

**For Official Use**

**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2001)1/PROV**



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

**05-Jul-2001**

**English - Or. English**

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE  
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE**

**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2001)1/PROV  
For Official Use**

## **Working Party on Aid Evaluation**

### **SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING**

**held on 22-23 May 2001**

*Election of Chair and Vice-Chair. 2000 Annual Report by the Chair. Promoting Joint and Collaborative Efforts in Evaluation. WP-EV and peer reviews. Glossary of Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Local Governance and Decentralisation. Further work on gender and evaluation. Evaluation Capacity Development. Review of other ongoing work.*

Contact: Mr. Hans Lundgren, Tel: 33 (1) 45 24 90 59, Fax: 33 (1) 44 30 61 47;  
Email: [hans.lundgren@oecd.org](mailto:hans.lundgren@oecd.org)

**JT00110576**

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine  
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

**English - Or. English**

1. Mr. Dabelstein, Chair, opened the meeting. He welcomed the new arrivals in the Working Party, and the new Director of DCD, Mr. Roeskau, who noted the importance of evaluation for efficient use of scarce resources in development.

**I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA [DCD/DAC/EV/A(2001)1]**

2. The agenda was adopted.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 33RD MEETING  
[DCD/DAC/EV/M(2000)2/PROV]**

3. The summary record of the 33<sup>rd</sup> meeting was approved.

**III. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

4. Mr. Niels Dabelstein was elected Chair of the Working Party, nominated by France and seconded by Canada. Mr. Colin Kirk was elected Vice-Chair nominated by the Netherlands and seconded by Sweden. Both elections were unanimous.

5. The Chair thanked the outgoing Vice-Chair, Ms. Anne-Marie Fallenius, on behalf of the WP and noted the numerous substantive contributions and had made to the work over the past three years including the inputs she made on the occasion of the workshop on evaluating gender equality held in 1999.

**IV. ANNUAL REPORT BY THE CHAIR OF THE DAC WP-EV [DCD/DAC/EV(2001)1]**

6. The Chair presented the Annual Report, which is submitted yearly to the Members of the WP and to the DAC as an instrument for assessing progress in the implementation of the work programme of the WP.

**V. PROMOTING JOINT AND COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS IN EVALUATION**

[Room Document No. 1] [Room Document No. 9] [Room Document No. 2] [Room Document No. 11]  
[Room Document No. 3]

*i) Joint or Co-ordinated Evaluations*

7. Mr. Elle (Denmark) presented some of the main findings of the joint evaluation conducted by donors in Ghana's road sub-sector programme. He stated that the report was now finalised and highlighted some of the lessons learned from this experience. Among these, he mentioned the importance of a strong "mover" in the joint process; preparing Terms of Reference in close co-operation with partner country officials to ensure ownership; a good communication infrastructure; holding steering committee meetings in the partner country; flexible consultation mechanisms; and the pooling of funds. Donors who participated in this endeavour felt it was a constructive pilot exercise which would help refine the methodology for the future, and from which all could learn. It was noted that a potential drawback stemming from joint evaluation was that it may detract attention from individual donor accountability. While the total cost of a joint evaluation may seem high, the overall savings realised by one joint evaluation instead of multiple individual exercises and the reduced burden on the partner were mentioned as key advantages.

8. Mr. Picciotto (World Bank) provided a status report on the evaluation of the Comprehensive Development Framework. Considerable progress had been made since the last meeting when the matter was discussed in a special session. This evaluation involves several DAC Members as part of the Steering Committee. It provides a rare opportunity for drawing lessons on the systemic issues related to the four principles of CDF: long-term holistic strategy; ownership and participation; partnership; and results focus. The detailed design of the evaluation was to be discussed at a Steering Committee meeting on 14 June.

9. Ms. Fallenius (Sweden) presented a brief update on the evaluation of the three Cs: Co-ordination, Complementarity, and Coherence, in the context of European Union aid. A steering committee has been set up, composed of the EC, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK, and was given the mandate to evaluate the three Cs at a meeting in Brussels in October 2000. A preparatory study has been carried out.

10. Mr. Kliet (the Netherlands) reported on progress with the joint evaluation of external support to basic education. A meeting was held in The Hague in February where it was decided to go ahead with the joint evaluation and twelve development agencies are currently involved. A scoping study has been completed and discussions on the TOR will take place in the autumn.

11. Mr. Kliet (Netherlands), Mr. Feinstein (World Bank), and Mr. Alam (UNDP) gave a brief update on the status of the planned recipient-led evaluation with Mozambique, Netherlands, World Bank and UNDP, which had been postponed from last year due to flooding. A meeting is to be held in Maputo shortly to set the parameters for the evaluation. Other donors were invited to join in the exercise, and interested parties were encouraged to contact any of the three donors involved. The Chair noted the challenge of ensuring real recipient leadership after the initial donor-led stage.

12. In closing the discussion, the Chair noted that several important initiatives are ongoing, and the need to continue to discuss joint evaluations and assess maturing experience by the WP. Partner country perspectives, methodological issues, costs and joint accountability were mentioned as key elements to be considered in this discussion.

*ii) Tour de Table*

13. The Secretariat (Mr. Lundgren) presented Room Document No. 2 "Planned Evaluation Matrix". The purpose of the document is to contribute to information sharing and better knowledge about evaluation plans of agencies participating in the WP-EV. Moreover, it should help to prevent duplication and facilitate the planning of joint or co-ordinated evaluation efforts.

14. Members briefly reported to the group on recent changes within their administrations, and on ongoing and programmed evaluations, with some focus on potential joint efforts. The matrix was welcomed as a useful input. The Chair noted the need for a Member to take an active lead in developing joint initiatives. He encouraged Members to explore further partnerships and joint efforts in order to avoid duplication, reduce transaction costs for partners and be able to account jointly for achievements on more aggregate levels.

15. There was also some discussion of the costs of various types of evaluation studies, but it was concluded that launching a comparative costing study would be methodologically difficult to pursue at the WP level, and bilateral contacts should be made as needed.

*ii) Briefings by the multilateral banks' Evaluation Co-operation Group (ECG) and the UN Interagency Working Group on Evaluation*

16. The Chair of the ECG, Mr. Kariisa (African Development Bank) briefed the WP on recent developments within the ECG. One of the main aims of the ECG is to strengthen the use of evaluation for greater effectiveness and accountability in the multilateral development banks and harmonisation of evaluation approaches. Two working groups have been established, one on the private sector and one on the public sector. The Chair noted the importance of seeking opportunities for value added interaction with the ECG and the UN Interagency Working Group.

17. Mr. W. Stevenson (IFC) presented "Good Practice Standards for Evaluation of Private Sector Investment Operations" developed by the ECG's private sector working group. The standards are intended for application in evaluation of individual private sector investment operations and synthesis reporting of such evaluations. In summing up the discussion, the Chair thanked Mr. Kariisa for the introduction and Mr. Stevenson for an interesting presentation. He noted that information exchange and interaction between the ECG and the WP-EV were useful. He also noted that several agencies, including the World Bank, were reviewing disclosure policies and welcomed steps towards increased transparency.

## **VI. WP-EV AND PEER REVIEWS**

18. The Chair of the Informal Sub-group (Mr. Dybfest) reported on the results of the meeting from the previous day. The suggestions made by the Sub-group included analytical work with an impartial observation of a selected number of forthcoming peer reviews. It would also entail obtaining views by Members on the usefulness and actual use of peer review results in capitals, possibly through survey and/or key informant interviews. This work should be done within the framework of the improvements already made to the PR process and the efforts to move from input orientation to results in the reviews. Peer reviews carried out by other OECD bodies could also be studied for possible lessons of useful practices. Germany agreed to provide a draft outline of the analytical study by June. This will be circulated to the Informal Sub-group and finalised by the Sub-Group by early September. The draft proposal will then be circulated to the full Working Party.

19. Other support actions by the Informal Sub-group would include continuing to act as a "sounding board" for new developments and experimentation/innovations in the Peer Review processes (such as reported for the review of the Netherlands). Early interaction between evaluation units and the peer review division was also encouraged, as in the case of the Netherlands and Germany.

20. Mr. Veglio, head of PRPM, commented on recent and upcoming peer reviews, noting the constructive spirit in which most DAC Members engage in them. He mentioned the increasing impact of Peer Reviews, demonstrated by more active follow-up to the recommendations formulated and noted the importance of focusing on high quality products to continue and build onto this trend. He welcomed closer collaboration with WP-EV and expressed his support for the suggestions made at the previous day's meeting reported by the Sub-Group Chair. It was also agreed that a synthesis of peer review findings on evaluation systems would be useful and that the PRPM should prepare a document on this subject which would serve as a basis for a discussion at the next meeting.

21. Members welcomed the suggestions by the Sub-group and agreed to proceed with the next steps.

## **VII. GLOSSARY OF TERMS IN EVALUATION AND RESULTS BASED MANAGEMENT** [DCD/DAC/EV(2001)3]

22. Mr. Picciotto (World Bank), Chair of the Task Force on the Glossary, made a brief presentation of recent progress. During the ensuing discussion, Members welcomed the improvements made compared to the earlier version but mentioned a few terms and definitions, which needed to be further discussed. Work conducted in parallel by the French was considered useful contribution. Members agreed to hold a meeting the next afternoon with interested members to finalise discussions on the glossary. The Chair noted that the objective of this exercise was not complete harmonisation but to contribute to more consistency and improved communication.

[The Task Force met directly after the WP-EV meeting and conducted a detailed review of outstanding terms and definitions and it was agreed that the World Bank would revise the document based on the discussions and written contributions submitted at the meeting. The review has since been completed and circulated to the members of the Task Force for final review. Following this, the document will be submitted to the WP-EV for approval].

## **VIII. LOCAL GOVERNANCE AND DECENTRALISATION** [Room Document No. 4]

23. Mr. Breier (Germany) presented the joint initiative planned by Germany (BMZ), the UNDP and the Secretariat for a study on lessons learned in support of decentralisation and local governance. He indicated some of the core elements of the study and welcomed comments and suggestions from Members, which could include the names of possible consultants and relevant other studies which should be considered in this work. It was agreed to set up a steering group with Germany, UNDP, France, the Netherlands, USAID, World Bank and the Secretariat as initial core members. It was stated that the DAC Network on Good Governance and Institutional Capacity Development (GOVNET) should be involved and kept informed on the study as it evolves.

## **IX. FURTHER WORK ON GENDER AND EVALUATION**

24. Ms. Robbins (Australia) presented briefly some ideas on follow-up work to the workshop held in Sweden in 1999 drawing on work by a consultant. She indicated this was preliminary thinking and welcomed suggestions and comments by Members on next steps. Some of the options for further work include: further dissemination of the findings of the workshop; guidance on evaluating gender equality and women's empowerment; capacity building in mainstreaming gender in evaluations (which would aim at evaluation tools and methodology such as terms of reference etc.); distilling from evaluations to draw lessons on gender mainstreaming. Some Members (United Kingdom, Sweden, World Bank, Canada) indicated their interest in improving mechanisms for gender mainstreaming in evaluation processes and welcomed the work conducted. Ms. Fallenius (Sweden) suggested the organisation of a workshop in the spring of 2002 to follow up and review the findings of a number of major ongoing evaluations. It was also suggested that the WP-GEN should be consulted in developing options for follow-up work and to involve them in this.

## **X. EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT** [Room Document No. 5] [Room Document No. 10]

25. Mr. Picciotto (World Bank) presented highlights from the March 2001 The Hague Workshop on "Building Evaluation Capacity For Poverty Reduction Strategies" (Room Document No. 5) sponsored by the evaluation department of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IOB) and the Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank (OED). He noted an increased demand for evaluation of poverty reduction within the framework of PRSPs, as these are becoming the overall framework for development

co-operation policies in many agencies and governments. He noted the three main objectives of the workshop: i) to exchange experience among developing countries regarding the potential and constraints for M&E systems related to PRSPs; ii) to initiate a dialogue between PRSP countries and donors on how to co-operate to support the design and implementation of PRSP-focused M&E systems related to PRSP initiatives; and finally iii) a training module, to transfer knowledge on how to design and implement M&E in PRSP countries. A full workshop report will be issued shortly.

26. One major concern expressed at the workshop was the danger of PRSP evaluations adding to “evaluation bombardment”, which further highlighted the need for joint initiatives. The Chair acknowledged this issue and pointed to the variety of reporting requirements of donors, stressing the need to work towards greater harmonisation. He further noted the necessity for including partners in evaluations as an indispensable part of capacity building efforts.

27. Mr. Feinstein (World Bank) briefed meeting participants on the status of the IPDET training programme, starting in June 2001. He mentioned that there was some room for additional participants in the second half of the course, and asked interested parties to contact the IPDET programme. The possibility of establishing a distance learning module will be explored after the first course cycle. It was further noted that developing country nationals make up approximately seventy per cent of the course participants.

28. Mr. Alam (UNDP) and Mr. Feinstein (World Bank) presented Room Document No. 10: “International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) – An Update”. A meeting took place on the 7-8 of May 2001 in London and was attended by participants from various aid agencies and ministries as well as developing country participants and a few members of national evaluation associations. A provisional steering committee (TSC), composed of a majority of developing country representatives, will be set up in order to draft by end 2001 recommend proposals about the legal formation of IDEAS, its constitutions and its initial work programs and funding plans. A provisional secretariat will be set up and a constituent assembly is foreseen for the first quarter of 2002.

29. Mr. Feinstein (World Bank) inquired about the possibility of including a separate section in the Evaluation Matrix on joint efforts in capacity building at the operational level. The Chair pointed out that central evaluation units would collect information from operational units and communicate it to the Secretariat. It was suggested that the Secretariat and the Chair should suggest cost-effective ways of collecting information on capacity building.

## **XI. REVIEW OF OTHER ONGOING WORK**

### *i) Evaluation Inventory [Room Document No. 6]*

30. Mr. Singh (Canada) presented a brief overview of actions taken since last meeting to improve the Evaluation Inventory. He evoked the new database engine designed to facilitate the management of the site, allowing for quicker modifications and submissions, and better statistical tracking of the site. The Inventory will revert back to CIDA. In addition to the technical issues it was noted that the usefulness of the Inventory depends in large part on Members' willingness to contribute abstracts to it. The Chair and Mr. Singh stressed to the necessity of making submission of abstracts part of administrative routines in order to reverse the current low level of submissions to the site. Accessibility and user-friendliness were also mentioned as important determinants for the use of the site. It was further agreed to explore the possible use of a search engine which would allow direct access to documents stored on Members' web sites instead of abstracts.

31. Mr. Singh (Canada) mentioned that other organisations (UNCDF in particular) have shown interest in contributing to the Inventory, and asked Members for their opinions on this issue. Reactions were positive, and it was decided to explore the interest of other organisations in submitting material to the Inventory. The Chair noted the probable increased workload for CIDA as a consequence, and mentioned the necessity for establishing clear criteria for eventual outside participation. The issue of disclosure policies and the question of having a private section of the site were also discussed. The Chair pointed to the continuous process of increasing openness and transparency in Member agencies and noted that most likely existing classified documentation in the Inventory was submitted before changes in policy. It was agreed that CIDA should look into the possibility of declassifying existing documents and a possible discontinuation of the reserved/private section.

*ii) Evaluation Development Forum 2002 [Room Document No. 7]*

32. Members welcomed the suggestion to organise an Evaluation Development Forum in 2002 [Room Document No. 7] and provided a number of suggestions on its orientation and the approach for outreach to evaluation agencies and partners which are not members of the WP. Some argued for a more limited and focused approach while others wished to see a broader, multi-dimensional agenda. It was agreed to set up a steering group with Belgium, France, Norway, the World Bank and the Secretariat to constitute the initial core of this group. Several delegations (including Norway, Netherlands and Switzerland) indicated a willingness to provide a financial contribution towards the organisation of the event.

*iii) Status Report on RBM [Room Document No. 8]*

33. The Secretariat provided a brief progress report based on Room Document No. 8 "Results Based Management in Donor Agencies: Progress Report on Phase Two". Work was progressing well but a number of interviews in capitals still remained. A set of notes with effective/good practices will be drawn up based on the results of the first and second phases and RBM will be a major substantive item for discussion at the next meeting of the WP.

## **XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

34. Mr. Breier (Germany) pointed to the danger of routine discussions at WP meetings and suggested that WP would take some time to reflect on what it wants to achieve as a group. He proposed reserving half a day at the next meeting for a brainstorming session on work and modalities. The Chair and the Secretariat noted that several decisions had been made at this meeting both related actions on ongoing work and new initiatives, notably on decentralisation, peer reviews, gender, and an evaluation forum. They also welcomed the initiative for a brainstorming around the work programme and modalities and how to engage members and observers more actively in joint work. It was decided that the Bureau of the WP should discuss how to prepare for a useful discussion at the November 2001 meeting.

35. The Chair noted that the publication "Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability" had just been released and Members were invited to contact the Secretariat if they needed additional copies for dissemination or internal use. The publication is also available at the Evaluation WP's web site in PDF format <<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation>>.

36. Next meeting will take place on 14-15 November at OECD.

## ANNEX ONE

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<b>Item 1</b>	Draft Annotated Agenda	DCD/DAC/EV/A(2001)1
<b>Item 2</b>	Summary Record of the 33 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting	DCD/DAC/EV/M(2000)2/PROV
<b>Item 4</b>	2000 Annual Report by the Chair of the DAC WP-EV	DCD/DAC/EV(2001)1
<b>Item 5 i)</b>	Managing the Joint Evaluation of Ghana's Road Sub-Sector Programme: Some Lessons Learned	Room DocumentNo. 1
	Approach Paper for a Multi-partner Evaluation of the Comprehensive Development Framework	Room DocumentNo. 9
<b>ii)</b>	Planned Evaluation Matrix	Room DocumentNo. 2
	Proposal for Cooperation on Evaluation of Poverty Reduction	Room DocumentNo.11
<b>iii)</b>	Good Practice Standards for Evaluation of Private Sector Investment Operations	Room DocumentNo. 3
<b>Item 7</b>	Glossary of Evaluation and Results Based Management Terms	DCD/DAC/EV(2001)3
<b>Item 8</b>	Lessons Learned in Supporting Decentralisation and Local Governance: Outline of Study	Room DocumentNo. 4
<b>Item 10</b>	Building Evaluation Capacity for Poverty Reduction Strategies – Highlights of the Hague Workshop	Room DocumentNo. 5
	International Development Evaluation Association – An Update	Room DocumentNo. 10
<b>Item 11 i)</b>	Evaluation Reports Inventory Update	Room DocumentNo. 6
<b>ii)</b>	Preparations for Evaluation Development Forum 2002	Room DocumentNo. 7
<b>iii)</b>	Results Based Management in Donor agencies: Progress Report on Phase Two	Room DocumentNo. 8
	Work Programme 2001-2002: Update	DCD/DAC/EV(2000)5/REV1



## ANNEX TWO

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Président/Chair: Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN (Danemark/Denmark)**

**Délégations du CAD / DAC Delegations**

ALLEMAGNE/GERMANY	<b>Mr. Horst BREIER</b>	Head of Evaluation Unit, Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ)
	<b>Mr. Simon KOPPERS</b>	Evaluation Division, BMZ
	<b>Mr. Sigfrid SCHROEDER-BREITSCHUH</b>	Senior evaluation officer, Evaluation Department, GTZ
	<b>Ms. Simone MAMIER</b>	Internal Evaluation Unit, GTZ
AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA	<b>Ms. Bronwyn ROBBINS</b>	Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)
AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA	<b>Mr. Anton MAIR</b>	Head of Evaluation and Audit Unit, Department of Development Co-operation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
BELGIQUE/BELGIUM	<b>Mr. Etienne DE BELDER</b>	Evaluateur Spécial, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
	<b>Mr. Jean-Dominique D'HAYÈRE</b>	Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
CANADA	<b>Mr. Goberdhan SINGH</b>	Director of Evaluation, Evaluation Division, Performance Review Branch, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
COMMISSION EUROPEËNNE/ EUROPEAN COMMISSION	<b>Mr. Simon ROBBINS</b>	Evaluation Unit, EuropeAid
DANEMARK/DENMARK	<b>Mr. Lars ELLE</b>	Deputy Head of Evaluation Secretariat, Danish International Development Assistance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
ESPAGNE/SPAIN	<b>Ms. Eva FERRUS GARCIA</b>	Counsellor, Planning and Evaluation Office, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
ETATS-UNIS/ UNITED STATES	<b>Mr. Gerald BRITAN</b>	Director, Centre for Development Information and Evaluation, USAID

	<b>Mr. Kelly KAMMERER</b>	US representative to the DAC
FINLANDE/FINLAND	<b>Ms. Eija LIMNELL</b>	Permanent Delegation
FRANCE	<b>Mme Anne-Marie CABRIT</b>	Responsable de l'Unité d'Evaluation, Ministère de l'Economie, Finances et Industrie
	<b>M. Philippe MARION</b>	Direction du Trésor
	<b>Mme. Elisabeth BARSACQ</b>	Chef du bureau de l'évaluation de la DGCID, Ministère des affaires étrangères français.
GRECE/GREECE	<b>Ms. Paraskevi KYRIAKOPOULOU</b>	Section for Planning and Policy, Directorate for Development Co-operation, Ministry of National Economy
	<b>Mr. Dimitris SERRELIS</b>	Permanent Delegation
ITALIE/ITALY	<b>Mr. Guido La TELLA</b>	Counsellor, Permanent Delegation
JAPON/JAPAN	<b>Mr. Michio HARADA</b>	Deputy Director, Evaluation Division, Economic Co-operation Bureau, MOFA
	<b>Mr. Koichi MIYOSHI</b>	Managing Director, Office of Evaluation and Post-Project Monitoring, Planning and Evaluation Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
	<b>Mr. Yoshihiro KUMAGAI</b>	Deputy Director, Development Operation Evaluation Office, JBIC
	<b>Mr. Kazunori MIURA</b>	JICA France Office
	<b>Mr. Tadashi KAGEYAMA</b>	Permanent Delegation
LUXEMBOURG	<b>Mr. Alain SIBENALER</b>	Directorate for Development Cooperation, Multilateral Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NORVEGE/NORWAY	<b>Mr. Jan DYBFEST</b>	Assistant Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<b>Ms. Inger Kristine STOLL</b>	Senior Adviser, Norwegian Agency for International Co-operation
PAYS-BAS/ NETHERLANDS	<b>Mr. Ted KLIEST</b>	Policy and Operations Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
PORTUGAL	<b>Ms. Maria Celeste BARRIER</b>	Evaluation and Planning Department, Institute of Portuguese Co-operation
	<b>Mr. Paulo J. NASCIMENTO</b>	Permanent Delegation

ROYAUME UNI/ UNITED KINGDOM	<b>Mr. Colin KIRK</b>	Head of Evaluation Department, Department for International Development (DfID)
	<b>Mr. Arthur FAGAN</b>	Deputy Head, Evaluation Department, DfID
SUEDE/SWEDEN	<b>Ms. Anne Marie FALLENIOUS</b>	Director of Evaluation and Internal Audit, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
SUISSE/SWITZERLAND	<b>Mr. Christoph GRAF</b>	Head, Evaluation and Controlling Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
	<b>Mr. Benoît GIRARDIN</b>	Evaluation and Controlling Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
	<b>Mr. Thomas KNECHT</b>	Deputy Head, Quality and Knowledge Management, Development and Transition, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
<b>Pays de l'OCDE non membre du CAD / Non-DAC OECD country</b>		
CZECH REPUBLIC	<b>Mr. Petr HALAXA</b>	National Project Manager, Institute of International Relations
	<b>Mr. Jan V. KROUZEK</b>	Senior Project Co-ordinator, Institute of International Relations
<b>Observateurs / Observers</b>		
FOND MONÉTAIRE INTERNATIONAL/ INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND	<b>Mr. Graeme JUSTICE</b>	Senior Economist, European Office
GROUPE BANQUE MONDIALE/ WORLD BANK GROUP	<b>Mr. Robert PICCIOTTO</b>	Director-General, Operations Evaluation, WB Group (OED/OEG)
	<b>Mr. Osvaldo FEINSTEIN</b>	Manager, Partnerships and Knowledge Programs, Operations Evaluation Department,
	<b>Mr. William STEVENSON</b>	Director, Operations Evaluation Group, International Finance Corporation (IFC)
PROGRAMME DE DÉVELOPPEMENT DES NATIONS UNIS/ UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	<b>Mr. Nurul ALAM</b>	Deputy Director, Evaluation Office

**Autres participants / Additional participants**

BANQUE AFRICAINE DE DEVELOPPEMENT/ AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	<b>Mr. Gabriel KARIISA</b>	Director, Operations Evaluation Department
	<b>Mr. Mohamed Hédi MANAI</b>	Chief Evaluation Officer, Operations Evaluation Department
BANQUE ASIATIQUE DE DEVELOPPEMENT/ ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	<b>Mr. Graham WALTER</b>	Manager, Operations Evaluation Department
BANQUE EUROPÉENNE POUR LA RECONSTRUCTION ET LE DEVELOPPEMENT / EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT	<b>Mr. Fredrik KORFKER</b>	Director, Project Evaluation Department
	<b>Mr. Wolfgang GRUBER</b>	Senior Evaluation Manager
BANQUE INTER-AMÉRICAINNE DE DEVELOPPEMENT / INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	<b>Mr. Stephen A. QUICK</b>	Director of OVE (Office of Evaluation and Oversight)

**Secrétariat de l'OCDE / OECD Secretariat**

<b>Mr. Michael ROESKAU</b>	Director, Development Co-operation Directorate
<b>Ms. Monique BERGERON</b>	Administrator, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, DCD
<b>Mr. Sean CONLIN*</b>	Principal Administrator, Peer Reviews and Policy Monitoring Division, DCD
<b>Mr. Kjetil HANSEN</b>	Consultant, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, DCD
<b>Mr. Paul ISENMAN</b>	Head of Division, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, DCD
<b>Mr. Hans LUNDGREN</b>	Advisor on Aid Effectiveness, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, DCD
<b>Mr. Pietro VEGLIO*</b>	Head of Division, Peer Reviews and Policy Monitoring Division, DCD

\* Participating in Peer Review discussions, Agenda item 6.