposal, exploring in particular the possibility to use Artificial Intelligence.

#### Item 16. Sub-channel code to identify women's rights organisations

93. The Secretariat (Mr. Olivier Bouret and Ms. Jenny Hedman) presented a proposal for a generic sub-channel code in the CRS to identify women's rights organisations and movements. The proposal noted that the current CRS codes do not allow for identifying the activities channelled through women's rights organisations and movements, beyond those intended to enhance these organisations' and movements' effectiveness, influence and sustainability captured by purpose code 15170.

94. Members generally welcomed the proposal but one feared that introducing a thematic channel code would create a precedent that should be considered carefully. Members had comments that would need to be taken into consideration in the next phase of this work, in particular they requested the development of a definition of "women's rights organisations and movements" as well as a list of organisations concerned.

95. One member questioned the cost/benefit of having a channel of delivery or co-operation modality over what was already well defined by a purpose code and expressed its scepticism with the exercise.

#### Action items

- There was broad support for the intent of the proposal, also noting the support and collaboration with Gendernet, and their demand to improve cross-sector analyses (i.e. funding through women's rights organisations in all sectors, not solely purpose code 15170).
- However, some members had comments on how to best proceed, noting specifically that introducing Channel codes with a substantive connotation would be a precedence. Members are invited to provide written comments by 18 October.
- The Secretariat will put forward a revised proposal taking members' comments into account, including providing a definition of Women's Rights Organisations and feminist movements.

#### Item 17. Measuring amounts mobilised from the private sector - Stock-take of reporting issues and coverage, WP-STAT workplan for further improvements

96. The Secretariat (Ms. Cécile Sangaré) presented a workplan to improve the measurement and reporting on mobilised private finance (MPF) in the CRS system, also emphasizing the increased strategic importance of this topic and related data in development co-operation policies but also more broadly (e.g. ongoing negotiations on the New Collective Quantified Goal – NCQG – towards climate finance and the recently established OECD Council Task Force on Mobilisation).

97. The presentation was followed by two interventions:

- Publish What You Fund (PWYF) (Mr. Paul James) which expressed general support for the workplan, in particular for Tasks 1 (increasing disclosure of activity-level data), 5 (capturing broader mobilisation while avoiding double counting) and 6 (further harmonisation of multilateral development banks' – MDBs' – and OECD approaches). He welcomed further collaboration with MDBs and highlighted the challenges due to the existence of two different methodologies including the reporting burden for DFIs and conflicting mobilisation data confusing data users. He

emphasised that work towards further harmonisation of methods will require compromises and political will on both sides.

- The OECD Environment Secretariat (Ms. Chiara Falduto) highlighted the crucial role of the WP-STAT work in the context of climate finance, and the heavy reliance on CRS data (multilateral organisations' outflows and mobilised private finance) to track progress towards the USD 100 billion goal. It also confirmed the growing interest in these data among the climate community more broadly, as well as in issues related to transparency and measurement. With the recent requirement for countries to report mobilised private finance under the UNFCCC Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), the OECD Environment Secretariat stressed the critical importance of members' internal coordination to ensure consistency with their CRS reporting. This also includes consistency on the definitions and scope of the measure (catalysation being part of the mobilisation reporting under the UNFCCC ETF).

98. Overall, members welcomed the Secretariat's proposed workplan:

- They widely welcomed the creation of the dashboard to increase transparency in MPF data disclosure when permitted (Task 1). Some members echoed the PWYF's concerns about the lack of transparency in current data disseminations due to constraints imposed by some data providers (in particular MDBs), limiting the use of MPF data for analytical purposes. A few members expressed the need to consult internally as well as with the Secretariat before implementing the updated rules for disclosure for PSI-related activities. Another member suggested publishing the level of disclosure permitted by each data provider, as an incentive for more transparency.
- Several members mentioned using the CRS data on mobilisation for their UNFCCC-ETF reporting against the USD 100 billion goal (with some adjustments), and a broad range of them recognised the importance of harmonising the reporting with UNFCCC. One member expressed not being supportive of making an explicit reference to the New Collective Quantitative Goal (NCQG) at this stage given that the negotiations are ongoing, it asked that this reference in paragraph 31 of the discussion paper be removed. Overall, members generally supported greater alignment in definitions with the blended finance Principles (Task 2). Members also shared their challenges for compiling and reporting the necessary data on mobilisation and welcomed the possibility of benefitting from tailored capacity-building sessions by the Secretariat (Task 3), as well as the development of a Handbook on reporting on mobilisation. One member expressed its appreciation for the tailored capacity building workshop organised by the Secretariat as they were preparing their reporting cycle for 2023, and invited members to take advantage of the Secretariat's willingness and availability to support. One member suggested adding a CRS checklist in the Handbook under development by the Secretariat.
- Members expressed strong support for finetuning the existing methodologies (Task 4), including to better cover mobilisation through bonds and the second level of mobilisation through equity funds. One member commented that working on second level mobilisation might be difficult given the obstacles in gathering and processing the necessary data. Members also welcomed further work on broader private finance mobilisation, including secondary mobilisation, balance-sheet optimisation and catalysation as per the PWYF categorisation (Task 5). Overall, members suggested prioritising the work on catalysation in close consultation with the climate and MDB communities for consistency purposes. However, some members stressed the need to approach catalysation with caution given the risk of double counting and inflation of figures.
- Finally, members supported reconvening the MDB – OECD DAC working group to discuss data transparency and harmonisation of methodologies for measuring mobilisation (Task 6). One member recalled the importance of working towards a harmonised approach that will take into account the role of all official actors in the attribution of mobilised private finance, in particular when bilateral institutions co-invest with MDBs. The WBG noted the idea of reconvening the

working group and will consult with MDB colleagues at the next MDB Task Force meeting to provide feedback, further discussions could take place in 2025.

#### Action items

- Members generally supported the workplan proposed by the Secretariat. They are invited to share written comments and factual corrections by 30 September.
- The Secretariat will send an invitation to members and other experts from DFIs and MDBs to participate in a first working session to kick off work on Tasks 4 (refining current methodologies) and 5 (broadening the scope).
- It will also follow up with MDBs on strengthening collaboration (Task 6).

#### Item 18. Update on Secretariat's revision of the CPA measure

99. The Secretariat (Ms. Yasmin Ahmad) presented the work it had undertaken to update the Country Programmable (CPA) measure. CPA was developed in 2007 and represents a subset of gross ODA that provides programme for individual countries or regions in the long term and over which partner countries could have a significant say. By definition, it excludes less predictable aid flows, such as humanitarian aid or debt relief, as well as expenditures in provider countries.

100. CPA has been used as a measure to analyse aid concentration, fragmentation, aid orphans, etc.

101. When the WP-STAT agreed to abolish the Forward Spending Survey which was based on CPA, this led to a discussion on the future of CPA measure. In addition, there is a proliferation of measures of ODA going to partner countries (e.g. "Real Aid", transfer aid) and there is a lot more scrutiny on the non-CPA elements of ODA (e.g. in-donor refugee costs, humanitarian aid). Furthermore, recent improvements in the CRS have led to a lot more granularity in the data. All these elements prompted the need to update the CPA measure.

102. The updated version of CPA is entirely derived from the CRS (as compared to deriving gross disbursements from Table DAC2a and subtracting certain items from DAC2a and the CRS), thus enabling analysis by sector, channel, modality, etc, as well as being fully transparent, accountable and replicable. It also includes ODA data from secondary/tertiary agencies (e.g. municipalities) and development food aid which were previously excluded. By contrast it excludes scholarships to study in provider countries

103. The Secretariat informed members that it had tested the updated CPA measure by comparing it with data reported by donors to the Government of Ethiopia's aid management platform with an over 90% accuracy, consulting interested members and raising awareness of the measure at EU CSO days end-May, providing sample dataset to World Bank for health sector analysis. It will continue consultations at the next WP-STAT/CSO dialogue and will also consult further with think tanks, multilateral organisations and research institutes.

104. The Secretariat informed members that CPA V1 had just been posted on the OECD Data Explorer to allow users to test the updated CPA measure and provide further feedback to the Secretariat to refine it. In January 2025, the Secretariat will publish a final version that incorporates user feedback.

105. One member stated that it would not support the reinstatement of a mandatory CPA report, questioning the feasibility and relevance of such a report in the context of evolving implementation methods (increase of regional activities, difficulty to effectively programme in an unstable international environment). The Secretariat's presentation clarified that this measure would be derived directly from members' CRS reporting, requiring no additional reporting burden from members.

#### Action items

- The Secretariat just posted V1 of the updated CPA measure in the OECD Data Explorer: <http://data-explorer.oecd.org/s/bp>. Members are invited to provide feedback by 18

October. The Secretariat will continue consultations with CSOs and other users and will incorporate feedback in a final version of the measure to be published early 2025.

- Members encouraged continued discussion on this measure to ensure alignment of messaging to external audiences.

#### Item 19. Round table on WP-STAT workflows

106. The Secretariat (Ms. Valérie Gaveau) presented the current status of the WP-STAT workflows, highlighting the procedures and tools for the preparation of the meetings, the publication of the documents, the sharing of written comments and approvals on non-objection basis, as well the modalities for sharing agendas and summary records. The Secretariat asked members to comment on the questions for discussion that included knowledge management, timeline for documents sharing, in person versus online meetings and the general organization of the working procedures of the subsidiary body.

107. Members expressed appreciation for the work of the Secretariat and the opportunity to discuss these topics and suggested several improvements, including:

- **Timing of documents.** Most members indicated that the current practice of sharing documents two weeks in advance (10 working days) was too short for handling consultations in the capital, especially considering the large number of papers produced and the complexity of some topics. Members appreciated that the papers for the September meeting had been shared more in advance and this allowed a better engagement of the concerned administrations.
- **Format of the documents.** Some members suggested that the Secretariat improve the readability of documents bearing in mind that they might be shared with government officials that might have limited knowledge of WP-STAT processes. Suggestions included the reinforcement of the background/context section and a clear use of formatting to highlight the changes in negotiated text between the different revisions. One member also suggested to add a paragraph highlighting political sensitiveness of the topic.
- **Written comments deadline.** Several members suggested to have differentiated deadlines for written comments after the in-person meetings, to allow easier process of reviews. Documents for which written comments are less urgent could be given longer deadlines. One member suggested that on selected topics members could send prior comments before the discussion in the meeting, so that it would be easier to negotiate and achieve a consensual outcome.
- **In person/online meetings.** Most members praised the fact that WP-STAT has in person meetings, which allows for a degree of interactions, including last-mile negotiations, which are simply not possible online. Members also appreciated the possibility of having informal, thematic meetings online to allow for more in depth discussion of selected themes, when necessity arises.
- **Meeting dates.** Several members asked the Secretariat to avoid overlaps between the data submission deadlines (for either the advanced questionnaire and the full CRS submission) and the dates of the meetings. Separating these events would allow a better management of the resources in the administrations involved. Additionally, one member commented on the preference to have two in person meetings a year, one other to have three.
- **Community space.** Several members expressed appreciations for how the community space works and encouraged its further use.
- **Reference documents and induction sessions.** Members suggested that induction sessions / welcome package for new members of the delegations would be useful, and as well the availability of reference material to be informed in a concise matter on the historical background of the various dossiers.
- **Paper on reporting issues.** Members appreciated the yearly paper on reporting issues. One member invited it to be circulated earlier in the year if possible.

- **OECD.org website and data-explorer.** Several members noted that with the reorganization of the OECD.org corporate website, access to information for data reporters, statistical standards, code lists etc. has been more difficult and asked the Secretariat to facilitate access to this information. They also noted that the new OECD corporate data warehouse while powerful has experienced technical difficulties.

#### Action items

- Members should notify the Secretariat of the issues they are encountering with the redesign of the OECD web pages or accessing data on the OECD Data Explorer.
- The Secretariat will endeavour to provide feedback on members' reporting in a more timely fashion in order to make it relevant for the current reporting cycle.
- The Secretariat and the Bureau will take stock of the suggestions made to improve the workflows (induction sessions for newcomers, welcome package, collection of written comments prior to in-person discussions, etc) and will start their implementation whenever possible.

#### Item 20. AOB

108. The following topics were briefly discussed in the AOB session.

- Sweden informed members that they have shared with the Secretariat a document on tracking digitalization in development co-operation activities and are asking members to comment on the issue.
- Australia noted the increased importance of the policy marker on inclusion and empowerment of persons with disabilities. It proposed to reinforce the handbook on this marker with the addition of minimum standards, as for the guidance developed for the gender equality marker.
- Italy proposed to organize a workshop to support the reporting for the Ghana and Zambia debt relief under the Paris Club.

109. The chair thanked the participants, the Secretariat and closed a meeting.

#### Action items

- The Secretariat will share the document received by Sweden on digitalisation through the Community Space for comments by 18 October.
- The Secretariat took note of Australia's proposal to update the disability marker handbook to include minimum standards as in the case of the gender equality marker.
- Italy proposed to organise a workshop on debt reporting in the margins of the next WP-STAT meeting, to discuss the agreements reached in 2024 at the Paris Club (Zambia and Ghana).
- The WP-STAT/CSO dialogue will take place on 14 November.
- The next WP-STAT meeting will take place on 3-5 March 2025.