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Summary Record of the 1042nd DAC meeting, held on 9 April 2018

Item 1. Welcome and Adoption of the Agenda

1. The DAC Chair welcomed participants and thanked the departing Norwegian delegate for his service to the Committee. She informed the Committee that the OECD Secretary-General, the DCD Director, and the DAC Chair would participate in a press briefing at 12:45 to present the preliminary 2017 Official Development Assistance (ODA) figures and that it would therefore be useful to end the morning session at 12:30. She then invited the DAC to adopt the agenda. The US delegate requested that item 5 (Untying Aid: 2018 Progress Report) be changed from "for approval" to "for discussion". It would then be for approval in a future DAC meeting. Denmark, Spain, Czech, Hungary, and the EU all supported this position. The Committee agreed to this change and adopted the agenda without further modification.

Item 2. Approval of Draft Summary Record

2. The Chair announced that the deadline for objections to the revisions proposed by Sweden to the summary record from the 1 February 2018 DAC meeting has passed. The EU provided a couple of editorial comments on their interventions that were so minor that they did not require Committee approval. These related to paragraphs 32 and 33. The Secretariat has therefore issued the revised summary record as final and declassified it, as agreed by the Committee.

3. The Chair then asked Committee to approve the draft summary record from the 12 March 2018 DAC meeting. The DAC approved the record without modification and agreed to its declassification.

Item 3. Briefing by the DCD Director and DAC Chair

4. The DCD Director reported to the Committee on a number of recent developments. He mentioned the 5 April 2018 Global Forum on Development1, which built a new engagement beyond the DAC on gender and youth. Some of the messages will require additional discussion. He informed the DAC that the Secretariat had posted to ONE [under the cote DCD/DAC(2018)15] a document consolidating guidance from the Secretary-General and a heads of delegations’ convergence paper. This document will help inform deliberations on the 2019-20 Programme of Work and Budget.

5. The Director then mentioned a number of upcoming meetings of interest to the DAC. On 17-18 April, the Secretariat is organising with Portugal an event that will focus on how to make best use of the value added of triangular co-operation. He encouraged delegations to share this information with their capitals and to participate at the highest level possible. On 10-11 April, the results community will hold a workshop covering issues around measuring results of private sector engagement and better use of data and new technologies for results-based management. There will also be breakout sessions on new technologies.

---

1 See http://www.oecd.org/site/oecdgfd/
developments with the results agenda such as adaptive management and payment by results. The Secretariat and the DAC Chair will be involved in a number of interesting events at the Financing for Development Forum in New York from 23-26 April. These include events on the Global Outlook on Financing for Development, Blended Finance, Social Impact Investing, Total Official Support for Sustainable Development, and Small Island Developing States.

6. The Director also announced that, in light of recent global developments relating to moral and sexual harassment, the Secretariat is establishing an internal group to develop proposals to the Committee regarding a possible formal DAC decision/recommendation. The Secretariat will revert to the Committee at a later time once reflections have advanced.

7. Lastly, he presented the preliminary 2017 ODA figures\(^2\), embargoed until 15:00 that day. He announced that ODA remains stable with a slight drop relative to 2016, the main reason for which relates to the reduced intensity of the refugee crisis. Removing in-donor refugee costs from the calculations, overall ODA actually went up slightly. The data show an increase in ODA to Least Developed Countries and Africa, reversing the declining trend in recent years. Five DAC members – Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom – met the United Nations target for an ODA/GNI ratio of at least 0.7%. Overall the ODA/GNI ratio is down across the DAC. Total net ODA flows rose in 11 countries, with the biggest increases in France, Italy, Japan and Sweden.

8. The DAC Chair then reported on recent developments from her office and pointed delegates to the newsletter update she had just issued to the Committee. She reported to the Committee that she participated in a lunch discussion with all OECD Committee chairs to prepare the Ministerial Council Meeting and has recently met bilaterally with a number of those chairs, including those from the Development Centre, the Investment Committee, the Working Party on Responsible Business Conduct, and the Economic Policy Committee.

9. She highlighted her upcoming participation at the Spring Meetings of the World Bank and IMF in Washington and the Financing for Development Forum in New York. In Washington, she will convene meetings with Members, including a G7 meeting on development finance and development and security. In addition, the Global Partnership on Effective Development Co-operation will hold a Steering Committee meeting. She will also attend the Stockholm Forum on Gender Equality later this month.

10. In discussion, delegates expressed strong support for conducting work on moral / sexual harassment and suggested that it could be launched through an informal meeting of the DAC group on Major Policy Issues. Members also suggested exploring how to facilitate greater and more explicit communication on how the donor community can support the 2030 Agenda, including through ODA. One member requested that the Secretariat provide an explanation in writing for the revised frequency of peer reviews, which the Director agreed to provide.

**Item 4. Programme of Work and Budget 2019-20**

11. The co-chair of the DAC Focal Group on the PWB briefed the Committee on the discussions that took place in the informal meeting of 28 March. The Director presented a

\(^2\) The figures were later released to the public at the following address: http://www.oecd.org/development/development-aid-stable-in-2017-with-more-sent-to-poorest-countries.htm
revised version of the draft Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) for the 2019-20 biennium [DCD/DAC(2018)8/REV2]. He thanked the co-chair of the PWB focal group for having convened the informal meeting and the Delegations for their comments. The Director highlighted the main changes in the revised version, taking into consideration the comments from members.

12. The Secretariat mainstreamed references to least developed countries (LDCs), poverty reduction, and gender in the introductory paragraphs of the PWB document and adopted the HLM Communiqué classification of countries. The Director stressed that Output Area 5.1.1 should be seen as a consolidated block in which the output results (OR) 1, 2, and 3 interlink and jointly contribute to advancing the work on financing for development; they represent three crucial dimensions (measuring, mobilising and learning). Throughout output area 5.1.1, the LDC approach has been mainstreamed into the proposed reports, but a new LDC study has not been added as it would increase the budget and it would be better to include LDC analysis in the various reports to have a more comprehensive approach to LDC challenges. A new optional element was added under private finance for sustainable development (IOR 3.4), and the OR3 budget has been decreased by 280 KEUR with TOSSD decreased by 90 KEUR. On the topic of energy, members’ comments were accommodated and it was explained that there is no duplication of efforts with the International Energy Agency.

13. On output area 5.1.2, the Director explained that based on members requests the Secretariat decided to add new work on Data for Development to IOR 5.5 with a budget envelope of 310 KEUR. The Director informed the Committee that adjustments were made to the Evalnet budget to bring the network closer to the budget levels of the other networks (1,285 KEUR). The Director said that it would be important to see more cross-fertilisation between the work of Evalnet and the results community of practice. He mentioned that members frequently ask for adjustments to the peer review schedule (e.g., for 2019, four members requested to be moved to 2020). To accommodate what are often good reasons for making adjustments, flexibility needs to be ensured. Members also consistently request more from the peer team in relation to learning. To accommodate this, without increasing staff resources, the PWB proposal needs to go back to ten reviews per biennium. In turn, the Secretariat will go back to the practice of setting out a learning action plan for the biennium.

14. On output area 5.1.3, the text of IOR 8.3 was changed to accommodate members’ comments. Illicit financial flows (IFF) work is very important and has been developed at the request of African countries and in collaboration with African and UN institutions. The Secretariat has added language that clarifies partnerships and the purpose of this work. On IOR 9.2 the reference to the work on gender equality in conflict was inserted.

15. Following the informal meeting on 28 March, and the consultations on the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS) and the Effective Institutions Platform (EIP), the Secretariat has adjusted the figures on 5.1.4. The EIP budget is increased to 511 KEUR and the IDPS budget to 924 KEUR. For both partnerships, the budget covers the minimum staff composition that would be needed to run the Secretariats as well as a limited level of non-staff costs.

16. In discussion, members welcomed the proposal and suggested that more attention be given to prioritising the core areas of the DAC and to mainstream the language on LDCs and advised to focus on the core values of the DAC, avoiding duplication with other international organisations. Some members asked for clarification on the budget allocated to Evalnet and budget adjustments made by the Secretariat that allowed to increase the
budget envelopes for IDPS and EIP. Some members requested that more funding could be allocated to the work on statistics; one member (supported by others) proposed to add more on peacekeeping to the statistical work; Ireland anticipated that further reviews around this issue would not occur in 2019-20; and another member state requested clarification of the existing draft language. One member suggested more work should be done on infrastructure and one suggested to reduce the budget for TOSSD (several members were against this proposal). Some members emphasised the need to do more work on transition in collaboration with other parts of the Development Cluster. A few members requested more information on IOR 8.3 and the work on illicit financial flows.

17. In concluding the session, the DAC Chair informed the Committee that another informal meeting of the PWB will take place (dates to be decided with the co-chairs). The Director reiterated that, in compliance with the preliminary guidance from the Secretary-General, the Secretariat used the 2018 Part I base budget figure as a basis for preparing the draft 2019-20 PWB. On next steps in the process, the Director invited written comments on the proposal by Friday, 13 April. The Secretariat will redraft the proposal based on those written comments as well as the comments expressed today and will provide the next iteration in track changes.

Item 5. Untying Aid: 2018 Progress Report

18. The Secretariat presented the 2018 Untying Report, the main findings of which show a general positive trend. The share of ODA covered by the Untying Recommendation that was reported as untied has increased from 82.6% in 2015 to 88.3% in 2016, the highest level recorded since the Recommendation was agreed. In terms of transparency provisions, 80% of members reported on ex post contract awards, which is the highest level recorded since the beginning of this reporting. However, the reporting on ex ante notifications of untied aid offers remains adhered to by very few members, only 25% in 2017.

19. In addition to the report on Members’ adherence to the Untying Recommendation, the report included, in the annexes, two proposals for approval by the Committee:

- A proposal to simplify the reporting requirement of ex ante notifications (Annex B), and;
- A proposal to renew the extension of the Recommendation coverage to non-LDC Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) for a further five years (Annex C).

20. The DAC welcomed the aid untying report. The Secretariat was asked to reflect in the body of the report suggestions by Hungary with regard to its reporting of the tying status of aid, and by Portugal regarding the inclusion of additional information in the paragraph about ex ante notifications. While there were no objections raised on the analysis outlined in the body of the report, the Committee did not formally approve the report, as questions or concerns remained with regard to the annexes. Members requested additional information on the relevance of the extension of coverage to non-LDC HIPCs and possibly other low-income countries in general. With regard to the simplification of ex ante notifications, while some Members welcomed simplification of ex ante notification reporting, some other Members opposed simplification of the ex ante notification reporting without co-ordination with the Export Credits Group. The Committee asked the Secretariat to co-ordinate with the Export Credits Group secretariat and to keep the DAC informed of any proposals emerging from those consultations, and to resubmit the report and annexes for discussion and approval at a future meeting.
Item 6. Perspectives from Geneva: Bridging the humanitarian, development and security gap through the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

21. The Director-General of the United Nations Office in Geneva, Mr. Michael Møller, gave an exposé over how the SDGs have changed the way all actors work in Geneva, not only the UN organisations. The SDGs had given them the leitmotif to gather the Geneva actors and had bridged the linguistic barrier that previously existed between them. For his part, he had decided, after the adoption of the SDGs, to set up what they called an SDG lab, to co-create solutions to do something completely new, as collaboration can deliver better outcomes. As it is no longer enough to work in silos and with old technology, this new mind-set had also driven change internally to better collaborate. But it was clear to him that we have to pick up speed as progress is too unevenly spread and more focus should be given to proper integration of the SDGs in our systems. The UN system would have to work closer with each other but also with partners and donors. This was the idea of the funding compact proposed by the UN Secretary-General to increase the predictability of the system. Better investment in prevention could save the international community massive amounts of money and would help finally deliver to the most vulnerable. However, prevention was a hard sell to governments who exist in short-term realities and Mr. Møller said that the gap between short-term political systems and long-term needs were growing, which was a deep structural problem. He said that it was our task in the multilateral system – as this is why it had been set up – to make a better case on why we had to invest long-term, both to the public and decision makers. We would also have to scale up partnerships, as ODA will not take us all the way.

22. In discussion, comments circled around the importance of the DAC’s role in the wider community and on how to change the way it works to deliver on the SDGs. Several members picked up on the importance of coherence within their respective governments. Mr. Møller admitted that the UN system naturally had the same challenges regarding coherence as ministries in member states. He pointed out that the more innovative and whole-of-government ways of working in order to maximise impact was happening in the South, in countries such as Costa Rica, Colombia and Niger. He also explained the rationale behind some of the suggestions of the UNSG in his reform, for example the new proposal to give the UN Resident Coordinator a broader mandate.

Item 7. Development Co-operation Report 2018

23. The Secretariat presented the concept, objectives and draft outline for the special theme of the 2018 Development Co-operation Report (DCR) – Unpacking Leave No-One Behind. In his introductory remarks, the Director noted that this is the first time the Secretariat has consulted with the Committee in the conceptual stage of the report and that the DAC Chair is engaged throughout the process. The Director stressed the importance, relevance and timely nature of unpacking the meaning of leave no-one behind and how members are working to leave no-one behind through ODA and other forms of international co-operation. The Secretariat is eager to collaborate with DAC members and a broad range of stakeholders to be as comprehensive and multidimensional as possible.

24. The Secretariat stressed that the Report is not seeking to provide a definition or to recommend specific measures of leave no-one behind. The Secretariat recognises that this phrase means different things in different contexts and that the 2030 Agenda stresses that all member states will define how the agenda will be delivered in their own contexts. The Secretariat is taking an open, non-prescriptive and evidence-based approach to its research
and analysis in order to provide the DAC, its partners and the various users of the DCR with up-to-date evidence on who is furthest behind in relation to the SDGs with an emphasis on poverty, inequality, gender and youth, disability, vulnerability, marginalisation and economic, social and political exclusion. The report will also provide an evidence-based analysis of the different policies and tools for eradicating poverty, reducing inequality, promoting inclusive and people-centred development that has a positive impact on the lives and opportunities of the poorest, most vulnerable and excluded people in different contexts. The report will also serve as a platform for DAC members, developing countries, civil society and other actors to share diverse lessons on what works in relation to fighting poverty, creating opportunities and being inclusive.

25. Members commented on the relevance and scope of the report. There was overwhelmingly positive support for the focus on “Unpacking leave no-one behind” from a multi-dimensional and people-centre perspective. One member expressed reservations about the concept and advised caution in how to present Leave No-One Behind, which is not a commitment and which it considers to be aspirational. Several members stressed the importance of being poverty-, equity- and inequality-centric while also going beyond income/consumption-based deprivation, to focusing on needs, vulnerability and discrimination. Members suggested that current approaches that they are taking, for example human security, human rights–based approaches, gender mainstreaming and focus, can inform the evidence base and provide lessons. There was a general sense that the report can inform future DAC discussions on delivering the 2030 Agenda.

26. In terms of next steps, the Secretariat will update the concept and table of contents in light of the discussion, will finalise the donor profiles for release in June, and aims to launch the DCR in November 2018.

**Item 8. Total Official Support for Sustainable Development (TOSSD)**

27. The Secretariat made a presentation on the recent and upcoming TOSSD events, including the consultation with the Participants of the Arrangement on Export Credits and the WP-STAT workshop on the TOSSD provider perspective held in March and three events to be held in April, namely the presentation on TOSSD to the UN Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDG indicators, the information session on TOSSD for the MDBs, and the side event on TOSSD at the Financing for Development Forum organised by the Task Force and Ghana.

28. Mr. Laurent Sarazin, co-Chair of the TOSSD Task Force, informed the Committee via videolink of the status of work on TOSSD development, noting good progress made on the cross-border resource flows pillar and that first discussions on the development enablers/global challenges pillar would be held at the 4th Task Force meeting in May. He walked the Committee through the emerging reporting instructions [DCD/DAC/RD(2018)4], highlighting key points in the preamble (main objectives of the TOSSD measure, assumed compliance with environmental and social standards, complementarity to ODA), the TOSSD definition (and the underlying definitions of sustainable development, resource flows and officially supported flows), main reporting principles (e.g., compliance with UN statistical standards, reporting and publication of TOSSD data at activity level), scope (financial instruments and maturities covered), eligibility criteria (link with SDG targets/goals, list of TOSSD recipients), measurement methods (e.g., in-kind technical co-operation), and reporting format.
29. The DCD Director emphasised the inclusiveness and transparency of the work of the TOSSD Task Force and informed the Committee that Brazil had decided to join the Task Force as an observer. The Task Force had representatives from 11 developing countries; China (Chinese Academy of International Trade and Economic Cooperation, CAITEC, serving the Chinese Ministry of Commerce) also participated as an observer.

30. Members welcomed the progress made by the Task Force and expressed their support for the process. They made suggestions on the emerging reporting instructions as follows.

- **Preamble:** Spain would welcome a stronger reference to international standards on human rights and the UK expanded wording on the difference between TOSSD and ODA. The US commented that the primary value of TOSSD was better data on inflows to developing countries from all sources and that linking TOSSD to the SDG monitoring framework seemed too narrow a justification for the measure. A more robust and policy-oriented narrative was about the importance of mobilising all resources for the 2030 Agenda.

- **Scope:** The EU, Japan and Poland expressed the view that export credits should be included in TOSSD if provided for sustainable development, while the US argued for their exclusion. Norway and the UK asked for further clarification on the reasoning for excluding export credits. Spain emphasised the need to present figures on private finance mobilised separately. The UK asked whether amounts mobilised would be attributed to the official providers and if so according to what methodology.

- **Eligibility criteria:** Poland commented that the eligibility criteria needed to be further clarified. The UK requested further clarification specifically on enterprises under significant government influence. As regards the list of TOSSD recipients, New Zealand welcomed the idea of the opt-in procedure but suggested defining eligibility through more objective criteria based on income or vulnerability, and not through exclusion (of “traditional donors”). Mexico commented that country eligibility based on a multidimensional view of development would have been more objective; in its view the proposed opt-in procedure could put countries in an awkward position.

- **Data reporting:** Denmark and Norway noted the need for the TOSSD framework to remain simple, minimise reporting burden and draw as much data as possible from existing sources. Denmark, Spain and the UK suggested including a reference to IATI in the reporting instructions. Spain stated it agreed with the principle of activity-level reporting but noted the need to seek coherence with ODA reporting.

- **Provider perspective:** The EU encouraged further work on the provider perspective including work on development enablers and global challenges. The US commented that in the Task Force there were different views on the issue and that the discussion was not settled yet.

31. Members also exchanged views on future discussions on TOSSD in the Committee. Belgium hoped that some elements of the emerging reporting instructions (e.g., those indicated with placeholders) be presented for discussion by the DAC to build a bridge between the Committee and the technical discussions in the Task Force and the WP-STAT. Canada stated it saw TOSSD having a longstanding impact on the measurement of financing for development and suggested that the Committee should therefore think strategically how to possibly use the next DAC Senior Level Meeting to advance buy-in, while recognising that the DAC was only one stakeholder group of TOSSD. The UK
stressed the need to increase outreach with G-77 countries and civil society organisations. The EU suggested that the Global Relations Secretariat could promote TOSSD horizontally through its regional programmes.

32. Mr. Sarazin responded to members’ questions by explaining that, regarding the list of TOSSD recipients, the Task Force had discussed various options, including the multidimensional poverty assessments (ECLAC methodology), but had chosen the opt-in system for simplicity. The question of export credits would be further considered by the Task Force based on the consultation with the Export Credit Group, but arguments presented in the Task Force for the exclusion of export credits from TOSSD had been similar to those in the debate on private sector instruments. Regarding data reporting, the Task Force had already started a discussion on cohesion with IATI; a consultation with the CSOs had been planned at the end of May back-to-back with the 4th Task Force meeting. As regards the question of how data collection from partner countries could be achieved, he noted the need for capacity building of the national statistical offices but stressed that the proposal for reporting by the recipients had originated from the developing country representatives of the Task Force.

33. In response to the question from Belgium, the Secretariat suggested that a number of topics indicated in the emerging reporting instructions with placeholders be discussed at the DAC and that members could signal to the Secretariat the ones they would wish to focus on. On collaboration with IATI, she emphasised the distinction between the TOSSD statistical measure and the reporting tools; linkages with IATI would be developed but since TOSSD was a statistical measure a quality assurance mechanism was also required. She also explained that the Secretariat was developing additional communication material on TOSSD (e.g., frequently asked questions) for use in future outreach. The DCD Director proposed a webinar to improve communication between the DAC and their counterparts in New York who had a less optimistic perception of TOSSD because of the general discussions on financing for development with G-77 countries.

34. The DAC Chair concluded the discussion by stating that DAC members should be ambassadors of TOSSD and further reflection should go into whether they had all the necessary tools to do so, given that the TOSSD measure was shaping up but still a work-in-progress.

**Item 9. DAC Policy Network Update: Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment**

35. The Secretariat presented progress on the Programme of Work and Budget for the DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET) in 2017-18. Gender equality and women’s empowerment are crucial enablers and multipliers of all development outcomes. Economies are more resilient, productive and inclusive when they reduce gender inequalities and actively support women’s equal participation in all spheres of life. GENDERNET undertakes evidence-based policy analysis and provides a platform for donors’ learning and accountability on gender equality and women’s empowerment through development co-operation and currently focuses on three main themes: i) Gender equality and women’s participation in fragile and conflict-affected contexts; ii) monitoring and analysing ODA flows targeting gender equality; and iii) in the context of the OECD Policy Dialogue on Women’s Economic Empowerment, supporting women’s access to economic opportunities through reducing their unpaid domestic and care workload.

36. GENDERNET works to ensure that global and national commitments on gender equality and women’s rights are underpinned by adequate resources for effective
implementation. While aid targeting gender equality reached an all-time high in 2015-16 with USD 41.4 billion of bilateral allocable aid, only USD 4.6 billion of the aid to gender equality (11%) targeted gender equality and women’s empowerment as the main objective. DAC donors need to target gender equality more actively as a primary objective, rather than a secondary objective among several others, according to analysis by the GENDERNET Secretariat.

37. The Secretariat signalled that the DCD Team on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment was now fully staffed with the lead analyst, Jenny Hedman, in her role since September 2017, and the new Team Lead, Lisa E. Williams, newly appointed. Members welcomed progress in 2017-18 on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, noting that the Secretariat had done a good job advancing the PWB in the last period and recognised the Gender Team’s contribution to the high-profile Global Forum on Development, The Power of 4 Billion: Inclusive Approaches to Women and Youth, 5 April 2018. Denmark and Sweden specifically reiterated the importance of GENDERNET as a crucial convening space for network members to push gender equality forward in development and across the global agenda, also at a time of greater attention to the issues. Members also raised the need for substantive work on gender equality and women’s empowerment across the agenda in the DAC and DCD, including in the peer reviews. Canada mentioned the need to connect with WP-STAT on SDG 5 alignment. The UK pointed out that GENDERNET may be helpful in any potential efforts on safeguarding against risks of sexual abuse and exploitation in development co-operation.

38. Policy Dialogue on Women’s Economic Empowerment: Members appreciated the work on the Policy Dialogue currently focussed on Unpaid Care work which brought more than 170 participants from across countries and organisations to Paris in January to unpack the key challenges to scope out work going forward. Jointly managed by three Directorates, this work brings together three pillars of OECD expertise: analysis of the data and relevant practices of development agencies via GENDERNET by DCD, time use surveys from SDD, and the SIGI database from the Development Centre. The importance of sex-disaggregated data to recognise intersecting discriminations was signalled as critical to this work and other areas (Belgium, Finland) and some raised the need to address the issue of sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and access to contraception for women to access economic opportunities. The EU welcomes policy dialogue and user-friendly guidance for domestic policy makers. The US signalled a need to deepen understanding around unpaid care work. Austria stressed the importance of the shared responsibility topic for policy dialogue and a need to bring discourse on changing social norms to country-level by helping donors to work with developing countries on this issue.

39. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations: This work was presented at the World Bank Fragility Forum (by INCAF) and at the Commission on the Status of Women and the Global Forum on Development (by GENDERNET). Many members encouraged deeper and more operational, practical guidance to follow on from the prior joint analytical work (Belgium, Finland, Ireland, Canada, Sweden). Collaboration between GENDERNET and INCAF was seen as an asset by the US and a model for replication. One member raised the issue of how to effectively address concerns for women with disabilities. There was broad and strong support for continued collaboration with INCAF, suggested a presentation in the next INCAF meeting and Sweden referred to developing guidelines to mainstream gender in conflict programming in pilot countries. Austria suggested linking up with the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS).
Item 10. Summary of Conclusions

40. The Secretariat provided an overview of the decisions, action points, and next steps emerging from the day's proceedings. The Secretariat will circulate this overview to the Committee in electronic form.

Item 11. Any Other Business

41. The Chair reminded the DAC that the May meeting will address the issue of a Senior Level Meeting in December 2018. She also mentioned the 2018 DAC roadmap which will be reviewed and adjusted as necessary in the coming Committee meetings.