

**For Official Use**

**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2002)1/PROV**



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

**12-Jul-2002**

**English - Or. English**

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

**Working Party on Aid Evaluation**

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 36th MEETING**

**held on 29-30 May 2002**

Contacts: Mr. Hans Lundgren, Tel: 33 (1) 45 24 90 59; Em: [hans.lundgren@oecd.org](mailto:hans.lundgren@oecd.org).  
Ms. Monique Bergeron, Tel: 33 (1) 45 24 19 79; Em: [monique.bergeron@oecd.org](mailto:monique.bergeron@oecd.org)  
Fax: 33 (1) 44 30 61 47

**JT00129553**

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

**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2002)1/PROV  
For Official Use**

**English - Or. English**

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING

1. The Agenda was adopted.
2. The Summary Record of the 35<sup>th</sup> meeting was approved.

### **Item 3. Election of the chair**

3. The election was postponed to the second day of the meeting under item 5.

### **Item 4. Follow-up on the Brainstorming Session held at the November 2001 meeting, and proposed Programme of Work**

4. The Chair invited comments from Members on the note "Key Elements from the Brainstorming Discussion" [Room Document No. 1]. He echoed Members' sentiment that the discussion on brainstorming had been fruitful and noted that it had led to the identification of collective challenges and new work modalities. Several participants referred to the importance of enhancing evaluation practice through joint work and exchange in the WP.

5. The results of the brainstorming had fed into the preparation of a new work programme for the Working Party [DCD/DAC/EV(2002)1]. The Chair highlighted the main areas of work as well as new modalities for work in task teams, which would be addressed in the context of the discussion on the individual work themes. He underlined the importance of feeding back results to the DAC and of communication between the WP and the various levels of the DAC. The upcoming ranking exercise of subsidiary bodies was noted.

#### **Theme I: Joint reviews and evaluations**

##### **a) Lessons Learned in Donor Support to Decentralisation and Local Governance**

6. Horst Breier (Germany), co-chair of the Steering Group, introduced the progress report and announced the meeting of the steering group to be held the following day. He mentioned plans for a workshop to be held in September in Oslo, to which Members of the WP-EV and of the DAC Network on Good Governance and Capacity Development (GOVNET) would be invited. The Steering Group was to discuss the outline of the workshop the next day. [The dates of the workshop have since been set to 23-24 September 2002.]

7. Comments from Members on the progress report included: the need to broaden participation from other developing countries than those focused on in the study; the need to look at issues such as capacity building in a decentralised context; as well as incentives and mechanisms for accountability.

##### **b) Gender and evaluation**

8. Elizabeth Brouwer (Australia) introduced the document presenting progress made in the study over recent months [Room Document No. 3]. Despite the fact that the project was still at an early stage, she was able to highlight some key findings including the differentiated information available on

programmes with a gender focus and those without. Members were sympathetic to the suggestion to address the issues of gender auditing, and key NGO work on gender and evaluation. The next steps include following up more closely with Members and with their gender focal points, comparing data with the 1999 findings, and considering further collaboration with key members. The Netherlands offered financial support and a consultant to work in collaboration with the lead Australian consultant. It was also agreed by Australia to review findings prior to 1999.

9. The Secretariat (Monique Bergeron) confirmed the interest of the WP-GEN in this study, as it is an integral part of their work programme.

#### **c) Client survey study of peer reviews**

10. The Chair of the WP-EV Informal Sub-group on Peer Reviews (Jan Dybfest) provided an update of developments. The Informal Sub-group had met on the day preceding the WP-EV meeting for a first interaction with Guido Ashoff, the consultant selected for conducting the client survey study. The study has now moved into the implementation phase, and interviews with various stakeholders, including key players in capitals, will take place over the coming months. The Sub-Group will meet on 15 October to review a draft report prepared by the consultant.

#### **d) New areas**

- **Lessons learned on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Peace Building**

11. It was noted that the Evaluation Matrix (Room Document No. 4) included several planned evaluations on conflict-related issues, notably on conflict reconstruction and peace building. Jan Dybfest (Norway) indicated that Norway was considering holding a conference on peace building in 2003.

12. Summing up the discussion on post conflict, the Chair noted the interest expressed by several Members in this topic and the relevance to the DAC agenda. He offered to prepare a note outlining some ideas on how joint work or a synthesis evaluation could be carried forward.

13. On 'difficult partnerships' the World Bank indicated that it has started looking at a number of countries which are considered by the Bank as Low-Income Countries under Stress (LICUS). The Secretariat noted the collaboration between the DAC and the World Bank on these issues and the decision made at the May DAC High-Level Meeting to pursue joint work. Ted Kliet (the Netherlands) stressed the importance of exploring the experience of NGOs, as they often become the key actors in such difficult partnership situations. He also evoked the possibility of including this as a topic for the outreach workshop with NGOs.

- **Evaluation of general budget support**

14. Joanne Asquith (UK) presented suggestions for the evaluation of general budget support (Room Document No. 7). Summing up the discussion, the Chair concluded that this proposal had received wide interest and there was strong support to hold a workshop to bring forward this work. (Further information on this study can be found on the DFID website: <http://www.dgroups.org/groups/dfid/budgets/>).

**e) Other comments on the work programme**

15. In the context of the discussion of the future work programme and its related funding modalities for joint work, Horst Breier (Germany) noted the difficulties his government would have in the case of general support as opposed to specific projects. He recommended re-wording this section in the draft work programme. The Chair noted this comment and also the reservations expressed by France about general voluntary contribution (VC) support. He said that he intended to seek efficient, flexible and transparent ways of financing joint work, and that without VCs it would not be possible to implement the work programme. Mr. Isenman (Secretariat) noted that only those who could do so should consider providing "untied" funds, while others could continue the practice of project-specific funding to support joint work. Both practices are used in other working parties and the DAC networks.

**Theme II: Evaluation methods and approaches**

**Part 1 a) The Glossary**

16. The Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management had just been published and the Secretariat thanked the Members who had contributed substantively and financially to enable a successful conclusion of this project. The World Bank indicated that it will use the glossary in its IPDET training course (see Theme III). A list was circulated for "orders" by Members which resulted in numerous copies being ordered. A re-print has since been requested to meet internal and external demand.

**b) Results-based management**

17. The desk study review on results-based management issues has contributed to a number of agencies' considerations on how to take this agenda forward internally, as well as contributing to various international events. The upcoming June 2002 MDB Round Table on better measuring, monitoring and managing for results was noted in this context as well as current review work by DFID of selected multilateral institutions. It was clear that the interrupted second phase of the WP-EV study would need to be re-designed to capture a rapidly evolving field and new review efforts. The Chair and the Secretariat were asked to collaborate on how to take this forward.

**c) Summing up**

18. In summing up the discussion, the Chair concluded that the theme of methods and approaches would not become a separate theme on its own. Instead, as it relates to both theme I (joint studies) and theme II (capacity and systems-related work) it will be integrated into these. He also noted the need for work on evaluation of donor contributions to PRSPs which was a theme likely to be on the evaluation agenda for most Members in the foreseeable future. This could create an opportunity for possible joint collaboration, rather than each agency assessing individually its part of the support. The experience of the CDF evaluation will be important in this respect; the report should be finalised in January 2003. The implications of this evaluation would likely merit attention at a forthcoming meeting.

**Part 2 Focus session on agency performance/development effectiveness reports**

19. Three members were invited to make presentations on their annual reporting systems and mechanisms and share key findings of recent exercises:

20. Colin Kirk (UK) presented the first study it has conducted in terms of a comprehensive Development Effectiveness Report on "How effective is DFID? " addressing both development and organisational effectiveness issues. Key issues for DFID included the need to clarify its overall strategy, and give higher priority to strengthening performance assessments and evaluation systems. The study

showed that attribution is still a difficult issue in assessing effectiveness. While the study was judged useful overall, it remains inconclusive as regards how effective DFID is. However, it appears likely that the effectiveness of DFID's support is increasing and making a growing contribution to development progress.

21. Gerry Britan indicated that USAID has been producing performance reports since the early 1990s. Their reports focus on performance at the operational and country level and try to clarify what AID has accomplished and why it is important. For many years the reports were deemed to be effective as a communications tool to the general public but less so much for improving policy and practice. Two years ago the format and audience of the report was modified to make it more useful for operational decision-making within AID, and other tools were developed for communicating with the public.

22. Osvaldo Feinstein presented the various types of performance reporting tools the World Bank has developed over the years, notably the Annual Report on Development Effectiveness (ARDE) and the Annual Report on Operations Evaluation (AROE), and their respective coverage and dimensions. The presentation is posted on the WP-EV web site, together with the DfID presentation.

23. Some Members related their experiences in this field and indicated encountering difficulty in showing correlation between the support from one donor and the outcome on the people in the partner country.

24. Marco Ferroni (IADB) commented on a reporting exercise which has come up with an important finding: projects are not designed or monitored to show development results. In this regard, the IADB will try to move towards higher levels of action in its partner countries, with a view to keep their evaluability in mind.

25. Gobarshan Singh (Canada) was invited by the Chair to make a few general remarks on reporting systems. He indicated that reporting systems present a challenge in various dimensions. He suggested six criteria which he judged important for reporting on at an aggregate level: i) the need for clear organisational context and strategic expected outcome; ii) the need for clear expectations on achievements; iii) key results being reported against the expectations; iv) the reliability of performance and of the information supporting it; v) whether the information is used; vi) the overall quality of the message.

26. Mr. Singh noted that in the Canadian context there had been an evolution in reporting by the Auditor General. More reference is made now to Canada's contribution to development rather than attributing development outcomes to Canada's efforts.

27. Hans Lundgren (Secretariat) indicated that development effectiveness depends on many variables in addition to aid. Donors are hence only partially, and sometimes only marginally, responsible for development effectiveness while they are definitely responsible for making their aid programmes effective.

### **Theme III: Evaluation systems and capacities**

#### **a) Evaluation capacity building**

28. In the discussion, Members underlined the importance of building evaluation capacity aimed both at Members and partners with scope for synergy between these efforts. Several multilateral institutions noted the lack of awareness of the role of evaluation, hence demand for it among partners, and the need to build incentives frameworks. Graham Walter (ADB) noted the limited success experienced so far in building capacity in partner countries. The new context with PRSPs was referred to and the need for capacity development to respond to related monitoring and evaluation needs. The link between audit functions and performance evaluation was also noted and stressed as a possible entry point for capacity

building efforts. Osvaldo Feinstein (World Bank) underlined the need for regional centres of excellence in evaluation and for strengthening evaluation associations.

29. Linda Morra (World Bank) presented the upcoming training course on evaluation (IPDET) and invited Members to consider participating or sending their evaluation staff to the course, as well as providing financing for developing country participants. She also referred to the successful course that took place last year to which several members of the WP EV had contributed.

30. Nurul Alam (UNDP) informed members that the first meeting of IDEAS was planned for September in New Dehli.

31. The Chair suggested that an inventory/survey of ongoing initiatives should be drawn up to better map out what is happening in terms of supporting partner countries. No volunteer was identified however.

#### **b) Experimental scorecard**

32. The Chair expressed appreciation of the offer by Goberdhan Singh (Canada), who in the context of the updating of the evaluation policy of CIDA, volunteered to draw up a draft experimental scorecard which could be used in the WP and also, subsequently, in a dialogue with partners. This could become a useful instrument for Members internally and for the WP-EV, including in the field of continued collaboration with peer reviews.

#### **c) Policy note**

33. He noted the support for elaboration of a policy note on "Improving aid programmes through better use of evaluation and its results" that would be submitted to the DAC, possibly at senior level, and build on earlier feedback work in the WP. The limited use of evaluation was a continued concern and such a note could contribute to a helpful dialogue on learning from evaluations as well as stressing the importance of evaluation systems. It was agreed that the task team should meet in the autumn to plan in more detail the work schedule on the various items under this task.

#### **d) Outreach event with NGOs and non-member multilateral organisations**

34. Daniel Kamelgarn (France), chair of the steering committee on the outreach workshop presented briefly the background to the organisation of this event and some elements of the plan so far. The workshop will be held in Paris back-to-back with the March 2003 WP-EV meeting. The themes proposed include: evaluation practices by NGOs; evaluation as a means to accountability; enhancing evaluation capacity; and collaboration and joint work between development agencies and NGOs. The next steps are for Members to consult informally with key NGOs in their countries to sound out their interest in such an event. Members expressed a strong interest in the workshop and some had already begun to consult certain partner NGOs which were interested in participating.

#### **e) Inventory**

35. Goberdhan Singh (Canada) reported on the improvements made to the inventory both in terms of technological and practical improvements. The Secretariat (Marc Tocatlian) briefed Members about the Development Gateway and AIDA and indicated how a link to the inventory on these portals would increase visibility of the inventory.

**Item 5. Election of the chair and vice-chairs and leaders for the three main themes of the work programme**

36. The Secretariat (Paul Isenman) invited nominations for the Chairmanship of the group. Colin Kirk, vice-chair (UK) nominated Rob D. van den Berg as chair, noting the engagement and leadership he had shown in the WP context and also in the Utstein evaluation network. Switzerland seconded him. For the election of vice-chairs, France nominated Colin Kirk (UK) and Australia nominated Niels Dabelstein (Denmark).

37. The outgoing chair, Niels Dabelstein, expressed his sincere appreciation to Members of the WP for their considerable support and confidence and thanked the Secretariat for the backing he had received during his chairmanship.

38. The newly-elected chair, Rob D. van den Berg, thanked Members for the vote of confidence expressed in electing him as chair. He said that he intended to chair the WP-EV for a period of two years. He underlined the importance of the main lines of work in the new work programme and expressed his intention to reach out to other evaluation communities and also make the work of the WP-EV better known to a broader development community.

**Item 6. DAC Development Partnership Forum**

39. The Secretariat (Mr. Lundgren) briefly referred to the outcome of recent HLM discussions; as a consequence, work is planned on aid effectiveness for the DAC PWB period 2003-04. The theme of the Partnership Forum will be discussed by the DAC but he flagged the possibility that if a broad approach to aid effectiveness issues were retained, inputs were likely to be expected from the WP. [A Room Document on the Forum was issued to the DAC meeting on 18 June, see DCD/DAC/A(2002)12/RD1.]

**Item 7. Further discussion/suggestions related to the evaluation matrix and to the note on highlights of evaluation developments**

40. In response to a question by the Secretariat about the usefulness of the matrix, several Members expressed their support for continuing the practice of a matrix of firmly planned evaluations. They also found the document on highlights of recent evaluation developments a useful complement. It was noted that this required more timely submissions by Members and Observers as it was difficult to provide any analysis as some submissions were made only days before the meeting was held. Members indicated their interest in using the matrix more as a planning tool. The Secretariat (Monique Bergeron) noted the importance and the interest for the matrix in other subsidiary bodies as many expert groups are not aware of evaluation plans related to their areas.

**Item 8. Other business**

41. A brief report on work of the Evaluation Co-operation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks (ECG) was provided by Marco Ferroni (IADB). IADB is currently chair of the ECG. Mr Nurul Alam (UNDP) reported on the UN Inter Agency Working Group on Evaluation, and its upcoming meeting at the end of June.

42. The Chair stressed the need for co-operation among the main elements of the evaluation architecture and referred to Figure 5 "Towards a new evaluation architecture" contained in the paper "Development Co-operation and Performance Evaluation: The Monterrey Challenge" by Robert Picciotto which was tabled at the meeting.

43. The Chair expressed his thanks to Bob Picciotto for his contributions over many years to the work of the WP-EV and for his support and collaborative engagement. He noted the many valuable inputs provided and his leadership in the evaluation field which had contributed to progress over the last years in terms of collective action.

## ANNEX 1

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Item 1.	Draft Annotated Agenda	DCD/DAC/EV/A(2002)1
Item 2.	Summary Record of the 35th Meeting	DCD/DAC/EV/M(2001)2/PROV
Item 4.	Brainstorming Discussion	Room Document No. 1
	Draft Programme of Work 2003-2004	DCD/DAC/EV(2002)1
4a.	Lessons Learned in Donor Support to Decentralisation and Local Governance	Room Document No. 2
	Evaluation and Gender	Room Document No. 3
	Client Survey Study of Peer Reviews **	DCD/DIR(2002)12
	Development Co-operation in Difficult Partnerships **	DCD/DAC(2002)11/REV1
	Evaluation Matrix	Room Document No. 4
	Highlights of Evaluation Developments	Room Document No. 5
	Evaluation of General Budget Support: A Preliminary Study by DfID in Preparation for Joint Evaluation	Room Document No. 7
	Aid Responses to Afghanistan: Lessons from Previous Evaluations **	DCD/DIR(2001)31
4c.	“Development Partners in Evaluation” workshop	Room Document No. 6
	DAC Evaluation Abstracts Inventory	Room Document No. 8

\*\* (background material to the discussion)

## ANNEX 2

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

## Chairs:

**Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN (Denemark) / Mr. Rob D. van den BERG (Netherlands)**

## 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. Achim MORTIER</b>	Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development
	<b>Mr. Hans-Rimbert HEMMER</b>	KfW
	<b>Ms. Sabine MÜLLER</b>	GTZ
AUSTRALIE/AUSTRALIA	<b>Ms. Elizabeth BROUWER</b>	Director, Program Evaluation, Office of Review and Evaluation, AusAID
AUTRICHE/AUSTRIA	<b>Mr. Anton MAIR</b>	Head of Evaluation and Control Unit, Department of Development Co-operation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
CANADA	<b>Mr. Goberdhan SINGH</b>	Director of Evaluation, Evaluation Division, Performance Review Branch, CIDA
COMMISSION EUROPÉENNE/ EUROPEAN COMMISSION	<b>Mr. Jean-Louis CHOMEL</b>	Head, Evaluation Unit, EuropeAid
	<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>Mr. Fernando SOTO MORA</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
FINLANDE/FINLAND	<b>Ms. Pirjo VIRTANEN</b>	Counsellor, Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<b>Ms. Krista NAPOLA</b>	Programme Officer, Development Cooperation
FRANCE	<b>Mr. Daniel KAMELGARN</b>	Responsable de l'Unité d'Evaluation, Direction du Trésor, Ministère de l'Economie, des Finances et de l'Industrie
	<b>Mme. Anne-Marie CABRIT</b>	Chef de la Division 'Politiques et Etudes', Agence française de développement (AFD)
	<b>Mr. Yves FICATIER</b>	Evaluateur, Division des évaluations rétrospectives, AFD
	<b>Mme. Elisabeth BARSACQ</b>	Chef du bureau de l'évaluation, Direction générale de la coopération internationale et du développement (DGCID), Ministère des affaires étrangères
	<b>Mme. Melissa BONNETON</b>	Stagiaire
IRLANDE/IRELAND	<b>Mr. Finbar O'BRIEN</b>	Analyst, Evaluation and Audit Unit, Ireland Aid
ITALIE/ITALY	<b>Mr. Antonio VERDE</b>	Head of Evaluation Unit, Directorate-General for Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<b>Mr. Guglielmo RIVA</b>	Evaluation Officer, Directorate-General for Development Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
JAPON/JAPAN	<b>Mr. Futao MOTAI</b>	Director, Aid Evaluation Division Economic Cooperation Bureau, MOFA
	<b>Mr. Kazuhide NAGASAWA</b>	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 Assistance Evaluation Office, JBIC
	<b>Mr. Takua SUGAWARA</b>	Permanent Delegation of Japan to OECD
	<b>Mr. Yuji MORIYA</b>	JICA France Office

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
NOUVELLE ZELANDE	<b>Mr. Brian WILSON</b>	Permanent Delegation to OECD
PAYS-BAS/ NETHERLANDS	<b>Mr. Rob D. van den BERG</b>	Director, Policy and Operations Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	<b>Mr. Ted KLIEST</b>	Policy and Operations Evaluation Department
PORTUGAL	<b>Ms. Maria Celeste BARRIER</b>	Direction de Services d'Etudes, Planification et Evaluation (EPA), Institut de la Coopération Portugaise
	<b>Mr. Paulo Jorge 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
	<b>Ms. Joanne ASQUITH</b>	Evaluation Department, DfID
SUEDE/SWEDEN	<b>Ms. Eva LITHMAN</b>	Director, Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
	<b>Mr. Stefan MOLUND</b>	Deputy 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. Paul OBRIST</b>	Permanent Delegation to OECD
<b>Observateurs / Observers</b>		
FOND MONÉTAIRE INTERNATIONAL/ INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND	<b>Mr. Graham JUSTICE</b>	Senior Economist, IMF Office in Europe
GROUPE BANQUE MONDIALE/ WORLD BANK GROUP	<b>Mr. Osvaldo FEINSTEIN</b>	Manager, Partnerships and Knowledge Programs, Operations Evaluation Department,

	<b>Ms. Rema BALASUNDARAM</b>	Evaluation Officer, Operations Evaluation Department
	<b>Ms. Linda MORRA</b>	Operations Evaluation Group
PROGRAMME DE DÉVELOPPEMENT DES NATIONS UNIS/ UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	<b>Mr. Nurul ALAM</b>	Deputy Director, Evaluation Office
	<b>Mr. Douglas KEH</b>	Evaluation Office

**Autres participants / Additional participants**

BANQUE AFRICAINE DE DEVELOPPEMENT/ AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	<b>Mr. Mohamed Hédi MANAÏ</b>	Chief Evaluation Officer, Operations Evaluation Department
BANQUE ASIATIQUE DE DEVELOPPEMENT/ ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	<b>Mr. Graham WALTER</b>	Director, Operations Evaluation Division 1
	<b>Mr. Stephen CURRY</b>	Lead Evaluation Specialist
BANQUE INTER-AMÉRICAINNE DE DEVELOPPEMENT / INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK	<b>Mr Marco FERRONI</b>	Principal Evaluation Officer, Office of Evaluation and Oversight
	<b>Ms. Julie FEINSILVER</b>	Evaluation Officer, Office of Evaluation and Oversight

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

<b>Ms. Monique BERGERON</b>	Administrator, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation, DCD
<b>Mr. Richard CAREY</b>	Deputy Director, 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>Ms. Carola MIRAS</b>	Assistant, Strategic Management of Development Co-operation