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Item 1. Welcome and Adoption of the Agenda

1. The DAC chair welcomed delegates and informed them that the United Kingdom proposed to invert the order of items 10 and 11. The Committee agreed to this change then approved the agenda without further modification.

Item 2. Approval of Draft Summary Record

2. The Chair announced that there remain diverging views on the summary record from the 16 May 2018 DAC meeting, which therefore require further work by the Secretariat and a group of members to arrive at a proposal for the full Committee to decide via the written procedure. The Chair then invited the Committee’s comments on the summary record from the 11 June 2018 DAC meeting. Greece, Korea, and the USA requested changes, which they will share with the Secretariat in writing. The Secretariat will incorporate those changes and issue a revised version for approval via the written procedure.

Item 3. Briefing by the DCD Director and DAC Chair

3. The Director informed delegates that the ODA trends and profiles of development co-operation providers would be available later that morning on the OECD website. As in previous years, the profiles provide the latest analysis of key development finance flows for 30 DAC members and 13 other providers that report to the OECD. This year the profiles also showcase statistics on private development finance from two foundations – the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the United Postcode Lotteries – and estimates on development finance for 10 countries that do not currently report to the OECD. A trends chapter also analyses some of the main shifts and trends in development co-operation. To align with the special theme of this year’s Development Co-operation Report (“Joining Forces to Leave No One Behind”), the profiles also present key facts on development co-operation providers’ approaches and priorities to leaving no one behind.

4. The Director reminded the Committee that Saudi Arabia became a DAC Participant in May 2018 and informed delegates that H.E. Dr. Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al Rabeeah will visit the OECD on 3 and 4 September 2018. Dr. Al Rabeeah is the Supervisor General of the King Salman Humanitarian Aid and Relief Centre and advisor to the Royal Court of Saudi Arabia. On 4 September, the Secretariat will organise a session to which OECD Ambassadors and DAC delegates will be invited, where His Excellency will provide a presentation on Saudi Arabia’s development co-operation landscape. An invitation will be issued to delegations soon. As Saudi Arabia will chair the G20 in 2020, this event gives the OECD an excellent opportunity to start working with the country to support its presidency, ensuring that the OECD and the DAC inputs feed into these discussions.

5. The 2018 Global Partnership monitoring round has now been officially launched, with an official invitation letter from the Bangladesh, German, and Ugandan co-chairs sent to over 100 partner countries. Over 50 partner countries have already expressed interest to participate, and this number is set to increase. Data collection and validation will run through December 2018. Fresh evidence on effectiveness will become available in 2019 and will directly inform reporting on SDG17 and SDG5, and the Global Partnership’s 2019 Senior Level Meeting. The 2018 monitoring round features strengthened indicators and provides a critical accountability tool for the DAC. The Joint Support Team stands ready to support active DAC participation and use of monitoring findings. The Director also noted that the Global Partnership will convene an event on 11 and 12 September 2018 in Paris on “Reinvigorating Effectiveness for the 2030 Agenda”.
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6. The Director informed the Committee that on 3 July he presented the DAC’s 2019-20 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB) to the Budget Committee. Members were very appreciative to have learned more about the Committee’s work and asked about the linkages between the DAC reform and the definition of the PWB. In October/November, the Secretary-General will submit the draft 2019-20 PWB to Council for discussion with the expectation that Council formally approves the PWB in December.

7. The Director and Chair will both attend meetings at the High Level Political Forum in New York. The Secretariat will organise two side events: a High-Level Event on “More and Better Financing for Development Data” on 11 July and a High-level Launch Event of the OECD States of Fragility 2018 report on 17 July.

8. The Director thanked members for their participation at the 6 July kick-off meeting of the DAC Reference Group on Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA). The Secretariat has issued a note summarising the highlights. In the message, the Secretariat asks members to share their experiences in addressing SEA and to express their interest in participating in the group – which is open to all OECD members, observers, and participants. The group is looking at how to involve CSOs and developing countries as well. Ireland has expressed its willingness to serve as chair and its preference for a co-chair arrangement. To date, no other member has expressed an interest in co-chairing. Interested delegations are invited to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible. The DAC Chair added that members still have the opportunity to endorse the SEA statement from Tidewater1 and are invited to inform the Chair’s Office should they wish to do so. In addition, in an attempt to develop principles and procedures on SEA, UNAIDS has launched a panel and asked the DAC Chair to serve on it.

9. The revision of DAC network mandates is ongoing. In cases where networks will not hold their plenary meetings until much later in the year, the co-chairs are agreeing to the revisions via email. The Secretariat will strive to present as many of the revised mandates as possible at the 25 October DAC meeting, as programmed in the forward planning. It may be necessary to share the remaining mandates with the Committee for approval the written procedure.

10. Lastly, the Director informed the Committee that the Secretariat would convene a meeting on the peer review methodology on 4 October in the North Dome conference room in the Boulogne building. The exact timing is still to be determined, so the Secretariat will revert to the DAC when the date approaches.

11. The Chair then reported on developments from her office. She highlighted three main points for the Senior Level Meeting (SLM) in December 2018. First, the SLM would be an opportunity to meet with civil society organisations, in line with the Framework for Dialogue. Second, the Secretariat proposed to reach out to LAC countries from a donor perspective, as the DAC already does with the Arab countries. Third, the DAC Chair suggested inviting the leader of the UN reform on development to share experiences.

12. The Chair also mentioned that she wishes to launch preparations for the 2019 Tidewater meetings earlier than in previous years. A number of members have expressed their interest in hosting; other members are also welcome to express such an interest by reaching out to the Chair’s office.

13. To drive forward a decision on private sector instruments, the Chair has spoken with all of the most interested countries. They have confirmed that they are ready to engage but do not wish to reopen the discussion entirely. The Chair has decided not to convene a technical task force but rather a meeting in September (exact date still to be determined) with the most interested countries who will represent all views and come up with a proposal for review by the full Committee. The DAC Chair will not preside over that September meeting. The process will be inclusive and will include information-sharing back to the full Committee. Members welcomed this proposal and look forward to further details.

Item 4. DAC Framework for Dialogue with CSOs

14. The Secretariat presented the Framework for Dialogue between the DAC and Civil Society Organisations [DCD/DAC(2018)28]. The DAC Chair and the Director reiterated that the document provided a good framework for dialogue with the DAC and thanked the delegates and the co-chair of the informal group on engagement for all the support during the process. The Director highlighted that there was an extensive consultation process and that CSOs were in agreement with the proposal. The Secretariat then presented the main characteristics that define the Framework. The objectives of DAC-CSO dialogue are to facilitate a broad and meaningful dialogue, promote policy debate, and build relationships and trust. The scope of the Framework refers to the dialogue between the DAC and CSOs, not to subsidiary bodies or working groups, the representation of CSOs is based on their own self-organisation, and the selection of CSOs attending meetings with the DAC must be transparent and representative. The Secretariat also referred to the dialogue principles: information and knowledge sharing, space for consultation and dialogue as a shared responsibility between DAC and CSOs. The dialogue will be subject to internal evaluations by the DAC and CSOs on an annual basis, and externally every four years.

15. The Committee approved the DAC framework for dialogue with CSOs but highlighted a few concerns. Several members emphasised the relevance of clear and transparent criteria for the selection of CSOs that will attend meetings. They expressed their interest in a balanced representation of CSOs based on geographic and sectoral criteria, highlighting that CSOs from partner countries should also be present to achieve a meaningful dialogue. Some countries stressed the importance of knowing in advance the list of CSOs that will participate in the meetings and who they represent. DAC members also expressed their concern over the shrinking of the civic space in a number of countries. A couple of countries mentioned that the CSOs that participate in the dialogue must respect the principles of international law.

16. The Secretariat informed the Committee that CSOs have always shared the list of participants in advance, but the Secretariat will include more information when distributing the list (full name, sector and networks and whom they represent). The Secretariat clarified that this framework does not imply any changes to the current DAC decision making rules. The DAC Chair reacted very positively to the suggestion that the DAC address the shrinking space for CSOs and noted that, if the DAC aims at having southern representation, DAC members should also think about funding it.

Item 5. Financing for Stability

17. The Secretariat gave an overview of INCAF’s Financing for Stability package, which focuses on lessons learned from applying the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) to fragile contexts. There have been five financing strategy case studies conducted so far: Haiti, Madagascar, the Central African Republic, Sudan, and Malawi. Lessons learned from these case studies include the following:

- There is not enough financial literacy in the field.
- The right financing strategy is context-specific.
- There is very little financing available for public goods.
- The international community cannot think about flows to fragile contexts without thinking about humanitarian spending and the peace/humanitarian/development nexus.
18. The presentation addressed why financing for stability matters and outlined a range of recommendations concerning emerging challenges for INCAF to address when it comes to development financing in fragile contexts. These challenges fall under the scope of financing with the right amount, the right tools, the right timing, and the right incentives. Questions were then posed to members on how this work could be more broadly useful to the DAC going forward.

19. Members expressed their approval of the DCD and INCAF’s work on financing for stability and found the analysis useful and insightful. It was agreed that doing development differently, ensuring coherence, and continued engagement from other donors would contribute to better development outcomes in fragile contexts. In discussion, members suggested strategies through approaches such as financing for prevention, ensuring longer investments in multi-year commitments, and considering other financial flows. Several members expressed interest in private sector involvement, domestic resource mobilisation, and financial literacy, and welcomed ongoing discussion, research, and further evidence on these topics. The need for co-ordination through avenues such as exploring synergies with the World Bank on Pathways for Peace, and through consulting with other OECD expertise in areas such as financial education and the Development Centre was emphasized. New Zealand expressed the need for knowledge on how guidance is reaching practitioners and how they are applying it in the field, and Canada requested advice on how to share knowledge between the parts of its agencies that address financial literacy and those that address conflict and fragility.

20. The Secretariat reiterated the significance of addressing illicit financial flows, the small amount being spent on prevention, the lack of co-ordination between donors, and the need for synergies between ODA and investments. The Secretariat also highlighted the difficulty with which the private sector works in fragile contexts, emphasizing the importance of increasing incentives, and the potential for alternative short-term solutions such as south–south foreign direct investment. Innovative financing – such as pension funds – might also be an option in some fragile contexts, and internal budget support – a more risky option that can pay off if done well. Other suggestions included block chain as a means of reducing the cost of remittances. The Secretariat also confirmed that guidance on financing for stability is reaching practitioners in the field.

21. The Director encouraged members to consult DCD’s other work on crises and fragility for further information and emphasized that financing for stability is also being discussed extensively within the private sector. The Secretariat emphasized the importance of co-ordination and suggested plans for a round table to discuss what exists in order to come together for one collective discussion.

**Item 6. Total Official Support for Sustainable Development**

22. The Secretariat presented an update on progress in recent work to develop the Total Official Support for Sustainable Development (TOSSD) measurement framework [DCD/DAC(2018)29]. The presentation focused on the dialogue with the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal indicators (IAEG-SDG), the outcomes of the 4th meeting of the TOSSD Task Force (29-30 May 2018) and the consultation with CSOs (31 May 2018), as well as the preliminary results of the TOSSD country pilot in Nigeria (30 April – 11 May 2018).

23. The Committee was invited to comment on these recent activities and to provide inputs on how to respond to two specific CSO concerns: the continued perceived risk that TOSSD could undermine ODA and the issue that TOSSD may give rise to inflated figures if the total amount of official support is added up with the amount of private finance mobilised. Ten members (Canada, Denmark, EU, Finland, Germany, Norway, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, US) commented on the various aspects as below.

24. Members thanked the Secretariat for actively engaging with the IAEG-SDG and the UN and called for an intensification of these talks. One member questioned whether acceptance from the IAEG-SDG would lead to recognition or validation of TOSSD by the UN and suggested that more clarity was needed on the strategy for reaching out to the UN. Another member suggested the creation of a “Friends of
TOSSD’s Ambassadors’ group in New York and encouraged further engagement with the UN there. To help the Task Force engage more effectively with these institutions, members – especially those that have a seat on both the IAEG-SDG and the UN Statistical Commission – were encouraged to pursue a whole-of-government approach.

25. With regard to the outcomes of the 4th TOSSD Task Force meeting, members welcomed the progress made by the Task Force and stressed the necessity to start publishing TOSSD data, especially in light of the upcoming DAC Senior Level Meeting at the end of the year.

26. The US clarified that it will not report on TOSSD (or ODA or OOF) by SDG goals or targets for both policy and practical reasons and warned that the US could be eliminated from the TOSSD framework if the link with SDGs was taken as a strict eligibility criterion. According to the US, some flexibility was required to encourage broad reporting. Two members expressed their support to the reporting at target level and recalled that several DAC members, as well as all developing countries in the Task Force, also supported reporting at this level.

27. One member flagged that the Task Force had made good progress on the issue of export credits during the Brussels meeting. Three other members stated they would welcome more discussion on export credits, one expressing particular concern about possible reporting on export credits on a voluntary basis as this would weaken the comparability of TOSSD data from the recipient perspective. This member also thought that the Task Force might be overstepping its mandate on this issue and called for a cautious approach.

28. Members noted the need to have experts participate in discussions on pillar 2 and to ensure that discussions are carried out in full co-ordination with other fora (e.g., UNFCCC on climate). One member suggested focusing current work on pillar 2 only on one topic to be able to define at least one development enabler by the deadline of March 2019. Another member asked for caution in addressing questions on peace and security in TOSSD, especially regarding the use of force.

29. With regard to the TOSSD pilot in Nigeria, many members supported the usefulness of these pilots for testing the TOSSD methodology and encouraged future ones, for example to try to obtain information on Chinese flows.

30. Members thanked the Secretariat for engaging with CSOs as this helps to alleviate misconceptions and concerns and supported continued engagement with them in the future. Several members also expressed their support for the comments by CSOs, in particular regarding the need to develop sound eligibility criteria, principles and standards for TOSSD. One member explicitly supported the CSO point about the need to separate official flows from private finance mobilised.

31. As regards the risk that TOSSD could undermine ODA, members were still concerned about this possibility, even though one member indicated that appropriate measures were being taken to avoid it – these included the emphasis on the recipients’ perspective and the explanatory notes on the differences in scope and measurement methods of ODA and TOSSD.

32. In response to members’ comments, the Secretariat recalled that the ambition is to have reporting instructions that can accommodate as many providers as possible while sticking to the agreed TOSSD principles, including on how TOSSD activities should support sustainable development. Regarding export credits, she confirmed that there was indeed agreed wording within the Task Force, except for one member, but this question could be brought for discussion at the DAC if needed. She indicated that the development of pillar 2 would require the involvement of experts. For example, a session with INCAF could be organised on the issue of peace and security. She concluded by noting that the agenda of the next meeting of the Task Force in Accra was under preparation and that the Secretariat was also developing a mock up TOSSD database.
33. The Secretariat then highlighted the good discussions held on TOSSD at the most recent meeting of the DAC Facilitator Group on Major Policy Issues (MPI) and the possibility of regional consultations for which members’ support would be appreciated. He also noted that experience had shown that once countries get to know more about TOSSD, including for example pilot countries, they become strong supporters of the measure.

34. The DAC Chair praised members for their engagement, called on them to lead the charge through MPI meetings and the Task Force, and supported the idea of a “Friends of TOSSD” Ambassadors’ group in New York.

35. The DCD Director concluded by noting the progress on many fronts including on the content, on the engagement with external stakeholders (including with Brazil and CSOs), and on the pilots. He highlighted the challenges ahead including the necessity to continue engaging with non-DAC providers, with the New York community and expanding the pilots as a vital step to produce more data and evidence on TOSSD. He suggested developing a process of briefings and feedback between the DAC and the Task Force. Since the IAEG and the Statistical Commission were not the usual ecosystem of the DAC, it was critical the Committee helped ensure that their representatives in these institutions followed a whole-of-government approach.

**Item 7. Tax and Development**

36. The Director of the OECD’s Centre for Tax Policy and Administration (CTPA) summarised the main results of CTPA’s development work (spelled out in greater detail in [COM/CTPA/CFA/DCD/DAC(2018)1]), outlined the progress to date, and highlighted plans for the future to mainstream development considerations throughout the work of CTPA. Delegates warmly welcomed the report and expressed strong support both for the results of the work to date, especially the extent of inclusion of developing countries in the various OECD tax forums, and for the plans for increased mainstreaming. The value of ensuring the work is demand-led was emphasised, as was the need for strong co-operation between the international organisations working in this area, as well as between DCD/DAC and CTPA/CFA.

**Item 8. Innovation for Development**

37. The Secretariat presented a stock-take on innovation for development and introduced a proposed peer learning exercise. The Secretariat recalled the broad scope of innovation for development as set out at the DAC High Level Meeting and further unpacked at the DAC Chair–Canada roundtable. He reminded members of the centrality of innovation for development in the pillars of DAC reform and the upcoming PWB.

38. The peer learning exercise seeks to establish a baseline of good practices and challenges amongst DAC members with introducing, incentivising, and measuring innovation in development co-operation policies and programmes, with a view to establishing a full work stream in the next biennium. It will consist of peer-to-peer exchanges and country deep dives. The peer learning exercise is additional to the current PWB, and members are therefore invited to express interest in funding this work. Further, the Head of the Observatory of Public Sector Innovation in the OECD Public Governance Directorate introduced members to the complementary experience, resources, and networks of the Observatory, with a view to working in collaboration with the DAC going forward.

39. Members expressed strong support for the peer learning exercise proposal in the context of the DAC’s focus on the SDGs. Some clarifications were sought on the deep dives and the steering committee. The Secretariat will share criteria for the selection of deep dives and terms of reference for the steering committee once the work is funded. Several members expressed interest in participating. A few members mentioned specific interest in a focus on SIDS, fragile states, leave no one behind, experience with measurement of impact, and action-based learning. In response to different comments on definition, the
Secretariat confirmed that the peer learning exercise will be used to continue to conceptualise and define innovation for development. Members were invited to follow up with Rahul.Malhotra@oecd.org with further questions and expressions of interest.

**Item 9. Financing the Functions of the DAC Chair**

40. The DAC Chair introduced this item by commenting that in the last DAC meeting members discussed the principles and requested clarity on the Chair’s budget, which was based on averages of the four previous Chairs. The Chair noted that the revised paper put to the Committee today provides a more detailed budget. It also highlights two financing models: (1) a sole member pays the Chair’s salary/housing and the remaining members finance the Chair’s Office via a breakdown to be determined; and (2) a three-tiered financing of the total budget based on criteria such as GNI or ODA. It was noted that a follow-up survey would be conducted.

41. In discussion, members expressed conflicting views concerning the principle of DAC residency. Some members viewed it as necessary for the functions of the Chair, with others noting that residency was not the most important feature rather it was availability and the full-time aspect of the function. Inclusivity was requested to be included as a principle. The issue of burden sharing and predictability of the DAC Chair’s resources were viewed as being of great importance. Members also discussed the number of staff within the Chair’s office and questioned the salary cost of the advisors as well as how to consider the amount allocated for travel.

42. Concerning a possible survey, members showed an openness to respond. However concerning the financing options, a number of DAC members noted that the status quo option should be included as this was one of the most supported options from the previous survey. Several members noted that they would not be open to options that would increase their current contributions. Members also requested clarification on how expenses would be shared and calculated for the DAC Chair’s office and how the tiers would be determined. The next steps are to provide clarification on how the costs pertaining to the running of the office of the DAC Chair would be shared among members and the distribution of the survey.

**Item 10. Harmonising OECD & MDB Measurement Methodologies**

43. The Secretariat introduced the revisions included in document [DCD/DAC(2018)25/REV1] compared to its initial version [DCD/DAC(2018)25]. The note aimed at informing the Committee of the ongoing discussion on the harmonisation of OECD and multilateral development bank (MDB) methodologies for measuring the mobilisation of private finance. It also described the similarities and differences between the two approaches and explained why harmonisation was needed, in particular since 12 bilateral development finance institutions (DFIs) contributed to the MDB report on mobilisation using the MDB approach. Members were invited to express their views and provide guidance on how the issue of harmonisation could be moved forward but also to remind their respective DFIs of the reporting obligations to the OECD on their operations in developing countries, including the amounts mobilised from the private sector (some of the 12 DFIs which participated in the MDB report do not currently report to the OECD on mobilisation). The Chair also reminded participants that DAC members represent the main MDBs’ shareholders and therefore have a role to play.

44. Members generally supported the Secretariat’s efforts to work with MDBs toward the harmonisation of the two approaches. A few members stressed the importance to take into account the role of all official actors, including the smaller ones, and to avoid double counting at the international level. One member (Denmark) expressed cautioned about the need to ensure reporting credibility and transparency (activity-level reporting), especially in the TOSSD context. Another member (Austria) suggested that the OECD should be the organisation responsible for collecting the data on mobilisation from the bilateral DFIs (MDBs could derive this information from OECD DAC statistics). A couple of members also raised technical questions relating to the attribution methods (role of export credits or private philanthropic institutions).
Item 11. DAC Policy Network Update: WP-STAT

45. The Chair of the DAC Working Party on Development Finance Statistics (WP-STAT), Mr. Jérôme Le Roy, presented the highlights of the WP-STAT meeting held on 13-15 June 2018. He noted that the meeting agenda had been rich, with items varying from business as usual to work to update the DAC statistical system to respond to challenges of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. He then drew delegates’ attention to a number of specific topics that had been discussed, including:

- the implementation of the ODA grant equivalent measure and relevant updates to the Reporting Directives (debt sustainability and how to operationalise the IMF Debt Limits Policy and the World Bank’s Non-Concessional Borrowing Policy in the ODA context; treatment of debt relief in the ODA grant equivalent system; final revisions to the reporting forms);
- implementation of clarified directives on in-donor refugee costs;
- DAC List of ODA Recipients;
- tracking development co-operation in the field of migration and the policy issues this topic raised;
- measuring mobilisation and TOSSD;
- approval of several proposals to improve the statistical methodologies (e.g., new voluntary field to track the SDG focus of development co-operation activities and policy markers on nutrition and persons with disabilities);
- statistical peer reviews (peer learning based on the report on the first pilot carried out for Australia and initial feedback from the second pilot carried out for Canada);
- Secretariat’s assessment of the quality and timeliness of members’ reporting and its review of progress in expanding the data collection to non-DAC provider countries, multilateral organisations and philanthropic foundations; and
- revision of the WP-STAT mandate.

46. The WP-STAT chair concluded his presentation by noting that the Working Party and DAC statistics were becoming more inclusive — several non-DAC provider countries regularly attend WP-STAT meetings and this has started to bear fruit in terms of improved reporting from them. It was very likely that a third WP-STAT meeting would be needed this year, in particular to conclude the work on the Reporting Directives.

47. The Secretariat presented, for discussion, the proposal for a methodology for reinstatement on the DAC List of ODA Recipients [DCD/DAC(2018)31] and summarised WP-STAT’s discussions of this issue during its meeting on 13-15 June 2018 and in writing by end June. The written comments had echoed those made during the meeting: most members had fully supported the proposal as shown in the document, but two members had reiterated their concerns about the timescales for reinstatement and later graduation of a reinstated country. One of the two had asked for more comprehensive discussions to determine the number of years spent under the high-income threshold before reinstatement and the criteria for “re-graduation,” analysing the cases of declining income levels due to natural disasters or humanitarian crises.

48. The WP-STAT Chair, the DAC Chair and the Secretariat all urged members to come to a decision quickly (by end September) on this issue, so as to respond in a timely manner to the 2017 High Level Meeting mandate.
49. During the discussion that followed, twelve members expressed their full support of the proposal on reinstatement as presented by the Secretariat in the paper (Australia, EU, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and United Kingdom), while Switzerland stated that it did not support reinstatement immediately after a country falls under the high-income threshold. Switzerland explained its concerns on this aspect of the proposal, which, it stated, were correctly reflected in paragraph 20 of the Secretariat’s document. The United States also stated that it would prefer the rules to require three years below the high-income threshold before reinstatement.

50. Members also made a few comments on the presentation made by the WP-STAT Chair. The DAC Chair expressed her appreciation for the overview and the update on topics on which the technical work had been carried out and which would be brought for discussion at the DAC. One member noted that some topics on the WP-STAT agenda had become very political and that it was therefore indeed appropriate to bring them for discussion at the Committee level. Another member asked for clarification on what kind of issues could come to the Committee for policy dialogue. The Secretariat responded that one such issue was migration and that the questions were about the fundamental ODA definition. The Secretariat maintained that some migration-related activities were in the boundaries of ODA and it was difficult to assess their eligibility on a project-by-project basis. A broader policy discussion on the role of development co-operation in supporting migration as well as the inter-relationship between migration and development was needed. In response to other comments, the Secretariat confirmed it would circulate a note informing members of the outcomes of the various WP-STAT written procedures and that a more fundamental discussion on the policy markers had been planned; the latter would be based on a comprehensive review of the marker system, for which terms of reference had already been developed.

**Item 12. Election of DAC Vice-Chair**

51. In accordance with established practice, the Director chaired this session to elect a Vice-Chair. He reminded the Committee that on 12 June, he sent a letter to all DAC delegates to inform them that the U.S. delegate, Ms. Nadereh Lee, would be reassigned in her government over the summer. In that same communication, he invited nominations to replace Ms. Lee on the DAC Bureau as Vice-Chair, with a deadline of 22 June. By the 22 June deadline, the Secretariat had received a single nomination then issued a second letter to the DAC on 25 June, informing delegates of the one nomination and inviting the DAC to elect its new Vice-Chair on that basis. The Director then announced that the seat must be nominated and seconded by a peer from the DAC Membership. Spain intervened to nominate the representative from the European Union, Mr. Philip Pierros. Australia seconded the motion. The DAC then approved this nomination by acclamation. The Director congratulated the EU representative for his election to the DAC Bureau and returned the floor to the DAC Chair.

**Item 13. Summary of Conclusions**

52. 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 14. Any Other Business**

53. The Chair welcomed the delegate from Colombia and congratulated his country for its upcoming accession to the OECD. The Colombian delegate introduced himself and expressed his country’s eagerness to collaborate with the DAC.
54. In her capacity as co-facilitator of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation (Evalnet), the delegate from Portugal reported on that network’s meetings held on 28-29 June 2018. The meetings discussed the DAC evaluation criteria, evaluations on the theme of disability inclusion and blended finance, and multilateral effectiveness. The network delegates are discussing their mandate, which will be revised via email. A more robust update on the work of Evalnet is currently scheduled for the 25 October 2018 DAC meeting.

55. The delegate from the European Union cited a recent study entitled *Reshaping Decentralised Development Co-operation: The Key Role of Cities and Regions for the 2030 Agenda*[^2], which was financed by DG DEVCO and carried out by the OECD. The report was pre-launched on 26 June in Brussels during the EC Partnership Forum and was very well received by the participants. A high-level political launch will be organised during the European Week of Cities and Regions in October in Brussels. The EU commented that the recommendations of the report will allow increasing the effectiveness and impact of decentralised development co-operation and strongly encouraged the DAC to build on this report and to continue working on this area. In terms of next steps, the EU would be glad to continue this fruitful collaboration with the OECD, in particular on the role of cities and regions for the localisations of the SDGs through decentralised development co-operation. DEVCO will launch an important programme on city-to-city partnerships for the localisation of SDGs and would like to find synergies with the OECD Programme on the Territorial Approach to SDGs.

56. The Committee thanked the departing delegates from Greece, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and USA for their service to the Committee and wished them great success. The Secretariat also recognised the contribution that the departing DCD Deputy Director Brenda Killen and Head of Division Nadine Gbossa have made to the DAC and the OECD over the years.