



PARIS

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE  
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

DCD/DAC/EV/M(2000)2/PROV  
For Official Use

**Working Party on Aid Evaluation**

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING**

**held on 22-23 November 2000**

*Promoting joint or co-ordinated evaluations. Glossary of terms in evaluation and results-based management. Strengthening the DAC's Peer Review process: the role of the Working Party on Aid Evaluation. DAC WP-EV Tokyo workshop on Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability. Evaluation capacity development and training. Work Programme and observership issues. Recent developments in ministries and aid agencies. Brief status reports on other ongoing or planned 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)  
Strategic Management of Development Co-operation Division

98739

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

Or. Eng.

1. Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Chair, opened the meeting.

**I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** [DCD/DAC/EV/A(2000)2]

2. The agenda was approved.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 32<sup>ND</sup> MEETING**  
[DCD/DAC/EV/M(2000)1/PROV/ADD1]

3. The Summary Record of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting was approved.

**III. PROMOTING JOINT OR CO-ORDINATED EVALUATIONS**

[Room Document No. 1] [Room Document No. 2]

*i. Brief overview of ongoing joint evaluations*

4. Mr. Elle (Denmark) gave a brief presentation of a joint evaluation of the transport sector in Ghana, jointly led by Denmark and the Ghanaian authorities, which had just been completed. The findings of the evaluation show that the main goals of the various programmes have largely been achieved. Mr. Elle pointed out that this initiative confirmed that joint evaluations were not only possible but added value as they combined donor efforts and he expressed his, and the Government of Ghana's, hope that individual donors would refrain from initiating evaluations of the road sector for a while. The Chair suggested that a brief report should be produced by Denmark, outlining the main process-oriented lessons stemming from the joint evaluation, in order to contribute to current know-how on these aspects.

5. Mr. Kliet (Netherlands) presented the status of the multi-donor evaluation of basic education support, co-ordinated by the Netherlands. A preparatory study is currently underway. The Steering Group will subsequently elaborate the terms of reference, and determine specific modalities for each participating agency's involvement.

6. The evaluation of UNAIDS was briefly evoked. In the planning stages, two models of implementation had been discussed, one involving collaboration with the evaluation departments of the sponsors of the evaluation. In the end this option was not retained, and UNAIDS decided that an external body should undertake the evaluation.

7. Ms. Fallenius (Sweden) mentioned a new initiative to evaluate the three C's: Co-ordination, Complementarity, and Coherence, in the context of European Union aid. A framework is under preparation.

*ii) Suggestions for new joint or co-ordinated work*

8. The Secretariat (Mr. Lundgren) introduced the two background documents for the agenda item: *DAC Members' Evaluation Portfolio* (Room Document No 1), and *DAC Members' Aid Flows by Sector and Recipient* (Room Document No 2). Participants acknowledged their usefulness as instruments for sharing information and for promoting joint and co-ordinated work. It was agreed that the Secretariat would maintain a regularly updated version of the evaluation portfolio on the restricted part of the website, and would also develop a standard format for reporting evaluation plans in order to facilitate continuous updating. Members should also submit new plans to the Secretariat in a timely fashion. The Chair stressed

the need to engage in further joint and co-ordinated work. He noted that involvement in joint evaluations could take place with different levels of commitment, ranging from a lead role or active participation to simply sponsoring, depending on individual agency capacity at the time.

9. Ms. Fallenius (Sweden) suggested that SWAPs could function as a basis for joint evaluations, since donors are collaborating in the implementation of these programmes, and co-ordination is a cornerstone of SWAPs. Some Members pointed to the heterogeneity of sector wide approaches, but the general feeling was that this should not be a deterrent and Sweden was encouraged to further elaborate on this and provide some concrete suggestions.

10. Mr. van den Berg (Netherlands) gave a brief update on a recipient-led evaluation, supported notably by UNDP, World Bank and the Netherlands. The initial plan with Mozambique taking the lead had been postponed due to problems related to flooding. A fresh attempt will be made to get this evaluation started next year, with an evaluation workshop to be held in Mozambique.

11. Mr. Picciotto (World Bank) reported on the preparatory work for a joint evaluation of the CDF. It was felt that the focus should be on implementation and learning, since it is still too early to evaluate the outcomes of CDF approaches. The Chair noted that considerable progress had been made in the design of the evaluation based on the results of a recent workshop. The establishment of an Advisory Group is envisaged as part of the governance structure of this major evaluation. This group should be comprised of development policy makers and practitioners, including experienced and respected individuals from developing countries, NGOs, development assistance agencies and private sector representatives. A number of Members expressed strong support of this initiative, and several indicated interest in taking part in the proposed advisory group.

#### **IV. GLOSSARY OF TERMS IN EVALUATION AND RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT** [DCD/DAC/EV (2000) 6] [Background Document No. 1] [Room Document No.4]

12. The Chair introduced the subject and noted that the current glossary is not an attempt to reach complete harmonisation, but rather to reach a certain level of consistency in terminology throughout the development evaluation field. It was noted that the elaboration of the French and the Spanish versions will be based on terms used in the evaluation communities working in these languages with the aim of reaching as much convergence as possible between the various language versions.

13. Mr. Samset (consultant) gave a presentation of the draft English version of the glossary. He pointed out that the previous glossary, created in 1986, had provided the basis upon which the new process had been initiated, and that approximately one-third of the new glossary consists of terms from the older version, while two-thirds are made up of new terms. The current version of the glossary was the result of a consultative process, including meetings of the WP-EV and the Glossary Task Force. He suggested that the web version of the glossary be constructed so as to allow linkages to the background document upon which the glossary was based.

14. Several Members expressed satisfaction with the current document, and looked forward to its rapid finalisation. Some Members, however, stressed the need for one last round of consultations providing the opportunity for final comments and suggestions. It was underlined that the document should address a broad development public, hence the need to establish full confidence in the final product.

15. Mme Ambrois (consultant) presented the French version of the glossary. She outlined the methodology used, and evoked the effort that went into embodying the spirit of the English version and the attempt to reach the closest possible convergence between the two glossaries. She pointed out that the format of the French glossary was constructed with the idea to allow for easy and direct comparison

between the two versions. It was noted that an important step forward had been made in the development of the two glossaries, and the considerable convergence between them.

16. IADB confirmed its commitment to begin work on the Spanish version as soon as the English version was finalised.

17. The Task Force was requested to finalise the glossary and present a final draft at the next meeting of the WP. [During the ensuing meeting of the Glossary Task Force, steps were decided to enable one final round of consultations in order to achieve the twin objectives of high quality and consensus. The Secretariat has since sent a letter to Members asking for comments by the end of January 2001. The World Bank will engage an outside expert for a review of the final product. France will continue work on the French version, and before final completion, draw on the improvements to the English version. The necessity for a final -- or virtual -- meeting of the Task Force will be considered when the incorporation of the last round of comments commences].

## **V. STRENGTHENING THE DAC'S PEER REVIEW PROCESS: THE ROLE OF THE WORKING PARTY ON AID EVALUATION [DCD/DAC/EV(2000)7]**

18. The Chair introduced the subject by referring to the DAC meeting on the review of subsidiary bodies when the issue of WP-EV/Peer Review collaboration had first been raised. The Secretariat (Mr. Lundgren) noted that it had been suggested at several DAC meetings that the WP should develop modalities for such collaboration. He drew participants' attention to four points in particular:

- i. Suggestion for creating a task force/working group for interaction with the Peer Reviews
- ii. Mid-term self assessments
- iii. Greater role for evaluators as co-examiners in the Peer Review process
- iv. Greater inputs from evaluation departments in preparation of Peer Reviews

19. Participants generally welcomed DAC's request for closer collaboration. The importance of the peer review exercise was recognised, and Members expressed a willingness to assist in further improving this process. Several participants pointed out that recent peer reviews had brought about significant changes in the systems of the countries reviewed.

20. The proposed modalities in the Secretariat note were seen as good starting points for discussion, although there was some concern about the exact role of evaluation units in the proposed mid-term self-assessments. The concern centred on the desire to ensure an appropriate level of engagement for evaluation units in the PR process, where it was felt that evaluation units should play mainly a "supporting" role to the agency's self assessment.

21. Germany (Mr. Breier) expressed some concern about the proposed involvement of WP-EV in the Peer Review process. He questioned the need to improve the process and suggested that many challenges for improvement lie with the reviewed countries themselves, and referred to follow-up mechanisms on Peer Review recommendations. He proposed that collaboration could start with a comprehensive review of the present Peer Review process to identify its strengths and weaknesses, followed by proposals for improvement and the identification of areas where the WP-EV might possibly be able to contribute to the process. Several Members expressed support for further analytical work based on needs identified through the collaborative work with Peer Reviews. A number of Members felt that the interaction should focus on providing methodological support on assessment and evaluation issues in the Peer Review process, mainly defined on a needs basis, to contribute effectively within the limited means and resources available.

22. In summing up the discussion, the Chair noted the agreement to establish a task force/working group and Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden volunteered to participate. Canada, Japan, UK and US expressed interest in contributing, but indicated some concerns about practical aspects including travelling. It was decided that the Secretariat would propose a meeting of the Task Force/Working Group in early 2001. It was agreed that the question of mid-term self-assessments need to be discussed further, in the light of various issues on the role of evaluation units in this process. Guidance from DAC would be helpful. It was also agreed to include PRs as a point on the agenda of future WP meetings, with a focus on forthcoming issues. Finally, it was noted that the issue of participation by evaluation personnel as examiners would have to be decided on a case-by-case basis by the countries concerned.

## **VI. DAC WP-EV TOKYO WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION FEEDBACK FOR EFFECTIVE LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY** [Room Document No. 6]

23. Mr. Shirakawa (Japan) gave a brief presentation of the recent Tokyo Workshop, noting that this was the first time Japan had hosted a DAC WP-EV event. He provided some highlights of the main issues from the conference, stressing the importance of effective feedback mechanisms in the evaluation process. He also informed Members on Japan's efforts to further improve its feedback system in the wake of the workshop.

24. The Chair noted the positive feedback from workshop participants and thanked Japan for hosting this important event. The Secretariat was asked to prepare a publication in the *Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness* series. Due to the heterogeneous nature of the workshop material, the publication should principally draw upon the workshop report and the review document prepared on the basis of the questionnaire responses. Members' comments should be received within two weeks (by 7 December) in preparation for publication in early 2001. The possibility of posting individual presentations on the website was also evoked, subject to approval by individual Members, and the Secretariat was asked to take appropriate action.

## **VII. EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING** [Room Document No. 9] [Room Document No. 10] [Room Document No. 11]

25. Mr. Rist (World Bank) presented the room document *Building Skills to Evaluate Poverty Reduction: International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)* [Room Document No 9]. This initiative, led by the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation in collaboration with Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada, envisages providing evaluation training for professionals in the development field and other interested individuals, through a rigorous two to four week training course, giving both a general insight into evaluation and the opportunity to deepen knowledge on specific subjects. Participants welcomed this initiative, noting the lack of training of this kind and its importance for both evaluation professionals and for the building of evaluation capacity in partner countries. To further encourage capacity building, it was stated that scholarships would be available for developing partner country participants. The programme will commence in the summer of 2001, and Members interested in submitting candidates were encouraged to contact the World Bank.

26. Mr. Alam (UNDP) gave an update on the joint UNDP-WB initiative International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) [Room Document No. 10]. Some of the key objectives of IDEAS are to foster evaluation as an instrument of public accountability and learning in development and to promote exchanges of professional experience in development evaluation. Mr. Alam further noted that demand for high quality evaluation was increasing in developing countries. Mr. Rist (World Bank) remarked that, although a multitude of national and regional evaluation associations exists, there is no professional organisation for development evaluation. He further emphasised the wide membership base envisaged for

IDEAS, including civil society participants. He suggested the establishment of a steering committee, and invited all interested parties to volunteer.

27. Several participants welcomed the IDEAS initiative. The importance of keeping a focus on the South was underlined and the need to include partner countries from an early stage with the objective of linking the IDEAS objective with capacity building. The idea of inviting NGO representatives to join the association was also welcomed. Germany expressed a point of concern, noting that the establishment of a structure parallel to national associations could entail risks of fragmenting existing national evaluation association efforts.

28. Mr. Kariisa (AfDB) presented the summary report of the Regional Workshop and Seminar on Evaluation Capacity Development for Africa [Room document No. 11] and drew attention to the strong positive feedback received from participants in response to the seminar.

29. The Chair welcomed the various organisations' initiatives and noted that evaluation capacity building is part of the mandate of the WP-EV. He encouraged broader action by Members in this field, as it is of major importance for engaging partners more fully in all stages of evaluations.

## **VIII. WORK PROGRAMME AND OBSERVERSHIP ISSUES**

### **A. Work Programme [DCD/DAC/EV(2000)5]**

30. Following the Chair's suggestion, the meeting proceeded by examining the items of the work programme not covered by the previous discussion:

#### *i) Strengthening Exchange of Experience*

31. Concerning Item C "*Evaluation Partnerships*", it was noted that further work should draw on previous undertakings including the donor survey, but in particular be structured so as to benefit from experiences in ongoing joint and recipient-led evaluations before elaborating good practices in this area.

#### *ii) Lessons Learned*

32. On item A "*Gender/WID evaluation*", AusAID and the World Bank reported on their current efforts in gender evaluations.

33. Mr. Breier (Germany) presented a proposal for work on "Lessons learned from support of partner country efforts towards the promotion of decentralisation and the strengthening of local governance". The work would be based on earlier joint efforts in the area by UNDP and Germany. The proposal was welcomed and will be incorporated into the Work Programme. The Chair asked Germany, UNDP and the Secretariat to collaborate and prepare the terms of reference and budget. He noted with appreciation Germany's willingness to make financial resources available to take this project forward.

#### *iii) Joint Studies*

34. The Secretariat (Mr. Lundgren) introduced item D "*Using ICT as a Tool for Development*" -- in the context of ongoing discussions on the digital divide -- and suggested reviewing existing evaluation material and possible new information needs in this area. The idea was welcomed and the Chair proposed collaboration between the Secretariat, UNDP and the World Bank in elaborating an approach paper.

35. On item C “*Peace building and conflict prevention*”, the Chair noted the high importance of the subject for Members. It was suggested that the DAC Task Force on CPDC could perhaps be encouraged to make a concrete suggestion to the WP-EV in order to found any joint efforts on clearly identified needs and a target group for the evaluation product.

*iv) Evaluation Capacity of Developing Countries*

36. The suggestion of organising an Evaluation Development Forum in 2002, linked to one of the two WP-EV meetings and with a broad range of partners in development evaluation, was welcomed. The purpose would be to improve mutual understanding and promote dialogue among development evaluators. During the discussion, the European Commission and Australia commented on the importance of establishing a common quality framework with NGOs to facilitate future evaluations, and some indicated a mixed record for previous experiences in interacting on evaluation with NGOs. The Chair summed up by noting support for holding a forum and asked the Secretariat to prepare a plan of action for consideration at the next meeting based on informal consultations with Members and potential partners.

**B. Observership issues [Room Document No. 5]**

37. The Chair referred to the formal request from IFAD on membership in the WP as contained in Room Document No. 5. He suggested that some of the Task Forces or Steering Groups could benefit from the participation of specialised agencies, while acknowledging the importance of keeping the size of the WP at a manageable level. He referred to past examples of such requests and suggested that a clear and transparent approach would be needed to deal with participation/observership.

38. WP Members welcomed IFAD's interest in its work and stressed the usefulness of its collaboration, such as its participation in the recent Tokyo workshop on evaluation feedback. Members felt, however, that it would be difficult to provide a regular observer seat around the table for IFAD, essentially for reasons of principle. As many agencies and international organisations have demonstrated interest in the work of the WP, admitting one agency, notwithstanding its major importance, would mean opening the door to more applications than the WP could accommodate.

39. It was agreed, however, that short of observership, new ways to strengthen collaboration should be sought. The Chair of the WP-EV was asked to explore -- with the Chairs of the UN Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation and the multilateral banks Evaluation Co-operation Group -- ways to reinforce co-operation between the members of these groups and to report back to the next meeting of the WP in May 2001. It was further recommended that informal seminars and workshops should involve key partners in development to a higher degree. In addition, the 2002 Development Evaluation Forum would provide an excellent opportunity to engage in a dialogue with a broad range of partners.

**IX. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN MINISTRIES AND AID AGENCIES**

40. Members reported on recent changes and developments in ministries and agencies, including overall new policy directions, particularly related to evaluation. Although mainly an information sharing item, the Chair noted its importance, and expressed his intention to give it prominence on the agenda in future meetings.

**X. BRIEF STATUS REPORTS ON OTHER ONGOING OR PLANNED WORK**

*i) DAC Evaluation Reports Inventory [Room Document No. 3]*

41. Mr Singh (Canada) gave a brief update on the Evaluation Inventory, noting that an extensive cleanup had just been performed, and that a restricted section had been established for members. He

reported a continuous increase in users, but expressed some concern about the limited number of regular contributors to the site. He made some suggestions for improvement; such as direct links to full reports on members homepages, proposals that were well received by participants.

42. The Chair suggested that options should be explored on further technical upgrading including expanded search facilities. It was also seen as necessary to attract more contributors on a regular basis. It was said that abstracts could now be submitted to CIDA throughout the year and it was suggested that evaluation departments should make the submission of an executive summary or an abstract to CIDA part of the administrative routine when distributing their final report. It was decided that CIDA should examine various options for upgrading the site, and gather data on users and potential demand for the site, including connections with the Gateway initiative. It was also agreed that Members should make an effort to submit abstracts in a timely fashion.

*ii) Further Work on Poverty Reduction*

43. Mr. Singh (Canada) reported that the workshop was still on the agenda for CIDA, but that it will require careful preparation. The suggestion to hold a follow-up workshop was generally welcomed. In order to ensure value added for Members, it was agreed to review ongoing evaluation work and take stock of the forthcoming PRSP workshop before deciding on timing and content. Canada, the Netherlands and the UK agreed to collaborate in this effort.

*iii) Status Report on RBM [Room Document No. 7]*

44. A brief update on the status of work on RBM was presented by the Secretariat (Mr. Lundgren). A revision of the first phase desk study will be sent out shortly, and interviews for Phase 2 will start in December with USAID, World Bank, UNDP and UNICEF. Phase 2 interviews will continue in the spring. A progress report will be provided at the next meeting, and results of Phase 2 presented in November 2001. Mr. Korfker (EBRD) suggested that the Task Force should also conduct interviews with the EBRD in this process.

*iv) Recent work on Sustainability of Development Programmes [Room Document No. 8]*

45. Mr. Nicholls (Australia) presented highlights from a recent evaluation report on sustainability undertaken by AusAID. Several Members complimented Australia on a useful piece of work. Any further comments on the report should be sent to AusAID.

*v) Update on WP-EV Website*

46. The Secretariat (Mr. Tocatlian) gave a brief overview on the use of the WP website. He pointed out the relatively high, and rising, number of users and the popularity of Evaluation publications, with a consistent rating among the top ten most downloaded DAC documents. He further outlined some of the expected changes in the structure of the homepage as a result of the upcoming migration of the OECD site to a new platform. The WP-EV website was considered useful and the Secretariat should continue updating and improving the site.

## **XI. OTHER BUSINESS**

47. In view of the fact that Mr Doyle (EC) would shortly be leaving the WP, the Chair expressed thanks to him on behalf of the WP for his many important contributions to the WP during the past six and a half years, and presented his best wishes for his next posting.



## ANNEX ONE

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

<b>Item 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Annotated Agenda</li> </ul>	DCD/DAC/EV/A(2000)2
<b>Item 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAC Members' Evaluation Portfolio</li> <li>• DAC Members' Aid Flows by Sector &amp; Recipient (Sector Matrix)</li> </ul>	Room Document No. 1 Room Document No. 2
<b>Item 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glossary of Evaluation and RBM Terms</li> <li>• Annex: Glossary of Evaluation and RBM Terms. Terms and Definitions submitted by Members</li> <li>• French Glossaire</li> </ul>	DCD/DAC/EV(2000)6 Background Doc No. 1 Room Doc No. 4
<b>Item 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening the DAC's Peer Review Process: the Role of the Working Party on Aid Evaluation</li> </ul>	DCD/DAC/EV(2000)7
<b>Item 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report from Tokyo Workshop</li> </ul>	Room Document No. 6
<b>Item 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Skills to Evaluate Poverty Reduction: International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)</li> <li>• International Development Evaluation Association</li> <li>• Regional Workshop And Seminar On Evaluation Capacity Development For Africa: Summary Report</li> </ul>	Room Document No. 9 Room Document No. 10 Room Document No. 11
<b>Item 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme 2001-2002</li> <li>• Lessons Learned From Support of Partner Country Efforts Towards the Promotion of Decentralisation and the Strengthening of Local Governance</li> <li>• Observership issues</li> </ul>	DCD/DAC/EV(2000)5 Room Document No. 12 Room Document No. 5
<b>Item 10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAC Evaluation Reports Inventory 2000 Interim Activity Report</li> </ul>	Room Document No. 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results Based Management in The Donor Agencies. Status Report: Phase 2</li> </ul>	Room Document No. 7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability of Development Programmes</li> </ul>	Room Document No. 8

**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>Ms. Sabine MÜLLER</b>	Senior evaluation officer, Evaluation Department, GTZ
	<b>Mr. Sigfrid SCHROEDER-BREITSCHUH</b>	Senior evaluation officer, Evaluation Department, GTZ
	<b>Ms. Yildiz GÖTZE</b>	Permanent Delegation
AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA	<b>Mr. Rick NICHOLLS</b>	Manager, Quality Assurance Group, Performance Information and Assessment Section, 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
CANADA	<b>Mr. Goberdhan SINGH</b>	Director of Evaluation, Evaluation Division, Performance Review Branch, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
CE/EC	<b>Mr. Sean DOYLE</b>	Head, Aid Evaluation Unit, SCR/F/5, European Commission
DANEMARK/DENMARK	<b>Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN</b>	Head of Evaluation Secretariat, Danish International Development Assistance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DANIDA)

	<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>Ms. Jean Du RETTE</b>	Chief, Programme and Operations Assessment Division, Center for Development Information and Evaluation, US Agency for International Development (USAID)
FINLANDE/FINLAND	<b>Mr. Sakari ERÄPOHJA</b>	Head of Evaluation and Internal Audit, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department of International Development Co-operation
FRANCE	<b>Mme Anne-Marie CABRIT</b>	Direction du Trésor, Responsable Evaluation, Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances
	<b>Mme. Elisabeth BARSACQ</b>	Chef du bureau de l'évaluation de la DGCID, Ministère des affaires étrangères français.
	<b>Mr. Michael RULETA</b>	Bureau de l'évaluation, DGCID, Ministère des Affaires étrangères
	<b>Mr. Jean-Claude BREDELOUX</b>	Responsable de l'Evaluation Rétrospective, Agence Française de développement (AFD)
	<b>Mme. Pascale AMBROIS</b>	Consultante, cabinet d'étude C3E
	<b>Mr. Jacques TOULEMONDE</b>	Co-directeur, C3E
	<b>Mr. Fabrice DREISKI</b>	Permanent Delegation
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
IRLANDE/IRELAND	<b>Mr. Martin BURKE</b>	Evaluation and Audit Unit, Development Co-operation Division, Department of Foreign Affairs

ITALIE/ITALY	<b>Mr. Giancarlo PALMA</b>	Directorate-General for Development Co-operation, Evaluation Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<b>Mr. Carlo CIBÒ</b>	Directorate-General for Development Co-operation, Evaluation Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
JAPON/JAPAN	<b>Mr. Mitsunori SHIRAKAWA</b>	Director, Evaluation Division, Economic Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<b>Mr. Hiroyuki INUI</b>	Evaluation Division, Economic Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<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. Yoshitaka SUMI</b>	Deputy Director, Office of Evaluation and Post Project Monitoring, Planning and Evaluation Department, JICA
	<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
PAYS-BAS/ NETHERLANDS	<b>Mr. Rob van den BERG</b>	Director, Policy and Operations Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<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. David TODD</b>	Social Development Adviser, Evaluation Department, DfID
SUEDE/SWEDEN	<b>Ms. Ann Marie FALLENIOUS</b>	Director of Evaluation and Internal Audit, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
SUISSE/SWITZERLAND	<b>Mr. Benoît GIRARDIN</b>	Strategic Controlling Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
	<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 countries</b>		
COREE/KOREA	<b>Mr. Jai-chul CHOI</b>	Permanent Delegation
<b>Observateurs / Observers</b>		
FMI/IMF	<b>Mr. Graeme JUSTICE</b>	Senior Economist, European Office
GROUPE BANQUE MONDIALE/ WORLD BANK GROUP	<b>Mr. Robert PICCIOTTO</b>	Director-General, Operations Evaluation Department
	<b>Mr Ray RIST</b>	Senior Evaluation Officer, Operations Evaluation Department
PNUD/UNDP	<b>Mr. Khalid MALIK</b>	Director, Evaluation Office
	<b>Mr. Nurul ALAM</b>	Deputy Director, Evaluation Office
<b>Autres participants / Additional participants</b>		
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. J. Antonio M. QUILA</b>	Chief, Operations Evaluation Office
BERD / EBRD	<b>Mr. Fredrik KORFKER</b>	Director, Project Evaluation Department
	<b>Mr. Wolfgang GRUBER</b>	Senior Evaluation Manager
BIAD / IADB	<b>Ms. J. FEINSILVER</b>	Office of Evaluation and Oversight
	<b>Mr. Rod CHAPMAN</b>	Senior Press and Information Officer IDB Special Office in Europe
<b>Consultant Invité / Invited Consultant</b>		
	<b>Mr. Knut SAMSET</b>	Senior Partner, Scanteam International AS, Oslo
<b>Development Centre</b>		
	<b>Ms. Ida MCDONNELL</b>	Policy Dialogue Unit
<b>Secrétariat de l'OCDE / OECD Secretariat</b>		
	<b>Mr. Hans LUNDGREN</b>	Advisor on Aid Effectiveness, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, Development Co-operation Directorate
	<b>Mr. Kjetil HANSEN</b>	Consultant, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, DCD
	<b>Mr. Michael LAIRD</b>	Administrator, Peer Reviews and Policy Monitoring Division, DCD
	<b>Ms. Marjolaine NICOD</b>	Consultant, Peer Reviews and Policy Monitoring Division, DCD