

Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators

WORKING GROUP ON MEASUREMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

Fourteenth meeting, 14, 15 and 20 September 2021  
8:00-11:00 a.m., New York time (EST)

Agenda item 3: Results of the pilot study conducted by OECD

## **Request for testing and piloting the current indicator proposal of the Working Group**

The Co-Chairs requested the OECD to provide data for the following five indicators as defined in the current proposal of the Working Group shared for open consultation on 16 July 2021:

1. official sustainable development grants
2. official concessional sustainable development loans
3. official non-concessional sustainable development loans
4. mobilized private finance (MPF)
5. private grants.

The data should take account of the various exclusions and specifications mentioned in the proposal, such as leaving out debt relief and in-donor refugee costs, and taking only the ODA coverage of peace and security activities.

For each of the five flows the Co-Chairs would like to receive data on the gross receipts in US dollars of each country on the DAC List of ODA recipients, plus the total amount for each of the flows, from all official sources other than countries that themselves are on the DAC List of ODA recipients. This is to avoid confusion with the SSC process, which is ongoing. For MPF, the amounts mobilized (i) in the recipient country and (ii) in other countries that are on the DAC List of ODA recipients should be provided separately as sub-items of the full amount of MPF.

Ideally, data for each of the five years 2015-2019 could be provided.

## Response to pilot study request

<b>Years</b>	<b>Request covers 2015-2019; data relate to 2019 because data for 2015-18 were not specifically screened against the criterion of sustainable development</b>
<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Only pillar 1 data are included</b>
<b>Exclusions</b>	<b>Debt relief (modality F0x)</b>
	<b>In-donor refugee costs (modalities I01, I02 &amp; I05)</b>
	<b>Administrative costs (modality G01)</b>
	<b>Peace and security exclusions: 1513010,1513020,1513030,1516010,1516020,1520010 (see TOSSD code list : <a href="https://www.tossd.org/docs/tossd-codes.xlsx">https://www.tossd.org/docs/tossd-codes.xlsx</a>)</b>
	<b>Officially-supported export credits</b>
<b>Basis</b>	<b>Gross disbursements, except for MPF (which is measured on a commitment basis), USD</b>
<b>Provider</b>	<b>All excluding ODA recipients (Costa Rica, Indonesia, Nigeria), Chile is included as it graduated from the DAC List of ODA Recipients in 2018</b>

## Response to pilot study request – Results for 2019

Source = TOSSD, tossd.online  2019 Gross disbursements, USD million	Indicator 1. Official sustainable development grants	Indicator 2. Official concession al sustainable development loans	Indicator 3. Official non- concession al sustainable development loans	Indicator 4. Mobilised Private Finance				Indicator 5. Private grants  (Source = OECD data collection on philanthropic flows for sustainable development, <a href="https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DV_DCD_PPF">https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DV_DCD_PPF</a> )		
				Origin of funds mobilised			Grand Total	Grants	Non-grants	Grand Total
Recipient country				Beneficia ry country	Third developin g country	Other countries				
<b>Total</b>	<b>107,384</b>	<b>44,024</b>	<b>64,249</b>	<b>7,276</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>37,526</b>	<b>45,024</b>	<b>7,434</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>8,839</b>
Africa, regional	1,295	218	315	190	7	2,210	2,408	248	5	252
Albania	228	61	166	15		1	16	1		1
Algeria	146	0	1					0		0
America, regional	347	45	162			155	155	52	0	52
Angola	204	45	633			914	914	0		0
Antigua and Barb	20	5	0			0	0			
Argentina	205	196	2,173	17		1,936	1,953	18		18

## Responses to follow-up question (summary)

1. Please can you provide data / proxy data for the earlier years 2015-2018 as the data for 2019 has been raising questions with some values appearing to be relatively low.
  - OECD compared CRS (ODA + OOF) data with TOSSD for indicator 1 and indicators 2+3 using the same exemptions and was able to explain all differences.
  - OECD is of the view that using CRS data for years 2015-18 as a proxy would not provide the right baseline for the new indicator of measurement of development support. The data would not match the proposed definitions of the sub-indicators, and would create confusion (e.g. in cases where CRS data are larger than TOSSD because they include activities that do not comply with the indicator definition.)
  - On WB and Germany data: OECD confirmed that the results for 2019 include amounts provided by World Bank and countries like Germany which were not reported under TOSSD.
  - On using ODA+OOF as a proxy “using the same concessionality test”:
    - Determining the concessionality, based on the IMF definition, of ODA and OOF loans reported in the CRS for past years is not straightforward.
    - In addition, such an exercise will necessarily be incomplete/incorrect.

## Responses to follow-up question (summary)

2. Please can you provide more information on the peace and security expenditures that are included and excluded, maybe by providing a breakdown of the total included/excluded by available purpose codes. In addition, please can you also address the concern to what extent the purpose codes always match the actual activity and are a reliable indicator of ODA eligibility..

- As explained in the notes of the Excel file, OECD excluded the following purpose codes from the indicator, all related to peace and security and considered mainly non-ODA eligible: 1513010, 1513020, 1513030, 1516010, 1516020, 1520010. (would add 8 per cent)

1513010	1513020	1513030	1516020	1520010
Fight against transnational organised crime	Countering violent extremism	Cyber security	International criminal justice	Disarmament of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

- OECD included all the other purpose codes in the indicator.
- In the file provided, OECD show a breakdown for peace and security related purpose codes that were included/excluded.
- As regards the last part of this question, purpose codes are verified in the course of standard quality controls when processing TOSSD data, and the same applies to ODA data. In ODA data, peace and security related activities are particularly scrutinized for eligibility, so in principle only eligible projects have been included in the indicators.

## Responses to follow-up question (summary)

3. Under MPF, please can you let us know whether the category “Other countries” include data when the country of the funds is unknown. In other words, is the category “Other countries” equal to “Provider (non ODA recipient) countries”?
  - The category “Other countries” in the Excel file indeed includes cases where the country of origin of the funds is unknown. However, this is not equal to “Provider (non ODA recipient) countries”. The category includes the cases where the country of origin is a provider, cases where the funds have multiple origins and cases where the origin is unknown.
  
4. Under private grants, please can you explain the inclusion of non-grants. It seems that for Colombia the data provided and the flows received are loans from the private sector (bbva foundation) to a small bank in Colombia (bancamía) which is contributing to the implementation of the peace agreement with the issuance of micro-credits to small farmers.
  - In the Excel, OECD has included the non-grants for information to demonstrate that limiting the reporting of the indicator to traditional grants will give an incomplete picture even when it comes to private flows.