



## International Forum on TOSSD

### Second Meeting of the Steering Group of the International Forum on TOSSD (IFT)

24-26 September 2024, Paris, France

#### Summary Record and Action Points

This document presents the main conclusions and action points from the second meeting of the Steering Group of the International Forum on TOSSD (IFT).

The document and is submitted for approval under written procedure and shall be considered approved unless any objections are received before 22 November 2024 c.o.b.

Contact:

Julia Benn, Head of Secretariat, International Forum on TOSSD ([julia.benn@tossd.org](mailto:julia.benn@tossd.org))

## MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND ACTION POINTS

**The main conclusions and action points from the Second IFT Steering Group meeting, as recorded by the co-Chairs and the Secretariat, were as follows.**

The Steering Group approved the meeting agenda.

**Item 1.** The Steering Group took note of the status of requests for IFT membership and observership.

**Item 2.** The Steering Group approved:

- i) the proposed edits to the language in the Reporting Instructions on triangular / trilateral co-operation;
- ii) the creation of a new ‘framework of collaboration’ code FC03 for tracking multilateral organisations’ support for South-South Co-operation; and
- iii) edits to the list of diseases prevalent in developing countries guiding the reporting on Global Health support, noting that additional diseases could be inserted in the list in due course.

The Secretariat would integrate the agreed adjustments in an updated version of the Reporting Instructions, which would be circulated for approval by the Steering Group under written procedure.

In addition, the Steering Group generally supported the Secretariat proposal on the classification of core contributions to international organisations (Pillar II.A for activities that address issues specific to developing countries and Pillar II.B for activities that address issues of a global nature or that provide benefits at the global level). The Secretariat will further review the case of IAEA and keep the list open for further edits as required.

**Item 3.** The Steering Group appreciated the use of TOSSD data as a source for tracking spending on biodiversity and expressed interest in refining TOSSD data on biodiversity, although some Members cautioned against expanding the scope of TOSSD. Members agreed to re-visit the proposal for a pilot study on this topic once the Secretariat has developed a more concrete plan for the pilot. The IFT Secretariat would collaborate with DCD on the plan and present it to the Steering Group for further discussion.

**Item 4.** The co-Chair concluded that, subject to the incorporation of the requested revisions, the Steering Group had approved the use of multi-dimensional criteria, in addition to the GNI per capita, to construct and update the list of TOSSD recipients. The Secretariat would circulate the updated text to paragraph 52 and Annexes B and G of the Reporting Instructions for approval under written procedure. The new criteria would take effect from 2025 onwards (for 2024 TOSSD data reporting).

**Item 5.** The Steering Group exchanged views on how the IFT could contribute to the Financing for Development (FfD4) process and how TOSSD concepts, methods and data could help monitor the new FfD agenda. The co-Chair summarised the main action points as follows: The Secretariat would present inputs for the FfD Elements Paper. The Secretariat would adjust and circulate language proposals, taking into account the Steering Group’s comments. The Secretariat would aim to participate in the 2nd Preparatory Meeting for the FfD4 (to be held in New York from 2 to 6 December 2024) and work to ensure a positive reference to TOSSD in the FfD4 zero draft (expected mid-December). The Secretariat would encourage Members to include positive references to TOSSD, TOSSD data and the IFT in their inputs to the Elements Paper.

**Item 6.** The Steering Group welcomed the progress in testing the data review mechanism, highlighted its importance as a tool to assert the statistical validity of TOSSD and encouraged the Secretariat to contact more recipient countries to join the exercise. The co-Chair concluded that the testing of the mechanism should continue towards its establishment as a regular aspect of TOSSD. The co-Chair also appreciated the insightful presentation from the Dominican Republic and highlighted how at this stage, it would be interesting to have more volunteers to participate in the test, as more participants would mean that TOSSD could learn more from this exercise. Furthermore, the WBG and EBRD non-reporting is a delicate issue that needs to be addressed in a way that is carefully thought through. The co-Chair encouraged Members and the Secretariat to first focus their efforts on engaging with the WB data reporting team at Operations Policy and Country Services. The Head of IFT Secretariat reasserted the urgency of the matter and confirmed the Secretariat's commitment to working with Members to resolve this issue.

**Item 7.** The Steering Group welcomed the Secretariat's analysis on the use of #Gender keyword. The co-Chair concluded that consistent use of keywords in the TOSSD database can improve the accuracy and coherence of TOSSD data. The Head of IFT Secretariat emphasised the importance of identifying the gender equality focus in the reporting.

**Item 8.** The co-Chair concluded that, for the first year of the SWG, the provisions in the current IFT ToRs should be applied and that any adjustments in light of inclusiveness could be discussed based on the experience of the first year. The Secretariat would contact Steering Group Members to check who would be their representative in the SWG. The SWG meetings should be organised immediately after Steering Group meetings, and co-ordination with other relevant bodies could be undertaken through virtual meetings or informal workshops. While allowing collaboration, there should be no formal SWG co-ordination with the WP-STAT to keep the two bodies clearly separate.

**Item 9.** The Steering Group welcomed the paper on the use of Special Drawing Rights in sustainable development and how TOSSD could be used for collecting related statistical evidence, appreciating the fact that it addressed the political imperative underlying the 2021 SDR allocation, the related international commitments to rechannel them for sustainable development, and the need for statistical evidence on the ways that SDRs are used in sustainable development. The co-Chair encouraged Members and the Secretariat to seize the opportunity presented by the discussion to strengthen the IFT's collaboration with the IMF and further grow the number of TOSSD reporters.

**Item 10.** The Secretariat presented the current funding situation, which is on track for 2024 and 2025. They explained that, provided that funding pledges materialise, the IFT work is fully funded up until the end of the current MOU term, which is 31 December 2026. Regarding the IFT annual report, the Steering Group was in general agreement with the proposed outline. The Secretariat advised that it would work on the annual report and launch it towards the end of Q1 2025, before the FfD forum and after the TOSSD 2023 data are released.

## SUMMARY

### Introduction and welcome

1. The co-Chairs (Mr Laurent Sarazin, EU and Mr Risenga Maluleke, South Africa as well as his alternate, Mr Ashwell Jenneker, South Africa) welcomed participants to the Second meeting of the IFT Steering Group (see list of participants in the [Annex A](#)). Mr Maluleke invited the Steering Group to approve the meeting agenda. The agenda was approved.

### Item 1. Update on membership and observership requests and outreach efforts

2. Ms Julia Benn, Head of the IFT Secretariat, presented the latest updates regarding the membership of the IFT. She also informed the meeting of main outreach activities between May and September 2024, as well as the Secretariat's planned actions for outreach for the period September 2024 to January 2025. Several participants shared their outreach efforts to invite more countries to join the IFT and/or to report to TOSSD. A Member shared that it was developing TOSSD data visualisations, and it reaffirmed its commitment to position TOSSD at the G7 and G20. Another Member emphasised the need to continue building consensus around TOSSD with various constituencies and stakeholder groups.

### Item 2. Refining TOSSD definitions and reporting methods

3. Ms Julia Benn and Ms Daniela Ibarra Díaz (IFT Secretariat) presented the Secretariat's proposal to address several pending matters from the Steering Group meeting held in May 2024. The proposal included:

- i) revised language for “pivotal partner” of triangular/ trilateral co-operation;
- ii) a new code for tracking multilateral organisations' support for South-South Co-operation (SSC);
- iii) classification of core contributions to multilateral organisations (Pillar II.A or Pillar II.B); and
- iv) additional diseases to be included in the reporting guidance on support to Global Health.

4. There was broad support for the revised language on triangular / trilateral co-operation and the new code for tracking multilateral organisations' support for South-South co-operation.

5. Regarding the classification of core contributions to multilateral organisations in Pillar II, several Members expressed their general support for the Secretariat's proposal. The questions, comments and requests for clarification related to:

- how TOSSD avoids double counting of multilateral flows
- difficulty at the recipient country level to identify all funds channelled through multilateral organisations
- consistency with the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) list of ODA-eligible multilateral organisations
- exclusion of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) from the proposed classification
- terminology used for describing the sub-pillars, with a suggestion to call one “development-related” and the other “sustainability-related”.

6. In response, the Secretariat described the mechanisms in place to avoid double counting, i.e. data on core contributions to multilateral organisations are included in TOSSD only when organisations do not report to TOSSD. As for the consistency with the CRS, the Secretariat highlighted that not all ODA (official development assistance) flows were TOSSD-eligible as the assessment was based on different criteria. The case of IAEA could be further reviewed, possibly as part of a broader discussion on sustainability of nuclear energy and its associated risks.

7. Regarding the list of diseases disproportionately affecting developing countries, Members requested that the Reporting Instructions clearly indicate the non-exhaustive nature of this list and suggested the addition of Mpox, polio, and water-borne diseases (including cholera). A Member mentioned that their health expert would review and possibly comment on the inclusion of polio. The Secretariat stated it would implement these suggestions, keeping the list open for future revisions as needed.

8. The Secretariat would integrate the agreed adjustments in an updated version of the Reporting Instructions, which would be circulated for approval by the Steering Group under written procedure.<sup>1</sup> Regarding the classification of core contributions to multilateral organisations, the Secretariat will further review the case of IAEA and keep the list open for further edits as required.

### **Item 3. Clarification of TOSSD eligibility criteria in the area of biodiversity and proposal for a TOSSD thematic pilot**

9. Mr Juan Casado Asensio and Ms Dominique Blaquier from the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) presented an overview of the ways that TOSSD data are being used to track spending on biodiversity, aligned with Sustainable Development Goals 14 and 15. They expressed interest in collaborating with the IFT on a pilot study on biodiversity data in TOSSD Pillars II.A and II.B. The IFT Secretariat supported the idea of a pilot as it would help refine the TOSSD Reporting Instructions in this area.

10. Participants expressed interest in refining TOSSD data on biodiversity, but some cautioned against expanding the scope of TOSSD. It was highlighted that for funds to be included in TOSSD, there must be a benefit to developing countries, while biodiversity-related projects were sometimes entirely focused on high-income countries. At the same time, the use of TOSSD data for biodiversity demonstrated the importance of this reporting and continuing to improve the reporting in relation to the SDGs. A Member commented that expenditure for biodiversity was still quite low and would therefore not dwarf other expenditures, and if there were to be a problem in the future, it could be addressed as and when it arises. The co-Chair of the EU added that data on biodiversity could help attract new IFT members, including developing countries actively working on biodiversity conservation.

11. Members agreed to re-visit the topic once the Secretariat has developed a more concrete plan for the pilot. The IFT Secretariat would collaborate with DCD on the plan and present it to the Steering Group for further discussion.

### **Item 4. Constructing the list of TOSSD recipients: defining the boundaries using multi-dimensional criteria**

12. Mr Camilo Gamba Gamba (IFT Secretariat) presented the Secretariat's review of options, proposed by the Steering Group during its first meeting in May 2024, to use multi-dimensional criteria in addition to GNI (gross national income) per capita to construct the list of TOSSD recipients. He also presented the Secretariat's proposal on this matter i.e. using exclusion criteria, the Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI), the Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index (ND-GAIN) and the United Nations Multidimensional Vulnerability Index (UN MVI).

---

<sup>1</sup> The updates were approved on 11 October 2024.

13. Members generally agreed with the Secretariat's proposal. Many Members noted the robustness of the proposal, appreciating that the additional criteria would consider the three dimensions of sustainable development, emphasising the importance of the proposal for countries that have been (or are soon to be) graduated from ODA and the strength of the proposal since it was not based on decisions taken at the DAC (Development Assistance Committee) of the OECD. At the same time, it was recalled that the list serves statistical purposes and not graduation.

14. The specific questions and comments from the Steering Group, and responses by the Secretariat, related to:

- *The use of the HDI value in cases where an IHDI value is missing:* The Secretariat explained that IHDI data coverage is gradually expanding, with more countries being included each year, though HDI proxies may still be necessary in some cases.
- *Whether the correlation between GNI per capita and the ND-GAIN index had been evaluated:* The Secretariat noted that GNI per capita correlates with many existing indexes and indicators. The correlation should not hinder the IFT from using the ND-GAIN, especially as GNI per capita remains the primary criterion for the list.
- *The use of both ND-GAIN and the UN MVI and only using them in case-by-case reviews:* The Secretariat explained that the ND-GAIN is a robust data source (data are available for the last 30 years) and recalled that, according to the original proposal, the UN MVI would help define whether a SIDS (Small Island Developing State) country should stay on the list. Referring to interventions of several participants, the Secretariat emphasised that there is a strong narrative for having multi-dimensional criteria that are aligned with the three dimensions of sustainable development. The Secretariat also advised that the case-by-case review should be limited to the extent possible, and only be carried out in the case of data gaps. Finally, it noted that the governance aspects of UN-MVI had indeed progressed but that the application of the index would depend on data availability.
- *The rationale behind the groups mentioned in the exclusion criterion:* The Secretariat explained that the sole use of multi-dimensional criteria would make several traditional providers TOSSD recipients, which would not be beneficial for TOSSD's legitimacy.
- *Communication on the changes to the list of TOSSD recipients and its relationship with the list of ODA recipients:* A Member noted that, for many providers, GNI per capita remains the basis for defining their aid allocations. It is necessary to carefully communicate on the methodology used for the TOSSD list to avoid any confusion with the DAC list of ODA recipients. The WP-STAT Chair thought that it would be important to ensure co-ordination with the updating of the list of ODA recipients. The Secretariat recalled that the list of TOSSD recipients differs from the DAC list both in its purpose and composition, and that this would be clearly communicated once the new criteria were approved.
- *Treatment of countries that have reached high-income status but not for three consecutive years:* The Secretariat confirmed that such countries would remain on the list of TOSSD recipients.
- *Impact of the updates to the list on TOSSD data series:* The Secretariat indicated that the updates would not have a major impact on the data series.
- *Other models:* UNCTAD shared its experience on the M49 classification and proposed that it be considered in the context of submissions of data for the SDG indicator 17.3.1., thus ensuring a co-ordinated approach between the two co-custodian agencies. A Member asked whether it would be possible to consider models such as the one used in the LDC graduation process, where countries must comply with two criteria to graduate.

- *Presentation in the paper of the Mexican proposal to the International TOSSD Task Force (in 2022).* The Secretariat advised that it would publish a revised version of the paper to improve the description of the Mexican proposal.
- *Updating the text relating to the list of TOSSD recipients in Annex G of the Reporting Instructions:* The full text of the TOSSD Reporting Instructions should be reviewed to see if there were other sections that should be updated too.

15. The Steering Group that requested the Secretariat proposal be revised to:

- keep the opt-in and opt-out procedures as currently included in the Reporting Instructions;
- expand the use of the MVI to all countries to be reviewed, considering that the UN MVI is not only focused on SIDS;
- not present the Schengen area as an exclusion group (since this group is not related to economics; the Holy See, Monaco and San Marino could be explicitly excluded from the list); and
- delete the reference to the exclusion of “countries with a firm date of EU accession” (wording used in the context of ODA, but TOSSD is broader than ODA).

16. The co-Chair concluded that, subject to the incorporation of the requested revisions, the Steering Group had approved the use of multi-dimensional criteria, in addition to the GNI per capita, to construct and update the list of TOSSD recipients. The Secretariat would circulate the updated text to paragraph 52 and Annexes B and G of the Reporting Instructions for approval under written procedure.<sup>2</sup> The new criteria would take effect from 2025 onwards (for 2024 TOSSD data reporting).

## Item 5. Preparations for the Fourth International Financing for Development (FfD4) Conference

17. Mr Camilo Gamba Gamba (IFT Secretariat) presented the Secretariat’s thinking on how the IFT could contribute to the Financing for Development (FfD4) process and how TOSSD concepts, methods and data could help monitor the new FfD agenda, to be agreed upon in Seville in July 2025. He also shared the Secretariat’s suggestions for actions to promote TOSSD at FfD4 and a proposed division of labour.

18. The Steering Group appreciated the Secretariat’s efforts to promote TOSSD. The main comments included the following:

- Several Members emphasised that TOSSD’s success should be showcased through the data (“let the data speak for themselves”). The Secretariat should continue developing data-driven communication products for key audiences. Two participants stressed the importance of promoting the sustainability and quality checks of TOSSD data, especially in connection with the SDGs. Another Member stressed that TOSSD’s data review mechanism is a valuable tool aligned with country ownership principles, and that it should be central to FfD4 negotiations.
- Members highlighted the need to further promote the inclusivity that TOSSD represents, both in terms of IFT membership and TOSSD reporters. Furthermore, references to TOSSD in the 2022 and 2023 FfD Forum outcome documents should form the basis for negotiations on the language, notably that TOSSD is an established measure. A Member invited the Secretariat to revise the proposed language in the background paper, noting that there are some language options that are stronger than the “middle scenario”. Two Members signalled the low likelihood of the FfD4 outcome document encouraging countries to become IFT Members. They also suggested not linking the potential TOSSD reference to the ODA reform process.

<sup>2</sup> The updates were approved via written procedure on 31 October 2024.

- A Member asked about the Secretariat’s approach to tracking climate finance, while another Member pointed out that these discussions should occur at UNFCCC (United Nations Climate Change Conference) negotiations. The Secretariat explained that climate finance would be addressed in the 2025-2026 IFT Budget and Work Plan, but it was excluded from the current paper to avoid complexity.
- Two Members raised concerns about how the G77 might perceive TOSSD, particularly regarding mobilised private finance. A Member noted potential sensitivities within the G77 regarding the classification of some form of development support. The Secretariat commented that a potential reference in the FfD4 outcome document to TOSSD’s focus on cross-border flows to developing countries (Pillar I) could help make the framework more acceptable to G77.

19. The co-Chair summarised the main action points as follows:

- a) The Secretariat would present inputs for the FfD Elements Paper.
- b) The Secretariat would adjust and circulate language proposals, taking into account the Steering Group’s comments.
- c) The Secretariat would aim to participate in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Preparatory Meeting for the FfD4 (to be held in New York from 2 to 6 December 2024) and work to ensure a positive reference to TOSSD in the FfD4 zero draft (expected mid-December).
- d) The Secretariat would encourage Members to include positive references to TOSSD, TOSSD data and the IFT in their inputs to the Elements Paper.

## Item 6. Update on the testing of the TOSSD data review mechanism

20. Mr Gabriel Di Paolantonio (IFT Secretariat) presented an update on the ongoing test of the TOSSD data review mechanism that had been presented in the first Steering Group meeting in May 2024. Representatives from the Dominican Republic that were piloting the data review mechanism shared their experience.

21. The Steering Group welcomed the progress in the work, highlighted the importance of the data review mechanism as a tool to assert the statistical validity of TOSSD and encouraged the Secretariat to contact more recipient countries to join this exercise.

22. Participants reacted to the update from the Secretariat, with the following additional comments. The tests could:

- help define how to filter activities that are likely to be captured in the information systems of the recipients. In this context, a recipient country Member signalled the difficulties they faced when comparing the TOSSD template to the national datasets. They asked that the Secretariat aim to make data reporting and the processes of the data review mechanism as easy as possible for the recipients. In response, the Secretariat referred to its capacity-building activities, such as workshops on TOSSD recipients, providers and data users, most recently organised for the LAC (Latin America and Caribbean) and MENA (Middle East and North Africa) regions.
- identify data gaps and explore the possibility of including in the TOSSD database additional data that are found in the recipient’s information system.
- bring about opportunities to promote TOSSD with as many recipients as possible.

23. One Member stressed that, before making any adjustments to TOSSD data following their review by a recipient, it was important to organise a discussion between the provider and the recipient to reach consensus on the adjustments.



24. The co-Chair concluded that the testing of the data review mechanism should continue towards its establishment as a regular aspect of TOSSD. The co-Chair also appreciated the insightful presentation from the Dominican Republic and highlighted how at this stage, it would be interesting to have more volunteers to participate in the test, as more participants would mean that TOSSD could learn more from this exercise.

25. One of the data gaps identified in the test by the Dominican Republic was for the World Bank (WBG). Mr Tomas Hos (IFT Secretariat) updated the Steering Group on the Secretariat's engagement with the WBG and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) on data reporting. He explained that the Secretariat had drawn the data gaps (amounting to approximately USD 100 billion) to the attention of the advisors to the WB Executive Directors and EBRD leadership respectively, but there was no progress so far. In addition to hindering analyses by recipient, the issue could negatively impact the role TOSSD could play in the context of the FfD4. In this context, the Secretariat presented and invited the Steering Group to comment on five options for next steps:

- a) a letter from the IFT Secretariat to WBG (and EBRD) leadership, with EDs on copy.
- b) a joint letter by the IFT Secretariat and Members to WBG (and EBRD) leadership, with EDs on copy.
- c) engagement with WB data reporting team at Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS).
- d) engagement by IFT Members with EBRD on data reporting.
- e) the utilisation of publicly available data to fill the gaps.

26. The Steering Group generally acknowledged the need for continued efforts in this area. On the WBG, three Members suggested first engaging with the OPCS team and deploying other options, in particular a written request to WBG leadership, only if the first step did not deliver the expected outcomes. One of the Members highlighted the sensitivities involved and called for a thoughtful approach, reassuring others that the WBG already felt the pressure to report on TOSSD. Several Members showed their readiness to intensify their communication with both the WBG and EBRD. Furthermore, one Member encouraged the Secretariat to use publicly available data until the non-reporting issue has been resolved, while another member expressed the view that such an approach would likely not put forward the added value of TOSSD.

27. The co-Chair concluded that the WBG and EBRD non-reporting is a delicate issue that needs to be addressed in a way that is carefully thought through. He encouraged Members and the Secretariat to first focus their efforts on engaging with the OPCS team. Ms Julia Benn reasserted the urgency of the matter and confirmed the Secretariat's commitment to working with Members to resolve this issue.

## **Item 7. Use of the #Gender keyword in TOSSD and its coherence with reporting on sector codes and SDG5**

28. Mr Gabriel Di Paolantonio (IFT Secretariat) presented an analysis on the use of the #Gender keyword in TOSSD and its coherence with reporting on sector codes and SDG5. The analysis showed comparisons from bilateral and multilateral providers, highlighting the efforts required to improve data coherence.

29. The Steering Group welcomed the Secretariat's analysis. One Member highlighted the importance of the #Gender keyword and the analysis of gender-related activities in TOSSD for their national specialists. Another Member signalled that they were still working on improving the alignment of their gender-related activities with the #Gender keyword, flagging possible interest in using artificial intelligence to improve the coherence of the data. Another Member stressed that not all gender-related activities fall exclusively into the SDG5 or the purpose codes 15170 and 15180 (for example, education-related activities under the SDG4 can be gender-focused and could therefore be assigned the #Gender keyword).

30. The co-Chair concluded that consistent use of keywords in the TOSSD database can improve the accuracy and coherence of TOSSD data. Ms Julia Benn emphasised the importance of identifying the gender equality focus in the reporting.

## **Item 8. Preparation of the creation of the IFT Statistical Working Group: composition and practical organisation of meetings**

31. Ms Julia Benn presented the Secretariat's thinking on the setting up of the IFT Statistical Working Group (SWG), including its composition (defined in the IFT Terms of Reference), issues for discussion at the SWG and options for co-ordination with other relevant bodies (e.g. WP-STAT, SEGIB, IATI).

32. Several Members welcomed the creation of the SWG, with the following comments:

- The *membership of the SWG* should reflect the membership of the Steering Group as members outside the Steering Group might have neither the capacity nor resources to be actively involved in the SWG. The co-Chair expressed the view that the ToRs should be applied for the SWG for at least one cycle, to test them and take evidence-based decisions on any changes potentially needed (e.g. inclusion of additional Members).
- Regarding *representation in the SWG* (i.e. who attends the SWG meetings), the co-Chair (EU) thought that it should be up to each Member to decide who attends each group, and that possibly the same person could attend both the Steering Group and SWG meetings.
- On the *organisation of the meetings and work with other relevant bodies*, a few Members commented that the SWG should meet back-to-back other IFT meetings and that meetings with other relevant bodies could be conducted virtually to ease the logistics of co-ordination. Regarding possible organisation of joint SWG / WP-STAT workshops suggested by two Members, the WP-STAT Chair noted that many WP-STAT participants consider the co-ordination with the IFT important and that it would be important to present ideas of joint work to the DAC. The IFT co-Chairs stressed that there should be no formal interaction between the SWG and the WP-STAT, and that this interaction should be limited to informal workshops and allowing the WP-STAT Chair to observe the SWG and vice versa.

33. The co-Chair concluded that, for the first year of the SWG, the provisions in the current IFT ToRs should be applied and that any adjustments in light of inclusiveness could be discussed based on the experience of the first year. The Secretariat would contact Steering Group Members to check who would be their representative in the SWG. The SWG meetings should be organised immediately after Steering Group meetings, and co-ordination with other relevant bodies could be undertaken through virtual meetings or informal workshops. While allowing collaboration, there should be no formal SWG co-ordination with the WP-STAT to keep the two bodies clearly separate.

## **Item 9. Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) and sustainable development**

34. The item was opened by an oral presentation by Ms Pauline Charazac on behalf of the Bank of Mauritius, outlining Mauritius's contribution to sustainable development through a strategic use of SDRs. Mauritius also signalled its intention to become an IFT member. Building upon Ms Pauline Charazac's presentation, the Mr Tomas Hos (IFT Secretariat) presented a methodological paper on the use of SDRs in sustainable development and how TOSSD could be used for collecting related statistical evidence.

35. The Steering Group welcomed the paper, appreciating the fact that it addressed the political imperative underlying the 2021 SDR allocation, the related international commitments to rechannel them for sustainable development, and the need for statistical evidence on the ways that SDRs are used in sustainable development.

36. Several participants found the proposed data collection on SDRs an exciting opportunity but thought that the next steps should be co-ordinated with the International Monetary Fund (IMF). They also stressed that SDRs, as a reserve asset, should be presented separately from financial flows to avoid inflation

of TOSSD figures on cross-border flows. One Member shared ideas about concrete ways to separate SDRs from flows and flagged that some information on SDRs may be subject to data sensitivity regimes. Another Member was rather sceptical about tracking SDRs in TOSSD, as the original purpose of SDRs is not related to sustainable development. The Member was unsure of IMF's readiness to engage in TOSSD processes. A few Members stated that they would provide their comments in writing following the meeting.

37. Ms Julia Benn highlighted the uniqueness and innovative character of the SDR discussion. The co-Chair encouraged Members and the Secretariat to seize the opportunity presented by the discussion to strengthen the IFT's collaboration with the IMF and further grow the number of TOSSD reporters. He stated that in his opinion, the case of the Bank of Mauritius was considered very encouraging and invited proactive engagement with the IMF.

## **Item 10. Progress in the implementation of the 2024 Budget and Work Plan and structure of the IFT Annual Report**

38. The Secretariat briefly presented the paper, "Progress in the implementation of the 2024 Budget and Work Plan", for the period January to June 2024, explaining the format is very factual and gives references and links to documents and major outcomes produced during the first six months of the IFT's existence. The Secretariat reminded everyone that the text had already been approved by written procedure on 4 September 2024 due to an earlier deadline for its inclusion in a formal OECD Committee Progress Report document. The Secretariat informed the meeting participants that the document would be reissued in a different format due to OECD publication rules.

39. The Secretariat presented the current funding situation, which is on track for 2024 and 2025. They explained that, provided that funding pledges materialise, the IFT work is fully funded up until the end of the current MOU term, which is 31 December 2026. They cautioned that if the IFT were to continue beyond 2026, full funding for 2027 and 2028 needs to be secured or pledged prior to signing a new MOU.

40. Regarding the IFT annual report, the Steering Group were in general agreement with the proposed outline. They pointed out that it could serve as a strong outreach product, helping to promote TOSSD. A Member suggested that the annual report include all the refinements made to the methodology, as well as the outreach and communication efforts. Another Member suggested highlighting the work on the data review mechanism and the key priorities for FfD4.

41. The Secretariat advised that it would work on the annual report and launch it towards the end of Q1 2025, before the FfD forum and after the TOSSD 2023 data are released.

## **Closing remarks**

42. The co-Chairs thanked the meeting participants for their active contributions to the discussions in the second meeting of the Steering Group.

## Annex A

### List of Participants

Name	Country / Organisation
Mr Laurent Sarazin	IFT co-Chair, EU
Mr Risenga Maluleke	IFT co-Chair, South Africa
Mr Ashwell Jenneker	IFT co-Chair (Alternate), South Africa
Mr David Alix	France
Ms Joan Atherton	United States
Ms Aris Balbuena	Dominican Republic
Ms Dominique Blanquier	OECD
Mr Gerardo Bracho Carpizo	Mexico
Mr Juan Casado Asensio	OECD
Ms Pauline Charazac	Mauritius (Bank of Mauritius)
Mr Luca De Fraia	ActionAid Italy
Mr Juan Fierro	Chile
Ms Laura Gallacher	UN CEB
Ms Elise Guzda	Norway
Ms Katrine Andrea Heggedal	Norway
Ms Diana-Laura Ionita	Romania
Mr Abul Kalam Azad	Bangladesh
Dr Lorenz Kammermann	Switzerland
Mr W. Jean Marie Kébré	Burkina Faso
Mr Nicholas Knowles	Organization of American States (OAS)
Mr Jérôme Le Roy	EU
Ms Denise Leamy	Brazil
Ms Janna Lopez	Dominican Republic
Mr Maher Mamhikoff	Canada
Mr Bojan Nastav	UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
Mr Pierre Valere Nketcha Nana	UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Ms Kim Osborne	Organization of American States (OAS)
Ms Jocelyn Roberts	United States
Ms Mirjam Rordorf Duvaux	Switzerland
Mr Juan Sainz Herrero	Spain
Ms Linn Kristin Sande	Norway
Ms Clarisse Senaya	France
Ms Angela Sima	Romania
Ms Grace Sanico Steffan	UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Ms Maria Vianna-Santos	EU
Ms Julia Benn	IFT Secretariat, Head
Ms Marisa Berbegal Ibanez	IFT Secretariat
Mr Camilo Gamba Gamba	IFT Secretariat
Mr Gabriel Di Paolantonio	IFT Secretariat
Ms Valérie Thielemans	IFT Secretariat
Mr Tomas Hos	IFT Secretariat
Ms Daniela Ibarra	IFT Secretariat
Mr Max Moreno	IFT Secretariat
Ms Elisabetta Da Prati	IFT Secretariat
Ms Amélia Costa da Silva	IFT Secretariat