

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/STAT(2016)17

Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

14-Jun-2016

English - Or. English

Development Co-operation Directorate
Development Assistance Committee

DAC Working Party on Development Finance Statistics

UPDATE ON REPORTING BY MULTILATERAL ORGANISATIONS, NON-DAC COUNTRIES AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

WP-STAT Formal meeting, 4-5 July 2016

This document is submitted for INFORMATION AND COMMENT under Item 5 of the draft annotated agenda DCD/DAC/STAT/A(2016)2.

This note informs members of progress in work to increase the coverage and quality of data on resource flows from providers beyond the DAC.

Willem Luijkx - Tel +33 1 45 24 98 82 - Email willem.luijkx@oecd.org
Julia Benn - Tel + 33 1 45 24 90 39 - Email julia.benn@oecd.org

JT03398098

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

DCD/DAC/STAT(2016)17
Unclassified

English - Or. English

TABLE OF CONTENTS

UPDATE ON REPORTING BY MULTILATERAL ORGANISATIONS, NON-DAC COUNTRIES AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS	3
Introduction.....	3
Section A: Multilateral Organisations	4
A1. Overview of multilateral organisations’ reporting to the OECD.....	4
A2. Major Improvements in 2015/2016.....	6
Section B: Non-DAC Countries.....	7
B1. Overview of reporting by non-DAC providers of development finance	7
B2. Major Improvements in 2015/2016	8
Section C: Private Philanthropy.....	9
Section D: The Busan Transparency Indicator	9
Section E: Conclusion.....	9
ANNEX 1. PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT OF 2014 CRS DATA FOR THE BUSAN TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR.....	10
Tables	
Table 1. Improved coverage of DAC statistics and activity-level data	3
Table 2. Multilateral Organisations' Reporting to the OECD.....	5
Table 3. Non-Dac Countries Net ODA Disbursements.....	7
Table 4. Development co-operation by countries beyond the DAC.....	8
Table 5. Development co-operation by countries beyond the DAC.....	10

UPDATE ON REPORTING BY MULTILATERAL ORGANISATIONS, NON-DAC COUNTRIES AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

Introduction

1. DAC statistics aim to present the global picture of development finance flows. This note informs members of the progress being made in increasing the coverage and quality of data on resource flows from development co-operation providers outside the Committee, including multilateral organisations (see section A), non-DAC countries (section B) and private foundations (section C). It also sets out the results of the Busan Transparency Indicator assessment for some of these providers, carried out for the monitoring report of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (section D). The note is circulated **for information and comment** at the meeting of the Working Party on Development Finance Statistics (WP-STAT) scheduled on 4-5 July 2016.

2. Table 1 summarises the main improvements in terms of coverage since the WP-STAT meeting in May 2015. In comparison with 2014, the coverage increased from 90% to 93% of total multilateral flows.¹ As regards bilateral flows, 96% of total estimated concessional finance² by provider countries (including DAC member countries) is captured in DAC statistics for 2014.

3. The table also shows the number of organisations and countries reporting at activity and aggregate levels. The number of activity-level reports amongst multilateral organisations is high. Less than half of the non-DAC countries report at activity level, but the number is rapidly increasing. For organisations and countries that still report at aggregate level, the Secretariat will be converting the aggregate data into (Creditor Reporting System) CRS format as from 2016 reporting on 2015 flows, so that all the data will be available in the CRS online dataset.

Table 1. Improved coverage of DAC statistics and activity-level data

May 2015 - June 2016	Multilateral*	Bilateral*
Reported for the first time**	UN Food and Agricultural Organization	Azerbaijan
	UN International Labour Organisation	Kazakhstan
	Climate Investment Funds	Timor Leste
Reporting at activity level for the first time	Caribbean Development Bank	Hungary
		Lithuania
		Romania
Coverage of total estimated 2014 flows	93%	96%
Number of activity/aggregate level reporters	33 / 3	9 / 12

* A full overview is available further below of multilateral reporters (table 2) and bilateral reporters (table 3).

** First-time reporters always report at activity level, as we are phasing out reporting on aggregate level only.

-
1. The coverage is estimated by calculating the share of core contributions to the reporting multilateral organisations in total multilateral ODA.
 2. This total is based on reporting by 28 DAC Member countries, 20 non-DAC countries and OECD estimates on another 10 non-DAC countries (Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Qatar and South Africa).

Section A: Multilateral Organisations

A1. Overview of multilateral organisations' reporting to the OECD

4. The Secretariat seeks to obtain activity-level reporting in the CRS from agencies with core-funded expenditures³ exceeding USD 100 million annually, giving priority to the largest of these agencies. An overview of multilateral agencies' reporting to the OECD concerning 2014 flows is shown below in Table 2. It shows that DAC statistics include the outflows from all major multilateral development organisations and that the large majority of them report at the activity level in CRS.

5. The ten main agencies on the List of ODA-eligible International Organisations, in terms of volume, that are not reporting are the United Nations Organization, the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), the United Nations Department for Peacekeeping Operations (UNDPKO), the International Drug Purchase Facility (UNITAID) and UN-WOMEN, the Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR), the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), the Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG), the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) and UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), each of them representing between 0.2% and 1.1% of total multilateral ODA in 2014. The Secretariat is already working with some of these organisations. Members' support in obtaining statistics from non-reporting organisations is very helpful.

6. At the September 2014 WP-STAT meeting, members supported the Secretariat's proposal that any organisation added on the List should report if requested by the Secretariat and that this be made a criterion for adding an organisation on the List. In that context discussions on reporting are well under way with the Green Climate Fund.

7. At the February 2014 DAC meeting, members welcomed proposals by the Secretariat to make DAC statistics more inclusive. One of these proposals was to include on the List of ODA-eligible International Organisations, multilateral organisations of which the membership includes none or few DAC members (and that are therefore unlikely to be proposed for inclusion on the List). In recent years several organisations have been included already and the Secretariat continues the work in this area. For example, it could explore the inclusion of the New Development Bank once it is fully operational.

3. Multilateral organisations are only requested to report on core-funded activities [regular budgets and any voluntary core (unearmarked) funds]. Activities financed from non-core (earmarked) funds are reported by the bilateral providers with the organisation identified as the channel of delivery.

Table 2. Multilateral Organisations' Reporting to the OECD¹
2014 flows, gross disbursements in USD million

Agency Name	Concessional Flows	Non-Concessional Flows
Adaptation Fund	13	
African Development Bank (AfDB)	2 148	3 045
Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (AFESD)	885	
Asian Development Bank (AsDB)	2 798	7 600
Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA)	126	
Caribbean Development Bank	113	49
Climate Investment Funds (CIFs)	350	56
Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)	77	285
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)		4 823
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) ²	452	
The Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations (GAVI)	1 415	
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	606	
Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)	16	
Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM)	2 887	
Inter-American Development Bank (IaDB)	1 938	8 789
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)	74	
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) ³	531	92
International Finance Corporation (IFC) ⁴		9 145
IMF Concessional Trust Funds	832	
Islamic Development Bank (ISDB)	246	1 517
Montreal Protocol	45	
Nordic Development Fund (NDF)	50	
OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID)	460	688
Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)	131	
UNAIDS	239	
UN Development Programme (UNDP)	463	
UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)	14	
UN Population Fund (UNFPA)	340	
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	480	
UNICEF	1 342	
UN Peacebuilding Fund (UNPBF)	65	
UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA)	680	
World Food Programme (WFP)	309	
World Health Organisation (WHO)	471	
World Bank (IDA & IBRD)	13 759	15 858
	34 354	49 546

Note: Shaded organisations are those reporting at aggregate level only.

1. The EU is discussed in the paper on reporting by DAC members, and is not included here.

2. Figure for 2013 flows.

3. CRS data available for commitments only.

4. Figure based on commitments.

A2. Major Improvements in 2015/2016

8. **Adaptation Fund** – The Adaptation Fund reported to the OECD for the first time in the beginning of 2015, including commitment and disbursement data for 2010 to 2014 flows.
9. **Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (AFESD)** – For the first time in 2015 Arab Fund reported in one consolidated format, including information on channels of delivery.
10. **Asian Development Bank Group (AsDB)** – The AsDB included in its CRS reporting for the first time climate components.
11. **Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA)** – For the first time, BADEA reported in standard CRS format and included the following fields: extending agency, nature of submission, channel of delivery name and code, multi-bi, type of flow, type of finance, long description and general sector codes.
12. **Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)** – CDB reported in CRS format for the first time in May 2016, including activity-level data for commitments enabling them to report on items such as commitment dates, project titles, purpose codes, type of flow and type of finance.
13. **Climate Investment Funds (CIFs)** – The CIF Secretariat reported for the first time in the 2nd semester of 2015. Disbursement data are still directly collected from the CIF implementing agencies.
14. **European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)** – The EBRD reported on the implementation of CIF-funded projects (disbursements) for the first time. EBRD's reporting on its core resources was less detailed than in the past as it revised the 2010-14 data excluding descriptive information based on a reference to its Public Information Policy.⁴
15. **Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)** – The FAO reported to the OECD for the first time in 2015, including data as from 2013 flows. Reporting is in CRS format, but at semi-aggregate rather than project level.
16. **Global Fund** – The Global Fund reported for the first time on commitment dates, channel codes and types of aid in 2015.
17. **International Labour Organization (ILO)** – The ILO reported for the first time to the OECD in May 2016. The data relate to ILO's Regular Budget as well as the Regular Budget Supplementary Account (which both have a channel code on the List of ODA-eligible International Organisations).
18. **Nordic Development Fund (NDF)** – For new commitments, the NDF reported long descriptions and expected starting and completion dates for the first time.
19. **UN Development Programme (UNDP)** – The UNDP updated mapping of purpose codes following the introduction of its new corporate results framework (UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017).
20. **World Bank** – The World Bank reported more timely so that the data could be included in OECD analytical work on climate finance.

4. The Secretariat is in contact with the EBRD to address this issue.

Section B: Non-DAC Countries

B1. Overview of reporting by non-DAC providers of development finance

21. As part of its overall engagement strategy, the OECD-DAC encourages countries that are not members of the Committee to report their development finance flows for inclusion in DAC statistics. Although this reporting is voluntary, currently 21 non-DAC countries provide data on their development finance flows to the OECD-DAC. Although an increasing number of non-DAC countries is reporting at the activity level (in CRS format), most still report at an aggregate level. Reporting in converged format (including CRS data, the DAC1 table and the validation table) is encouraged.

22. Table 3 below shows total net ODA disbursements in 2010-14 from the non-DAC countries that report their development finance flows to the OECD. More information, including a breakdown of these countries' bilateral and multilateral ODA as well as their reported ODA/GNI ratios, is available online.⁵

Table 3. Non-DAC countries' Net ODA disbursements, 2010-14

Constant 2014 Prices, USD Million

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Bulgaria	42	48	40	50	49
Croatia			22	45	72
Cyprus ^{1a, 1b}	54	37	25	20	
Estonia	22	25	25	31	38
Hungary	115	133	122	127	144
Israel ²	165	221	201	206	200
Kazakhstan				9	33
Kuwait [KFAED]	243	173	181	232	277
Latvia	18	19	22	24	25
Liechtenstein	28	31	29	28	27
Lithuania	41	52	55	51	46
Malta	14	20	19	18	20
Romania	120	162	144	134	214
Russia	521	483	421	631	876
Saudi Arabia	3 646	5 027	1 311	5 704	13 634
Chinese Taipei	399	376	307	273	274
Thailand	5	22	12	36	69
Timor Leste					3
Turkey	884	1 195	2 385	3 118	3 591
United Arab Emirates	434	703	766	5 422	5 080
TOTAL	6 750	8 728	6 088	16 161	24 672

*Shaded countries are those reporting on aggregate level only.

1.a. Footnote by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to "Cyprus" relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".

1.b. Footnote by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Union: The Republic of Cyprus is recognised by all Members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

2. The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

5. See the webpage on development finance of countries beyond the DAC at <http://www.oecd.org/dac/dac-global-relations/non-dac-reporting.htm>.

23. The Secretariat also makes estimates on development co-operation flows of several other provider countries, including the OECD Key Partners (Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa), Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Qatar. These estimates expand the information available on concessional development finance; they also provide a basis for the Secretariat to engage with these countries on issues related to development finance. In 2014, total concessional flows from these countries were estimated at USD 7.5 billion, representing 4% of estimated global ODA-like flows. (See table 4. Estimates country by country are available online.)

Table 4. Estimated global ODA-like flows
(gross, USD billions, current prices)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2014 (% of total)
ODA from current 28 DAC member countries	141.2	150.1	140.1	151.8	150.8	82.2%
ODA from 19 reporting countries beyond the DAC	7.1	9.5	6.8	16.9	25.2	13.7%
Estimated development co-operation flows from ten non-reporting countries beyond the DAC	4.3	5.2	5.7	6.9	7.5	4.1%
<i>Subtotal flows from non-DAC providers</i>	<i>11.4</i>	<i>14.7</i>	<i>12.5</i>	<i>23.8</i>	<i>32.7</i>	<i>17.8%</i>
Estimated global total	152.6	164.8	152.6	175.6	183.5	100%

Notes: i) Brazil and Mexico have not published data on their development co-operation for all the years included in this table. To complete the table, Brazil's development co-operation in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 is estimated to be at the same level as in 2010 and Mexico's development co-operation in 2013 and 2014 is estimated to be at the same level as in 2012.

ii) Azerbaijan and Timor Leste were not yet included in the figures.

B2. Major Improvements in 2015/2016

24. **Azerbaijan** – Azerbaijan reported for the first time to the OECD in May 2016. The data are currently being processed with a view of including them in the September 2016 data release.

25. **Estonia** – Estonia, that started reporting at activity level in 2014, improved reporting on extending agency, recipient countries, channel of delivery name and purpose codes.

26. **Hungary** – In 2015, Hungary reported for the first time in CRS format.

27. **Kazakhstan** – Kazakhstan reported for the first time to the OECD in 2015. It reported at the activity level, but not yet in standardised CRS format.

28. **Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development (KFAED)** – The Kuwait Fund reported on multilateral ODA for the first time in 2015.

29. **Lithuania** – Lithuania reported for the first time in CRS format in 2015, including data on all the policy markers.

30. **Romania** – Romania reported for the first time in CRS format in 2015, including data on all the policy markers.

31. **Russian Federation** – Russia reported debt relief operations for the first time in 2015.

32. **Saudi Arabia** – Saudi Arabia's reporting to the OECD on its development co-operation programme consists of aggregate figures on humanitarian and development assistance by region,

multilateral aid and loan disbursements and repayments by the Saudi Fund for Development. The Secretariat is seeking more detailed reporting. A statistical seminar is planned to take place in Saudi Arabia during the second semester of 2016.

33. **Thailand** – Thailand improved reporting on multilateral ODA in 2015.
34. **Timor Leste** – Timor Leste reported to the OECD for the first time in 2016. Data were included in the March 2016 data release.
35. **United Arab Emirates (UAE)** – In 2015 and 2016 the UAE broadened the coverage of its reporting on Other Official Flows and private flows. It participated in a pilot on Total Official Support for Sustainable Development which also resulted in improved data quality.

Section C: Private Philanthropy

36. In 2015, the **Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)** reported to the OECD on its grants extended under the Global Health and Global Development Programs as well as on its loans and equities (Program-Related Investments – PRIs).
37. Aside from the data collection activities, the OECD is in the process of updating its 2003 report on *Private Foundations and Development Co-operation*, aiming at reflecting on the role of private philanthropy in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. In 2016, as a part of this exercise the OECD will carry out a survey targeting the largest private philanthropic foundations worldwide to collect information on their philanthropic giving to developing countries, focusing on the extent to which they contribute to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. The collaboration with the U.S. Foundation Center will be pursued in this context. The report update is expected to be issued in the course of 2017.

Section D: The Busan Transparency Indicator

38. In November 2016, the GPEDC will hold its 2nd High Level Meeting in Nairobi, Kenya. In preparation for this meeting, the Joint Support Team of the GPEDC will prepare a progress report on the implementation of several commitments from the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness held in Busan in 2011. One of the key commitments is that information on development co-operation should be made publicly available. This commitment is tracked through indicator 4 of the GPEDC Monitoring framework. One of the elements of the indicator is reporting timely, comprehensive and accurate information to the CRS.
39. The Secretariat has assessed the CRS data of those multilateral organisations and non-DAC countries that have an implementation schedule for the Busan commitment on transparency or that have indicated their wish to voluntarily participate in the assessment. The preliminary results can be found in annex 1.

Section E: Conclusion

40. The coverage and quality of reporting by multilateral organisations, non-DAC countries and private foundations is improving. Involving non-DAC providers in the work of the DAC and specifically the WP-STAT, and taking into account the needs of these providers in the DAC statistical system, is essential for the coverage and inclusiveness of the DAC's data on development finance. The Secretariat also welcomes members' support in reaching out to these providers.

**ANNEX 1. PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT OF 2014 CRS DATA FOR THE
BUSAN TRANSPARENCY INDICATOR**

CRS Assessment - Non-DAC reporters					
	Country / organisation	Timeliness	Comprehen- siveness	Accuracy	Overall assessment
Countries					
Good	Estonia				Estonia's reporting is timely and complete. There is some room for improvement for example by starting to report on the tying status of their programme.
Good	Lithuania				Lithuania reported at activity level for the first time in 2015, which explains their low score on timeliness. Considering it reported for the first time, Lithuania did a very good job.
Good	Kuwait				Kuwait Fund reporting is very timely. It can improve reporting on fields such as purpose codes and descriptions.
Multilateral Organisations					
Very good	IADB				Very timely, coherent and accurate reporting. Purpose codes and channel codes could still be improved.
Very good	NDF				Very timely, coherent and accurate reporting. The descriptive information could be improved.
Very good	AsDB				Very timely and accurate reporting. AsDB could report in a more coherent format.
Good	Arab fund				Arab Fund recently improved reporting. There is room for improvement in reporting on descriptions and policy markers.
Good	World Bank				World Bank actually made a major effort in 2015 to report earlier than usual because of a climate finance report. Its fiscal year makes timely reporting to the OECD a challenge. The accuracy can be improved in the areas of descriptions and purpose codes.
Good	UNDP				UNDP scores well on timeliness and comprehensiveness. Especially the descriptive information and reporting on policy markers could be improved.

	Country / organisation	Timeliness	Comprehensiveness	Accuracy	Overall assessment
Good	WFP				WFP scores well on timeliness and comprehensiveness. Especially the descriptive information and reporting on policy markers could be improved.
Good	WHO				WHO scores well on timeliness and comprehensiveness. Some of the geographical information is not very detailed.
Good	AfDB				AfDB scores well on timeliness and comprehensiveness. Especially the descriptive information and purpose codes could be improved.
Good	IsDB				IsDB scores well on timeliness and comprehensiveness. More detailed information per project would improve their accuracy scoring.
Good	GAVI				GAVI reports accurately, but could improve its score by more timely reporting.
Good	IFAD				IFAD could focus on timeliness to improve their scoring. Comprehensiveness can be improved by reporting disbursements in the same format as commitments. Its reporting is quite accurate, but for example on descriptive information there is room for progress.
Good	UNICEF				UNICEF recently made improvements to their reporting. Further improvements can be made in reporting on commitments, channel codes and descriptions.
Fair	UNFPA				UNFPA reports by outcome rather than project, which affects their scoring on the accuracy dimension.
Private Foundation					
Good	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation				The BMGF's reporting is timely and complete. There could be improvements for example with channel code and type of aid reporting or also by starting reporting on policy makers.